



Proposed Terminology Review Task Force

Background:

- Rehabilitation science and practice has benefitted from the diversity of multiple disciplines, but this diversity may have contributed to the evolution of a lexicon of measurement terminology that includes single terms with multiple meanings (e.g., validity), and single concepts with multiple terms (e.g., minimal detectable change/smallest detectable difference).
- Other groups have addressed this problem, including the American Psychological Association and the American Educational Research Association jointly publish the *Standards for Educational & Psychological Testing (2014 Edition)*, and the COSMIN initiative (**CO**nsensus-based **St**andards for the selection of health **M**easurement **I**Nstruments.) implemented a Delphi study to develop a consensus-based taxonomy.
- Both of these resources define measurement terms and constructs common across healthcare domains, but neither serves as a comprehensive and complementary reference for terminology. For example, The APA/AERA standards define validity in terms of valid interpretation of scores, {Standards for Educational} which is one of the concepts put forth by Messick, {messick} whereas COSMIN promotes the traditional framework by defining types of validity (content, criterion, and construct). Neither adequately addresses issues of measuring change over time, or of measuring differences confounded by an underlying pattern of change.
- The ACRM, and specifically the MNG, is uniquely positioned to address the gaps and discrepancies in measurement terminology that is complementary to the multidisciplinary nature of rehabilitation practice and science.

Objectives:

This task force will

- Identify and review current measurement terminology resources
- Collate, compare, and contrast terms, definitions, and usages of measurement terms
- Recommend preferred terminology from existing sources where available, and identify gaps in terminology where adequate definitions or terms do not exist, or where existing terms are confounded by confounded or conflicting meanings (e.g., the connotation that validity is an attribute of an instrument).
- Submit results for peer reviewed publication

Methods:

- Circulate announcements prior 2016 Annual Meeting to strike task force at the meeting.
- Review and refine objectives, determine the scope of the review, and determine the methods for search and review of terms. Searches could include
 - term-based search of relevant databases (PubMed, EMPASE, CINAHL, PsychInfo)

- search for systematic reviews on measurement topics or terms
- “hand”-search of rehabilitation journals (e.g., *Archives PMR*)
- search and review of measurement textbooks and other resources (websites, webinars, etc.)
- Define deliverables
- Establish working groups to address specific terms or concepts (e.g., validity, reliability, measuring change, interpreting change, etc.)
- Set timeline and target dates for deliverables
- Meet periodically (monthly or bi-monthly) to monitor working group progress and resolve problems

DRAFT