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WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Good Morning welcome to day 2 of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity. And if I may have for the benefit of the people in the audience us introduce ourselves. Rich you start.

MR. O’DONNELL: Good morning I’m Rick O’Donnell, CEO of Skills Fund.

MR. JONES: And I’m Brian Jones, President of Strayer University.

MS. DERBY: And I’m Jill Derby, Senior Consultant with Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Steve Van Ausdle, President Emeritus, Walla Walla Community College.

MS. NEAL: Anne Neal, Senior Fellow American Council of Trustees and Alumni.

MR. FRENCH: George French, President of Miles College, I can’t figure out how to work the system.

MS. MORGAN: Sally Morgan, I’m with the Office of General Counsel at Department of Education.

MR. BOUNDS: Herman Bounds I’m the Director of the Accreditation Group at the Department of Education.
MS. HONG: Jennifer Hong, Executive Director, Designated Federal Official of NACIQI.

MR. KEISER: Art Keiser, Chancellor of Keiser University.

MS. DERLIN: Bobbie Derlin, Associate Provost, New Mexico State University.

MS. PHILLIPS: Susan Phillips, Faculty, University of Albany, State University of New York and Leadership Fellow, SUNY Sail Institute.

MR. WOLFF: Ralph Wolff, President, Quality Assurance Commons.

MR. PRESSNELL: Claude Pressnell, I’m the President of the Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities.

MS. SULLIVAN ALIOTO: Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, Advocate for Read, Play and Sing with Your Child 10 Minutes a Day.

MR. BOEHME: Simon Boehme, Student Member.

MR. MULA: Chuck Mula, Department staff.

MS. LEFOR: Good morning, Valerie Lefor, Department staff.

MS. DAGGETT: Elizabeth Daggett, Department staff.
PRESENTATION BY THE WASC SENIOR COLLEGE
AND UNIVERSITY COMMISSION (WSCUC)

GRADUATION RATE DASHBOARD

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I’ll again welcome everybody to our meeting. This morning we’re going to start with a presentation from the Western Association of Senior Colleges and University, the WASC Senior College and University Commission and they were here last time and we were very impressed with what they were doing with their graduate dashboard.

And we would like to have you welcome -- we welcome you. Would you introduce yourselves, especially our former Chair, we do appreciate that you’re here and make your presentation, thank you.

MS. STUDLEY: Thank you very much Chair Keiser. It’s good to be back at NACIQI. Not everybody says that every time but we truly mean that. Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak with you today.
We’re very excited to talk about one of my favorite subjects -- student success. The data part follows along from that commitment to student success. I’m joined here by Henry Hernandez, the WASC CIO.

WASC is a membership organization of about 200 institutions at the Bachelor’s level and above operating in California, Hawaii, the Pacific Islands and internationally and it’s also a regional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

To put our presentation in context I thought I’d dial it back a bit to 2011 when here in NACIQI we were beginning to discuss student outcomes and ask every accreditor how they thought about student learning outcomes and other performance measures.

In 2013 the President challenged the Department of Education to find new and better ways to understand access, affordability and outcomes leading to a national search for better questions, measures and strategies for understanding student success and institutional effectiveness.

In 2015 the revised college scorecard launched to provide user-friendly ways to understand exactly that. And late in 2015 the first stages of accreditor dashboards were introduced.
They’ve been improved steadily by the staff. I’m very impressed by what that rudimentary dashboard has turned into and used very effectively by NACIQI.

For WASC student success is deeply rooted in learning outcomes. For us that means that students are prepared for success in their personal, civic and professional lives and that it embodies the values and behaviors that make each institution distinctive.

Success is understood in part in through strong retention and degree completion rates and by a variety of other metrics that we all work on to understand the different dimensions for each student, for each institution of what success can look like.

On one level this is complicated -- that’s why we’ve chosen a nuclear power plant control room. But on another level this is really quite straightforward. We want to understand what’s happening with students in the classroom and beyond so that we can make improvements for students wearing our institutional improvement hat and so that we can make critical decisions about gatekeeping, about access to precious taxpayer funds and understand the performance of institutions in a rounded and complete way.

Let me just make a couple of comments and then
I’ll hand off to my colleague. Our intention is not to make accreditation decisions solely on the basis of these data but to use them in concert with other sources of information and other sources of data from IPEDS and other places to put together -- the multiple measures to surround the complex issues of performance that are at the heart of our gatekeeping and also of our institutional improvement.

Ultimately we want evidence of sufficient breadth of student success at member institutions that we can make those important gatekeeping decisions and help institutions and improve the national conversation around degree attainment, student success and ultimately the value of higher education.

I’ve given you a time line for a variety of projects in which you were involved. Now Henry will talk about what was going on in WASC at the same time and how we developed the tool that we are going to talk to you about today. At the end I’ll come back and talk a bit about some benchmarking activities that we’re doing that are the next frontier for us.

But as we do all of this let’s think about how can we work together collectively on these efforts? How can we continue our work across regional accreditors, across the universe of all accreditors in partnership with the Department and with our
in institutional members in the interest of student success, with that
Henry.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thanks Jamie, good morning everyone, can you hear me okay. Okay I’m going to switch back and forth between my glasses because I’m of that age where I can either see you or I can read -- I haven’t quite graduated to bifocals yet.

Anyway I’ll be showing some slides. Hopefully you guys can follow along with me and the slides -- just switch to the next one. This is our Agenda today, I’m hoping to keep our formal presentation short so we have time for discussion. And again please jump in because I don’t want this to be too formal.

We want this to be a conversation. You’ll also notice as I run through the slides that I might skip a few, we’ll share the slides with you so you have this deck and we’ll also point out where a lot of this information could be found on the WASC Senior website so don’t feel compelled to take meticulous notes.

And so that’s just in the interest of time so we can get to the fun part of discussion. And before I click through the slides I just wanted to clarify again like Jamie said, the graduation rate dashboard for us is part of a broader effort to understand and improve student success so yes, this is an important tool but it’s
only one tool in a toolbox that we want as accreditors and we want our institutions to engage in.

So Jamie gave you a brief overview of the kind of institutions we serve. I know you guys get a dashboard as well as our performance but I just wanted to bring up for you one slide that this is a data point that we’ve been tracking for a while and we find quite interesting.

The line graph simply shows the proportion of the undergraduates in our region, the graduates actually, that are members of the IPEDS first-time full-time cohort. And you know, it’s right around I don’t know 37, 38, 40% or so. So for us that says roughly 60% of the student success in our region for under grads isn’t being captured by the more traditional measure of IPEDS.

And we all know that but just to put this in context, this is part of what motivated us back in the day when we started looking at these data to find better ways to measure student success so we could capture all the success in our region.

And let’s go to the next slide. I know this one is tough to read so I’ll read it to you. Just in summary but this presentation and what we’re talking about here is really a story of how we’ve searched for this better way to measure student success.
And as we thought about this we came up with a wish list -- here’s all the things we would want to be able to do. We’d want to be able to see institutional efficiency and the effectiveness of their student success efforts. We’d want to see what’s happening with students regardless of time to degree. We needed an annually updated format, disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender.

We want to be able to account for both the graduating students as well as those that didn’t keep going. We want to be able to track the transfer activity of students to understand where they’re coming from or going to so we can account for all that success.

We’d love to see this as a nationally comparable data set, of course, with results in an easy to understand graphical and publicly available format and finally in a way that is attuned to the unique populations and missions of each of our students or each of our institution students.

So in essence we have this wish list of something that doesn’t exist. And one of the things this reinforced for us as we looked at different models out there -- things like IPEDS or data we could get for the clearing houses, we must have multiple measures as Jamie said to surround the issue -- different ways
where we can look at facets of the problem because no one measurement system alone was capable of producing all that detail.

So just a quick time line here, Ralph will remember this clearly as the lead up to the 2013 version of our handbook, the Commission identified student success as one of the central issues that we wanted to grabble with so they formed a task force. The task force did some work, came up with a method.

We iterated again that first method was cumbersome and highly detailed. John Etchemendy, one of your colleagues and some other Commissioners rebooted that effort and that’s what came to produce what we now know today as the graduation rate dashboard.

We piloted it, we piloted it again and then as of 2015 this is a required piece of the data elements that institutions have to submit to us every year. So since 2015 we’ve been collecting 8-year chunks of data. So we actually have quite a large data pool already on this measure.

But what is the graduation rate dashboard is what we’re really here to talk about. And simply it’s a tool for tracking institutional level performance related to retention and graduation and it’s focused on units. The method looks at 6 data points and from those data points it develops two completion measures.
The first one is called the unit redemption rate and the second one is called the absolute graduation rate. I’ll also add on that there’s actually a third completion measure on the dashboard which is the IPED’s first-time full-time graduation rate, because we use that as a reference point.

And if any of you guys have been sailing or doing any kind of hiking it’s nice to have a point by which to triangulate your position -- like oh, I know that mountain over there and what that means so I think I’m right about here.

So another important thing to keep in mind before I get into the explanation what the data points are and the measures is that this is not a cohort based model. And what I’d like to tell us all to do is if you could just take the idea of this cohort based model, put it in a little boat and just push it out to sea for a second because this is an entirely different way to think about it and getting rid of the cohort idea is going to be key to your understanding.

Instead, I’d like you to think about it like this -- and luckily it’s not right before lunch so this isn’t going to get your tummies grumbling but let’s call this the student success sandwich. And with the dashboard we’re in essence collecting yearly slices of data -- these 6 data elements that make up the unit accumulation
and redemption patterns.

Each slice is on the academic year defined by IPEDS so that’s the July 1 - June 30 year. So we do that to keep it aligned so we can use IPEDS as a cross reference. And now let’s just jump into the data points themselves because I think this will start to make a lot more sense for you.

So there is in essence three buckets of data we’re looking at in the dashboard. The first two are about those students who were actively enrolled as degree-seekers at the institution and the units that they accumulate during that year -- pretty simple.

The second two -- number 3 and 4 on the slide are the students that graduated in that year in the units that they got from the institution that were redeemed in essence for a new degree.

And then finally, and very interestingly is the 5th and 6th which are those students who did not continue at the institution. Who were they and how many institutions have they accumulated that in essence, will not go redeemed by this institution for a new degree?

And there’s deep definitions -- again I’ll point you to the WASC website and I’ll have a link to this later where you can really get into the finer points of detail on what these
definitions are -- but those are the three basic buckets -- the
students that are enrolled, the students that are graduating and the
students that didn’t come back. And what do we do with those?
Glad you asked.

The first measure that we developed is called the
unit redemption rate and this is simply the proportion of units
granted by the institution that are eventually redeemed for a degree
from that institution -- that’s irregardless of time and irregardless
of the student status -- again this isn’t a cohort model, it’s simply a
balance sheet of how many units got issued versus how many
issues got redeemed in essence to turn into a degree.

And the interesting thing about this if we think
about units as a proxy for the very complex issue of tuition and
resource in essence how much money resource time did everyone
spend -- the students, institution in seeing this education delivered
and what came out of that.

So it’s in essence a unit of efficiency. How
efficient is the institution delivering the units that the students
needed to see those units then turned into a degree? And in a little
while we’ll talk about a terrific example of what looking at this
kind of data can help an institution discover.

So I won’t go into the math here but it will be
available to you and let’s skip on to the next data element which is that of the non-continuing student.

Now this is unique to the dashboard in that every year the institution is reporting to us the number of degree-seeking students that didn’t keep going and the total cumulative units that they had gotten from the institution.

Now that’s important to understand what the definition of this is -- it may be referred locally as an inactive student, a stop out, a drop out, a withdrawn and you notice right there I have a transfer as grade out.

And that’s an important issue because even with the new IPEDS outcome measures that understand transfers coming in, one of the things this helps us do is look at transfers going out. So institutions that can reliably verify that a student who didn’t continue with the institution actually went somewhere else to succeed, they don’t have to include them as a non-continuing student because they’re still succeeding just not at that moment or that institution that houses their data.

This to me is maybe perhaps next to the UR one of the most actionable lines of inquiry the institution can pursue. So for example, who were these students down to the student record level -- who are they? What programs were they in, what courses
did they take? What advising or support services did they take advantage of and what are the patterns in those and that kind of inquiry can produce terrific results for improvement.

One thing I will mention about this is this is probably the most challenging bit of the graduation dashboard for institutions to look at because they’re not used to looking at their data in this way and unless they support or unless they participate in student clearing house or have some kind of exit survey, it’s hard for them to understand that the student reliably went somewhere else.

And then here we have our second completion measure which is the absolute graduation rate and you can read the slide but it’s simply the proportion of students who started at that institution that eventually graduate from this institution. So that’s regardless of time to degree, regardless of part-time full-time swirling, a student could come back 20 years later, finish their final set of courses and their success would be counted in this measure.

So it is in essence a more inclusive method than we see by a cohort defined model. That being said, we don’t think of the AGR as the better IPEDS first-time full-time graduation rate replacement -- it’s not. It’s a different summary measure. It’s based on an entirely different methodology and it also doesn’t
work for every institution.

Those that have rapid enrollment decreases or increases, you know, just the way the methodology is built, it doesn’t work for everyone but for those institutions that serve significant portions of students who aren’t first-time full-time, those students who may take more than 6 years to finish or that come and go, this is a very appreciated method and a very engaging method for them because it helps them demonstrate success that would otherwise, like we saw in that little line chart, be invisible.

So again, there’s more math. You can check those out at your leisure but I just wanted to summarize by saying you know, the graduation rate dashboard itself it’s a unit focused methodology, it has this unique insight to seeing the non-continuing student and that’s a huge boon for the institutions to be focused on that.

It works on multiple periods of time so even with one year’s data we have a reliable set of information that we can engage the institution on. Obviously if we have 8 or 10 or 12 years of trend, it’s more interesting and more reliable. But last but not least it’s not this cohort based model, it’s in essence this balance sheet idea of the students coming in and the students going out and
the relationships.

Again, I’ll skip this one in interest in time and for your eyes. That’s what the data might be represented as and as Jamie said it’s complex, but it also tells very clear stories.

Now the next and most -- I think, salient question for us, all of us, how do we use this in our accreditation process?

So first, we make institutions report this every year. This is an annual reporting requirement.

Second, we analyze this as staff as their mid-cycle and we also require institutions to narrate this as part of their institutional reports -- their self-study. So they’re required to engage on this component, talk about it in relationship to other measures that they use again multiple measures for us.

It’s shared and discussed with the peer review teams so the peer review teams are trained on it, they’re discussing it with the institutions and then of course it’s shared with the Commission and finally and interestingly enough, it’s also publicly available on the WASC Senior website so you want to go to the website you can see a visualization tool that lets you look at all this data for all the institutions that serve undergraduates.

Ooh, and I mentioned that we would talk a little bit about a UR example and I thought this would be useful from the
point of view of how we use this in accreditation. So I’m sure you
guys all know who UCLA is -- a very strong institution and they
have on the face of it very -- they’re very successful with their
graduation rates. They have a unit redemption rate of 93%. 93%
of the units they give out turn into degrees -- that’s fantastic.
90% of the students in either the passive graduation
rate or the IPEDS rates graduate so fantastic results. But they took
the UR methodology and burst out that information down to the
student level to find out where is the last 7% going? Where’s the
waste?
And they identified it was in STEM courses and
they identified at the student level what the actual courses were
and by being able to do that they cross-referenced what they’d
found with the UR and what an academic program assessment had
done and said, “Aha, we’ve found where the leak is,” and in
essence redesigned the pedagogy and they’ve seen their unit
redemption rates go up -- an already successful institution is still
able to in essence increase their efficiency.
So what have we learned so far from this? That
again, this is great for institutions that serve significant non-
traditional populations and for our region that’s a pretty big deal.
60% of our students at the under-graduate level are this non-
continuing or this non-traditional student.

We’ve also learned that getting your head around this new kind of method and producing some new data can be challenging for especially the smaller institutions that don’t have the IR capacity at a very basic level.

And then we’ve also learned importantly that even high-performing institutions can use elements of the measures. And again, the absolute graduation rate is just one piece of what the dashboard shows you. It’s about using these data in reference to other measures, to other systems that they have as well as things like the efficiency rating of the unit redemption rate.

Sorry -- and then of course there’s comparative data. I won’t pull this up, you can if you want this little website URL right here but there’s an actual tool like I said that you can pull up this data and slice and dice it, check it out at your leisure.

But for us comparative data really isn’t enough to make sound accreditation decisions and to help institutions benchmark themselves against the performance of others and Jamie do you want to step in here and talk a little bit about benchmarking?

MS. STUDLEY: Yes. Yes, thank you very much.

We are continuing to work with our institutions to use these data.
One of the things that we do with the GOD has provided two schools and provide support for the institutions so they can think about how to incorporate it along with other outcomes. At the same time we know that that’s not the end of the conversation. There’s more that we want to understand and we’ve talked many times here and elsewhere about providing other ways to understand student success. For us the frontier that comes beyond that is the development of predictive models that let us benchmark against actual graduation rates and also freshmen retention rates against expected performance that take into account the profile of students. This is becoming the holy grail of data systems. It’s not enough to have raw numbers. Over reliance on pure raw outcomes compared across institutions that are quite different can understate success, can distort the results of some schools, especially those with populations that have academic or other challenges. Predictive measures are not an excuse but they are a way to find relative effectiveness and compare institutions with like types of populations to see where the value add is and to identify schools that even with those predictive subtleties are not doing well enough by the students to warrant their continuation or
support from taxpayers.

So we have been starting to look for predictive measures that we can add to the tools that we use to understand institutions. The -- we certainly don’t -- we know that we are not the only ones doing this, there are many different ways to come at it, there are many different people who are doing work along these lines.

And we’re trying to collaborate them -- collaborate with them but at the same time, we’re working to take advantage of the fact that we have a universe of institutions that we understand quite well. Data that is available to us that we can easily manipulate, a manageable scale of institutions so that we could actually sit down with members and see what is understandable to them, what we’re missing, make improvements over time and do things that we can then share with other accreditors with folks like you, with other people who are trying to understand at a deeper level what successful performance looks like and what inadequate institutional performance looks like so that we can get beneath the surface and populate with new measures.

The -- a truer understanding, taking advantage of our region’s interest in doing all of this and in the lessons that
we’re taking from others who are doing this. So we are looking at predicted retention and graduation rates and we are looking at what student characteristics seem to be the most important so that we can provide new tools that institutions can use.

Let me just show you an example. This is a coming attraction and the distance is challenging but I can tell you what we did was identify one institution as just a preview of the kinds of things we’re going to be doing.

If you look simply at descending order of actual graduation rates, the University of Laverne in our region comes out about two-thirds of the way down the pack. It’s got an actual graduation rate of 63% -- not bad, but not terrific either. But if you resort those to take into account what we understood to be the predictive measures looking at our institutions performance, you get a very different story.

It turns out that Laverne, looking at its student population out-performs its predicted graduation rate substantially by 14% and is at the top of the group of institutions that we thought it was fair to compare them to. That column will show where Henry is highlighting shows the 14% over-performance and then the places that are doing just about what you’d expect given their student population and then at the bottom there are.
institutions we haven’t given you their names because this is still a work in progress, that have fallen short that we thought would do even better and should be really asking themselves why can’t we get better results for these students compared to other institutions who are doing a similar task.

Some of you might remember from scorecard conversations. I used to wear a necklace that had a diver to describe the diving analogy for reflecting our understanding of institutional performance by how hard a dive people are doing. Walter Kimbrough and I both used this example to explain why raw numbers alone aren’t enough. I’ve now for those of you who can see me on NACIQI I’m wearing my data necklace. I happened to be lucky and Madelaine Albright does it with pens, I do it with necklaces.

The point of this is to help institutions understand what they’re doing to identify peer groups so that they can benchmark performance and help everybody move forward and where I know another hat of quality assurance to help us identify which institutions are falling short so that our students pose challenges is not an excuse but is a way to understand how the school can do the best job it possibly can.

I mentioned that this is a set of coming attractions.
We are working further on this benchmarking project. I want to thank the fellows from our campuses who are helping us with both of these. The work that we do is embedded in our membership and we draw on institutional actors who are expert in these areas to help us design them so that they’re realistic and can make an actual difference to campuses and to be sure that we’re in touch with what is useful to them and that what we do can actually fold into their conversations on an institution-wide level about performance.

We are doing other presentations about the benchmarking project at institutional research conferences and we’re working on introducing it to our region so that people can understand how to put it to use and so that we have no surprises with our members and can use this and incorporate it into the conversations that we’re going to be having going forward.

With that I think this is a good point to break and see if you have questions or suggestions. I’ll just go back to where we started. We’re doing everything that we can to explain this, to share the work right from the beginning. There’s a white paper at the genesis of this project that was developed by John Etchemendy.

There were use cases including the UCLA example that Henry talked about. We are committed to making this work
available to anybody who’s interested in partnering with our
colleagues in accreditation with you and with everyone else who
wants to help move toward student success and a fair
understanding of quality and student -- to student performance in
our higher education institutions. So thank you again for this
opportunity and if you’d like we’d be happy to take questions.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jamie thank you, that was
an outstanding presentation. I think you’re really right on the cusp
of where we’re trying to go. Questions from the group, Brian and I
have a question but then Kathleen.

MR. JONES: I just have a quick question and first
let me say to you I have mad respect for any direct guy who can
incorporate a Tiny Wes album in his presentation but my question
really is for you. So as you know in the open policy debates there
is much talk of this idea of using risk adjusted metrics to measure
outcomes for institutions.

Is it fair to say the way you just talked about when
you think about assessing the predicted outcome -- I’m looking at
the predicted outcome for institutions -- is that -- do you use a risk
to adjust the metrics by another name or do you see a distinction
between what they’re doing and the risk adjustment debate?

MS. STUDLEY: You know we talked about this a
little last night because different people hear it in different ways.
So I’ll tell you how I understand it but it’s very possible that we
have applying it in different phases.

I use the phrases distance travelled or value added
that what we’re trying to get here is the contribution of the
institution from where their students start and what we know are
challenges for an institution to help somebody reach the learning
results and the results beyond that -- employment, civic
engagement, leadership in the community and so forth from
college.

