

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 48

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Training Company

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

. Providers' methodology of RPDCA upgraded and aligned with management standards

Enable companies to adopt or concur with a management system method, if even not certified, to enhance the RPDCA practice and to support the IACET's claim of 'globally recognized standard'

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

- More details are needed in order to critique for example - The internal audit is just a heading. How is the audit program managed, what is the audit process, and what is the qualification to audit? Corrective Action???
- There are five elements for managing a process - it is not clear here and the method to manage them

- Include risk in the standard to arrive at plans
- Exclude Preventive action linked to corrective action - preventive control to manage risk is the current practice
- Management of change
- To include practicum (????) as the means to evaluate learning event outcomes
- 3.1.20
- Remote learning - media Controls????, webinars????
- The term is continual improvement

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Alignment with International Management System Standards which are based on Risk, Plan, Do, Check and Act

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

- Training effectiveness is demonstrated by outcomes through practicums, which is where it matters.
- The methodology will link into Competency for management standards
- Maybe effectiveness can reflect on the degree of competency
- Providers will have to up their game for additional training for alignment to ISO standards
- Provider documentation controlled
- Determines the basis for corrective actions
- Developed as a system and not as independent clauses

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

ISO 9001 clauses can be used as a reference. Perhaps the ISO Standards numbering system can be used,

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 11:22 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 49

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7.1.3, insert 'transcript'

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

The update maintains consistency with the initial paragraph in this section.

'The Process shall recognize and communicate successful completion of the learning event through a certificate, transcript, badge, or other mechanism which specifically identifies what the learner completed and make that available to the learner.'

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

IACET CEUs shall be recognized through a certificate, **transcript**, badge, or other mechanism.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

consistency

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

clarity, consistency

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:21 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 50

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Conference Guidelines: Overview and Checklist

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

consistency and relevancy

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

consistency and relevancy

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Will the conference guidelines: overview and checklist be reviewed/updated once the new standard is finalized?

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:27 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 51

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Guide to IACET Accreditation Program
Manual

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

consistency, relevancy

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Will the current Guide to IACET Accreditation Program Manual be reviewed
/updated accordingly when the new standard is finalized?

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

example content area to be impacted includes the glossary of terms

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:31 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 52

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: A Guide to Working with Third Parties and
Maintaining IACET Accreditation

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

4.2.4 'Neither shall the Provider issue CEUs for learning events that it has purchased
from another organization.'
consistency and relevancy

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

consistency and relevancy

How should the third party guide be interpreted against the new standard, section
4.2.4?

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Will the guideline be reviewed/updated when the new standard is finalized?

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:36 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 53

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.22 Satellite Transmission

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Needs clarified what you intended by 'satellite transmission'.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Propose creating a new term / definition: **Satellite Transmission**

In support of virtual instructor led learning, may include online collaboration tools such as Microsoft Teams, Webex, GoTo Webinar, etc.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

I don't think this standard means to state the definition as:

"Put simply, satellite transmission is a **relay of information** between a satellite and a communication point back on earth."

Source: google.com

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:44 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 54

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.26 capitalize 'r'

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

grammar

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Learner **Record Control:** the process of addressing which and how learner records are kept, by whom, for how long, and how they are disposed.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

grammar

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/7/2023 1:46 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 55

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Credentialing Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.5 NOTE 2 (the first Note 2)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

NOTE 2: IACET CEUs are not awarded for unsupervised, unstructured, or non-sponsored learning activities or for non-countable activities, such as breaks, non-working meals, and anything promotional or intended for sales only.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

I am concerned about the use of the word "unplanned" here, especially for asynchronous activities that might be guided or led by ML versus a live instructor. For instance, a learner may discover that she has an unexpected free hour since a client canceled a meeting and may decide to put on her VR headset and complete an unplanned learning activity. Such an activity, if provided by an accredited

learningservices provider, should count.

Perhaps unplanned here is meant to convey un-designed versus not scheduled. If so, maybe unstructured would be a better fit?

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Text revision might better apply to non-traditional forms of learning

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/13/2023 8:24 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 56

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Credentialing Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.16 Instructor

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

3.1.16. Instructor: individual or entity involved in the facilitation or delivery of information that results in an increase in learner knowledge and/or skills.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Machine learning is increasing in quality very quickly. Credible learning can now be delivered using ML components, and the adoption of this technology for CE/T is increasing. I suggest editing the definition of Instructor to include ML guidance or tutors, although I can understand a reluctance to say this outright. Using the word "entity" may help here.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Reduced likelihood of extending time until next revision is necessary. Allows for greater inclusion.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/13/2023 8:34 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 57

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Credentialing Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6.1.4.1.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The Providers shall have a Policy that individuals or entities (programs?) involved in the design, development, delivery, and evaluation of learning events are qualified to perform their assigned tasks.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

To accommodate the growing use of ML in education

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/13/2023 10:08 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 58

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Regulatory Agency

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Need to get continue licence and learning

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Need to get easy access online.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Need to get easy access online.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Need to get easy access online.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Need to get easy access online.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Need to get easy access online.

