

ISWP Competency Subcommittee

February 21st, 2018 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Competency Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, February 21st, 2018 from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Meeting Recording Link: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p7w7sng0a2d9/>

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 7th, 2018 at 10:00 am U.S. EST.

Discussion

1. Brief updates from ISWP

- **ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Basic Test:** The test is now available in 14 languages: Albanian, Arabic, English, French, Lao, Hindi, Mandarin, Khmer, Portuguese, Russian, Romanian, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese. 2,292 Basic Test takers as of 31st January, 2018 with 70% pass rate.
- **ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Intermediate Test:**
 - **a. Knowledge Test** 285 test takers with 65% as the pass rate. 38 Spanish test takers with 15% pass rate. ISWP received a request to translate intermediate test in Arabic, ICRC Iraq will assist.
 - **b. Skills Test:** For English, 19 case studies from 13 test takers (6 test takers submitted 2 case studies each) have been submitted so far. No case studies have been received yet for Spanish.

2. Update from Mentoring Phase 2: Case studies were submitted, scored and returned to mentees. The group currently is in the middle of case study presentations; a bit behind because of connection challenges. Goal was to have 2 mentors, each leading a group of 7 mentees. The second mentor had to withdraw from the program, so ISWP requested other mentors; due to the short timeframe, they were not available. The 7 mentees who had submitted case studies will participate in Phase 4.

Megan Giljam is mentor for Phase 3. Of the original group of 7 mentees, 2 new mentees withdrew; 4 of the remaining 5 mentees are from Phase 1.

Regarding the timeline, Phase 3 is delayed by two weeks due to working through mentors' and mentees' schedules. The new estimated timeline to complete Phase 3 is the week of March 9. Tutor sessions will begin the week of February 26 and focus on hand simulation, checklist and

checklist/drawings of PSDs. Depending on the number of tutor sessions, Megan anticipates completing Phase 3 the week of March 5.

3. Intervention Update and Activities for Future Competency Subcommittee Meetings: ISWP needs 3 additional mentors for the intervention (Phase 4, part of Alex Miles' dissertation). Dietlind is interested in participating. Megan and Sarah will follow up after checking schedules. ISWP welcomes suggestions of other mentors and ideas on how to expand the mentor pool.

Alex will send a survey to community requesting additional resources to use for the intervention. She will distribute the proposed additional resources to the subcommittee for feedback during March 2018 subcommittee call. ISWP also will validate Intermediate skills test score sheet on inter-rater reliability. Sue Fry said they had made suggestions to the score sheet and wondered whether the changes will be incorporated before it will be validated. Alex said they will.

Alex reviewed topics which were discussed during previous phases; namely, the time period and planning period prior to actual case study starting. For Intervention, she scheduled a month of planning time for mentors to review case studies. ISWP has received 15 case studies from 15 mentees which have not been scored yet so could be used for the intervention. Sue and Dietlind feel it is sufficient time for 5 mentees per mentor to review 5 case studies – one from each mentee.

4. Alternatives to Intermediate skills test: Mary received information from service providers around the world regarding what is done elsewhere related to skills assessment.

Subcommittee members are asked to review materials provided through this link: (LINK: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1nQOpp37i6uvLAoHfvY8ewcA6vHANJ381>) and be prepared to discuss on the March Subcommittee call.

The discussion of alternatives comes from a handful of concerns, including a Canadian test taker who indicated he did not feel comfortable sharing his prescription form, even with a client consent. And, the ISWP case study form is different than what he uses in day-to-day practice. While what we are requesting is not unique, Mary asked the subcommittee whether we design a process that is more contextually sensitive; e.g., a person already is completing a form specific to his/her center, could that be reviewed instead of the ISWP-approved form? Sarah indicated the UK is anticipating new legislation related to client privacy; it has not occurred yet, but likely there will be certain steps that need to be followed. Mary mentioned one option could be to do a real-time client evaluation via Skype or another platform. The mentee would need to have person's consent that an outside evaluator is participating as an observer; the observer could provide feedback after the official test part is completed. Sarah said it is difficult to have a video connection in countries where she is working. Sarah suggests **Subcommittee members** consider options and present during March Subcommittee call.

Participants *(check mark indicates participation on call)*

- ✓ Sue Fry, Motivation Africa
- ✓ Sarah Frost, Motivation UK
- ✓ Dietlind Gretschel, Rehab Lab (chair)
Patience Mutiti, Motivation Africa
Charles Kanyi, Motivation Africa
Haleluya Moshi, KCMC
Maureen Story, Sunny Hill Health Centre for Children
Megan Giljam, Shonaquip
Catherine Ellens, Sunny Hill Health Centre for Children
Sharon Sutherland, Consultant
Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult
Nekram Upadhyay, Indian Spinal Injuries Centre
- ✓ Alex Miles, University of Pittsburgh (co-chair)
- ✓ Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
Jon Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Nancy Augustine and Krithika Kandavel

Reviewed by: Dietlind Gretschel