It seems, based on the following added CRDNs for the 2022 standards, that ACEND is attempting to change entry-level standards of practice that even our seasoned 200+ DI preceptors don’t do, unless additional credentials have been earned (which is NOT entry-level). This means the preceptors would not be able to supervise the intern completing all or a portion of the following skills in each CRDN.

**CRDN 3.3** Perform routine health screening assessments including measuring blood pressure, conducting waived point-of-care laboratory testing (such as blood glucose or cholesterol), initiating pharmacotherapy plans (such as insulin management), and administering vaccine injections (such as flu shots).

**CRDN 3.4** Provide instruction for self-monitoring blood glucose, insulin administration and adjusting diabetes medication.

**CRDN 3.5** Insert nasogastric or nasoenteric feeding tubes.

**CRDN 3.6** Initiate and conduct bedside swallow screenings.

Please provide an explanation why these have been added for programs designed to train entry-level RDNs.

Secondly, graduate employer data required per the standards has not produced reliable assessments of the quality of graduates, in my experience, based on extremely poor response rates despite great effort to connect with grads/employers and encourage completion of surveys. This has been the case for the 12 years in my role as director. Other directors with whom I collaborate say the same. Our discussions have questioned the purpose and efficacy of this requirement when we are just really following through steps that tell us incomplete information with not enough responses to draw any conclusion of the overall quality of our program/grads, rather a few opinions on just a few individuals over several years of time. Can this be removed as a measure of success and allow us to continue surveying our grads if they felt/were prepared, passed the RD exam in one year as sufficient measures, etc?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACEND Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The addition of these higher levels was based on comments that came to ACEND during the first round of public comments. The ACEND Board is committed to ACEND’s mission of ensuring quality education to advance the practice of the profession. Through strong educational preparation, ACEND programs can extend the skills of their graduates to equip them for the positions available in the field and help them advocate for better opportunities in the workplace. The enhanced skills proposed in the 2022 Accreditation Standards promote opportunities for ACEND programs to engage in interprofessional education (IPE) by collaborating with other departments and health professionals to assist in providing their students and interns with the required skills. Such collaborations will further highlight the value of the Registered Dietitian Nutritionist (RDN) as an essential member of the health care team. The Core Knowledge KRDN 3.4 and Competencies CRDNs 3.3-3.6 were added to the Proposed 2022 Accreditation Standards after multiple conversations with Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics units; discussions with other allied health care professionals; and reviews of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Scope of Practice (SOP) for the Registered Dietitian Nutritionist (RDN) including the Revised 2017 SOP for RDNs (pages 149-150). While some or all these skills may not be approved to be performed by the RDN at facilities in some states, there are many instances where RDNs are performing these skills, or they are being asked to do so. Competent graduates armed with many of the skills expected in the workplace can expand the field and advance the practice of the profession. 2) ACEND is recognized by USDE and as such, is required to gather data from programs on the outcomes of graduates of ACEND-accredited programs. The ACEND Standards require programs to collect data on several different outcome measures. Data may be collected using qualitative methods including talking with preceptors who hire program graduates. The Accreditation Standards are revised every five years and the public is given an opportunity to comment on the proposed standards. Comments, based on program directors’ experiences, such as this are welcomed and taken into consideration when the Standards are revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are both questions that would impact under-resourced individuals seeking to enter the profession.

Q 1. Has there been any discussion for a pathway that would allow individuals who have earned a graduate degree to enter the profession in a resource-efficient way (time, cost)? Most will not find earning another graduate degree or earning a DPD verification statement resource efficient. Potentially, a similar pathway as the ISPP for PhDs would support their entry into the profession - taking specific required courses prior to enrollment.

Q 2. Can the preselect option for DIIs be expanded? Currently, the policy allows for pre-select for internal candidates from the same university. Expanding it to allow for preselect according to geographic location would likely help both the programs use all their placement sites and help applicants become placed in a geographical location that would help them manage the costs of the program.

