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Background
This job analysis study was conducted to identify critical tasks performed by respiratory therapists who specialize in sleep disorders testing and therapeutic interventions. Study results will influence examination content for the ongoing Sleep Disorders Specialty (SDS) credentialing program of the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC). The job analysis study was conducted in 2021 and was the third study of this job. Multiple-choice items, each with four options, will continue to be the basis for assessment with this examination.

Members of the job analysis committee (the Committee) supervised the study and made the decisions affecting data gathering and results evaluations.

Table 1. The Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest degree, Credentials, Recognitions</th>
<th># Years in Sleep</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura L. McFarland</td>
<td>BS, RRT, RRT-SDS, RPSGT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cambridge Medical Center</td>
<td>Professor; Sleep Services Coordinator</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian W. Carlin</td>
<td>MD, FCCP, FAARC, FAAASM, MAACVPR</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sleep Medicine &amp; Lung Health Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chasse</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Title Health Medical Partners</td>
<td>Medical Director of Critical Care</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Roby</td>
<td>MHHS, RRT, RRT-SDS, RPSGT, RST, CCSH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>Associate Professor; Director of Clinical Education</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya M. Brooks</td>
<td>BHS, RRT, RRT-SDS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Neurosciences Manager</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Griffen</td>
<td>BS, RRT, RRT-SDS, RPSGT, CCSH, RST</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mary Lanning Healthcare</td>
<td>Sleep Lab Manager</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria McMichael</td>
<td>BS, RRT, RRT-SDS, RRT-NPS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Southern Regional Medical Center</td>
<td>Sleep Technologist</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara A. Phillips</td>
<td>MD, MSPH, FCCP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Kentucky, College of Medicine</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Rozenisky</td>
<td>MS, RRT, RRT-SDS, CPFT, RPSGT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Cochran</td>
<td>BS, RPSGT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Essentia Health</td>
<td>Sleep Medicine Manager</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods
The survey study was conducted in phases including development, distribution, and response analysis. The Committee developed task statements plus items intended to collect background information about
respondents. The survey was set up to require a response to each task on a page before a respondent could move to the next page. The Committee developed sampling plans for survey distribution after consulting with NBRC staff.

An invitation asking potential respondents to participate in the online survey was electronically mailed to 874 sleep disorder specialists who had credentials designated as active within the NBRC database. A total of approximately 2,767 members of the Sleep, Leadership & Management, and Ambulatory & Post-Acute Care sections of the American Association of Respiratory Care (AARC) also received access to the survey. The NBRC partnered with the American Association of Sleep Technologists who sent invitations to 1,776 of its members as well. Additionally, the final page of the survey permitted respondents to send an email containing the survey link to other technologists.

**Results**

The response rate among those who were solicited could only be estimated because some mailing lists were out of the NBRC’s control and respondents could send the survey link to other potential respondents. A volunteer sample of 256 chose to provide usable responses in time for the analysis. The estimated response rate among potential respondents was 4.7%.

After respondents had rated each task, at least 97.6% found that the list of tasks had adequately covered the scope of their job activities, from which the Committee concluded there were no content gaps.

The intraclass correlation value involving 256 sets of responses to 128 tasks was .984, so the same results were highly probable among other potential samples from the population. The coefficient alpha value involving 256 sets of responses to 128 tasks was .970, so tasks within each content domain had received ratings that were highly consistent.

**Assessment of Sample Quality**

The Committee assessed the degree to which the study sample had represented subgroups (for example, regions, settings) within the population of specialists. Committee members detected no disproportionate representation. Still, the Committee decided to use a task exclusion method that would give sample subgroups opportunities to exclude tasks in case representation bias was present, but undetected by the Committee.

**Task Exclusion**

The Committee established a total of 17 exclusion rules designed to narrow the full list of 128 tasks to a subset of those tasks that were critical to practice. The concept of criticality subsumed two attributes, (1) the **extent of practice among the respondents** and (2) the **importance to practice**. In other words, to be considered critical to practice, a task had to be performed by a large percentage of the sample and considered important by them. There were two rules based on responses from the whole sample that were created for extent (50% do the task) and importance (1.80 out of 2 within two standard errors). Additional rules based on subgroups (for example, regions, settings, experience level) within the sample were created from responses about task importance (1.74 out of 2 within two standard errors).
The Committee was guided to decisions about these rules by information from Figure 1, which was made necessary by their decision to simplify the importance scale from 4 points (high, above average, below average, or low importance) to 2 points (high or low importance). Figure 1 transformed the ratings that had been used during the 2014 study when the importance scale contained 4 points to the 2-point scale from the 2021 study. Both scales also had a zero value that allowed respondents to indicate a task that was not performed. This point on the scale allowed for a calculation of the extent to which each task was a part of practice.

![Figure 1. Task Ratings for the Same Tasks from 2014 and 2021](image)

Tasks that were labeled as critical had to survive each of the 17 rules. Application of these exclusion rules retained 127 of the 128 tasks across 5 content areas. Subsumed under these major content areas were 14 sub-domains for which examination items were specified.

Examination Form Specifications
The decision process about specifications was accomplished when the Committee did the following:

1. Members assigned cognitive complexity designations by consensus to each critical task according to their perceptions of the mental process by which practitioners behaved competently. The cognitive complexity ratings were 1 - Recall, 2 - Application, and 3 - Analysis.

2. To guide decisions regarding the item count for each sub-domain, members considered mean content weightings across the 5 major domains that had been calculated from sample members’ responses and the number of critical tasks remaining in each of the 14 sub-domains.

3. Having tentatively decided on the total number of items to allocate to each of the 14 sub-domains, members divided each sub-total across the three cognitive levels. Members assessed and then made final adjustments to item counts across the 14X3 table.
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(4) The Committee had anticipated that special competencies arise when assessing and treating pediatric patients, so members evaluated the prevalence of activities involving the pediatric sub-population as indicated by survey responses. While developing examination form specifications, the Committee defined minimum and maximum item counts for (a) pediatric patients 6 years of age or younger, (b) pediatric patients between 7 and 17 years of age, and (c) general patients.

(5) The Committee said special competencies arise when a patient who has a tracheostomy undergoes a sleep diagnostics study since the artificial airway bypasses a portion of the upper airway and many cases of obstructive sleep apnea are caused by upper airway anatomy. Members decided on a minimum number of items that involve a patient with a tracheostomy.

(6) The Committee said that since the last job analysis study was done many diagnostic sleep studies have shifted from occurring in labs to occurring in homes to decrease costs and increase patient convenience. Members decided on minimum item counts involving studies at home, in a lab, and in a general setting in which the location is not relevant to the competency being assessed.

In summary, item counts are specified for the following parameters:

- Content sub-domains
- Cognitive levels
- Patient populations as defined by age
- Type of patient airway
- Sleep study location

The Detailed Content Outline document describes specifications used to build each examination form. The first forms to rely on this document will be released in September 2023.