



**EFPA**

**WORKING GROUP EFPA \_ EAWOP**

**ON**

**TEST USER STANDARDS**

**Convenor : DAVE BARTRAM**

**REPORT to the**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2007 in PRAGUE**

**EFPA**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON**  
**TESTS AND TESTING (SCTT)**

**Report on the work of the EAWOP-EFPA Steering Group's  
European Test User qualification project**

**EFPA General Assembly, 2007**

Agenda item 7.4.1

Dave Bartram, Convenor of the EFPA Standing Committee on Tests and Testing (SCTT) and EFPA liaison on the EAWOP-EFPA Steering Group

## Summary

The EAWOP-EFPA Steering Group (SG) was set up jointly by EFPA and EAWOP in 2005 to take forward the work of the previous EFPA-EAWOP European Working Group.

Since it began in July 2005, the SG has

- Completed a revision of the test user standards – presented for approval by the General Assembly under Agenda item 7.2.1.
- Produced a draft set of standards for assessment in work and organizational settings by recontextualising the EFPA-EAWOP Test User standards (Appendix 5). This may provide a valuable input to the new ISO PC230 project on setting an international standard for assessment in work and organizational settings.
- Defined four main types of role for test use, which could form the basis for future qualification recognition (Appendices 2 and 3).
- Completed two pieces of empirical research exploring the relationships between context, knowledge and skills and performance criteria associated with each of these roles (Appendix 4).

We are now in a position to produce a specification of the relevant performance criteria, knowledge and skills for each of these four roles. This provides the basis for moving forward to an accreditation process for national test user certification procedures.

### Next steps

EFPA should offer to provide a liaison-support role for any work EAWOP might seek to do with the broader occupational assessment version of the EFPA-EAWOP standards and should maintain a close involvement with the work of the ISO PC230 Project Committee on occupational assessment.

Strategically, the EFPA SCTT should focus its efforts on issues associated with test quality and test user competence within this broader domain and on establishing its *de facto* as well as its *de jure* position in this area through the delivery of European-wide test user accreditation procedures and test quality evaluation criteria. We recommend that the EC seeks the approval of the GA to:

- Establish an EFPA Implementation Group (IG) to develop pilot projects aimed at accrediting existing national test user qualifications and for accrediting those currently under development.
  - The remit of the EFPA-IG will be to work with the relevant national bodies to develop accreditation procedures and to run pilot accreditations.
  - The EFPA-IG would be tasked with reporting back to the EFPA GA in 2009 with a completed set of pilot implementations and recommendations for extending the accreditation procedure to new qualifications.

# Project Report

## Background: 2003-2005

In Vienna in 2003, a project was initiated to develop a set of 'contextualisable' standards for test users across Europe. For the initial development, it was decided to do this within the context of occupational assessment. For the future, the standards were developed in a manner which would make it possible to contextualise them for application in other areas: educational testing, clinical testing, testing in other health-related settings, forensic testing and so on.

EFPA collaborated with EAWOP in this development, and in 2005 both organisations presented the standards to their respective General Assemblies with a jointly agreed report recommending that a new project be set up to explore how these standards might be used to form the basis for European accredited qualifications in test use.

Both of the General Assemblies approved the standards as being a sound basis for proceeding to this next step and approved the terms of reference for the follow on project.

Specifically, in relation to the work of the joint EFPA-EAWOP working group (EWG), the EWG recommended to the General Assemblies the following course of action in its report. That:

1. The standards are recognised by the General Assemblies as an acceptable basis for the further development of European Standards for Test Use in the field of Work and Organizational assessment.
2. Through its Standing Committee on Tests and Testing, EFPA establishes procedures to support and maintain these standards.
3. That EFPA and EAWOP, through their Executive Committees, establish a small joint board responsible for reviewing progress, and dealing with policy issues.
4. EAWOP takes the lead role in implementing a European process for accrediting local national qualifications in test use based on the Standards and for establishing a European Register of Test Users.
5. A small joint EFPA-EAWOP implementation group is established to explore issues relating to the above.
  1. Complete the standards development and definition work in the light of the feedback from the consultation.
  2. Develop a set of rules and regulations regarding European accreditation and European certification, using the European Diploma in Psychology regulations as a model.
  3. Collaborate with current certification providers and pilot projects launched at the national levels.
  4. Prepare a proposal for how the Standards and the accreditation is administrated and managed at the European level, including a definition of the responsible partners and bodies.