Timestamp Submitted: 6/14/2023 11:27 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 59

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Consultant

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3.2.2

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Too many unrelated, mutually exclusive requirements which double-barrels (or triple-barrels)the element(e.g., can something be "fair and equitable" but not comply with regulatory requirements?).Further, I'm not sure how applicants/APs would be clear on how to execute in their practice and how would reviewers ascertain compliance of the entire element?:

1. Fair and equitable may be too difficult to objectify for stakeholders. How do they demonstrate compliance to this and how would a reviewer be able to ascertain compliance? What would be required in the application?
2. Comply with all regulatory (1), statutory (2) requirements and legal obligations
- (3). Same here - how do they demonstrate compliance and how would a reviewer ascertain compliance? Where would this live in the application?

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Perhaps review this as really being important to the integrity of the standard, or put this as an agreement in the introductory section of the application and not make it a separate element (a check off box?).

Define what it means to be "fair and equitable". Provide examples of regulatory, statutory, and legal obligations.

Separate out "fair and equitable" from complying with regulatory, statutory requirements and legal obligations.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

As it is currently written, I'm not sure of the purpose of this element.

However, if it is indeed determined that this requirement needs to be part of the standard, we need to be clear on what tangible evidence would be required to ascertain compliance and clearly define and separate out these components of the element as they are mutually exclusive.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/15/2023 1:06 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 60

Demographics

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Consultant

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.34. SMART objectives

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusing language. We need to settle on "outcomes" or "objectives" or just include outcomes/objectives/goals.

The inconsistencies may take away from the integrity of the standard

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

SMART outcomes/objectives/goals

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Consistent language. Integrity.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/15/2023 1:16 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 61

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Consultant

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 4.2 IACET authorizes

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Could be confusing because we have moved from "authorized" designation to "accredited" provider over the past years.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

IACET **accredits** organizations to offer IACET CEUS as an Accredited Provider

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

It's okay to use "accredit" twice in a sentence in this case.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/15/2023 1:19 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 62

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6.1.4.2 Strike

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Consider striking this text from the standard

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Performance evaluation of individuals developing and delivery CE/T is an administrative task and issues with performance are self-correcting problems. program evaluations completed by learners should address the quality of instruction. The provider should be required to demonstrate how it has acted on that feedback.

6.1.4.2 seems to overlap with 6.1.6.3.

How about modifying 6.1.6.3 to read

The Provider shall have a Process for summarizing, analyzing and

addressing learning event evaluation results and sharing relevant information with appropriate CE/T personnel

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/16/2023 8:53 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 63

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7.1.3

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The Provider shall have a Process to inform the learner if they have or have not met successful completion requirements of the learning event.

The Process shall detail if there are opportunities for remediation to learners that have not met successful completion requirements .

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Learners that did not meet the requirements should be informed as to how they might demonstrate successful completion. Do they need to re-take the course (and pay again), can they makeup sections?

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/16/2023 9:00 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 64

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Credentialing Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 5.3.2.2.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Policies (and processes, where applicable) shall be fair and equitable.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

In MOST cases Reviewers will not be familiar enough with "all regulatory and statutory requirements and legal obligations that pertain to the Provider" to be able to approve or disapprove Policies and Processes based on these requirements.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/18/2023 9:34 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 65

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Training Department

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.11 Feedback

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

With so many organizations offering asynchronous learning events, I think it would be beneficial to add examples of what feedback would look like in a self-paced course.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Many organizations offer learning events that include knowledge checks throughout the learning event that provide feedback on correct and incorrect responses. Some courses include interactive activities that provide immediate feedback. It would be helpful to the applicants to have examples.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

To provide clarity to applicants of the standard and the expectations of reviewers.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

This revision will ensure consistency with respect to reviewers communicating expectations to applicants.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/19/2023 8:36 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 66

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Training Department

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3.3.2. The result of an internal review shall be documented.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

The internal review is paramount to maintaining standards. This is often misinterpreted.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Many applicants complete the IACET checklist for internal review by marking "yes" throughout the document. I am proposing that the checklist be modified to simply include comments (instead of being required when "no" is checked).

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Comments are expected when applicants are conducting an internal review however, it appears as though comments are only required when "no" is selected. Perhaps a

more detailed explanation could be provided that indicates comments are expected when conducting an internal review (possibly explaining how they meet the standard).

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Applicants will understand what is expected when conducting an internal audit which will result in fewer returns for additional information.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/19/2023 8:48 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 67

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Training Company

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 6.1.6.2 b)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Instructor presented material clearly and was responsive to learner questions.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

There are two considerations, judgments from learners and provider responsibility. Most students are unqualified to judge the competence and instructional knowledge /skills of an instructor. The provider needs to establish a process to determine the skill, knowledge, and abilities of the instructor and their fitness to be an instructor.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Creating, Implementing and Managing Effective Training and Development, Kurt Kraiger, Editor. Refer to page 347, chapter 11, final sentence.

