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# Executive summary

## Purpose

The Institute for Divorce Financial Analysts (IDFA™) offers the Certified Divorce Financial Analyst (CDFA™) examination. A job task analysis study was conducted to provide content validity evidence to ensure that the certification exam is measuring content that is currently important for competent performance in the job role.

## Job Task Analysis Study Process Overview

A job task analysis study is an in-depth study of the important tasks, knowledge, and skills needed to competently perform as a private wealth advisor. The job task analysis study consisted of the following activities:

* Test definition process
* Job task analysis survey development and pilot test
* Job task analysis survey administration
* Job task analysis data analysis, finalization, and linkage study
* Test blueprint development

Subject matter experts (SMEs) participated throughout the process to ensure the success of the project.

## Test Definition Process

SMEs and other CDFA™ exam stakeholders participated in a web conference to complete the Test Definition activity. The test definition process ensured a common understanding of the exam purpose, target audience, exam eligibility requirements, geographic scope of the certification, expectations of a minimally qualified candidate, etc. before the job task analysis survey development began.

## Job Task Analysis Survey Development

Eleven SMEs and two IDFA™ representatives were assembled for a two-day panel meeting in Nashville, TN in April 2012 to develop the content for the job task analysis survey. During the two-day meeting, the group:

* reviewed and revised a draft list of tasks that may be performed as part of the divorce financial analyst job; new task statements were written for missing content areas
* reviewed and revised a draft list of knowledge and skills that may be needed to perform the job tasks of a divorce financial analyst; new knowledge and skill statements were written for missing content areas
* developed background information questions for the survey to identify characteristics of the survey respondents (e.g., specialty area, years of experience, geographic location) that might impact their job task analysis survey ratings

The work product from this meeting was used to create an online job task analysis survey consisting of 17 background information questions, 35 task statements (grouped into nine domains), and 142 knowledge and skill statements (grouped into 10 domains).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task Domains** | **Knowledge and Skill Domains** |
| 1: Establishing the parameters of the engagement | 1: Professional Responsibilities |
| 2: Gathering relevant documents and information | 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology |
| 3: Analyzing and evaluating the information | 3: Property and Taxation |
| 4: Developing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation |
| 5: Communicating analysis and/or recommendation(s) and obtaining feedback | 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits |
| 6: Adjusting and finalizing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation |
| 7: Carrying out the scope of the agreement or engagement | 7: Insurance and Risk Management |
| 8: Providing post-divorce client services | 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy |
| 9: Practicing within professional and regulatory standards | 9: Financial Analysis and Planning |
|  | 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) |

Respondents were asked to rate each task statement on the *Frequency* that it is performed in the respondent’s job (across all clients) and its *Importance* to competent job performance.

**Task Rating Scales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Frequency0 = Not part of my job1 = Performed at least once2 = Every few months to yearly3 = Every few weeks to monthly4 = Every few days to weekly5 = Every few hours to daily  | Importance0 = Not important1 = Somewhat important2 = Important3 = Very important |

Respondents were asked to rate each knowledge and skill statement for its *Importance* to competent job performance and if the knowledge or skill is *Needed at Certification* to be considered competent.

**Knowledge and Skills Rating Scales**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Importance0 = Not important1 = Somewhat important2 = Important3 = Very important | Needed at Certification0 = No1 = Yes  |

 |  |

The survey was pilot tested with a few SMEs before being distributed to the full survey audience.

## Survey Administration

An email invitation to take the survey was distributed to 7,488 persons from the IDFA™ mailing list. The survey was available from July 25 to August 15, 2012. Incentives were offered for completing the survey, including a prize drawing for a 32 GB new iPad (all survey respondents eligible) and two continuing education credits (only current CDFAs™ eligible). Reminders to complete the survey were sent on a weekly basis until the survey was closed.

A total of 447 respondents completed the survey in its entirety, which met the minimum statistical sampling requirements for a population of this size.

## SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

The survey data was cleaned and reviewed to ensure respondents included in the data analyses met the minimum experience requirements for the credential and were representative of the target audience for the exam. Data from 88 respondents were removed from the final data set for one or more of the following reasons:

* Respondent had less than one year of experience in his or her primary occupation.
* Respondent had less than one year experience providing any financial advisory services (except if respondent indicated he or she was a lawyer or mediator).
* Respondent reported that he or she did not provide divorce financial advisory services (except if respondent indicated he or she was a lawyer or mediator).
* Respondent reported working on zero divorce cases during past year.
* Respondent’s primary occupation was outside of the credential’s target audience (e.g., Admin Assistant).
* Respondent’s data contained response patterns (e.g., no variation in task or knowledge/skill ratings).

## Respondent Demographics

There were 359 respondents included in the final data analyses. These respondents were predominantly White (90.5%) and had earned at least a Bachelor’s degree (88.9%). Slightly more women (54.6%) completed the survey than men (44.3%). The majority of respondents were between the ages of 41 and 60 years old (63.6%). Respondents were well dispersed across the U.S. and worked predominantly in suburban and urban community types. More than half or respondents reported their primary occupation as a financial advisor (56.5%). The top three types of firms in which respondents reported working were traditional investment/brokerage firm (23.1%), being an independent registered investment advisor (20.6%), and working in an independent brokerage firm (18.7%). The largest percentage of respondents reported having worked in their primary occupation for more than 20 years (35.9%); very few respondents reported less than six years of experience. As might be expected, most respondents also reported having more than 10 years experience providing financial advisory services. The largest percentage of respondents reported having more than 20 years of experience providing financial advisory services (29.5%). Most respondents provided a range of services for their clients (e.g., portfolio management, financial planning, retirement planning, estate planning).

The vast majority of respondents reported providing divorce financial advisory services (98.6%). The five respondents included in the final data analysis that did not report providing divorce financial advisory services were either lawyers or mediators. The largest percentage of respondents (29.5%) reported working on one or two divorce cases during the past year; another 25.9% of respondents worked between three and five cases during the past year. Respondents reported working predominantly on litigation, mediation, and collaboration divorce cases and working on cases with a marital worth of varying size ranges.

The survey data were analyzed using all 359 respondents and by dividing the data into the following subgroups.

* Respondents who held the CDFA™ designation
* Primary occupation of respondents

Before being considered final, the results of the data analyses were reviewed by two panels of SMEs during web conferences held in September 2012 and May 2013.