I tend to hear risk adjusted as a measure that we use
when we think about institutions and the whole picture of the
institution, not because I don’t apply risk to students, but I think
some people do and maybe we -- you’re pointing out the need to
improve our language.

I think of the risk -- so it certainly is a term that
could be applied here. I tend to keep risk on the side of the
institutional measure and think about risk adjusted regulatory
results or for us we have 6, 8 and 10-year cycles of approval. We
see very little risk for an institution.

If we see very little risk for an institution and it’s
continued success based on its governance, financial stability and
the performance of the institution we would give it 10 years
because we think it’s low risk, 6 would represent a higher risk.
But there are people who think about predictive analytics as
measuring the possibility or the risk that you will not be able to
help students complete -- but as I say I think it’s a very fair
question because they’re used in very different ways.

MS. ALIOTO: I have two questions and the first
one is that we have concerns with students graduating or the
business community is saying students are graduating but they
don’t have the skills that we need. Is there any way in which this
addresses that challenge?

MS. STUDLEY: We and many others are
addressing that challenge but these numbers don’t directly do that.
What they rely on of course is that an institution by saying you are
ready to graduate and complete at this institution has rigorous
standards of its own for what deserves a diploma.

And because we have expectations about the core
competencies that students will have, critical thinking, quantitative
capacity, ability to work effectively with others in teams, those
actually are the same things that employers say they want. So
embedded in our saying are people graduating from your
institution is the notion that graduation includes being able to do
the very things that business people tell us are important core
cOMPETENCIES that they want their work force to be able to have
and that we know that citizens need.

So we are not directly measuring work force
readiness with these numbers, but the diplomas that it measures
should incorporate exactly what business wants. There’s a
separate conversation we’re having about how we convey that and
how we work with the business community, the non-profit, the
government community that is looking for our graduates from all
of our schools to be able to understand what they know and can do
and if they can’t do what’s important, how can they get that and
how can schools do so?

So they’re connected but it is not a direct measure
of work force readiness.

MS. ALIOTO: And the other question is directly
connected to that which I think that the -- that one of the major
problems that we have is what is actually occurring in the
classrooms of America.

And I’m concerned that we get involved in all of
this data collection and instead of helping the institutions to focus
on what’s actually occurring in classrooms and I don’t see that this
matrix is doing that in any way.
MS. STUDLEY: Actually I’d go back to the example of UCLA’s use in classrooms. That’s a very specific example but it shows us how in -- when this all works together beautifully and harmoniously the numbers -- I don’t start as a believer in numbers, I start as a believer in institutional improvement and working from every level in the institution to understand where your strengths are and understand where your weaknesses are.

So the numbers would help an institution whether it’s a strong one to be able to say even we have some places where we might have gaps. What are our areas of effectiveness, where might we be weak? Who’s falling off even if it’s only 7% it’s not going to trouble us in a pass fail accreditation model but the other hat that we wear -- the first hat that accreditors wore was institutional improvement.

So being able to look at those numbers and say who makes up that group that’s failing? If it should turn out to be women and STEM or older students or transfer students, it does help an institution dig down and do exactly what you want which is do it at the level of classroom teaching and student performance. So I think it’s a combination of the two -- we can help pinpoint those, was that helpful?
What we’re doing is trying to have those conversations on every campus. When we arm our review teams with these kinds of numbers, they can go to an institution and say how are you feeling about this? Did you notice that schools that you identify as your peers are generating better results?

What do you think accounts for that? What are you doing at the campus level that can help you move forward?

Whether they’re struggling or whether they’re doing well we think this is really just a flashlight. It’s not the end of the story it’s a flashlight.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jamie I have a question, then Rick and then Ralph.

Your association is probably the most homogeneous of all the institutional accreditors. I’d say 98-99% of your members are Baccalaureate or above. Do you think your model would be applicable to some of the more diverse groups that -- let’s say North Central or Higher Learning Commission or SACS which has community colleges, all kinds of other potential institutions?

MS. STUDLEY: Ah, let me start but Henry has been having conversations for several years even before I came to
WASC with other regions who are quite interested in what we’re doing. And as I said we’re eager to share it for a variety of reasons.

One -- we’ve invested a lot of time and thought and think it can help students. Another is that to really use this body of knowledge we need a bigger sample size than our membership allows so we also have a very practical interest in hoping that others will use it as well so that we can broaden to different institutions.

But while obviously other accrediting agencies can speak to whether it works for them and for their populations. It’s a general applicability it should work especially because you can set your own peers that you want to look at so you can set it by institutional type of population or scale or resources or rural urban or any other way that you want to understand your comparison, do you want to add to that?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, yeah and it’s a great question actually because we’ve been presenting on this for a number of years, received lots of inquiries from institutions throughout the country who are experimenting with it regardless of what’s happening, you know, as far as a requirement from their accreditor whether regional or national.
And like we talked about at the beginning this is we hope a useful tool in a toolbox of things that institutions can use. It’s not the better IPEDS it’s another framework and in that regard for institutions that have that sort of population of those non-traditional students so they’re trying to find a more inclusive way to capture success it can be useful. If they’re highly enrollment volatile, it’s not as useful. If perhaps they’re a graduate institution, on the face of it the methodology, the way of thinking about efficiency and the inputs versus the outputs would be applicable but the tools we built you know, they’re just not ready for say the graduate community or if they’re not specifically designed for the say -- community college community, but I think the conceptual framework is very applicable.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Rick, then Ralph, then Anne.

MR. O’DONNELL: Thank you, great presentation. My question is around the kind of the comparison tool by identifying institutions that are exceeding expectations or not exceeding expectations. I’m just curious how are those expectations set? I often worry that in higher ed as people look at
peer institutions if everyone’s performing poorly and you measure yourself against institutions that aren’t doing great you look great.

But and so do we have an expectation that institutions truly are designing themselves to serve at risk populations if that’s who they serve in a way that really makes those students successful in college?

And so are there bright lines where you would assume any institution should be meeting or are your expectations that, you know, for instance, if a certain group of colleges all have low graduation rates and have for years that’s -- I don’t want to say it’s okay but doing a little bit better than their peers good enough. I’m just curious how you set the expectations to compare.

MS. STUDLEY: Henry can talk about how we designed the algorithm that we’re using but we have along with our fellow regional accreditors established a set of numbers that are not bright line pass fail, but are level that we use for further inquiry.

So this is not a way to say if everybody is doing poorly and not serving people everybody gets a pass. Quite the opposite -- it’s to help us distinguish at a point above when we’re all in a conversation about with adequate institutions how we can do that improvement and to identify where we need to look further
because institutions even when they have a population that might
be more complex and I’m including a variety of factors -- this can
include age, it can include things that are not captured by us -- how
far people are commuting, what their, you know family situation
is, what stresses are they under but we use it both to identify where
we should dig deeper to determine whether an institution is in fact
meeting our standards and should be eligible to participate -- not as
a bright line but as part of a tool kit of inquiries, some of which is
judgmental based on visiting that institution, watching what it
does, talking to its leadership, talking to its students and faculty
and staff.

And then for those that are doing well enough to
continue to participate, how can we move them all toward greater
success and well with that why don’t I let Henry answer your
specific question about how the algorithms were built.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, so it’s an excellent
question and one that we’ve actually spent a good bit of time
churning over. So as we looked at what are the predictors of
student success we were very careful that we wanted to isolate
from the analysis the institution’s characteristics, the money they
spend, the endowment, all that from the students that they serve.

So the model is based purely on IPEDS data so it’s
public data and it’s based on the student population characteristics. So things like their preparedness and we look at things like SAT score, their race, ethnicity, gender profiles, those kinds of factors were all analyzed over I think 200 different factors were looked at. We identified the core set of things that are most predictive and that’s where this number comes from. So in essence it’s not a gameable system because your comparator is yourself. It’s the perfect comparator based on the exact students that you serve and the analysis is done using the entire universe of institutional data in IPEDS. So for this model we had say 1,700 institutions that we pulled all the profile data of their students and said how do they perform and then based on that profile and how it matches with say University of Laverne, how should they perform? And if the tide rises so will the expectation. So in other words if you start changing your admission’s profile and you become more selective, the expectation of the model adjusts accordingly year over year. So you’re bar will go higher as you admit better students. And I’ll use John and Stanford is an example. When we looked at Stanford we said, “Aha, they’re doing as we expect they would given the students they serve.” And that’s why
this is so interesting is that it’s differentiating for all to see that
based on this kind of population, how are you doing in serving
them?

And for us the big “aha” here as an accreditor is we can have these conversations with the institutions that are out performing against their expectations to find out what are you doing? What’s the secret sauce here? How are you achieving this excellent result so we can then share that with our region or if they’re institutions that are falling short year over year, then it gives us like Jamie said that flashlight -- that way to say well no actually, other institutions that serve students just like you are doing a lot better.

So are you in a position to serve that population or not and that’s a piece of the puzzle that we haven’t had. I hope that -- I hope that and I’m happy to share the actual model and what the factors are and all the regression analysis if you’re in to that kind of thing.

MR. WOLFF: Yeah, thank you. I’d just like to first of all acknowledge how far you’ve come but I want to -- Henry started with the history and I will say when I was President in Jamie’s position that we launched this commitment to retention and student success and the first iteration didn’t work well.
It was too cumbersome. So one -- I want to commend that the Commission stayed with it and I also want to acknowledge that John came up with -- John Etchemendy came up with a good deal of the model because the original model didn’t work. And it is important I think to say these are not easy issues to address given the complexity of the data, the types of institutions and it does take time.

And so I want to commend the fact that your commitment to transparency which I tried to launch but is real and that you’re sharing all this data. One of the biggest concerns we had in institutions I’ve had is what if our data isn’t good and we put it out and make it public, is it going to damage us?

And I think the fact that all of this is public is really an important part of the process and you’re continuing to iterate it. So Henry, I have two very quick questions. One, does it seem to work as well for online institutions? I don’t know why I’m asking. I would think it would but I just wonder is there anything different for large scale whether it’s Ashford or others that want to skip credits that are fairly large institutions that are predominantly online.

And you also made a comment that it wouldn’t work for community colleges or I think that’s what you said
Henry, and I know Richard’s sitting there but I wonder to the extent that nearly half the students are in community colleges and we are really struggling to know what completion means in that context.

If you just unpack that a little more and then I just have one other question after that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: So I’ll reserve my third question, thanks Ralph. So on the issue of online colleges it’s not so much about online, it’s about admission patterns. And again the beauty of this model is that it’s blind or doesn’t care about cohorts in the traditional IPEDS methodology.

So for an online school that admits, you know, every week even it’s fine because we’re just looking at census dates of July 1 - June 30, what happened. It’s snapshots -- what happened. And then we’re tracking that equation -- that balance of inputs and outputs over the course of each of those years.

So in those cases it does work and can work. That’s not the challenge of the model. The challenge of the model is when there is sustained or volatile enrollment patterns so if you have an institution that is in rapid and steady and pervasive growth or decline, it’s a highly sensitive tool because it’s again those yearly snapshots, so it throws the numbers off.
It’s not that it’s not useful because it’s showing what’s happening. It’s say oh, your enrollment is year over year, 10, 15, 20% up or down, it’s just part of the noise of the model that we look at from a smoothing point of view of let’s look at a longer period.

So not just the one year but let’s look at 8 years of data to see where that trend smooths out. Now with community colleges --

MS. STUDLEY: Could I just add something to that? All of that is absolutely true but at the core we have to be sure that every diploma means something so for every institution of every type you can count whether people get the diploma or not but the proof of whether that has value is whether what they’re getting reflects a responsible program and some value.

So this is another case in which no one number by itself answers all the questions. I don’t have to tell you or the members of NACIQI that. So we look at the educational program and the performance -- the achievement of student learning outcomes on the way to getting the thing that we’re measuring here which is do you graduate and how does that compare to other institutions?

And then we all are expecting institutions to look at
things like whether people are employed, going back to Kathleen’s question -- whether people are employed, whether they default on their loans or are able to repay them as an indicator of whether the employment market thinks that they’ve got value.

So yes we think that the question applies equally well to any kind of program but we still have to do the traditional things that we do which is look at what happened on the way to the diploma and what happens to the student after they received it to understand whether there’s effectiveness all the way around,

community colleges?

MR. HERMANDEZ: Yeah, I’ll just switch back to one slide -- this one which I think is the key issue for us with community college. It’s that last grade outfit of transfers. So you know at WASC Senior we don’t have this population. We have, you know, Maui, sort of a community college used to be.

But institutions whose mission is to serve in a transitional place in the educational continuum of students -- in other words students are coming in intending to transfer -- this is what they’ll tell you on their entrance survey and this is what plays out unless institutions are in a good position to understand that that student did indeed go somewhere to continue their education,

that’s where they can get tripped up in this model.
If they can do that either because they’ve built their own system to track it or they participate in Clearing House, or for our point of view they’re actually reporting that optional transfer question on IPEDS, you know, that’s a hard thing for us to verify, but that’s a key part of this puzzle that we’re trying to sort out is that transfer issue of not just like the new outcomes measures -- who’s transferring in but who’s transferring out and where are they going.

Like, you know, did they go on to succeed? Well that’s a success and we didn’t talk about another pilot project that we’ve been doing with Clearing House data but I think it kind of plays into this conversation which is if we look at the student level, those same kind of measures and we see -- we can see that that student goes on to graduate, there’s our answer and that’s where it can work for institutions like community colleges, or other smaller institutions that serve in that transitional capacity.

MR. WOLFF: I know the Chair is concerned about time so I’ll make this a comment rather than a stated question. We’re all worried about bright lines and yet on the other hand there are points at which there are institutions whose completion rates are completely unacceptable.

And so on the one hand while there are -- these are
efforts that are focused on getting learning and getting it right each
and iterating it. At some point all Commissions are going to need
to make declarative statements that this is not good enough and
institutions are going to need to be able to demonstrate
improvement.

And I would just make the comment that there is a
point at which the data needs to become more consequential -- not
the only data point but consequential around being able to answer
how and when our accrediting commissions, particularly regionals,
going to make decisions that completion data are not adequate and
to take some kind of declarative action and mandate follow-up -- I
understand not at that point but I would just say that you’re
building your foundation I think to make more responsible
judgments along with others than just the IPEDS data, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you Ralph, Anne?

MS. NEAL: Well I just want to welcome you both.

Jamie it’s good to see you again. I’m delighted to hear your
presentation but given my new job I guess I’ll be the skunk of the
garden party. I just wanted to renew a concern I raised yesterday
when we were meeting with the lawyers that I am concerned that
we are praising and privileging a particular approach from a
regulated entity.
And I find that troubling and particularly I think just going to Kathleen’s question because at the end of the day we’re trying to determine whether or not our colleges and universities are adding value and producing educated graduates and a point that Ralph’s making we’ve all for years on this body been trying to struggle with what is quality and we know that that is an issue that the creditors have problems with, that institutions have problems with and for better or for worse, we have in so many ways turned to graduation rates as a proxy for quality.

And I think what concerns me is that in listening to this and it’s very important that we get the data right, that it goes to the really -- the essence of accreditation and how do we assess quality? And I hope that by listening to this and hearing about better data in terms of completion rates that we don’t then ignore a broader question about what are other metrics which are not like these that accreditors might be looking at that go directly to issues of quality such as rigorous reading and writing or assurance of a lack of grade inflation or a core curriculum or a student teacher interaction or an expected research paper, or internship.

Indicia of ways to get educational quality that don’t go to these less than perfect issues of graduation rates, so I just wanted to raise that concern and thank you at the same time.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude?

MR. PRESSNELL: Thank you for the presentation

and I agree with you I think that this is one tool in a toolbox and

we need to really explore other options around the whole quality

and really student success model is to attract what that means and I

think Kathleen, you know, in that tune, terms of employers

satisfaction and you know, are we actually making an impact in the

workplace in the non-profit community, in the civil society as a

whole so I think that’s true.

So part of my question was around student mobility.

You hit that on Ralph’s question. Obviously I was trying to figure

out how in the world do you handle these transfer students. If you

could give me though a little more clarification on -- you know,

you have students who are stopping out and then you’re saying

then you can pick them up when they come back -- I would still

think that they may not come back to your institution even though

you have a homogeneous set of institutions, there’s still student

mobility in many of those institutions.

So how are you tracking -- how are you tracking

them?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Got you, fair enough
question. So again we want to think about this as like census data, it’s a yearly slide so what happened July 1 - June 30, July 1 - June 30. So in year one we have a student named Claude who’s taking a course, he’s seeking a degree.

In year two Claude doesn’t come back. We don’t think he transferred because we didn’t see him go anywhere so we’re going to count you and your units as a non-continuing student. In year three you show up again, hey Claude, welcome back.

So now you go back in the enrolled student and continuing unit pile. So that’s just going to happen in slices. So it’s that over time view on the inputs of students attending and the outputs of student graduating or those students dropping out.

With the transfers, once we identify that in year two it’s not that you didn’t come back, it’s that you went on to community college and that’s where we would count you in essence.

MR. PRESSNELL: You’d count them then at that institution?

MR. HERNANDEZ: You’d count them as not inactive, non-continuing student, withdrawn, stop out, whatever you want to call them. You would then discount that student from
those counts because you knew they went on to go to another college to pursue that success. So it’s in that yearly census slices of where are the students at this moment? Are they actively enrolled? Have they transferred? Have they just stopped and we don’t know what happened or did they graduate? You can’t be all of those at the same time.

MR. PRESSNELL: Right so are you able to as a recruiter are you able to look at least among your membership and look at that student mobility piece to know if I went from one institution to another institution within your --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, unfortunately we can’t do it with these data because for this this is a -- this is like a 30,000 foot view of the institutions. What we’re expecting at the institutional level when the teams and the staff talk to them that they’re taking the time to chase these white rabbits down their holes to the point of the student to say I know my 532 non-continuing student’s name, you know, course loads, programs of study, you know, it’s at that level that we’re expecting the institution’s because that’s the way in which they can make informed decisions about you know, what are the patterns here with those students?

What are we not doing that we could be in advising
or you know, academic support? But I have a ton of this stuff on
the website that you know, or we could sit down with John.

MR. PRESSNELL: Well let me again compliment
you on the hard work here because I think that the first-time full-
time freshman cohort is grossly out of date. It only applies to
actually a very minority set of institutions. I work with 34
universities and I'd say it works with 3 of them, maybe 4 and the
rest of my members it doesn't work at all.

So I think that that's really, really critical and I
think too that it's more reflective of student behavior. Not that we
want students to prolong their time to a degree but it does take into
account life circumstances that might be, you know, that might be
taking place.

I think that what's critical again -- I mentioned this
yesterday is that we’ve just got to keep, you know, our shoulder to
the wheel on removing -- identifying and removing as many
barriers as possible for student success and student completion that
we very possibly can.

And for those things that we can try clearly to
identify and what can we control, what can we not control. There
are things that we can control, let’s get about them and get them
done. But I appreciate, you know, this new approach, a different
way of looking at it that again puts a tool in the toolbox but doesn’t
necessarily identify all components of student success but I think
it’s a good move, thanks.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you Claude. Well it
seems that’s to be the end of our questions and I want to thank you
for being here. I think you should be rewarded, you know, not
rewarded but certainly congratulated for your hard work in this
area and a lot of positive things in there in terms of looking at the
issue of differential students and different types of students and
different types of institutions.

I think you should be applauded and thank you for
being here and hopefully we won’t see you for a while because I
think you were up last time right?

MS. STUDLEY: That’s right. Thank you very
much we really appreciate this and we, you know, we have a lot of
humility about the fact that it is only one piece of a complex
puzzle. There are a lot of things that happen within the institution
that can’t be captured this way but it helps us identify where we
should be having which conversations and to the extent that
schools find it helpful to be able to put their effort in the right
places.

We’re also very happy to share it with others and
know that it’s a part of a very extensive conversation about ways of understanding through metrics and also through judgment and expertise when schools are doing well enough by their students to warrant participation or when we can help even good schools get better.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you very much.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: We’re now going to move into our beginning. Let me go through this and then we’ll take a break because we’ll have to switch out.

What we’re going to be doing after we take a break is begin our process of review. The Commission that we’ll be looking at will be the Renewal of Recognition for the Council of Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs. Our process is very specific and I’m going to go over that again now.

Once we have the Primary Readers who were assigned the task, will introduce the Agency’s application at which point the Department staff will provide us a briefing. The Agency representatives will then be able to provide comments about their application. The Primary Readers will then question the Agency including the standard questions which we adopted for initial renewal application, then questions by the rest of NACIQI
followed by response and comment from the Agency.

If there are third party comments, the third party commenters will come before us at which point the Agency then has an ability to respond to the third-party comments. Getting close to the end the Department staff responds to the Agency and the third-party comments, then a motion is made, discussion will occur and then a vote and then if necessary we will be looking at the final set of standard questions.

So that’s our process. Now I am recusing myself from this next meeting at which point Frank is not here and our former Chair Susan Phillips will step in to take over the podium or whatever we are, thank you. We have a 10 minute break.

(Break 9:48 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.)

**RENEWAL OF RECOGNITION**

**COUNCIL ON ACCREDITATION OF NURSE ANESTHESIA EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

**(COANAEP)**

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Alright we’re going to get started again. Welcome back to part 2 of the second day of our NACIQI meeting. I’m Susan Phillips drawn out of retirement to serve as Chair temporarily. Good afternoon and welcome back, good morning, welcome back.
I’m Susan Phillips I’ve been drawn out of retirement to serve as Chair for this particular session. Before we get into the Agency review before us I wanted to ask John Etchemendy to introduce himself. He wasn’t available at our earlier time, John if you would just introduce yourself to add to the equation here.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I’m John Etchemendy from Stanford.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you John. The Agency before us is a Renewal of Recognition for, excuse me, the Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs. I got all of the words right on that. Any recusals for the record -- okay, hearing none let me invite the Primary Readers -- Reader now to introduce the Agency application.

MR. JONES: Thank you, the Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs accredits institutions and programs that prepare nurses to become practicing nurse anesthetists.