5. Produce detailed recommendations on implementation for the EFPA and EAWOP Executive Committees in 2007 with final proposals for the standards and their implementation.

The EFPA GA accepted the EC's recommendations that the:

- report be accepted
- formulated standards for Test User Qualifications be approved as the basis for European Standards for Test Use in the field of Work and Organizational assessment.
- cooperation between EFPA and EAWOP continue.

## **The current project: 2005-2007**

As the plan was to explore implementation within the occupational assessment field, it was agreed that while EFPA had taken the lead in the initial development of the standards, EAWOP would take the lead in the next stage of the project.

EAWOP decided to manage the project by setting up a small steering group (the EAWOP-EFPA SG) in the hope that this would be a more efficient way of making rapid progress. Representation on the SG was as follows:

- A chair, selected by the EAWOP Executive Committee.
- An EAWOP liaison member
- An EFPA liaison member
- Two other members who had an active interest in implementation of test user qualifications in the occupational setting.

I was nominated to be the EFPA liaison member and Henry Honkanen the EAWOP one. Sverre Nielsen, representing Nordic interests in test user certification and Vicente Gonzalez-Roma, representing Spanish interests were chosen as the two additional members.

### **Issues within the SG**

Initially Elmer Lammerskitten was appointed by EAWOP to chair the SG. The attached chronology, however, shows that the SG took some time to form. There was a delay in identifying the Spanish representative and after the first meeting the Chair stepped down. As a result, the first full meeting of the SG did not take place until 25 March 2006, with Andreas Klug in the chair. Given that the final meeting prior to the EAWOP General Assembly in May 2007 was held in London on 16-17<sup>th</sup> February 2007, the total duration of the project has actually been nearer one year than two.

In addition two issues were identified early on that created some difficulties for the group.

- The first concerned the role of psychologists and non psychologists in test use

- The second concerned a desire by the EAWOP liaison to expand the scope of the project to cover all of occupational assessment and not just test use.

With regard to the first, it was agreed that we need to produce a solution that is 'neutral' with respect to who may or may not be eligible for qualification. It was envisaged that an accreditation procedure would be developed in cooperation with local professional associations and it would be up to them to apply local regulations. In line with the principle of 'subsidiarity', someone who obtained a European recognised qualification in Country A would not as a matter of right be able to treat that as a licence to use tests in any European country. Each country might seek to impose additional constraints that would need to be adhered to.

The second proved more problematic and threatened to prevent any progress being made with the project. From the EFPA position it was noted that:

1. The remit of the project was to look at implementation of the current standards and not to develop a broader based version of them. The latter was regarded as being a substantive project in its own right and one that would need to be independently sanctioned by the respective Executive Committees.
2. There were a number of existing 'markets' for European accreditation of the test user certification (i.e. UK, Norway and Sweden) and others that were interested in developing this (i.e. Spain). With the exception of the DIN 33430 developments in Germany there was no evidence to show that there was a market for a broader occupational assessment qualification. The information provided by our German Chair was that even in Germany, the DIN-based user qualification had only attracted a small number of people and that many of these were clinical psychologists looking for a qualification in occupational assessment to support them in working in that field.
3. There was a large number of other stakeholders to include in any standards development in this area as many aspects of occupational assessment 'belong' to professions outside of psychology, notably the human resources profession. In many countries they would regard an attempt by psychologists to develop standards in this field as an encroachment upon the area of their specialisation. For such a project to succeed it would be vital to develop occupational assessment standards in collaboration with the human resources profession. For test use, however, the human resources profession is generally happy to acknowledge psychology as the relevant centre of expertise.