Currently, graduates more than 5 years out from graduation are not counted on a DPD program’s one-year RD exam pass rate. Is there any discussion to increase this time frame, given the upcoming requirement for a master’s degree? It is likely that some graduates will complete the MS part-time, adding to the time from DPD completion to RD exam. We are a small program, but we have a significant number of graduates who choose to work for a year or two before applying to supervised practice, both for experience and financial reasons. Five years can pass quickly when you need to complete both a supervised practice and a MS, and perhaps save money to pay for both!

Recently the ACEND Board approved a more holistic approach to reviewing programs. The holistic approach allows the Board to look at other program outcomes besides pass rate and factors within the program that may impact program quality. This approach could be advantageous to DPD programs as it takes into consideration that DPD graduates may have gaps in their education. The ACEND Board could consider evaluating the five-year time frame for including pass rate results as it continues to implement the holistic approach to program reviews.

Regarding competencies 3.3-3.6. CRDN 3.5: We have been told repeatedly here in California that we are not able to place feeding tubes due to lack of licensure. How is ACEND addressing this oversight? Additionally, what are the proposals for those facilities that are not in an academic setting or do not have ability to access SIM space for this training? CRDN 3.6: Please explain this competency further. Is this referring to screening questions, or a physical evaluation of swallow?

1) ACEND is collecting and gathering feedback and comments on these proposed competency statements. The SOP for RDNs do include these skills, along with the caveat that state and institutional requirements take precedence regarding these practices. 2) Competency 3.6 only addresses screening for swallowing difficulties. If issues are identified, the patient should be referred to other health professionals for a complete swallowing evaluation. The ACEND Board realizes that when advancing practice, preceptors may not have the skills to train students on new competencies. If these new competencies are included when the Board releases the standards, ACEND will provide support for program directors to train students and preceptors on these competencies, similar to when the Nutrition Care Process and Nutrition Focused Physical Exam were introduced.
With the increase in the match rate to the mid-70s and so many programs with openings in the second round, is ACEND planning to discontinue ISSPs as an option for students who do not match in the near future?

ISPP data is reviewed each year by the ACEND Board. Through this review the Board has determined that there is no reason to discontinue Individualized Supervised Practice Pathways (ISPPs) at this time as the ISPP is still a viable option for some students to complete the requirements to become an RDN.

Would ACEND consider posting a list of programs that are transitioning from a DI to either a Future Model Graduate Program, Coordinated Graduate Program, or MS/DI and the anticipated start dates that the reorganization will begin? It is challenging as a DPD director to help my students research supervised practice programs when it is unknown which programs are moving into a new type and the date they will be recognized as their new program type by ACEND.

ACEND only lists its accredited programs on the program directory on its website https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/accredited-programs/accredited-programs-directory. Once a candidacy program completes the accreditation process and is recognized as an accredited program the program will be listed in the ACEND program directory. Programs that are reorganizing as a Future Model Graduate program will also be listed in the ACEND program directory once the reorganization is approved. If a student is interested in a program and has questions about the status of the program they should direct these to the program director.

1. Why has ACEND removed the info re: program size (# of Interns for which program is accredited) from the program directory on eatright.org, making it impossible for applicants to find information without going to each program's site. Could it have anything to do with pushing sales of the $35 directory published annually and sold through the eatright store. Transparency?

2. Why has ACEND not made an effort to “diversify” the board in terms of types of programs represented. The overwhelming majority of board members represent university or hospital based programs. There is no representation from privately operated programs.

3. Why does ACEND allow clearly erroneous information to stand, uncorrected and unchallenged, on the NDEP listserv?

4. On their face, the proposed 2022 standards, particularly as they relate to privately owned internships, demonstrate an overwhelming lack of knowledge in a number of areas, not the least of which are the myriad of complicated legal, financial and business related requirements for conducting a business of this nature. It is possible that there may even be a legal issue regarding business interference in the standards, as they are now written. I have been told, when inquiring about one particular change, was that what the standard implied, as currently written, was not what the board meant. If this is the case, no matter which standard is at issue, does the board expect to produce a quality product without presenting another draft instead of attempting to ram through this embarrassing piece of work in an effort to avoid having to change the implementation date which is already on the document?