Timestamp Submitted: 6/20/2023 1:58 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 68

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Reviewed and no edits.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Reviewed and no edits.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Reviewed and no edits.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/22/2023 10:08 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 69

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Reviewed and no edits.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Reviewed and no edits.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Reviewed and no edits.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/22/2023 10:09 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 70

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 99

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Consistency and Clarity: Standard sections provide a structured format and consistent language, which can enhance clarity and understanding for stakeholders. It ensures that information presented in a standardized manner, making it easier for stakeholders to navigate and interpret the content.

Efficiency in Communication: Standard sections can streamline communication processes between stakeholders. By following a standardized format, stakeholders can quickly locate and extract the information they need, reducing the time and effort required for communication and improving overall efficiency.

Enhanced Comparability: When stakeholders are presented with standardized sections, it becomes easier to compare different entities or projects. By using consistent terminology and organization, stakeholders can make more accurate assessments and comparisons, facilitating decision-making processes.

Improved Accountability: Standard sections often include relevant information and metrics, which can enhance accountability among stakeholders. By providing

consistent data and performance indicators, stakeholders can assess the progress and outcomes of a project or organization, holding parties responsible for their actions.

Facilitated Compliance: Standard sections can assist stakeholders in meeting regulatory or industry requirements. By adhering to established standards, stakeholders can ensure that their documentation or reports fulfill the necessary criteria, reducing the risk of non-compliance and associated penalties.

Enhanced Stakeholder Trust: Clear and consistent communication through standard sections can contribute to building trust among stakeholders. When information is presented in a standardized and reliable manner, stakeholders are more likely to trust the content and the organization behind it.

Potential Limitations: While standard sections can offer numerous benefits, they may also have limitations. Stakeholders who prefer more flexibility in communication may find the rigid structure of standard sections restrictive.

Additionally, stakeholders from diverse backgrounds or cultures may require additional support to understand and navigate standardized formats.

Author: Phoebe from [Supmea](#)

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The language or text should be more clear and understandable so that the individuals can deeply understand its meaning and grasp its purpose.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Standard sections provide a structured format and consistent language, which can enhance clarity and understanding for stakeholders. It ensures that information is presented in a standardized manner, making it easier for stakeholders to navigate and interpret the content.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/25/2023 9:13 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 71

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 1.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Inclusion of evaluation in addition to designing, developing and delivering.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Evaluation is part of the learning and design process/cycle. Additionally section 6.1.6.2 speaks to collecting evaluation results. and 3.1.25 includes evaluation as part of a learning programme

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/27/2023 2:00 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 72

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 2.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Some additional clarification may be needed as to the type of additional documents that aren't needed

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

It may be assumed this also carries over to the Standard Application

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/27/2023 2:07 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 73

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Suggestion to include instructional resources as defined in 3.1.15 here

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

For greater clarity and for persons to understand what can be categorised as instructional resources up front

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/27/2023 2:11 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 74

Demographics

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.31

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Suggestion to also include why the particular process is needed (in the note section)

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

This often helps with determining if a process document is required at all and if it is clarifying its purpose

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/27/2023 2:18 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 75

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 6.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Suggestion to change the order of this section to the following:

The learning event's learning outcomes shall align with the stated needs from the needs analysis

The Provider shall have a process for conducting a formal needs analysis to guide the development of learning events.

Determining learning outcomes

Each learning event shall have outcomes that are specific measurable achievable realistic and time based

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

For more of a stepwise progression which reflects the fact that the instructional design process begins with the needs analysis and then focuses on the the development of learning outcomes

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 6/27/2023 2:29 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 76

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Postsecondary

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical
Section/Line of Proposed Change: N/A
Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

N/A

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

N/A

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

N/A

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

N/A

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Regulations and accreditation

Timestamp Submitted: 6/29/2023 10:56 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 77

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Association

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.12

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Should read "Hybrid Learning: See Blended 3.1.2"

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

alignment

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/7/2023 6:42 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 78

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Training Department

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: In depth understanding for practical reasons for digital transformation failure

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Filling the gap between the theoretical teaching of digital transformation and its practical implementation.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Practical revision

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

leading the theory to more practical success rate

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

more efficient digital transformation projects

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/11/2023 5:23 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 79

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Regulatory Agency

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Overall

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

By not retaining IACET 1-2018 document process language, failing to provide additional definitions, and not including evidence examples, a Stakeholder/Provider will lack clear guidance on the scope and boundaries of the new IACET Standard.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

1. An International standard should outline basic requirements to include containing clear guidance of examples, so the message/intent is clear to not only the writer but to the reader (Provider). Consider including the “Guidance” material that is currently used in your ANSI/IACET 1-2028 “Application for First-time Accreditation” bundle.
2. Retain the documented process language that is currently in the IACET 1-2018 standard.

3. The proposed IACET 1-2023 standard lacks “Category or Clauses” to identify each section.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

1. Including specific guidance and examples will ensure the Provider staff builds those expectations and requirements into their documented process for the success of their training organization and to provide a positive learner experience.