## Data Results

All 35 tasks statements were retained as important to competent performance as a divorce financial analyst. To be retained, a task had to receive an importance rating of 1.5 or above, have a majority of respondents report that the task was part of his or her job, and the SME panel had to review and approve the data. Below is the average importance rating and standard deviation for each task domain.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Domains** | **Average Importance Rating**  | **Importance Rating****Std. Dev** |
| 1: Establishing the parameters of the engagement | 2.62 | 0.63 |
| 2: Gathering relevant documents and information | 2.80 | 0.44 |
| 3: Analyzing and evaluating the information | 2.80 | 0.45 |
| 4: Developing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 2.67 | 0.56 |
| 5: Communicating analysis and/or recommendation(s) and obtaining feedback | 2.78 | 0.47 |
| 6: Adjusting and finalizing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 2.63 | 0.60 |
| 7: Carrying out the scope of the agreement or engagement | 2.48 | 0.70 |
| 8: Providing post-divorce client services | 2.45 | 0.70 |
| 9: Practicing within professional and regulatory standards | 2.88 | 0.36 |

As with the task statements, the data from knowledge and skill statements were reviewed by SMEs before being considered final. Of the 142 knowledge and skill statements included in the survey, 105 statements were retained for measurement in the CDFA™ examination. Statements were eliminated because the knowledge is state or jurisdiction specific and could not be fairly measured in a national certification examination, the statement is covered or could be logically combined with other knowledge and skill statements for measurement on the examination, the statement is not required at the time of certification (e.g., represents more advanced or specialized knowledge or skills that would be expected of the more experienced professional rather than the minimally qualified candidate for the certification), or the knowledge or skill could not easily be measured in a choice examination and could be better assessed in continuing education courses.

Below is the average importance rating and standard deviation for each knowledge/skill domain.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge/Skill Domains** | **Average Importance Rating**  | **Importance Rating****Std. Dev** |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 2.57 | 0.59 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 2.48 | 0.68 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 2.70 | 0.52 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation | 2.84 | 0.40 |
| 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits | 2.50 | 0.65 |
| 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 2.66 | 0.56 |
| 7: Insurance and Risk Management | 2.51 | 0.64 |
| 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy | 2.43 | 0.72 |
| 9: Financial Analysis and Planning | 2.60 | 0.59 |
| 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) | 2.25 | 0.77 |

A linkage study was performed to ensure that all knowledge and skill statements retained to be measured in the certification exam could be linked to a retained task from the job task analysis. The linkage study was completed by eight SMEs who participated in the September 2012 meeting to review the survey data.

## Test Blueprint

A draft test blueprint was calculated based on the job task analysis data and information from the linkage study. The draft test blueprint was reviewed and adjusted by SMEs to ensure reliable and adequate measurement of a candidate’s knowledge in each of the test domains. An initial test blueprint was developed in September 2012; it was revised in May 2013 with input from another SME group in response to difficulty in writing examination items for some of the knowledge domains. The test blueprint was reviewed and approved by the IDFA™.

# INTRODUCTION

The Institute for Divorce Financial Analysts (IDFA™) contracted with Kryterion to conduct a job task analysis study to provide content validity evidence to ensure the Certified Divorce Financial Analyst (CDFA™) examination is measuring content that is currently important for competent performance in the job role.

The procedures used in the job task analysis study complied with all relevant technical and legal standards for professional certification and licensure as well as the requirements for accreditation by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA) and American National Standards Institute (ANSI). Many of these requirements are described in the following three documents:

* The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1999) jointly published by the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME),
* Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs from the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA), and
* ISO/IEC 17024: General Requirements for Bodies Operating Certification Systems of Persons and IAF Guidance to ISO/IEC 17024 from the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

The job task analysis study utilized the expertise of Kryterion psychometricians, IDFA™ staff members, subject matter experts (SMEs) performing divorce financial analyst services, and a national sample of persons performing or thoroughly familiar with the divorce financial analyst job tasks.

This report details the job task analysis study and test blueprint development processes and outcomes conducted between March 2012 and September 2012.

# Test Definition

The test definition process is critical for ensuring that the strategic direction of the certification program is determined and that there is a common understanding of important aspects of the certification program among the sponsoring organization, stakeholders, and vendors before the job task analysis begins to prevent costly and time consuming changes in direction later in the process. The test definition process was completed via two web conferences. Prior to the web conferences, Kryterion worked with client representatives to complete as much of the Test Definition document as possible to maximize productivity during the web conference. The web conferences were held on March 27 and 28, 2012. Table 1 lists the participants of the test definition process.

**Table 1: Test Definition Participants**

| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Janet Bouma | J. Bouma & Associates, LLC | Pittsburg, PA |
| Barbara Shapiro | Cadaret Grant | Dedham, MA |
| Sherry Wyble | Scott Private Wealth Group | Greensboro, NC |
| Cindy Gleason | Gleason Resource Group | Cedar Falls, IA |
| Christine Hennigan | 1847 Financial | West Chester, PA |
| Kathy Williams | Waddell and Associates | Memphis, TN |
| Justin Reckers | Pacific Divorce Management | San Diego, CA |
| Michelle Rozsypal | JMG Financial Group, Ltd. | Oak Brook, IL |
| Carol Lee Royer | Waddell and Associates | Memphis, TN |
| Kris Dwyer | Long View Wealth Management. | Atlanta, GA |
| Brad Crump | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Shar Banks | IDFA | Southfield, MI |
| Diana | IDFA (marketing) | Toronto, CA |
| Patricia Young | Kryterion | Sacramento, CA |

During the web conferences, the group reviewed and discussed the content of the draft test definition document. The final test definition document is provided in Appendix A.

# Job Task Analysis

A job task analysis study is a systematic process for collecting information regarding a profession, occupation, or job role to identify the essential job duties and associated knowledge and/or skills required for competent performance. Information on the relative importance of the tasks and knowledge/skills is also collected during this process. The results of the job task analysis describe the breadth and depth of knowledge and skills that must be covered by the certification exam for it to be deemed valid, reliable, and legally defensible. The results of the job task analysis are also used as the basis for the test blueprint and exam development activities. Everything that is measured in the exam must to be linked to an important knowledge or skill from the job task analysis.

The following steps were performed as part of the job task analysis study:

* Literature review to prepare for the job task analysis SME panel meeting
* SME panel meeting to develop the job task analysis survey
* Pilot test and finalization of the job task analysis survey
* Survey administration and data collection
* Data analysis
* SME meeting to review data results and perform linkage study
* Test blueprint development

## Literature Review

In preparation for the job task analysis SME panel meeting, relevant literature of the divorce financial analyst job role was reviewed. Relevant literature included the learning objectives from the CDFA™ training modules and job task analysis data from similar occupations. This information was used to develop a list of draft job tasks that might be performed by a divorce financial analyst and a list of draft knowledge and skills that may be required to perform job tasks. The preliminary lists of job tasks and knowledge/skills were grouped according to similarity and redundant statements were either eliminated or combined.