As EFPA representative, I requested that the SG make a clear decision about how it was planning to proceed when it met on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2006. Three options were put forward (see Appendix 1 on Chronology of the project). It was agreed that we should go forward with Option 1:

**Option 1. Stay with the original remit** as specified in the EFPA /EAWOP General Assembly reports (as set out clearly in the mission statement on your report to the EAWOP Executive Committee, Jan 2006)

- Keep the focus on testing in work and organizational settings, and do not broaden to include other forms of assessment.
- Focus on proposing implementation recommendations for the General Assemblies in 2007 (recommendations could include e.g. certificate, curriculum, accreditation, etc.)

Implications:

- We (i.e. the current SG) agree not to address broader work / organizational assessment issues in this project,
- The broader approach could be dealt with through a separate project which could start either now or later with a different group running it.

Despite this, the issue of broadening the scope continued to be raised in subsequent meetings. In the end, it was agreed that we would review a draft revision of the EFPA-EAWOP Test User standards, carried out by the EAWOP liaison, with a view to broadening their scope. However, this was on the understanding that the main focus of the project should remain implementation of the test user standards.

Feed back on this was provided and this document (draft EAWOP-EFPA Occupational Assessment Standards) is provided as one of the deliverables of this project. However, it must be emphasised that this is only a first draft that has been briefly reviewed once within the SG. It has not been consulted on more widely nor have the implications been addressed for how it might be translated into one or more qualifications. I remain of the opinion that development of this is a major new project that requires market research as well as a new project team.

It should also be noted that this coincides with the start of an ISO project on defining standards for occupational assessment (building on the work done in Germany on DIN 33430). This ISO project is scheduled to reach its conclusion in 2010. This is likely to be the timescale required for EAWOP to produce a finalised set of occupational assessment standards. In my view it would make more sense for both EAWOP and EFPA to work with the ISO Project Committee, as acceptance is likely to be far greater in industry and HR for an ISO standard on occupational assessment than it is for one from EFPA or EAWOP.

## **Progress towards the initially agreed project aims**

Due to the problems that the SG faced over its delayed start-up and its lack of focus on the originally agreed objective, it was not possible to produce materials for the originally envisaged reference group meetings. In the end, it was decided to cancel the original meeting and a subsequent one that had been scheduled for March 2007. Furthermore, it was not possible to complete the tasks necessary to meet the objectives that had been set out in the EWG report and that had been adopted by the EFPA GA.

However, despite these drawbacks, significant progress was made by the SG. The outcomes are described below.

## **Final revisions to the EFPA-EAWOP standards: Helsinki Sept 2005**

The final meeting of the EWG was held in Helsinki after the EFPA GA in 2005. At this meeting the late feedback from the consultation exercise was reviewed and some final editorial improvements made to the standards. There were not substantive changes from the version that the GA had seen. The final post-consultation version has been put on the EFPA website.

One of the first tasks of the SG was to consider how to derive qualification specifications from the standards. This has been achieved through a number of actions.

- Extraction of the context specification. A single set of statements that defined the context or settings in which the qualifications would apply was produced.
- Extraction of the knowledge and skills specification. In a similar way, the knowledge and skills specifications were extracted from the standards into a single document – in effect a curriculum statement.
- Extraction of the performance criteria. Finally, we were left with the statement of performance required by a competent tests user.

Having completed this work, there remained two questions to answer.

1. What level and depth of knowledge and what degree of skill is actually required of a practicing test user?
2. Which of the performance criteria are relevance for competent test use?

In order to answer these questions we needed to define the main scenarios for test use in occupational settings. Four were identified as capturing most of the practice. For the moment these have simply been identified as Levels 1A, 1B, 2, and 3 (see Appendix 2 for details). Briefly they relate to

1A: The role of making decisions about test use within an organisation but not actually doing any testing (i.e. a policy maker and gate-keeper role).

1B: Test administration under well defined conditions.

2: Test use of a limited number and range of instruments in well-defined conditions (such as assessment for job selection).

3: Specialist use of tests for in-depth assessments and in providing guidance and advice to others on the use of tests.

