

**Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing  
Report on the Management Committee Meeting (11/8/09)  
Progress Report 7**

Committee Members:

Wayne Camara, APA  
Suzanne Lane, AERA  
David Frisbie, NCME

Organizational Representatives:

Marianne Ernesto, APA;  
Gerald Sroufe, Staff Liaison for the Management Committee

Visitors:

Lauress Wise and Barbara Plake (partial attendance)

Update from Joint Committee

This meeting of the Management Committee was scheduled to coincide with the Joint Committee's meeting at the APA headquarters building. Members of the MC met with the Joint Committee (JC) to discuss several issues.

Technology Panel - The first order of business was a review of a technical panel that was convened by the JC on the first day of its November meeting. The technology subcommittee of the JC had arranged for a panel of experts to meet with the full JC membership to explore implications of new technology capacities and issues for their work in revision of the 1999 Standards. Members of the JC technology subcommittee as well as those not on the subcommittee felt that the information gained was highly informative and would be instrumental in their work. A member of the Management Committee, who had attended the workshop, agreed with the assessment and commended the subcommittee for its work in convening and implementing the workshop. In particular, it was felt that the information provided by the diverse expert panel of individuals on the cutting edge of technology was not otherwise available to the JC, and that it would help in preparing not only "algorithm disclosure" standards but also standards dealing with validity, reliability, and test development, among others. This may be the only panel convened by the JC to inform their revision, and members of both the MC and JC agreed that such a panel was useful in this particular area for a number of reasons:

- Many of the innovations in technology involve either proprietary activities or work conducted by researchers employed or consulting in organizations.
- Much of the current innovative work is not yet published in journals.
- There are many different areas of technology that the JC needs to investigate and consider for the revision, and members of the JC do not possess the same level of expertise on all issues. Individuals on this panel each made a presentation on a different area(s) where technology and assessment are related.
- Technology presents a number of unique challenges to a Standards document because it is constantly changing, and it is important to develop standards that address the larger issues without being tied to specific technologies that may be replaced during the life of the most current revision of the Standards.

Individuals on the Technology panel who participated in the discussions with the JC were reimbursed for their travel, but no honoraria were provided.

Communications Plan and Review of Draft Standards - The second topic discussed at the joint meeting of the MC and JC concerned the communications plan for the current revision. The draft communication plan that had been developed by the MC in the fall served as a basis for discussion. Topics raised included the need for internal and external review of the draft and procedures for getting feedback from external review to the JC. In accord with the letter of agreement between the three associations responsible for the Standards revision, the MC will take responsibility for soliciting and collecting evaluative feedback from the field, but input from the JC will be solicited to ensure that the feedback is useful in content and format to the JC. Some characteristics of the planned feedback mechanisms include: (1) the interface should be tested well in advance of the draft availability for operational aspects to test the rubrics designed to solicit and direct comments and to establish prudent limits on length; (2) the process should provide a suitable timeline for responses; (3) the process should call attention to the opportunity for both internal and external stakeholders to respond in advance; and (4) the process should provide a firm requirement that all feedback be online to facilitate coding and distribution.

Proposed future dates for meetings of the JC -

January 13-15, 2010

April 23-25

July 23-25

(possibly September, 2010)

December 3-5

January 14-16, 2011

March 6-8

September 9-11

December 2-4

Joint Committee Budget for 2010. In the subsequent meeting of the MC the first item of business was consideration of a revised JC budget prepared by a member of the MC. Following discussion, it was decided that the airfare expenditure estimate used in the budget should be increased. It was noted that the budget included only costs of meetings of the JC and for preparation of the document, and it did not address printing and marketing costs. It was decided that \$81,000 should be forwarded to APA to cover budgeted expenditures of the JC in 2009 by December 15, 2009.

Management Committee Website

The MC received updates on the websites from APA and AERA staff. Marianne Ernesto noted that the restricted site supported by APA for the work of the JC had proved to be very effective in facilitating the work of the JC and in saving on printing and mailing of materials. The MC had conducted an extensive review of the Management Committee's web site ([www.teststandards.org](http://www.teststandards.org)) and noted that presentations, reports, and a bibliography of publications related to the Standards were now available on the website. Members expressed appreciation to the AERA staff for getting the public website online and revising its content, format, and appearance. There was discussion of additional

materials to be included on the public website (e.g., future presentations, JC co-chair report on the November meeting, MC progress reports to the associations, and organizational links).

