

PSC-ED-OPE-PA

**Moderator: Carol Griffiths
April 13, 2012
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Good morning and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are on listen-only for the duration of today's conference.

If you'd like to ask a question or make a comment please press Star 1.

I'd like to inform participants that today's call is being recorded. If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time.

And I would like to turn the call over to your conference hosted a Ms. Jamie Studley, Chairperson NACIQI. You may begin.

Jamie Studley: Hello. Thank you very much (Trey). And thank you all for being on. Welcome to this meeting of NACIQI.

We are trying something new for us and appreciate your patience with this new format that's allowing us to meet this way today.

I appreciate all the members of NACIQI who've made the time to be on and the commenter's and audience members who are joining us.

We have important work to do today on a complex topic of ever growing national significance.

Whatever our views on more specific questions I think we can all agree that education is important to our country and that quality education is vital to individuals, families, our economy and society.

We are here to help finalize a report to the Secretary at his request about how best to assure the federal government's investment in higher education is well used.

I appreciate the input that we've received from many sources. I hope the committee members have had an opportunity to review the thoughtful and often detailed comments that we received and I thank you all commenters and committee members for the very respectful discourse that we've been having so far and that I count on continuing.

At this point Carol will take a roll call of members of the committee. Carol would you please proceed with that?

Carol Griffiths: Yes thank you. I will start with you Jamie Studley?

Jamie Studley: Present.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Rothkopf?

Arthur Rothkopf: Here.

Carol Griffiths: Bruce Cole? Bruce Cole? George French? George French?

George French: Present.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser? Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: I am here.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. (William Rick Kerwin)? (William Rick Kerwin)? Earl Lewis?
Wilfred McClay? Anne Neal? Anne Neal?

Anne Neal: Anne Neal is present.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. William Pepicello? William Pepicello?

William Pepicello: I am present. I am...

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Susan Phillips? Susan Phillips?

Susan Phillips: Susan Phillips present.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. (Aaron Shimlitz)? (Aaron Shimlitz)? Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples: I'm here.

Carol Griffiths: Cameron Staples here. Larry Vanderhoof? Larry Vanderhoof?

Larry Vanderhoof: I'm here.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Carolyn Williams? Carolyn Williams?

Carolyn Williams: Here.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Frank Wu. Frank Wu?

Frank Wu: I'm not sure I'm doing this right. I'm here.

Carol Griffiths: Yes you are. Thank you.

Frank Wu: All right.

Carol Griffiths: Frederico Zaragoza? Frederico Zaragoza? Frederico Zaragoza?

Frederico Zaragoza: Frederico Zaragoza.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Now chair I have roll call...

Woman: Thank you very much. Present.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you.

George French: Madame Chair?

Jamie Studley: Yes. Who is that please?

George French: This is George French. I was on the call the first time for roll call but you all could not hear me. So I called back in.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. We did hear you. What I - the second time. I think - so I appreciate that. What I - we had asked and I think we now have our answer

about the length of the time delay from calling on someone to their line opening.

So I think we're all sensing that the two seconds we were told is the maximum feels a little bit long. So I appreciate your patience as we go forward.

We did - it sounds like we heard everybody on the second try because...

Carol Griffiths: Yes.

Jamie Studley: ...the line took a little bit to activate. So thank you all.

We have a set of commenters, three commenters, who have requested the opportunity to speak and participate.

We also have a large number I believe approximately 60 members of the public who have joined us for this call.

So I ask you to imagine everyone our typical meeting setting. We will begin with the three speakers who have notified us in advance of their interest in speaking to us.

We are not going to have an open additional public comment segment for today's meeting.

After they speak we will move to committee questions if any from the commenters and then we will move to the consideration of the draft report.

At that point I will describe the procedures that we will use for the draft report but I think they'll be fresher in our minds if we do it after the oral comments.

So Carol would you be willing to - I'm not sure what order they're speaking in
- would you please introduce...

Carol Griffiths: All right.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: We would like to call forward to make her presentation Dr. Joyce
Rechtschaffen?

Dr. Joyce Rechtschaffen: Rechtschaffen.

Carol Griffiths: Rechtschaffen thank you, Director Office of Government Affairs, Princeton
University.

Dr. Joyce Rechtschaffen: Hello. Do you hear me?

Jamie Studley: Yes we can. Thank you Joyce.

Dr. Joyce Rechtschaffen: Okay. All right thank you Carol. I am definitely not a doctor so let
me correct that but thanks everyone. And if there's any problem with the
hearing just let me know.

On behalf of President Tilghman I want to thank the commission for
conducting its work with openness and transparency and for encouraging
robust discussion within the broader higher education community.

The members' commitment to ensuring that the United States remains the
world leader in higher education has been evident at every stage.

As you know President Tilghman has been gravely concerned that the movement by accreditors towards imposition of one size fits all measures of performance and learning is posing real harm to our system of higher education by infringing on the academic freedom of institutions with a proven record of excellence.

We believe that the implementation of some of the commission's recommendations can go a long way toward reversing this trend while replacing reliance on data points such as graduation and completion rates, job placement and/or other insidious career progress which are significantly undervalued in the current standards by which institutions are judged for accreditation.

Both the commission's draft report Recommendation 17 and the alternative report submitted by Commissioners Neal and Rothkopf embrace these measures.

We strongly support the commission's recommendation that accreditors be encouraged to design system for expedited review for institutions with an excellent record of serving their students on key indicators.

And we are pleased at this approach also has the endorsement of the authors of the alternative report.

The measures set forth in Recommendation 17 should be among those that are used for determining whether an institution qualifies for an expedited review.

We also endorse the recommendation to use the principles of risk assessment in establishing the nature and duration of review.

If implemented this recommendation will enable the accreditor's greatest effort to be focused on poor performing or newly established institutions.

We appreciate the commissions called for a dialogue within the accreditation community about moving from a region based to a mission or sector based organization over time.

We hope that the final report will include strong language in favor of such an outcome in the long run.

Some of the comments submitted to the commission raise the concern that peer review will be weakened under such a system because of increased travel costs.

In fact we believe that if there are increased costs they will be justified by the increased benefit of a peer review that will be of much greater value.

Peer review works best when standards are set that are appropriate to the sector and reviews are conducted by individuals who have deep familiarity with the mission and organizational structure of the institution under review.

With respect to cost we applied the commission's attention to the recently escalating costs and intrusiveness of the accreditation process and its proposals and Recommendations 13 and 14 to make the requirements less intrusive, prescriptive, granularly granular, and costly wherever possible.

Thank you again for your public service and dedication to these issues that are of critical importance to our nation's future.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Jamie?

Jamie Studley: Hello. Thank you very much. Carol would you move on to the second presenter.

Carol Griffiths: Yes. Joseph Vibert, Executive Director Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors.

Joseph Vibert: Good morning. Can you hear me?

Carol Griffiths: Yes.

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Joseph Vibert: Yes okay. Good morning Madame Chair and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your recommendations to the Secretary on the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

The Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors strongly supports the concept of freedom for institutions and accreditors in academic decision making and determination of quality and self-improvement that is espoused in the reports opening section.

We also support the notions of improving communication and collaboration among the members of the triad.

We are concerned though about the direction that the report takes in the more than 20 recommendations that collectively would increase federal regulation of higher education and potentially turn accreditors into an arm of the federal government.

This increased regulation and subsequently increased costs in the system runs contrary to the majority of the input that the committee has received thus far in the information gathering process for the report.

If legislation were to be proposed that increases federal regulation and cost we would oppose it.

Several of the recommendations incorporate a one size fits all approach and that concerns us as well especially when considering the wide range of professions and disciplines that ASPA member agencies accredit.