2. The proposed IACET 1-2023 standard has only four documented process requirements in the entire document, whereas the 1-2018 had 23. When adhering to standards, it takes more than having a process. There must be documented processes to ensure exact steps needed to complete a task are outlined from start to finish.

Documented processes also allow for regular review from staff and management, including Internal/external audits to gauge performance and conformance of tasks.

3. An international standard should have section requirements identified by “Categories or Clauses” to aid in referencing applicable material in reports, application processes, or internal/external audits.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

1. If the proposed IACET 1-2023 revision does not include specific guidance or examples, a Stakeholder/Provider will risk failing to demonstrate or document how they meet the requirements and rigor of a globally recognized standard.

2. Without documented processes identified, an organization or IACET auditors will be unable to determine the organization's effectiveness and compliance with IACET Standards without verifiable documented process evidence.

3. Unclear structure of standard to meet compliance or be referenced to.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

1. IACET 1-2018
2. IACET 1-2018
3. Reference: IACET 1-2023, IACET Application matrix and ISO9001

Timestamp Submitted: 7/18/2023 6:53 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 80

Demographics



Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Association

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Section 3: Terminology

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Please include a definition for "Continuing Education Credit" (CEU) that aligns with the IACET articles of incorporation.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Clearly define a CEU and its place/role in professional development and learning.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/20/2023 11:30 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 81

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Training Company

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Several sections - annotated below, both editorial and technical comments

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed standards. Below are my suggestions for review/consideration.

1.2 pre-supposes that IACET providers are delivering content to their employees. Suggest a minor word change.

Change:

demonstrates a commitment to education that is accessible and applicable to their workplace,

To:

demonstrates a commitment to education that is accessible and applicable to their learners,

-or-

demonstrates a commitment to education that is accessible and applicable to their

target audience,

3.1 Definitions - incorrect reference. The following definition refers the reader to 3.1.3, but 3.1.3 is “Conflict of Interest”. Synchronous is 3.1.37, and asynchronous is 3.1.1.

“Blended learning: a CE/T program (formal or informal) that combines synchronous and asynchronous (3.1.3) delivery methods”

Suggest the following edit:

“Blended learning: a CE/T program (formal or informal) that combines synchronous (3.1.37) s and asynchronous (3.1.1) delivery methods”

3.1.5 introduces terms that are not defined, including classroom learning and self-paced. I suggest editing to limit this to defined terms, which theoretically, should address contact hours:

“classroom learning, self-paced learning, asynchronous/blended/hybrid learning, or other projects/activities in support of a learning outcome.

Suggested edit:

asynchronous/blended/hybrid/synchronous learning, or other projects/activities in support of a learning outcome.

3.1.5 Regarding the use of the term “unsupervised”: by definition, many asynchronous activities are unsupervised - they are activities that are completed by the learner on their own. This is particularly true of “other projects/activities in support of a learning outcome” included in 3.1.5. Suggest striking that word.

“NOTE 2: IACET CEUs are not awarded for unplanned, unsupervised, or non-sponsored learning activities or for non-countable activities, such as breaks, non-working meals, and anything promotional or intended for sales only.”

3.1.5 The calculation in the note is incorrect:

“NOTE 2: One (1) Contact Hour = (Total minutes countable activities - Total minutes noncountable activities)/60 minutes”

Should read:

“NOTE 2: The number of Contact Hours = (Total minutes countable activities - Total minutes noncountable activities)/60 minutes

3.1.16. The use of facilitation is too broad in this definition for instructor. There are many individuals playing a supporting role in content delivery who are considered “facilitators” (eg. education technology specialists) who are not instructors:

“Instructor: individual who is involved in the facilitation or delivery of information that results in an increase in learner knowledge and/or skills.”

3.1.34 The description of SMART objectives should not be a separate definition. It should be incorporated into 3.1.24. Also, 3.1.34 refers to “objectives” where 3.1.24 refers to “outcomes.” Section 6 also refers to learning outcomes (eg. 6.1.1.2, 6.1.1.3, 6.1.2.1, 6.1.2.2, 6.1.3). In fact, 3.1.34 may be the only place that refers to “objectives” rather than “outcomes.” I suggest consistent language throughout.

4.1 What is meant by non-credit in the following (and some subsequent) statement (s)? If it refers to credits offered by institutions accredited by accreditors approved by the Dept. of Education, that should be spelled out.

“Provide a standard unit of measure for non-credit CE/T activities”

4.2.2. The following statement from 4.2.2 seems to conflict with 7.1.3. Is this a typo? I believe Providers ARE required to issue IACET CEUs to learners who successfully complete learning outcomes for an event:

“IACET does not require the Provider to issue IACET CEUs to learners who successfully complete their learning outcomes. The Provider shall have a method for calculating IACET CEUs. (See 7.1.4)”

7.1.4 Regarding CEU calculation, does the following mean that IACET will start to allow Providers to offer courses in half-hour increments, such that a 91 minute event is offered for 0.015 IACET CEUs? If so, there will need to be a process to accommodate transition from activities currently adhering to previous calculations (where a 91 minute event is offered for 0.2 IACET CEUs) - or - to allow providers to allow previous calculations to be maintained for events created before this goes into effect.