The MC and JC co-chairs acknowledged that it would be most desirable to have a single host for all comments rather than two separate hosts (one for APA governance and one for all other internal and external groups), as had been implemented during the initial call for comments. The issue is that different web portals could be used for APA governance and other comments, but that they should all feed into one integrated database rather than two separate ones, which was the approach used in the initial call for comments. Three options were discussed: (1) contracting with an outside agent or individual; (2) having APA/AERA staff do the analysis; and (3) asking APA to host all comments and contracting with an individual to integrate data through APA. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to use development funds to pay for the necessary analysis. A member of the MC observed that the major issues were primarily IT functions that needed to be addressed soon. Ernesto agreed to inquire about these issues at APA and provide a report by the March meeting.

A member of the MC agreed to prepare a draft of a high-level response (interface) process for collecting comments and include proposed wording for review by the MC and for discussion by the JC at its January meeting.

The MC also met with the co-chairs of the JC to discuss scheduling and future collaborations. The JC anticipates a six-month hiatus while reviews and comments are being received following the release of a draft in December 2010, with comments to be due by July 2011. Legal and editorial reviews are anticipated prior to July 2012, when the final draft would be available for review by the associations' governing boards.

The JC chairs reviewed some of the considerations derived from the November, 2009 meeting of the JC and reported that no additional requests for support of expert panels were anticipated. However, they did seek approval for JC members to meet for an extra day at the January meeting in subcommittees. Similarly, the accountability committee is seeking support for a webinar meeting at modest additional cost. The JC co-chairs provided a brief report on some of the substantive issues that have arisen during the revision.

Each of the three sponsoring associations should be developing its own plan for providing formal comments on the revised draft. It is hoped that the January meeting of AERA Council, for example, will include discussion of the liaison report and adoption of a plan for the association's review and comment.

The MC was urged by the JC co-chairs to notify as key organizations well in advance about the importance of reviewing and commenting on the draft standards. A list of key organizations (a potential liaison or point of contact, and their email address) will be designed by the MC and then shared with the JC members. Members of the JC and MC will need to provide substantive assistance in completing such a list. All suggestions from the JC should be submitted to Marianne Ernesto while suggestions from the MC will go to Jerry Sroufe by a date to be decided. A MC member and Ernesto will each attempt to find lists of organizations used in the last revision as a starting point.

### Editor

The JC and MC agreed that the draft standards should have an editorial review before they are posted for comment and a final editorial review before the final draft is delivered to sponsoring associations for approval. The MC decided that a single editor would be required for the draft manuscript, and a member of the MC agreed to contact an individual who could serve this role to determine his or her willingness and availability to provide this service.

### Legal Review

The MC recognizes that a legal review should be conducted prior to the submission of a final draft to associations for approval. In addition, APA, and perhaps the other organizations, may have requirements for a legal review. The MC believes that any legal review or other processes required within an association are the responsibility of that association, just as occurs with any other governance issues or standards/guidelines documents that it handles. If a legal review is undertaken by the MC, it would address substantive issues and legal concerns that are relevant to the MC and all three associations.

### ISO/ANSI/PC230

At the last MC meeting, The MC was briefed on the status of the international standard being developed by ISO and the controversy over a substantial misrepresentation in Oslo in April 2009 of ISO requirements for such a standard. These issues will be discussed at the December 2009 ISO project committee meeting. However, he felt certain that this Standard would now require one additional year for completion.

### Financial Reports

The MC reviewed and discussed monthly financial reports of the JC expenditures provided by APA. These reports have been used to make adjustments to the preliminary 2010 JC budget and to review policy regarding JC meetings outside of DC. The 2010 budget sheet will include 2009 actual expenditures as soon as those values become available.

AERA provided a financial report for the 1999 Standards, including sales, inventory, expenses, and fund balance. A revised report showing clarification of past advances to APA will be sent to MC members prior to the next meeting.

### Next Meetings

The next meeting of the MC will be held in Washington, DC on March 3 and 4, 2010. Management Committee issues for its next meeting will include: (1) the publication of the 1999 Standards on Amazon/Kindle as a beta test; (2) marketing of the Standards; (3) discussion with the APA attorney about alternatives and costs for a legal review of the revised Standards.