There is a wide range of indicators that can be used to provide evidence of quality. Each individual accreditors best equipped to determine how and what the appropriate measures of quality are for the programs under review based on the discipline as well as the program's mission and goals.

The final recommendations in the report regarding the committee's role as a federal advisory body are also troubling.

The committee's main purpose is to make recommendations on the recognition of accrediting agencies.

As noted in the report the triad is responsible for higher education and quality. In that triad it's the role of the accreditors and institutions to decide to design excuse me, accreditation processes and oversee academic quality and institutional improvement not the federal government.

And NACIQI isn't part of the triad. It's not equipped to be a standards setting body nor is it constituted in order to make determinations on the performer of institutions and programs that are reviewed by accreditors.

ASPA however does support the idea that NACIQI consider greater nuance or gradation in the recognition determination regarding accreditation agencies.

As ever ASPA and its members look forward to working collaboratively in addressing the issues and promoting the highest quality of education in this country. Thank you.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much. We appreciate your comments. And Carol our third presenter?

Carol Griffiths: Dr. Sylvia Manning, President Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.

Sylvia Manning: Good morning. Can you hear me?

Carol Griffiths: Yes.

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Sylvia Manning: Thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions representing the seven regional accreditors.

My remarks today will address the most salient points we made in a written submission.

We support much in the final draft. Thank you for alleviating some of our concerns about earlier drafts and for your deft representation of the value of nongovernmental self-regulation and the importance of continuous improvement for higher education.

I will use my time to address issues that remain of concern. There are 25 proposals included in this report.

Taken together they could lead to significantly more federal regulation and new mandates for states, accreditors, and institutions.

We have concerns wherever these recommendations could be understood as calls for regulated national standards or protocols.

And we note that although some of the recommendations might save costs, on the whole they would inevitably increase cost for taxpayers and the students.

In the section of the report on the role and scope of the accreditors we find a number of proposals that still concern us.

Regarding Recommendation 8 we do not think it is possible to identify the more risky litigation prone elements.

Experience tells us that any institution facing an adverse action may respond with litigation. Moreover isolating such institutions from the mainstream of peer review would not be beneficial.

We do appreciate NACIQI's recognition of our risk. We support dialogue but some specific suggestions in Recommendation 9 worry us.

While basing accreditation agencies on geography makes little obvious sense in 2012 the notion of basing a system on sector may be equally outdated.

The 2005 classification system of a Carnegie Foundation demonstrates that the distinctions among mission have been blurring and they continue to blur at an increasing pace.

Furthermore institutions learn from institutions unlike themselves as well as from institutions like themselves and thus an organization of diverse institutions promotes improvement.

For those of us who believe in the sorting power of markets the notion of competition is always attractive.

But allowing such competition among regional accreditors would create a race to the bottom. Such accreditation shopping has already occurred on the part of some institutions with the freedom to relocate.

For the higher learning commission that was why we recently tightened our jurisdictional definitions.

Also the shifting of institutions among accreditors would complicate the work of both states and accreditors increasing cost.

And the potential of seven regional accreditors each working with 50 states 350 lines of communication would militate against NACIQI's recommendation Number 2 and the accreditor's wish to work more closely with the states in which their institutions are located.

We applaud Recommendations 10 and 11 regarding how accreditors can differentiate among institutions in degree of scrutiny and encourage more expedited forms of review.

Current regulatory rigidity is inhospitable to innovation. We hope the recommendations will create opportunity not requirement.

Similarly with regard to gradations in our decisions Recommendation 12 in effect we already have that in the degrees of follow-up we require of institutions. And we're not eager for a mandated system.

We support calls for decreasing the burden upon institutions as we collect data and for sharing data for efficiency or consistency.

We would however underscore the caveats in the recommendations. Such activities should not become a federal mandate for the nature or interpretation of data or the consequent imposition of uniform standards.

Finally regarding Recommendation 23 frankly we aren't sure what it may mean but it sounds like a task that would either be insufficiently granular to be meaningful or a granular enough to constitute NACIQI second guessing accreditation decisions something that would negate much of the value this NACIQI subcommittee has attributed to the current system. I thank you again for your time and attention.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much. We appreciate the comments from all of you. We heard from each of these organizations before and they have supplied us with written comments.

If there are very brief clarifying questions from the members at this point I will entertain them otherwise we will move on to consideration of the report.

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time to ask your questions please press Star 1.

We show no questions.

Jamie Studley: Okay thank you. Let me describe now then the process that we will use. This should be familiar as Robert's Rules of Order.

But I don't think Robert anticipated the electronics. So let me say one more time in order to be able to speak committee members need to hit Star 1.

Only committee members are empowered technologically and otherwise to participate by speaking in this conversation.

What you will hear is that the Vice Chair, Carol Griffith the Executive Director, and I are on open lines and we do not have the time delay that we will have with all the rest of our speakers. So note that distinction.

Arthur Rothkopf: Jamie you might mention this is Arthur. I'm also on an open line.

Jamie Studley: Yes. I said the vice chair was.

Arthur Rothkopf: Okay.

Jamie Studley: Thank you okay. I will begin by -- in order to get the ball rolling -- I will begin by requesting a main motion on the draft final report. And if that motion is seconded we will proceed to consider that.

The procedure for all motions main and secondary will be that the member who proposes the motion and if desired the member who seconded may speak first to any motion. And then we will have discussion. And then we will take action.

If during that discussion there are secondary motions then each of those motions will be taken in order.

And motions to amend or substitute are considered immediately while the main motion remains on the floor.

We will vote on those motions. And what the three of us convening this call and Susan did discuss procedure and given - we will take roll call votes as in order to be sure that we hear from everyone and don't misjudge simply by the sound of voices where we're not together.

Unless it is very clear on a vote that there is unanimity. If the discussion suggests that I will ask if that's the case otherwise we will take voice votes on all motions.

We are not going to have a formal time limitation on comments but I do ask people to be crisp and to the point.

And I will call on people who have indicated that they want to make comments or have questions in the order in which they sign up unless there are people who haven't spoken and then I will privilege them to the extent that we can see that on the list and give them an opportunity. So it will be in order of sign up with that variation.

If it appears necessary during the course of the conversation to constrain us a little bit more I will ask you to do so and indicate a time limit.

After the resolution of all secondary motions we will remain motion with any amendments that have been adopted.

We will have - complete our discussion of it. Vote on the motion. And that one will be by roll call for sure.

Does anybody have any questions about the procedures?

Coordinator: Once again you may press Star 1 to ask a question.

Jamie Studley: And I've seen the Dr. Phillips has a - Professor Phillips has a question.

Coordinator: Yes. Dr. Phillips your line is open.

Susan Phillips: Thank you. I have no question. I'm just waiting for the opportunity to make a motion.

Jamie Studley: Then the floor is yours to do so.

Susan Phillips: Okay my motion would be to advance the draft report as it stands for consideration as adoption in full by the committee.

Jamie Studley: Do I hear a second or see a second I suppose would be?

Coordinator: Please press Star 1 if you'd like to second.

Cameron Staples your line is open.

Cameron Staples: Hi. Did you - is my line open?

Jamie Studley: Yes it is.

Cameron Staples: Oh okay. I was...

Jamie Studley: Go ahead Cam.

Cameron Staples: ...going to second the motion. I was calling in to second the motion.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much. The motion's been moved and seconded. Susan would you like to speak to in support of the motion and then Cam you'll have that same opportunity?

Coordinator: One moment.

Jamie Studley: I couldn't stand that Dr. Phillips business. Susan?

Susan Phillips: I'm here. Can you hear me?