“(1) IACET CEUs shall be rounded to the nearest hundredth.”

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

See above

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

See above

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

See above

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

This was the document I reviewed:https://www.iacet.org/default/assets/File/2023Standard/IACET_1-2023_Standard_Revision_Draft_Public%20Comment.pdf

Timestamp Submitted: 7/21/2023 11:48 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 82

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.15

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Add understanding

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Revise second sentence to add "participant guides."

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Typical courseware item

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

nothing additional

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:07 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 83

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.12

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Adds clarity

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

add detail on what constitutes hybrid learning

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Hybrid learning is a term used by many people to mean many things. We think its important to more clearly define what fits into this category.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Add clarity

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Recommend aligning to the ATD definition.

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:10 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 84

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.22

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Updates common terminology

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Under Learning Event. Change the last sentence by deleting the phrase satellite transmissions and replace with virtual platforms.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

virtual platforms is a better description here v. satellite transmissions.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

add clarity

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

none

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:13 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 85

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.5

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

add clarity

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The term "countable activities" should be described within the standard. Or revise to "Total minutes of learning activity or event."

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Adds clarity to the note

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

add clarity

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

none

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:15 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 86

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.1.1 pg7

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Improves understanding of expectation

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Change "shall be" to must be". Standard needs to have clear language in this passage

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Shouldbe leaves too much gray area for a standard document.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

clarifies expectations

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

none

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:19 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 87

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3.3.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

adds specificity to requirement

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

In regard to the phrase "periodic internal review" please specify frequency.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

adds clarity to the standard

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Will drive a specific review routine.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

none

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:22 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 88

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6.1.2.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

adds clarity

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

...content appropriately supports the learning outcomes.

This is subjective terminology. The term appropriate will vary from reviewer to reviewer. Recommend deleting.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

adds clarity and avoids misalignment of expectations

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

adds clarity

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

none

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 12:25 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 89

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Consumer/Learner

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7.2.3

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

More clarity is needed around the expectation of learners records being private and secured. Clearly cyber threats do mandate that this aspect be part of the standard. However some baseline of expectation or example may be useful here.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Add minimum standards required or identify LMS' which fulfill cyber protection elements.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Add clarity

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

This is potentially an expensive requirement for stakeholders. But protection of user information does make this element imperative to providers.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Cornerstone online description of their security profile.

Timestamp Submitted: 7/26/2023 1:06 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 90

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3. Terminology, 3.1.25

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Currently, we are reviewing at least 3 learning events for each accreditation and re-accreditation applications. For each of learning events, we require applicant organizations to furnish documentary evidence relating to ADDIE (analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation).

Analysis in the form of needs assessment and analysis to presented; full design documents of 3 learning events (including those organizations with only 1 or 2 modalities of delivery), development in terms of courseware developed and conducted with evidence of attendance lists of each course plus completed course evaluation forms. During A.I. session, we also require applicant organization to present on their action plans in response to evaluation scores/results of each course as part of continuous improvement.

Currently, it poses a challenge for some applicant organizations to present 3 learning events. If we introduce the term of 'learning program' it may be an additional

challenge to the applicant organization especially for those that does not have a full learning program but full-fledged learning events that can be integrated eventually to a full learning program.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Proposed to consider removing this term of 'learning program' as it may confuse stakeholders i.e. applicant organizations. By requiring the applicant organizations to provide full documentary evidence that covers ADDIE for all the 3 learning events, Commissioners can still ensure that the appropriate system or structure is in place within an organization for the latter to follow.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Currently, it is already posing a challenge to most applicant organizations to provide evidence of 3 full learning events. Even we require the learning program, it may result in difficulty for applicant organizations to furnish during the A.I. session besides causing some confusion when differentiating between learning program and learning events. Some applicant organization(s) may have 3 different modalities of delivery and thus may need to furnish a few learning programs to show the integration of relevant learning events within an organization.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Remove any possibility of confusion over the terms 'learning program' and 'learning events' and continue to provide documentary evidence for 3 learning events. And the understanding is to furnish complete documentation (ADDIE) of their 3 learning events to justify proper structure of a CET system in place.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/27/2023 5:54 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 91

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Standards Developer

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7. Recognizing successful achievement and maintaining learner records, 7.1.4 (1)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Currently, some applicant organizations encountered difficulty in demonstrating the computation of CEUs by rounding to the nearest tenth. If the new standard changes it to "IACET CEUs shall be rounded to the nearest hundredth", it may pose a challenge to these applicant organizations to comply with it.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Retained the current 2018 standard's text of "IACET CEUs are rounded to the nearest tenth."

