U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

+ + + + +

MEETING

THURSDAY
JULY 30, 2020

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met via Video Teleconference at 9:00 a.m., Arthur E. Keiser, Chair, presiding.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- DR. ARTHUR E. KEISER, Chair, Chancellor and CEO, Keiser University
- DR. KATHLEEN SULLIVAN ALIOTO, Strategic Advisor, Fundraiser and Consultant
- DR. RONNIE L. BOOTH, President Emeritus, Tri-County Technical College
- DR. WALLACE E. BOSTON, President, American Public University System, Inc.
- MS. AMANDA DELEKTA, Student Member, Michigan State University College of Law
- DR. JILL DERBY, Senior Consultant, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
- DR. DAVID A. EUBANKS, Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Institutional

Effectiveness, Furman University

- DR. GEORGE T. FRENCH, JR., President, Clark Atlanta University
- DR. PAUL J. LeBLANC, President, Southern New Hampshire University
- DR. D. MICHAEL LINDSAY, President, Gordon College
- MS. ANNE NEAL, Senior Fellow of American Council of Trustees and Alumni and President, National Association for Olmsted Parks
- MR. RICHARD F. O'DONNELL, Founder and CEO, Skills Fund
- DR. MARY ELLEN PETRISKO, Education Consultant
- DR. CLAUDE O. PRESSNELL, JR., President,
 Tennessee Independent Colleges and
 Universities Association
- DR. STEVEN VanAUSDLE, President Emeritus, Walla Walla Community College
- RALPH WOLFF, J.D., The Quality Assurance Commons for Higher and Postsecondary Education

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT:
DR. GEORGE ALAN SMITH, NACIQI Executive
 Director, Designated Federal Official
HERMAN BOUNDS, Director, Accreditation Group
ELIZABETH DAGGETT, Staff Analyst
DR. NICOLE S. HARRIS, Staff Analyst
CHARITY HELTON, Staff Analyst
VALERIE LEFOR, Staff Analyst
REHA MALLORY, Staff Analyst
DONNA MANGOLD, ESQ., Acting Deputy Assistant
General Counsel

DR. STEPHANIE McKISSIC, Staff Analyst MICHAEL STEIN, Staff Analyst

ACCREDITATION AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

New York State Board of Regents, State Education Department, Office of the Professions (Nursing Education)

RENEE GECSEDI, Associate in Nursing Education JEANNE-MARIE HAVENER, Associate in Nursing Education U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
DR. JIM MARTIN, Dean of Academics

National Intelligence University

J. SCOTT CAMERON, President

JOHN GANNON, Chair, Board of Visitors

TERRENCE MARKIN, Provost

DAVID SMITH, Assistant Provost

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome
Standard Review Procedures
Reorganization and Curriculum Change by
Federal Agencies and Institutions, CGSC
Reorganization and Curriculum Change by
Federal Agencies and Institutions, NIU
Subcommittee on Governance
Presentation on Student Success
Adjournment

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:03 a.m.)

DR. SMITH: Thank you. Good morning and welcome, everyone. This is day two of the meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, also known as NACIQI.

My name is George Alan Smith and I'm the Executive Director and Designated Federal Official of NACIQI. NACIQI was established by Section 114 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, or HEA, and is also governed by provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act as amended, or FACA, which set forth standards for the formation and use of advisory committees.

Sections 101 C and 487 C-4 of the HEA and Section 8016 of the Public Health Service

Act, 42 USC Section 2966, require the Secretary to publish lists of state approval agencies, national accrediting agencies and state approval and accrediting agencies for programs of nurse education that the Secretary determines to be

reliable authorities as to the quality of education provided by the institutions and programs they accredit.

Eligibility of the educational institutions and programs for participating in various federal programs requires accreditation by an agency listed by the Secretary.