## Job Task Analysis SME Panel Meeting

On April 21 and 22, 2012, the SME panel meeting to develop the job task analysis survey was held in Nashville, TN. Eleven SMEs and two client representatives participated in the meeting. Table 2 lists the participants of the job task analysis SME meeting.

**Table 2: JTA Panel Meeting Participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| Sandy Arons | Arons & Associates Divorce Planning | Brentwood, TN |
| Rosemary Frank | Dollars of Divorce | Brentwood, TN |
| Amy Bouchie | Ameriprise Financial Services | Evansville, IN |
| Scott Martin | DivorceDirection | Lake Mary, FL |
| Joe Masiello | LPL Financial | Stamford, CT |
| Justin Reckers | Pacific Divorce Management | San Diego, CA |
| Barbara Shapiro | Cadaret Grant | Dedham, MA |
| Andrew Hoffman | Andrew Hoffman, CDFA | Mandeville, LA |
| Kathy Williams | Waddell and Associates | Memphis, TN |
| Perry Long | Long Range Financial, Inc. | Maple Grove, MN |
| Gigi Robson | Respond, LLC | Richmond, VA |
| Brad Crump | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Shar Banks | IDFA | Southfield, MI |
| Patricia Young | Kryterion | Sacramento, CA |

The meeting convened at 12:30 pm on April 21, 2012. At the beginning of the meeting, participants were provided a brief review of the Test Definition document and training on the importance of job task analysis to a certification program, the job task analysis process and steps, and specific guidelines for developing the job task analysis survey.

Before beginning to review and revise the draft task statements, the group was asked to review and provide feedback on the draft task domains (i.e., groupings of task statements) and knowledge domains (i.e., groupings of knowledge and skill statements). The task and knowledge domains can provide a helpful framework for reviewing and writing new or missing task or knowledge/skill statements. Modifications to the domains were made based on SME feedback.

The majority of the first day was spent reviewing the draft task statements as a group. The draft task statements were projected onto a screen to allow edits and added statements to be reviewed and agreed upon as a group. The statements were written using general verbiage that would be understood and applicable to divorce financial analysts working in various specialty areas, geographic regions, and work settings. As the statements were reviewed and edited, the task statements were also assigned to a task domain.

This activity was continued until the group felt a comprehensive list of all job tasks that a divorce financial analyst might perform had been developed.

After completing the task statements, a similar process was used in reviewing and writing the knowledge and skill statements that divorce financial analysts would need to perform the job tasks. The activity continued during the second meeting day until the participants felt that the list of statements represented an accurate and comprehensive list of the knowledge and skills that might be needed to perform the job tasks of a divorce financial analyst.

During the afternoon of the second meeting day, participants were asked to do a final review of the task and knowledge/skill statement lists. Participants were then asked to assist in the development of background information questions for the job task analysis survey. The purpose of the background information questions is to identify characteristics of the survey respondents (e.g., specialty area, years of experience, geographic location) that might impact their job task analysis survey ratings. The background information questions are needed to accurately analyze the data, ensuring that the respondent data included in the analyses have the minimum amount of experience and education required to provide meaningful ratings and that the data can be divided and analyzed by meaningful subgroups (as determined by client representatives or SMEs). As a group, the SMEs wrote the background information questions and response options and suggested a sequence in which the questions should be presented in the survey.

## Online Job Task Analysis Survey

The work product from the job task analysis SME panel meeting was used to create an online job task analysis survey. The survey contained three sections: 17 background information questions, 35 task statements (grouped into nine domains), and 142 knowledge and skill statements (grouped into 10 domains). Responses were required for most of the survey questions; a few demographic information questions in the background information section were the only exceptions (e.g., age, gender, ethnic background).

Respondents were asked to rate each of the task statements on Frequency and Importance. The ratings scales are provided below. The Frequency scale was included to identify job tasks that are performed by a majority of divorce financial analysts and identify job tasks that are performed most frequently.

Task Frequency Rating Scale

0 = Not part of my job

1 = Performed at least once

2 = Performed every few months to yearly

3 = Performed every few weeks to monthly

4 = Performed every few days to weekly

5 = Performed every few hours to daily

The Importance scale was included to identify the tasks that are most important to competent job performance. This information is essential for ensuring that content measured on the certification exam is relevant to competent job performance.

Task Importance Rating Scale

0 = Not Important

1 = Somewhat Important

2 = Important

3 = Very Important

Respondents were asked to rate each knowledge and skill statement on Importance and Needed at Certification. The rating scales are provided below. The Importance scale was included to identify the knowledge and skills that are most important to competent job performance. This information is critical to identifying the knowledge and skills that should be measured on the certification exam or assessed through eligibility requirements to sit for the exam.

Knowledge/Skill Importance Rating Scale

0 = Not Important

1 = Somewhat Important

2 = Important

3 = Very Important

The Needed at Certification scale is included to determine which knowledge and skills are required at the time of earning the certification. Some knowledge and skills are critical for performing the job in a competent manner at the level of the credential and should be measured on the certification exam. Other knowledge and skills may be considered important for advanced performance and acquired after a period of time performing the job; these knowledge and skills should not be measured on the certification exam (but may be appropriate as recertification requirements).

Knowledge/Skill Needed at Certification Rating Scale

0 = No

1 = Yes

## Pilot Test of survey

Thirteen individuals identified by client representatives were asked to pilot test the online job tasks analysis survey. The pilot testers were asked to complete the job task analysis survey and complete a feedback questionnaire. The feedback questionnaire requested their comments and suggested improvements on the survey, including the length of time it takes to complete the survey, clarity of the instructions and rating scales, ease of navigation through the survey, and presentation, content, or other characteristics of the task or knowledge and skill statements. Ten of the 13 individuals completed survey and feedback questionnaire during the pilot testing period. The pilot test was conducted from June 25 to July 15, 2012.

The job tasks analysis survey was revised based on the pilot test feedback and finalized for distribution to the survey target audience. An exported copy of the final job task analysis survey is presented in Appendix B (format and design elements were lost in the export). A paper copy of the job task analysis survey is provided in Appendix C because the answer options for the pull-down menu are not viewable on the exported copy.

## Job Task Analysis Survey Administration

On July 25, 2012, an email invitation to take the job task analysis survey was distributed to 7,488 persons from the IDFA™ mailing list. The email invitation was distributed by Kryterion using the Survey Analytics survey platform. Reminders were sent approximately weekly to these persons until the survey closed on August 13, 2012. A copy of the email invitation and reminder emails is provided in Appendix D.

