

Report of the Meeting

National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity

December 11-12, 2012



/s/

Jamienne S. Studley, Chair

Report of the Meeting
National Advisory Committee
on Institutional Quality and Integrity

December 11-12, 2012

Jamienne S. Studley, Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY5

SUMMARY OF AGENCY-RELATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

I. Petitions for Renewal of Recognition as Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agencies including any Expansion/Contraction or Revision in the Scope of Recognition as Currently Written.

Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics.....7

American Veterinary Medical Association, Council on Education (AVMA-COE).....8

Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).....10

Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME).....11

Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).....12

New York State Board of Regents (NYSBR).....13

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC)15

II. Renewal of Recognition as Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agencies Based on Review of the Agency’s Compliance Report

Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools (ABHES).....17

American Board of Funeral Service Education (ABFSE).....17

Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation (COMTA).....18

Distance Education and Training Council (DETC).....19
Higher Learning Commission (HLC).....20
Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (MACTE).....20
Midwifery Education Accreditation Council (MEAC).....21

III. Petition for Renewal of Recognition of a State Agency Recognized for the Approval of Nurse Education

Missouri Board of Nursing.....22

DISCLAIMER

This report was written as a part of the activities of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI), an independent advisory committee established by statute. The NACIQI is subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the regulations implementing that statute. This report represents the views of the NACIQI. The report has not been reviewed for approval by the Department of Education, and therefore, the report's recommendations do not purport to represent the views of the Department.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background:

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI or the Committee), was established by Section 114 of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 and, most recently, Section 106 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). The HEOA made changes to section 496 of the HEA “Recognition of Accrediting Agency or Association” and suspended the activities of the NACIQI upon enactment on August 14, 2008. It also changed the composition of the Committee by increasing the membership from 15 to 18 and shifting appointment authority that had been vested solely in the Secretary to the Secretary, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, each of whom may appoint six members. Also, rather than having the Secretary appoint the Chair, the HEOA required the members to elect a Chair. In July 2010, new regulations went into effect that govern the process by which accrediting agencies seek recognition by the Secretary as a reliable authority regarding the quality of education and training provided by an institution (or program) they accredit.

Chief among its statutory functions is the Committee’s responsibility to advise the Secretary of Education, or his designee, the Senior Department Official (the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education), regarding the recognition of specific accrediting agencies or associations, or specific State approval agencies, as reliable authorities concerning the quality of education and training offered by the postsecondary educational institutions and programs they accredit. Another function of the NACIQI is to advise the Secretary on the establishment and enforcement of the Criteria for Recognition of accrediting agencies or associations under Subpart 2, Part H, Title IV, of the HEA. The NACIQI also provides advice to the Secretary regarding policy affecting both recognition of accrediting and State approval agencies and institutional eligibility for participation in programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The NACIQI is required by law to meet at least twice a year.

Discussion:

At its December 11-12, 2012 meeting, held at the Marriott-Wardman Park in Washington, D.C., the Committee met to carry out its duties to advise the Assistant Secretary with respect to the recognition of accrediting agencies and State approval agencies.

The Committee reviewed petitions for renewal of recognition from 7 accrediting agencies, and 1 State approval agency for nurse education, as well as 7 compliance reports from accrediting agencies. Eleven of the accrediting agencies are recognized for Title IV purposes. Among the accrediting agencies that were reviewed, six accredit both programs and freestanding institutions; three are regional accrediting agencies; one is a national accrediting agency; and one is a State. The three other agencies that were reviewed accredit only programs.

The Committee also participated in an administrative/training session. This agenda included the required annual ethics training, as well as a review of the consent agenda process, the agency review and post review process, and the scope of Committee motions.

NACIQI members in attendance for all or part of the meeting included Jamieenne S. Studley (Chair), Arthur J. Rothkopf (Vice Chair), Jill Derby, George T. French, Jr., Arthur Keiser, William “Brit”

Kirwan, Anne Neal, William Pepicello, Susan D. Phillips, Cameron C. Staples, Frank H. Wu, and Frederico Zaragoza.

U.S. Department of Education personnel who participated in the meeting included: Committee Executive Director Carol Griffiths, Accreditation Director Kay Gilcher, Program Attorney Sarah Wanner, Office of Postsecondary Education staff: Herman Bounds, Elizabeth Daggett, Karen Duke, Jennifer Hong-Silwany, Patricia Howes, Charles Mula, Steve Porcelli, Cathy Sheffield, and Rachael Shultz.

