

IACET CET SDC MEETING SUMMARY - APRIL

Date: March 16, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM Eastern

Location: Zoom

Meeting Type: Monthly SDC Meeting

Facilitator: Sherard Jones

Called by: Sherard Jones

Committee Members Invited:

Barbara van der Schalie; Darlene Reese-Sittig; Carlos Chirivi; Mohamed Ibrahim; Talia Fox; Brenda Brill; Nancy Dupre Barnes; Lyli Ana Gastanadui Ybanez; Walter Bell; Arnold Webster; Norma-Ivette Arriaga; Diane Zalapi; Larissa Burbback; Rick Gividen; Randa Soliman; Aubrae Anne Wilson; Kira King; Eman Elsokary; Ashley Kacenjar; Tye Lawson-Beard; Tim Osborne; Amy Hasselkus; Arnaldo Costeira; Rafik Raouf Wahba Habib

Registered Guests:

Heather Witt; Alia Shoeib; Caroline Van Howe; Ana Sejeck; Beth Scholz; Hannah Teter; Gillian Gansler; Vicki Giles; Sofie McNamara; Allison Goff; Orvella Lottt; Chris Walker; Natasha; Natalie; Elena Smith; Luana Bannister; Graham; Wen Lin; Michele Segres; Rowell; Karen; Gareth McAlister; Carmen van Leeuwen; Lourdes; Celina; Carmen Hufcut; Renata McGuire; Lynn Mortilla-Rocap, MBA, CAE, CMP, ICE-CCP; Carlos; Joy Stephenson; Andrea Fairman; Jennifer Erickson; Patti; Kate Cline; Tracey; Gamal Casimir; Gabriel Morales; Laura; Harmony; Sean; Sophia Chaale; Kayleen; Deborah McGuire; June Mastan; Joseph; Karen LaMarsh; Sal Ferrer; SHARON DOCTOR; Tom Liberty; Bridget Mangan; Ellie Houghton; Kathleen Maka; Mohamed; Patricia Gould; Chelsie Rauh; Moaz M.; Amira EL-Deeb; kym Carroll

Agenda Reference: IACET CET-SDC Meeting - April Agenda

1. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Sherard Jones / Tye Lawson-Beard

The meeting was called to order with welcome remarks and roll call. Sherard Jones acknowledged both committee members and registered external participants attending the session. Minor technical issues (audio echo) were reported and resolved at the start of the meeting.

2. IACET STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT MILESTONES

Sherard Jones

Sherard provided an overview of the CET standards development process and reaffirmed the current milestone timeline. He directed participants to key resources, including the SDC webpage and working draft documents, to support ongoing review efforts.

The committee was reminded of the structured review schedule and the importance of aligning feedback with ANSI standards development procedures.

3. PRESENTATION OF COMMISSION COMMENTS ON SECTIONS 1-3

Tye Lawson-Beard

Commission feedback on Sections 1-3 of the draft CET Standard was presented for committee consideration. The comments focused on clarity, terminology consistency, and structural alignment across sections.

4. REVIEW OF SDC COMMENTS ON SECTIONS 1-3

All

The committee conducted a comprehensive and structured review of all submitted SDC comments related to Sections 1-3 of the draft CET Standard. The discussion reflected a high level of engagement, with members focusing on improving clarity, consistency, and usability of the document.

Key discussion areas included:

- **Terminology and Definitions Strategy:**
A significant portion of the discussion centered on how best to handle key terminology throughout the document. Multiple members expressed a preference for consolidating definitions within a dedicated Definitions section rather than repeating terms across multiple sections. This approach was viewed as a way to reduce redundancy and maintain consistency. However, members also acknowledged the need to ensure that definitions are easily accessible and do not require excessive cross-referencing that could disrupt the reader's flow.
- **Balancing Redundancy and Clarity:**
While there was general agreement to minimize repetition, some members cautioned that over-reliance on the Definitions section could introduce ambiguity if readers are required to frequently navigate away from the main content. The group discussed striking a balance by ensuring critical terms are clearly defined while maintaining readability within each section.

