ISWP Competency Subcommittee

January 16, 2019 Meeting Recap

The ISWP Competency Subcommittee met by conference call on Wednesday, January 16, 2019 from 9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. U. S. Eastern Time. This provides a recap.

Meeting Recording Link: **https://iswp.adobeconnect.com/pnxz6m1h84ad/**

Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 6th, 2019 at 10:00 am U.S. EST

Discussion:

1. ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Basic Test: As of 31st December 2018, the test is available in 14 languages and was attempted by 3,093 test takers with a pass rate of 70%; 90 countries are represented. Currently, the French-Canadian version of the basic test is being validated.

2. ISWP Wheelchair Service Provision Intermediate Test:

> **a. Knowledge Test** As of 31st December 2018, 506 test takers with 59% as the pass rate, 13 countries are represented. The test is available in English and Spanish.

> **b. Skills Test:** 26 case studies from 19 test takers have been submitted so far (5 test takers submitted 2 case studies each).

3. Mentoring Program update: The program is completed. 7 service providers completed the entire program. ISWP is conducting focus groups with mentees regarding their experience with the program, including technology, experience with mentors, development of the program including logistics and experience overall. To date, we have received good feedback, including on tools used – goal attainment scale and weekly reflections. Next, Alex will prepare a report for the subcommittee and will set up interviews with mentors to receive more detailed feedback.

4. ISWP Funding: USAID issued a called for proposals for a resource center and received a handful of competitive applications. ISWP was one of the organizations which received a contract, along with ISPO. Four primary areas will be supported: a) advocacy and coordination; b) competency testing, certification and assessment; c) products standards and testing; and d) contextualization and socialization of product and competency standards resulting from ISWP work; e.g., working on integration activities based on ISPO, WHO and ISWP previous work and help to infuse basic certification with their partners. ISWP will work on the first three. Item 'd' was awarded to ISPO and collaborators. A kick-off meeting with USAID and ISPO is on hold due to U.S. government shutdown.

5. Alternatives to skills test: Subcommittee members commented on the Google drive document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iyJHMRe3NVjx0BmROZpHIFJ0D7r6_OY9aoywYeTrstY/edit
Mary suggested that it's still worth discussing in light of direction change and may be included in some way. It's good to look at alternatives and consider whether something else should be implemented or focus on communicating intermediate skills test.

Discussion
Yesterday, Mary added more comments and extracted the points that seem to be repeated under several areas:

*Not seeing client at present or not being able to access client information: These comments have come from fulltime instructors and trainers and people who are working in sales who previously had substantial client interaction and service experience, as well as additional certification, training or education, who still see value in passing the intermediate test, but are not currently working as a service provider. They are having challenges trying to satisfy the requirements of the test.

Elsje: In her experience, people working in sales and as instructors – instructors aren't typically a full-time job since there isn't full time training occurring. Instructors still have good relationships with organizations where they present the training. Would that be an avenue for them to explore? Usually training held at a venue where it can support users, has devices and up to date services, are centers which see value of having people trained at their facilities and are open to accommodate outsiders. Overcome an obstacle about privacy limitations. Perhaps those people need to explore other options. From ISWP side, we do more and work toward getting regional centers – collaborating with ISWP and providing access to participate in training.

Mary asked for recommendations on how centers could be qualified. **Sarah** – keep things simple and start off with a venue and a statement of willingness for people to be able to go in and do case studies. The question is what happens with follow-up.

Elsje: Most of the centers where she has worked or trained usually workload is so big that they can be seen as volunteers. Abide by rules and sign something that they practice within rules and practice policies, procedures. They do assessment, fitting and training. Still need to be signed off by a local provider but has the necessary documentation to submit. Elective placement to get experience. Largest centers in Africa and other centers – people will come, get exposure and guidance, work within context of organization, submit paperwork to training organization (school, training course). Just need willingness for organization to offer the skills.

Mary envisions someone coming to the website to see where they can take the Intermediate skills test. Mechanism – if they are not connected to a particular service center, we offer assistance to work through our network to identify a reputable service center and provide an

introduction. In the U.S., privacy laws are such that images can't be shared. If that is an issue within even a service center, it is doubtful they will let anyone come in. **Krithika** can explore further and identify a handful of service centers around where people have the concern and identify a location which might be more feasible.