THE RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITING AGENCIES AND STATE APPROVAL AGENCIES:

The Committee reviewed petitions and reports from 15 agencies – 14 accrediting agencies and one State approval agency for nurse education.

Summary of Agency-Related Actions Taken by the Committee:

I. Petitions for Renewal of Recognition as Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agencies including any Expansion/Contraction or Revision in the Scope of Recognition as Currently Written.

A. Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal Recognition.

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and pre-accreditation, within the United States, of Didactic and Coordinated Programs in Dietetics at both the undergraduate and graduate level, post baccalaureate Dietetic Internships, and Dietetic Technician Programs at the associate degree level and for its accreditation of such programs offered via distance education.

Committee Recommendation: Vote of 11-0

Recommend that ACEND’s recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12-month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.14(d)(e)	§602.15(a)(3)	§602.15(a)(4)
§602.15(a)(5)	§602.16(a)(1)(iv)	§602.16(a)(1)(ix)
§602.16(b)(c)	§602.17(g)	§602.19(b)
§602.19(c)	§602.20(b)	§602.22(a)(2)(i-vii)
§§602.22(a)(3)	§602.22(b)	§602.23(a)
§602.23(c)	§602.24(c)(1)	§602.24(c)(2)
§602.24(c)(3)	§602.24(c)(4)	§602.24(d)
§602.25(h)	§602.26(d)	

The issues identified above, span a number of the agency’s operations to include requirements pertaining to governance, the organizational composition of the decision-making entities, the agency’s student support services standard, various operating requirements (monitoring and enforcement, substantive change, teach outs and notification).

The Committee concluded that the primary outstanding issue spanning most of the compliance issues is documentation of the revision and/or application of the agency’s policies and procedures

in these areas. Committee queried the agency on its efforts to address the needs of its programs, particularly the issues of minority –serving programs, with regard to meeting the agency’s student achievement standards for completion and licensure pass rate.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. Susan Phillips; Dr. Frank Wu

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Ulric Chung, Executive Director, ACEND

Dr. Elaine Molaison, Chair, ACEND

Third Party Oral Commenters:

Dr. Ethan Bergman, President, Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics

Dr. Glenna McCollum, President-elect, Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics

B. American Veterinary Medical Association, Council on Education (AVMA-COE)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition.

Current Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("Reasonable Assurance") in the United States of programs leading to professional degrees (D.V.M. or D.M.D.) in veterinary medicine.

Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("*Provisional Accreditation*") in the United States of programs leading to professional degrees (D.V.M. or D.M.D.) in veterinary medicine.

**NOTE: The language above reflects only a technical change initiated by Department staff regarding the term the agency uses to confer its "preaccreditation" status.

Committee Recommendation: Vote of 9-0

Recommend to continue AVMA-COE’s recognition and require the agency to come into compliance within 12 months, and submit a compliance report that demonstrates the agency's compliance with the issues identified in the staff report.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.13	§602.15(a)(5)	§602.15(a)(6)
§602.16(a)(1)(i)	§602.16(a)(1)(ii)	§602.16(a)(2)
§602.17(f)	§602.20(a)	§602.20(b)
§602.21(a)(b)	§602.21(c)	§602.23(b)
§602.26(b)	§602.26(c)	

The issues identified above span a number of the agency's operations to include requirements pertaining to acceptance of the agency by others, the selection of site team members, the agency's consistent and effective application of its student achievement, curricula, and pre-accreditation standards, enforcement of its standards, its systematic review of standards, the agency's need to solicit and consider the input of its constituencies in the review of its standards and its evaluation of veterinary programs, and its notification practices.

The Committee heard testimony from ten 3rd party oral commenters, many whom the Committee engaged in follow-on discussion. Third party comments included both positive and negative testimony. The concerns raised by the commenters allege that the agency is not sufficiently separate and independent of the AVMA, lacks transparency in its accreditation activities, inconsistently applies its standards particularly pertaining to clerkships and research programs, and does not give adequate consideration to the input of its constituencies. Commenters also allege that the AVMA- COE gives insufficient consideration to marketplace factors such as the debt to employment ratios for veterinarian graduates, and consider it applicable under the student achievement standard.