### **Empirical assessment of the performance criteria required for each of four possible qualifications in test use.**

The descriptions of these four 'roles' were used as the basis for an empirical survey. Psychologists who had experience of working in the training and development of test users were asked to rate each performance criteria in terms of its relevance for each of the four qualifications. Specifically they were asked to give each criterion a rating of 2, 1 or nothing for each of the four roles:

- If it is clearly relevant, enter a '2' in the cell
- If you are not sure or if it is of borderline relevance, enter a '1' in the cell.
- If it is not relevant, leave the cell blank (score 0).

15 people provided usable sets of data. Four of the five members of the SG completed the task and 11 others.

The countries covered (with numbers of people in parentheses) were:

UK (2), (Germany (2), Norway (2), Spain (2), Switzerland (2), Belgium (1), Denmark (1), France (1), Netherlands (1) Sweden (1).

While this is not claimed to be a representative sample, it was sufficient to indicate whether such a diverse group could agree.

High levels of agreement were obtained. Two measures for each performance criterion were considered:

- The percentage of people assigning either a 1 or a 2 rating to that criterion.
- The average score of that criterion scaled from 0 to 100. This score was computed by adding the ratings and dividing by 2n, where n is the number of raters.

Thus if all 15 people gave a criterion a rating of 2, the percentage would be 100% and the score would be 100. If 5 people gave a rating of 0, 5 gave a rating of 1 and 5 gave a rating of 2, the percentage would be 67% and the score would be 50.

The cut scores for including a performance criterion in a qualification specification was that both the score must be greater than 70 and the percentage choosing it must be greater than 70%. This resulted in clearly differentiated specifications for four qualifications corresponding to the four roles. The most notable features of these were:

- All qualifications contained performance criteria relating to ethical issues. For Role 1A, these were the only criteria included.
- All criteria are included in the 'specialist' qualification. This is a validation of the original standards as nothing was deemed to be not relevant for a specialist.

The four specifications are attached as Appendix 3.

### **Empirical assessment of the context, knowledge and skills specifications**

The second piece of empirical work was to examine the relevance of the context specifications and the knowledge and skills that had been associated with the performance criteria. The full instructions are presented as Appendix 4. In brief, three categories of content had been defined:

**E = Essential for all test users.** Anyone who uses tests should know this, have this skill or be able to operate in this context. Any training course is test use must cover this.

**U = Useful for some test users but not essential for all.** It is good for anyone who uses tests to know this, have this skill or be able to

operate in this context. Training in test use may cover this but it is not 'core' to competence in test use.

**L = Less relevant for most test users, or only relevant for specialists.** While relevant for test use, this knowledge, skill or context of application is too peripheral or overly specific or specialised to be a requirement for general competence in tests use. Training in test is unlikely to cover this, and it is not 'core' to competence in test use.

- For context specifications, respondent were asked to indicate whether the context variable was relevant for not for E, U or L.
- For knowledge and skills five levels were defined and respondents were asked to rate each knowledge/skill item accordingly.

19 people completed this task. They were all experienced psychologists. A few were in academic positions, but most were practitioners working in the occupational testing field. Six were from the UK (of whom most were both practitioners and BPS appointed test certification verifiers). There were 3 from Norway, 2 from Germany, 2 from Spain and one each from Croatia, Malta, the Netherlands, Sweden, Slovenia and Finland.

As for the previous piece of work the results were very clear.

- The selection of relevant contexts within which the person should be able to practice was based on those elements chosen by 50% or more of the respondents.
- The selection of knowledge and skill requires for each of the three categories (all users, most users and some users) was based on those elements that had been selected by 70% or more of the respondents. For each of these elements, the average rating of level (from 1-5) provided the indication of the depth of knowledge required or the degree of skill required.

The detailed results of this are available from the SCTT Convenor on request. Again, this piece of empirical research helped to validate the standards. All contexts were selected and all the elements of knowledge and skill were selected as relevant for at least some test users. A meaningful subset of these was selected as relevant for 'all' or 'most' users.