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Request for the committee's kind consideration not to change this requirement to be stricter in computing CEUs. It may result in posing a challenge to applicant organization(s) when they are presenting their evidence by demonstrating the calculation of IACET CEUs and rounding them to the nearest hundredth. Currently, for professional certification/re-certification, most professional certification bodies are using number of hours with the minimum of a hour to count. For real learning to take place, courses/certificates/learning activities that are conducted in less than an hour are mostly not considered unless it is accumulative by counts of an hour. That includes micro credentials and if it involves a credit system like in the universities or institutes of higher learning, it is definitely counted or considered by the number of hours that is used to conduct the course/learning activity. Therefore, the current CEUs rounding to the nearest tenth is able to cater for this practice of counting by an hour.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

If there is no change to existing requirement, then there can be no foreseeable impact on stakeholders.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

The International Coaching Federation (ICF) uses 40 Continuing Coach Education Units (CCEUs) for recertification of professional coaching accreditations i.e. Associate Certified Coach (ACC), Professional Certified Coach (PCC), Master Certified Coach (MCC) over a 3-year period. CCEUs are issued to the nearest tenth. E.g. A 1.5-hr webinar awards 1.5 CCEUs.

World at Work requires 12 credits for recertification of professional credentials -

Global Remuneration Professional (GRP), Certified Compensation Professional (CCP) over a 3-year period. E.g. 1 credit for a certificate program offered by World at Work. Credits are considered to the nearest tenth e.g. 0.5 credit for half a day training course being attended by the credential holder.

To ensure the professionalism of the adult educators, the (Singapore) Adult Education Professionalization (AEP) requires each certified Adult Educator to show 200 hours of practice related to training delivery, assessment, and design & development type of work as well as minimum of 40 hours per year (x 3 years) for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) hours when applying for re-certification over a 3-year period.

Timestamp Submitted: 7/27/2023 8:11 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 92

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Standards Developer

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3. Terminology, 3.1.20

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

The consideration to expand the definition of assessment methods, formative or summative, will be helpful to be able to consider some other uncommon assessment methods.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Propose to committee to consider including Reflective Journaling, Practical Performance as officially recognized summative assessment methods.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

With this consideration to include 1) Reflective Journaling (RJ) and 2) Practical Performance as assessment methods, it allows IACET to also consider applicant organizations who use (either of) these 2 methods to test cognitive knowledge being

applied and test live application/demonstration of competencies/capabilities being demonstrated by learners respectively.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

It widens the definition of learning assessment to include more, and different types of assessment methods which may be utilized by the applicant organizations in their conduct of CET courses.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/27/2023 10:48 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 93

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Standards Developer

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6. Requirements for the learning program,
6.1.3.2.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Minimal or minor impact to stakeholders

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Suggest to committee to consider replacing the word 'level of mastery' with 'level of proficiency'

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Usually it is quite rare and may not be realistic to assume learner can gain mastery over a few days' course.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Minimal or minor impact of proposed revision to stakeholders as it's just use of more appropriate words to describe a learner's attainment of certain competency level.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/27/2023 11:01 AM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 94

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): No
Stakeholder Group: Standards Developer

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3. Terminology, 3.1.27

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

This will allow applicant organization to have other reasons (not stated in the definitions) as consideration when justifying their needs assessment.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Propose to committee to consider including organizational requirements (related to Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and Legal requirements besides industry requirements and learner requirements. Organization, Industry, Legal and Learner (OILL) requirements to be more inclusive.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

before "industry requirements", I propose to the committee to consider including organizational and legal (federal or state) requirements.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

A more thorough definition of needs analysis may be helpful to applicant organizations which may consider having some of these needs to justify their other course(s).

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/27/2023 11:28 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 95

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Training Company

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.5

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

6.1.3.2 - Many of the APs that I review provide CEUs for internal trainings that are informal. The achievement of learning outcomes is more holistic in nature and mastery is not the intent. Assessment may be through a group discussion or self-reported perception. The adoption of the standard would severely affect many APs that we currently have and would discourage others from pursuing accreditation. Mastery is not always the goal, so a cut-score is not always appropriate.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Break up the statement into two statements and add qualifying language for situations where mastery is appropriate.

The learning assessment Process shall establish the appropriate evidence of achievement. As appropriate, the level of mastery accepted (e.g., pass score, rubric

score, completion level) will be communicated and individual learner performance documented.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

The revised language gets to the issue of communicating mastery criteria when mastery, in a traditional sense, is the desired outcome, but allows for training goals that are focused more toward the affective domain or where are more holistic in nature. Many of our current APs have such events.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

As revised, current APs will be able to retain their accreditation and the recruitment of similar APs will be viable. So much of current training is increasingly directed toward dispositions or attitudes and is not in the traditional (behaviorial) format.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

N/a

Timestamp Submitted: 7/28/2023 10:11 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 96

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Training Department

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 4.2.2 and 7.1.3 Clarification

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

4.2.2 states IACET does not require the Provider to issue IACET CEUs to learners who successfully complete their learning outcomes

7.1.3 states IACET CEUs shall be recognized through a certificate, digital badge, or other mechanism

Please clarify these requirements as it relates to generic professional development hours and what must be documented on the learner certificates.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Please clarify these requirements as it relates to generic professional development hours and what must be documented on the learner certificates.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

This may be a point of confusion. LMS has been modified to accommodate IACET CEU and certificate template. If this does not need to be explicitly listed on the certificate, then system modifications are not needed and tools can be used out of the box.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

