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What does the ASWB Examination Committee do?

The Examination Committee is responsible for:

• Reviewing, editing, and approving new items by committee process.

• Ensuring that all new items are linked to appropriate Knowledge, Skills, and Ability statements (KSAs), and assigned to the appropriate ASWB examination.

• Evaluating pretested items, including performance statistics, to decide whether such items should be deleted, included in the scored item banks, or edited further and pretested again.
The Examination Committee is responsible for:

• Approving, through volunteers or designees, new forms of all ASWB examinations by evaluating item content and overall quality.

• Participating in passing score studies or other psychometric support services as needed.

• Contributing to policy decisions regarding item composition, content, and phrasing.
17 members
Selected from a pool of proficient item writers
Balanced for demographic and practice diversity
Terms are for one year, renewable for up to three years

**NEW MEMBERS:** this year three new members joined the committee from ASWB’s pool of proficient item writers.

Sujata Pai (NY)

Stephanie Washington (TX)

Liz Johnston (CA)
How it works

• 2 ½ -day meetings
  • Up to 4 (or more) times a year
  • 2013 meetings: January, March, June, August, October

• Committee functions as three subgroups
  • Bachelors, Masters, Clinical

• Members of each subgroup are determined at the beginning of each year

• Main task: approve new items to be pretested on an ASWB examination
The process

Step 1. Pair Review

Pairs of committee members review new items in hardcopy.

Edit item or approve it as-is, forward for group onscreen review.

Return the item to the consultant/writer, with suggestions for revisions.
The process

Step 2. Group Review

Items sent forward by paired reviewers are projected onscreen for group review; all decisions are made by consensus.

- Return item to consultant/writer, with suggestions for changes
- Edit or approve item as-is, move to pretest
- Delete item*
  *Committee records reason for deletion; these statistics are tracked to better inform item writers and consultants
What the committee looks for

**An item that’s too easy...**

A client invites her social worker to attend a cowboy boot sale party in the client’s home. The social worker is interested in the cowboy boots that will be featured for sale at the party. What should the social worker do?

(A) Decline the offer
(B) Accept the offer
(C) Ask to review the client’s product catalog for purchase
(D) Obtain information from the client about how to host a similar event in the social worker’s home

*NOTE:*
Not an actual item submitted for review
What the committee looks for

An item that’s not critical to practice...

Which of the following percentage represents the rate at which U.S. adolescent obesity has increased from 1980- to 2010?

(A)3%  
(B)9%  
(C)20%  
(D)13%

NOTE:  
Not an actual item submitted for review
What the committee looks for

Other factors...

- Is the question focused?
- Is there more than one correct answer?
- Does the correct answer depend on jurisdictional factors?
- Is the question appropriate for use in Canada?
- Is the question too difficult?
- Other stylistic elements – problems with structure of options, potential cultural bias in question, readability for ESL candidates, presence of extraneous information, etc.
Committee performance 2013

1,635 items reviewed

1,234 items approved for pretest

93 items returned to the writer - consultants use returned items to help writers create better items overall

101 items deleted - the committee is always trying to rescue items!

196 items reviewed in pairs only – these items still need group review in the future

11 items moved to another exam – these items were sent to other exams and do not have a final disposition yet
Committee performance 2013

Why is reducing deletions important?

By the time an item makes it to the examination committee, significant time and resources have been spent on the item writer, the item development consultant, and ASWB staff. Instead of simply deleting items, the Examination Committee provides feedback to the writers and consultants on items with problems.
Problem Item Review (PIR)

The exam committee also reviews items that have been flagged for statistical concerns or for content reasons by the form reviewers.

- Committee members review statistics and content of each item and make real-time changes onscreen in Pearson’s item bank.
Problem Item Review 2013

713 items reviewed

471 items revised and approved to be pretested* again

7 items approved as-is

235 items archived

*any time an item is revised, it must be pretested again for statistical analysis and evaluation.
Form Review

Multiple volunteers return to review final versions of tests before they go online.

Process

• Work is conducted in pairs

• Review and approve entire 150-question draft operational forms

• Review two pretest pools (40 per pool in Bachelors, 60-80 per pool in Masters and Clinical); of those pretest pool items 20 items are randomly selected for each candidate administration

• Conduct final Subject Matter Expert (SME) review of test before the form is released and administered to candidates
In 2013, form review was held in January, March, June, and October.

12 examination forms were approved for release (four each: Bachelors, Masters, Clinical)

1,800 operational items

1,520 pretest items
Probably not goodbye, exactly.

Four Examination Committee members completed their appointments to the committee in 2013.

Congratulations and best wishes! Chances are, we’ll be seeing you again as emeritus exam committee members!

Saundra Starks (KY)

Brent Meyer (GA)

Elizabeth Collardey (CO)

Keeva Hartley (MN)
Want a closer look at the people involved?
Check out this year’s Examination Program Yearbook