### **Combining the performance criteria with the context, knowledge and skills.**

Due to the way in which the project developed, the exploration of importance and depth of knowledge and skills was carried out before we had identified the four roles that formed the basis for the analysis of the performance criteria. However, there is some logical overlap between these two pieces of work. This is summarised in the table below. For any qualification in test use, we should expect people to have covered the knowledge and skills, associated with the relevant performance criteria, which are required for 'all test users' in those contexts deemed necessary for 'all test users' (roles 1A and 1B).

For the routine test user it would be necessary to extend the knowledge and skills to include those topics deemed necessary for 'most test users but not all'. It may also be necessary to broaden the range of contexts within which these apply.

Finally, for the specialist, it was clear that all the knowledge and skills contained in the standards would need to be covered as applied in all the contexts. In practical terms this would make the 'specialist' qualification one that is very demanding to obtain. I would be very likely to require a background in psychology or a related professional qualification with a large amount of psychological content at postgraduate level, it would require specialist training in testing and test use and experience of application within a wide range of occupational assessment contexts.

Competences covered:	Context, Knowledge and Skills relevant for		
	All test users	Most test users	Some test users
1A Policy maker	Required		
1B Test administrator	Required		
2 Typical user	Required	Required	
3 Specialist	Required	Required	Required

Detailed specifications for each of the four roles are presented in Appendix 5.

## Summary of outputs from the project

In relation to the original objectives for the SG:

1. Complete the standards development and definition work in the light of the feedback from the consultation. COMPLETED.
2. Develop a set of rules and regulations regarding European accreditation and European certification, using the European Diploma in Psychology regulations as a model. NOT DONE.
3. Collaborate with current certification providers and pilot projects launched at the national levels. STARTED.
4. Prepare a proposal for how the Standards and the accreditation is administrated and managed at the European level, including a definition of the responsible partners and bodies. NOT DONE.
5. Produce detailed recommendations on implementation for the EFPA and EAWOP Executive Committees in 2007 with final proposals for the standards and their implementation. NOT DONE.

However, significant progress has been made in a number of areas.

1. We have completed a revision of the test user standards and will present the updated version for approval by the General Assembly
2. Although it was not part of the original project remit, a draft set of standards for occupational assessment has been produced from the EFPA-EAWOP Test User standards, and this may form the basis of further work by EAWOP (Appendix 6).
3. We have defined four main types of role for test use, which could form the basis for future qualification recognition (Appendices 2 and 5).

4. We have completed two pieces of empirical research exploring the relationships between context, knowledge and skills and performance criteria associated with each of these roles (Appendices 3 and 4.
5. Within each role we know that we will need to allow for variation in terms of range and diversity of contexts covered. However, by defining the role and the relevant contexts, we can now produce a specification of the relevant performance criteria, knowledge and skills. This provides the basis for moving forward to an accreditation process.

## Next steps

EFPA should offer to provide a liaison role for any future work EAWOP might seek to do with the broader occupational assessment version of the EFPA-EAWOP standards.

We would recommend, however, that any effort in this broader direction would be better directed towards supporting the work of the ISO Project Committee (PC) on occupational assessment. This PC had its first meeting in March 2007 and will, over the next three years, develop an ISO standard covering the area of occupational assessment. It will build on the work of the DIN 33430 standard and will include a wide range of stakeholders.

Strategically, EFPA should focus its efforts on issues associated with test quality and test user competence within this broader domain and on establishing its *de facto* as well as its *de jure* position in this area through the delivery of European-wide test user accreditation procedures and test quality evaluation criteria. EFPA accredited test user qualifications could readily be incorporated into an ISO standard as a basis for people involved in occupational assessment demonstrating their competence in test use. .