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Susan Phillips: Okay. A quick recap for the committee members, I advanced this motion in part because I served as the Chair of the subcommittee that put it together.

That process began over a year and a half ago with an open forum, a good deal of background, a good deal of input conversation in the committee as in the committee as well as from the public.

Our most recent conversation at the public meeting in our last NACIQI public meeting included a period of considering each item modifying it as according to the group discussion and arriving at a draft report circulated to the committee for further comment.

We did indeed receive further comment from the committee in the course of that last draft conversation.

And the document that you see before you represents the outcome of the final feedback that we've heard from the - across the committee members review.

So all of which to say - is to say that there is considerable thought that has been included in this document and considerable attention to the feedback both of the community that commented and the committee members itself.

Would invite any of the other subcommittee members or other committee members to comment on their concerns or questions about the draft?

Jamie Studley: Cam as the seconder would you like to speak to the motion?

Cameron Staples: Sure just briefly, thank you Jamie. Just very briefly I want to I support what Susan said.

I think that it's a report that was very carefully drafted to incorporate as much consensus as possible from the committee after a lot of hearings and a lot of discussion. And I think it's a very good report for us to send forward and I support its adoption.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. We will now take comments on the main motion. The floor is open for discussion.

Coordinator: Thank you. Please press Star 1 at this time.

Jamie Studley: The discussion invitation includes the opportunity for secondary motions.

Arthur Rothkopf: Madame Chair it's Arthur Rothkopf speaking and I would like to make a motion at this time if I might?

Jamie Studley: Go ahead. Yes. Go ahead.

Arthur Rothkopf: Yes I move that the comments submitted on March 16, 2012 to NACIQI which were entitled Alternative to the NACIQI Draft Final Report submitted by Anne Neal and myself be substituted in its entirety for the draft final report.

Jamie Studley: Is there a second for that motion? Please remember to Star 1. Anne?

Anne Neal: Yes.

Jamie Studley: The motion has been moved and seconded that the document to which the motion referred be substituted for the main motion. Would anyone like to make a comment on this motion?

Arthur Rothkopf: I would if I might be able to...

Jamie Studley: Go ahead. Yes.

Arthur Rothkopf: ...speak to the motion. And I'm going to be, you know, somewhat longer than Susan's comments because I'm assuming - I can't assume that everyone has read the alternative.

And let me explain why I and Anne as well have made this motion.

First I want to commend the committee and especially Susan Phillips for the extensive and very thoughtful work that went into preparation of the draft final report.

The discussion was extremely open and collegial. Unfortunately I'm unable to support the final product which Anne and I and perhaps others on the committee believe do not begin to solve the problems created by our current system of accreditation.

And I would just note that I make these comments is one who was a college president for 12 years and who has served in leadership positions in Higher Ed Association.

The draft final report mistakenly retains linkage between accreditation and Title IV funding. And it makes several recommendations.

I can say that some of them I view as positive for example the ones on transparency and better data while it makes others that head in the wrong direction such as suggesting that accreditors be indemnified in litigation prone cases.

Taken as a whole the report takes the view that the current accreditation system is working well and efficiently it endorses and preserves the status quo and makes recommendations that I believe are quite modest in nature.

And what's been the reaction of the accreditation community? While there were varying comments submitted the overall view of the draft report was negative.

Respected accreditation groups describe the report as consolidating federal control over the academic enterprise. And we heard some of that orally in the comments just made.

Others fear that the creation of national standards and seating more power to NACIQI which we also heard.

The academic community calls for transparency in every corner of national life except as it effects accreditation.

Several groups were aghast at the suggestion that accreditation reports should be made available to the public with one of the groups calling instead and I quote "for a better understanding of the accreditation process."

How does that happen when accreditation remains secret? The accrediting community wants to preserve the current system and in effect saying to the public trust us. In my view that's not good enough.

In fiscal 2011 federal student aid amounted to \$175 billion and of course as we all know it's mounting rapidly.

There is over \$1 trillion outstanding in student debt. This is an issue of major national concern and yet the current system of linkage uniquely outsources the receipt of Title IV funds to private entities that receive the benefits of those funds.

The accrediting agencies that make the decisions as to entitlement to Title IV are funded and controlled by the very institutions that receive the benefit of the funds.

Conflicts abound in these circumstances that would not be tolerated elsewhere in the economy.

It is also the potential and the reality for inconsistent results from the many, many accrediting agencies.

As we point a - as Anne and I point out in our paper it's as though banks were themselves able to decide who was to receive the benefit of fed funding and other government (largess).

Accreditors are clearly uncomfortable with their gate keeping roles. They don't like being treated as agents of the federal government. And we heard that just a few minutes ago from a major group of accreditors.

But that's what they are doing in dispensing huge sums of federal funding. Like it or not they are agents of the federal government.

Our motion would return accreditors to their original functions, quality improvement. We would remove the link between accreditation and Title IV.

I would note that NACIQI received considerable testimony from witnesses who complained about the intrusiveness of accreditors and complaints about excessive costs incurred in the accreditation process. And again we heard a repeat of that just a few minutes ago.

Let's just turn for a minute to the results of the current system. Once an institution is accredited and in many instances the bar is quite low there are rare cases in which accreditation is lost.

More importantly student learning is not benefiting from the current system. As we heard from Professor (Arum) more than half of the students surveyed by him and Professor (Roxa) in their recent book learn little or nothing in their first two college years.

Employers consistently report that the quality of higher education is inadequate for workforce needs and we have sites to that in our paper.

Our proposed solution would be to require institution to post certain data on their Web sites and file that data with the Department of Education which would then make it available to the public in a usable form.

The data would have to be certified by an independent accounting firm and would provide key information to the public.

And let me just cite the information that would be required. Some required some voluntary tuition, fees, cost of attendance, available financial aid, degree programs offered, graduation rates, transfer rates, retention rates, student loan defaults.

And then on student outcomes this would be up to the individual institution if there are licensure involved in their graduates, licensure test results, any value-added assessment if the institution utilized it and other information such as alumni satisfaction, professional school placement data. And Congress in its wisdom could provide that additional data be specified.

Importantly incorrect data filed would be subject to significant penalties. This would be a cost effective and transparent system.

That accreditors would perform their quality improvement functions freed of the gate keeping that they don't seem to like and its difficulties for them.

I just want to conclude with some language that appeared in the comments of the Association of American Universities and on that was submitted to NACIQI.

They did not recommend delinking but they included a sentence that I believe summarizes what our motion seeks to achieve and I'm quoting now.

AAU recommends that the federal role in accreditation focus on financial integrity, and stability, and on regulatory compliance while accreditors focus on the nongovernmental role of evaluating academic programs and facilitating program quality improvement through accreditations peer review evaluation process.

We think that hits the nail on the head. In our view the current system is hopelessly flawed and opaque. We need fundamental reform and I urge the members of NACIQI vote for this motion. Thank you.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much Arthur. I am sorry to do this but Anne before I see if you have comments I have a question for the operator.

(Trey) this is the convener. I no longer have access to Meeting View and I'm being told that the conference is unavailable at this time.

Coordinator: Okay. I was given the same message and if you would just go ahead and keep trying to log in...

Jamie Studley: Okay.

Coordinator: ...you'll be able to rejoin.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Thank you.

Arthur Rothkopf: Log in to Meeting View?

Jamie Studley: To Meeting View where we have the list of participants and...

Arthur Rothkopf: Okay thank you.

Jamie Studley: So I will - we will soldier on. Anne do you have any comments that you want to make as the seconder?

Anne Neal: Yes. Thank you. I would. Can you hear me?