If this does not need to be explicitly listed on the certificate, then system modifications are not needed and tools can be used out of the box.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 10:47 AM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 97

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Association

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7.1.4(2)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

This line defines the amount and form of work learners need to do in order to earn 1 CEU.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Replace "10 Contact Hours = 1 IACET CEU" with "10 On-task Hours (including synchronous and asynchronous activity directly related to the learning event) = 1 IACET CEU.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

The use of "contact hours" to calculate CEUs implies that learning should be measured by the amount of time spent synchronously with an instructor or facilitator present, but adult learning theory suggests that this is not a good measure of

learning. If learning is to be measured in hours spent, we propose that those hours explicitly include all learner time on task, including both synchronous and asynchronous activity. More inclusive phrasing is better suited to a world where learning events are increasingly asynchronous, on-demand, and individualized. "On-task Hours" also better reflects the guidance in the 2018 IACET Standards, which specify that allowed learning activity for CEUs includes "self-paced, distance learning or other projects in support of a learning outcome." (Guidance for Standard 6.4)

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

By making it clear that CEU hours can include asynchronous, self-paced, and independent learning activities, CEU providers will have more confidence to design innovative learning formats that benefit learners without sacrificing the ability to issue CEUs. It will also reduce the chance that providers read "contact hours" narrowly and then undercount learning activity time that should count toward CEUs.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 12:55 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 98

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Association

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Add to Section 6

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

In the current standard draft, there is no explicit requirement to consider Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) in design & development

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

"The Provider shall have a Process to ensure that the design, review, and and delivery of the learning event follow Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) principles, and that diverse perspectives are represented."

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

DEIB is foundational and essential for learning in every domain.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Attention to DEIB can increase the degree to which learning events are offered equitably, the probability that all learners will feel included and supported, and the degree to which content reflects a diversity of experiences and perspectives.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 12:57 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 99

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Association

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6.1.5.2 ("The Provider shall ensure the learning environment(s) support the achievement of learning outcomes.")

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

This section helps to ensure that the event's environment is physically and logistically appropriate for the learners.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

"The Provider shall ensure the learning environment(s) support the achievement of learning outcomes, **including compliance with relevant ADA and environmental standards.**"

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Drawing attention explicitly to ADA and environmental standards can help ensure that providers follow accepted best practices for accessibility and environmental safety.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Attention to ADA and environmental standards may enable participation from learners who might otherwise face barriers to participation.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 12:58 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 100

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.30

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

The use of learning event and learning program within the application is problematic and will create confusion among our applicants and existing APs.

Many of them use program to represent a certificate program, not a department or a function of the organization.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Policies define scope, roles and/or responsibilities within a Provider's operations.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Policies are typically established at an organizational or operational level, not at a program level. This may be confusing to many of our applicants and APs.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Clarity and consistency for our end users andfor Commissioners who will be reviewing the applications.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 3:57 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 101

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.25

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusion

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Instructional design process: the totality (analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation) of the learning event.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

IACET has been using the term learning event to define webinars, courses, certificate programs - the various types of training events that organizations are offering that will award IACET CEUs. We have established that for every learning event that awards CEUs, they must create a design document that includes the needs analysis summary, defines the learning outcomes, indicates the supporting instructional

methodologies, identify the appropriate assessment methodologies, and shows the correct CEU Calculation - the instructional design process.

Using the terms learning event, learning program, and CE/T program in the same application will muddy the waters and create a lot of confusion for applicants and existing APs. Clarity can be maintained by using learning event as a comprehensive term to cover the various CE/T events that are conducted. Provider's CE/T Program could be used for the operations or department. Learning program should not be used at all in the application to avoid confusion.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Clarity and consistency of terminology among the applicants and existing APs.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 4:22 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 102

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.16, 3.1.18, 3.1.9, 3.1.22, 3.1.24

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

All five of these definitions (Instructor, Learner, Learning, Learning event, Learning outcome) should agree. The instructor is the one who facilitates the learning event and increases the _____ of the learner. The learner is the individual who is pursuing additional _____ for personal and/or professional development.

Learning is the acquisition of _____. A learning event is made up of activities that are designed to help learners to increase or enhance their _____.

Learning outcomes must be written as actionable, observable, and measurable and are defined in terms of _____.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

In the blank is it knowledge, skill, competencies, and capabilities OR skills, abilities, and capabilities OR knowledge, skills, and abilities?

Please eliminate the use of "understanding of content' from this definition and leave "enhance learners' ability to perform skills that satisfy a set of learning outcomes."

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

This will provide consistency across these related terms.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

We have traditionally used Bloom's Taxonomy when helping people write their learning outcomes and this has proven to be very effective. It provides the instructional methodology and the measurement they need for their formative or summative assessment at the knowledge, skill, and ability levels.