The Agency currently accredits 120 programs located in 38 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico which includes two single purpose free-standing institutions. The Agency’s most recently full review for recognition was in the
spring of 2007 at which time the Agency’s recognition was renewed for a period of 5 years and it was granted and expansion of its scope of recognition to include distance education and to modify the scope to include territories.

The COA appeared before NACIQI at its December, 2013 meeting with its petition for continued recognition. The NACIQI recommended to the Secretary that he continue the Agency’s recognition and required the Agency to come in to compliance.

Following the compliance report that occurred in 2015 the Agency’s recognition was reviewed and the current review is the next scheduled review for re-recognition of the Agency.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you very much.

Valerie Lefor is the staff member for this Agency and if you could also fill out the Agency’s profile.

MS. LEFOR: Great, thank you. Good morning members of the Committee. For the record my name is Valerie Lefor and I will now be presenting a summary of the petition for continued recognition submitted by the Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs referred to as the COA or the Council.
The staff recommendation to the senior Department official for the Agency is to renew the Agency’s recognition for a period of 5 years. Based on a review of the information in the Agency’s petition, and observation of a site visit in October, 2017 and a Council meeting in January 2018, Department staff found that COA is in compliance with the Secretary’s criteria for recognition with no issues or concerns.

The Department has not received any written third-party comments or complaints regarding this Agency during this review cycle. Therefore, again the staff recommendation to the senior Department official for the Agency is to renew the Agency’s recognition for a period of 5 years.

Representatives are here from the Agency and I and them will be happy to answer any questions that you may have, this concludes my report, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you very much. Representatives of the Agency please come forward. Welcome, if you could introduce yourselves and any comments that you’d like to provide.

MR. WALKER: My name is Jim Walker and I’m President of the Council.

MR. GERBASI: Yeah I’ll go ahead and start if
CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Introductions if you would for both of you.

MR. GERBASI: It is part of my presentation, thanks.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you.

MR. GERBASI: Madam Chair and members of NACIQI on behalf of the Council on Accreditation for Nurse Anesthesia Education and the 120 programs it accredits, good morning. My name is Frank Gerbasi, I serve as the Chief Executive Officer for the Council and I’ve done that for 16 years. With me today is the President of the Council, Dr. Jim Walker. Dr. Walker is the Program Administrator for the Baylor College of Medicine, Doctor of Nursing Practice Program, Nurse Anesthesia. Also with me today is Dr. Laura Bonanno, Vice President of the Council.

Dr. Bonanno is the Program Administrator for the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center School of Nursing, Nurse Anesthesia option.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today in support of the Council’s petition for continued recognition by the U.S. Department of Education. We want you to know that...
the Council is working to ensure nurse anesthesia educational
programs are providing students with a high quality education.

All nurse anesthesia programs today are at the
graduate level and they must meet rigorous standards and
requirements that are established by the Council. We would like to
thank Valerie LeFor, Chuck Mula, Herman Bounds and Jennifer
Hong for their assistance in providing guidance in the development
and the submission of our petition.

The Council received the final staff analysis on May
14th, the final state report indicates the Council is in full
compliance with the recognition requirements and the Council
appreciates the thorough review and the positive findings.

We would like to take the opportunity here to
respond to the standard questions on improving institutional and
program quality that NACIQI has been asking accreditors for
renewal of their recognition.

We have each taken a topic to discuss. I would like
to start with discussing the Council’s decisions and data gathering
activities. Dr. Bonanno will address the Council standards and
practices related to student achievement and Dr. Walker will
conclude by addressing the Council’s activities in improving
programs and actions.
The Council and certified registered nurse anesthetists are taking to address the opioid crisis. In the interest of time we will keep our responses brief and welcome any questions at the conclusion of our presentation. Since the Council’s last review of NACIQI in 2013 for continued recognition, the Council has approved 54 programs for continued accreditation, 11 new programs for new initial accreditation and 48 programs were approved for transitioning to the Doctoral level for entry into practice.

The Council has also reviewed 66 mid-point student and faculty evaluations and 979 clinical sites were approved. During this time 30 programs were placed on monitoring for their certification exam pass rates. No programs have been placed on probation or had their accreditation revoked.

When serious concerns regarding the program’s compliance with the standards are identified, the Council has determined a mechanism to conduct what we term an unannounced on-site visit. The Council has conducted 4 unannounced on-site reviews during this time period.

In 2008 the Council established a requirement that all nurse anesthesia programs award a practice Doctoral Degree to students entering programs on January 1st, 2022 and thereafter.
I’m pleased to report that at this time 72 out of the 120 programs have been approved to award a Doctoral Degree for entry into practice. As far as data gathering and the review by the Council, the Council requires all programs to submit annual reports. Annual reports provide the Council with data on the programs financial status, changes that could impact their accreditation status, student achievement indicators and plans to enhance the quality of their educational programs.

The Council also conducts anonymous student and faculty evaluations at the mid-point of program’s accreditation cycles and also prior to on-site visits. The Council carefully reviews the evaluations and requires programs to provide progress reports on areas that have been identified as concerns.

Dr. Bonanno will now address the standards and practices regarding student achievement.

MS. BONANNO: It is my pleasure to appear before NACIQI today and to assure you that the Council has established effective standards and accreditation policies and procedures to assess student achievement in its accredited programs.

Programs can establish their own student achievement indicators, however, all programs must meet the
Council’s required indicators including national certification exam pass rates, attrition and employment rates.

Through the Council’s annual report process, programs report their attrition and employment rates. The Council obtains programs NCE pass rates directly from the National Board of Certification and Recertification of Nurse Anesthetist or the NBCRNA which is the only organization that administers a national certification exam for nurse anesthetist.

The Council first established standards and policies for the assessment of programs NCE pass rates in 2004. Since then revisions have been made based on the Council’s ongoing assessment of program data.

In 2014 the Council revised the requirements and established a preferred NCE pass rate of 80% for all first-time takers in a testing period. The established mandatory pass rate is 80% of all first-time takers when considering the three most recent graduation cohorts.

Programs that do not meet the Council’s mandatory benchmark are placed in monitoring. While in monitoring programs must conduct a causal analysis designed to improve their graduate’s ability to pass the NCE and provide the Council will annual status reports.
Programs must have two consecutive years at or above the mandatory benchmark to come off of monitoring. Programs identified as being out of compliance with the standards must come into compliance within 24 months. Due to the newness of the revised policy, no programs have yet received an adverse action related to the NCE pass rates.

I’m pleased to report nurse anesthesia programs completion and employment rates are very high. The national average for program completion is 97% and programs report 100% of graduates are employed as CRNA’s within 6 months of program completion.

Due to the rigor of nurse anesthesia education, student’s ability to work while enrolled is very limited. As a result students can acquire significant debt, however due to the high demand for CRNA’s graduates can secure employment and repay loans in a relatively short period of time.

The Council President, Dr. Walker, will now conclude our presentation.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, I also appreciate having the opportunity to speak before you today. An important part of the Council’s mission is to assist programs and improving their educational quality. The Council conducts a number of
activities in support of this mission including hosting workshops such as the self-study workshop, Doctoral Degree transition workshop and new program administrator’s workshop.

The President, Vice President and staff also hold informal meetings with programs at the nurse anesthesia annual Congress to provide guidance in helping programs enhance their quality.

The Council provides presentations and participates in open forums to convey important accreditation information and respond to questions at our national assembly of school faculty. In regard to identifying the at-risk status of programs while we do not use the term “at-risk” per se, we do carefully monitor programs’ compliance with the standards using tools such as the program’s annual report data and anonymous student and faculty evaluations.

The Council follows up with the programs that are not in full compliance with our standards. The programs are required to provide progress reports when an area’s non-compliance are identified. As previously mentioned the Council conducts unannounced site visits when concerns are identified through ongoing monitoring.

In addition, the length of continued accreditation that is awarded is based on the program’s compliance with the
standards and accreditation history. The number of years granted decreases based on the program’s lack of compliance with the standards and history of accreditation related concerns.

The most commonly cited standards relate to the program’s committee structure including public students and faculty participation, the governance structures facilitating appropriate involvement and communication, a lack of compliance with the Council’s policies and lastly the program’s continuous self-assessment promoting program effectiveness, purposeful change and needed improvement.

These tools have worked well in identifying programs at risk and helping programs improve their educational quality. The workshop attendees provide positive feedback and have helped programs implement improvements.

Awarding years of continued accreditation based on the degree of the program’s compliance with the standards, has helped programs address concerns by requiring an earlier review by the Council for Continued Accreditation.

The unannounced on-site visits have assisted programs in addressing compliance issues and making improvements that were not otherwise possible.

Lastly I would like to briefly discuss the important
activities the Council and the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists are doing to address the opioid crisis. Over 2 million people each year switch to persistent opioid use after surgery and nearly half of all U.S. opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid. The Council and the AANA are calling on the healthcare community to use opioid-sparing pain management techniques to better present opioid addiction and abuse.

Once such approach is termed “enhanced recovery after surgery,” or ERAS. This includes a patient-centered evidence based pain management strategy employed by the peri-operative team to reduce the needs for opioids, improve patient outcomes and reduce cost.

In addition, continuing education and professional development activities have been developed to enhance CRNA’s knowledge and skills in pain management. This includes an acute surgical and advanced pain management fellowship programs, sub-specialty certification by the NBCRNA is now available and non-surgical pain management.

We also support current federal legislation that would help the healthcare system better utilize CRNA’s as part of the inter-disciplinary team to help fight the opioid crisis. The Council appreciates having the opportunity to appear before
NACIQI today and we would be happy to entertain any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you very much.

Questions by the Primary Readers?

MR. JONES: Sure, thank you for that thorough presentation. So you cited remarkable statistics -- 100% employment and so a question for you about the demand we’ve talked to a medical school program accreditor yesterday and talked about the, you know, the lack of qualified doctors in rural and underserved areas.

I assume that is a challenge that your community faces as well. And so I’m curious how you think about that, how your institutions are addressing the demand issues you might be seeing.

MR. WALKER: So the anticipated growth is about 19% for our specialty. Our national organization has recently embarked upon a work force study. I serve as a technical expert on that panel. We are working with them to help identify what the real need is and as you mentioned it can be difficult but we will use all available data sources to attempt to get at that. Our programs certainly are aware of the shortage of nurse anesthetists that exists today and we also have data from the
national member survey that the AANA conducts that indicates
that in the next 8 years about 25 to 30% of the nurse anesthetists in
the country will be retiring and so we will definitely have a
challenge replacing those.

So hopefully the work force study will identify
closer to what that need is and in respond to that our programs can
make necessary adjustments.

MR. JONES: Great, and is there any attention
though given to encouraging institutions to make sure that they are
attentive to those pockets of need in the country. Again, whether
in rural areas, low-income urban areas or otherwise?

MR. WALKER: So that is a piece of data that the
ANA does follow fairly closely and the majority of anesthesia
services provided in rural hospitals across the U.S. are provided by
nurse anesthetists. So we are very attuned to the needs in our rural
communities in particular.

The statistics regarding where nurse anesthetists
practice are, of course, located in the big cities and so that
definitely addresses some of the urban needs that we are fully
aware of that our nurse anesthetist colleagues are providing
important services toward that end.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. WALKER: You bet.

MR. JONES: That’s all I’ve got.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you, questions from other members, Claude?

MR. PRESSNELL: Yes, thank you for a very good presentation. I appreciate it. So on your website you indicate that there’s a voluntarily closure of an institution in Rhode Island. And I was just curious if you could give us a little insight around that. Was that an anticipated closure that you knew was coming and I saw that you’ve approved the teach-out plan -- are the students sufficiently protected in that?

MR. GERBASI: Yeah that was a voluntary closure where the financial support for the anesthesia program was eliminated and that forced the program to close. So they are going through a process they’re no longer admitting students into the program and I think their tentative date for their last graduating class is in the fall of 2019.

MR. PRESSNELL: It was a hospital based program?

MR. GERBASI: Yes.

MR. PRESSNELL: So about how many are hospital based and how many are independent or university based?
MR. GERBASI: Well yeah, I don’t have the exact number on that but all of the programs are at the graduate level so even for those that are still hospital based they all have academic affiliations with universities. I’m not sure what the exact number of hospital based we have versus university based but I would say the majority of the nurse anesthesia programs currently are based within universities.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Further questions -- Ralph?

MR. WOLFF: Thank you, since you were here yesterday you might be prepared for this but around student participation I’d be curious to know how students are involved in your process and whether they’re involved in teams or decision making at the Commission level, but proven to be an area of great interest and we’re learning a lot, thank you.

MR. WALKER: It’s an excellent question and the short answer is yes. We have a student member on the Council. That person is elected each year. They serve for a one year period of time and there are within the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists there are 7 geographic regions that are identified and so the student representative for the Council rotates between all 7 of those each year so we take nominations and then the Council
votes and makes a decision, they’re elected to a Board.

The student representative is involved in absolutely
everything we do. They’re assigned to committees. When we are
reviewing programs they are assigned to a work group and they
participate fully in that and at the Council meeting they are fully
involved in our decision-making process. And in fact we
encourage their participation and sometimes when there’s an issue
that is something that we want more of the student’s perspective,
we will even ask them to please opine.

So we definitely value them and consider them a
very important part of our decision-making processes.

MR. GERBASI: And I would just add to that also
not only do we have the student on the Council but the Council
also really values student input into the accreditation process. I
don’t think many of the accreditors do anonymous student and
faculty evaluations which the Council does at the mid-point in a
program’s accreditation cycle as well as prior to the on-site visits.

We get feedback from the students on the programs.

We also during the on-site visit, they meet with the students
specifically and obtain their concerns and in our standard we
require that programs have processes in place to get a valuation
feedback from the students and that they have a process to
incorporate those concerns into their on-going quality improvement activities.

We also require that they do alumni evaluations after the students have finished the program and we get -- and they get employer evaluations of the graduates as well.

MR. WOLFF: Can I follow-up on Brian’s question from a different angle and that’s how do you track the diversity of your students and it’s not only the ability to address inner-city needs or rural needs or different needs but could you comment on given this is a licensure mandate but you not only need people to serve in that area but people representative of the communities themselves.

MR. GERBASI: Yeah, the -- well the Council supports activities in diversity in a number of ways but it is challenging to nurse anesthesia programs because the applicants from a pretty defined pool. All of the individuals that are applicants have to be registered nurses and they have to have Baccalaureate Degrees.

They have to have at least a year of intensive care experience and most of them have 3 years of experience so you kind of define into a small pool, you know, the applicants as far as looking at diversity.
So when you look at diversity you really have to start that process before they even become a nurse and I know some programs have activities that are related to that. Currently we track -- the Council tracks diversity through its annual report data and we ask programs to provide us with the ethnicity of their students as well as their faculty.

And currently the last report 2017 about 20% of the student body was in a non-white distribution of individuals. We -- like I said participation in activities that try to promote diversity -- we are involved in a CRNA diversity workshop that’s held a couple of times a year and that workshop is really focused on applicants that are applying -- minority applicants that are applying to nurse anesthesia programs as well as the individuals in programs helping them, giving them some points to help them be successful in that endeavor.

We also support the activities of our professional association, the AANA. They have a diversity and inclusion committee that specifically works on that area as well.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: We have Steve and then Simon and then Bobbie.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: So I understand your entry into practice here in a few years we’ll be the Doctorate Degree.
What’s the percentage of people practicing now with Doctorate’s compared to Master’s?

MR. WALKER: I’ll speak to that. I don’t know the exact percentage because we have not had Doctoral programs for really long but I would guess it’s probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 to 15% in that area.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Is this a controversial issue among current practitioners? Does everybody say we see the need, we have to raise the bar?

MR. WALKER: I don’t think ever does everybody -- but our process has been a very lengthy process getting to this point. The first discussions happened in the early ‘90’s about moving to the Doctoral level and at that time there was certainly not support for it for a variety of reasons.

And as time moved forward the American Association of Colleges of Nursing took a stand that they felt that all APRN’s needed to be at the Doctorate level and because of those conversations it caused us to revisit this issue.

And the way that that was approached, the AANA appointed a Doctoral Task Force that spent a year canvassing various communities of interest, looking at all evidence that was available, comparative analysis of our programs as would be
benchmark against other Doctoral programs, other Master’s programs and the results of that strongly led us to the fact that we probably needed to move to the Doctoral level.

The complexity of healthcare today requires very in-depth education. Our specialty has people’s lives in their hands and it’s very important that we stay abreast of everything.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Well we all appreciate your focus on quality assurance.

MR. WALKER: Yes, definitely.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Pathways was the question I had. I think Ralph’s question kind of got at that in terms of your answer of a Baccalaureate Degree in nursing as a gate as entry in, if the person has a Master’s and Nursing Degree does that shorten the pathway or I assume that’s a good -- an appropriate pathway as well or do they need to take the Master’s from your Council?

MR. WALKER: So it really depends on the institution’s policies about what they accept. Some programs will accept an MSN in lieu of a BSN. We have some programs that don’t require a Bachelor’s Degree in nursing specifically that can be a Bachelor of Science in a related science, biology, chemistry -- that sort of thing as long as they are a registered nurse with the requisite intensive care nursing experience.
So some institutions will consider transfer credit if they have a Master’s Degree already. There may be some course work that the institution might reasonably accept but again that’s at the institutional level. They have to meet our curriculum requirements and our standards are very specific to what curriculum has to be in place and as long as the program can demonstrate that their processes assure that our curriculum standards are being met, we would be accepting of that.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: And they must have practiced as a nurse as well.

MR. WALKER: Yes.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: For entry.

MR. WALKER: Absolutely.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Sounds like that.

MR. WALKER: Yes.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Well I appreciate your focus on student achievement consistent with our desire and wishes of quality, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you I have Simon and then Kathleen.

MR. BOEHME: Yeah I was just going to acknowledge and Ralph beat me to it to ask about student
members. I appreciate my colleague’s question and also I note my
other colleague, Kathleen has been asking about the opioid crisis
and I find that very interesting to see how you are all addressing
that -- this crisis, so thank you for your work.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Kathleen?

MS. ALIOTO: Well I wanted to thank you for your
attention to this national crisis in terms of your responsibilities and
I’m also curious -- this might be out of left-field but what are the
statistics in terms of life and death with your nurses presently?

MR. WALKER: Is the question about do we have
data about the numbers that would be related to opioid misuse? Is
that --

MS. ALIOTO: Or period, you know somebody
goes in and has a general --

MR. WALKER: Oh, for anesthesia.

MS. ALIOTO: Yes.

MR. WALKER: Yes, so there are various studies
that have looked at that and the quality and safety of anesthesia
care has improved steadily over the last really 3 decades. It’s due
to a large number of reasons, monitoring is much more effective
than it was in previous decades. The drugs that we have available
to us are much safer and better studied.
And in terms of an absolute number, the number that I use is about 1 in a quarter million people will have some sort of negative outcome related to anesthesia. So it’s very rare that we have a significant mortality.

MS. ALIOTO: You said?

MR. WALKER: 1 in 250,000 -- one in a quarter million.

MS. ALIOTO: That’s pretty good huh?

MR. WALKER: Yeah.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you.

MR. WALKER: And we’re at that six sigma level, getting there.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Jill?

MS. DERBY: My question for you is whether or not those students -- those nurse anesthetists that now have Master’s Degrees will have opportunities pre-2022 to upgrade to the Doctoral level. Full disclosure -- I have a daughter who’s a nurse anesthetist. She works 2 days a month as part of her private practice in a rural clinic but I’ve cleared that I don’t have a conflict in this matter.

MS. BONANNO: There are various opportunities for CRNA’s educated at the Master’s level to achieve Doctoral
There are many, many programs throughout the country have Doctor of Nursing practice degree programs for post-
Master’s students that they can attend so we actually -- I know at my program we have a post-Master’s program so that those CRNA’s who want to reach the Doctoral level can achieve that.

MS. DERBY: Is it specifically in nurse anesthesia or are you saying more generally?

MS. BONANNO: Some are, some are Doctor of Nursing practice more general. Some, if they have nurse anesthesia in their title then they actually have to have Council on Accreditation approval. So that varies.

MR. GERBASI: We currently have 23 programs that offer post-Master’s CRNA, what we call completion degrees specifically for CRNA’s to go back and obtain their Doctoral Degree.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Any further questions from the Committee, and I don’t believe we have any third-party commenters, no -- further comments by the staff?

MS. LEFOR: I have nothing additional, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you. I’d entertain a motion.

MR. JONES: Alright, I move that we adopt the
staff recommendation to renew the Agency’s recognition for 5 years.

MS. DERBY: I’ll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: Thank you, any further discussion? Those in favor’s hands -- those opposed, abstentions, congratulations thank you for being here.

NACIQI RECOMMENDATION

NACIQI recommends to extend the Agency’s recognition for 5 years.

CHAIRMAN PHILLIPS: I’m going to switch gears and move to the recognition -- Renewal of Recognition and Expansion of Scope for Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools Accreditation Commission.

I’m going to switch gears and I’m going to go back into retirement and our Chair is going to return, a 10 minute break to get there.

(Break 10:37 a.m. - 10:47 a.m.)

RENEWAL OF RECOGNITION AND EXPANSION OF SCOPE, ASSOCIATION OF ADVANCED RABBINICAL AND TALMUDIC SCHOOLS ACCREDITATION COMMISSION (AARTS)

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Welcome back everybody.
Would you like to introduce yourself Frank, Frank just joined us.

MR. WU: Frank Wu, University of California.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I hope everybody had a good break. We’re here now to do the Renewal of Recognition and Expansion of Scope for the Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools, the Accreditation Commission. Primary Readers are George French and Susan Phillips, I will turn it over to them.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you Chair. The Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools Accreditation Commission known as AARTS is a national institutional accreditor.

The current scope of recognition is for the accreditation and pre-accreditation of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic schools. Institutions accredited by this Agency grant a post-secondary Degree such as the Baccalaureate, Master’s, Doctorate, First-Rabbinic and First-Talmudic Degrees.

It is requesting an expansion of scope to include Associate Degrees. Of the 75 current institutions, 62 accredited and 13 candidates, the majority are located within the New York Metropolitan Area. In addition schools are located in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New
Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Approximately 56 of the schools have total enrollment of under 200 students with 39 of those schools having less than 100 students. 9 schools have an enrollment between 200 and 300 while 10 schools have over 300 students. The Agency’s recognition enables its institutions to establish eligibility to receive federal student assistance under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, Title IV funds.