We recommend that the EC seek the approval of the GA to:

- Establish an Implementation Group (IG) to develop pilot projects aimed at accrediting existing national test user qualifications and for accrediting those currently under development. The IG should consist of a chair and one representative from each country that is actively involved in this process with a view to establishing procedures for making accreditation work.
  - The remit of the IG will be to work with the relevant national bodies to develop accreditation procedures and to run pilot accreditations. The IG will need to develop solutions that recognise the constraints under which EFPA operates. That is, all the administrative functionality and support will need to be based within member countries rather than central to EFPA. Accreditation could follow a similar model to that being developed for EuroPsy.
  - The IG would be tasked with reporting back to the EFPA GA in 2009 with a completed set of pilot implementations and recommendations for extending the procedure to new qualifications.

Specifically, this group would complete the work that the EAWOP-EFPA Sg had been set up to do:

1. Develop a set of rules and regulations regarding European accreditation and European certification, using the European Diploma in Psychology regulations as a model.
2. Collaborate with current certification providers and pilot projects launched at the national levels.
3. Prepare a proposal for how the Standards and the accreditation is administrated and managed at the European level, including a definition of the responsible partners and bodies.
4. Produce detailed recommendations on implementation for the EFPA and EAWOP Executive Committees in 2007 with final proposals for the standards and their implementation.

Based on the experience of the past two years, this is most likely to be achieved by a small group led by EFPA rather than one led by EAWOP or jointly by EFPA and EAWOP.

# **Appendix 1: Chronology of EFPA SCTT and EFPA-EAWOP SG meetings 2005-2007**

EFPA SCTT Granada, 7 July 2005

EFPA General Assembly: Granada, 9-10 July 2005

Final EFPA-EAWOP EWG Helsinki, 2-3 September 2005

EAWOP-EFPA SG 1: Helsinki, 3-4 September 2005

*[Elmer Lammerskitten (Chair), Dave Bartram (EFPA), Henry Honkanen (EAWOP), Sverre Nielsen (Norway), vacancy (Spain)]*

*[Elmer Lammerskitten stepped down as Chair]*

*[Vicente Gonzalez-Roma joined but not able to attend London meeting]*

EAWOP-EFPA SG 2: London, 16 January 2006

Meeting held without Chair – just 3 members: DB, HH & SN

*[Andreas Klug joins SG as new Chair]*

EAWOP-EFPA SG 3: Stockholm, 25 March 2006

*[First full meeting of SG with five people in attendance]*

EAWOP-EFPA SG 4: Brussels, 28 June 2006

*[Agreement reached on focus for SG – Option 1 or 3 proposals – see below]*

EFPA SCTT Brussels, 5 July 2006

10 July 2006: Test Use and K&S Survey tools circulated to EFPA SCTT members with September deadline

15 Aug 2006: Reminder sent.

13 October 2006: Note pointing out poor response sent

EAWOP-EFPA SG 5: London, 4 November 2006

*Backtrack on Brussels agreement and return to discussions of scope.*

EAWOP-EFPA SG 6: Valencia, 19-20 January 2007 – part by telephone

*Cancelled plan to hold open workshop in Prague on 10 March 2007 due to poor response to Expression of Interest. Only 3 people indicated interest in attending.*

EAWOP-EFPA SG 7: London, 16-17 February 2007

EAWOP-EFPA SG Workshop: Stockholm, 10 May 2007

EAWOP General Assembly: Stockholm, May 2007

EFPA SCTT: Prague, 2 July 2007

EFPA General Assembly: Prague, 7-8 July 2007

## **The Scope issue**

After a lot of discussion around the scope issue with no real progress being made, in Brussels 28-6-06 the following options were debated by the SG:

**1. Stay with the original remit** as specified in the EFPA /EAWOP General Assembly reports (as set out clearly in the mission statement on your report to the EAWOP Executive Committee, Jan 2006)

- Keep the focus on testing in work and organizational settings, and do not broaden to include other forms of assessment.
- Focus on proposing implementation recommendations for the General Assemblies in 2007 (recommendations could include e.g. certificate, curriculum, accreditation, etc.)

Implications:

- We (i.e. the current SG) agree not to address broader work / organizational assessment issues in this project,
- The broader approach could be dealt with through a separate project which could start either now or later with a different group running it.