Commenters expressed concern that NACIQI has been operating under the assumption that as a programmatic accreditor, AVMA's international accreditations were without consequence to the Federal Student Loan Program. Commenters noted that as of 2015, accreditation by AVMA-COE will be requisite for veterinary students attending foreign institutions to be eligible for foreign student aid dollars and that these accreditation activities are not reviewed and are currently outside the oversight of NACIQI. The Committee Chair noted this as an issue that may be raised for further discussion at a later time.

In its extensive deliberation of the agency's petition, the agency was asked to respond to questions pertaining to the agency's clear and consistent application of substantial vs. limited accreditation status; charges of inconsistency in its application of standards in its review of programs, particularly with regard to student achievement and curricula; and based on the level of 3rd party concerns, the Committee queried the agency on its interaction with its constituencies and their concerns.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Mr. Cameron Staples; Dr. Frederico Zargoza

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Sheila Allen, Chair, AVMA-COE

Dr. David E. Granstrom, Director, Education and Research Division, AVMA

Third Party Oral Commenters:

Dr. Paul D. Pion, Co-founder and President, Veterinary Information Network

Dr. Robert R. Marshak, Dean Emeritus, University of Pennsylvania, School of Veterinary Medicine

Dr. Deborah Kochevar, DVM, Ph.D., DACVCP, Dean and Henry and Lois Foster Professor, Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine at Tufts University

Mr. Andrew Maccabe, Executive Director, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges
Dr. John Pascoe, University of California Davis
Dr. James F. Wilson, DVM, JD, Priority Veterinary Management Consultants
Mr. Mark Cushing, Tonkon Torp LLP, Founding Partner, Animal Policy Group
Dr. Frank E. Walker, Practitioner and Former Member of the COE
Dr. Nancy Brown, VMD, DACVS, DACVIM, Hickory Veterinary Hospital, Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania
Dr. William Kay, Practitioner and Former Member of the COE

Third Party Written Comments: The Department received thirteen third-party written comments recommending against the agency's continued recognition.

C. **Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE)**

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition.

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("Candidate for Accreditation") in the United States of physical therapist education programs leading to the first professional degree at the master's or doctoral level and physical therapist assistant education programs at the associate degree level and for its accreditation of such programs offered via distance education.

Committee Recommendation: Vote of 8-0

Recommend that CAPTE's recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.15(a)(6)	§602.16(b)(c)	§602.19(c)
§602.20(a)	§602.20(b)	§602.26(b)
§602.26(d)		

The issues identified above include the need to have clear and effective controls against conflict of interest for its administrative staff ; to have written process and procedures to review programs offered via distance education; documentation of the agency's effective monitoring of overall growth in programs; demonstration of the agency's enforcement of timeframes required for compliance with agency requirements and/ or its initiation of adverse action should the program fail to bring itself back into compliance with the standards within the timeframe; and documentation that it adheres to compliant notifications requirements

The Committee had no questions for the Department staff. In response to the Committee's question regarding its review of distance education, the agency reiterated its assurance that it is

willing and able to address the Committee’s concern that the agency has a written process and procedures to review distance education programs

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. Jill Derby; Mr. George French

Representatives of the Agency:

Ms. Mary Jane Harris, Director, Department of Accreditation, APTA

Dr. Martha R. Hinman, Chair, CAPTE

D. Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition.

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation of medical education programs within the United States leading to the M.D. degree.

Committee Recommendation: Vote of 9-0

Recommend that LCME’s recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.20(b) §602.26(b) §602.28(b)
§602.28(c)

The issues include the need for the agency to clarify under what circumstances it would grant extensions for good cause to a program before initiating an adverse action, documentation of its timely notice regarding negative decisions to all the entities listed in the criterion; and finally, to provide documentation of the effective application of its policies regarding negative actions by other accreditors.

The Committee had no questions for the Department staff. The Committee’s discussion with the agency included inquiry regarding the agency’s and medical education’s response to the need for more physicians, the agency’s position on the use of distance education in medical education, and the use of innovative models such as distributive education and blended learning.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Reader:

Mr. Arthur Rothkopf; Dr. Jill Derby

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Barbara Barzansky, Co-Secretary, LCME (American Medical Association)
Dr. Dan Hunt, Co-Secretary, LCME (Association of American Medical Colleges)
Dr. Christopher C. Colenda, Chair, LCME
Dr. Jeffrey Gold, MD, Chair-elect, LCME

E. Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition

Current Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("Candidacy status") of institutions of higher education in Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, including distance education programs offered at those institutions

Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("Candidacy status") of institutions of higher education in Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, including distance education *and correspondence education* programs offered at those institutions.