As provided in HEA Section 114, NACIQI advises the Secretary in the discharge of these functions and is also authorized to provide advice regarding the process of eligibility and certification of institutions of higher education for participation in the federal student aid programs authorized under Title IV of the HEA.

Further, in addition to these charges NACIQI authorizes academic graduate degrees for federal agencies and institutions.

This authorization was provided by letter from the Office of Management and Budget in 1954 and this letter is available on the NACIQI website along with all other records related to NACIQI's deliberations.

1	Thank you again for participating
2	today. And at this point I'll turn the meeting
3	over to our Chairman, Arthur Keiser.
4	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well good morning,
5	everyone. Welcome to day two. We'd like to
6	begin by having the members of the committee
7	introduce themselves to you.
8	So, we will start with Amanda, our
9	student representative. Amanda, introduce
10	yourself.
11	MS. DELEKTA: Good morning. I am
12	Amanda Delekta and I am a rising 2L student at
13	Michigan State University College of Law.
14	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Anne?
15	MS. NEAL: Anne Neal, Senior Fellow of
16	American Council of Trustees and Alumni.
17	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude?
18	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Claude
19	Pressnell, President of the Tennessee Independent
20	Colleges and Universities.
21	CHAIRMAN KEISER: David?
22	DR. EUBANKS: Good morning. David

1	Eubanks at Furman University.
2	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill?
3	DR. DERBY: Senior Consultant,
4	Association of Governing Boards of Universities
5	and Colleges, Jill Derby.
6	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?
7	DR. ALIOTO: Kathleen Sullivan Alioto,
8	educational advocate for children from birth to
9	five.
10	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?
11	DR. PETRISKO: Mary Ellen Petrisko,
12	Educational Consultant.
13	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Michael?
14	DR. LINDSAY: Hi, I'm Michael Lindsay.
15	I serve as the President of Gordon College in
16	Boston.
17	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Rick?
18	MR. O'DONNELL: Rick O'Donnell,
19	Education Entrepreneur.
20	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Steven?
21	DR. VANAUSDLE: Steven VanAusdle,
22	President Emeritus, Walla Walla Community

1	College.
2	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Wallace?
3	DR. BOSTON: Wally Boston, President
4	of the American Public University System.
5	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Last, but on the
6	bottom without a camera is Paul.
7	DR. LEBLANC: Paul LeBlanc, President
8	of Southern New Hampshire University. Sorry, I
9	didn't put my camera back on.
10	CHAIRMAN KEISER: And my name is
11	Arthur Keiser. I'm Chancellor of Keiser
12	University in Florida. And welcome, everybody
13	who is joining us.
14	We have a couple of institutions that
15	we're going to be dealing with and some topics of
16	discussion. First, I would like to did
17	somebody say something?
18	DR. FRENCH: Yes. This is George
19	French. I'm on the call and on the screen.
20	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Oh, George.
21	DR. FRENCH: President of Clark
22	Atlanta University.

1 CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were not on the 2 screen for some reason. George, introduce yourself. 3 Go ahead. 4 DR. FRENCH: Okay, thank you. George 5 French, President, Clark Atlanta University. CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were on earlier 6 7 you were not on --8 I was on earlier and now DR. FRENCH: 9 the little thing is going on a circle. So, what I do is I'll sign off and sign back on because 10 it's going in a circle. I'm sure the host can 11 12 help me. Thank you, sir. 13 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, thank you. 14 I'm sorry to have missed you. I also would like to introduce George Smith who will introduce his 15 16 team, which I think is him. 17 DR. SMITH: You mean Herman Bounds. 18 CHAIRMAN KEISER: I thought I was 19 going to, George, don't you have you and Donna? 20 DR. SMITH: Donna is -- go ahead, 21 You can introduce yourself. She is part of OGC. 22