Elsje: If concern is from developed world, thinking of other platforms – international publications and organizations – case studies are being shared and promoted everywhere. ISWP should look at what else we need to add to our own privacy requirements so we are in line. Asking to share case studies certainly is happening on a large scale internationally at conferences within international organizations as part of testing and examination. We need to find the solutions around this. It is working for other organizations.

Mary: Some of the feedback seemed to be a mix reflecting the mentoring program, not associated with training intervention. It had to do with knowledge of WSTP specifically. Messaging could be added to the test to describe general principles in the exam, as well as resources that if the person is an experienced service provider, but less familiar with the packages, we recommend they review the packages in advance. Again, have an expert panel – if this is a disconnect with higher income settings – gather an expert panel to determine if a word or phrase should be added to make it more relevant to the setting. We did this with the basic and intermediate test, showing both anatomical and layman's terms to minimize concern/issue about word usage. Consider bringing in additional subject matter experts (someone not already engaged as mentor or test developer) and get their suggestion on how to adapt/add pieces to the test to be sure it is universal.

Elsje: Agrees and suggests: a) where you give additional information, there is misconception that WHO WSTP is for less-resourced settings. Add a message that it is the minimum foundational principles applicable to all contexts and services, not linked to a particular level of resources or products. Principles that can be applied universally across all contexts. Expect that someone from high income setting would be able to do that plus everyone should have the minimal foundational knowledge. B) implicit – how it impacts our selection of reviewers of the test. Those reviewers need to be able to assess contributions and submissions from all contexts. Even if the same vocabulary or terminology is used, recognize that the key foundations/principles have been applied. Having worked through most of the test submissions from mentors, that was the case. Our reviewers took that into account.

Krithika to draft language to be added to the intermediate test pages.

Alternatives: Could these people be part of grandfather process or do something similar for more experience mentors to see if they have the industry knowledge and skills to review?

Mary: Decided on grandfathering process or see if there is something else out there. Haven't done it yet.

Elsje: What is the exception to the rule?

Mary: The number of people who said they couldn't do this would be relatively low. What is concerning about the current test is the extremely low pass rate and low interest in participating. I wonder if we are preventing people from taking it for some reason and try to identify what that is. Krithika indicated there have been 4-5 test takers; by far, most of the test takers have come from the mentoring intervention. They likely wouldn't have taken the test if they hadn't participated in the mentoring program. Think about how we can encourage people to take the test and what alternative we can provide.

Elsje: Investigate why uptake for test is so low. One reason – discussed before: It doesn't mean anything for them within their services or educational system – no more money or recognition. No better job. That would be something else. Unless it becomes an additional qualification, which provides a meaningful reward in country and in services and we get countries to adopt the qualification, we will have low uptake.

Mary: We could do more to identify underlying issues which would be helpful for future planning. Maybe do a survey throughout the community related to incentives or lack thereof and solicit comments on other skills assessment they have completed in the past to give us some ideas.

Mary: Has concerns about an in-person skills assessment being resource intensive, as well as video conference skills assessment. Mary's thoughts – grading could potentially occur on the spot and provide more flexibility. This is something she is testing with the basic level, however, what they are asking trainees to cover at the basic level is small in comparison to intermediate. Maybe identify issues and challenges first and then go from there.

Summary of next steps:
- Expand the description on the test page – being baseline, fundamental principles and resources they should familiarize themselves with.

- Select some resource/service centers from around the world – especially high resourced settings – and ask them to review the intermediate test process. Mary likely would incorporate into the new work plan which could be done across several months. Might have to be on hold.

- Have expert reviewers from different settings than involved to date to review test language.

- Conduct survey/assessment about the motivation to take the intermediate test.

Participants *(check mark indicates participation on call)*

- ✓ Sue Fry, Motivation Africa
- ✓ Sarah Frost, Motivation UK
- 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
- ✓ Megan D'Innocenzo, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Mary Goldberg, University of Pittsburgh
- Jon Pearlman, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Nancy Augustine, University of Pittsburgh
- ✓ Krithika Kandavel, University of Pittsburgh

Prepared by: Nancy Augustine, Krithika Kandavel, and Alexandria Miles