

ISWP Testing Subcommittee

February 1, 2017 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Testing Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, December 7, 2016 from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Meeting Recording Link: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p5t71nlsxhq/>

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 1st, 2017, 7:00 a.m. U.S. Eastern Time

Discussion (action items are in bold/underline):

Call focused on the Intermediate Knowledge and Skills test.

- 1. Testing Subcommittee Co-chair:** Elsje Scheffler has stepped down as co-chair but will remain a Training Subcommittee members. Dietlind Gretschel takes over as co-chair. We thank Elsje for her commitment and leadership.
- 2. Intermediate Knowledge Test:** Beta phase was launched on December 5, 2016. Krithika sent an invitation to WG members and partners. To date, have had 15 people take the test, of which 14 passed. Krithika then invited them to submit case studies. Two individuals have submitted case studies so far.

Subject matter experts are reviewing all of the knowledge test questions, which Krithika is revising and uploading to test.com. Krithika described the process to remove, add and change questions.

- 3. Intermediate Skills Test:** The beta phase also was launched on December 5. Invitations were sent to 32 individuals who passed the alpha phase, as well as 25 people who took the test between September 1st 2016 and January 31 2017. Of those, 19 secured a pass score, for a total of 51 people. We received 2 case studies this week, subject matter experts are reviewing.

The rubric currently is formatted in a Word document. Elsje suggested converting to an editable PDF form, which will facilitate sharing with the participant. Group discussed whether the individual rubrics would be shared or just final scores with comments.

Elsje said since some participants may submit case studies over a period of time. To have similarity between knowledge and skills test, the knowledge test shows incorrect responses and provides answers. Patience and Sue agreed with Elsje that it is important to provide feedback. Patience – with team in Asia – has been doing mentoring after WSTP training – follow up with clients who have been assessed and fitted and provided the service provider feedback on areas for improvement.

Elsje suggested adding a comments section next to each line on the table to permit

comments. Krithika to revise and send to the Subcommittee.

Once the primary reviewer has finished, where does it go next. Or, can the primary reviewer submit to the next reviewer directly, with a copy to ISWP.

For the pilot, send second package both to primary reviewer and secondary (moderator) at the same time. When the primary reviewer is finished, then it is sent to the moderator. Group agreed it is better not to know the country where the participant is located. The Candidate ID is enough.

One participant asked how long it will be before he/she receives results. Elsje explained the process and specially with the pilot, she had mentioned that it will take more than 72 hours.

Elsje said we need to include a message to the reviewers that indicates should the reviewer identify the participant, client or organization and has prior knowledge the reviewer should declare a conflict of interest, and the case study would be sent to another reviewer.

For the pilot phase, Dr. Goldberg had previously recommended forwarding the package to one expert contributor, who will review and return to Krithika with a score. The next submission will go to the second expert; the third, to the third expert, and the fourth, back to the first expert. Elsje and Dietlind recommend two subject matter experts evaluate the submissions to ensure consistency in how scores are applied. Elsje described another project where case studies were submitted. It was good to have two people to evaluate the submission; one person could identify something or provide a different point of view, resulting in a more balanced evaluation overall. It doesn't take that much more time for the second reviewer. Group agreed to use the two-evaluator approach for the pilot phase.

3. **Open Discussion:** Elsje asked ISWP to re-send the calendar invitation for the Testing Subcommittee call so that it appears correctly on everyone's calendars.

Participants *(check mark indicates participation on call)*

- ✓ Sue Fry, Motivation Africa
- 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
- ✓ Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh
- Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Krithika Kandavel and Nancy Augustine