Committee Recommendation: Vote of 6-0

Abstention: Neal

Recusals: Kirwan, Phillips, Rothkopf

Recommend that MSCHE's recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.15(a)(1)

§602.21(a)(b)

§602.23(c)

§602.24(f)(2)

The issues include documentation of the agency's financial status after it revises its relationships with the entities that comprise the Middle States Association; of its completion of its upcoming standards review process; evidence of its timely review and processing of all complaints; and documentation that the agency consistently reviews credit hour assignments made by its institutions.

The Committee requested clarification on the Department's concern for the financial status of the agency once it completes its separation from the Middle States Association to which staff

confirmed that it was a cautionary measure based on earlier issues that have arisen during the course of the separation from the Middle States Association. The agency also provided a clear and comprehensive update on the status of its separation and financial condition. Other topics put forward by Committee members included a discussion of the agency’s approach to balancing “cost vs. value” and its experience with international accreditation.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. Arthur Keiser; Mr. Frank Wu

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. R. Barbara Gitenstein, Chair, MSCHE

Dr. Gary Wirt, Vice Chair, MSCHE

Dr. Elizabeth Sibolski, President, MSCHE

Dr. Robert Schneider, Senior Vice President, MSCHE

Ms. Mary Beth Kait, Director for Planning & Policy, and Chief of Staff, MSCHE

Mr. Joseph Pellegrini, Director of Finance and Administration, MSCHE

F. New York State Board of Regents (NYSBR)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation of those degree-granting institutions of higher education in New York that designate the agency as their sole or primary nationally recognized accrediting agency for purposes of establishing eligibility to participate in HEA programs including accreditation of programs offered via distance education within these institutions.

Advisory Committee Recommendation: Vote 8-1

Recommend that NYBRE’s recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.15(a)(1)	§602.15(a)(2)	§602.15(a)(3)
§602.15(a)(5)	§602.15(a)(6)	§602.15(b)
§602.16(a)(1)(i)	§602.16(b)(c)	§602.17(e)
§602.17(g)	§602.19(b)	§602.19(c)
§602.19(d)	§602.19(e)	§602.20(b)
§602.21(c)	§602.22(a)(1)	§602.22(a)(2)(i-vii)

§602.22(a)(2)(viii)	§602.22(a)(3)	§602.22(b)
§602.23(a)	§602.23(c)	§602.24(c)(2)
§602.24(c)(3)	§602.24(c)(5)	§602.24(d)
§602.24(e)	§602.24(f)(4)	§602.25(a-e)
§602.25(f)	§602.25(g)	§602.25(h)
§602.26(a)	§602.26(b)	§602.26(d)
§602.26(e)	§602.27(a)(6-7)(b)	§602.28(a)
§602.28(b)	§602.28(c)	§602.28(d)

The Committee noted that many of the agency’s outstanding compliance issues are the result of the significant (organizational) differences between other recognized accrediting agencies (private, non-profit entities) and the New York Board of Regents (public, State body) rather than “substantive issues”. As did the Department staff, the Committee concluded that the agency will be able to address its concerns in a compliance report within 12 months.

The Committee queried the NYBR on its application of established benchmarks for graduation rates and job placement for every type of institution it accredits. According to the primary Committee reader (Neal), “what they have in place... is engaging in the kind of protection and demand of student achievement that we attempt to seek.”

The Committee’s review focused extensively on the NYBRE’s request that it continue to be recognized for its accreditation of distance education and that it be provided the opportunity to demonstrate in its compliance report, its review of distance education following its re-accreditation review of one of its (24) accredited institutions. The Committee sought clarity as to whether this is an expansion of scope (the agency’s current grant of recognition includes distance education – as granted under the notification criterion) and the implications of removing distance education from the agency’s scope on students’ access to Title IV funding. It was understood that it could impact students’ access to Title IV financial aid.