1) ACEND has found the best source of information for students is on the program's own website. ACEND doesn't want to publish misleading information about programs since information often changes. The information provided on the ACEND website includes the program director contact information and a link to the program's website where the most accurate information is listed. 2) The ACEND Board includes program representatives based on program type (DPD, DI, CP, DT) and an at-large representative. Program directors from dietetic internships sponsored by business entities are welcome to apply to become an ACEND reviewer and potentially serve on the ACEND Board. The ACEND Nominating Committee is looking at other options to recruit board members and increasing transparency of the process for individuals wishing to become a board member. Currently, experience as a ACEND program reviewer is required to be considered for a ACEND Board member position, as thorough understanding of the standards is critical to a board member's role. 3) The Discussion Board is owned by NDEP and as such it is for the educators and NDEP. ACEND is happy to answer any questions and everyone is welcome to contact Rayane AbuSabha directly at rabusabha@eatright.org or ACEND staff at acend@eatright.org with questions. ACEND also hosts the quarterly town hall which also provides an opportunity for individuals to ask questions directly to ACEND and allows an opportunity for ACEND to correct erroneous information. 4) The 2022 Standards are still under review and have not been finalized as ACEND is still receiving public comments. Timelines for implementation will be specified at the time the Standards are released.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why does ACEND not have stricter supervised practice training requirements similar to other medical profession? ACEND needs to require a specific number of clinical hours of supervised on-site, in-person practice that cannot be replaced by simulations, case studies, etc. E.g. nursing does not learn clinical patient assessment and triaging <strong>SOLELY</strong> in a simulated environment; nursing has mandatory supervised on-site, in-person supervised clinical practice hours that are required. No other health care profession allows the level of simulation that ACEND is now allowing.</td>
<td>The proposed 2022 standards specify that the majority (&gt;50%) of the hours in each of the major rotations must be completed in person. This was added based on public comments regarding the need for more specificity regarding this topic. ACEND will also add clarification and expectations regarding compliance with the 2022 standards in the Guidance document that will be released fall 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the ACEND board &quot;a closed shop&quot;, i.e. it nominates its own board members? How many voting members are on the board? How many of the voting members are elected by the general membership and/or the education community?</td>
<td>There are 17 voting members on the ACEND Board. ACEND needs individuals experienced in the site visit program review process to ensure programs receive a fair review by their peers. ACEND program review reviewers fulfill the role of ACEND Program Representative on the ACEND Board. Program representatives function as peer reviewers on the program review team and provide guidance and support to the program reviewers as they complete the review process. This requires knowledge and understanding of ACEND accreditation standards, self-study/site visit processes and policies which is gained through experience as a program reviewer. Other ACEND Board members include 3 public members, 2 student members, an RDN practitioner and NDTR practitioner. The practitioner Board members are elected by the Academy membership. Educators and practitioners are always welcome to apply to become a program reviewer and are encouraged to do so each year. Here is a link to where the program reviewer application can be found:<a href="https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/training-and-volunteer-opportunities/program-reviewers">https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/training-and-volunteer-opportunities/program-reviewers</a>. The ACEND Nominating Committee is currently reviewing this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the FEM BS-DTR program was eliminated and there are still NO programs participating in the FEM Associate program will the later program be discontinued and associate degrees continue to be an option for DTRs?</td>
<td>ACEND still plans to continue the Future Education Model Associate's (FA) degree demonstration program. This program type is not meant to replace NDTR programs as it is a very different type of degree program. Due to the disruption of the pandemic, there has been a pause in the efforts towards this pilot. Marketing of the FA Program Standards will resume as the pandemic subsides. As ACEND begins to accredit FA programs it will use the same process used to evaluate Future Bachelor's programs and then determine the future plans for the FA program. ACEND will also continue to accredit associate degree NDTR programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM (MS RD) program aggregate data. For the spring 2021 semester how many FEM (MS RD) slots were available, how many total applications were received and how many of the total slots were filled?</td>
<td>ACEND tracks enrollment and application numbers for all program types through the annual report each fall. ACEND only has information on the number of available slots, total applications and total slots filled for the first round computer match cycle for dietetic internships that participated in the spring 2021 match. This information is provided by D&amp;D Digital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After Jan. 1st 2025, what will be the expectations for stand alone DI programs in terms of a) admitting students, b) ability to provide Verification statements?