The Agency serves as the Title IV gatekeeper for almost all of the institutions it accredits. Consequently the Agency must meet the Secretary’s separate and independent requirements.

AARTS was first added to the list of nationally recognized agencies in 1974 and has received periodic renewal of recognition since that time.

And I’ll turn it over to the staff for the review.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Introduce yourself Chuck.

MR. MULA: Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. For the record my name is Chuck Mula and I will be presenting a brief summary of the petition for continued recognition by the Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools Accrediting Commission hereinafter referred to as the Commission.
The Commission is also requesting an expansion of its’ scope to accredit and include Associate Degrees. As part of its evaluation the Agency’s petition to Department staff reviewed the Agency’s narrative and supporting documentation and also observed an on-site evaluation conducted by the Commission at one of its accredited schools in Brooklyn, New York.

There are no third-party comments in connection with the Petition and no active complaints being reviewed by the Department. The Department’s review of the Commission’s petition found that it is in compliance with the Secretary’s criteria for recognition. The Department has no concerns and is recommending to the senior Department office is that she renew the Commission’s recognition for 5 years and grant the expansion of scope. This concludes my report.

There are Agency representatives and we will be glad to answer any questions that you may have, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you Chuck. Would the Agency -- do you have any questions to the staff at this point?

Please welcome the Agency representatives, please introduce yourselves and welcome.

MR. FRYSHMAN: Good morning, my name is Bernard Fryshman. I’m the Interim Executive Director of the
Agency. I was the Executive Vice President of the Agency and then we engaged another person who worked with me for 3 years and served as Executive Director and then the school with which he was teaching -- he asked that he put in more time for his school and so I’m back as Interim Director.

You probably know we’ve always looked to have an academic serve as head of the Agency. I’m Professor of Physics at the New York Institute of Technology and the person who I hope will replace me -- Dr. Mark Holtzman, is the Chairman of the Accounting Department at Seton Hall University and that’s why he’s not here because of all the things that happened today his Dean insisted that all the Chairmen be present and one doesn’t negate that so that takes priority.

But so that explains why I’m still here. To my right is Rabbi Yaakov Applegrad. Rabbi Applegrad is a person of great experience in the Shiva Movement and he’ll be working with me and with Dr. Holtzman in a variety of activities and a variety of responsibilities particularly in dealing with institutions directly.

To my left is Mrs. Gitty Rosenbaum who is a Special Assistant and who’s been working with us for a number of years. I just wanted to make a brief comment and then just open the floors to questions and conversation if you’d like.
I just want to begin by thanking Chuck Mula for his help and guidance. There’s a little bit more -- I want to thank him also for the effort, the special time and effort he made in beginning to understand what we’re all about. We’re not like everybody else, the content that we teach is different and the methodology -- the approach to teaching is different although the people in Harvard in 1635 and perhaps the people who wrote the Yale Report of 1828 would understand very much what we’re all about.

We’re an old traditional approach to learning and maybe we’ll get into that a little bit later. But I also wanted to thank -- this may be the last time I’m before you. The various people I’ve worked with over the years since 1974 who have taken the time and trouble to understand what we’re all about, to do the extra work to appreciate the nature of our learning, the nature of our studies and of course for the kind comments we’ve always received.

We’ve always found the -- our relationship with the Department to be a cooperative helpful one and I just wanted to express my appreciation to all the people in additional to Chuck who I’ve worked with over the years.

Now if there are any questions I’d be delighted to respond.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any questions for the Primary Readers, Susan?

MS. PHILLIPS: As you know Bernie, we’ve been asking a series of questions of accreditation agencies and I’m hoping that you would be willing to address some information about how your institutions are doing and what kind of actions you’ve taken since the last time you were before us?

MR. FRYSHMAN: Okay, I was anticipating these questions of course and I did prepare some information. Just to discuss the range of activities we’ve been involved in, we had -- we took since the previous visit recognition process, we recognized 14 candidate stated schools and there were 14 candidate stated schools that moved up to accreditation -- full accreditation status.

We had one initial accreditation, one school that became an accredited school initially, excuses me -- initially. We did 65 renewals of accreditation in that period of time. We had 7 resignations and we did two unannounced visits. We’ve had 7 appeals and this year alone we have a process that we’ve introduced whereby we try to monitor, we try to visit every school, every year.

This year for example we had 53 monitoring visits in addition to the site visits that we had, so approximately 60 of the
73 schools by the way -- the number we are accrediting is 73. Of the 73 schools had an on-site visit. We have 3 people whose responsibility it is to just go and spend a day -- half a day to a day to visit a school, to have a conversation with the administration, with faculty, with students. It’s not a comprehensive site visit but it does enable us to keep a close plus to watch precisely what’s taking place at every school.

We feel that this gives us an opportunity to detect risk, to detect problems, to recognize growth, to see what the students feel. Virtually everything that one wants to know about a small school can take place in this kind of visitation.

We know that this is not the sort of thing one can do if one is accrediting 1,000 schools, but since we’re only accrediting a small number of schools, we thought it was worth the time, the effort, the money -- a great deal of money, a great deal of staff time to undertake this -- undertake this to gather data and to enable us to watch our schools very carefully.

MS. PHILLIPS: Could you describe a bit about what prompts an un-invited -- unannounced site visit?

MR. FRYSHMAN: If we feel that -- if we hear that a school is losing its enrollment, that’s probably the one area of risk which we will sometimes ask people about or we’ll just go
down unannounced just to see for ourselves what’s happening.

That’s the area of risk I guess that was just touching on another
area of concern.

For small schools the one area of risk that threatens
the existence and the ability of a school to survive is when its’
enrollment goes beyond the level of critical mass for an
educational program. And even though we pride ourselves on
giving you the great deal of faculty attention to students but there
comes a point where you really can’t have a school that will
survive below a certain point and that’s what we look for.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you and one more question
if you could say a bit more about how your Agency defines student
achievement.

MR. FRYSHMAN: Well, as you see, I prepared
myself. Student achievement is -- it’s really integral to the nature
of what we’re teaching. We teach Talmudic studies. What we’re
trying to do is create Talmudic scholars.

And teaching scholarship as distinct from teaching
an occupation is focused on the growth of the individual, the
development of skills -- the focus is on the Talmud as a platform,
it’s the discipline against which we exert our efforts but the
process is a very similar one to other scholarship areas.
We look to develop the mind, to challenge the student. I mentioned earlier the Harvard of 1635, they spoke extensively about the thrust and parry whereby the faculty member would interact with the student on a one-to-one basis and present a situation and look for an answer and then interact and challenge a student so that the student will then aspire to a further level of accomplishment.

We look to see whether there are indications of the student’s development on a one-by-one basis from the high school graduate to the student who will enter a graduate program and will be able to have -- bring to bear the tools of scholarship which we all recognize the ability to think, the ability to analyze to synthesize, the critical thinking characteristics, the ability to present a hypothesis and to defend it against his colleagues and to similarly sit as an audience among his colleagues and then criticize and engage in this very, very -- sometimes very abstract thinking.

The student achievement is not something that one could measure with numbers. It’s got to be measured on a one-to-one basis and that’s what characterizes our schools. There’s regular assessment, there’s regular discussion of a student one by one and this growth takes place year by year -- that’s what we look for when we go on an accreditation visit.
We look to see if there’s a trajectory of growth -- whether students at one level answering a certain question -- we’ll put it the other way where the students at the highest level answering a specific question will bring more to bear than students at a lower level answering the same question.

There will be conversations with students and students will be asked, “Did you see growth in your own development and how and why?” We look for certain indicators which define intellectual growth and of course when our students enter the secular world in education their ability to learn, their perseverance, their concentration, their confidence -- their ability to look at a problem and be certain that they could solve it -- that just carries through.

I don’t know whether I answered your question but I --

MS. PHILLIPS: I had a related perhaps follow-up question. I’m curious if there -- the institutions that you accredit how do they convince you that they’ve reached the standard of student achievement that you expect? How do they show you that, do they offer you the same thing?

MR. FRYSHMAN: Well first and foremost there’s a very intensive self-study. And we look to see whether or not
they touched all the bases where we’re satisfied. We’ll look at
their finances mission, their physical plan, we look at the externals,
we look at the inputs, we look at the --

MS. PHILLIPS: I’m focusing really just on the
student achievement part of that.

MR. FRYSHMAN: Okay, well that’s to a certain
extent part of their description but to a greater extent it’s to the
peer review that we undertake. We visit a school and we look to
see whether or not the students are enabling the school to satisfy its
mission.

We look for the growth, we recognize that there are
some schools which are better schools than others, more rigorous,
more demanding, they get a higher -- more gifted students, but
even at the lower level we look to see whether that growth takes
place, whether that’s that progression of intellectual skills that will
enable the graduate to effortlessly go into a point where he can do
independent research and independent Talmudic research.

That’s usually the touch or that is the touchstone
that will make or break a situation, but it’s not a bright line, it’s not
a metric, it’s a very, very -- it’s a very -- it depends at scholars
looking at scholarship.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, George anything?
MR. FRENCH: Thank you, thank you Mr. Chairman. I thank you so much for your presentation. We always enjoy your participation in NACIQI even when AARTS is not up for review.

Let me ask a couple of simple questions and make sure I understand. Were the 13 candidates -- in the compliance report there were 13 candidates, I think you mentioned 14.

MR. FRYSMAN: 14 candidate schools.

MR. FRENCH: Right, are they still in candidacy status?

MR. FRYSMAN: The way we use the word candidacy goes back to the ‘70’s so I’ll try to explain. A candidate status school is an accredited school. It has accreditation status, it’s eligible for student financial aid. It’s not a school that is applying to us and we want to see whether it’s eligible for recognition.

We have a policy whereby any school that comes in for the first time will be placed in candidate status, not because they’re not satisfying the standards -- they satisfy the standards but they haven’t reached their plateau.

In other words, when the school is deemed ready to move up from candidacy to accreditation status, we feel that it’s
processes are not only in place but they’ve reached a level of
maturing that this is what we expect the school to be, the size will
have gelled, the physical plant will be complete -- well it’s
complete previously but there are always growth aspects that take
place with a new school.

So the candidacy is not candidacy in the sense that I
think people are using it now. I’ve had conversations with Sally
about that to how to define, how to describe what we use but that’s
basically what the situation is.

Now we had 14 in this interval -- we had 14 schools
that applied and they were visited. They submitted a self-study,
they were visited, there was a comprehensive site visit. There was
a decision by the Accreditation Commission to agree that they
satisfied all the standards, they were granted candidate status.

5 years later or 4 years later depending on the
school they went through another process whereby they submitting
self-study, had a site review, a comprehensive site review, a
decision was taken and they were granted accreditation status.

MR. FRENCH: Thank you and secondly you know
teaching scholarship of course which is a laudable goal -- what is
the impetus for going from requesting the Associate Degree
recognition status?
MR. FRYSHMAN: It changes in the dynamics of
the community. There are students -- many students, many, many
students who before they complete their Baccalaureate want to go
off to more -- I guess schools of better, higher repute. I’m afraid to
say better schools but there are schools of higher -- graduate
programs, more advanced programs in Israel.

So they leave the Baccalaureate Degree and the
thinking is that they should be offered the opportunity to at least
demonstrate that they have a piece of paper, they’ve accomplished
a certain amount of learning that’s been examined and has been --
that they have and has been rewarded by the award of Associate
Degree.

There’s another aspect that has arisen in some of
our schools. Some schools now have a two-track program in their
senior years. The Talmudic Program has always been in place but
at the senior years there are some schools which offer a program
which is much more focused on the law aspect which emerges
from the theoretical Talmudic studies.

A student at the end of his first three years might
decide that he wants to go off to one track or another and it was
decided that it made sense to offer a program -- an aspect our
program which resulted in his being awarded a degree.
There’s a third aspect -- there are some small schools which haven’t -- they haven’t the resources to apply for accreditation on their own, but they might be able to do so if they are only offering a 2-year program or a 3-year program and so while they couldn’t aspire to a full Baccalaureate program they could aspire to a 2-year or 3-year Associate program -- so those three reasons -- they’re really societal reasons. They’re demographic reasons but those are the reasons we’re asking for the Associate Degree.

MR. FRENCH: Thank you and you were last before us in June of ’13 and you provide or ’15 and you provided an excellent compliance report from June ’13, congratulations on that.

MR. FRYSHMAN: Thank you.

MR. FRENCH: And we don’t have any major issues here on compliant this year according to staff report, Chuck.

MR. MULA: There are none, none.

MR. FRENCH: Thank you, last question when do you anticipate the new leadership taking?

MR. FRYSHMAN: We move slowly. We go back several thousand years, everything takes longer.

MR. FRENCH: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: On that I will recognize John?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: So Bernie, when -- I want to follow-up on one of Susan’s questions. When Susan asked about outcomes and how you determine whether the institutions are producing the outcomes you want, you described a very intensive procedure of rather than something more numerical or statistical, but an intensive visit procedure where your visiting team is directly measuring student learning.

And that I think is probably -- if it can be done is idea. You know, I mean I think that’s great but I’m curious how large are the schools that you’re accrediting and how feasible is that? I realize they’re small but I also realize that if we were accrediting UCLA I could not imagine a team trying to take that approach to student learning outcomes.

MR. FRYSHMAN: Well I can show you how UCLA can do it but I think you’d rather see how we do it. We’ll pick a number of students, we have a team -- the teach will consist of an academician -- the academician will be a professor -- someone with a professorial rank at a regionally accredited school.

We’ll have an administration -- a person who has run a school, Rabbi Applegrad was one of those for example. And
we’ll have a Rasha Shiva, the Rasha Shiva is the head of an institution. He himself is an acknowledged scholar and he knows what to expect at each level because he also has students at that level.

He also will see whether or not there’s growth and he will be able to select students at random if he so wishes and he’ll interview them and he’ll watch to see what happens year by year.

He will listen in during the visit on a sheer -- a sheer is a lecture. It’s not just a lecture, the way the day begins students will spend 3 or 4 hours with a fellow -- Hvrusha it’s called and they will work on a certain section of the Talmud. At the end of that period and of course there will be back and forth, give and take and thrust and parry with faculty members in the base measures.

The base measure is the lecture hall -- study hall my colleague tells me, that’s right. At about 12:30 - 1:00 there will be a sheer -- a major lecture. The Rasha Shiva will then deliver an exposition on that material and of course he’ll show where he left off from the superficial.

He’ll show how he generates depth where he’s able to exact from the same material they were working at, so much
more. And of course as students are part of that process over a number of years after a while they get to understand where he’s going after a while they’ll begin to challenge him.

After a while it will find that the Rasha Shiva at the end of the period is surrounded by 10 or 12 others and everybody’s yelling at the top of their voices as to getting their ideas across and why they think they’re right and so forth.

The Rasha Shiva visitor will listen in at one of those sheer and then he will ask students to see whether or not they picked up and what they picked up. And if he’s -- I would like to think that I could do that in a physics class. I could walk into a physics class and watch what the teacher is teaching, then afterwards go over to a couple of students and say well what did you pick up and then know -- I would like to think I could do that too but our people can do that.

And so that’s what happens. It’s -- not every student is examined by a peer review team but a sufficient number of students are interviewed and a sufficient number of aspects are review. Rasha Shiva might look, go over to a student and say, “Show me some of your --,” or it would be some insight, some special insight that the student had and he wrote it down. He wanted to see maybe he’ll get it published one year or something
and say, “Show me your notebook,” or “Show me the notes you
took at the sheer.”

And these things will help the visitor get a picture
of the level and the process and the success the schools had in
terms of its mission. I’m sorry of all these, I should have brought a
glossary.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: No it’s fascinating. The
one piece of my question you didn’t answer is just what are the
average size of the institutions?

MR. FRYSHMAN: Sorry, oh the average size.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Yeah.

MR. FRYSHMAN: It’s I guess 75 to 100 is the
average size.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Okay, thanks.

MR. FRYSHMAN: We have bigger schools too
but that’s coming. What’s been happening is that smaller schools
have been opening. At one time I thought all the schools are going
to get big, it’s not so because there are lots of little schools that are
opening because scholars try to get their own students and so it’s --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Simon?

MR. BOEHME: Thank you for your presentation.

I was wondering if you could just walk me through how you
involve students in that process.

MR. FRYSHMAN: How?

MR. BOEHME: You involve students in that process?

MR. FRYSHMAN: The students are pretty open, we have a good part of our site visit involves a conversation with students and we make sure that in that room there are no faculty members, just students. And I’ll ask or somebody else -- the facilitator will ask a question, maybe get there would be a U4 student or U5 student in fact. What did you see different about yourself that you didn’t see from you now from what you were when you first came into the school?

And then he’ll say something and somebody else will jump in and so on and so forth. That conversation is very, very helpful.

MR. BOEHME: Would you consider putting students on site teams or on your Board?

MR. FRYSHMAN: I’m not sure that would be a healthy, a healthy approach. If you ask me would I consider putting a certain person on maybe, but students as per students, I’m not sure -- I’m not sure. You would probably be a good student to be on the Accreditation Commission.
MR. BOEHME: If I get into one of your programs.

MR. FRYSHMAN: But I’m not sure that the whole concept of having students just because they’re students are on an accreditation Board or on a visiting team would make a very big difference.

It’s an interesting innovation, it might be something we might try. How we would get a student who would be willing to go out and judge other students -- our students are pretty aggressive when it comes to ideas but they’re pretty different when it comes to dealing with other people.

The mode of the scholar, the nature of the scholar is not to be aggressive. Part of the scholar is to be helpful, aggressive in terms of defending one’s ideas but not in terms of criticizing and finding fault. You would find that in much of our students so my answer is -- is it something we would consider? I bet the Accreditation Commission would consider that. Would it happen - - can’t be sure.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?

MS. ALIOTO: Well first of all I want to thank you because we’re all looking at how accrediting agencies can help improve the quality of what’s happening and it seems that that’s very central to what you are doing.
I’m curious, when you said you could see how to do this at UCLA -- was that when you used the physics example?

MR. FRYSMAN: I’ll do that. I teach physics at the New York Institute of Technology. We’re a little bit smaller than UCLA and our reputation is not quite that. But I’ll tell you one issue that I once brought up -- maybe even to this body. The question of what takes place in a physics lab.

Very often when one walks into the physics lab there might be 3 people around the table. One person is working, doing the -- getting the equipment and setting it up. One person is helping and one person is just taking notes.

And the job of the professor who’s in charge is to make sure that everybody gets involved in doing the experiment. Another thing that I would insist upon is I want to see that the equipment helps the student learn, not makes the school look good and that’s where -- that’s a conflict which I’ve seen at least with my own eyes.

One time I taught at a school where the equipment was very, very old. And you had to use your head to figure out how nature is going to give up its secrets. The equipment was old, it was well built, it was -- it enabled the student, it forced the student to think.
Very often now what one gets is digital equipment, put the meter over here you get an answer, put it down that’s the answer. The question is -- is that to the benefit of the student or is that to the benefit of the school? In my opinion, excuse me, the school looks good. Here’s a piece of equipment, it’s much cheaper to teach without this old equipment. Things are quicker and it looks nicer and the school can report better results -- superficial results, metric type results.

But for a person walking in and knowing what’s really taking place and watching what students are learning and seeing the insight that students have to bring if they’re using old equipment or out of date equipment, they come across a situation and they’re asked to come up with an answer, well then one could make a very strong argument that we are not going in the right direction when we pick up these aspects.

This aspect of the physics department in terms of checking out the physics department at UCLA I would say to myself I better keep my mouth shut because the professors there probably know a lot more than I do. There are ways though I mean when you have a peer review of top notch physicists talking to faculty and seeing what they’re teaching and seeing where the students are having problems, seeing whether students there are
also beginning to slack off in doing homework.

These are problems, these are very real problems
and a good professor, a good teacher has to know how to adapt that
-- adapt the course, adapt the program, maybe change the number
of hours in the classroom, maybe change a text. Too often these
ideas, these problems are just papered over but I don’t want to
criticize another school. John, did I touch on this correctly or?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Yeah, it works if you have
the expertise on the team. Yeah, no I think that’s a terrific way to
assess the quality of the instruction and so forth and so on if you
have the appropriate expertise on the team.

And the problem with doing that with a larger
school with a much more diverse set of offerings is it’s impossible
to put together the teams that have the expertise. But I take your
point.

MS. ALIOTO: My other question is slightly
simpler -- do you have women in your program?

MR. FRYSHMAN: No.

MS. ALIOTO: Do you think that that is something
that will ever come or is it one of the things that is moving slowly?

MR. FRYSHMAN: That’s not going to happen.

That’s a problem that relates to that’s a religious consideration that
we won’t happen.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Steven?

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Well thank you very much.

As I see it you’re working with as you said nearly 70 private non-tribal institutions. They enroll about 15,000 students so you are a gateway to higher education for a lot of these students. About half of them are receiving PELL support so that means there are some requirements that brings us here today to a degree.

I’d like to understand your student body a little bit more. What’s the average age, what’s the intent of these students when they graduate or complete? It looks like the transfer rate is pretty high of your students so they are going on. So they’re getting a unique religious education experience while they’re also getting a comprehensive education experience, prepared to move on?

MR. FRYSHMAN: The word religious education is a strange word. The word religious implies people are being taught how to worship, how to pray, how to carry out religious functions. We learn that too but that will take place at the high school level.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Well you have to educate me
here.

MR. FRYSHMAN: I’m happy to do so.

MR. VAN AUSLE: Chuck’s had an experience working with you, he knows, now tell us.

MR. FRYSHMAN: The nature of the Talmud it’s a comprehensive approach to a world that was focused on several hundred, maybe a thousand years ago let’s say, maybe more. And then the Talmud is refreshed in each generation by scholars who approach the world using the principals of the Talmud to try to address what’s taking place here and now.

