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Hong Kong’s HKICA joins IPC

Hong Kong’s HKICA’s Full IPC Membership certification award ceremony took place during the auditor conference in Hong Kong on August 16, 2018. IPC Chairman Osman Vural talked about differences between qualification and competency based personnel certification programs. Also he mentioned about the IPC MS Auditor Certification program endorsed by the IAF in his speech to the conference. President of HKICA Dr. Tommy Lo expressed his pleasure to be recognized as the full member of IPC and emphasized the importance of competency-based auditor certification in his speech. A large number of government officials, NGO and private company representative attended the press-conference.

IPC is welcoming PECB to IPC ML

PECB has been successfully addressed all the IPC MLA requirements and has been invited to become an IPC MLA signatory member. PECB is the seventh Personnel Certification Body globally achieving to join CEPAS (Italy), EOQ (Europe), GPC (Korea), QMCe/Norsk Sertifisering AS (Norway), STAREGISTER (USA) and TRA (USA) into IPC MLA.

The objective of IPC MLA is to facilitate international recognition of the certificates issued by those Personnel Certification Bodies (the signatories) that certify personnel and/or recognize training courses against the IPC criteria. This is achieved by operating under a common set of rules and by working within a common certification framework. You can contact IPC and PECB at: www.ipcaweb.org and www.pecb.com
ISO's Annex SL update in progress

IPC General Secretary Dr. George Anastasopoulos participated at Atlanta, Georgia Tech, ISO meeting (photo 1), joining the "dream team" of MS experts, as stated by the group's conveyor Mr. Nigel Croft (photo 2). This is an ISO high level meeting, with task to develop a solid and pragmatic base for management system standards in the years to come (called Annex SL). Annex SL is not a "standard" in its own right, but it constitutes the basis for a significant number of generic and sector-specific ISO management system standards. According to existing Annex SL, a Management System Standard should follow the structure: Scope, Normative references, Terms and definitions, Context of the organization, Leadership, Planning, Support, Operation, Performance evaluation, Improvement.

This structure is expected to be updated when the new Annex SL will be issued by the end of 2020.

IPC's expert on food safety among top 6 ISO expert

IPC representative at ISO TC34/SC17 for food safety, Mr. Dimitrios Katsieris, was selected by ISO organization to consult ISO related committees for food safety issues and standards. This will increase IPC’s reach to technical expertise in this field and may identify new areas of work.

Mr. Katsieris is included among the six Food Safety Experts worldwide to be selected for such position. We congratulate him and wish him the best of success in his new role.
K2A Management Co. joins IPC

K2A Management Co., based at Cambodia, joined IPC as an Associate Member.


For more information you can contact K2A Management Co. at:

K2A Management Co., Ltd
#321 Street 480 Phsar Deoum Thkov,
Khan Chamkarmon,
Phnom Penh, Cambodia 12307
Tel: +855 964 339 780
E-mail info@k2amanagement.com
Web www.k2amanagement.com

HKICA joins IPC as a Full Member

Hong Kong Institution of Certified Auditors (HKICA), based at Honk Kong, joined IPC as a Full Member.

HKICA is a non-profit making organization. Its Executive Board comprises members from universities, public authorities, governmental organizations, certification bodies, management systems consultants in Hong Kong. HKICA provides services to the quality, environmental, occupational health & safety, food safety, laboratory and other management systems auditing professions in Hong Kong.

HKICA also provides a series of personnel certification schemes to meet the ever changing need of the industry and the expectation of the community at large.

HKICA is the only Hong Kong professional institute operating certification of persons for competence of QMS auditors as per ISO 17024:2012 which is vital for internal auditing, second party auditing and third party certification auditing on organizations or companies.

HKICA is accredited to ISO/IEC 17024 by China’s Accreditation Body CNAS (accreditation no: C176-R).

For more information you can contact HKICA at:

Hong Kong Institution of Certified Auditors
Rm 108, 1/F, Sun Ling Plaza,
30 On Kui Street,
Fanling New Territories,
Hong Kong, China
Phone: +852 27892389
Fax: +852 27892390
E-mail: info@hkica.org
Web www.hkica.org
Global New Kaizen joins IPC

Global New Kaizen, based at in Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam, joined IPC as an Associate Member. The Global New Kaizen is providing training and consulting services to companies of all sizes and industrial segments as well as private, university/college and public service organizations in Vietnam.

Dr. Hiep Nguyen, the founder of Global New Kaizen, is an expert in the World Class Management System Paradigm, Kaizen way to Lean -6-Sigma in Manufacturing Health Care, Kaizen - Lean System, Total Quality Management in Education and ManagementS such as ISO 9001, ISO 14001, ISO 45001, ISO 50001 and ISO 22000.

In addition, Global New Kaizen has been involved in scientific projects applied in business and education sectors, having established business development strategies for different enterprises.