We need to follow some of our own best advice.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 4:39 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 103

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.10 Evidence - hard copies of the certificates presented following the learning event

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Unrealistic burden on APs and applicants

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Copies of certificates presented following the learning event.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Many of our APs and applicants are issuing electronic pdfcopies of certificates, especially since the pandemic and the shift to virtual and online learning.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

More reflective of actual, practical application.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 4:53 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 104

Demographics

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Second Note 2 that says Note 2: One (1)
Contact Hour=(Total minutes countable activities – Total minutes non-countable
activities)/ 60 minutes

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusion

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Note 3: One (1) Contact Hour=(Total minutes countable activities - Total minutes
non-countable activities)/ 60 minutes

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Correcting a typo.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Clarity

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 4:56 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 105

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 3.1.36

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusion

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Support services personnel: any personnel who contribute to the creation delivery, and maintenance of the CE/T program, such as instructional design and development staff, subject matter experts, program evaluators, and administrators, event planners, and instructors.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

The use of learning program and learning event is confusing. The use of learning program as previously defined (3.1.25) and defined here again(3.1.36)is redundant. The use of learning program and definition (3.1.25)is not needed.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Reduction of confusion.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 5:11 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 106

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 4.2.4

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusion over the use of learning program and event.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

IACET accreditation is not transferable. In the event that a learning event is sold or licensed to another organization that then represents the learning event as its own, the Provider shall not state or imply that IACET accreditation is included as part of the agreement. Nether shall the Provider issue CEUs for learning events that it has purchased from another organization.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Consistency in the same paragraph.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Reduce confusion.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 5:18 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 107

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Technical

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3.2.1

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Confusion to applicants

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The Provider shall have written policies (and processes as indicated below in the parentheses below) to address, at a minimum, the following:

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

To make it very clear that it is not just up to the applicant for them to determine where it is applicable, but to direct them to the exact element where they will need to include a process.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Very clear directions for applicants - no guessing.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 5:24 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 108

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 5.3.2.2.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Very confusing, subjective, and complex requirement. Who determines what is fair and equitable? Typically regulatory and statutory can be clear for certain industries.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Eliminate this one.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

IACET does not meddle in the business of the Provider.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Reduce liability of IACET.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 5:34 PM

IP Address: 

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 109

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 6.1.3.2.

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

For continuing education and training, not all learning events result in mastery, but may be at the introductory or intermediate levels to retool learners or enhance learners' skills. Some of our successful organizations, US and international APs, use reflective journaling and other assessment techniques that may appear to be more subjective but can be coordinated with an intended learning outcome.

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

The learning assessment process shall establish the appropriate evidence of achievement of the learning outcome and shall document individual learner performance.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Mastery is a word to show that a learner has grasped the whole concept or idea comprehensively and is more of a professional and skilled person on the subject. Proficiency is used to describe a learner's level of comprehension and skill.

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Allowing our applicants to determine the appropriate measure of successful completion for their learning events for their audience and their industry or field.

NOTE: The Interpretations Subcommittee can include information about *level of proficiency accepted (e.g., pass score, rubric score, completion level) if appropriate.*

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 9:14 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 110

Demographics

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes
Stakeholder Group: Other

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: Learning Outcomes (throughout)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

Learning Objectives

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Learning Outcomes certainly works; Learning Objectives is also very common.
Curious if there is a possibility to reference both?

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 9:15 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Response to 2023-1 Standard for CET RFC ID: 111

Demographics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Are you a provider of Continuing Education and Training (CE/T): Yes

Stakeholder Group: Accrediting Body

Comment

Nature of Comment: Editorial

Section/Line of Proposed Change: 7.1.4.(1)

Impact of Standard Section to Stakeholders:

A lot of work on putting together supporting documentation for a very short learning event

Proposed Revision to Language/Text:

(1) IACET CEUs shall be rounded to the nearest tenths.

Reason/Rationale for Proposed Revision:

Round to the nearest tenth. The CEU total should only have one digit after the decimal point. 2.2 CEUs NOT 2.18. Also, make sure that you round up, meaning that if the total ends in 5 or higher, you round up to the next number. So, 2.18 becomes 2.2.

Since the total number of CEUs can never be less than .1, this means that a course

which is 30 minutes long would have the following calculation:

$30\text{min}/60 = .5 \rightarrow .5/10 = .05 \rightarrow$ round to the nearest 10th and your 30-minute learning event is .1 CEU.

So, in strict adherence to the IACET Standard, no one single IACET CEU learning event should be less than 30 minutes long. An organization can have groupings of smaller learning events to get to the total of 30 minutes or more, but no learning event should be less than .1 CEU. This has already been in place for years.

For our APs who have LMSs that are programmed for tenths, this could be a hurdle for them since it is a "shall" not a "may."

Impact of Proposed Revision to Stakeholders:

This allows organizations that want to offer micro credentials to bundle them together and award CEUs. They can put forth the effort to also bundle their supporting documentation, instead of a piecemeal approach to putting it together for every 15 -20 minute learning event.

Miscellaneous (Optional)

Identify Reference to any Existing/Proposed Standards, Requirements, Regulation, or Accreditations:

Timestamp Submitted: 7/31/2023 9:35 PM

IP Address: [REDACTED]

