

Rater Perspectives on *Applied Training* of Cognitive Clinical Outcome Assessments, Delivered by Neuropsychology Experts



Svenja Wacker, Ph.D.¹ & Jordan Mark Barbone, M.A.¹ (¹ Cogstate Ltd, New Haven, CT, USA)

Background

- **Cognitive assessments are critical in understanding the effects of investigational therapies**
- **Their use can be vulnerable to variability in test administration and scoring. Careful training of raters** on proper test administration cognitive tests is crucial to **ensure optimal reliability and validity of clinical outcome data**
- Trainee feedback is important in ensuring a training program is comprehensive, well-delivered and well-received
- **LEAD:** Local Expert Advisors as expert neuropsychology clinical coaches/trainers

Rationale

- **Limited empirical research is available on the quality of rater training programs** and their impact on data quality, and raters' perspective on their training experience has received even less attention
- LEAD performance regarding their effectiveness as clinical coaches to site raters in training is closely monitored and documented
- LEAD performance during "Applied Training" calls is rather subjective in nature, but warrants evaluation, nonetheless
- **Applied Training:** Live 1:1 interactive training videoconference with rater and LEAD for assessment of scale administration skills and in-real-time feedback.

Method



Optional Rater Training Survey was implemented to monitor perceived quality of training delivery

- Survey questions investigated perceived effectiveness of live training videoconferences
- Evaluated via optional, **online "Rater Training Survey"** deployed to raters to **report on their training experience**, trainer competency, and perceived preparedness for live assessments with study participants following training completion

Site raters report positive training experience and favorable impression of clinical expert coaches in live, remote training sessions.

Raters' reported agreement with quality statements about training experience with LEADs:

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
(Q1) Lead Competency				2	46
(Q2) Lead Preparedness			1	3	44
(Q3) Lead Feedback				1	47
(Q4) Assessment Congruency			1	3	44
(Q5) Rater Readiness	1			3	44

Average ratings of LEADs

Mean (Standard Deviation)

	(Q1) Lead Knowledge	(Q2) Lead Prepared	(Q3) Lead Feedback	(Q4) Rater Agree	(Q5) Rater Equipped	(Q6) Training Overall
1						
LEAD: A	4.9 (0.3)	4.9 (0.3)	5.0 (0.0)	4.9 (0.3)	5.0 (0.0)	4.7 (0.7)
LEAD: B	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)
LEAD: C	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	4.3 (1.2)
LEAD: D	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)
LEAD: E	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	4.9 (0.3)	4.9 (0.5)
LEAD: F	4.9 (0.3)	4.7 (0.6)	4.9 (0.3)	4.7 (0.6)	4.9 (0.4)	4.4 (1.1)
LEAD: G	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)	5.0 (—)
LEAD: H	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	5.0 (0.0)	4.2 (1.8)	5.0 (0.0)

LEAD: Local Expert Advisor
¹ LEAD names redacted

Survey categories and descriptions

Survey category	Description
Q1 Perceived LEAD Competency	The Cogstate LEAD was knowledgeable about the study-associated scales.
Q2 Perceived LEAD Preparedness	The Cogstate LEAD was adequately prepared for the training session.
Q3 Perceived Feedback Delivery by LEAD	The Cogstate LEAD's feedback and observations were delivered in a construction and positive manner.
Q4 Congruency of trainee-vs trainer assessment	You (the rater) agree with the Cogstate LEAD's evaluation of your skills and recommended next steps (certification, additional training activities, or follow-up coaching session).
Q5 Perceived Rater Readiness	Upon completion of this training do you (the rater) feel equipped with the necessary skills to conduct live scale administrations?
Q6 General Impression of Rater Training Program	How do you rate the Cogstate Rater Training Program overall?

Results

- **261 English speaking raters were invited to complete the survey on 6 different LEADs; 48 (18.4%) submitted responses**
- Questions on *LEAD Knowledge*, *LEAD Feedback*, and *Rater Equipped* received 100% positive (Strongly Agree/Agree) responses
- Additional comments lauded the trainers' engaging and constructive approach to training delivery with effective preparation for assessments with study subjects

Conclusions



Raters submitted highly favorable reviews of their training experience with Cogstate LEADs

- This survey format proved to be a **low-burden approach to quality control of clinical coaches**
- Raters, trained through this rater training program, reported an **overwhelmingly positive training experience** with the program overall and with the Applied Training session, specifically
- The **"personal touch" of live training modalities** with expert coaches appears to be an **effective training approach** to support raters' skill mastery and feeling of preparedness for clinical assessments