**2. We (the current Steering Group) decides that a broader scope** also including W/O assessment is necessary to address now, and we should not just focus on testing

Implications:

- This leads to two projects:
  1. An EFPA-Project which would pick up the original remit and continue with looking into issues relating to the implementation of the standards
  2. A new EAWOP Project that would have as its mission the development of a broader set of standards and possible qualifications in the area of occupational assessment.
- This change would require new mandates from the EFPA and EAWOP executive committees.
  - As the EFPA SCTT focus is on tests, it would naturally take over the current project. The new project (2) would be an EAWOP project
  - EFPA could still provide some liaison on the EAWOP project and vice versa, but these would cease to be 'joint' projects in the sense that the current one is.

**3. The work is done 2 phases**

1. Joint work on completing the original remit -as in Option 1 - through to 2007.
2. EAWOP develops a follow on project looking at the broader issues beginning in 2007 to develop w/o Assessment standards & qualifications, while EFPA looks at other implications of the test standards (e.g. applications in educational or clinical testing)

The group choose option **1. Stay with the original remit.**

At the following meeting in London (November, 2006) the EAWOP liaison again presented proposals that involved expanding the scope of the project. Finally it was agreed that he could work on preparing a version of the EFPA standards that were modified to increase the scope.

Valencia (January 2007): The draft occupational assessment standards were worked on by those present. Concerns expressed by the EFPA liaison that this was a new project and would require a lot more resource and time.

At the London meeting (February 2007) it was agreed that the remaining time should focus on the original remit of the project and any further developments of the draft occupational assessment standards should be a matter for EAWOP to take forward. In the meantime there has been little progress made regarding the original objective of the project: Development of an implementation plan for using the existing standards as the basis for European accreditation of test user qualifications.

## **Appendix 2: Outline descriptions of qualification levels**

### **Foundation level knowledge (Level 1A)**

- Well informed about use of tests in occupational assessment
- Knowledgeable about key technical qualities of tests
- Knows where to find information or who to consult in order to evaluate potential use of alternate tests
- Not qualified as a test user
- Not a specialist in test user and not able to provide expert advice or guidance.

HR professional or other with responsibility within their organisation for assessment in recruitment and development, talent management etc, but who is not an actual test user.

This person has a gatekeeper role regarding use of tests by others, which tests are used and on testing policy.

Guideline training input requirements:

One to two day training course; pre- and post-course reading; ongoing updating and maintenance of knowledge.

### **Foundation level skills (Level 1B)**

- Able to administer and use specific tests under the supervision of a person at Level 2 or 3, or in clearly constrained settings.
- Not able to make choices about which tests should be used or provide interpretations of test scores beyond those provided in standard reports.
- Have awareness of broader issues related to testing and test use, of limitations and value of using tests, and know when to seek more expert help.

An individual who uses specific tests in well-defined and constrained contexts, such as routine recruitment and selection procedures or standardised development programmes. Operates within organisational policies and directives on testing and test use. Choice of tests and details of how they are to be used and applied is outside the person's responsibility. Interpretation of tests is limited to information provided in standard reports and to guidelines provided on how to use test information together with other assessment data in decision making.

Guideline input requirements:

One to two day training course; pre- and post-course reading; ongoing updating and maintenance of knowledge and skills.

## **Intermediate level (Level 2)**

- Able to make choices between tests and of when to use or not use tests.
- Has an understanding of the technical qualities required of tests sufficient for understanding but not for test construction.
- Can work independently as a test user.
- Has the necessary knowledge and skills to interpret specific tests.

Guideline training input requirements:

Four to five day training course; pre- and post-course reading; ongoing updating and maintenance of knowledge and skills.

Typically will be working in an HR department, employment agencies or within consultancies offering testing services. May be involved in testing for personnel selection, development or career guidance and advice.

## **Expert level (Level 3)**

- Able to provide advice and consultancy on testing.
- Able to train others in test use.
- Able to provide expert evidence in court cases.