And so the importance of what takes place in the Talmud is not as important as the skills one develops in exacting information from the words of the Talmud, the thinking, the challenges, the process is one in which the words of the Talmud engross the student in the discussion that took place then and the student is then encouraged to try to develop insights, to go beyond the surface, to go well below the surface and depth then to compare his accomplishments to that of scholars of an earlier age - - a much earlier age.

As one grows more sophisticated, one is able to assimilate ideas more effectively to be able to generate new insights on his own. And after a while the student is able to take a
piece of the Talmud -- the Talmud is a large -- it’s 20 volumes and
he is able to try to generate ideas, try to apply them to the real
world now and try to just benefit from the effort of scholarship.

Maybe you can get a better perspective. There is
now a computerized, digitalized version of 90,000 volumes of this
Talmud cognitive volumes, religious volumes, the entire discipline
is focused on something that now has 90,000 different volumes.
So you can understand it’s not just one small little book -- it’s
something which is pregnant with ideas, with meaning, with
aspects that have nothing to do with religion per se.

It’s a body of knowledge. Now this is not to say
that our activity is not a religious activity. It is a religious activity.
Many things that we do is a religious activity. If I give charity
that’s a religious activity, if I’m kind to people that’s a religious
activity -- study is a religious activity but it’s not religious studies
per se, it’s Talmudic studies and I hope that makes it a little easier
for you but I don’t know whether I made that clear, tell me, I’ll try
it again.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: No, that’s helpful for me. So
you know, one of the things that we’re trying to get at -- what
difference are you making in the lives of these students, you’re
teaching them how to think. You’re preparing them for life, both
MR. FRYSHMAN: Well this is where excuse me, this is where a problem sometimes arises. For some students people whose beards are trimmed and they aren’t wearing long curled Payots, the world has opened up a little bit. We find jobs in other areas, teaching physics at a secular university. We have a school in Lakewood, New Jersey which has the highest passing rate and the highest average grade in New Jersey in accountancy.

These people pick up -- their ability to learn is such that they swim right to the top. We have students who haven’t -- who graduate from our schools and take the LSAT’s reach grades like 180. We’ve got students in Harvard Law, we’ve got students in Columbia, University of Pennsylvania. We have students who’ve gone on to medical school.

We have a number of students now in dental school. They just take these standard exams and they do exceptionally well.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: What the average age of your student?

MR. FRYSHMAN: Traditional age, 17 to 20, 22, 23 that’s general range. There’s another element in our community, the Hassidic community. The Hassidic community
their program is just as rigorous, just as challenging, just as
difficult. And students emerge with all these qualifications but we
don’t -- they don’t -- I can’t say we but they don’t get a chance at a
job.

I mean even tokenism would be a major step
forward. For example in government -- government throughout
the United States I don’t think there’s a single person who has you
know, the Payots, you know what I’m talking about the curled
sideburns -- maybe you don’t know, beards and not one.

In all of corporate America I doubt that you’ll find a
single person, a single person who fits that mold.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: I want to thank you very
much for responding to that question. I have a better insight into
your accrediting unit now, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Bernie thank you, oh I’m
sorry Anne?

MS. NEAL: Well Bernie since this may be your
valedictory I want to say congratulations on your continued
feistiness when it comes to refusing to go in the direction of
metrics. I know that that has disturbed you for decades and so you
have maintained your purity today in your answers to us.

And a bit in gest I guess I want to ask you is an
Associate’s Degree in Talmudic Studies -- isn’t that essentially an oxymoron?

MR. FRYSHMAN: In what sense?

MS. NEAL: Are you distinguishing the AA versus the BA simply in terms of the number of years or is there something different in terms of what one learns in the AA versus a Bachelor’s Degree in Talmudic Studies?

MR. FRYSHMAN: A person who has an AA has reached a certain level which you can examine for and that person is now -- he has a platform in which he could go off into more advanced Talmudic Studies, years 3, 4 -- years 3, 4, 5 -- a Graduate program, or he has a basis for going into a loss approach to the study of law based on his Talmudic background. It does establish a floor.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Sensing no more questions thank you for your presentation. We can now ask --

MR. FRYSHMAN: Do we leave?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You’re finished

MR. FRYSHMAN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: It’s our job.

MR. MULA: Mr. Chair I would just like to say that when we first -- when I first started to work with this Agency
Herman and I sat down in his office for about 40 minutes and talked about how really beneficial it would be to do this -- all this research on the Agency and the schools. And since Steve Purcell used to have the Agency I also contacted him and he gave me a lot of points. But I would recommend that maybe if somebody would like to go on a site visit someday to see how this works. It is very unique, very rigorous education, but it is a culturally-based education and the Department only judges on its compliance with our standards. So it's something that you should look into if you can go with it, that’s all.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I would now entertain a motion from the Primary Readers.

MS. PHILLIPS: I move that NACIQI recommend that the AARTS recognition be renewed for 5 years and I further move that the NACIQI recommend that the senior Department official grant the Accreditation Agency’s request for an expansion of scope to include -- scope of recognition to include its accreditation of Associate’s Degrees.

MR. FRENCH: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Second by George French, discussion? I just want to say this is probably -- this is like my
fourth or fifth time that they have appeared before me and this was
without a doubt the easiest one we’ve had to deal with and they
seem to have really made a major effort to come into compliance
with the standards which we thank them. Any further discussion --
sensing none all in favor of the motion signify by raising your
hands? All of those opposed -- thank you for being before us.

**NACIQI RECOMMENDATION**

**NACIQI recommendation is that the AARTS**

**Recognition be renewed for 5 years and that the Department**

**official grants the Accreditation Agency’s request to expand**

**their scope to include accreditation of Associate Degrees.**

CHAIRMAN KEISER: We are now at lunch time.

Yesterday I cheated you out of your lunches, today I’m going to
give you reprieve. You have an extra 25 minutes. We will
reconvene after lunch which what time do we want to come back
for lunch -- 1 o’clock, that would give you an hour and a half so
you could even go off campus if it’s not raining, I have no idea if
it’s raining and thank you for your hard work this morning and we
have two schools this afternoon and then of course tomorrow the
discussions on both the issues presented by the Senators and then
the issues under Bobbie’s Committee.

(Lunch break 11:34 a.m. - 1:03 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Let’s get started. I hope you all had a good lunch. Whole Foods has an incredible bar -- food bar, so that was fun.

RENEWAL OF RECOGNITIONS

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF ART AND DESIGN (NASAD)

We are now going to -- we have two Agencies this afternoon. The first is a Renewal of Recognition for the National Association of Schools of Art and Design and the Primary Readers are Kathleen Sullivan Alioto and Arthur Rothkopf and Arthur is not here but Kathleen you will lead off and go for it.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design, NASAD, Commission on Accreditation is both a programmatic and an institutional accreditor. The principle purpose of this Agency is the accreditation of free-standing institutions and art design units that offer degree-granting and non-degree-granting programs, and the accreditation of programs within institutions accredited by a national recognized regional accreditor.

However, only it’s free-standing schools may use accreditation by the Agency to establish eligibility to participate in Title IV HEA financial aid programs. The Agency accredits 23
institutions in 13 states and the District of Columbia where the accreditation by NASAD co-op may enable them to participate in Title IV programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

The Agency is presently the gatekeeper for these 23 institutions. The Agency is seeking its continued waiver of the Secretary’s separate and independent requirements.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you Kathleen.

Stephanie you’re up.

MS. MCKISSIC: Good afternoon Mr. Chair and members of the Committee. For the record my name is Stephanie McKissic and I will be presenting a summary of the petition for continued recognition submitted by the National Association of Art and Design, also referred to as NASAD or the Agency.

The staff recommendation to the senior Department official is to renew the Agency’s recognition for a period of 5 years. Based on review of the information in the Agency’s petition and an observation of a Commission meeting and site visit, both held in April, 2018, Department staff has found that NASAD is in compliance with the Secretary’s criteria for recognition with no issues or concerns.

The Department did not receive any written third-
party comments or official complaints during this review cycle,
therefore, as previously stated the staff recommendation to the
senior Department official is to renew the Agency’s recognition for
a period 5 years.

There are Agency representatives here today and we
will be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time.
This concludes my report, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, any questions
for the staff -- sensing none, will the Agency representatives please
come forward if you would introduce yourselves and make your
presentation.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Good afternoon. Thank you
Mr. Chair, my name is Karen Moynahan. I’m the Executive
Director of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design.
Joining me today is Mr. Richard Mann, NASAD’s counsel.
We extend our thanks to the members of the
Committee for the time they devote to this process as well we offer
appreciation to the members of the Department staff and in
particular, to Stephanie McKissic for her assistance and the help
that she’s provided.
Miss McKissic has approached her work with the
Agency diligently and thoughtfully at every step. It is our pleasure
to have the opportunity to participate in conversations that result in
the advancement of the depth of expertise and breadth of
knowledge held by our students.

The individuals we charge with the responsibility to
advance our efforts and the efforts of the nation and in whom we
entrust our future. The National Association of Schools of Art and
Design began its work in 1944. It sought and has held Secretary
recognition continuously since 1966.

Interest in NASAD and its effectiveness is
exampled by the participation of approximately 350 accredited
institutional members. It would be our privilege today to address
questions as they relate to the Agency’s application for continued
recognition, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, Kathleen?

MS. ALIOTO: Yes, thank you for your hard work.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Thank you.

MS. ALIOTO: On behalf of these 350 institutions.

I wondered, in terms of the 350 institutions could you tell everyone
how that is differentiated from the 23 of which you are presenting
your petition today?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’d be happy to, thank you,

thank you for your kind comment. And I believe the staff got you
headed in the right direction regarding the website I hope.

MS. ALIOTO: Yes that was helpful last week when I couldn’t find all the information I needed so thank you.

MS. MOYNAHAN: You’re welcome. NASAD is a discipline-specific accrediting body that offers that service to institutions -- post-secondary institutions throughout the United States. And those institutions include multi-purpose as well as free-standing institutions.

So the combination of those institutions that are equivalent to the 362 give or take some, would be multi-purpose and free-standing. However, its role as a gatekeeper is only for those that are free-standing. Multi-purpose institutions would work with the regional associations as their gatekeepers.

So when we look at the application, the application pertains to those schools -- those 23 that will use us as their gatekeeper for the purposes of participation in Title IV programs.

MS. ALIOTO: And in terms of those 23 is the Academy of Arts University in San Francisco -- are you a gatekeeper for them or is that WASC that’s the gatekeeper?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I can’t say for several reasons. Number one is I don’t have that information before me and number two is the application of an institution would be confidential.
Although you are not asking that question I don’t -- I’m sorry to
say I haven’t memorized all that are members.

MS. ALIOTO:  Well I’m concerned about it as one
of the institutions that you actually lead your website with and I
wonder when you say that you’re helping advance quality among
the 350 or 360 institutions you’re serving, in what way are you
assisting the quality of institutions when you’re not a gatekeeper?

MS. MOYNAHAN: All the institutions that are
accredited by NASAD are required to meet the standards outlined
in the handbook. And those standards will include the basic ability
to operate as well as curricular standards. So whether an
institution is free-standing or multi-purpose, those standards will
apply to that institution.

MS. ALIOTO: And in terms of the operation of a
school for example the Academy of Arts University, do you
monitor when they get involved with lawsuits for which they are
now in the process of paying 60 million dollars to the City of San
Francisco for their egregious behavior?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’m sorry I can neither
confirm or speak to that issue but if you’d like to talk about the
procedures in general.

MS. ALIOTO: It’s in the newspapers so you don’t
get involved in anything like that?

MS. MOYNAHAN: The institutions that come to us come to us to receive accreditation and we’ll apply the standards to that institution so I cannot speak to that question specifically.

MS. ALIOTO: Could your lawyer?

MR. MANN: I think what Karen is trying to explain is that NASAD views its role as assuring compliance with standards themselves and individual litigation issues or things like that for institutions at the time that it’s happening is not really part of the purview of this -- of this organization.

MS. ALIOTO: The ethics of an institution is not?

MR. MANN: It could become relevant in a later accreditation process but in terms of the involvement with the litigation itself, NASAD would not be involved in the actual litigation.

MS. ALIOTO: No, I’m not talking about you being involved in the litigation, I’m talking about your viewing what is being aware of what is happening with your 362 institutions and using some of that to determine whether or not you would want to continue the accreditation of an institution.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Let me approach it through a
broader procedural perspective if I could -- maybe that will offer some clarity. Every institution that holds accreditation in NASAD is responsible to meet the standards that apply to that institution on an on-going basis.

Accreditation is granted and that’s the understanding. Each institution is put on a review cycle and that review cycle will include a comprehensive review. And the comprehensive review will include a requirement of the institution to study itself which culminates in the writing of a self-study, the responsibility to host a team of visiting evaluators, the responsibility to respond to the visitor’s report if they so choose to do that and then to be reviewed by the Commission on Accreditation.

So that is a requirement of every single institution.

In addition, on an annual basis there are no less than 4 reports that are required of every member institution. And what these 4 reports allow us to do -- one of them is the HEADS data survey that I imagine you read about in the application -- the institutional audit, the affirmation statement and the supplemental annual report.

What these annual reports are intended to do similar to the comprehensive review, is to ensure that NASAD on an annual basis is able to look at institutions comprehensively. And if
through these indicators, the collection of data and the review of
the information provided in the report, if there are issues of
apparent non-compliance indicated, then there are procedures in
play NASAD which enables NASAD to open a review process.

So can I speak to what’s happening with regard to
an institution that we’ve read about in the press and the answer is
no, not about that institution because we don’t know where that is
in the process -- but in our process does our process allow us,
allow NASAD, or does it have mechanisms that allow us to
systematically on specific schedules review all institutions that are
accredited?

And if in doing that we find issues of apparent non-
compliance do the procedures allow us then to open conversations
to seek further information and the answer to both of those
questions would be yes.

MS. ALIOTO: When you say that you -- that one
of these four reports involves an audit?

MS. MOYNAHAN: The audit that I’m speaking
about is called -- we term it an institutional audit and the
institutional audit is a review of the institution’s representatives
and all the curricular programs that they offer because as a
discipline specific accrediting body we’ll review all of the degrees
they offer by level, major and area of emphasis.

It’s not a financial audit however the supplemental annual report which is also required, requires from the institutions an audit with opinion from an external accounting firm. So through that process NASAD on an annual basis will review the audited financial statements of every institution for which we serve as the gatekeeper.

MS. ALIOTO: Are there any institutions that you have looked at following the -- your criteria, that you have put on probation?

MS. MOYNAHAN: In the history of NASAD yes.

MS. ALIOTO: In this latest period?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Probation is one step in a due process, so in this period meaning since our last review by the Secretary?

MS. ALIOTO: Mm-hmm.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I do not believe so, no.

MR. BOEHME: I can be the second reader on this if you’d like.

MS. ALIOTO: Okay.

MR. BOEHME: I can be Arthur Rothkopf. I think --
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Frank’s up next, I’m sorry.

MR. BOEHME: But can I be the second reader? I mean there’s not a second reader, there’s supposed to be a second reader.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just wait until after Frank gives his presentation, unless you want --

MR. WU: Yeah I just had two very quick points. It’s more for us and I’d offer this more as a question with due respect knowing that I have engaged in the very practice I’m going to speak of.

So I’m sympathetic to agencies that come before us and that get asked questions about a particular institution for a particular case. I’m a little worried for two reasons -- one is sometimes I feel bad for the Agency representatives who may not off the top of their head just have facts about a particular institution or a case or issue because they were prepared to come deal with a set of questions that they can anticipate and they can’t always anticipate when we ask about something very, very specific, very particular.

So I -- it’s just a thought for us to bear in mind that not everyone -- no matter how on top of things they are since they accredit dozens, hundreds, even thousands of institutions, will have
But the second reason that I want to be cautious is I am mindful that all of these agencies have particular procedures and schools are entitled to a certain process and this is a public forum on the record so if Agency representatives start to say about X or Y or Z school, oh, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah -- that might create a problem for them in how they then conduct their next review of the school.

So it’s just a sympathetic word for the Agency representatives here in front of us as to questions about particular institutions, I would sort of caution for all of us to all my friends I offer this as a thought.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Simon?

MR. BOEHME: Yeah, I think Claude was before -- I only wanted to volunteer for a second reader to help to be helpful not to be a burden.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude and then I’d like to say something.

MR. PRESSNELL: Just a real quick process question that actually was kind of unearthed from here. So if the situation presents itself whether it be in the media or in any other way that’s brought to your attention that might indicate that they’re
out of compliance, are you saying you’d wait until a regular review
or will you go ahead and make an inquiry at that point?

MS. MOYNAHAN: We always have the ability to
review an Agency. I think you really hit the nail on the head and
that is not so much the institution and Vice Chair Wu thank you for
that clarification -- it’s the Agency because of law, because of
regulation, does the Agency have due process in place that it
exercises when issues of an institution’s possible lack of ability to
continue to meet standards arises? That really is the question and
the answer is yes.

The handbook has a stipulation that states that the
staff can for appropriate cause move an issue to the decision-
making body for a review, in addition to the comprehensive review
and in addition to that which is found within the annual review
process.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen if I just may, I
looked up the issue -- first of all they’re WASC accredited, that
would be the institutional accreditor. Second, both the lawsuits,
one was the 60 million you are talking about was on code
enforcement, not necessarily a student issue or a quality of
education issue.

The second lawsuit which is currently going on is
about incentive compensation so neither of those are related to educational quality and it would be if they were considered institutional problems they would determine administrative capability that would tend to be focused by the WASC Association so just information, Simon?

MR. BOEHME: Thank you Mr. Chair. So if I can just go along with your line of questioning because I think my colleague Kathleen did ask a question which is in our pilot, but it’s not a pilot anymore because it’s in the Federal Registrar and it’s what we ask you accreditors is what activities since the last time you’ve come before us have you engaged with and have you put any of them on whatever types of probation warning or whatever signals you have to let institutions know or programs know that they’re in trouble?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Could you go back to the first part of your question with his -- what activities?

MR. BOEHME: So when did you come back to NACIQI -- when was the last time you came in front of NACIQI?


MR. BOEHME: So since 2014, what actions as an accredditor have you taken against some of your programs with the art programs in the past 4 years?
MS. MOYNAHAN: The possible actions that are available to the Commission based upon the stage of the application are those outlined in our procedures documents. Have we -- has the Commission used those actions liberally and the answer is yes. Have we placed an institution on probation in that period of time -- I don’t believe so. But I would suggest to you that following due process those that are outlined in the procedures are those that have been employed by the Commission.

MR. BOEHME: What kind of data do you collect about your programs, your members?

MS. MOYNAHAN: In what regard?

MR. BOEHME: Student outcomes?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Well we look at those that are admitted. We look at those that continue. We look at those that graduate. We look at the progression of students that are enrolled in these art programs throughout their time at the university by degree, by major, by level.

MR. BOEHME: How do you define completion or how does your accreditation agency view completion graduation rates? I’m sure you’ve listened to our conversation and maybe you heard WASC’s presentation today and it’s always interesting to me how people take different angles on completion.
How does your Agency look at completion or how do you define it? Do you have an official definition? Do you let the programs define it?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I believe that the programs would define what they would call completion of a program. Now we have expectation with regard to student achievement -- those are two different things.

MR. BOEHME: And what is the student achievement in?

MS. MOYNAHAN: The NASAD handbook is full of language that we term essential competencies. And as an example there are essential competencies at a general level, a general degree level, a specific degree level and a major level. So what we define or how we define student achievement can be reviewed by looking at the essential competencies that are required at each level of every curricular program.

So if you were to look at a student majoring in a degree in “X” with a track in “Y” we would have competencies for “Y”, we would have competencies for “X”, we would have competencies for the degree.

And what we expect the institutions to do is insure that students throughout their time develop those competencies
progressing from one level to the next.

MR. BOEHME: Okay.

MS. MOYNAHAN: And those competencies exist for all degree programs, non-degree-granting programs throughout the level whether it’s a 2-year, 4-year.

MR. BOEHME: Okay, thank you.

MR. MOYNAHAN: You’re welcome, thank you.

MS. ALIOTO: I’m wondering yeah I actually hadn’t finished asking my questions, no, actually. In terms of these 363 institutions you serve, do you have a dossier on each school? There’s concern about talking about things publicly here from some of my colleagues but in terms of your being able to make judgements -- do you look at the scorecard? Do you look at the clearing house -- at the figures that your institutions are submitting to the federal government in order to make any of these calls?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Of course.

MS. ALIOTO: Or do you and it appears that it’s a rubber stamp without an analysis, for example, that particular institution has -- is below the national graduation rate even though the students are paying between the tuition and room and board which is provided by one of the 40 buildings that the college owns
-- the university own, over $40,000 a year and yet the graduation rate is below average.

MS. MOYNAHAN: NASAD’s process is rigorous and I would respectfully suggest that it is not a rubber stamp. It includes a requirement that the institution review comprehensively what it does in relationship to the NASAD standards and then through its own study culminating in a self-study it demonstrates compliance with those standards.

And if the institution is not meeting a standard, that process due to its depth and its rigor will bring to light those issues of non-compliance and the Commission through its work would then open up a dialogue with the institution requesting further information and always in the case of non-compliance, confirmation through documentation and defense of activities -- how those standards are being met.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you.

MS. MOYNAHAN: You’re welcome.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: John and then Ralph.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I just have a quick question for Stephanie actually. Do you know why we only have data on 7 -- so there are 23 institutions that they say they accredit and are gatekeepers for and we only have data on 7 of them, do you know -
- does anybody know why?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I don’t.

MS. MCKISSIC: And I don’t either, I don’t know why it’s just the 7, that’s just what was listed on the scorecard.

MS. MOYNAHAN: And the data on the 7 is incomplete if you look at the picture.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I know, I noticed that yeah.

MS. HONG: So again those are data that the institutions self-report to FSA on who their gatekeeper is. So if again, we have 7 showing up, 7 have reported to FSA that NESAD is their gatekeeper. So --

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Maybe some of the others have a separate regional?

MS. HONG: It’s possible they have another regional but there is discrepancy between, you know, what the Agency is reporting and what the institution’s reporting so.