MS. MANGOLD: Donna Mangold, from the 1 2 Office of General Counsel of the Department of Education. 3 4 CHAIRMAN KEISER: And then Herman? 5 MR. BOUNDS: Yes. This is Herman I'm the director of the accreditation Bounds. 6 7 group. And the accreditation staff that should 8 be on today are Mike Stein, Karmon 9 Sanders-Coates, Charity Helton, Stephanie McKissic, Nicole Harris, Valerie Lefor, Reha 10 11 Mallory , Elizabeth Daggett. And we also have an 12 intern that worked with us this summer, Angela 13 Chiang. CHAIRMAN KEISER: 14 Well, thank you, Again, thanks to the whole staff for 15 16 their hard work. 17 Before we get started let me go over 18 what we normally do in terms of our standard 19 review process. We have primary readers who are 20 assigned to each agency to look at the report. 21 The primary readers introduce the 22 agency's application. From that point, the

department staff provides a briefing based on their findings at which point the agency representative provides comments in response to findings of the staff.

The primary reader then begins the process of asking questions of the agency, including potentially the standard questions adopted by NACIQI for initial and renewal applications.

Questions by the rest of the committee is followed by a response and a comment from the agency. There will be third party comments if there are any signed up at this point or requested in advance to appear.

The agency then has the opportunity to respond to the third party comments. The department staff then responds to the agency in third party comments.

The committee will then have a discussion and vote on the agency's application.

Then potentially a finer set of standard questions on improving instruction program

1 quality for initial renewal applications. 2 questions? Hopefully everybody is comfortable 3 4 with this process. It's been going on for a long 5 time. At which point now I'd like to 6 7 introduce, we are going to be reviewing the New 8 York State Board of Regents, State Education 9 Department, Office of Profession, specifically Nursing Education. 10 11 Our primary readers are Wally Boston 12 and Anne Neal. And I will turn it over to you 13 folks. You're muted, Anne. 14 Wally, do you want to MS. NEAL: Yes. 15 start or you want me to? 16 DR. BOSTON: Go ahead, I'll yield. 17 MS. NEAL: Okay. Just to summarize, 18 we are starting with the New York State Board of 19 They are here for a petition for Regents. 20 continued recognition. The Regents were established by state 21 22 law in 1784 and were granted authority to

accredit educational programs through a registration process in 1787. All educational and related institutions in New York State are under the leadership of the Regents.

They oversee the education licensure practice in terms of the practitioners in 45 or the 47 licensed professions. So, they are before us today and that's my introduction.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, I'd like to welcome the department staff, Charity Helton to give her report.

MS. HELTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the committee. My name is Charity Helton and I am providing the summary of the petition for renewal of recognition for the New York State Board of Regents in the area of Nursing Education.

The state most recently appeared before NACIQI for renewal of its recognition in 2016. At that time, the state was asked to submit a compliance report which was accepted by NACIQI in 2018.

The state's recognition for its accreditation of nursing programs does not includes access Title IV HEA programs.

It should be noted that this review of the state's recognition for its nursing education which encompasses RN programs is distinct from the state's recognition for vocational education which is limited to licensed practical nursing programs and which was the subject of review at the February 2020 NACIQI meeting.

The staff determination identified one outstanding issue related to the agency's on-site visits which I will discuss in a moment.

The staff recommended to the senior department officials to continue the agency's current recognition and require the agency to come into compliance within 12 months and to submit a compliance report 30 days after the 12 month period that demonstrates the agency's compliance with its bylaws and with the criteria for state agencies.

The staff analysis consisted of a

review of the agency's petition and supporting documentation. Department staff observed a site visit in the spring of 2020 which was held virtually due to the COVID pandemic.

The agency has not had any complaints or third party comments submitted to the department since its last review. The one outstanding issue for this petition is related to the agency's site visit.

During the past review cycle, the agency documented site visits to registered nursing programs including a mix of on-site, desk or virtual reviews for each program listed within the eight or ten year time frame required by the state depending on the type of program.