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Anne Neal: I want to also endorse Arthur's opening remarks. And like Arthur I want to commend the committee and especially our study leader Susan Phillips for the immense work that's gone into the preparation of a draft final report.

I think all of us who participated can certainly say that the deliberations were friendly and open even as they did highlight some sharp differences in perspective.

While the draft final report raises many important issues and concerns I think at the end of the day it calls primarily for more discussions in the community of accreditors.

It kicks the can down the road one more time raising many important matters but without any clear resolution or clear recommendations.

The alternative is designed to offer specific recommendations to guide the Secretary and Congress as they prepare for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

And I would like to emphasize just a few points, some of them that Arthur talked about as well.

First the draft final report endorses the current accreditation system as a unique private sector peer review system.

That characterization I believe is fundamentally inaccurate. As Arthur has noted in his comments and as did many of the commentators that we heard from accreditors are currently gate keepers.

They hold the purse strings to more than \$175 billion in federal financial aid and in serving as gate keepers they are agents of the federal government.

They have the ability to permit or withhold federal funds a matter of life and death for most institutions.

It's because of this very powerful rule that a number of institutional witnesses raise serious concerns about growing regulatory prescriptions and intrusiveness and we certainly heard that this morning.

Dartmouth President Kim now nominee to head the World Bank noted in written testimony to us that accreditors often substitute their own judgment for that of an institutions trustees and administrators.

If accreditors generally want to be private peer review teams engaged in rigorous self-improvement delinking them from their gate keeping role is essential to achieving this end and the alternative makes that recommendation.

Second, the draft final report states that the - and I quote “the federal role in accreditation includes the assurance that taxpayer funds are only used for acceptable educational activities. This assurance cannot be satisfied by evaluation of financial stability compliance data alone but must include both financial and quality considerations.”

We agree. The alternative proposal fully addresses both financial and quality considerations.

Our alternative would have the federal government continue its existing baseline financial review to ensure institutional solvency on the understanding that it would enforce it stringently refusing financial aid to students at those schools that are not financially sound.

In addition institutions would be required to post a statement certified by an independent auditor that they have sufficient resources to ensure that all enrolled students can be supported to the completion of their degrees. If the statement is not supplied federal funds would be cut off.

Our alternative recommendation calls for consumer information on key measures of quality.

In other words rather than the relatively opaque self-studies and reviews that we have now institutions would be required to provide a basic set of information on their home pages for parents and the public much of which should be noted is already collected for the Department of Education's College Navigator site designed to offer clear and accessible data on quality and affordability.

And just as Arthur has noted tuition fees, cost of attendance, net cost, degree programs, graduation rates disaggregated by demographics, transfer rates if available, student loan default rates, value-added assessments if utilized and job placement rates again -- many of the metrics that we heard this morning from the witness from Princeton.

If the institutions falsify these metrics substantial penalties would apply.

In written testimony Stanford Provost John Etchemendy argued that accreditation is no substitute for public opinion and market forces as a guide to the value of the education we offer. Arthur Rothkopf and I agree and the alternative addresses those concerns.

Now as we've heard from witnesses who are not now employed by the system accreditation is an expensive and counterproductive system carved up into outdated regional cartels.

It is a system that's uniquely designed and understood by the insiders or the so called community as we've heard time and time again during the discussion.

But it has as Arthur said seriously failed to protect the public and ensure quality.

It's time that we acknowledge that the accreditation system we need is not a community but a system of quality assurance designed to protect students, the public, and taxpayers. And so I urge members of NACIQI to vote for the alternative. Thanks.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much. We will now invite discussion on the motion to substitute for the draft final report. (Trey) I can't see who wants to comment. I hope you can.

Coordinator: Yes. Arthur Keiser your line is open.

Jamie Studley: Go ahead Arthur.

Arthur Keiser: This is very difficult. I've got disconnected once. It was hard to get back on.

But I would speak against the motion because and while I respect Anne and Arthur's viewpoint and from an outside perspective to suggest that the market would seek its own level of quality based on disclosure just does not seem appropriate or realistic to me.

And I believe that the balance we have between the collegial process of peer review and accreditation juxtaposed to government regulation and oversight is probably one of the most effective balances that have created the diverse type of education that we have in this country.

And I would speak against the motion. And speak for the - actually speak for the motion and against the alternative motion.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. (Trey) who's the next commenter?

Coordinator: Larry your line is open.

Larry Vanderhoof: Thank you very much. I - there's not much that I can say beyond what Arthur and Anne have already said.

There are things I'm tempted to say but I want to start off by saying that I support the alternative motion. It's not easy because I think the original motion that we are viewing here is very, very good.

And in fact one of the problems I have with the alternative motion is that there are some things that I would like to take from the original motion and put into the alternative motion.

But all things aren't balanced. I think the alternative motion addresses something that just has been a building problem over the years.

I've been involved with accreditation. I was on a regional commission for nine years and was the President of a University for or the Chancellor of a University for 15 years and a Provost for ten years before that.

And it's not something that happened all of a sudden. It's just something that's happened slowly over time.

The current - the system that we're using and that we've been trying to change slowly as time has passed has just not kept up with the problems.

There are lots of things again that can be discussed, things that have happened that certainly make me very concerned having to do for example with the directions that the Pell Grant money is going now a huge percentage way out

of proportion to the number of institutions to the for profits for example, things that probably could be corrected under the current system but for one reason or another are not.

We need a separate kind of close look at federal student aid and where it goes and the reasons that it goes there.

Again there are more things to say about my view of the reasons why this alternative proposal is a good one.

I think Anne and Arthur have done very well though and so I'll stop there for now.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Next in line (Trey)?

Coordinator: William Pepicello your line is open.

William Pepicello: Good morning everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in here. I wish to support not (unintelligible) solution.

While it contains a number of salient points at this point represents a minority view. And I'm a bit puzzled why we as a committee would want to essentially replace the work of the committee with essentially the minority view.

I believe that the original draft report is in fact sufficiently specific to allow Secretary some leeway in leading an ongoing discussion of a process here.

I don't think that either of the documents that are up for discussion represent an endpoint but rather the next milestone in where we were moving.

And the original draft of course represents a consensus. And we didn't all agree with all (unintelligible) by the committee and was significant (unintelligible) the last year or so.

You know, as we look at the (unintelligible) that went into that (unintelligible).

As the input indicates any trends or dominant themes that would indicate that the committee (unintelligible) organization (unintelligible) upon gone off course.

And if you look at the array of comments and inputs there I think what I saw was much of what we heard this morning there is some agreement there's some (unintelligible) concern.

But I think on the whole the draft recommendations as submitted allow for other points of view.

But still give a pretty specific guidance and direction (unintelligible) and wish to strongly support the draft is submitted.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much Bill. (Trey) could you since the - my list is not working of who is teed up could you just read to us in order the names of the people who have indicated a desire to speak on the alternative motion?

Coordinator: At this time we show no one else in queue.

Jamie Studley: Okay.

Coordinator: That was the last one.

Jamie Studley: Okay. In that case let me give folks a moment because they may have been waiting to hear the comments or process their own thoughts about the length of the discussion so...

Coordinator: Thank you. Again please press Star 1 at this time.

Jamie Studley: While people are doing that is there is still a technical problem on your end or...

Coordinator: Yes...

Jamie Studley: ...there is still a problem on my end.

Coordinator: Yes. And our technical department is looking into it from the back end.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Coordinator: ...but we do have Anne Neal that has just queued up once again and your line is open.

Anne Neal: Thank you. I just wanted briefly to address the notion that we've heard from two folks this morning that competition in the accreditation system would be a race to the bottom.