Incentives were offered for completing the survey. The incentives included a drawing for a 32 GB new iPad and two continuing education credits for current CDFAs™.

A total of 447 respondents completed the survey in its entirety, which met the minimum statistical sampling requirements for a population of this size.

## Job Task Analysis data cleaning

The data from the ten pilot testers and 437 respondents of the final job task analysis survey were consolidated into a single data file for analysis.

Before analyzing the data, a data review and cleaning process was conducted to ensure that only qualified respondents and quality data were included in the analyses. During this process, the data file was checked for duplicate responses (i.e., persons who had completed the survey more than once), response patterns (e.g., no variation on one or more rating scale), and screening criteria identified by IDFA™. There were no duplicate responses to the survey. Data from respondents who had no variation on their ratings on at least three of the four rating scales were removed from the data file. Based on IDFA™ screening criteria, respondents meeting one or more of the following criteria were also removed from the data file.

* Respondents who reported less than one year of experience in their primary occupation.
* Respondents who had less than one year experience providing any financial advisory services, except if respondent was a lawyer or mediator.
* Respondents who reported that they did not provide divorce financial advisory services, except if respondent was a lawyer or mediator.
* Respondents who reported working on zero divorce cases during past year.
* Respondents whose primary occupation was outside of the credential’s target audience (e.g., Admin Assistant).

This resulted in a total loss of 88 respondents. Identifying information regarding the respondents was removed at this time (i.e., name and email address).

There were 359 respondents included in the final data analyses.

## Respondent Demographics

Of the 359 survey respondents included in the final data analyses, the majority were White (90.5%) and had earned at least a Bachelor’s degree (88.9%). Slightly more women (54.6%) completed the survey than men (44.3%). The majority of respondents were between the ages of 41 and 60 years old (63.6%). Tables 3 through 6 below display the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents.

**Table 3: Gender of Respondents**

| **Gender** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Female | 196 | 54.6 |
| Male | 159 | 44.3 |
| Missing/Omitted | 4 | 1.1 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

**Table 4: Ethnicity of Respondents**

| **Ethnicity** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 4 | 1.1 |
| Asian | 9 | 2.5 |
| Black or African American | 4 | 1.1 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5 | 1.4 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 |
| White | 325 | 90.5 |
| Other | 1 | 0.3 |
| Missing/Omitted | 11 | 3.1 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

**Table 5: Age of Respondents**

| **Age Range** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 21-30 | 7 | 1.9 |
| 31-40 | 56 | 15.6 |
| 41-50 | 86 | 24.0 |
| 51-60 | 142 | 39.6 |
| 61-70 | 55 | 15.3 |
| 71 or older | 3 | 0.8 |
| Missing/Omitted | 10 | 2.8 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

**Table 6: Highest Educational Level of Respondents**

| **Highest Educational Level** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| High School diploma or equivalent | 20 | 5.6 |
| Associate’s degree | 20 | 5.6 |
| Bachelor’s degree | 183 | 51.0 |
| Master’s degree | 112 | 31.2 |
| Doctorate degree (e.g., PhD, JD, DBA) | 24 | 6.7 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

The majority of the respondents currently held the CDFA™ designation (88.3%). Many respondents also held one or more other designations or certifications, as identified in Table 7. The “Other” designations or certifications included AAMS, ABA, ABV, ACM, AEP, AFC, AIF, ASA, ATA, ATP, AWMA, CAP, CASL, CBA, CEA, CEBS, CDBV, CFDP, CFDS, CFE, CFF, CFFA, CFFP, CFLS, CFS, CIMA, CIRA, CLTC, CMA, CMFC, CMPS, CPWA, CRC, CRPC, CRPS, CSA, CSNA, CVA, CWC, EA, IAF, IAR, IMA, LCPC, LLM, LMHC, LUTCF, MCDR Certified Mediator, various mediator certifications, NCC, PFS, RP, RFC, Series 6, Series 7, Series 24, Series 65, and WMS.

**Table 7: Other Designations or Certifications**

| **Other Designation or Certification** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CFP | 184 | 51.3 |
| CFA | 7 | 1.9 |
| CPA | 49 | 13.6 |
| JD | 19 | 5.3 |
| ChFC | 28 | 7.8 |
| CLU | 19 | 5.3 |
| None | 49 | 13.6 |
| Other | 146 | 40.7 |

More than half of the respondents reported their primary occupation as financial planner or Certified Financial Planner. Table 8 displays the reported primary occupation of the respondents. The “Other” primary occupations included banker, bank wealth management, business appraiser, CDFA or divorce financial analyst, CDFA educator, CRP, divorce financial advisor and RIA, divorce planner, mediator, mediator and lawyer, mediator and divorce financial advisor, mediator and financial advisor, paralegal, PFS and RIA, and QDRO drafter. Ten of the 29 “Other” responses were mediator or mediator combined with another occupation.

**Table 8: Primary Occupation**

| **Primary Occupation** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Financial Planner or Certified Financial Planner (CFP) | 203 | 56.5 |
| Accountant or Certified Public Accountant (CPA)  | 44 | 12.3 |
| Insurance Agent | 2 | 0.6 |
| Registered Investment Advisor | 32 | 8.9 |
| Lawyer | 9 | 2.5 |
| Registered Representative | 40 | 11.1 |
| Other  | 29 | 8.1 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

The largest percentage of respondents worked for traditional investment/brokerage firms (23.1%), reported being an independent registered investment advisor (20.6%), or worked for independent brokerage firms (18.7%). Table 9 details the type of firm for which respondents worked. The 18 respondents who chose “Other” for this question indicated they were self-employed as a divorce financial advisor or worked for a divorce financial advisor consulting company, divorce advisory company, personal financial planning firm, financial consulting firm, private industry, RIA and divorce advisory company, or RIA and financial planning firm.

**Table 9: Type of Firm for Which Respondents Worked**

| **Type of Firm** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Traditional Investment/Brokerage Firm | 83 | 23.1 |
| Independent Brokerage Firm (e.g., LPL, Raymond James) | 67 | 18.7 |
| Independent Registered Investment Advisor (RIA)  | 74 | 20.6 |
| Dual Registered (i.e., work in both of the above two options) | 31 | 8.6 |
| Bank/Trust Company (e.g., Northern, US Trust, Bessemer) | 4 | 1.1 |
| Investment/Asset Management Company (e.g., mutual funds, hedge funds) | 4 | 1.1 |
| Single or Multi-Family Office Firm | 9 | 2.5 |
| Family Office Member Organization | 1 | 0.3 |
| Insurance Agency or Company | 7 | 1.9 |
| Academic Institution | 1 | 0.3 |
| Law Firm  | 8 | 2.2 |
| Accounting Firm | 40 | 11.1 |
| Mediation Firm | 12 | 3.3 |
| Other  | 18 | 5.0 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

The largest percentage of respondents reported working in their primary occupation for more than 20 years (35.9%). Very few respondents reported less than six years of experiences. Table 10 displays the number of years of experience the respondents reported working in their primary occupation.

