

TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS

LAURO A. MUNOZ, OTR, MOT, CHC

TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS

An evaluation that allows for deeper analysis of underlying impairments contributing to activity limitations and participation restrictions during performance of the actual occupation

- This evaluation approach begins by analyzing the roles of the individual and the areas of occupation that encompass the client's typical day.



BOTTOM UP EVALUATIONS

An evaluation approach that focuses on possible impairments affecting performance of functional tasks.

The focus is on the client's impairments and generic abilities and makes inferences as to how these might affect performance in present and future occupations



TYPICAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The choice of evaluation approach is partially influenced by the client's ability to engage actively in the evaluation process. During the evaluation process, the occupational therapist may move between a top-down and bottom-up approach, depending on the phase of recovery and the client's expressed desired outcomes.



EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS

MICHELLE HEDLEY , 2013

"Take on global perspective and focus on the client's participation" (Brown & Chien 2010) in the context they live. Bottom Up Approach "They tend to examine small separate components of a client's skills, or occupational performance components" (Brown & Chien 2010). Top Down Approach

Spirituality

Environment

Contextual

Personal Goals

Lifestyle Exploration Physical impairment

Evaluate specific criteria

Components causing performance issues



EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS 2

In contrast to the macrolevel, Christiansen and Baum (1997) describe the bottom up approach as a microlevel functional level of analysis based on data acquisition. This only addresses one aspect of occupation as a tool. Top Down Focuses on ability of client to participate in meaningful occupations. Examining motivations, routines, habits, and roles within their environment. Evaluates how the environmental demands influence occupational performance. The information gathered guides intervention (Ideishi 2003 cited by Kramer et al. 2003, p.281). Physical Learning Disabilities Top Down & Bottom Up A person with learning disabilities has a range of needs that require an holistic approach facilitating strategies for needs that continue through person's lifetime. Top down approach suits learning disabilities as this meets all needs of the person, e.g. OT's encourage those with learning disabilities to engage in meaningful occupations (COT 2011).



EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS 3

An example of this is in Autism. Autism affects the child's ability to perform key occupational roles. A top-down approach is ideally suited to address these kinds of issues. The therapist focuses on barriers to his/her occupational performance, and addresses issues such as the development or acquisition of skills, and compensation or task adaptation where necessary. Adapting the environment is also an important part of the top-down approach, e.g. facilitating capacity building for the child and his/her family, rather than implementing strategies that aim to reduce the characteristics of the condition as a bottom up approach tends to do.



EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS 4

Pediatrics Top Down Addressing the child's problems in occupational performance, together with their role participation at home, school and in the community (Chen et al 2003).

Adopts an individual client centered approach focused on strategy based skill position. Bottom Up Limited as focused primarily on physical deficits not taking into account the many variables present in the child's life. Top Down The selection process involves the information gathering from notes and interview (Pearson 1999). The OT recognizes areas that need to be assessed and chooses ax and goal setting approaches. MOHO which is a top down approach is a favored model in mental health settings in due to its components, e.g. Dorset Healthcare Trust use MOHOST as a standardized assessment tool. Bottom Up Putting the impairment first and blending together knowledge of performance requirements.

EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS 4

Christiansen, C.H. & Baum, C.M., 2005. Occupational Therapy Performance, Participation, and Well-Being. 3rd ed. : Slack Incorporated.
Case-Smith, J., 2005. Occupational Therapy for Children. 5th ed. Missouri: Elsevier Mosby.

Chen, H.F., Tickle-Degnen, L., & Cremack, S. A., 2003. The Treatment Effectiveness of Top-down Approaches for Children with Developmental Coordination Disorder: A Meta- Analysis in Journal of Occupational Therapy Association, R.O.C. 21, 16-28.

Hemphill-Pearson, B.J., 1999. Assessments in Occupational Therapy Mental Health: An Integrative Approach. 2nd ed. United States of America: SLACK Incorporated.

Ideishi, R.I., 2003. Influence of Occupation on Assessment and Treatment. In: Ch.10. Kramer, P., Hinojosa, J., & Royeen, C.B., 2003. Perspectives in Human Occupation: Participation in Life. United States of America: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.

Laver, A.J., & Baum, C.M., 1992. Areas of Occupational Therapy Assessment Related to the NCMRR Model of Dysfunction. In: Laver, A.J., 1994. The Development of the Structured Observational Test of Function (SOTOF). Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Surrey, Guildford, 185 - 186, 191.

Lintern, S., 2012 . Mortality rate for mental illness is three times the population average. Health Services Journal. Available from : <http://www.hsj.co.uk/news/mortality-rate-for-mental-illness-is-three-times-the-population-average/5046462.article> [Accessed 12th January 2013].

National Center for Medical [[# | Rehabilitation]] Research (NCMRR), 1992. Report and Plan for Medical Rehabilitation Research to Congress. NCMRR, US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD.

EVIDENCE ON TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS 5

Payne, S., Howell, C., 2005, An evaluation of the clinical use of the assessment of motor and process skills with children). In: Occupation in occupational therapy: a labour in vain? In: occupational therapy and physical dysfunction, Curtin M., Molineux M., Supyk-Mellson J., 2010, Elsevier limited

Rodger, S., 2010. Occupation centred practice with children: A practical guide for occupational Therapists. Malaysia: Wiley Blackwell.

Trombly, C., 1993. Anticipating the Future: Assessment of Occupational Function. American Journal of Occupational Therapy (47): 253-257.

Turner, A., et al., 2002. 5th ed. Occupational Therapy and Physical Dysfunction: Principles, Skills and Practice. London: Churchill Livingstone.



EXAMPLES OF TOP DOWN EVALUATIONS

A-ONE

AMPS

Executive Function Performance Test

Kitchen Task Assessment

Multiple Errands Test , although not developed by occupational therapists

MOHOST

SCOPE