I think it's the concern that we've already reached that bottom of that motivates our alternative since we do in fact have accredited institutions with single digit graduation rates. So I simply wanted to address that point. Thank you.

Jamie Studley: Anyone else?

Coordinator: Please press Star 1 at this time. Susan Phillips your line is open.

Susan Phillips: Thank you. I'd like to just reflect a moment on a perspective that might aid consideration of the original report.

I'm not sure procedurally I realize that you have to keep going down the consideration of the alternate motion.

But I am wondering if it would be an important statement to include in the main - in the original draft report when we get to it about that the recommendations that are advanced are really intended to be in the context of quality assurance being solidly recognized as a nongovernmental and nonfederal function.

Should we arrive back at the point of considering the main motion on the floor I might want to add that as a issue for us to consider adding to that report.
Thank you.

Coordinator: We show no further participants in queue.

Jamie Studley: Okay. I'm doing this a little slowly because I know that there are both technical reasons and, you know, new ideas coming on. So if anyone has a comment and reaction to that.

I want to give you a - or anything about the secondary motion. What will come next just to recap is once I'm sure that everyone has spoken to this who wants to then we will take a vote on the alternative motion made by Arthur and Anne.

And then we will move to other discussion or motions related to the main motion. So last chance I guess on this motion.

Coordinator: Thank you. Please press Star 1 at this time.

Jamie Studley: No requests?

Coordinator: No requests.

Jamie Studley: Okay thank you. In that case we will take a vote on the alternative motion. And since we already know that there are views on both sides we will do this by roll call. Carol would you or the staff please conduct the roll call?

Carol Griffiths: Yes we will. This is to substitute the written comments submitted by Anne Neal and Arthur Rothkopf for in lieu of the draft final report.

George French?

George French: No.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: No.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: No. I don't know how to do this.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. No we did hear you. We heard like half a word but now we've heard you loud and clear. Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you. Anne Neal?

Anne Neal: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: William Pepicello? William Pepicello?

William Pepicello: Hello I no. Can you hear me?

Carol Griffiths: Yes I can hear you. You vote no.

William Pepicello: Thank you.

Jamie Studley: Like (Trey) is it that people have to hit Star 1 to vote in order to vote or are you open the lines as she calls them?

Coordinator: They can hit Star 1.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: Susan Phillips?

Coordinator: Susan your line is open.

Susan Phillips: Voting no.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Rothkopf?

Cameron Staples: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples?

Coordinator: Cameron please press Star 1.

He has not responded.

Carol Griffiths: Okay. Larry Vanderhoof?

Coordinator: Larry your line is open.

Larry Vanderhoof: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Carolyn Williams?

Carolyn Williams: No.

Carol Griffiths: Frank Wu?

Carolyn Williams: No. Did you get that?

Carol Griffiths: Yes.

Jamie Studley: You vote no.

Carol Griffiths: Yes. Frederico Zaragoza?

Frederico Zaragoza: Did you get that yes?

Carol Griffiths: I got it. Yes. And Jamie are you voting?

Jamie Studley: No as the Chair I will not vote unless there's a tie.

Carol Griffiths: All right thank you.

Jamie Studley: I do - because we know that Cam is doing this from Europe on cobbled together phone lines could you try him one more time?

Carol Griffiths: I will. Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples: Hello?

Carol Griffiths: Yes we hear you.

Cameron Staples: Hello?

Jamie Studley: Yes we can hear you Cam.

Cameron Staples: I'm can - I've been trying to push it for the whole time. Can you just automatically open our lines?

Is there a reason we have to actually indicate that we want our line open when you're doing the roll call?

Coordinator: (Trey) can you open all the lines during the roll call?

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Studley: It's okay if you open all the lines all the way through, is that possible, the time delay is a problem?

Coordinator: Okay would you like me to go ahead and open up all committee members?

Jamie Studley: Yes please.

Coordinator: Thank you. One moment.

Jamie Studley: Okay and Carol...

Cameron Staples: I'm voting no by the way.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Carolyn Williams: Did you get my vote Carolyn Williams?

Jamie Studley: Yes I did.

Carolyn Williams: Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you.

Coordinator: And the members are open.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Jamie Studley: And Carol would you like to recap the vote count? I have seven to four, is that correct?

Carol Griffiths: I have seven no and four yes.

Jamie Studley: Yes four to seven I guess is the right way to say that.

Carol Griffiths: Four to seven correct.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Thank you very much. With that the alternative motion has not passed and we will return to discussion of the main motion on the draft final report including any amendments to that draft report.

Would you please - it would still be helpful for you to hit Star 1 to indicate that you want to speak even though your lines are open and there will not be a time delay.

So I'll give you a minute to indicate if you would like to participate and then ask (Trey) to read all the name so that we have a sense of both the number and order of interested participants.

Coordinator: And yes actually all lines are open.

Jamie Studley: Okay. And has anyone indicated a desire to speak?

Frank Wu: Jamie this is Frank Wu. I did want to speak. I have a, just a procedural question.

I've looked up the agenda that was sent in advance but I just wanted to understand more clearly what is happening today in this telephone meeting.

We've had the oral comments. We've dealt with the alternative motion. We're now going to discuss the main motion and after that vote and that's all our business? Is that right? I just want to make sure I understood...

Jamie Studley: Yes that is correct.

Frank Wu: Okay.

Jamie Studley: We're going to discuss the main motion and any other motions related thereto. And that is our business for today.

Let me mention because I didn't run through this again Carol outlined in the preliminary material but because we do have a number of additional listeners.

Let me just add that the motions that are considered here will if adopted obviously revise if there are any motions that alter the draft final report they will be included.

If there are any motions that fail including the substitute motion that we just considered those will be included in the package that goes forward.

We will include the text of that as part of the record of our consideration so that thinking and those perspectives will be evident to people who receive our report or want to consult it.

With that I'd like to know if there's anyone who wants to speak to the main motion or offer a secondary motion? (Trey) has anybody indicated such interest?

Coordinator: All lines are open at this time.

Susan Phillips: This is Susan Phillips. I have a proposed amendment.

Jamie Studley: Go ahead.

Susan Phillips: In recognition of some of the feedback especially very pronounced this round I'd propose adding at the end of the document the following statement.

We advance these recommendations with the further guidance that there consideration and/or implementation be undertaken with recognition that determination of quality be solidly recognized as a non-governmental and nonfederal function.

Jamie Studley: Is there a second for that motion?

Cameron Staples: I would second it.

Jamie Studley: Is there any discussion?

Frank Wu: This is Frank.

Jamie Studley: Would you like Susan, would you like to speak to the reasoning for your motion? And then Cam you'll have an opportunity as well. And then we'll have discussion on the motion. Susan?

Susan Phillips: Yes thank you. The issue that I am responding to is the concern, the perception that while the document clearly asserts that there is value in determination of quality as a nongovernmental function the interpretation of subsequent specific recommendations appears to lead to a different kind of conclusion.

And my thought was to close the document...

Man: Ma'am...

Susan Phillips: ...simply with a reaffirmation of that issue.

Jamie Studley: Can you want to speak to the motion?

Cameron Staples: No. I think Susan's summary is fine.

Jamie Studley: Please indicate your interest in commenting on the motion by hitting Star 1.

George French: Could you repeat the language?

Jamie Studley: Would you hit Star 1 to indicate if you want to speak to this motion? Who is that please?

George French: This is George French. Could you - could I hear the motion again, the language?

Jamie Studley: Susan would you please read the language again? I think that'll also help the staff make sure they have the wording.

Susan Phillips: Yes. The proposed language to be included at the very end of the document is as follows.