Typically, this person will be an experienced occupational or w/o psychologist who has specialised in test use and will have completed a number of training courses relating to a variety of different tests and types of tests. Some users in this category may come from related professions (e.g. HR) having a background in psychology (e.g. master's degree in psychology) and having acquired the necessary additional psychological knowledge and skills through their professional practice.

Guideline training input requirements:

Experienced professional practitioner in the field of occupational assessment.

Multiple relevant training courses; pre- and post-course reading

Ongoing updating and maintenance of knowledge and skills.

Psychologist or other professional with strong background in psychology.

## **Appendix 3: Results of the analysis of data relating to performance criteria relevant for the four test user roles.**

[Documents to be attached]

## Appendix 4a: Instructions for the rating of levels of knowledge and skills and relevance of context.

The attached spreadsheet contains information on occupational context, knowledge and skills contained in the EFPA-EAWOP Test User Standards.

- The **occupational context** defines the scope of the knowledge and skills expected. That is, in what settings does the person need to be able to operate, under what conditions, with what sort of people?
- The **knowledge and skill definitions** outline the curriculum content, with the assumption that knowledge is assessed through examination and skills through observation of practice or evidence of practice either in vivo or through role-play or simulations.

**The present task is to consider each of the context, knowledge and skills items listed in the spreadsheet and rate its importance for competence in test use in the work and organizational field.** Do this by:

- Context: Type an 'X' in the relevant column (E, U or L) for the context sheet.
- Knowledge and Skills: Type a number indicating the Level of knowledge or skill required in the relevant column (E, U, or L).

*Please read the definitions carefully before you begin.* Make sure you click on all tabs in the spreadsheet to enter your responses:

### Columns:

**E = Essential for all test users.** Anyone who uses tests should know this, have this skill or be able to operate in this context. Any training course in test use must cover this.

**U = Useful for some test users but not essential for all.** It is good for anyone who uses tests to know this, have this skill or be able to operate in this context. Training in test use may cover this but it is not 'core' to competence in test use. This could be because it is peripheral or too specialised for most people.

**L = Less relevant for most test users, or only relevant for specialists.** While relevant for test use, this knowledge, skill or context of application is too peripheral or overly specific or specialised to be a requirement for general competence in tests use. Training in test is unlikely to cover this, and it is not 'core' to competence in test use. This can include things that are highly specialised, which you would only expect to find with expert or consultant test users.

### Levels

In order to indicate level or depth of coverage, please use the following 5-point scale.

1. The concept should be touched on and the person made aware of it such that they are able to provide a simple definition of it. E.g. they can explain that validity is concerned with what a test measures and know that it is different from reliability.

2. The concept should be explored in some detail so that people understand its importance and relevance. E.g. could explain that validity is about what a test score means, why this important and how important validity needs to be supported by empirical evidence.
3. The concept should be explored in more detail, so that people understand it well enough to be able to work with it in a critical fashion. E.g. could explain how a validity study is carried out and the differences between different validity designs. Would be able to read a non-technical summary of a validity study and understand it.
4. The person needs a working knowledge and understanding of the concept at a level one would expect from a graduate student. E.g. they know about validity, different designs of validity study and their pros and cons, understanding the limitations placed on validity by criterion measurement issues etc. Would be able to read a non-technical account of a validity study and critically evaluate it.
5. The concept need to be explored in depth, to the level one would expect of a postgraduate specialist training course in this area. Would be able to critically review validity studies in the literature.

If you are unsure about the correct level to enter, either enter a '?' (for 'not sure'), or enter a range of levels, (e.g. '2-4' to indicate that the level should be somewhere in this range).

Please feel free to add comments or elaborate on what you think the correct level or depth of knowledge or skill should be.

When completed, please save the file with your initials appended to the file name and email it back to the person who sent it to you.

## **Appendix 4b: Results of the analysis of data relating to knowledge and skill requirements and relevance of context.**

[Document to be attached]

## **Appendix 5: Detailed specification of the four test user roles.**

[Documents to be attached]

## **Appendix 6: Adaptation of Test User Standards for Occupational Assessment.**

[Document to be attached]