**Table 10: Years of Experience in Primary Occupation**

| **Years of Experience** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Less than 1 year | 0 | 0 |
| 1 year to 5 years | 43 | 12.0 |
| 6 to 10 years | 62 | 17.3 |
| 11 to 15 years | 67 | 18.7 |
| 16 to 20 years | 58 | 16.2 |
|  More than 20 years | 129 | 35.9 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

As might be expected, most respondents also reported having more than 10 years experience providing financial advisory services. The largest percentage of respondents reported having more than 20 years of experience providing financial advisory services (29.5%). Table 11 provides the number of years of experience providing financial advisory services that respondents reported. The person reporting less than one year of experience providing financial advisory services was either a lawyer or mediator.

**Table 11: Years of Experience Providing Financial Advisory Services**

| **Years of Experience** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Less than 1 year | 1 | 0.3 |
| 1 year to 5 years | 39 | 10.9 |
| 6 to 10 years | 62 | 17.3 |
| 11 to 15 years | 72 | 20.1 |
| 16 to 20 years | 50 | 13.9 |
| More than 20 years | 106 | 29.5 |
| Not applicable – I don’t provide financial advisory services. | 29 | 8.1 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

Most respondents provided a range of services for their clients (e.g., portfolio management, financial planning, retirement planning, estate planning). Table 12 displays the number and percentage of respondents who indicated that they provided each service to the majority of their clients during the past one year. The “Other” responses included accounting and auditing, bookkeeping, budgeting, business valuation, college or education financial planning, division of financial assets or community estates, tracing separate property, divorce financial analysis, divorce litigation support, divorce planning, divorce settlement planning, liability management, financial litigation support, financial neutral in mediation and collaborative processes, financial planning for mediated divorce, financial statement preparation, fraud investigations, legal support to attorney, long-term care planning, mediation, collaborative law negotiation, judge pro tem, private corporations, QDROs, tax compliance and accounting services, tax preparation, and valuation.

**Table 12: Services Provided to Majority of Clients During Past Year**

| **Services Provided to Majority of Clients** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Portfolio Management | 234 | 65.2 |
| Brokerage  | 109 | 30.4 |
| Tax Planning | 157 | 43.7 |
| Estate Planning  | 173 | 48.2 |
| Multigenerational Family Legacy Planning  | 73 | 20.3 |
| Asset Protection Planning | 130 | 36.2 |
| Charitable Giving | 61 | 17.0 |
| Planning for Executives | 58 | 16.2 |
| Retirement Planning | 259 | 72.1 |
| Planning for Closely Held Business Owners | 61 | 17.0 |
| Insurance Planning | 158 | 44.0 |
| Financial Planning | 275 | 76.6 |
| Legal Representation | 8 | 2.2 |
| Other  | 52 | 14.5 |

Most of respondents (67.4%) reported working in one state or jurisdiction as either a CDFA™ or RIA. Another 11.4% of respondents reported working in two states or jurisdictions as a CDFA™ or RIA. Table 13 displays the number of states or jurisdictions in which respondents reported working as a CDFA™ or RIA. Figure 1 displays the number of respondents who reported working in each state or jurisdiction. Respondents were well dispersed across the United States.

**Table 13: Number of States or Jurisdictions Worked as CDFA™ or RIA**

| **Number of States or Jurisdictions** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 242 | 67.4 |
| 2 | 41 | 11.4 |
| 3 | 21 | 5.8 |
| 4 | 9 | 2.5 |
| 5 | 9 | 2.5 |
| 6 | 9 | 2.5 |
| 7 | 4 | 1.1 |
| 8 | 7 | 1.9 |
| 9 | 2 | 0.6 |
| 10 | 3 | 0.8 |
| 11 | 4 | 1.1 |
| 12 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 13 | 2 | 0.6 |
| 15 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 17 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 19 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 26 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 33 | 1 | 0.3 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

**Figure 1: U.S. States or Jurisdictions Worked as CDFA™ or RIA**

The majority of respondents reported working in suburban or urban communities. Table 14 below displays the number and percent of respondents who reported working in each type of community. The “Other” community types reported included exurban and metroplex.

**Table 14: Community Type**

| **Number of Divorce Cases** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Urban | 155 | 43.2 |
| Suburban | 247 | 68.8 |
| Rural | 33 | 9.2 |
| Other | 2 | 0.6 |

The vast majority of respondents reported providing divorce financial advisory services (98.6%). The five respondents included in the final data analysis that did not report providing divorce financial advisory services were either lawyers or mediators.

If respondents reported that they had earned the CDFA™ credential or provided divorce financial advisory services, they were asked how many divorce cases they had worked on during the past year. Table 15 provides their responses. The largest percentage of respondents reported working on one or two divorce cases during the past year.

**Table 15: Number of Divorce Cases Worked During Past Year**

| **Number of Divorce Cases** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 to 2 | 106 | 29.5 |
| 3 to 5 | 93 | 25.9 |
| 6 to 10 | 57 | 15.9 |
| 11 to 15 | 23 | 6.4 |
| 16 to 20 | 16 | 4.5 |
| Didn’t receive question | 20 | 5.6 |
| **Total** | **359** | **100.0** |

Respondents who reported having the CDFA™ credential or providing divorce financial advisory services were also asked about the cases on which they worked during the past year. Most respondents reported working on a combination of types of divorce cases that consisted of predominately litigation, mediation, and collaboration divorce cases. Table 16 shows the number of respondents that indicated some percentage of the divorce cases on which they worked fell into each category. The “Other” type of divorce cases included a no fault divorce.

**Table 16: Types of Divorce Cases Worked**

| **Types of Divorce Cases** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Litigation | 197 | 54.9 |
| Mediation | 211 | 58.8 |
| Collaboration | 130 | 36.2 |
| Arbitration | 21 | 5.8 |
| Cooperative | 77 | 21.4 |
| Uncontested | 65 | 18.1 |
| Pro se | 38 | 10.6 |
| Other | 1 | 0.3 |

Figures 2 through 8 show the percentage of divorce cases that respondents reported having worked in each category during the past year.