The Committee questioned the agency, at length, regarding its experience with the review of distance education programs. The NYBR described, in detail, its review of distance education programs under its program approval (registration) functions and stated that it has performed over 1400 distance education program reviews (by the State staff that also conduct the accreditation reviews) under criteria that include an assessment of the program in the context of institutional capacity and oversight, and that exceed the Federal regulatory requirements. The Committee was persuaded by the NYBR’s quality assurance efforts in distance education (both in program registration and accreditation policy); its commitment to review an institution offering distance education programs as part of its reaccreditation activities during this year; and its willingness to respond and to address the issues raised by the Department and the Committee.

The Committee also looked to its “record” of recommendations to ensure there is consistency in its recommendation. It concluded that its recent experience with another agency (MACTE-F2010) -- for which it recommended, as did the Department staff, a continuation of the agency’s recognition (to include distance education) – was a sufficiently similar circumstance. In both cases, the current recognition included distance education and the agency’s recognition was continued to allow the agency 12 months to demonstrate its application of its distance education review process.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. William Kirwan; Ms. Anne Neal

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Charles R. Bendit, Regent

Dr. John B. King, Jr., New York State Commissioner of Education and President, University of the State of New York

Dr. Russell K. Hotzler, Chair, Regents Advisory Council on Institutional Accreditation

Dr. John L. D'Agati, Deputy Commissioner, New York State Education Department

Ms. Shannon Tahoe, Esq., Assistant Counsel for Legislation, New York State Education Department

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, Chancellor Emeritus, New York State Board of Regents

G. Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC-SR)

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition and Expansion of Scope to include the agency's accreditation of nursing education programs at the doctoral level.

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and preaccreditation ("Candidate for Accreditation") of senior colleges and universities in California, Hawaii, the United States territories of Guam and American Samoa, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, including distance education programs offered at those institution.

Advisory Committee Recommendation: Vote 8-0 (Recusals: Kirwan, Wu)

Recommend that WASC SR's recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.14(b)	§602.15(a)(2)	§602.15(a)(3)
§602.15(a)(5)	§602.15(a)(6)	§602.16(a)(1)(vii)
§602.16(a)(1)(viii)	§602.16(a)(1)(ix)	§602.16(a)(1)(x)
§602.16(b)(c)	§602.17(d)	§602.19(a)
§602.19(b)	§602.19(c)	§602.19(d)
§602.20(a)	§602.21(a)(b)	§602.21(c)
§602.22(c)(3)	§602.23(a)	§602.24(c)(2)
§602.24(e)	§602.25(f)	§602.25(h)

§602.26(a)
§602.26(e)

§602.26(b)
§602.28(e)

§602.26(d)

These issues span several areas of the criteria to include issues of organizational governance pertaining to meeting the separate and independent requirements and the agency's appeals process, the agency's standards and their application, to include its standards review process, analysis of student achievement and other data collected in its annual reports, review timelines, and how it reviews compliance with several of its standards. In the area of required operating policies and procedures, the issues include specifically the need for additional information on or modification to policies related to rapid growth, teach-outs and notification requirements.

The Committee noted that many of the issues identified in the staff analysis only require the need for additional policy modifications or documentation, and noted that WASC Senior can resolve the concerns and demonstrate its compliance in a written report in a year's time.

The Committee engaged the agency in extensive discussion of its approach to transparency and accountability, the limitations of current data collections and the need for a more meaningful set of criteria to adequately assess institutional quality in the context of student performance outcomes. Two examples of legitimate institutional low completion rates under current data collections were suggested by the agency: the student who transfers and goes to another institution and completes, and the part-time student who takes longer than the current cut-off but still completes.

Other issues discussed with the agency included transfer of credit, application of a cost/benefit approach to the accreditation investment and the challenges to find the right level of oversight and accountability. One challenge for the agency is what, if any, is the appropriate level and amount of agency forbearance as an institution seeks to comply with compliance criteria and how the agency assesses institutional effectiveness notwithstanding compliance.

Following testimony from the 3rd party commenters, the agency and Department staff responded to Committee questions.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. William Pepicello; Mr. Arthur Rothkopf

Representatives of the Agency:

Mr. Ralph A. Wolff, President, WASC SR

Dr. Linda Johnsrud, President and Chair, WASC SR

Dr. Richard Winn, Consultant

Third Party Oral Commenters:

Mr. Douglas Yoder

Ms. Anna Nizhegorodtseva

After a brief discussion of the differences between denying an agency a portion of their current scope of recognition (for distance education) vs. accepting an agency's request that its scope of recognition for renewal of recognition going forward not include distance education, the Committee chose to accept the agency's request to remove distance education.

