



*Inspired Leaders Serving Their Communities*

National Registry of EMTs  
6610 Busch Blvd  
Columbus, OH 43229

RE: Comments on NREMT Resolution 22-Resolution-13

Dear National Registry Board of Directors and Leadership Team,

The National EMS Management Association (NEMSMA) represents the interests of leaders in the field of paramedicine from a variety of backgrounds and organizational types. While mostly focused on networking and the sharing of best practices amongst EMS leaders, we also have a strong interest in the development of paramedicine as a profession and believe that capable, well-prepared, and thoughtful clinicians are the building blocks of good leadership and the future success of our profession.

To that end, NEMSMA appreciates the opportunity to comment on NREMT Resolution 22-13 regarding updated eligibility criteria for initial EMS education. While we understand and appreciate the balance that the NREMT board must consider between a wide variety of stakeholders, we feel strongly that the NREMT should reconsider its currently proposed position that creates a new “back door” option for state level accreditation.

Third party accreditation, through CAAHEP or otherwise, is a key factor in establishing competence and credibility in the delivery of paramedic education at the college level. As NEMSMA strongly supports an associate degree requirement for paramedics we would not recommend removing or diluting current accreditation requirements for paramedic level programs. We also join with many of our partner associations in reminding the Registry that significant effort has been expended over decades to conform our current paramedic level education system with published national agendas and best practices in healthcare education and certification. Reversing this progress, for real or perceived concerns by some states, educational programs, or employers would be, in our opinion, unwise and counter-productive to the overall standard we have already achieved.

Our concerns about paramedic level education aside, we believe access to AEMT and EMT programs should be a primary consideration when states and the National Registry of EMTs consider education and accreditation requirements for programs at those levels. While we recognize that accreditation is a potential barrier, we also understand it is a safeguard to ensure candidates are successful and well-prepared to enter our workforce. As such we trust the NREMT, CAAHEP and the States to effectively balance those interests. Furthermore, we would support a more lenient approach to AEMT accreditation in order to ensure our current paramedic level maintains a high standard.

Finally, we do not believe accreditation standards requiring a limited subset of sponsoring institutions for EMT or EMR programs, particularly post-secondary educational institutions, are necessary or appropriate as access to EMT and EMR level education should be affordable and widely available in a variety of settings. As such we would be generally unsupportive of accreditation requirements at those levels but would encourage States and the National Registry to actively monitor and publish information on quality and success rates of those programs.

Thank you for considering our comments and we appreciate the NREMT's thoughtfulness as you continue to navigate this and, many other issues, for the benefit of our profession and the public we serve.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S. M. Caffrey', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sean M. Caffrey, MBA, FACPE, CEMSO, NR-P  
President