

CE/T Standards Development Committee Meeting Summary – February 6, 2023

Attendees

Present: Kevin, Tye, Mohammed, Barbara, Wen, Mair, Elizabeth, Amy, Daniel, Larissa, Nick, and James

Absent: April, Nikoya, and Dave

Summary

Introduction

- **Agenda Overview**
 - Roll call by tag team: Sherrard, Kevin, and Laverne
 - Review draft development subcommittee work
 - Review research subcommittee work
 - Overview of proposed draft standard by Kevin
 - Overview of ballot process and work draft procedure by Sherrard
 - Vote to register final working draft for draft standard stage
 - Review and comment by March 20th for registered draft standard
 - Reconvene on March 27th to address comments and discuss next steps
 - Request for interpretation subcommittee volunteers
 - Adjournment
- **Roll Call**
 - Majority present for quorum
 - Committee members confirmed attendance

Draft Subcommittee Work Review



- **Draft Subcommittee Work**

- 8 committee members met 14 times since June 13th
- Reviewed new 2023 standard format with 7 sections
- Addressed 34 elements from 2018 standard plus proposed additional elements
- Document reviewed twice for clarity and consensus

Research Subcommittee Work Review

- **Research Subcommittee Work**

- 6 members met biweekly since June 7th
- Initial scope on various trends narrowed down to skill-based training, DEI trends, and microlearning
- Suggested monitoring other trends for future consideration
- Proposed immediate consideration of microlearning, especially for CEUs
- Constructed a survey on DEI for global understanding

The New Draft

- **Technical Issues with Meetings**

- Participants faced challenges with Zoom meetings and had to update their software.
- Some had trouble opening Zoom links and had to access meetings through browsers.
- Despite technological advancements, issues with software compatibility persisted.

- **Meeting Overview**

- Participants struggled with audio and visual connections during the meeting.
- Efforts were made to ensure all members could join the call successfully.
- Time zone differences caused some members to miss previous meetings.

- **Research Committee Updates**

- The committee has been meeting biweekly since June 7th.
- Initial focus areas included skill-based training, DEI trends, hybrid learning, metaverse training, and micro-learning.



- Narrowed down focus to skill-based training, DEI trends, and micro-learning for immediate consideration.
- Proposed monitoring other trends for future relevance and conducting a survey on global DEI trends.
- **Presentation of Substantive Changes**
 - Overview of substantive changes in the new draft document was provided.
 - The new format aligns more closely with other ANSI standards.
 - Participants will have a comment period to delve deeper into the document.
- **Conclusion**
 - Participants were informed about the format changes in the new draft.
 - Emphasis was placed on allowing time for thorough review during the comment period.

Requirement Of Standard

- **Overview of the new format**
 - Yellow highlights for clarification
 - High-level components: scope reference terminology, requirements for use, learning, and successful achievement
 - Mapping existing learning clauses into the new document
 - Retained about 95% of content from the old document
- **Terms and Definitions**
 - 38 terms defined for significance and use
 - Inclusion of language from various sources like ISET guidance documents
- **Requirements for CE Provider**
 - Reorganized sections for organization responsibilities, controls, and documentation
 - Written policies required for specific areas
- **Requirements for Learning Program**
 - Covers instructional design, learning content, assessment of outcomes, personnel, learning environment, program evaluation, and recognition of achievement



- **Adjustments in the Standard**
 - Transition from 2-digit to 4-digit numerical designations for elements
 - Language tuning for specificity and clarity
 - Emphasis on maintaining high quality, improving organization, and achieving mission
- **Calculation of CEUs**
 - Proposal to calculate CEUs to the 100th instead of the 10th
 - Aimed at recognizing microlearning in a more granular way
- **Enhancements in Learning Assessments**
 - Shift towards objective, measurable, and documented assessments
 - Focus on rigor and evidence in assessing mastery of learning outcomes
- **Evaluation Criteria**
 - Emphasis on including specific aspects in learning event evaluations
 - Criteria include quality of materials, learning environment, instructor competence, meeting learner expectations, and suggestions for improvements
- **Call for Feedback**
 - Encouragement for reviewers to provide comments during the feedback period
 - Detailed information to be available in the documents for further review and understanding

Draft Standard Step

- **Presentation and Confirmation**
 - Members of the work in draft subcommittee affirm readiness to present and turn over the final work in draft to the Standards Development Committee.
 - Balloting process overview presented with affirmation from members.
- **Committee Draft vs. Draft Standard**
 - Committee draft allows for more work and initial comments before the draft standard ballot.
 - Committee draft ballot open for at least 3 weeks, draft standard for at least 6 weeks.



- **Voting Process**

- Affirmative, affirmative with comment, negative with justification, or abstain options in the electronic ballot.
- Quorum needed for the ballot, determined by consensus.

- **Decision and Timeline**

- Proposal to register the draft as a draft standard for a 6-week ballot period.
- Comments to be submitted by March 20th, resolution meeting on March 27th.

- **Motion and Voting**

- Motion made to register the draft to draft standard stage, seconded, and voted upon.
- Majority in favor of registering the draft as a draft standard.

Conclusion

The decision to move directly to the draft standard stage was made after discussion and voting among the members present, with the majority in favor of the proposal. The timeline for submission of comments and the resolution meeting was set, ensuring progress towards finalizing the draft for approval.

Addressing Comments on Draft Standard

- **Timeline for Review**

- Review proposed draft "cetdash2023_workingdraft1" by March 20th.
- Meeting on March 27th to resolve comments and finalize the draft for council approval.

- **Comment Sheet Instructions**

- Add initials on the line you comment on.
- Provide justification and proposed changes for clarity.
- Line numbers crucial for reference and grouping comments.

- **Voting and Addressing Comments**

- Vote to move forward with comments.
- Committee decides how to address comments.
- Ability to make comments multiple times before final vote.



- **Visibility of Comments**
 - Comments circulated before the meeting on March 27th.
 - Comments and vote happen simultaneously.
 - Additional meetings needed to address all comments.
- **Concerns about Participation**
 - Participant's absence from 15th to 21st.
 - Comments circulated for review even before the meeting on 27th.
- **Decision Making Process**
 - Decide to move forward with draft with or without comments.
 - Present comments on March 27th for resolution and closure.

Actual Draft Standard

- **Email Communication**
 - Laverne will email both the comment sheet and the actual draft standard to everyone.
 - Emphasize confidentiality and not circulating the draft standard.
- **Balloting Process**
 - Options for balloting: Yes with comment, No with justification, or abstain.
 - Timeline: 6 weeks at the committee level, then 2 weeks to move up to the council.
- **Next Steps**
 - Final approval by the council, public comment by ANSI, resolving public comments within the committee, final review by the council, and consensus by ANSI.
 - Target timeline for finalizing the standard by August.
- **Interpretation Subcommittee**
 - Looking for 5-10 members for the interpretation subcommittee.
 - Responsibilities include updating guidance and handling official interpretations.
 - Volunteers needed for the subcommittee.

Conclusion



- **Question on Fielding Questions**
 - Discussion on the process of fielding questions from stakeholders.
 - Past experience with receiving questions related to accreditation rather than specific elements of the standard.
- **Acknowledgment and Thanks**
 - Appreciation for committee members' participation and dedication.
 - Recognition of the hard work and expertise contributed by subcommittee members.
 - Thanking the staff support team for their efforts in the background.
- **Adjournment**
 - Closing remarks and plans for future communications and next steps.

