

ISWP Competency Subcommittee

July 6, 2017 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Competency Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, July 6th, 2017 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Meeting Recording Link: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/pwb56u1d33tc/>

Next Meeting: Please indicate your availability for the August Competency subcommittee call through this link: <http://doodle.com/poll/3mc7dr487a3bduvd>

Discussion

1. Brief updates from ISWP

- **ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Basic Test:** The test is now available in 13 languages: Albanian, Arabic, English, French, Lao, Mandarin, Khmer, Portuguese, Russian, Romanian, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese. As of June 30th 2017, the test was attempted by 1782 test takers across all languages with a pass rate of 71%.
- **ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Intermediate Test:**
 - a. **Knowledge Test** 225 test takers with 65% as the pass rate. The test is also being piloted in Spanish; 29 test takers have taken the test so far. Krithika sent them invitations to submit case studies in Spanish. No case studies received yet.
 - b. **Skills Test:** Ten case studies from 5 test takers have been submitted so far.
- **Mentoring Pilot:** 12 participants will take part in this pilot. They have been divided into three groups. As the next step, each participant will be invited to present on their case study presentation.

2. Discussion:

- **Selection of volunteers to assist with the scoring of case studies submitted as part of the skills test**

Dietlind updated the group that apart from Elsje, Sue and herself there were two other volunteers to score the case studies. Sarah to follow-up with Rosi of her interest to volunteer.

Dietlind also added that there was a very large discrepancy when compared with her scores with that of the volunteer. Elsje also helped in moderating Dietlind's score to be sure. Dietlind empathized the importance of the volunteer having the skills and knowledge to mark the scores and hence critical to have some standard and well drafted criteria for the volunteers.

Sarah suggested to have some kind of induction process. Elsje added that there are also reviewers and moderators for each case study in this process. She also added that it's important to select more experienced volunteers so that the primary and secondary evaluators have adequate skills and knowledge to work on the tool.

Sarah asked the group if the volunteers are aware of the discrepancy. Elsje mentioned the importance of selecting volunteers who had went through the WHO WSTPt – Intermediate Level and suggested that we could set this as the baseline for selection along with practicing and delivering at that level.

Elsje added that she was able to identify many missing pieces when she moderated the scoresheet from Sara Munera and so suggested for some clear and consistent criteria to select the volunteers who can mark the case studies which will help minimize the large discrepancy. Dietlind suggested to include 3 years of working experience at the intermediate level to the list.

Sarah added that she's concerned on the small pool of people that we might be pushed to draw from if we establish strict set of criteria. Sarah suggested to provide a feedback to Sara Munera explaining on the missing pieces in her scoring process. Sarah also volunteered to look at the case study and provide her feedback/thoughts as an external reviewer.

Sue suggested to have Sara, Elsje and Dietlind's comments and scores in one document. **Krithika** to merge all the scores and comments into one document and share it with the group.

Mary suggested to add the criteria from today's discussion to the existing list and continue to recruit volunteers. She cautioned that she doesn't want to create a challenging system to miss out on eligible volunteers.

Elsje suggested that we should also think about putting together a mentoring process to assist for newer, younger and less-experienced Intermediate level trainers to also start working in this process under guidance and mentorship.

Mary suggested in having a tool that we're comfortable with and having it reliable and valid is better rather than having a tool that maybe changed in the future.

- Discussion on unifying group, [ToR \(updates in suggesting mode\)](#), and suggestions on how to strengthen activities moving forward

Mary suggested to put together a form with questions where the items will be prioritized and ranked in advance of the next meeting. **Krithika** to put together this document.

Participants (check mark indicates participation on call)

- ✓ Sue Fry, Motivation Africa
- ✓ Sarah Frost, Motivation UK
- Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India
- ✓ Dietlind Gretschel, Rehab Lab
- Tamsin Langford, Motivation UK
- Abdullah Munish, Motivation Africa
- Patience Mutiti, Motivation Africa
- Jamie Noon, Independent Consultant
- ✓ Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult
- Celia Stubbs, Motivation UK
- Mr. Sudhakar and Ms. Venilla, Mobility India
- Nekram Upadhyay, Indian Spinal Injuries Centre
- ✓ Alex Miles, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
- Jon Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
- Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Krithika Kandavel