**Figure 2: Percentage of Litigation Divorce Cases**

**Figure 3: Percentage of Mediation Divorce Cases**

**Figure 4: Percentage of Collaboration Divorce Cases**

**Figure 5: Percentage of Arbitration Divorce Cases**

**Figure 6: Percentage of Cooperative Divorce Cases**

**Figure 7: Percentage of Uncontested Divorce Cases**

**Figure 8: Percentage of Pro Se Divorce Cases**

Respondents reported working on cases with a marital worth of varying sizes during the past year. Table 17 identifies the number and percentage of respondents who reported working on cases within each range of marital worth during the past year.

**Table 17: Marital Worth of Cases**

| **Client Net Worth** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Less than $500,000 | 227 | 63.2 |
| $500,000 to $1 million | 209 | 58.2 |
| $1 million to $5 million | 205 | 57.1 |
| More than $5 million  | 79 | 22.0 |

Figures 9 through 12 show the percentage of cases that respondents reported working in each marital worth range during the past year.

**Figure 9: Percentage of Cases With Marital Worth of Less Than $500,000**

**Figure 10: Percentage of Cases With Marital Worth of $500,000 to $1 Million**

**Figure 11: Percentage of Cases With Marital Worth of $1 Million to $5 Million**

**Figure 12: Percentage of Cases With Marital Worth of More Than $5 Million**

## Job Task Analysis Data Analysis and results

The survey data were analyzed using all 359 respondents and by dividing the data into the following subgroups.

* Respondents who held the CDFA™ designation
* Primary occupation of respondents

The goal of the analyses was to identify the critical tasks and critical knowledge and skills required for competent performance as a divorce financial analyst. Before being considered final, the preliminary data results were reviewed by 11 SMEs and two client representatives during a web conference meeting on September 12, 2012. A list of the meeting participants is provided in Table 18.

**Table 18: JTA Data Review Participants of September 12, 2012 Meeting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| Peter Cicciari | Maranatha Financial Services | Simi Valley, CA |
| Carol Moya | Carol C. Moya & Associates, Inc. | Oldsmar, FL |
| Pattie Adair Morgan | Adair Financial Group | Pittsburg, PA |
| Lisa Benneig | Lisa Benneig, CDFA | Williston, VT |
| Rosemary Frank | Dollars of Divorce | Brentwood, TN |
| Ivy Menchel | Family Wealth Planning Partners | New York, NY |
| David Emery | The Marshall Financial Group | Doylestown, PA |
| Darlys Harmon-Wright | Financial Solutions for Divorce | Louisville, KY |
| Sherry Gozur | Gozur Financial Consulting Corp. | Charlotte, NC |
| Adam Landvik | Landvik Financial | Arden Hills, MN |
| Joseph O’Donnell | Wellington West Capital | Fredericton, NB |
| Brad Crump | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Matthew Armstrong | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Patricia Young | Kryterion | Sacramento, CA |

### Task Results

To identify the critical tasks required to competently perform the job of a divorce financial analyst, the following retention criteria were used to generate the preliminary data results.

1. At least 60% of the respondents had to indicate that the task is performed or is part of the job (i.e., assign a task Frequency rating of 1 or greater).
2. The mean Importance rating, for those respondents who provided a Frequency rating of 1 or greater, had to be at least 1.50, which is the mid-point of the rating scale.

As mentioned above, SMEs reviewed the preliminary data results before they were considered final.

In all analyses, one task statement (task #27) did not meet the above retention criteria; specifically, it did not meet the Frequency retention criterion. Table 19 displays the average task importance rating and standard deviation for the tasks within each task domain.

**Table 19: Relative Importance of Task Domains**

| **Task Domains** | **Average Importance Rating** | **Importance Rating Std. Dev** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Establishing the parameters of the engagement | 2.62 | 0.63 |
| 2: Gathering relevant documents and information | 2.80 | 0.44 |
| 3: Analyzing and evaluating the information | 2.80 | 0.45 |
| 4: Developing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 2.67 | 0.56 |
| 5: Communicating analysis and/or recommendation(s) and obtaining feedback | 2.78 | 0.47 |
| 6: Adjusting and finalizing analysis and/or recommendation(s) | 2.63 | 0.60 |
| 7: Carrying out the scope of the agreement or engagement | 2.48 | 0.70 |
| 8: Providing post-divorce client services | 2.45 | 0.70 |
| 9: Practicing within professional and regulatory standards | 2.88 | 0.36 |

The SMEs recommended retaining all 35 task statements as critical to competent performance as a divorce financial analyst. Appendix E includes a list of the task statements, overall data results, and task results for the subgroup analyses. The overall data results worksheet includes the SME final disposition for each task statement. The SMEs suggested a minor clarification to the wording of task statements #30 and #31 that are shown in red font in Appendix E on the overall data worksheet.

### Knowledge and Skill Results

To identify the critical knowledge and skills required for competent performance as a divorce financial analyst, the following retention criteria were used to generate the preliminary data results.

1. At least 60% of the respondents had to indicate that the knowledge or skill is Needed at Certification.
2. The mean Importance rating had to be at least 1.50, which is the mid-point of the rating scale.

As with the task statements, SMEs reviewed the preliminary data results before they were considered final. The knowledge and skill statement data results were initially reviewed on September 12, 2012, by the 11 SMEs and two client representatives listed in Table 18 above. However, after item writers had difficulty writing items to certain knowledge and skill statements, a second group of SMEs was convened on May 3, 2013, to reconsider the retention of the knowledge and skill statements with which the item writers were struggling. The majority of these knowledge and skill statements were statements that did not meet the Needed At Certification retention criterion listed above, but were retained by the September 2012 SME group. The participants of the second review web conference are listed in Table 20 below.

**Table 20: JTA Data Review Participants of May 3, 2013 Meeting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| Michelle Smith | Source Financial Advisors | New York, NY |
| Barbara Shapiro | Cadaret Grant | Dedham, MA |
| Seth Kaplan | Robert W. Baird & Company, Inc | Sacramento, CA |
| Justin Reckers | Pacific Divorce Management | San Diego, CA |
| Diane Shepherd | IDFA | Toronto, ON |
| Brad Crump | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Matthew Armstrong | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Patricia Young | Kryterion | Sacramento, CA |

Using the data from all 359 respondents, 24 of the 142 knowledge and skill statements did not meet the above retention criteria. All 24 statements did not meet the Needed at Certification retention criterion. Table 21 displays the average knowledge/skill importance rating and standard deviation for the knowledge and skill statements within each knowledge domain.