MR. WOLFF: Yeah I don’t want to get engaged with an individual institution. I think the issue is and I think the where the two ships are passing in the night here is there are a set of questions that we’ve been asking every accrediting agency and most have come forward with some kind of data around what kind of actions they’ve taken or helping us to get at the issue of student
success in relationship to achievement, completion and the like
beyond just referencing the handbook and what standards are.

So apart from that because I’m not interested into
going into any individual institution and I appreciate the distinction
between institutional accreditation and programmatic, having
worked with you on both sides of the situation. I’m just curious to
know are you -- can you address more on the questions that Simon
referred to in terms of any kind of explanation beyond -- am I not
close enough? Okay, thanks -- I think you know, is there anything
beyond just referencing the handbook in terms of and what we’re
really trying to get at is what kinds of, you know, are there things
to be learned about approaches that you’re taking?

And my own experience in working with art schools
that you all accredit is that the CRITS and the way in which
assessment is done actually one of the best ways possible, with
their open, their transparent and the like. But I just wonder if there
are things you might want to add beyond just saying we have
standards in the handbook.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’d be happy to. Let me give
you some numbers to start with and then what I want to talk about
is student achievement. The NASAD Commission on
Accreditation meets twice a year. It reviews agendas of
approximately 200 institutions.

Some of those institutions are coming up with comprehensive review. Some of those are responses to comprehensive reviews with regard to apparent non-compliance issues. Some of those have gone through the comprehensive review successfully and received approval and now we’re following up through progress reports -- that would be an approval, maybe this goes back to Simon’s question.

The grand majority or the rest of the actions on the agenda would be new curricular programs because NASAD requires that every accredited institution submit for review and approval prior to enrollment or publication, every area of emphasis of each major of each degree.

So the agendas encompass all of that as well as a review of those 4 annual reports. The combination of actions that happen on any given agenda could be to approve, to approve with a progress report, to approve with multiple progress reports, to defer with a response, to defer pending completion of another visit -- there are a wealth of possibilities.

What happens in the review of each institution is at least two things. Number one is that the institution is required to demonstrate compliance with operational standards -- faculty,
facilities, finances, governance and administration, size and scope -
- a balance of size and scope as well as curricular programs which
would be the applications for plan approval and final approval and
so forth.

Within each of those applications because NASAD
is discipline specific and because the handbook has a wealth of
information regarding the essential competencies, with regard to
every institution, each degree program is reviewed against those
essential competencies to ensure that the curricular programs meet
the standards and by meeting the standards show -- demonstrate
that the students are developing -- gaining those essential
competencies that the handbook requires they should get.

How do we do that? Well, we review a self-study.

We review student work that’s submitted in the self-study and we
sent a team of visiting evaluators to campus specifically to look at
many things, one of which and one of the most important is student
work.

So, one of our requirements of institutions that are
submitting these applications are to provide the Commission
student work. So, if you were to take a particular degree at a
particular level, a particular major beneath that degree, a particular
track beneath that major -- what the visiting evaluators would do is
to review work, freshman, Baccalaureate Degree freshman,
sophomore, junior, senior level in that particular major to ensure
that the competencies are being developed, to ensure that the
students are progressing and to ensure that the work that the
students are doing is appropriate to the degree which they are
seeking.

MR. WOLFF: Yeah I think you’re one of the few
agencies, I think APED also, but actually looks at student work,
knowing how hard it is from an institutional. I have one other
question and that is we used to do joint visits. I wonder do you
still do joint visits with regional accreditors or institutional
accreditors, particular with respect -- I mean obviously as a
specialized accreditor and most of your programmatic
accreditation is with regionally accredited or I mean I’m just trying
to get a sense of the percentage that you’re doing jointly with
regional accreditors or independently.

And even of those 23 I think it is, are those all
independently by NASAD or are some of those joint in which
institutions actually hold two different kinds of institutional
accreditation?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Many of our free-standing
institutions are accredited by obviously NASAD and by the
regionals which is their choice. For institutions that are accredited
by both they have the ability to seek approval from both agencies
and Ralph and I used to put these together some 35 -- almost 40
years ago whereby we bring the procedures of the regional bodies
together with the procedure of the regional body together with the
specialized body and we assist the institution to mount one review
process, one self-study that addresses both agencies, one team
individuals from both agencies, one visitor’s report typically --
there are variations on a theme.

We used to do a lot more. The institutions are -- we
still offer the opportunity, we used to do a lot more, it’s up to the
institutions to decide whether or not they want to participate in a
joint visit. It’s also up to the regional body as well so all three
entities have to agree to want to go through the process in that way.

MR. WOLFF: And I take it fewer are doing it now
than before from what you’re saying?

MS. MOYNAHAN: I think that’s fair to say yes,
yes.

MR. WOLFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: John?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I want to come back to I
guess it was your responses earlier I forget who was asking the
questions but about what kind of data you collect. One of the things you said was that you collect data on graduation. I would imagine that a lot of the programs that you accredit are -- do not have a lot of first-time full-time students, so I’m curious what data you look at?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Did you say do not have?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Yeah.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I think they -- probably it’s just the opposite. The data that we collect with regard to enrollment is from each member institution, from potential member institutions and from those that would like to participate with regard to enrollment, we will collect information with regard to the number of students enrolled in every degree by level and by major.

And we’ll also collect the number of students that graduate each year by major for every degree program that falls under the purview of NASAD.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: The number, so that doesn’t give you necessarily a percentage right?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Percentage based upon --

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Usually when we look at graduation rates we look at, you know, various ways of getting at a
percentage number that says, oh well, you know, this institution
graduates 20% or 80% of its students.
And just counting the number of students who
graduate really doesn’t give you that.
MS. MOYNAHAN: No, it doesn’t, but if you look
at it on a long-term basis, comparing one year to the next you can
see changes in movement. You can see whether institutions are
moving up, moving down and so we do review reports of changes
in enrollment at each institution on an annual basis.
MR. ETCHEMENDY: Changes in enrollment,
okay.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any further questions,
Bobbie?
MS. DERLIN: If what I say is incorrect please let
me know, but I think I heard you say you meet twice a year and at
each of these meetings you’re considering about 200 actions, some
of which are successful completion of a renewal, some of which
are compliance reports of various kinds catching up with standards
that previously were on that and so on.
Can you give me an idea of those 200 actions how
many are associated with compliance reviews for specific items?
How many are successful completers of the renewal process and so
on, by whatever categories make sense from your Agency’s standpoint.

MS. MOYNAHAN: If you take an agenda well let me back up a little bit further. If there are 300 institutions -- 360 institutions -- this will be straight math but not correct math. If you take 360 institutions and you divide by 10 a 10-year cycle which they’re not all on, you’re looking at about 36 institutions a year, divide that by two but it’s more than that because you have potential members and it’s not always an easy divisible answer.

So there may be 5 to 10 to 15 comprehensive brand new, comprehensive applications that are reviewed. I think the question you’re asking me I think -- help me to understand, is how many of those are approved, how many of those are approved with the progress report, how many of those have apparent non-compliance issues -- am I, is that what you’re looking for?

MS. DERLIN: Yes, I’m looking for the categorizations and the number of transactions that make sense from your Agency’s standpoint that are requiring follow-up or some other action by your Agency.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Well let me give a broad -- a broad answer to that. The accreditation process is about ascertaining whether or not the institution is in compliance with the
standards that apply to the institution. But it’s also about helping
the institution to go further -- helping the institution to reach
beyond the threshold standards helping the institution to realize
that which it puts forward as its priorities.

So with regard to the 200 or so, how many do we
continue to speak with? And I would take an educated guess and
say that the grand majority 75 to 80% of those that we’re following
up on because they have initiatives, some that are in non-
compliance and some where they could benefit from the feedback
that the Commission can offer them with regard to development of
programs, development of majors, development of initiatives.

So of those 200 on any one given Agenda, are we
opening a conversation with the institutions and the answer is in
the great majority of cases, yes that would be true.

MS. DERLIN: Can you tell me a little bit about
how many institutions right now are under some form of a sanction
and what the sanctions might be?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Again an educated guess -- if
an agenda has 200 institutions then about 200. I would suggest
that a sanction could be a conversation. Are you speaking about
just non-compliance or are you speaking about any kind of
conversation?
MS. DERLIN: I’m speaking about non-compliance issues.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I don’t have that figure at the top of my head or with me.

MS. DERLIN: Thank you.

MS. MOYNAHAN: You’re welcome.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?

MS. ALIOTO: Yes my colleagues are quite antsy about my focusing on just one institution and they are correct I stand they are correct. But how about the other academies of art that you also are acting as an accreditor for or Argosy University -- you have a number of institutions under your purview where the information that you and we are receiving is not great in terms of what seems to be happening.

Of course this is where it’s like quicksand and not knowing about the graduation and so forth and that’s why WASC is trying to create a better way of dealing with it. Nevertheless it’s not looking good for the institutions that you’re overseeing, and particularly when you give the -- what your intentions are, but I feel I’m easy about continuing to give you accreditation when you’re not coming to us with precise facts or dossiers about how you’re helping these institutions.
It’s conversational but it doesn’t seem -- it doesn’t feel to me that it’s dealing with what’s actually happening in those schools and I think it’s wonderful that you have portfolios from students. I think if that happened in every institution it would be great but I don’t see that reflected in the success rates of a number of the schools under your purview.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’d first like to ensure that we confirm which schools you’re speaking about to ensure that they are indeed institutions that hold our accreditation. But may I ask did you have an opportunity to review the Commission action reports which are in the dossier?

This is the -- the Commission action report is the outcome of the Commission’s decision. The Commission action report is indicative of the question that Ms. Derlin asked and that is when there are issues to communicate about, this is the way the Commission communicates the concerns to the institution.

A Commission action report will articulate in great depth what the issue of apparent non-compliance is, what the standard specifically says, what the institution may or may not be doing and what the Agency’s expectation is for the reply.

And so I think that level of rigor that you’re looking for or the trust in the process can be seen by reviewing those
Commission action reports. We provided some in the original dossier and then Miss McKissic asked us for additional Commission action reports.

It’s those letters that will depict the level of rigor that the Commission uses to review an institution and that level of rigor will deal with issues regarding operations, again facilities, faculties, finances as well as the curricular programs.

I also want to make the point that our structure -- that the law and the regulation and the structure of the accrediting bodies allow for due process and that due process allows the accrediting body to seek information and to take action as appropriate on that information.

So can I speak to a specific institution -- I can’t but the fact that I can’t does mean that NASAD’s process isn’t rigorous or that these institutions aren’t under review at this time. And I don’t think we can draw that conclusion from that.

I think the conclusion we draw is to look at the examples that we have provided to you and look at the depth of rigor that is in the process that exists within NASAD right now and to know, to understand that that is the depth of rigor that NASAD applies in every case to every institution it reviews regardless of what category it falls under in the agenda or with regard to its
comprehensive review or the review of any of those four annual reports.

So the example of the depth of rigor can be seen specifically in the detail in the Commission action reports which specifically talk about as an example, institutions that are in non-compliance, those areas, those standards that they do not comply with at the time of review.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: John?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Do you publish those -- the action letters or the action after you've made the decision, do you put them on your website for everyone to see?

MS. MOYNAHAN: A summary of the actions, not the letters themselves. The institutions receive the letters themselves.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jennifer?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: And how much information is in the summary?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Numbers, number of institutions approved, number of institutions deferred, number of progress reports accepted, number of plan approvals, approvals of new curricular programs approved, number of transcripts verified against approvals.
MR. ETCHEMENDY: So if a student was thinking about enrolling in a particular school that you accredit, the student couldn’t find out whether it’s in trouble, whether there’s been some adverse action or might be some adverse action from you?

MS. MOYNAHAN: We’re required to publish adverse actions so yes, those would be published.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: So the actual adverse action so if it’s a -- the status of the institution is published or is an actual report that says here is the adverse action and here are the reasons for it.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I believe the law requires that adverse actions are published and the reasons for those actions are published as well if I’m not mistaken.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jennifer and then Ralph.

MS. HONG: I don’t know if this will help but so NASAD adopts a competency based framework for its student achievement standards. So basically you’ve identified competencies that programs and institutions must reach -- demonstrate in order to be in compliance with your student achievement standard -- is that right?
MS. MOYNAHAN: That’s fair.

MS. HONG: So it’s an accrediting agency that makes that determination. You haven’t left it up to the program -- the program or the institution. It’s the accrediting agency that passes that judgment. I don’t know if it would be helpful then if you could provide maybe an example -- I think that’s where people are getting stuck -- like an example of a competency within your student achievement standard that you could kind of illustrate, you know, why, you know, how an institution might fall short of that, what do you look at -- would that be helpful for the members, I’m just trying to --

MS. MOYNAHAN: One example might be the institution’s not only definition of credit and time, how much credit is granted for how much time and whether or not the students are required to dedicate a sufficient amount of time that will enable them to develop the competencies that the standards are requiring.

And if in reviewing an application as indicated by possibly lack of information or the level of student work, if those indicators are present the Commission may well ask the institution to review its procedure for granting credit and also to review how students are moving through programs with regard to the
competencies that they are to develop at each of the different levels -- each of the different years.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: John, turn your microphone on please, Bobbie, the three of you guys you can just fight it out.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Jennifer asked about an example competency and you said well we review the time allocated, the time required for units and that doesn’t tell us a competency like what kind of competent.

You said is adequate time required to develop the competency but we wanted an example of a competency.

MS. MOYNAHAN: May I offer several?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Yeah.

MS. MOYNAHAN: If you could bear with me just one moment. Let’s look at a Bachelor of Fine Arts professional degree program with a major in illustration. The competencies as examples that I will read to you which are standards which the institution must meet.

These competencies, examples of which I’ll offer to you are specific citations offered to you had to do with just the major in illustration. They’re not speaking now to our history, they’re not speaking to the
general standards for a professional degree, they’re not speaking to
the general standards for a Baccalaureate Degree. These are just
the specific competencies that speak to a major in illustration.

The handbook has a set of competencies for each of
the different majors that are articulated in the handbook, so to give
you an example. Understanding of how basic design principles
and elements including color, are utilized to address specific
narrative or expressive problems. The development of solutions to
communication and design problems should continue throughout
the degree program.

Competency and facility in drawing, knowledge and
skills in the use of basic tools, techniques, processes sufficient to
work from concept to finish project -- this includes capabilities in
fields such as painting, photography, topography, general design
procedures, digital computer aided design, an understanding the
commercial applications and basic business practices of
illustration, functional knowledge of the history of illustration
including its origins in the fine arts and its relationship to written
communication.

Preparation of illustrations in a variety of media and
a variety of subject matter from rough to finished pieces, easy and
regular access to materials, studios and equipment and library
resources related to the study of illustration and so forth.

And these are articulated for each major within every degreed program and the institution must demonstrate that the students are meeting this competency and they do that through many ways, one of which is the review of student work at the freshman level for Baccalaureate Degree, freshman level, sophomore level, junior level and senior level.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Bobbie?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Students are critiqued at the end of each semester to see where they are with regard to developing these competencies.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Bobbie?

MS. DERLIN: I'll pass until we get back to Stephanie.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Ralph?

MR. WOLFF: I think the challenge we’re having here is you meet -- you’ve been reviewed and with respect to the formal criteria and I think the staff has found there are no issues with the criteria.

For the last couple of years we have been trying to work with agencies on meta-analyses of the kinds of actions where there are problems, particularly around issues related to student
achievement and completion.

And so the challenge we’re having is that your responses are within the framework of we have very rigorous standards that are very detailed around competencies which just looking at them are clearly identified in each of the sub-categories and as well as the general generic skills where we might say
general education and the like.

But what we’re not hearing and where I think where there is no communication is the meta-analysis of where are the challenges that you face with respect to both the programmatic side and the institutional side -- not individual program one by one, but in looking across either design programs or BFA programs or the like, how are you looking at the effectiveness of your assessment measures?

So yes we understand that you are looking at each individual program, you’re looking at specific institutions, but where are you finding categories of where follow-up is needed? Is it around specific competencies or the like? As we look at student achievement -- or are there particular completion areas or types of institution where there are completion issues.

So acknowledging that there is a thorough review done individually at both the program and at the institutional level,
that’s not the challenge for us -- the challenge is really what I’m saying since 2014 or since your last review, where have you found in your own Agency’s analysis of student achievement where there are issues at more of an aggregate or meta level?

And we can understand how you’re using or are you gathering data around the multiple reviews as you indicate there are dozens or hundreds of them that have occurred and is there the kind of analysis that would enable you and then be able to report to us here where the problems have been found in terms of quality issues with respect to student achievement and with respect to completion?

So I don’t think anyone is challenging the individual thoroughness or rigor of the review, it’s what does it add up to as an Agency that works with several hundred programs and on the program side that’s not where your recognition is but even on the institutional side.

And so I just think that we’re not -- it’s not clear, these are the conversations we’ve been having with the agencies for the last couple of years and it’s where -- it’s not clear that you have that kind of aggregate data or meta-data around of all the kinds of follow-up reports, what have been the challenges where there have been sanctions, not just adverse actions, but any kind of
sanctions. Where have the challenges been?

And not in any way is punitive inquiry but we’re trying to learn and work with agencies to give emphasis to the statutory requirement on student achievement -- so I think that’s where we’re having the problem with communication. It’s not about saying yes, there is an individual process, but what does it add up to?

If you look at an annual or multi-year basis, where are the challenges that the Commission has found in working with institutions and how are you responding to them?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Well, let me ask what role does the conversation that the Commission has with an institution - - what role does that play in your understanding of just what you’re asking?

MR. WOLFF: Well all of the Commissions and I shouldn’t say many -- I don’t know how many of them actually interact with individual Commission representatives, certainly many do. I think that’s part of the individual interaction with accreditor and either program or accreditor and institution, so it plays a very important role.

The issue is one -- if over the course of from 2014 if let’s say you’ve had a thousand actions of all different types,
categorically how many have been of this type, how many have
been in that where there’s been follow-up have most of them been
around finance, around governance, around faculty qualifications
to the extent that they revolve around student achievement and
achievement of those competencies in what areas is the greatest
issue.

And so that you’re doing that kind of analysis to
assist your institutions and give them feedback, more than on an
individual basis, but rather as a collective for the community. But
then in working with us as we work with different agencies in the
recognition process of seeing how the aggregate or the meta-
analyses of all of these actions how you’re evaluating them to
make assistance to your institutions and to make judgments about
where the biggest issues around quality are -- quality with respect -
- quality -- from our standpoint, quality with respect to student
achievement and completion.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Anybody else -- Steve?

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Well thank you I’ve been
looking at the criteria standard for student achievement in here and
you’ve attached some big files. I’m having trouble getting all of
those files up in a short period of time. But one of the files that
was listed to document your results of student achievement was
101 and I pulled that file up and I looked at the Table of Contents
and even how you describe it -- you say, “Art and Design Data
Summaries 2016-2017,” and it lists all the characteristics -- it
describes in great depth and detail your institutions and all the data
about the institutions but Ralph, I think here’s where I agree with
you, there’s no analysis and synthesis unless it’s in another data
file that I can’t pull up here quick.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’m not sure of the file you’re
speaking about but within each comprehensive review the second
part of the self-study focuses on instructional programs and in that
section of the review it’s all about discussing competencies. It’s
all about how the institution will address the competencies that I
just read.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: So would that be described
in 602.16A here somewhere that I’m just not seeing.

MS. MOYNAHAN: I’m sorry I don’t know my
numbers.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: That’s allowing student
achievement.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Student achievement the
examples that we’ve given you are the sections of the self-study
that require the institutions to discuss how they developed those competencies.

We’ve offered to you as examples the visitor’s reports that review every curricular program and whether those programs are developing those competencies and we’ve provided the Associated Commission Action Report which is the Commission’s review of all of the previous documentation and the synthesis of that and the institution’s ability to meet the standards.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: So is there a synthesis file in here and I’ve got 155 it’s still working 10 minutes later. Does it show the graduation rates, retention rates, employment rates of students once they leave the institution, evidence of outcomes?

MS. MOYNAHAN: It may show you that published by the institution.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: By institution.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Right.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Okay, what I’m seeing is some great data collection but I haven’t seen the analysis and synthesis yet on how it has been applied and maybe I should have pulled some of these files up earlier and looked but you know the three I’m looking at here aren’t helping me much.

Getting to that point that Ralph was talking about --
is that, do you concur with that Ralph?

MR. WOLFF: Yes and I think we’re trying to move beyond the individual institutional review to a collective analysis.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Yeah.

MR. WOLFF: Of what does it mean as you do dozens and dozens of reviews.

MS. MOYNAHAN: Well let me ask this. The conversation with the institution is critical. I think we would all agree with that because it’s the institution’s ability to meet the standards that we review.

What is it that you’re looking for that this meta-data would offer that you don’t see by looking at the review of each institution?

MR. BOEHME: I mean this pilot is posted on the Federal Register right?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Right, but I think that’s the important part. A lot of the questions we can focus on to Stephanie because we’ve already covered a lot of this material over and over so unless you know, I just think we’re not going to where we need to go unless you have an absolutely directed, okay -- I think does anybody disagree with me on that?
What I want to do is thank you for being here and allow us to have the next conversation with is what our staff member, okay?

MS. MOYNAHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Stephanie I think you could probably address some of these issues --

MS. MCKISSIC: I think so.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Because you had the personal experience, thank you.

MS. MCKISSIC: Okay so I want to speak to the Department’s role in evaluating or reviewing the Agency’s petition. From my perspective or from my role I look at the regulatory requirements that are outlined by statute and I look to see does the Agency have standards that address those regulatory requirements?

I also did a site visit to an institution to see were the Agency’s standards implemented during that site evaluation and I also attended a Commission meeting to see a full cycle of that accreditation action process.

So with regards to 602-16 I did find that the Agency had standard -- had comprehensive standards 9 and 10 which looked at using student portfolios, teaching internships and
graduation rates to come into compliance with 602.16 as well as
standard 8 which addressed the issues beyond those required
particularly about art and design.

In addition, the Agency standard 4 and 5 addressed
602.17F which looks at the requirement for the assessment of an
institution’s performance in student achievement and I also
observed the Agency’s site evaluation team reviewing these
particular standards and the implementation of these standards with
a site -- with an institution’s self-reported data and they were
looking to confirm that the data was in compliance with their
report.

