

## **ISWP Testing Subcommittee**

## **November 4, 2015 Meeting Recap**

The ISWP Testing Subcommittee met via Adobe Connect on Wednesday, November 4, 2015 from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. EST. This provides a recap.

Link to Meeting Recording: https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/p8e2567iega/

Next Meeting: Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at 9 a.m. EST (2 p.m. UK)

#### **Discussion**

- 1. VOTE: 100% (6 voters) agreed with a 2 part intermediate assessment. This will include the knowledge test and the skills assessment (after training).
- 2. Steps of the intermediate test development
  - a. VOTE: 66.6% (4 out of 6 voters) agreed that the remaining intermediate questions should be developed by the Testing Subcommittee members, rather than ISWP staff.
  - b. <u>First step</u>: ~5 people develop ~7 questions each (by the end of November). The following members will be asked to review and develop at this step: Elsje, Dietland, Sudhakar, Venilla, and Jamie. It will involve a 2-3 hr commitment.
  - c. <u>Second step</u>: ~5 people review 7 questions each (by end December). Possible people to ask include: Sarah, Lauren, Ritu, Eliana, Jamie, Henry-Xavier Lemire, Sue Fry, Eliana Ferretti, and Celia. This will involve a 1-2 hr commitment.
  - d. Third step: ~3 people with a global perspective will review all questions (by mid-January). Elsje agreed to be one of these people.
  - e. Fourth step: ~60 people will take the alpha test, including 30 who are expected to pass and 30 who are expected to fail (by mid-Feb).
  - f. Fifth step: ~50 people will take the beta test (by the end of March).
- 3. VOTE: 100% (7 voters) agreed with a case study approach.
- 4. Intermediate test rules
  - a. If participants fail the knowledge portion, they can take it again in 30 days.
  - b. The participant can take the knowledge test a max of 3 times.







- c. The participant can submit the skills assessment immediately after receiving a passing score on the intermediate knowledge test. *It was not discussed how long after the training participants must wait before submitting the skills assessment.*
- d. If participants fail the case study, they can take it again in 60-90 days.
- e. If the case study is missing information, participants can re-submit up to 2 more times within 10-15 days with complete information.
- 5. Critical issues/parking lot
  - a. Who are the assessors? The subcommittee will address in January/February.
  - b. It will take about 30 min per case study for reviewers, so about 1 hour per participant. It is unclear who will pay the assessors. The subcommittee will address in January/February.
  - c. What is the mentoring process for participants who do not pass? The subcommittee will address in January/February.
  - d. "What is the test" session could be offered by trainers at the intermediate trainings.
- 6. Next meeting: December 2nd 9 a.m. EST; 2 p.m. UK time
  - a. We will discuss the rubric at the next meeting, which will last approximately 90 minutes. Topics include:
    - i. Pass/fail
    - ii. Adequate/inadequate for items that are not absolutely essential
    - iii. Which items are absolutely essential under each sub-heading (assessment, prescription, product preparation. etc.)? (e.g. automatic fail)
    - iv. What should the rating system be?

## **Action Items**

All members are asked to review the rubric headings for comment at the next meeting. Please consider whether each item should be rated as adequate/inadequate, or if the item is critical and therefore would be rated as pass/fail.

Rachel to send already drafted questions and requested domains to each person creating questions. This will include how the 7 questions will be broken down. The aim will be for about 2 domains per person.

Rachel will refine the consent form with Elsje's suggestions.







Rachel will draft "photo-taking" tips to accompany the case study example and example photos.

Rachel will draft a list of submission steps and alternatives (e.g. Whatsapp, email, etc.)

Rachel will draft a checklist with all forms and items for submission.

Rachel will draft criteria for suitable users, expanding on the WSTP criteria.

An example case study will be drafted.

# Participants (name, company)

- ✓ Elsje Scheffler, DARE Consult
- ✓ Celia Stubbs, Motivation UK
- ✓ Jamie Noon, Independent Consultant
- ✓ Mr. Sudhakar and Ms. Venilla, Mobility India
- ✓ Dietland Gretschell, Rehab Lab
- ✓ Nekram Upadhyay, Indian Spinal Injuries Centre Ritu Ghosh, Mobility India Abdullah Munish, Motivation Africa
- ✓ 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