We advance these recommendations with the further guidance that their consideration and/or implementation be undertaken with recognitions that determination of quality be solidly recognized as a nongovernmental and nonfederal function.

George French: Thank you.

(Arthur): May I speak? It's (Arthur)?

Jamie Studley: Certainly.

(Arthur): I guess I'm just puzzled by the language. And I really would have to go through the report and some, the draft final report that's on the table in some detail before I could support this.

I'm just not sure that this language I guess I'm not sure what it means, where it leads, and is it really consistent with everything else that's in the draft report?

So I'm (guess) I'm more puzzled by it and don't feel I could vote for it.

Frank Wu: This is Frank. I have a similar question really. I don't quite understand the point of it, I mean thrust of it. Is it which are we saying A or B?

Are we saying A that because it's a nongovernmental function it ought not be done or B though a nongovernmental function not one that the government is interested it should be done? So it could say two very different things. So I just don't quite understand that.

Susan Phillips: This is Sue Phillips to clarify, okay?

Jamie Studley: Yes go ahead.

Susan Phillips: To Frank's point the issue to which the amendment is trying to respond concerns the appearance of the report advocating for accreditation taking - being taken on as a governmental or federal function.

So a number of the commenter's have addressed the concern that the recommendations lead to or advocate for, or would end up making accreditation a function of a federal interest or a governmental interest. And that was the intent was to try to set that aside as a concern.

Frank Wu: If I may this is Frank once more. So what we're saying is accrediting agencies still ought to engage in it and very much so but the federal government is not asserting its interest if I'm hearing that correctly.

I'm fine with that. But I have a question, a legal question that is, entirely beyond the scope of my legal expertise but perhaps someone else on the line would know this.

When independent nongovernment entities such as accrediting agencies perform a task, such as what we ask them to do, if they also perform other tasks that are explicitly identified as nongovernmental is that legally okay or does that raise some sort of weird constitutional delegation or non-delegation problem?

You know, does it open up some strange problem with someone challenging the accrediting agencies by saying the Department of Education is authorized

you to do X, Y, and Z but it's disavowed a federal governmental interest in quality therefore you accrediting agency can't be doing it?

In other words can we say to the accrediting agency you ought to do it but it's not a federal government interest? That's the concise way to put my question.

Jamie Studley: I don't know if there's anyone prepared to respond to Frank's question, is there?

(Arthur): It's (Arthur). I'm not prepared to respond because I don't - I think it's a great question. I guess I don't - now that I understand what's being proposed here I'm really strongly opposed to it because it seems to be - I mean the whole premise of having accreditors review institutions to determine whether their students can get Title IV funding is that somehow quality assurance is part of it.

That's what we've been discussing for months now that we want the quality assurance feature within what the federal government requires in order for this to happen.

I happen to disagree with that but that was the premise. Now we're sort of taking out the quality assurance and saying no, no it's got quality assurance. That's a non-governmental function.

Well the fact is that we have given this power, the statute I believe and others who are more familiar with can say have given this power to the accreditors.

And they're supposed to take everything into account. And they have done a whole lot to try and determine quality through all the different rules.

And then the federal government has been negotiating with them at what they can do and what not do.

I just think this muddies the waters dramatically. And again now I really understand or really think that it - I would urge others to not support it.

Anne Neal: Hello?

Jamie Studley: Is there anyone else who wants to speak to the motion?

Anne Neal: Yes. This is Anne.

Jamie Studley: Go ahead.

Anne Neal: I wanted to thank Frank I think for raising a very interesting question which probably is beyond the scope of this tele-meeting in terms of challenging the constitutionality of a delegation of authority to private accrediting associations.

I dare say that that would not be without grounds and I urge someone to do so. But I don't believe that it helps to - the question can be answered here today nor do I believe that this suggested amendment clarifies any of the different perspectives that we have.

And in fact while Susan suggests that not - that it's not an appearance I do believe that the current system which is endorsed by the final draft makes accreditation a federal act.

And so the motion does not in any way clarify or change my perspective and hence I would urge voting against the motion amendment.

Jamie Studley: Would anyone like else like to speak to the motion or have any questions?

Susan Phillips: This is Susan Phillips. And I'd like to respond and suggest a way forward. I think that Frank's question is a very important one and one that clearly can't be answered at this moment.

I am happy to withdraw this amendment with recognition of the concern expressed about the increased federalization of the accreditation activity as I think there remains a concern but perhaps it need not be amended.

Jamie Studley: So do I hear you withdrawing the motion?

Susan Phillips: Correct.

Jamie Studley: Cam as the seconder I'm not sure whether I need to...

((Crosstalk))

(Jamie Studley): ...why don't I to be polite?

Cameron Staples: Yes absolutely.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Thank you very much. With that let me see one more time if there are any committee members who want to speak to the motion that's on the floor either - for either the purpose either of discussion or amendment?

Cameron Staples: Jamie I'd like to propose an amendment.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. Go ahead Cam.

Cameron Staples: And I hope this one will not be complicated. It seems that Section 8 of the recommendations that deals with providing some form of indemnification or legal protection to accreditors it doesn't seem to have support on various sides of the discussion.

And I think it probably was a good intent. It was well intended to protect accreditors. But I think in fact it might be more complicated than benefit.

So I would recommend that we delete Section 8 and just assume that accreditors have to bear the risk associated with the process that they're engaged in.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. Was there a second for that motion?

Susan Phillips: This is Susan Phillips I'm happy to second it. put it on the table.

Jamie Studley: Okay thank you. Let's see if any of you would like to comment on that? Is there any discussion?

Woman: To clarify this would mean simply removing the words our recommendation here and then the entire section labeled eight?

Cameron Staples: I was focusing on the recommendation provision which just speaks to - it's one paragraph and it speaks to exploring and establishing some form of indemnification.

Woman: Right.

Jamie Studley: So Cam to be clear you would take out that paragraph and leave the introduction before it and the paragraph after it...

Cameron Staples: Well it...

Jamie Studley: ...or tell us how much...

Cameron Staples: It seems as though the - well it seems as though the - there's a lot more in there that - I'm sorry I haven't even really read...

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Cameron Staples: ...recently that preceding paragraph.

I think the preceding paragraph does look like it explains a recommendation so I suppose that could come out as well.

That's consistent with that. And I guess we would just edit the draft accordingly if the recommendation is removed.

Jamie Studley: Okay let me suggest this...

Cameron Staples: Now that looks like the paragraph.

Jamie Studley: Right.

Cameron Staples: It looks like the paragraph preceding and the recommendation are all about that issue. So that - I would recommend that they both be deleted.

Jamie Studley: Okay. I think one possibility because it's difficult to edit as a group under the circumstances.

If the motion were to pass we could ask the trio that put together this final draft which was Susan, Arthur and me to just make sure we don't lose anything in that paragraph that's an important set up for what comes afterwards and run anything that we wanted to keep by the rest of you to see if that was a satisfactory edit.

But we'll take the amendment as deletion of the substantive recommendation in Number 8 and the language in the preceding paragraph that tracks with us setting up that Number 8 recommendation. Is that acceptable to you as the movement?

Cameron Staples: Yes. That's fine.

Jamie Studley: Okay. So there's a motion on the table made by Cam seconded by Susan. Is there any discussion or question or are there any questions?

And for the operator I am back in.

Coordinator: Yes thank you.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Well so going once, going twice. You can just indicate by speaking I think we are managing this just fine. Does anybody have anything they'd like to say to that amendment?

If not let's do a roll call since there's no discussion to give me an indication.
Carol would you please...

Anne Neal: Jamie this is Anne. If I can just have a clarification, so in other words this is a motion to delete two paragraphs on what is currently Page 5?