The proposed 2022 Accreditation Standards state that dietetic internships must 1) Admit only individuals who have a verification statement from a Didactic Program in Dietetics (DPD) or Foreign Dietitian Education program (FDE) and have earned at least a master’s degree granted by a U.S. accredited college/university or foreign equivalent, or 2) Admit only individuals with a DPD or FDE verification statement and has a process to ensure interns complete a graduate degree by the end of the program. 3. Meets the requirements listed above on or before December 31, 2023. If this proposed standard is implemented stand-alone DIs will need to meet one of these requirements by December 31, 2023. DI programs can also choose to do both, admit interns with a graduate degree and also offer a graduate degree for any interns that do not have one.

Regarding the 12/31/21 decision which stand-alone DIs need to make regarding partnering with an academic institution, or accepting only master’s-prepared students, is there a possibility of choosing both? For instance, could we set aside 6 slots for one, and 2 slots for the other?

As stated in the response to question 13, if the proposed standards are implemented as written, dietetic internships can choose to have two options, one for interns that have completed a master’s degree prior to entering the program and an option to complete a master’s degree as part of the program.

Can you confirm that the following information is correct: the 2022 Standards will not be released until September of 2021, ACEND is planning training videos for release in the fall, and there will be an in-person training in Spring 2022 (likely in March).

Yes, this information is correct, ACEND plans to release the 2022 Accreditation Standards, along with self-study report templates and the guidance document by September 1, 2021. It will provide training webinars on the 2022 accreditation standards in fall 2021 with a program director workshop in the spring. It is anticipated that the ACEND Board will vote on the approval of the 2022 ACEND accreditation standards at its July 2021 meeting. After the meeting the release date and the date all programs will need to come into compliance will be announced. The ACEND Board will take into consideration the effects of the pandemic on programs when deciding the date all programs will be required to come into compliance.

Why has ACEND only spent resources for “talking points” for FEM programs and not for all types of supervised practice programs? Doesn’t the membership fees from all types of dietetic programs provide the budget that ACEND has? IF so, shouldn’t all types of programs receive the same support and recognition?

The FEM talking points were developed in response to the many questions received by ACEND about the Future Education Model pilot program as these are a new program type. ACEND devotes its resources to all program types. For example, each ACEND accredited program, regardless of program type, is assigned an accreditation manager. The accreditation manager works closely with programs to answer accreditation questions, discuss how to prepare a self-study report, major changes and other reports. ACEND has an extensive website that includes much information and resources for and about its accredited programs. Here is a link to the section of the website that includes FAQs and resources for all program types. [https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/program-directors/program-directors-faqs](https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/program-directors/program-directors-faqs)

What new approaches is ACEND (and national AND) implementing to address the issue of dropping undergraduate dietetic student enrollment as well as a further decrease in supervised practice applicants? Dietitians in Canada have taken several approaches which ACEND (and national AND) could consider