In addition, one more, 602-19B the Agency has
Standard 20 which are all -- which were all listed in the petition
which looked at the monitoring of the provisions which were
defined in 602.16F.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Bobbie I’ll let you ask your
question then I’ll ask mine, so.

MS. DERLIN: Well I’m not exactly sure this is a
question and I hope even though the Agency isn’t at the table but
they’re listening -- over listening to my remarks. This does -- I
don’t have any quibble with the analysis that you conducted, the
results of your site visit or the presentation that the Agency made,
but it does appear that our pilot project questions and
considerations that has been published for quite some time,
somehow has gotten lost in the shuffle.

So it was unrewarding to me to have the Agency not
well prepared to respond to questions about aggregate types of
transactions. Ralph said this a lot better than I’m saying it now
earlier. So I just think this is -- so I guess my question for staff is
this -- you do your review based on the specifics of the criteria. Is
there any opportunity to call the Agency’s attention to these pilot
questions and considerations that NACIQI has participated in
sometime or is that just at the Agency’s discretion?

MR. BOUNDS: I think there’s always going to be
a -- I don’t want to use the word maybe disconnect but an issue or
problem with the staff review being based on regulatory
requirements and the Agency’s published standards.

I mean the statute prevents us from telling them
what that standard is. We have to kind of look at what they
publish and then as Stephanie said we look to see if they follow up
and they take action based on their specific standards.

We have to review the staff reports in a way that we
know that number one the report would stand up against any legal
action or those type things when the Agency may appeal. So you
know, to try to get, you know we can always remind the Agency it’s in the Federal Register notice that NACIQI is going to ask these questions and they’re interested in these questions but for us to be able to hold an Agency in a non-compliant status to put that in the compliance report is difficult for us to be able to do.

MS. DERLIN: Thank you Herman, I’m just jumping in here, hopefully I’m not out of order. I’m not in any way suggesting that the staff be responsible for holding agencies accountable for anything other than the specific regulatory provisions but I am happy to hear you say that it is possible for staff to consistently call agencies’ attention to these pilot questions and considerations. That makes me smile in the afternoon.

MR. BOUNDS: You know we, you know the Federal Register is published I mean so agencies know the questions that the Committee is going to ask. It’s just that we can only go so far in our preparation of an Agency for the meeting. You know, we have these black and white rules that we have to follow and when we complete, you know, the analysis and I mean the analysts complete their reviews, we have these discussions and it’s strictly on what gets in the report is strictly based on statutory and what the regulation requires of the Agency.

But again, we do remind the agencies to read the
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Stephanie I have a question. I think, you know, we understand that the Agency has a lot of individual program competencies -- there’s no question. What I did not hear has the Agency taken any actions on institutions who have failed to address the standards of the Agency?

MS. MCKISSIC: During my observation and at the Commission meeting, the Agency there were some institutions that had issues with their reports and the Agency deferred those decisions to allow time for the Agency to come into compliance with those areas.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: And were you able to identify any institutions that have been removed from the accredited status based on failure to meet the standards or competencies?

MS. MCKISSIC: Not during this review cycle.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Were any institutions placed on probation for failure to meet the institutional standards?

MS. MCKISSIC: Not during this review cycle.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: And of the 23 institutional accredited agencies that are institutionally accredited, were there
any negative actions taken based upon the -- not just the
competencies but in terms of the federal regulations or issues that
may have been more institutional rather than programmatic?

MS. MCKISSIC: I don’t recall that happening
during this review cycle.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is that standard that in a 5-
year period that they would not have had a negative action taken
by the Agency against an institution?

MS. MCKISSIC: I’m not sure what standard --
how you would define standard, however, given it’s a small
number of institutions and it’s a very specialized area, I’m not
surprised.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any other questions for
Stephanie -- sensing none I would entertain a motion from the
Primary -- are you going to have a question or are you going to
make a motion Kathleen?

MS. ALIOTO: No I’m not, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Oh okay, you’re slow.

MS. ALIOTO: I thought I had prepared well for
this but I still can’t find the document that she was referring to in
terms of student achievement within the -- could you refer me to
that?
MS. MCKISSIC: They were Standards 8, 9 and 10, Standard 20 and Standard 4 and 5 if I remember correctly. It’s probably Roman numeral in the petition itself so if you look at the NASAD Accreditation Handbook and look at those particular standards 4, 5, 9, 10 -- 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 20 specifically addressed the criteria pertaining to student achievement that had student achievement areas.

MS. ALIOTO: So may we can look at it afterwards together.

MS. MCKISSIC: Sure, no problem.

MS. ALIOTO: Thank you. Well I wouldn’t mind Mr. Chairman if either you or my co-leader to my right made this motion because I’m not going to.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You’re not going to make a motion?

MS. ALIOTO: I’m not going to vote for it.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well if you don’t -- you could make any motion you would like Kathleen.

MS. ALIOTO: Alright well in that case I’d like to make a motion that NASAD return to us in 12 months with an indication of how they’re referring to what the -- how they are meeting the suggestions of NACIQI in regards to student
achievement.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Would you like to look at this form and probably take the second -- the third one and it says I move that NACIQI recommend that the said recognition be continued and remit the Agency an opportunity within a 12-month period to bring themselves into compliance with the criteria set in staff report and then submitted for review within 30 day or after. Compliance report demonstrated compliance to the cited criteria which is outcomes and outcome assessment.

Such continuation shall be affective until the Department reaches a final decision, is that the one you want?

MS. ALIOTO: So moved.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay.

MR. BOEHME: I’ll second that.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Go ahead, there’s a question.

MS. HONG: So just to be clear could you cite the regulation with the student achievement under?

MS. ALIOTO: Yes, it’s particularly student achievement because if you look at the Oak Web it was a worksheet under student achievement there they’re not documents included.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: There’s a motion is there a second? Second by Simon, Claude?

MR. PRESSNELL: I would -- we’re at discussion right. So I would be very cautious about where we’re going because there’s no violation of the standards as articulated that I’m aware of that the staff have found.

And what I’m finding is that they’re taking a competency based approach that is different than what a lot of other accreditors have chosen to do which I find to be actually probably more complex and rigorous because we don’t -- with the challenges we just don’t have a number to look at.

So I wanted to -- so like I said yeah sometimes just having a number to look at it a reductionist approach to assuming rigor. So I just would be really careful because if we can’t clearly cite the precise element for which they’re non-compliant and articulate it exceptionally well why they’re non-compliant, then I think -- I think we just need to be careful with that.

So I would agree that they have done a poor job of being able to explain to us exactly what is the outcome of this competency-based approach and what is it teaching the accreditor and what is it teaching the institutions about improvement --
they’re not doing a good job with that at all.

So I think that -- I think they need to improve on

that and so in other words, based on everything we found, surely

not everybody is performing at 100% level so those that are not

how is this informing the improvement process and we didn’t hear

much of any of that and that’s problematic but I don’t know if it is

to the point that we -- of where we are, so that’s all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Frank, Ralph and then

John.

MR. WU: Just a simple question. I think this was

discussed but I wasn’t here. We have no more meetings in 2018

right so I just want to clarify. This often happens -- when we say

12 months it really is probably 24 or 18 months, that is it’s not

going to be 12 months just because of the timing of things right?

MS. HONG: Right so the 12 months is when the

report needs to be due to the staff so it doesn’t matter when we

meet but that report still needs to be due within 12 months to the

staff.

MR. WU: Right and it will be 12 months but the

start date would be when the senior Department official writes, so

that could be a week from now or it could be 6 months from now.

I’m just noting there’s always a little flex, but I just wanted us to
bear that in mind.

So whatever our view is of the motion 12 months is not 12 months from this minute.

MS. HONG: Right and at the long -- like 3 months from the decision, you know, from this -- the senior Department official is 90 days after the meeting to write the letter.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Ralph, John, Bobbie.

MR. WOLFF: You know I’m going to speak in support of the motion for two reasons. One, there are many ways of defining competence. There are outcomes identified in the standards, you can call them competencies or the like. It is not a competency-based model.

And they are very input driven in terms you need to demonstrate that they are competences. What we don’t have are the outcomes other than that there is a process of -- which I have personally experienced I think is the thorough one of looking at student work.

But we don’t know where it adds up in relationship to a collective evaluation of what those actions add up to across at least with respect on the recognition side to those institutions for which NASAD is gatekeeper.

Secondly, all institutions are required to have a
basis for review of their standards and this would be a fundamental
part for any review and I don’t see that the data is there the
analytical data.

Thirdly I would say whether this recommendation
or our action is accepted or not by the senior Department official, I
would just urge the Agency to bring members, at least one or more
members of the Commission here so that it is not just with the
Agency executive. We recognize Commissions not executives and
this is the only Agency that I can recall in my memory that hasn’t
had representatives of their Commission to be able to speak to how
the Commission operates and to hear the issues and concerns that
we reflect.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: So I want to say something
about Claude’s point because on the one hand I agree with Claude
that we can’t send an Agency back and say, you know, come back
in 12 months without actually pointing out what it is that they need
to provide.

On the other hand it does seem to me that the pilot
questions that we sent out were specifically -- those are basically
interpretations of how we’re interpreting 602-16 -- a component of
602.16 and we were hoping for answers to those questions and did
not receive them.
So I take it that that is in NACIQI’s view, they have not met the standards as we understand them and as we have asked them to demonstrate. So that’s what I would like is to see them come back and answer some of those questions.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If there’s no more discussion we have a vote on the motion -- oh Bobbie?

MS. DERLIN: Well I was pausing for a moment because my colleagues gave me such good things to think about but I think I do want to speak in opposition to the motion. I would favor the original motion which is to extend the accreditation.

We spent a lot of time talking about bright lines granted, in a totally different sphere but I think it’s important for us to distinguish between the very specific review of the regulations that are conducted by the staff and that the Agency did speak to. They do have exhibits in their dossier related to their student achievement standards. They do have that really ugly data summary file which you can’t get open and I’m assuming there is some data in there and that our staff member has reviewed it.

So I just think it’s important. I recognize your point John and Ralph spoke to it too but I still think we need to keep a distinction from a regulatory standpoint between the pilot stuff and
the actual regulation review so I am opposed to the motion and
now I’m done.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Steve?

MR. VAN AUSDLE: One thing I noted as I got
back into the work that you reported on student achievement.

There is a bottom line here that refers to where some of this
evidence might be and it says see attached continuation of response
to 602.16A-1. I can’t find that attachment. That might be some of
the evidence right there.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, John?

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Where would the attachment
be to that section? Its right above all the documents linked. I’m
looking for evidence.

MS. HONG: Just a technical -- if you go.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: Did you see where I’m --

MS. HONG: I see continuance of response to
602.16A-1, is that what you’re looking for?

MR. VAN AUSDLE: It says see attached for
continued response to the 602.16.

MS. HONG: Mm-hmm that might be it, Exhibit 96.

MR. VAN AUSDLE: It is not in Exhibit 101 so
there is an attachment here somewhere I think.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Even if it's buried, it's pretty difficult even in the conversation to get the specifics that I think we are looking for. So it’s hard for us -- I think to certainly make a positive decision.

MR. BOEHME: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes.

MR. BOEHME: I’m not sure if it would be a friendly amendment or not or maybe the Chair chooses not to take the motion but maybe something I would consider is 602.2B which is enforcement action. Looking through the -- well if I can take a step back -- I was not impressed with today’s presentation and I was for -- we’ve been doing this for years, we’ve been doing the pilot and not a lot of accreditors may like that we do the pilot but we’ve decided to do it.

It’s in the Federal Register and so to me I was really dissatisfied that it seemed that the executive could not provide a clear number on actions and this is something that we’ve been very consistent on so I’m not sure if maybe that is -- if we look towards the regulations at 602.2B with the enforcement action would actually be more in line for them to come in compliance with and maybe that would alleviate some of the concerns of the Committee members, maybe not.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: You’re the second to the motion so the maker of the motion if she would accept that as a friendly amendment, Kathleen?

MR. WU: What is the amendment exactly?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: The amendment is to change the citation that we use from what is it A to B?

MR. BOEHME: From student achievement which is 602.161A to 602.20B which is enforcement action, but I’m willing to take that away if that complicates things.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: It’s up to Kathleen if she accepts your amendment.

MS. ALIOTO: Well my concern is the student achievement but if you think that’s a better way to deal with it Simon?

MR. PRESSNELL: Just a quick comment. I mean if we’re going to cite that do we not have to have evidence that there was an institution out of compliance for which they did not apply so therefore we can’t do that unless you have proof that there was an institution out of compliance and the Commission didn’t act on it.

MR. BOEHME: I would -- well I’m sure we don’t want to bring the executive back up but I did not hear that. I don’t
have evidence because I did not visit this Commission or have that
evidence but I’m also compelled to think that the way that this
executive approached this and could not answer basic questions
around it I absolutely agree with you Claude is that I don’t have
that evidence so I don’t.

But to what extent are they out of compliance -- I’m
not sure but I don’t feel that they -- so everyone knows it’s if the
institution or program does not bring itself into compliance within
the specified period the Agency must take immediate adverse
action unless the Agency for good cause extends the period for
achieving compliance.

She could not tell us what the process was with
those two Board meeting is what action has taken place? Do they
write a letter, do they phone them? Do they bring them in and
question them? So to me, that was not satisfactory and the
evidence is is that I wish she could have been more concrete.

MS. HONG: Can I just to provide some guidance.

So two different sections of the regulations that you’re looking at -
- so the first one, right the standard is student achievement whether
they’ve met it and that they have a standard that’s of sufficient
rigor -- so that’s, you know, whether you want to find them out of
compliance on that basis or but with regards to enforcement action,
just so you know, there is a written record of the staff having established that -- I see your point about her, you know, about not articulating that here in front of us for the record.

But there is a written record as I understand it that staff has reviewed that they’ve demonstrated that they have enforced their accreditation actually within the guidelines.

MR. BOEHME: They could have written and I agree with Claude again, I don’t have the evidence. But there’s a difference between a written policy and we don’t even know if it’s being enforced or not. They could have all these policies written down but who knows.

MS. MCKISSIC: They did have a -- they do have a pilot standard for 602.20 and during my observation at the Commission meeting they did enforce action. I mean well they deferred an action so they did address the non-compliance issues but they deferred an actual decision about the action.

So I don’t think they were not -- they were in compliance with 602.20.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Excuse me I’m sorry. It appears that your friendly amendment has not been accepted so if you want to make an amendment we could vote on that, if not, okay, Bobbie?
MS. DERLIN: As long as the friendly amendment is not accepted I’m ready to be quiet.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: How about you Ralph?

MR. WOLFF: As I understand I just want to be more clear that in requesting a report within 12 months we would need to specify what particular provision we found the report needed to address -- is that?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If I’m not mistaken we have already done that with the 6 -- I can’t remember.

MR. WOLFF: 602.16 and that’s -- I’m supportive of that.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: That’s the one.

MR. WOLFF: I feel that’s an adequate basis.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: She said that she didn’t want to comment because there was no friendly amendment approved. Okay we have a motion on the floor, we’ve had a lot of discussion. All in favor of the motion signify by raising your hand, all those opposed. Motion passes.

NACIQI RECOMMENDATION

NACIQI recommends that the said recognition be continued and remit the Agency an opportunity within a 12-month period to bring themselves into compliance with the
criteria set in staff report and then submitted for review within 30 day or after. Compliance report demonstrated compliance to the cited criteria which is outcomes and outcome assessment. Such continuation shall be affective until the Department reaches a final decision.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If you’d like we can take a 5 minute break, make it 7 minutes okay, thanks.

(Break - 2:40 p.m. - 2:47 p.m.)

RENEWAL OF RECOGNITION STATE AGENCY FOR THE APPROVAL OF PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PUERTO RICO STATE AGENCY FOR THE APPROVAL OF PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Call the meeting back to order please. The final Agency of this meeting -- This is the Renewal of Recognition for the State Agency for the Approval of Public PostSecondary Vocational Education, the Puerto Rico State Agency for the Approval of Postsecondary Vocational Technical Institutions and Programs.

Our Primary Readers are Roberta Derlin and Ralph Wolff and whoever would like to begin, Ralph?
MR. WOLFF: Yes I will give a little background.

This is going to be on one level it’s I think a fairly simple resolution but I still think we need to address some of the issue involved. This is a Puerto Rico state Agency for a public postsecondary vocational technical institutions and programs. The Agency was created in 1982 approval by the Secretary in 1983 there was an extensive discussion of its review in 2014.

I was not here but there are some of you I think sitting at the head of the table were actively involved in that review. There was a recommendation as I understand for denial and the Secretary or the senior Department official did not accept it and a compliance report was requested for 2016 which was accepted by NACIQI and the senior Department official.

There is an interesting history and you will see that the staff -- we did not receive information entirely -- partially, but not entirely in English. There wasn’t time or the capacity for translation and going back into the history I found it was interesting that three staff members ago there was a Spanish speaking staff member who was actually able to review and interpret -- I mean to review the staff and it was accepted at least in part if not entirely in Spanish.

Then it went to a new staff member who was not
and again there were issues in the history of the Agency where not all the materials were translated. And in the current situation we have with the result of the hurricane there hasn’t been an opportunity. So the staff have received considerable information in English but not everything has been translated.

And I do have a number of questions about reasonable expectations of taking self-studies and translating them and the like about what we might -- what is being required of the Agency, but at the very minimum the Agency or the staff was not able to complete its review given that all the documentation was not in English.

The Agency accredits 3 postsecondary institutions one of which has 4 campuses and 1 certification institution so it’s a very small state agency. The other thing that Valerie has indicated that I think is relevant and I’d like to ask about is that it is -- as a state agency is reviewed under a separate provision from a traditional or regular accrediting agency under 2.03 -- I’m not sure what the other is but you’ll give us more on that.

But it has a 4-year cycle versus a 5-year. So one of the things I think we need to make sure we explore in assuming that the Agency is given time is that it doesn’t run afoul of the time limit that the statute provides of 4-years since I think it’s up against
4-years since it’s last review 2014.

So it’s already at a 4-year point. So there are a number of issues I think we need to clarify here from the staff and the Agency representative and see if we can find a good resolution, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: That was a good introduction. Valerie and then Herman.

MS. LEFOR: Alright just a quick clarification before I give my formal remarks. It’s under 6.03 I think you said 2.03 just to make sure so 34 CFR 6.03.

Good afternoon Mr. Chair and members of the Committee. For the record my name is Valerie Lefor and I will be presenting a summary of the Petition for continued recognition submitted by the Puerto Rico State Agency for the approval of public postsecondary vocational technical institutions and programs referred to as PRSA.

The staff recommendation to the senior Department official is to defer the Agency’s recognition for one year and for such additional 6 months increments as the Agency continues to demonstrate to the staff that due to the continuing impact of Hurricane Maria, it remains unable to submit complete documentation which has been fully translated into English.
Based on review of the information in the Agency’s petition and the extenuating circumstances that Puerto Rico has continued to face with hurricanes, power outages and other forces of nature, the Agency was unable to provide documentation for all of the relevant sections of the Agency’s petition.

Without this information, Department staff was unable to verify many sections of the Agency’s petition. The Department has not received any written third-party comments or complaints during this review cycle regarding the Agency.

Therefore again, the staff recommendation to the senior Department official is to defer the Agency’s recognition for a period of one year and for such additional 6 month increments as the Agency continues to demonstrate to the state that due to the continuing impact of Hurricane Maria, it remains unable to submit complete documentation which has been fully translated into English.

There are representatives here from the Agency and I’m happy to answer any questions that you may have, this concludes my report. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Valerie, excuse me, your recommendation is to defer.

MS. LEFOR: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Not based on the petition but based on the exigency of the hurricane?

MS. LEFORD: Well so due to the aftermath of the hurricane there has been ongoing outages -- power outages and ongoing issues within the country and because of those power outages the documentation that was provided in the petition -- there was some documentation, it was not complete.

And so I'm not able to fully completely verify if it’s compliant or not and because I don’t have the documents I’m recommending a deferral.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: And again this would be a point of order and I’d like to discuss before we even get into the issue of the Agency since this is a very different situation I’d like to poll a view of the Committee to see if it is a deferral there’s no point in going over the incomplete information in my mind.

So does that make any sense to you? Is there anybody opposed to going, you know, to deferring this Agency?

John?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I’m not opposed at all.

What does deferring mean? I just need to --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: It gives them more time to complete.
MR. ETCHEMENDY: But they continue their recognition for that year?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Okay good.

MR. WOLFF: Yeah there are -- I’m not opposed to the deferral, we have a modified recommendation that we will be proposing but there are questions we would have of the Agency representatives with respect to some of the issues and there are also a couple of questions I’d want to ask the staff with respect to the recommendation the staff is making.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If, I’m just curious if we’re going to defer them they’re going to have to come back with a full petition. Do we need -- I mean we can do it, I don’t have a problem if that’s where you want to go. I just think it seems to be a redundant process.

MR. WOLFF: Well the issue is if I may just say, excuse me, is that they will continue with recognition and involve new programs and the issue we want to address is does the Agency have the capacity to do the monitoring that would be required and what my understanding is there is a new program that they will be reviewing and we want to make sure that the Agency has the capacity to review and approve it during this deferral period.
Secondly, there are modifications to the proposed
continuation beyond the 12 months that would be 6 month
extensions that we have concerns about.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well look, unless it was
unanimous that we move to a deferral, let’s go on with the process.
Frank, if you have something you want to say otherwise we’ll just
move on with the process.

MR. WU: Yeah, so even if we’re going to move on
I just wanted to say two things, one of which I’m going to guess
will be support for. But the other which there may not be support
for but I want to articulate it and see what other NACIQI members
think.

So the first I think we, NACIQI, should on the
record say something about the hurricane and the federal
government and that it is important for the government and entities
of the government which NACIQI is to show solicitude and
support for Puerto Rico and to recognize that something disastrous
has happened and that Puerto Rico is in a situation that is
calamitous and therefore it is entirely reasonable to accommodate
for this natural disaster over which officials of Puerto Rico have no
control.

