

ISWP Testing Subcommittee

December 2, 2015 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Testing Subcommittee met via Adobe Connect on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. EST. This provides a recap.

Link to Meeting Recording: <https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p6jrv3m8wgw/>

Next Meeting:

Discussion

1. Intermediate Skills Assessment Rubric - Content

Celia had a concern about including 24-hour postural management in the rubric. Sudhakar agrees that it may not be beneficial to include. Elsje asked how it would affect the scoring. The subcommittee voted: (1) Leave it in-Mandatory, (1) Leave it in-Optional, and (4) Take it out. The subcommittee decided to remove this category.

The subcommittee decided to include all other categories.

See discussion point 3: Item-Specific Scoring (below) for individual criteria content alterations.

2. Intermediate Skills Assessment Rubric - Scoring

The subcommittee discussed the inclusion of critical pass/fail points. Mary suggested that pass/fail should only be if there is an immediate safety concern. Celia suggested some points could lead to automatic failure in a given section, rather than overall. The subcommittee voted to have pass/fail points to be per section rather than for the overall assessment.

Elsje suggested that the scoring could be three-part (adequate, inadequate but safe, and inadequate but unsafe). Mary suggested a threshold number of points candidates must



ISWP 10 University of Pittsburgh 10 6425 Penn Avenue, Suite 400 10 Pittsburgh, PA USA
15206

www.wheelchairnet.org

receive to pass overall.

Mary suggested 70% and Elsjie suggested 75% to pass. The subcommittee agreed on 75%. Mary suggested that if the candidate is not awarded 2 points in a section, the rubric will include comments (4th column) from the evaluator about what was incorrect. After the full rubric review, there were 20 criteria and 40 possible points. Therefore, candidates would need 30 points to pass (75%). The subcommittee also agreed that candidates cannot have more than 3 '0's total between preparation, prescription, assessment, and fitting. This information will be contained in the third column of the rubric.

3. Item-Specific Scoring

For the first criteria, Elsjie suggested the hip, trunk, and pelvis must be correct because they all influence the spine. Elsjie and Mary suggested that the scoring could be 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis posture are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), and 2 (all correct).

For item number 2, the subcommittee decided the critical pass/fail point would be the hand placement. The scoring would be as follows: 0 (photograph does not match description and incorrect hand placement), 1 (unclear and/or incorrect hand placement), 2 (correct). Dietlind suggested adjusting the assessment form to clarify that hand position must be demonstrated.

For item number 3 (temporary support), the scoring would be as follows: 0 (did not identify correct temporary supports and/or combinations), 1 (NONE), 2 (identify correct supports and fixed deformity).

For item number 4, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis posture are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (correct).

For item number 5, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis posture are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (checklist matches photographs of user).



ISWP 10 University of Pittsburgh 10 6425 Penn Avenue, Suite 400 10 Pittsburgh, PA USA
15206

www.wheelchairnet.org

For item number 6, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis posture are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (checklist matches photographs of user).

For item number 7, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (have not taken all of the critical measurements), 1 (1-2 errors), 2 (table completed correctly, i.e. ratio matches the photo in the final hand simulation).

For item number 8, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (incorrect), 1 (1-2 errors), 2 (correct).

For item number 9, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (basic posture support requirements are unmet and inadequate explanation), 1 (incorrect selection for environment, user function, fit, etc. according to resources and explanation is inadequate), 2 (correct basic support requirements and adequate explanation).

Item 10 was deleted.

For item number 11, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis posture and explanation are incorrect), 1 (error in user function, fit, etc.), 2 (correct posture and explanation).

For item number 12, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips and/or pelvis posture are incorrect), 1 (errors in legs, etc.), 2 (correct).

For item number 13, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis PSD are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (checklist matches hand simulation/supports identified in hand simulation).

For item number 14, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis PSD drawings are incorrect), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (checklist drawings match hand simulation/supports identified in hand simulation).

Item 15 was deleted.



For item number 16, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis wheelchair modifications are incorrect, if needed), 1 ("something" is wrong for the limbs and head), 2 (correct, whether or not modifications are made is based on user needs).

For item number 17, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips and/or pelvis placement and pressure are inadequate based on cushion selection or modification), 1 ("something" is wrong for the limbs), 2 (correct selection).

For item number 18, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis placement are inadequate based on hand simulation), 1 ("something" is wrong for the limbs), 2 (correct selection).

For item number 19, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (hips, trunk, and/or pelvis are incorrect and do not match hip/pelvis posture screen and hand simulation findings), 1 (error in drawing or photograph, description of limbs and head is wrong), 2 (checklist matches hip/pelvis posture screen and hand simulation findings).

For item number 20, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (training needs were not identified), 1 (training needs were identified, but inadequate), 2 (training needs were identified correctly).

For item number 21, the scoring would be as follows: 0 (follow up appointment was not given), 1 (follow up appointment was given, but inadequate timeframe according to posture and risk factors), 2 (follow up appointment was given with appropriate findings).

Item 22 was deleted.

Item 23 is the reflection and therefore not scored. This is the candidate's opportunity to clarify, explain, motivate, background information to the assessor (information about the user, information about their clinical reasoning, etc.). The content of the reflection can influence scoring of other sections.

Action Items



ISWP 10 University of Pittsburgh 10 6425 Penn Avenue, Suite 400 10 Pittsburgh, PA USA
15206

www.wheelchairnet.org

Rachel will distribute the process guidelines document to the subcommittee.

Rachel will update the rubric and assessment form. The updated rubric will be distributed to the subcommittee.



ISWP 10 University of Pittsburgh 10 6425 Penn Avenue, Suite 400 10 Pittsburgh, PA USA
15206

www.wheelchairnet.org

Participants (name, company)

- ✓ Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult
- ✓ Celia Stubbs, Motivation UK
- ✓ Jamie Noon, Independent Consultant
- ✓ Mr. Sudhakar and Ms. Venilla, Mobility India
- ✓ Dietlind Gretschesell, Rehab Lab
- ✓ Nekram Upadhyay, Indian Spinal Injuries Centre
- ✓ Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India
- ✓ Abdullah Munish, Motivation Africa
- ✓ Tamsin Langford, Motivation UK
- ✓ Alex Miles, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Rachel Gartz, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Rachel Gartz, University of Pittsburgh



ISWP 10 University of Pittsburgh 10 6425 Penn Avenue, Suite 400 10 Pittsburgh, PA USA
15206

www.wheelchairnet.org