The ACEND Board is taking several steps to address key issues in the profession including, efforts on diversity, equity and inclusion, reviewing the number of supervised practice hours, encouraging holistic admission, and much more. We will ensure the Board reviews the approaches by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has it been considered ever/recently to stop doing a match? The process is so complicated for applicants - businesses have been created to help applicants apply (and the applicants pay extra for this service). We never get a 100% match rate - and this past match had a relatively poor percentage. Can we discuss looking at moving away from the match and having applicants apply to the programs of their choice directly?</th>
<th>The NDEP Application (DICAS) Committee is charged with evaluating the DICAS centralized application and computer matching process for effectiveness. As part of this, the Committee is looking at ways to have a fair process for students and programs to select and admit applicants given the multiple program types that lead to the RDN credential. More information about any proposed changes to the computer match process will become available as the Application Committee completes its work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022 proposed standards.Given: that the COVID pandemic has required excessive, heroic efforts by educators in the last 14 months to keep program afloat; that these approved standards will not be approved until sometime in September giving educators only 8 months to implement in the middle of the 2021-2022 school year that USDE has been much more flexible during the COVID pandemic why can't the standards be moved to an implementation of June 2023 to allow everyone to make all of these changes in a way that assures quality of education will be maintained?</td>
<td>Thank you for this input. The far-reaching effects of the pandemic on students, educators, and ACEND accredited programs is always foremost in the ACEND Board's discussion as evidenced by the swift actions the Board took granting a variety of flexibilities for programs when the pandemic first took hold. The ACEND Board continues to discuss the impact of the pandemic on programs and students and will take it into consideration when they determine the timing of the roll-out of the ACEND accreditation standards. It is anticipated that the ACEND Board will vote on the approval of the 2022 ACEND accreditation standards at its July 2021 meeting. The ACEND Board will take into consideration the effects of the pandemic on programs when deciding the date all programs will be required to come into compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please reconsider the new amped-up clinical competencies (tube placement, vaccinations, especially). Aside from the fact that these functions are not entry-level, they are also something which I think you'll find that the majority of clinical preceptors could not teach or supervise since they do not do these functions themselves. I've been managing a DI at a Harvard teaching hospital for 17 years, and we could not consider including this skill in our scope of practice. Our patients are far too medically complex, and require significant clinical hours already in order to assess and monitor for nutrition support. Listen to your internal customers - your preceptors who are the backbone of the entire internship segment of dietetics education. They are already burdened with so much teaching responsibility. This is not the time for pie-in-the-sky, 'wouldn't it be nice if RDs did this' type of changes.</td>
<td>ACEND is completing its second round of public comments on the proposed revisions of the Accreditation Standards. Comments on the standards and competencies are welcomed and will be taken into consideration during the Standards revision process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions on CRDNs: Seems like some are redundant or could be effectively combined. This may be more appropriate for the mid-June deadline for standards review comments but since we are able to ask now, I wonder if other directors feel some are too similar to be separate. Also will there be an opportunity to receive clarity/explanation for each CRDN when considering the following examples in addition to the questions already posed for the new ones that are elevating entry level practice skills?

CRDN 1.1 and 1.3 - 1.1 is "select indicators of quality/customer service and measure achievement of objectives" which could easily be the same as "justification of programs, products, services or care"; both require justification through data or evidence (1.3). Could these be combined?

CRDN 2.3 and 2.4 - active participation, teamwork and contributions in group settings- could this include IPE? For example: "Demonstrate active participation, teamwork and contributions in group settings, including interprofessional teams."