And that it is good and important for officials and
we are government officials, to make some type of statement of
solicitude in that manner just out of common humanity and that
bureaucratic regulations shouldn’t trump these concerns.

So I at least, am going to make a statement. I’m
just speaking for myself, to that effect, that this is a very bad
situation. My heart goes out to you, complying with what NACIQI
wants when people don’t have clean water and sanitation and
electricity in my view would be the least of the concerns even of
your Agency, so my heart goes out to you.

The second issue though -- I wonder and I say this
with a little bit of trepidation but I wonder if other NACIQI
members and maybe staff has a different view, but I wonder if
other NACIQI members would be comfortable making some type
of statement to the effect that because Puerto Rico is a unique part
of the United States and it is part of the United States, to the extent
that materials are in Spanish or business is conducted in any
language other than English, my own view is that we ought to be
accommodating rather than the other way around.

And that we should, in some way, make clear that if
there are documents where there is a translation issue, et cetera,
that we -- education department, NACIQI and the staff of NACIQI
ought to do something and meet Puerto Rico halfway in terms of
timing and et cetera. So I would be prepared again -- this is me speaking just to say something because some of these issues are related to that.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Frank we can make those motions later on. All I was wanting to do is if everybody was in agreement it would be a deferment it doesn’t need to go beyond that but Ralph feels that we need to take it on and Herman you’re up for a second.

MR. BOUNDS: So first of all I want to address the first issue I think that Ralph brought up. There’s a requirement in the regulation that says an Agency must submit a petition for -- so they must submit within that time frame and once we get the petition and that has satisfied that regulatory requirement that they submit the petition for recognition.

Secondly I think Rachel Schultz was the analyst for Puerto Rico for years and I can remember in some of her staff reports we made note that the documentation didn’t come in English. We’ve always required documentation in English. We also report to those as you all know, the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education from foreign countries, all documentation has to be submitted in English.

Another couple of reasons for that they’re -- you know, the
Department may get FOYA requests, we couldn’t release that documentation without that information being translated and we don’t have the staff to do that -- staff or money to do that, but the expectation has always been to submit the petitions in English. We couldn’t accommodate, you know, languages in any of the territories, I mean we just couldn’t -- we couldn’t accommodate that process so I just wanted to make that point.

Again, the other issue with the deferral for Puerto Rico is not only the translation into English but again their process as you know, schools, that did not complete, students did not complete so the Agency has to have time to collect and gather information needed for the petition also and that was our reasoning for the -- to be able to work with them until we thought they had time to submit all the information and we had time to review the information.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well it’s good that we’re moving forward with the presentation from the Agency. I also want to introduce Tom Killiam who’s from the Office of Federal Student Aid who will act as translator for the -- for this process, okay Ralph.

MR. WOLFF: That’s important. The staff has recommended that not only there be a one year deferral but there be ongoing 6-month deferrals and my question is to explain what
would happen to trigger the ongoing 6-month deferrals and who
would make that determination and is there -- would these be
ongoing deferrals of 6-months, 6-months, 6-months but it seemed
like an indeterminate amount of time and so if you could just
explain how that would be triggered and what the end point would
be for the staff recommendation.

MS. LEFOR: So from my perspective the reason
we were making that recommendation was to acquire the
documentation needed to verify for all of the sections of the
review. So as I had mentioned there are several documents that
have been turned in, but they are not completed.

And so for example, the Agency collects a semi-
annual report and by semi-annual -- twice a year, so the one semi-
annual report that we have received collected information through
the month of February.

However, when you look at the report it looks like
half of the report is blank because the information that’s blank in
that other part of the section is about graduation rates and
information and so forth so the second half of that report would
come later -- probably in June and so having that second half of
information would give us a complete set of information and this is
how they do monitoring for an agency so in my experience in
working with other vocational and technical agencies they do an
annual report.

Puerto Rico has decided to do that as two reports
and so I wanted to get a full year’s worth of data. So in order to
get a full set of documents I would then make a determination if I
had all the documentation that I needed and if I had not gotten all
the documents that I needed at the end of one year I would be
coming back to you to report I have not received all of the
information, we will provide you another update in 6 months or
whenever the next NACIQI meeting is and provide regular
conversations to say, you know, I have not received this data or the
completion of all of these documents. And so that’s the way I
envision it in my head.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Do you want us to continue
are you ready for the continuation. Okay if the Agency would
introduce themselves and tell us the sad story of Puerto Rico.

MS. MOCKFORD: Thank you okay. Good
afternoon to Dr. Jennifer Hong, NACIQI Executive Director, Dr.
Arthur Keiser, NACIQI Chairman, Dr. Herman Bounds, Director
of the accreditation group, the U.S.D.E. staff and representatives
from all accredited agencies present this afternoon.

My name is Annie Mockford, Executive Director of
Puerto Rico State Approval Agency. After the devastation of two
hurricanes in September and all the criteria to complete and
comply with all the requirements for the renewal of recognition,
finally we are here.

We faced many challenges this past year, no
electricity, no communications, no internet, no water, no gas,
traffic jams until December then started to stabilize. Personally I
had electricity in mid-January. The deadline to submit the criteria
answers and evidence was on September 22\textsuperscript{nd}. Just two days after
the Hurricane Maria.

Thanks to all the persons in the USDE and the
accrediting group that shows -- with especially to Dr. Rachel
Schultz that she was in that moment still working for the
accreditation group, and Dr. Herman Bounds and also to the Dr.
Julio Callahan with the Department of Education Secretary that
gave me an extraordinary support allowing me to move to Florida
to continue working to comply with the process and the new
deadline by December 30\textsuperscript{th}.

I would like to take a moment to give the
background of the Agency. The Agency accredits 4 Associate
Degree institutions and one certification institution. The 5 of them
are posted. The tendency of these institutions was supposed to be
accredited during this year but they a -- are trying to stand up again
and the hurricane came through that and the east part of the island
and just crushed the institution so.

As accrediting Agency we recommend the
Secretary of Education and the technical education area to upgrade
the certificate institution, that’s the tool and dye-maker school to
that end an Associate Degree so we are in that process okay?

The Agency has two Boards, the Boards of
Examiners whoever raise the findings, the reaction plan and the
corrective action plan of the evaluator institution and determines
the amount of time of accreditations or any other determination.
The Advisory Commission that provides technical support and
advise the Agency and the Secretary of Education to maintain base
practices during the accreditation process of the applicants.

Both Boards have 5 member representatives of the
public employment areas and employers of postsecondary
educators and a graduate student of any of the 4 institutions and
representative also of the minority groups.

We also have a bank of 150 of our educators highly
qualified. All of this people who receive training during the year
and they are selected for an institution accreditation and additional
hands-on workshop. Also are trained every time the occupational
The Agency offers initial orientations to the institutions to be accredited and offers technical support to the accrediting steering committee as many times as they need it. Each institution submits a semi-annual report for each semester and a final report of the academic year.

This information is analyzed by the Advisory Commissions and make recommendations to the institutions and to the postsecondary program at the Department of Education. In 2017 the operation manual was approved that include all of the variations that the Agency had in just one manual.

It was designed with three major areas -- institutions, accreditation process, evaluators, process and the Agency procedures. We revised all the standards of accreditation, established ethical standards in all the forms used in the Agency procedures.

I also want to let you know that in December, 2017 all the institutions were visited to follow-up to the compliance with accreditation policy established by the USDE disaster plan. All of them complied and those that didn’t have the facility to offer the labs made alliance with private universities and industry to comply with the requirements.
I also visited those institutions to verify that students were properly served. At this moment I have visited 3 of the 5 accredited institutions to follow-up to the compliance with accreditation hours for the second semester. The first accredited semester ended in February and the second semester ends in mid-June.

I wish to let you know that up today I have been inform that the Agency would extend the accreditation services including the vocation of schools and we’d be part of a new accreditation under the Secretary of Education’s office.

As accreditation agencies we are growing as the new mission of the Secretary to emphasize the postsecondary education, making an alliance with the Labor Department and the Department of Economic Development and Commerce to offer the alternative to train and retrain the unemployed persons that lost their work after the pass of the hurricanes.

So here we are to receive the NACIQI recommendations to continue working for the economically this is my first visit from Puerto Rico and improve our accrediting process and service.

Finally I want to recognize the Commission’s support of Dr. Herman Bounds and Mrs. Valerie Lefor, the
accrediting group and make an open invitation to visit the Puerto Rico Agency next September when our institution is going to be evaluated on site. This way the USDE person may be familiarized with what we do and how we do and we make recommendations looking always to improve our procedures, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Primary Readers, do you have questions?

MR. WOLFF: Thank you very much. We’re really glad to have you hear and we -- I’ll just say very impressed that you were able to do all of this and to make all the visits and assure compliance in the midst of so many other things that really are higher priorities.

But we -- I have two questions. One is not withstanding -- I’m very concerned and I share Frank’s statement about all the attachments having to be translated and self-studies and the like and so I would just say I do wonder if there is any way in which a distinction can be made between your primary submission and some of the attachments and the work that needs to be done to translate.

But that’s an issue that I would ask that staff review because the supplemental documents and whether or not there would be people who would be able to read them in Spanish. But
the real issue it seems to me, the staff is recommending a one-year
deferral. Do you think you would be able to complete the
translations in that time frame?

        MS. MOCKFORD: Yes sir.

        MR. WOLFF: Thank you, and I just want to
acknowledge the work that’s involved in doing that. And
secondly, it does sound like that you are visiting with the
institutions making -- that they’re offering courses, that they’re
monitoring the credit hour and the like.

        You will be able to do, as you mentioned site visits
and will you be doing any reviews, institutional reviews, at the 5
institutions -- comprehensive reviews in the course of the coming
year?

        MS. MOCKFORD: Yes in September we are going
to evaluate on-site one of the campuses and in the second semester
we have the -- school, institutions excuse me, and the Ponce
campus so in this next year we are going to have three on-site
visits.

        MR. WOLFF: And those campuses are able to
offer classes and --

        MS. MOCKFORD: They are offering the classes
now.
MR. WOLFF: Okay.

MS. MOCKFORD: They have electricity, they have water, they’re operating.

MR. WOLFF: Excellent, we’re glad of that. And the other thing is so I also understand you’re working to approve a new program and so you will be able to complete that review?

MS. MOCKFORD: We are just starting with a postsecondary program in the Department of Education talking about this because that’s the certificate program that has more than 3,300 hours more 3 years -- almost 3 years. So we will make a story with other institutions in Puerto Rico that offer that course as a certificate and are only 900 hours so if we are offering 3,300 hours if you divide that it could be over to 73 certified credits so it could be changed to Associate Degree and they are working. The institution is working in that also.

MR. WOLFF: Okay thank you. I would just say that my concern was that you would be able to continue operations and it does sound like you are able to notwithstanding all the issues that are going on with getting the infrastructure, the island back up and running, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Bobbie?

MS. DERLIN: Well again thank you very much for
being here and for being so committed to your Agency’s work in
these tough times for you. In terms of the schools being open and
operational, do you have any estimate of whether those programs
are operating at the same level they were before the hurricane or
are there now fewer students, et cetera?

MS. MOCKFORD: When the hurricane -- they had
four campuses, they had more or less 4,000 students. They just
lost around 300 students that came back from those 300 students,
200 came back in the second semester.

MS. DERLIN: Great.

MS. MOCKFORD: So we just lost 100 students.

MS. DERLIN: That’s great, thank you very much.

I have a couple more questions that I have to scribble in between.
You mentioned that you’ll be doing four activities this year -- an
on-site campus visit in the fall, the pursuing the upgrade for the
tool and dye-maker school from certificate to Associates, visiting
the Ponce Campus and also the implementation of the new
certificate program. I didn’t hear or I didn’t understand properly
what is that certificate in?

MS. MOCKFORD: Tool and dye-maker.

MS. DERLIN: So that certificate is --

MS. MOCKFORD: Going to be now.
MS. DERLIN: Different but related to the tool and dye-maker school?

MS. MOCKFORD: Yes.

MS. DERLIN: Thank you. And this is a general question. As you do your reviews of the various campuses and programs and you might perceive that there are some programs that are operating in a very superior manner and perhaps some programs or schools that are struggling -- how do you differentiate the support you provide to different programs that are at different levels of accomplishment?

MS. MOCKFORD: That’s a complex -- well when I find that a program is not operating as we expect I communicate it to the program -- postsecondary program director in the Department of Education and I notify to the Advisory Commission and they make recommendations on what to do with them. Then we give follow-up during the year to see what the program has done in the Department of Education and how the institution is responding to it. So in addition to the on-site visits for the accreditations, we make follow-up visits at least two per semester, okay.

MS. DERLIN: Thank you. And I have one more question -- except I seem to be having a senior moment and I’ve
misplaced my question so I’ll -- oh, you mentioned there’s some
organizational restructuring for your unit, you’re reporting to a
different department in the future -- do you have an anticipation as
to how that will support your work?

MS. MOCKFORD: For sure it would be more
work okay. This is the first time in the 47 years and a half that I
have been working with the DE in Puerto Rico that a Secretary is
engaged with the postsecondary location and that’s why she made
some alliance with these other government departments so I know
that there will be more work.

I asked for more employees and we are in the
process.

MS. DERLIN: And one last thing I found my
forgotten question. There’s the issue of translation for lots of
material. There is also an issue of the completion of reports that
are related to student reporting by the institutions and their ability
to get those reports completed in a timely way. Are you feeling a
sense of confidence in the ability to get that work completed within
the next year?

MS. MOCKFORD: Well the person that is making
the translation is here. It’s a very hard work because for example
self-study can have 1,000 pages so it takes a lot of time to
translate, that’s why I’m asking for more employees in the office.

MS. DERLIN: But what about soliciting

information on student achievement the individual institutions. Do

you feel the institutions will be able to respond to you in a timely

way?

MS. MOCKFORD: Yes for sure.

MS. DERLIN: Thank you very much.

MS. MOCKFORD: Thanks to you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any further questions?

MS. ALIOTO: In one of the challenges that a

number of schools face without having a hurricane is businesses

and companies are not happy with some of the students who are

graduates of some of our programs.

In Puerto Rico what do you do to get the business

community and the schools connecting with one another so that

that’s less likely to happen? Are you doing anything like that?

MS. MOCKFORD: Well personally the Agency

doesn’t do that work. That’s an initiative of each campus to make

the alliances. Now for the first time the Secretary is making an

alliance with the Department of Labor and the Department of

Economic Development that has the statistics that we can help us

and the postsecondary education program to --
MR. KILLIAM: To redirect.

MS. MOCKFORD: To redirect the programs that are actually offered in the institutions.

MS. ALIOTO: And are there particular programs that have developed in response to the hurricane for construction or?

MS. MOCKFORD: That’s at the vocational -- that’s at the vocational education programs. They tend to take vocational schools. They have designed some programs, yes.

MS. ALIOTO: Okay thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I see no further questions, thank you very much for appearing before us and again our sympathies for all the people in Puerto Rico and the tragedy that they twice -- not once, twice they faced. We have got it once so.

Valerie, do you have any further comments?

MS. LEFOR: I think the one thing I just want to mention is while I sit here and I listen to the comments about the concerns of providing the documents in Spanish and then the English translation and the additional burden of that. I can recognize, you know, sort of the understanding and the place where that comes from.

I guess I just want to rearticulate the challenge that
it would present to us as it currently exists within amongst the Department staff. So we currently don’t have the resources to be able to you know, get those documents in Spanish. I’ve been with the accreditation group since 2014 and so during that time we have always asked both in this Committee and then sort of the sister Committee, the NCFMEA, that countries provide those documents to us in English.

We ask for that for a number of reasons. I think Herman talked about this. When we get FOYA requests, there’s a whole process that we have to go through in terms of redacting PII. If we were to add the additional layer of being able to translate that from Spanish to English and then having to do those redactions that would be an increased burden on the staff and so while I certainly recognize that one of the things that I’ve been doing a little bit of research on is trying to understand better, you know, the rules and processes of the government of Puerto Rico.

And so I was on their website and they do indicate that you know, while it predominantly is a Spanish speaking country they do recognize both English and Spanish as official languages and so I just wanted to sort of rearticulate the challenge that we have currently with the resources at the Department in order to be able to not have those documents in English. It’s a
limitation for us and it’s -- I just want to be on the record as saying
you know, I certainly recognize the concern and why that’s being
brought out but it is a challenge for us at the Department.

Also when -- I am planning to do a site visit,

hopefully, if it gets approved in September with the country and

we have been in early conversations with the school that they

would be providing the self-study document already in English in

anticipation that I would be attending that visit.

And so hopefully that would be, you know, some of

the burden off of Annie or the staff at the Agency and that the

institution itself would be providing some of that document even

though it can be a large document in English -- so just a few

additional thoughts.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Frank?

MR. WU: This is just a point of information that I

think it’s important to make because it’s a common confusion and

it’s -- understanding that there was no intent in which I think was

an erroneous statement. Puerto Rico is not a separate country, it’s

part of the United States, so I just want to be clear because it seems

that there are significant numbers of Americans who don’t realize

that and it’s actually if you ask me, related to the lack of response

to the hurricane because many people erroneously believed it to be
a foreign nation to which the United States doesn’t have some
obligation.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If we could stay, we have a
motion on the floor, is there any other comments about the specific
petition that we want to talk about because Herman made it clear
that that’s not our -- that’s their responsibility whether it be
translated or not. Is there anything else about the specific visit?

MR. WU: But I just want to make clear it’s not a
separate --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: We understand.

MR. WU: But I think is within our purview to be
clear about it’s part of the United States and if we were a separate
country they wouldn’t come before NACIQI to get our approval.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I understand.

MS. LEFOR: Per federal regulations Puerto Rico is
defined as a state, so thank you for making that clarification.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If we can focus and stay
focused there is a -- now I would entertain a motion, Bobbie?

MS. DERLIN: I have one.

MR. KEISER: Please.

MS. DERLIN: I have a motion. This is a revision
to the original staff recommendation to defer the Agency’s
recognition for one year to allow time for the Agency to submit and complete necessary documentation in English in a timely manner to enable full staff review period.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: There’s a motion is there a second -- second by Ralph who is the Primary Reader -- any discussion on the motion, John and Claude?

MR. ETCHEMENDY: So first it may change the 6 month extension thing.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yeah.

MS. DERLIN: Yes the main change is the elimination of the 6 month extension in part because of the ambiguity about just how long 6 month extensions might continue.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: So I’m afraid we’re going to fall on the opposite sides here. I don’t support that because I actually believe that giving the staff the discretion is a reasonable thing to do and I don’t think they will misuse it so I’m actually in favor of the original motion.

MS. DERLIN: Do I get to speak?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: If you’d like to speak.

MS. DERLIN: Well I don’t think my intention in offering this motion in this way is not to suggest that the staff would misuse the extension but in part to reflect the fact that there
is a particular history of the Agency prior to the significant challenge of the hurricane where things sort of were extended and slow and went on for a while. So this was more to support the Agency in completing its response in a timely way than any reflection on staff discretion, just to be clear on that score John.

MR. WOLFF: As I understand what the staff said was that if at the end of the year there was not an adequate basis to go forward they would come back here and ask for a 6 month extension so we’re not denying it but the staff recommendation seems so indeterminate we just wanted to say let’s try to put -- get this completed within a year.

There is -- and if not then we -- I don’t think the Agency would need to send representatives I just think that the staff would just come. But the staff recommendation was multiple 6 months and we were opposed to that.

MR. ETCHEMENDY: Could I offer a slightly friendly amendment.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Poor Jennifer.

MS. HONG: I just want to make sure we have the verbiage correct up here. We want to strike that last sentence right? You wanted a period, did you want the -- strike the last sentence but everything else was right but for one year -- one year
to allow.

MS. DERLIN: Yes.

MS. HONG: Okay, everything else is right just strike that last sentence.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Now John you can --

MR. ETCHEMENDY: I’m offering an amendment in the hopes that it might be friendly and that would be to say -- I don’t know how to word it to allow a single 6 month extension at the discretion of Agency staff.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Make it a motion.

MR. WOLFF: To staff there is a 4-year limit which they will be -- they’re already at and so if we go the way the 12 months is going to run is that it’s going to be 12 months from the date of the senior Department official’s letter which won’t be for another month or so and then we aren’t going to meet and so it will be a year plus the staff review following that.

I’m just trying to say it’s not so much I object to it but there is a 4-year time frame and it gets us into 6-years or a considerable period of time with an agency around which there have been previous issues and so how far can we go out and before we get to conduct our review.

MR. BOUNDS: If I may?
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Sure, the question was directed to you.

MR. BOUNDS: Okay thank you, so there’s an issue. There’s and Sally you can help me if I step on my toes here but so there are procedures in 602 and procedures in 603 and the relevance of it too where in 602 it states that an accrediting agency must submit their petition for recognition every 5 years. They are - - they being a state agency -- Puerto Rico -- they have a 4-year limit so that application of process kind of crosses over. So the issue is did they submit a petition within the 4-year period and then if there are other extenuating circumstances it causes a delay in the Department’s review or in this case for substantial reason.

I don’t think we would be in danger of any of the schools losing their Title IV, you know, losing their Title IV eligibility and since I have a mic I want to thank Frank for pointing out our comparison of our foreign metal committee with the aids was just an example of different languages that we were in no way saying that Puerto Rico was a foreign country, I just wanted to get on the record of saying that.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: There was a motion to make a friendly amendment. It was accepted by the maker, was it
accepted by the second?

MS. DERLIN: The friendly amendment.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay so the motion has been changed to reflect that one 6 month period. Is there any further discussion? All in favor of the motion signify by saying “Aye” -- all opposed thank you. You have been deferred.

NACIQI RECOMMENDATION

NACIQI recommends to defer the Agency’s recognition for one year to allow time for the Agency to submit and complete necessary documentation in English in a timely manner to enable full staff review period and to allow a single 6 month extension at the discretion of Agency staff.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Anything else that we need to cover today?

MR. BOEHME: I just wanted to at least say on the record that I agree with Frank’s point and certainly what’s going on with the hurricane, you know, our thoughts and prayers are with you and something to think about as a statement.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. This meeting is continued tomorrow morning at 8:30.

(Adjourned at 3:40 p.m.)