Jamie Studley: Correct. And the gloss that I added Anne was that if in looking at it in a little, you know, quieter setting if there's anything in the first paragraph that begins as a accreditation agencies continue to play, if there's anything there that is needed to make sense of this heading in a general way not related specifically to Number 8 we will ask the whole committee if it's okay to, you know, keep that more general language?

Anne Neal: All right thank you.

Jamie Studley: But thank you. Are we ready to take a roll call now on this motion? Carol would you please take the role?

Carol Griffiths: Yes. This is a motion to delete Recommendation 8 and the language in the preceding paragraph that sets up that recommendation Number 8.

George French? George French?

Coordinator: All lines are open.

Jamie Studley: Thank you. George has been on mute. And it sounded like conference - cell phone. So let's check with him at the end as well.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: I speak against that motion.

Carol Griffiths: Anne Neal?

Anne Neal: I vote in favor of removing those paragraphs?

Carol Griffiths: William Pepicello?

William Pepicello: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Susan Phillips?

Susan Phillips: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Rothkopf?

Arthur Rothkopf: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Larry Vanderhoof?

Larry Vanderhoof: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Carolyn Williams?

Carolyn Williams: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Frank Wu?

Frank Wu: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Federico Zaragoza?

Frederico Zaragoza: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: (Unintelligible) I'm sorry.

Man: Yes. Yes.

Jamie Studley: Thank you (Bill).

Carol Griffiths: And George French?

George French: Yes.

Jamie Studley: Thank you.

Earl Lewis: Earl Lewis has joined the phone call.

Jamie Studley: Who is this?

Earl Lewis: Earl Lewis.

Carol Griffiths: All right. And Earl Lewis?

Earl Lewis: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Yes.

Earl Lewis: Correct.

Carol Griffiths: Okay. I have 11 yes and one no. Motion passes.

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much Carol. I appreciate that. Are there any additional motions or discussion on the main motion?

((Crosstalk))

Susan Phillips: I'd like to propose one more?

Jamie Studley: Okay. Susan and did I hear somebody else just so we know what's in the queue?

George French: Yes I was - this was George French (unintelligible).

Jamie Studley: Go ahead George.

George French: I just want - this is not even a motion. This is a separate question. I just wanted to know when we would assess the efficacy of this telephone conference?

Jamie Studley: I think you and Cam may want to lead the consideration. Let me explain for you and for everyone else that we decided to do this when the Secretary, when the department asked us if we could send forward our report sooner than our June meeting.

So we agreed to experiment with this method. After the call we will indeed ask everyone how it went. And we will do a cross benefit assessment. That's my background.

Susan you have a motion that you wanted to make or a comment?

Susan Phillips: Yes I'd like - what I'd like to propose removing Recommendation 9. This is the recommendation concerning the structure and organization of the accreditation enterprise.

Many of the comments that we've received have spoken to the fact that the organization of the accreditation system is up to the accreditation system not up to anybody else.

And while the sentiment in the paragraph above, the one that begins of note seems reasonable to continue to include.

I am proposing that we remove Item 9 and the sentence stem that proceeds it, our recommendation in this regard include.

Jamie Studley: Do I hear a second for that motion?

Cameron Staples: I will second it.

Jamie Studley: That was Cam?

Cameron Staples: Yes.

Jamie Studley: Discussion on the motion to remove recommendation Number 9?

Susan Phillips: The recap for the people who don't have recommendation Number 9...

Jamie Studley: Oh I'm sorry Susan...

Susan Phillips: ...right this moment.

Jamie Studley: ...yes you can speak to it.

Susan Phillips: Yes. The recommendation Number 9 for those who may not have it pulled up on their screen or paper it says encourage dialogue within the - within the accreditation community about the structure and organization of the accreditation enterprise, the diversity of educational activity and mission today may call for a system of accreditation that is aligned more closely with mission or sector or other educationally relevant variables than with the geography.

This dialogue may also afford institutions greater opportunity to choose among accreditors.

All of the recommendation is one of encouraging a dialogue that the accreditation community can take up themselves without the encouragement of NACIQI or the Secretary.

Anne Neal: This is Anne. I guess I have - I'm just a little confused. We're not saying we're going to undertake the dialogue.

As it's currently phrased it simply is a recommendation that the accreditors take up this dialogue. So what is our interest in eliminating a discussion of sector based versus regional?

(Arthur): If I may speak to that, it's (Arthur). I have to say that I think we've heard some pretty persuasive arguments including one just, you know, an hour so ago from Princeton. And I think there were other schools that are supportive of this.

The fact that the accreditation community if you will doesn't like it is not a reason not to explore it.

Indeed there are institutions who feel that the accreditation community is not doing a good job in relation to their interest and the interest of students.

And actually I think this is an important recommendation. And while I opposed during the discussions we had over this past several months Number 8 I think Number 9 is a modest but very good idea so I would vote against the motion.

Anne Neal: And this is Anne. I too would vote against the motion. I believe these discussions need to be had. They have not. The accreditors have had the opportunity to have these discussions in the past. They have not had them.

And so I think it's important to recommend that they engage in this discussion and to look at more choices for institutions and for different ways of assessing institutions.

William Pepicello: Yes this is Bill Pepicello. I think I would agree with that. I think that the discussion could bear fruit in a number of different ways.

Jamie Studley: Any other comments or questions?

Susan?

Susan Phillips: Present, yes.

Jamie Studley: I am - what I'm hearing does raise the possibility. I mean you can go forward with your motion if you like but the comments that I hear are about encouraging the dialogue the first part of the motion.

I just wonder if there's a narrower motion that you might want to consider about some part of the rest of the paragraph.

Otherwise we can go ahead and if people are ready we will vote on the motion to delete all of nine.

Susan Phillips: Sure. I would be happy to substitute my previous all-encompassing motion with only removing the last two sentences of nine and remain - leaving it in, leaving in the encourage a dialogue within accreditation community about the structure and organization of the accreditation enterprise without being specific about what occurs in the next two sentences.

Jamie Studley: I will take that as a substitute motion, Cam would you continue to second the substitute motion?

Cameron Staples: Yes I would.

Jamie Studley: Okay. Is there any discussion on the new motion that's on the floor? Otherwise let's take a voice vote. Carol?

Carol Griffiths: Did you say a vote voice vote or roll call?

Jamie Studley: Roll call I'm sorry I apologize, a roll call, roll call right.

Carol Griffiths: This is a motion to remove the sentences two and three from Recommendation 9 and the - of Recommendation 9.

Man: Could someone repeat the motion though please?

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: The motion...

Jamie Studley: Go ahead Carol.

Carol Griffiths: The motion is to remove or delete sentences two and three of recommendation Number 9.

That would be the sentences that start with the diversity of education activity and ends with dialogue may afford institutions greater opportunities to choose among all accreditors.

Jamie Studley: So the recommendation would as a result -- thank you Carol -- be one sentence to encourage a dialogue about structure and organization. And the discussion that follows would remain.

Carol Griffiths: Are you ready to vote?

Jamie Studley: Are you ready to vote go ahead.

Carol Griffiths: George French?

George French: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: I vote against that.

Carol Griffiths: Earl Lewis?

Earl Lewis: No.

Carol Griffiths: Anne Neal?

Anne Neal: I oppose.

Carol Griffiths: William Pepicello?

William Pepicello: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Susan Phillips?

Susan Phillips: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Rothkopf?

Arthur Rothkopf: No.

Carol Griffiths: Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Larry Vanderhoof?

Larry Vanderhoof: No.

Carol Griffiths: Carolyn Williams?