There are likely others, but I will save for comments on the other survey.

| ACEND is completing its second round of public comments on the proposed revisions of the Accreditation Standards. Comments on the standards and competencies are welcomed and will be taken into consideration during the Standards revision process. |
| ACEND still plans to continue the Future Education Model Associate degree demonstration programs to educate Nutrition Health Workers. This program type is not meant to replace NDTR programs. Due to the disruption of the pandemic, there has been a pause in the efforts towards this pilot. This will resume as the pandemic subsides. |

Is there still a plan to pilot the nutrition health worker program at the associate degree level in light of the decline in current DTR associate degree programs?
The current Standards list 1200 hours of supervised practice required. The 2022 Standards list 1000 hours and the FEM list no required hours. Please discuss the thinking around this.

| The FEM standards are a pilot program initially designed to allow programs flexibility in deciding how many hours of experiential learning (supervised practice) would be required for graduates to meet the competency. As the pilot was implemented some programs had questions about the number of experiential learning hours necessary to meet state licensure requirements. ACEND worked with the Academy’s licensure team and determined that to ensure graduates of an FG program would meet licensure requirements in any state they would need to complete a minimum of 1000 hours of experiential learning. Thus, ACEND now requires FG programs to provide a minimum of 1000 hours of experiential learning. ACEND’s proposed 2022 accreditation standards will also require a minimum of 1000 hours of supervised practice as there is no good evidence that the additional supervised practice hours result in more competent entry-level practitioners.

On April 6, 2020, the ACEND Board voted to temporarily reduce the required number of supervised practice hours for programs accredited under the ACEND 2017 Accreditation Standards from 1200 hours to 1000 hours for RDN programs (CP, DI, FDE, IDE, DPD with ISPP), and from 450 hours to 375 hours for NDTR programs, for the period starting January 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2022. We encourage programs to review their total number of supervised practice hours and the need for the 1200 hours, as fewer well-planned hours will shorten the program length and decrease student costs.

ACEND seems chockful of unintentional biases that it it off the chart! How will ACEND and the Academy survive should many full-paying members abandon the Academy and the profession due to a decrease in diversity and having so many individuals from lower-income strata who find the expense of master degrees prohibitive? Many of us may choose to vote with our pocketbooks to not support the further degradation of diversity in our profession.

ACEND is a separate organizational unit within the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. ACEND is not funded by Academy membership dues. The Commission on Dietetic Registration establishes the eligibility requirements to become a registered dietitian and set the requirements for the graduate degree beginning in 2024. ACEND establishes the education standards for entry-level practice in the profession. ACEND is addressing diversity, equity and inclusion by strengthening the curriculum requirements for students and the training requirements for faculty and preceptors in the 2022 accreditation standards which are in the process of revision. ACEND has also provided webinars for program directors, faculty, students and other interested individuals on topics including Food and Racism, Legal and Ethical Admissions Processes that Promote Diversity and Introduction to Culturally Sustaining Teaching. ACEND is also requesting that programs submit any noteworthy practices that address this topic. These will be shared with program directors. The webinars, noteworthy practice information and DEI resources for educators are posted in the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion section of ACEND’s website, at this location: https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/about-acend/diversity-equity-and-inclusion
### Scenario below demonstrates the lack of job compensation related to MS RD entry level RD....

I was reminded by one of my grads – “I tried to get such and such more money by telling my supervisor – he has a master’s degree. But my supervisor responded – what can he do that a BS RD cannot do. When I had no answer – my supervisor said – then pay him the same salary”.

For information about salaries for RDNs with graduate degrees view the Academy’s Compensation Benefits Survey or contact the Academy of nutrition and dietetics membership team: membership@eatright.org. As an accreditor of education programs leading to the RDN credential, ACEND is prohibited from influencing dietitian salaries.

### Where are the various Types of support to confirm we are diversity supportive? In the nursing profession a student can take their national exam in any language they choose. They also can ask for more time or other specifics to help. I have reached out for help to aid a specific student to no avail. Crickets...

Several years ago, the ACEND Board submitted a formal request to the Commission on Dietetic Registration (CDR) Board requesting that CDR investigate offering the exam in Spanish. CDR researched this possibility and concluded that offering the exam in Spanish was not feasible for a variety of reasons. Contact CDR for any questions or concerns you have about the credentialing exam for RDNs, including questions about accommodations.

### Will ACEND continue to accredit BS programs come 2024? with the understanding that graduates will need to complete a master's degree to be eligible to take boards?