For more information you can contact Global New Kaizen at:

Dr. Hiep Nguyen, President
Global New Kaizen Co., Ltd
No 97 Dang Dung, Tan Dinh Ward, District 1, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
Telephone +84 8 6884 9648
Email: hiep@globalnewkaizen.com
Website: www.globalnewkaizen.com

22nd IPC AGM was held in Singapore on October 26-28, 2018.
Mr. Xiao Jianhua the President of IAF has been attended to the AGM
Setting the Passing Score of an Exam

Introduction

Standard setting is the process used to select a passing score for an exam. Of all the steps in the test development process, the standard setting phase may be the one most like art, rather than science; while statistical methods are often used in conducting a standard setting, the process is also greatly impacted by judgment and policy. The passing score (also known as the passing point, the cutoff score, or the cut-score) is used to classify examinees as either masters or non-masters. An examinee’s score must be equal to or greater than the passing point, in order for that examinee to be classified as a master, or to pass the test. If an examinee is misclassified, that is referred to as a classification error. Typically, the passing score is set at a score point on the exam that the judges determine reflects the minimum level of competency to protect the public from harm or to provide minimal competency at the occupational level being assessed. For the standard setting to be conducted successfully, the panel of judges should be carefully selected and then thoroughly prepared and trained to their task. There are a number of approaches to standard setting, including: informed judgment, conjectural, and contrasting groups methods.

Methods for Standard Setting

Types of Classification Error

The passing score for a test should be set in accordance with the purposes of the exam. It should not be set arbitrarily, but rather should be carefully determined by a panel of judges who are familiar with the content of the exam as well as the characteristics of the occupation concerned. Two types of classification error can occur when the passing score is applied. One type of misclassification is termed a false-positive (i.e., an error of acceptance). An example of a false-positive error would be an examinee who was not minimally competent, but who passed the test. The second type of misclassification is termed a false-negative (i.e., an error of rejection). In this type of misclassification, an examinee who actually has the level of competence fails the test. Depending upon the nature of the exam program, one of these types of errors may be far more problematic than the other. Awareness of these potential consequences may be used to influence the determination of the final passing score, after the panel of judges has made their recommendation. Policy makers at the exam program may adjust that recommended passing point based on other factors, possibly including operational test score data when it becomes available.

Informed Judgment Method

The informed judgment method is a test-based approach. A panel of judges, or stakeholders, reviews the overall test and its content. Based on their holistic reviews, the judges then each suggest a percentage of items on the test that he or she believes ought to be correctly answered by a minimally competent examinee. This percent-correct score on the total test can be viewed as the individual judges’ recommended passing score. Once you have these recommended passing scores from the panel you can use them, perhaps along with additional information, to set
the final passing score. The informed judgment method might be difficult to rationally defend when it is used in isolation. However, it may be a very appropriate method for use in combination with other methods, particularly the contrasting groups method.

Conjectural (Modified Angoff) Method

The modified Angoff method is the most commonly used of the conjectural methods, all of which are item-based approaches to standard setting. A panel of judges is assembled and is asked to review the test, one item at a time. For each item, each judge gives an estimate of the probability that a minimally competent examinee would be likely to respond correctly. (Alternatively, the judges may be asked to imagine a hypothetical group of minimally competent examinees and then to indicate the percentage of that group who would be likely to respond to the given item correctly.) These item probabilities, or percentages, are averaged across the set of test items for each judge, forming that judge’s recommended passing score. Typically, one or more additional rounds of review are then undertaken in order to allow the panel to talk with one another about the reasons for their assigned percentages, and to hopefully move towards consensus. These passing scores are then averaged across the individual judges to arrive at the full panel’s recommended final passing score.

Contrasting Groups Method

The contrasting groups method is an examinee-based approach to standard setting. This method in particular requires that the panel of judges be highly familiar with the target test population. The panel of judges identifies a set of examinees who are clearly non-masters and another set of examinees who are clearly masters; borderline examinees are not included. It is especially important that the non-masters be carefully selected. While these non-master examinees would not yet be considered minimally competent in the occupational area, they should nevertheless be members of the target test population. If, instead, the examinees who are identified as non-masters are completely unknowledgeable in the exam’s content area, the passing score may be set at an artificially low point. After the two groups of examinees have been identified, they are then administered the test. The two resulting test score frequency distributions are plotted on the same continuum. The passing score can be set at the intersection point of the two distributions; or, alternatively, the final passing score can be adjusted somewhat, based on the relative cost of false-positive and false-negative classification errors. While the contrasting groups method can be used independently, it may also be used as a complement to the informed judgment or other standard setting method.

Summary

Standard setting is the phase of test development in which the critical decision of setting the passing score is made. This decision will have direct and obvious consequences for examinees, as it will form the basis of defining which examinees pass the test and which do not. Several approaches to standard setting can be used, but in all cases human judgment must be applied. Careful selection and training of the panel of judges is essential for the success of the standard setting.

Published after permission by Professional Testing.
For more info visit: http://www.proftesting.com
IPC's IAF endorsed scheme now in PRINT edition

IPC is the scheme owner of the world-wide operated IPC-PL-11-006 “IPC Management System Auditors certification scheme”.

This IPC scheme which is the first personnel certification scheme ever to have achieved official endorsement by the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) is now available in print version. Copies are available by IPC secretariat (secretary@ipcaweb.org). There is no charge for IPC members. For third party orders a minimal shipping and handling fee will be charged depending on the quantity and delivery address.

The same document can be downloaded in pdf format, for free, from IPC website at http://bit.ly/2Uzk4dH.
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