The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Reader:

Mr. William Pepicello

Representatives of the Agency:

Ms. LaToshya Vaughn, Accreditation Specialist, COMTA

Ms. Elise Scanlon, Counsel

D. Distance Education and Training Council (DETC)

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation of postsecondary institutions in the United States that offer degree programs primarily by distance education up through professional doctoral degrees, and are specifically certified by the agency as accredited for Title IV purposes; and for the accreditation of postsecondary institutions in the United States not participating in Title IV that offer programs primarily by distance education or correspondence education up through professional doctoral degrees.

Advisory Committee Recommendation: Vote of 11-0 Recusals: Keiser; Pepicello
Accept the Consent Agenda. [NOTE: The Consent Calendar contained the specific recommendation to accept the agency's compliance report and to renew the agency's recognition for a period of four and a half years.]

Comments: There were no compliance issues and no further discussion of the agency's report.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Compliance report and supporting documentation submitted by the agency, and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Mr. Cameron Staples; Dr. Frederico Zaragoza

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Michael P. Lambert, Executive Director, DETC

Dr. Sally Welch, Associate Director, DETC

Dr. Nan Ridgeway, Director of Accreditation, DETC

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issue listed below. They include 34 C.F.R.

§602.16(b)(c)

The issue involves the need for the agency to finish and implement the agency's revised requirements for the consistent evaluation of an institution or program's use of distance education and to document how its decision-makers are trained to consistently evaluate the effectiveness of an entity's use of distance education.

Committee discussion centered on the agency's desire to retain distance education in its scope of recognition, what are the parameters for a good cause extension and the basis, if any, for the agency's meeting them. The agency reaffirmed its commitment to complete and implement the process and to submit evidence of this within the extension timeframe.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Reader:

Dr. George French

Representative of the Agency:

Dr. Rebecca Pelton, Executive Director, MACTE

G. Midwifery Education Accreditation Council (MEAC):

Action for Consideration: Renewal of Recognition after Review of the Compliance Report

Current and Requested Scope of Recognition: The accreditation and pre-accreditation throughout the United States of direct-entry midwifery educational institutions and programs conferring degrees and certificates, including the accreditation of such programs offered via distance education.

Advisory Committee Recommendation: Vote of 11-0 Recusals: Keiser; Pepicello Accept the Consent Agenda. [NOTE: The Consent Calendar contained the specific recommendation to accept the agency's compliance report and to renew the agency's recognition for a period of three years.]

Comments: There were no compliance issues and no further discussion of the agency's report.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Compliance report and supporting documentation submitted by the agency, and the Department staff analysis and report.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. William Kirwan

Representatives of the Agency:
None

III. Petitions for Renewal of Recognition State Agencies Recognized for the Approval of Nurse Education

A. Missouri Board of Nursing

Action for Consideration: Petition for Renewal of Recognition as a State Approval Agency.

Current Scope of Recognition: State agency for the approval of nurse education.

Advisory Committee Recommendation: Vote 9-0

Recommend that Missouri Board of Nursing's recognition be continued to permit the agency an opportunity to within a 12 month period bring itself into compliance with the Criteria cited in the staff report and that it submit for review within 30 days thereafter, a compliance report demonstrating compliance with the cited criteria and their effective application. Such continuation shall be effective until the Department reaches a final decision.

Comments: The Committee found the agency to be operating in compliance with the criteria for recognition, except for the issues listed below. They include

§3. §3e §3f

The issues above entail providing additional information regarding the agency's staffing, the Board's revision of its annual reporting requirements, and additional documentation related to its review of audited fiscal reports and school catalogs. The agency affirmed its commitment to the process and its ability to comply with the outstanding issues.

Written Materials Reviewed by the Committee: Petition and supporting documentation submitted by the agency and the Department staff analysis.

NACIQI Primary Readers:

Dr. Susan Phillips

Representatives of the Agency:

Dr. Roxanne McDaniel, President, MOSBN

Ms. Ingebord "Bibi" Schultz, Education Administrator, MOSBN