Yes, ACEND will continue to accredit bachelor's level Didactic Programs in Dietetics after January 1, 2024. The proposed 2022 Accreditation Standards for Coordinated Program in Dietetics require that CPs award a graduate degree after December 31, 2023.

### ACEND has so many standards of practice for dietetic internship programs that the DI director is becoming a virtual pencil pusher instead of focusing on managing his or her program and serving as mentor to his/her interns.

ACEND understands that program directors are very busy, often with job requirements beyond managing an ACEND accredited program. With the revisions to the 2022 Accreditation Standards, ACEND has streamlined the standards from 10 Standards to 8 standards. ACEND has also developed many templates, guidance documents, accreditation training, a Leadership certificate program and other resources to help make the program director's job easier. Feel free to contact an ACEND staff members if you have any recommendations for resources or training that would help program directors manage their programs.
Please clarify differences between MS DI, Graduate FEMs and graduate coordinated programs.

1) The Dietetic Internship (DI) is a postbaccalaureate program that provides only the required competencies (supervised practice) and admits students who have already completed an ACEND-accredited DPD and at least a baccalaureate degree. An MS/DI is a Dietetic Internship that requires the completion of a separate graduate degree while interns are completing the DI supervised practice requirements. The Master's degree could be in any topic and does not include the Knowledge Requirements that are met in a Didactic Program in Dietetics.

2) A Future Education Model Graduate (FG) program refers to an academic program designed to meet the knowledge and required competencies (through academic coursework and supervised experiential learning activities) for dietetics practice in one graduate degree-granting program. The FG is a pilot program that is built upon competency-based education by integrating classroom learning with hands-on supervised experiential learning activities.

3) A Coordinated Program in Nutrition and Dietetics must include the didactic instruction to meet the Knowledge Requirements and supervised practice planned to meet the competencies in one degree-granting program offered at the bachelor's level or higher. The proposed 2022 Accreditation Standards for Coordinated Program in Dietetics require that CPs award a graduate degree after December 31, 2023.

Is it a requirement that DPD Directors be members of the Academy? I plan to drop my Academy membership since I cannot with good conscience support this organization.

Membership in the Academy is not a requirement to be the director of an ACEND accredited program. Refer to standard 1 of the accreditation standards for any program type for a list of program director requirements.

There is another side to your decision to allow only past program reviewers as members of the ACEND board and that is the very real risk of having too much "group think" in the room. A less kind way of putting this to point out you only allow those indoctrinated with the current ACEND mindset. Please rethink this policy.

ACEND program reviewers fulfill the role of ACEND Program Representative on the ACEND Board. Program representatives function as peer reviewers on the program review team and provide guidance and support to the program reviewers as they complete the review process. This requires knowledge and understanding of ACEND accreditation standards, self-study/site visit processes and policies which is gained through experience as a program reviewer. Seven of the 17 ACEND Board members (3 public members, 2 student members, an RDN practitioner and NDTR practitioner) are not required to have any previous experience with ACEND and bring an outside perspective to ACEND accreditation activities.
I understand that you want to expand the role of dietitian and empower the next generation, however, we are still educating ENTRY LEVEL dietitians and there is a difference. Saying that you will give us resources is not the same as being on-site with us. Teaching students about med dosing when they don't even have all the meds memorized upon graduation, is not realistic. Inserting NG tubes when you don't have preceptors who do this or your university does not have simulation facilities is not realistic. I truly hope you listen to what educators are saying about some of these skills that are not entry level. I would rather focus on empowering our students to be excellent at the NCP, assessment, MNT, physiology, speaking to team members, including doctors, etc. when they leave, so they can have confidence and represent the profession upon graduation, which will lead to more opportunities in the workplace.

ACEND is completing its second round of public comments on the proposed revisions of the Accreditation Standards. Comments on the standards and competencies are welcomed and will be taken into consideration during the Standards revision process.