**Table 21: Relative Importance of Knowledge Domains**

| **Knowledge Domains** | **Average Importance Rating** | **Importance Rating Std. Dev** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 2.57 | 0.59 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 2.48 | 0.68 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 2.70 | 0.52 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation | 2.84 | 0.40 |
| 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits | 2.50 | 0.65 |
| 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 2.66 | 0.56 |
| 7: Insurance and Risk Management | 2.51 | 0.64 |
| 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy | 2.43 | 0.72 |
| 9: Financial Analysis and Planning | 2.60 | 0.59 |
| 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) | 2.25 | 0.77 |

The SMEs reviewed the knowledge and skill statement data. During the September 2012 meeting, the SMEs recommended retaining all except one of the 142 knowledge and skill statements for measurement in the CDFA™ examination. They recommended eliminating knowledge and skill statement #79 because it is not needed at the time of certification. Additionally, there were five statements that the SMEs recommended retaining for measurement in the CDFA™ examination (#14, 35, 36, 72 and 120) with restrictions or limitations to ensure any subgroup of examinees would not be advantaged or disadvantaged by item content (e.g., regional, jurisdictional, or specialty area differences). Finally, a new knowledge and skill statement was written to fill a gap that the SMEs felt was missing when reviewing the knowledge and skill statement data.

When it became clear that it would be necessary to review some of the knowledge and skill statement retention decisions made during the September 2012 meeting, the SMEs invited to the May 2013 meeting were provided with the original version of the technical report (dated December 3, 2012) in order to review the process and outcomes of the job task analysis data review and test blueprint meetings held in September 2012. At the beginning of the May 2013 meeting, the job task analysis data review process was summarized and the challenges experienced by item writers were explained to the SME participants. The goal of the meeting was explained and the SMEs were given an opportunity to ask questions.

IDFA™ representatives had highlighted the knowledge and skill statements on which the item writers were having difficulty writing items. The May 2013 SME group was asked to review these statements in relation to the job task analysis survey data and make a final determination regarding whether the statement should be measured on the CDFA™ examination. The May 2013 SME group retained 105 of the 142 knowledge and skill statements that appeared on the job task analysis survey. Thirty-seven knowledge and skill statements from the survey plus the new statement added by the September 2012 SME group were eliminated from measurement in the examination. Nine statements (#14, 37, 71, 72, 94, 135, 140, 141, and 143 [which is the statement added in the September 2012 review meeting]) were eliminated because the knowledge was state or jurisdiction specific and could not be fairly measured in a national certification examination. Twelve knowledge and skill statements were eliminated (#5, 7, 11, 70, 104, 105, 106, 119, 120, 128, 132, and 137) because they were covered or could be logically combined with other knowledge and skill statements for measurement on the examination. Sixteen statements were eliminated (#23, 24, 25, 26, 79, 92, 93, 95, 96, 100, 101, 122, 123, 124, 131, and 134) because they were not required at the time of certification; many of these knowledge and skill statements represent more advanced or specialized knowledge or skills that would be expected of the more experienced professional (i.e., the minimally qualified candidate for this certification is not expected to possess these knowledge and skills). One additional statement (#8) was eliminated for measurement in the examination because it would be difficult to measure in a multiple choice examination and could be better assessed in continuing education courses. Appendix F includes a list of the knowledge and skill statements, overall data results, and knowledge/skill subgroup data results. The overall data results worksheet includes the SME final disposition for each knowledge and skill statement. All edits to the statements are shown in red font in Appendix F on the overall data worksheet. These edits include the new knowledge and skill statement suggested by the September 2012 SME group (#143) and SME-suggested clarifications or changes to the wording of the knowledge and skill statements.

### Linkage Study

A linkage study was performed to ensure that all knowledge and skill statements retained to be measured in the certification exam could be linked to a retained task from the job task analysis. The linkage study was completed by eight SMEs who participated in the data review web conference on September 12, 2012. A list of participating SMEs is provided in Table 22 below. Please note that it was not necessary to update the linkage information after the May 2013 revisions to the job task analysis data since there were no changes to the task statement retention.

**Table 22: JTA Linkage Study Participants**

| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Peter Cicciari | Maranatha Financial Services | Simi Valley, CA |
| Carol Moya | Carol C. Moya & Associates, Inc. | Oldsmar, FL |
| Pattie Adair Morgan | Adair Financial Group | Pittsburg, PA |
| Rosemary Frank | Dollars of Divorce | Brentwood, TN |
| Ivy Menchel | Family Wealth Planning Partners | New York, NY |
| Darlys Harmon-Wright | Financial Solutions for Divorce | Louisville, KY |
| Sherry Gozur | Gozur Financial Consulting Corp. | Charlotte, NC |
| Joseph O’Donnell | Wellington West Capital | Fredericton, NB |

The purpose of the activity and explanation of how the linkage study would be used was explained during the web conference. SMEs were then emailed the instructions, a linkage form, and a task domain definition document (i.e., list of the task statements grouped by domain, sorted by mean importance rating in descending order) so that they could complete the activity independently. SMEs were asked to read the instructions and review the task domain definition document before beginning the exercise. To complete the activity, SMEs were asked to read each retained knowledge and skill statement and indicate if the knowledge or skill is helpful or essential to performing the tasks in each task domain. The SMEs were to enter a “1” in the relevant cell if they thought the knowledge or skill is helpful or essential to performing the tasks in the task domain. The SMEs provided a total of 1,278 ratings (142 knowledge/skill statements x 9 task domains).

For a knowledge or skill statement to be measured in the certification exam, at least 60% of the SMEs had to say that it was helpful or essential to performing the tasks in at least one task domain. Appendix G provides the final linkage results; a “1” indicates that 60% or more of the SMEs (i.e., 5 or more of the 8 participating SMEs) indicated that the knowledge or skill was helpful or essential to performing the tasks in the relevant domain. All 142 knowledge and skill statements were linked to at least one task domain. Many statements were linked to more than one task domain (average number of linkages=6.24 with a standard deviation=1.25).

# Test Blueprint

A test blueprint was developed for the CDFA™ examination using a two-step process. First, a draft test blueprint was calculated based on the knowledge and skill importance ratings from the job task analysis and the linkage study results. This draft test blueprint provided the percent of the exam that should be covered by each knowledge domain. The number of items per domain for exams of various lengths was also provided to allow a more concrete translation of each domain weight. The second step involved SME input on the quantitative test blueprint to ensure it made sense and would adequately measure a candidate’s knowledge and skill on each examination domain. Additionally, SMEs provided input regarding the number of items needed on the examination overall to adequately assess a candidate’s competency on the content domains.

A web conference was held on September 19, 2012, with six SMEs and two IDFA™ representatives to review the initial quantitative test blueprint. The participants of this meeting are listed in Table 23 below.

