

ISWP Testing Subcommittee

July 1, 2015 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Testing Subcommittee met by in-person on Wednesday, July 1, 2015 in Washington, D.C. This provides a recap.

Next Meeting: To be determined

Discussion:

1. Skills Assessment Structure

The group agreed that video documentation would not be possible.

The group agreed that the best direction would be to have candidates send images and write case studies to be evaluated. This is a method similar to methods used by Elsjé and Jamie to evaluate trainees. Privacy and confidentiality of wheelchair users will need to be addressed if images are made a part of the assessment structure. Permission must be obtained from the wheelchair user. Users should be given the option to give permission for photographs but excluding their faces from the photographs.

Elsje encouraged including a detailed set of guidelines for candidates. The assessment of the case study should be based on the outcomes of WSTP training, i.e. the ability to document the assessment findings and prescription on the WSTP service documents, with accompanying drawings and photographs. Although it will not be possible to assess how the person measured the user or did the fitting check, etc. the final outcome of these tasks will be observed in the final fitting photographs. The key intervention of intermediate level seating lies in identifying the postural deviations and prescribing the correct postural support to biomechanically support the posture. This can be easily observed from the documentation and the photographs. The process will require minimal additional writing from the participants. E.g. they may need to explain what options for wheelchair and/or PSD options were available and why they selected the particular options. Additional photographs will need to be taken to supplement the detail of the before situation, assessment, hand simulation and prescription and final outcomes.



2. Scoring of Skills Assessment

Elsje and Jon both stated that a committee review of case examples would be the best method of scoring. There should be a main reviewer and a second person to moderate the assessment and outcome.

Jamie suggested that the cost of reviewers/scorers could be built-in to the cost of training based on the time that would be required.

Elsje and Jon thought that the final skills assessment should not be done at the end of training. Both indicated that candidates would need time to practice intermediate skills and integrate the new knowledge into practice. A skills assessment at the end of the training can be done as an interim and an additional assessment by the trainer and will give the participant an indication on where to focus their development.

There is also an obligation on the trainers to provide ongoing mentoring and support for participants particularly in the absence of experienced and trained mentors in the various organizations and regions.

Elsje stated that the administration methods would need to be flexible. E.g. submissions via whatsapp, multi-media messages, etc. may be useful where candidates have difficulty accessing computers and internet. In addition, allowing an in-person evaluation of skills where necessary. This was in response to Lauren's concern about testing candidates that may not have exceptional communication skills, but may be competent in practice. However, this should only be needed in extreme cases as one of the requirements of WSTP is standardized documentation. Not much additional other documentation or writing is needed in addition to the documentation. As an outcome of the training course, one of the skills a participant will have to learn is how to document correctly. Jon indicated that any unbiased evaluator (i.e. not the candidate's trainer) could possibly assess the candidate.



Action Items

Elsje suggested that examples of previous case studies, with identifiers removed, could be provided to committee for review. ISWP Staff will draft another outline for the skills assessment for the subcommittee to review, based on the discussion above.

Participants (name, company)

- ✓ Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Jonathan Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult
- ✓ Lauren Flaherty, Motivation Australia
- ✓ Sarah Frost, Motivation UK
- ✓ Rosy Dorman, Motivation UK
- ✓ Jamie Noon, Independent Consultant
- ✓ Rachel Gartz, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Alexandria Miles, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Rachel Gartz, University of Pittsburgh

