

CE/T Standards Development Committee Meeting Summary – October 2023

Attendees

Present: Kevin, Mair, Wen, Amy, Daniel, Larissa

Absent: April, Barbara, Nikoya, Elizabeth, Tye, Mohammed, Dave, James, and Nick

Summary

Introduction

- **Meeting Agenda**
 - Call to order and roll call
 - Welcome and thanks from Kevin
 - Summary of committee and subcommittee activities
 - Discussion on next steps
 - Open discussion on opportunities for improvement
- **Roll Call**
 - Noted attendance of members
 - Lack of quorum for voting
- **Chair's Welcome**
 - Kevin expresses gratitude for dedication and participation
 - Reflects on the progress made in developing standards
 - Acknowledges the work of subcommittees and upcoming tasks
- **Summary of Activity**
 - Journey since March of the previous year
 - Progress from research committee to draft committee
 - Iterations leading to a draft standard for public comment

Final Draft Standard

- **Feedback and Clarity**
 - Received many comments and feedback to shape the standard
 - Aimed to provide guidance for accreditation and quality program development
 - Progressed to the final draft standard phase in the orange section of the process
- **Subcommittee Work**
 - Research subcommittee focused on current trends like microlearning, DEI, hybrid learning, and AI



- Emphasis on microlearning for CU recognition and acceptance of learning modules as short as 6 minutes
- Research on artificial intelligence's impact on continuing education and responsible use
- **Drafts of the Committee**
 - Began meeting in June 2022 for initial revision and development of the draft standard
 - Submitted for public comment in May, followed by meetings in August to incorporate feedback
 - Final draft standard submitted to the full SDC for vote and approval
- **Acknowledgments**
 - Subcommittee members dedicated significant time and effort to the revision
 - Appreciation for Laverne's assistance in managing and consolidating public comments
 - Positive working environment and collaboration within the group
- **Ballot Work**
 - March ballot on the draft standard's initial work to proceed for public comment
 - Continuation of the process towards finalizing and submitting the standard to ANSI

Review of Process

- **Voting Process and Acceptance of Document**
 - Initial ballot closed on 20th March with 10 affirmative votes out of 10.
 - Next ballot closed on 20th September with 13 affirmative votes out of 15.
 - Document accepted for submission to ANSI after meeting quorum.
- **Next Steps: Council Approval**
 - Council to review based on parameters: scope alignment, clarity, and impact on stakeholders.
 - Finalization of documentation for ANSI submission after council approval.
 - Meeting scheduled for next week to ensure all requirements are met.
- **Future Plans and Timeline**
 - Aim to submit to ANSI by the week of 16th.
 - Expectation to move towards publication by December.
 - Launch of new application processes in January.
- **Committee Updates and Future Opportunities**
 - Interpretation subcommittee working on application language revision.
 - Research committee expected to grow for developing new standards.
 - Focus on educating stakeholders for better performance as CT administrators.
- **Reflection on the Process**
 - Positive outcome of the process.
 - Acknowledgment of areas for improvement in communication and efficiency.
 - Satisfaction with the standard and groundwork laid for ongoing research.
- **Open Discussion**
 - Encouragement for feedback on improving the process.
 - Positive feedback on the evolution and effectiveness of the process.



Chapter 4: Know The Way

- **Documentation and Orientation**
 - Provide specific orientation for the committee in the first meeting.
 - Detailed description of what will happen, how, and when.
 - Introduce resources like Laverne at the beginning to clarify roles.
- **Leadership and Guidance**
 - Kevin and Laverne's leadership and guidance were essential.
 - Kevin's guidance in meetings was helpful.
 - Laverne's presentation in a grid format made the process logical.
- **Committee Suggestions**
 - Research subcommittee could start before standards development.
 - Consider starting with a smaller committee of 5 or 6 members.
 - Coordination between research and standards development.
- **Value of Commissioner**
 - Having a commissioner on the standards committee is valuable.
 - Standards should be developed with the perspective of potential providers and commissioners.
 - Standards should be auditable without significant judgment calls.
- **Positive Team Experience**
 - Process went well with respectful discussions.
 - Insertion of new considerations like DEI and AI was noted.
 - Appreciation for the teamwork and overall experience.

Commissioners On Draft Subcommittee

- **Importance of having 2 commissioners on draft development**
 - 2 heads are better than 1 for diverse perspectives and insights.
 - Example of valuable insights from commissioner training in Saint Louis.
- **Diversity of perspectives in committee membership**
 - Importance of including different viewpoints like administrative, international, and industry sector diversity.
 - Need for a deliberate definition of stakeholders and their representation.
- **Formalizing feedback and best practices**
 - Proposal for an instrument to gather feedback for internal use and sharing.
 - Creating a summary document of outcomes and takeaways from the revision process.
- **Engagement and utilization of unique expertise**
 - Acknowledgment of the unique perspective of the committee members.
 - Desire to engage members beyond the revision process and utilize their expertise effectively.

Conclusion

- **Appreciation for committee members' dedication**



- Acknowledgment of consistent contribution over a year and a half.
- Gratitude for the meaningful contributions that are the lifeblood of the organization.
- **Call for continued engagement**
 - Invitation to explore further opportunities to work together.
 - Emphasis on the role of the organization in providing tools for quality training.
- **Commitment to collaboration and improvement**
 - Willingness to be a resource and seek input from members for organizational benefit.
 - Encouragement for ongoing engagement and sharing of feedback for mutual growth

