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The History & Future of RaceRunning

• 2009: CPISRA classification for RaceRunning first implemented: RR1, RR2, RR3 classes

• 2018: RaceRunning introduced at WPA European Championships (RR1, RR2/3)

• 2019: RaceRunning on the programme for WPA World Championships (RR2/3)

• 2020: Introduction WPA Classification for RaceRunning

• 2024: Paralympic Games?
RaceRunning Classification: A Delphi Study

- 3-round Delphi survey study
- Panel of 48 experts from 15 countries across 4 continents
- Current and former athletes, coaches, founders, classifiers (RaceRunning and other WPA/IPC events), sports administrators, health professionals and academics
- Consensus defined as >80% agreement amongst those who answered
The Current Classification

Does the CPISRA classification fulfil its aim to minimise the impact of eligible impairments on the outcome of competition?

- Yes: 64
- Partially: 28
- No: 8
Eligible Impairment Types, MIC & Classes

The panel agreed that:

- Eligible impairment types at elite level should initially be: hypothonia, ataxia, athetosis (81% consensus)
- Athletes should be unable to functionally run (91% consensus)
- Effort should be directed towards making the description of the classes more precise and standardised (95% consensus)
- The number of classes should be informed by research (91% consensus)
The Physical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

Are the current components of the physical assessments **objective**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Partially (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spasticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to isolate joint movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static trunk control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic trunk control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of motion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph depicting the distribution of scores (0-100) for each component]
Are the current components of the physical assessments resistant to RaceRunning training?

The Physical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

- Spasticity
- Ability to isolate joint movements
- Static trunk control
- Dynamic trunk control
- Range of motion

- Yes (%)
- Partially (%)
- No (%)

[Bar chart showing the quality of the tests for each component]
The Physical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

Are the current components of the physical assessments sufficiently resistant to RaceRunning training?

- Spasticity
- Ability to isolate joint movements
- Static trunk control
- Dynamic trunk control
- Range of motion

Yes (%)  No (%)
The Physical Assessment

• Agreement that all assessments are at least partially objective

• Concern about resistance to RaceRunning training for all assessments except spasticity
The Physical Assessment

- Agreement that all assessments are *at least partially* objective
- Scope for improvement: more use of standardised tests
- Panel agreed on the inclusion of (part of):
  - Selective Control Assessment of the Lower Extremity (SCALE) (96% agreement)
  - Trunk Control Measurement Scale (TCMS) (88% agreement)
  - Scale for the Assessment and Rating of Ataxia (SARA) (84% agreement)
  - Australian Spasticity Assessment Scale (ASAS) (83% agreement)
  - Passive Range of Motion (85% agreement)
The Technical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

Are the current components of the technical assessments objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Partially (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foot drag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stride efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startle reflex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to steer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to brake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are the current components of the technical assessments resistant to RaceRunning training?

The Technical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

Foot drag: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Asymmetry: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Stride efficiency: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Propulsion power: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Startle reflex: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Ability to steer: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Ability to brake: Yes (%), Partially (%), No (%)
Are the current components of the technical assessments *sufficiently resistant to RaceRunning* training?

### The Technical Assessment: Quality of the Tests

- **Foot drag**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Asymmetry**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Stride efficiency**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Propulsion power**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Startle reflex**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Ability to steer**: 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Ability to brake**: 80% Yes, 20% No
The Technical Assessment

- Agreement that all assessments are at least partially objective
- Concern about resistance to RaceRunning training for all assessments except the startle reflex
Conclusion RaceRunning Classification

• WPA Classification should be based on CPISRA classification

• Classification should use standardised tests of impairments that are associated with activity limitation in RaceRunning

• Classification test scores should be longitudinally monitored to gain insight into the effect of sport-specific training

• Number of classes should be determined by research
Hvordan det vær?

Svært kan det være!
A massive thank you to the panel!