**Table 23: September 2012 Test Blueprint Meeting Participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Employer** | **City, State** |
| Peter Cicciari | Maranatha Financial Services | Simi Valley, CA |
| Darlys Harmon-Wright | Financial Solutions for Divorce | Louisville, KY |
| Pattie Adair Morgan | Adair Financial Group | Pittsburg, PA |
| Carol Moya | Carol C. Moya & Associates, Inc. | Oldsmar, FL |
| Adam Lanvick | Landvik Financial | Arden Hills, MN |
| Ivy Menchel | Family Wealth Planning Partners | New York, NY |
| Brad Crump | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Matthew Armstrong | IDFA | Durham, NC |
| Patricia Young | Kryterion | Sacramento, CA |

Because the changes made to the knowledge and skill statement results in May 2013 affect the test blueprint, a new quantitative test blueprint was calculated and presented to the group of SMEs listed in Table 20 during the May 3, 2013 meeting. For reference, a summary of the quantitative test blueprint that was presented to the September 2012 meeting participants is provided in Table 24.

**Table 24: Quantitatively-Derived Draft Test Blueprint for September 2012 Meeting**

| **Knowledge Domains** | **Percent of Exam** | **# of items for 150-item exam** | **# of items for 200-item exam** | **# of items for 250-item exam** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 7.24 | 10.86 | 14.49 | 18.11 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 11.07 | 16.61 | 22.15 | 27.69 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 15.39 | 23.09 | 30.79 | 38.49 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation | 11.93 | 17.90 | 23.87 | 29.83 |
| 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits | 5.25 | 7.87 | 10.50 | 13.12 |
| 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 10.66 | 16.00 | 21.33 | 26.66 |
| 7: Insurance and Risk Management | 6.60 | 9.90 | 13.19 | 16.49 |
| 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy | 6.52 | 9.78 | 13.04 | 16.29 |
| 9: Financial Analysis and Planning | 17.02 | 25.53 | 34.04 | 42.55 |
| 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) | 8.31 | 12.46 | 16.61 | 20.77 |

A summary of the revised quantitative test blueprint that was presented to the May 2013 meeting participants is provided in Table 25.

**Table 25: Revised Quantitatively-Derived Draft Test Blueprint for May 2013 Meeting**

| **Knowledge Domains** | **Percent of Exam** | **# of items for 150-item exam** | **# of items for 200-item exam** | **# of items for 225-item exam** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 7.65 | 11.47 | 15.30 | 17.21 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 11.64 | 17.46 | 23.28 | 26.19 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 18.46 | 27.69 | 36.93 | 41.54 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation | 14.90 | 22.35 | 29.80 | 33.53 |
| 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits | 4.27 | 6.41 | 8.55 | 9.61 |
| 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 13.31 | 19.97 | 26.63 | 29.96 |
| 7: Insurance and Risk Management | 4.03 | 6.04 | 8.06 | 9.06 |
| 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy | 4.39 | 6.58 | 8.78 | 9.87 |
| 9: Financial Analysis and Planning | 16.82 | 25.23 | 33.64 | 37.85 |
| 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) | 4.53 | 6.79 | 9.05 | 10.18 |

During both test blueprint meetings, the SMEs were provided a brief training on the purpose, importance, and components of test blueprints. The SMEs were then asked to review the draft test blueprint and provide feedback in relation to the domain groupings and names, number of items needed to adequately assess a candidate’s knowledge and skill on each domain, and the number of items needed on the exam overall to adequately assess a candidate’s competency on the content domains.

During the September 2012 meeting, the SMEs recommended slight increases or decreases in the exam domain weights to accommodate the complexity and intricacies of the knowledge and skills covered by each domain. The SMEs recommended that the examination form contain a total of 225 multiple-choice items with 10 to 15% of these items relating to case studies. Table 26 contains the recommended exam domains and weights from the September 2012 meeting.

**Table 26: SME-Recommended Exam Domain Groupings and Weights from September 2012 Meeting**

| **Knowledge Domains** | **Percent of Exam** | **# of items for 225-item exam** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 7 | 16 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 11 | 25 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 16 | 35 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation | 12 | 27 |
| 5: Social Security and Other Government Benefits | 4 | 10 |
| 6: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 11 | 25 |
| 7: Insurance and Risk Management | 7 | 15 |
| 8: Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy | 7 | 15 |
| 9: Financial Analysis and Planning | 16 | 37 |
| 10: Specialty Areas (e.g., military, same-sex, special needs, late-life divorce, disabilities) | 9 | 20 |

During the May 2013 test blueprint meeting, the SMEs recommended combining some of the examination domains because four of the domains had been reduced to a point that they could not be reliably measured in the examination. The SMEs recommended combining domains 4 and 5 and naming the combined domain Retirement Plans and Taxation and Social Security Benefits. They also recommended combining domains 7, 8, and 10 and naming the combined domain Specialty Areas (and noting that it includes insurance and risk management; debt, credit, and bankruptcy; and other specialty areas (e.g., military, same-sex, late-life divorce, disabilities). The SMEs thought that the quantitative domain weights made sense and recommended implementing rounded versions of these percentages. With the reduced number of knowledge and skill statements to be measured in the examination, the May 2013 SME group recommended reducing the number of items on the exam overall to 150 multiple choice items because they felt that a candidate’s competency could adequately be assessed with 150 items. They supported the September 2012 group’s recommendation to have 10 to 15% of the examination items associated to case studies. Table 27 contains the SME-recommended examination domains and weights from the May 2013 meeting. These also represent the final examination weights for the CDFA™ test blueprint.

**Table 27: SME-Recommended Exam Domain Groupings and Weights from May 2013 Meeting**

| **Knowledge Domains** | **Percent of Exam** | **# of items for 150-item exam** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Professional Responsibilities | 8 | 12 |
| 2: Divorce Law and Legal Terminology | 12 | 18 |
| 3: Property and Taxation | 18 | 27 |
| 4: Retirement Plans and Taxation and Social Security Benefits | 19 | 29 |
| 5: Spousal and Child Support And Taxation | 13 | 19 |
| 6: Financial Analysis and Planning | 17 | 26 |
| 7: Specialty Areas (Includes Insurance and Risk Management; Debt, Credit, and Bankruptcy; and other specialty areas [e.g., military, same-sex, late-life divorce, disabilities]) | 13 | 19 |

During the September 2012 meeting, the SMEs provided recommendations regarding the cognitive level at which test items should be written for each knowledge or skill statement to be measured in the exam. The SMEs were given a brief overview of item cognitive difficulty levels before beginning the activity. The cognitive difficulty levels are provided below. The cognitive difficulty level assignments were not updated by the May 2013 SME participants.

1 - Knowledge/Recall

2 - Application/Analysis

3 - Evaluation/Synthesis

The SME recommended test blueprint was approved by the IDFA™. Appendix H contains the final test blueprint.
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