

IACET CET SDC MEETING SUMMARY - JULY

Date: July 20, 2026

Time: 12:00 PM Eastern

Location: Zoom

Meeting Type: Monthly SDC Meeting

Facilitator: Sherard Jones

Called by: Amy Hasselkus

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 Burback; 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: Mary Aarons, Kristen Buck, Laura Clark, Shane Coleman, Aishah Dean, Margot Edil, Iris Erazo, Ralph Foster, Daphne Fudge, Stefan Fudge, Steven Garner, Charles George, Allison Goff, Shelley Hand, Margaret Hiatt, Jennifer Kraus, Nicki Lyons, Fredah Mainah, Bridget Mangan, Shelly McDowell-Porter, Sofie McNamara, Maha Mobasher, Olin Newsome, Althea Penn, Karen Rankin, Erin Renoll, Sue Reynolds, Allyson Sapko, David Shulman, Jeffrey Weaver, Stephen Weiler

Agenda Reference: IACET CET-SDC Meeting – July Agenda

1. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Sherard Jones / Amy Hasselkus

The meeting was called to order with welcome remarks and roll call. Amy Hasselkus acknowledged committee members, registered guests, and members of the public participating in the open standards development process.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REGISTERED GUESTS

Amy Hasselkus

Registered guests were acknowledged and invited to observe and contribute through the open-meeting process. Guest participation included questions and comments in the Zoom chat concerning quality metrics, corrective-action tracking, needs analysis, learning-event design, continuing education units, artificial intelligence, copyright, and evidence expectations.

3. IACET STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT MILESTONES

Sherard Jones

Sherard Jones referenced the public IACET CE/T Standards Development Committee webpage as the location for New Work Items and published meeting summaries. In response to a guest question, he clarified that the committee's active working document displayed during the meeting is not publicly accessible at this stage of development. The discussion reinforced the distinction between materials available to the public and internal working documents used by the consensus body during drafting.

4. CONTINUATION OF REVIEW AND OPEN DISCUSSION ON SECTION 5 – REQUIREMENTS FOR PROVIDER

All

The committee continued its review of comments associated with Section 5. Discussion focused on whether provider requirements are written with enough clarity to support consistent interpretation and assessment while avoiding unnecessary prescription.

Quality and Objectivity. Participants raised questions about how quality-related requirements can be evaluated with reduced subjectivity. Fredah Mainah asked what metrics could be used to reduce subjectivity and suggested that definitions or explanatory guidance may help providers understand expectations. The discussion reflected a broader concern that requirements should be assessable without forcing every provider to use the same internal method.

Corrective and Preventive Action Tracking. Steven Garner compared the discussion to ISO/IEC 17024:2012 practices, noting that corrective and preventive actions are commonly tracked through a log that can be reviewed by assessors. He described prior accreditation evidence that included policies, standard operating practices, and records showing implementation. Ralph Foster noted that some organizations may already have institutional policies that govern or overarch these processes. The committee considered the need to recognize such existing systems while retaining an expectation for demonstrable follow-through.

Evidence of Organizational Expectations. Discussion also addressed how providers may demonstrate that personnel and vendors understand and commit to applicable standards or organizational expectations. Examples shared in the chat included signed employee handbook acknowledgements and vendor documentation. The comments emphasized the distinction between requiring a specific document format and requiring sufficient evidence that expectations are communicated and followed.

5. REVIEW AND OPEN DISCUSSION OF SECTION 6 – REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LEARNING EVENT

All

The committee moved into Section 6 and reviewed requirements related to learning-event analysis, design, development, delivery, and supporting evidence. The discussion centered on preserving the intent of the standard while allowing providers flexibility in the processes and instruments they use.

Needs Analysis and Process Expectations. Participants discussed language associated with needs analysis and whether changing a requirement could unintentionally remove the expectation for a defined process. Steven Garner cautioned that eliminating the process expectation might miss the original intent, drawing on accreditation models that distinguish among policy, business practice or SOP, and evidence of implementation. Ralph Foster supported framing needs analysis in a way that promotes sound practice without prescribing one specific methodology. Charles George suggested that providers identify the instrument used to perform the needs analysis.

Learner-Centered Design. Charles George recommended “learner-centered” language, noting that “adult learning methodology” can encompass a very broad range of approaches depending on the content and context. The discussion supported terminology that focuses on the learner and intended outcomes while preserving flexibility in instructional design methods.

Learning Duration and CEU Considerations. The committee discussed the relationship among learning-event duration, contact hours, and CEUs. Steven Garner asked whether an eight-hour conference session awarding 0.8 CEU would be acceptable under the proposed language and noted that some organizations use contact hours rather than CEUs. The exchange highlighted the importance of ensuring that revised requirements do not create unintended barriers for legitimate learning-event formats.

Artificial Intelligence, Content Development, and Copyright. The committee discussed rapidly changing technologies, including generative AI and assistive technologies. David Shulman emphasized that faculty or subject matter expert involvement should remain central to content development so that generated content receives appropriate oversight. Fredah Mainah expressed support for a progressive approach given the pace of technological change. Steven Garner observed that the language under discussion appeared primarily concerned with copyright and property-rights compliance rather than the method used to create material. Comments also addressed the continuing human role in prompts, guidelines, research direction, and institutional work products.

Evidence of Implementation. Later discussion returned to the relationship between written requirements and evidence that a provider follows them. Examples from other accreditation settings included policies, SOPs, and records demonstrating that processes such as complaint handling were actually implemented. The committee considered these examples as context for determining how much specificity belongs in the standard versus guidance or assessment evidence.

6. NEXT STEPS

Amy Hasselkus / Sherard Jones / All

Based on the discussion, the following follow-up items were identified or implied for continued standards-development work:

- Continue refining Section 5 and Section 6 language to support consistent assessment while avoiding unnecessary prescription of a single provider process or document format.
- Consider whether definitions, guidance, examples, or measurable criteria are needed to reduce subjectivity in quality-related requirements.

- Review language concerning corrective/preventive actions and tracking to ensure the requirement addresses demonstrable follow-through while accommodating overarching institutional policies.
- Review Section 6 language on needs analysis to preserve an expectation for an appropriate process and evidence without prescribing one specific instrument or methodology.
- Consider learner-centered terminology where it more accurately communicates the intended instructional-design requirement.
- Continue evaluating language related to learning duration, contact hours, and CEUs for unintended impacts on valid learning-event formats.
- Continue reviewing requirements related to AI-assisted content development, faculty/SME oversight, copyright, and intellectual-property compliance as technologies and practices evolve.
- Incorporate applicable committee and public comments into the working draft for subsequent SDC review.

activities in accordance with the published standards development timeline.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Amy Hasselkus

The meeting concluded after the committee completed the scheduled discussion of Section 5 and advanced its review of Section 6. Participants were thanked for their comments and engagement in the standards-development process.