- **Strength and Precision of Language:**
The committee reviewed the use of verbs and phrasing throughout the draft, emphasizing the importance of clear, actionable, and enforceable language. Terms such as “demonstrate” were viewed favorably for their strength and measurability, while alternative verbs like “identify” were suggested where appropriate. Members agreed that verb selection should align with the intent of each requirement and support consistent interpretation across stakeholders.
- **Consistency in Organizational Terminology:**
Discussion addressed whether to use terms such as “organization,” “institution,” or “entity.” While “entity” was considered more inclusive, several members noted it could introduce unnecessary ambiguity. The prevailing recommendation was to retain “organization” and ensure it is clearly defined in the Definitions section to encompass all applicable structures and use cases.
- **Structural and Formatting Considerations:**
Members also commented on overall document structure, including how introductory language and explanatory statements are presented. Suggestions included refining introductory phrasing to improve readability and ensuring that bullet lists and requirement statements are clearly distinguished. There was also discussion on how to frame statements such as “The standard is intended for organizations who...” to better align with the document’s purpose and audience.

Overall, this section of the meeting emphasized the importance of producing a standard that is both precise and user-friendly, with consistent terminology and clear expectations for implementation.

5. OPEN DISCUSSION ON SECTIONS 1–3

All

The open discussion provided an opportunity for broader reflection on the direction, positioning, and applicability of the CET Standard. The conversation extended beyond specific edits to consider the document’s overall intent and usability across diverse contexts.

Key themes included:

- **Positioning of the Standard (Recommended Practice vs. Standard):**
Members discussed whether the document could or should be framed as a “Recommended Practice,” similar to models used by other organizations (e.g., API). This approach could allow for inclusion of both mandatory and non-mandatory elements while still promoting recognized industry practices. While no decision was made, the discussion highlighted the importance of clearly defining the document’s purpose and level of prescriptiveness.

- **Audience and Scope Considerations:**
The committee explored how the standard applies across different educational and training contexts, including distinctions between adult learning environments and primary or secondary education. Members noted that processes and legal considerations (e.g., parental rights for minors) may differ significantly across these contexts, raising questions about how broadly the standard should apply and whether additional clarification is needed within the Scope section.
- **Use of “Learner” as a Core Term:**
There was strong support for the use of the term “learner” as a flexible and inclusive descriptor that can apply across various educational settings. Members agreed that this term helps avoid unnecessary limitations while maintaining clarity.
- **Access and Inclusivity:**
The group discussed whether eligibility criteria, such as legal adult age, should influence access to CEUs. A viewpoint was raised that age should not be a limiting factor in accredited programs, reinforcing the importance of inclusivity and accessibility in the standard’s application.
- **Cognitive Framing and Intent Language:**
Members briefly discussed the tone and intent conveyed through language choices, including the use of terms such as “aspire” versus more action-oriented phrasing. The group noted that wording should promote clarity of expectations while encouraging higher-level thinking and outcomes.
- **Document Structure and Content Placement:**
Questions were raised regarding how different components of the document—such as the Foreword—should relate to the Scope. Clarification was sought on whether these elements should be explicitly referenced or integrated, indicating a need for alignment in document structure and navigation.
- **Operational and Logistical Feedback:**
Participants provided feedback on meeting logistics, specifically noting discrepancies between scheduled meeting durations and calendar invites. It was confirmed that future sessions are intended to be 90 minutes, and adjustments will be made to ensure consistency.
- **Participation and Engagement:**
Several members noted the need to leave early due to prior commitments but expressed continued interest in contributing to future discussions and reviewing subsequent sections of the standard.

This open discussion reinforced the importance of aligning the CET Standard with both industry expectations and practical implementation needs, ensuring it remains inclusive, clearly structured, and adaptable across a range of educational and training environments.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Sherard Jones

The meeting concluded with appreciation expressed to all participants for their engagement and thoughtful contributions. Members were reminded to continue reviewing draft sections and prepare for upcoming discussions on subsequent sections of the standard.

Several participants noted early departures due to scheduling conflicts, with acknowledgment of continued engagement in future sessions.

7. NEXT STEPS

Sherard Jones

- Share relevant resource links, including the SDC webpage and working draft documents (if not already distributed)
- Confirm and correct calendar invites to reflect full meeting duration
- Continue coordinating upcoming review sessions

Draft Subcommittee

- Convene to draft Forward and Scope Sections

All Committee Members

- Review and provide comments on Section 3
- Prepare for review of subsequent sections in upcoming meetings