Carolyn Williams: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Frank Wu? Frank Wu?

Let me go on. Frederico Zaragoza?

Frederico Zaragoza: No.

Carol Griffiths: Frank Wu? Can you speak up?

Coordinator: Mr. Wu has disconnected from the conference.

Carol Griffiths: Oh okay thank you.

Jamie Studley: Carol what's the vote that you have?

Carol Griffiths: I have five, four, five in favor of six opposed and...

Jamie Studley: Correct.

Carol Griffiths: It is sustained.

Jamie Studley: That's my count as well five yes, six know, the motion fails.

Carol Griffiths: It fails.

Jamie Studley: Are there any other comments, discussion, or motions related to the main motion that's still on the floor?

So I should say the motion failed therefore Number 9 remains as originally presented in the draft.

Anyone want to speak? Okay. If not - just remind you that we will go back to voting on the main motion.

Is there anyone who wants to speak knowing that this appears to be the last opportunity?

Okay in that case let us go to a roll call vote on the main motion made by Susan seconded by Cam that the committee adopt the draft final report as amended with respect to recommendation Number 8?

Carol Griffiths: Okay are we ready for a vote?

Jamie Studley: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Okay. This is a motion to adopt a draft final draft final report as amended with respect to recommendation Number 8.

George French?

George French: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Keiser?

Arthur Keiser: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Anne Neal?

Anne Neal: No.

Carol Griffiths: William Pepicello?

William Pepicello: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Susan Phillips?

Susan Phillips: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Arthur Rothkopf?

Arthur Rothkopf: No.

Carol Griffiths: Cameron Staples?

Cameron Staples: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Larry Vanderhoof?

Larry Vanderhoof: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Carolyn Williams?

Carolyn Williams: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Frank Wu? Frederico Zaragoza?

Frederico Zaragoza: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: And that is...

Earl Lewis: Earl Lewis is missed.

Carol Griffiths: I'm sorry Earl Lewis?

Earl Lewis: Yes.

Carol Griffiths: Thank you.

Carol Griffiths: Did everyone on line vote?

Jamie Studley: Was anyone missed? Thank you for identifying yourself Earl.

Earl Lewis: Sure.

Carol Griffiths: Okay. The tally is nine for two against, motion passes.

Jamie Studley: Okay not so, nine in favor two against.

Carol Griffiths: Correct.

Jamie Studley: That is my count as well. The motion passes. The draft final report as amended has been adopted.

I think we all want to take a deep breath and thank all of you for this very thoughtful consideration.

Thank everyone who participated both on the committee and among the commenter's for your efforts to engage with all of these issues clearly.

These recommendations are not the final word. Many of them themselves embody the notion that further consideration is required and asks the Secretary as he moves forward to develop the departments positions on a Higher Education Act to think about what - to think about the issues that we've raise.

I want to remind everyone that all of the comments that we've received become available as part of that consideration.

So I expect that the department's thinking, and the field's thinking, and I hope a wider audience engaging beyond the academy to members of the public will have the benefit of all of the commentary analysis differing views and struggle to achieve the best thinking that we can about to - about how to accomplish this complex task will be available for people to build on.

I think that all of that is important to know as the department I believe is likely to continue to seek input and to grapple with some of the questions specifically that we have flagged as needing attention and coming to grips with what legislative proposals ought to be made.

Is there anyone who wants to add anything at this point now that we have voted any discussion?

I promise that we will think about whether we can manage to ever try this technology again or for what purposes.

We as you know, we meet in June for our regular meeting regarding the approval of accreditors review and consideration of accreditors participation in this process.

If there is anything that comes out of these discussions we - that is appropriate for that agenda we will add it at that time.

But let me see if there's anybody who wants to either...

Man: Jamie...

Jamie Studley: ...say a word now. I would also like to say a special thank you for Susan because all of us worked very hard on it. But Susan and in the last round Arthur did special efforts to bring us to a point where we could learn as much as we have from each other really dig deep into these issues.

And I for one will add that I think there is a lot in the alternative motion that is important for us to continue to think about.

So I'm glad that it will be appended and travel with the main motion because there is much that's important to continue to think about in this realm.

But let me see if Arthur or Susan in particular wants to say anything at this stage and otherwise open it up to any of you for...

Arthur Rothkopf: Yes I just would like to echo the comments about Susan and her really extraordinary work in this activity and express thanks to the department staff

which (Melissa) of course Carol, (Kay) and others who have provided I think very important support along (the way). I think it has, you know, made the task easier, not easy but easier to do this.

I do have a couple of questions and things (unintelligible) discussed before Jamie and I don't know whether there's an answer to it.

Question one is when this report goes to the Secretary is that then posted on the NACIQI Web site or some other place so that the public has access to it?
Question one.

Question two we've had in the two significant votes we've had there were 11 members voting.

And I just wonder, I don't know if our total was 17 or 18 now but what about the others who have not who are not but didn't participate in this call and were not able to vote.

Do they have an opportunity or not to align with either the if you will, the majority report or the minority report?

Jamie Studley: Arthur we have it - consulted with the General Counsel's office on the question of members voting who were not able to be on the call.

And the answer is that they may not. The traditional Roberts Rules of Order point is rule on that subject is that you may not participate by proxy and must be part of the meeting unless the bylaws of the organization provide otherwise and ours do not.

Clearly people can informally and separately indicate their support for a different viewpoint for aspects of this but we cannot add to - we cannot allow them to vote on these provisions.

But I would definitely like to join you in thanking the staff. (Melissa) and now Carol who has joined in this role and many others have been very helpful to us in this entire process.

And I apologize for forgetting but I definitely want to second that motion with regard to that. Susan would you like to add anything now?

Oh then yes Arthur this will be posted on the Web site and we will make every effort to make it clear and available.

Arthur Rothkopf: Thank you. That's great.

Susan Phillips: Yes Jamie one last set of comments for me. I absolutely echo the thanks and support for the staff and hope that (Melissa) is enjoying her retirement.

And for those of you who have picked up after her departure thank you very much. The committee has been absolutely phenomenal to work with in trying to craft a path through some very divergent ideas.

Thank you very much for your collaborativeness and collegiality.

And a final thank you I believe we have 60 people, 60 listeners on this call who will add their comments and thoughts as we go forward.

We've had a number commenter's both speaking hearing appearing before us or submitting written comments. All of those have been enormously helpful in

framing the issues and pointing out difficult parts of the conversation and to providing a context as we take up these very challenging issues.

So let me extend a thanks to those who don't have a voice today but certainly have had a voice as we have gone through this process.

Jamie Studley: That's beautifully put. And Arthur and I actually can tell that many of them are still with us and I'm sure will continue to be through the stages yet to come of this discussion both NACIQI's own work and the department's development of the Higher Education Act.

So thank you to all the members of the committee. Thank you to our excellent and supportive staff. Thank you to the speakers today and for all of our commenters and thank you to those of you here in our listening audience.

I it's - Friday the 13th, made me a tiny bit nervous but except that it seems to have affected our conference call line otherwise I appreciate that we have gone beyond superstition to have a very valuable conversation and made progress on this. Thank you very much. It's 9:50 and I will entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

Arthur Rothkopf: So moved.

Jamie Studley: Arthur's made a motion. Second?

Earl Lewis: Second Earl.

Jamie Studley: Second. I think we can do this one by voice vote. All in favor please say aye?

Man: Aye.

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Studley: Thank you very much and thank...

Carol Griffiths: Thanks so much.

Jamie Studley: ...you all for...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Okay thanks.

Jamie Studley: Bye. Have a good day and a good weekend.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Jamie Studley: Thanks Carol.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END