The state provided a narrative description and documentation to demonstrate its efforts to provide in-person site visits in most cases and provided documentations of its process for desk reviews or virtual site visits for those cases where an on-site review did not occur.

Based on the documentation provided,

it is not clear that the state is providing on-1 2 site reviews to all registered RN programs as part of its periodic review of those programs. 3 4 There are representatives from the State of New 5 York here today to respond to your questions. CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'd like to 6 introduce Renee Gecsedi, the Associate of Nursing 7 8 Education to talk to us about the New York State 9 board admission. Ms. Gecsedi? Please hold on one 10 EVENT PRODUCER: moment, Renee. 11 You should be able to speak now. 12 MS. GECSEDI: Thank you. 13 morning, Chairman Keiser and members of the 14 NACIQI committee. My name is Renee Gecsedi and I am one of two associates in nursing education at 15 16 the Department of Education in New York State. 17 To the point that, I think Charity was 18 discussing, when we submitted our response to the 19 initial analysis we understood that we were

And we have been doing either eight

focusing on the visit that occurred during our

last term of approval.

20

21

year or ten year renewal reviews depending on the type of program that we were dealing with.

On our website which still is new, we put up there if the program was a ten year renewal but we felt that there was a need to go back sooner as a result of a prior visit our time frames were shorter.

So, we might have been there in let's say 2018 and you might see on our website that the visit was there. They are a ten year. But we're going back in 2021.

And the reason being that we found deficiencies during the site visit that warrant us going back. And the reason we sometimes will do a desk review is oftentimes we have to do visits, in person visits when there is a new, there is a change to the master plan amendment.

So, we have to go out and conduct visits then too and so sometimes if the actual site visit was relatively close to when we did the master plan amendment visit we wouldn't necessarily just go into another physical visit

at that time because we had just been there. 1 2 We would review all the documentation that was submitted in to us. 3 4 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is that your report? 5 Just to remind the members of the committees if 6 they have questions to use the hand at the bottom 7 of the participant list. 8 And then of course when we vote we'll 9 use the megaphone for that. And we're going to do it a little slower today because they were 10 11 having a hard time getting the counts on the 12 votes. 13 So, if you have questions, Jill, then 14 Anne and then Wally. Actually, I'm sorry, Wally and Anne first and then Jill. Go ahead. 15 16 MS. NEAL: So, Renee, welcome. 17 to clarify, are you saying that in fact you have 18 followed and are in compliance with the 19 requirement that you do site visits within an 20 eight and ten year calendar? 21 MS. GECSEDI: Yes. 22 MS. NEAL: So, you disagree -- so

you're saying that you disagree with the staff's 1 2 analysis of your website and your visit? Yes, because what we had 3 MS. GECSEDI: 4 submitted in response we understood we were just 5 focusing in the four year period. Our website, as I said, is relatively new. 6 7 So, the list -- we gave, we submitted 8 in to the staff a list of the schools that was 9 not encompassing of all of our schools. just the schools that we had conducted a site 10 11 review during this last term. 12 I know that there was a comment made 13 in the final report that, for example, one of the 14 schools, from her vantage point, it appeared that we hadn't visited it in 30 years. And the fact 15 16 of the matter is that it had been visited and it 17 was a ten year renewal. 18 It was visited in 2015. So, they're 19 not going to be reviewed again until 2000-20 whatever, 25.

MS. NEAL: Thank you for that clarification.

21

1 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, Wally? 2 DR. BOSTON: I have a question on that So, this is Wally Boston. 3 exhibit too. Office of the Professions Nursing Accreditation 4 5 Programs and Nursing Accreditation, I think the example cited by the department was Adelphi. 6 7 The listing clearly says the last 8 visit spring of 2003. And I don't believe that 9 is the only one. Adirondack Community College says spring of 2005. 10 11 So, you know, without reviewing the 50 12 page list which, you know, I can understand you have a substantial number of institutions that 13 14 you're evaluating. But at the same time, if this is the evidence and the documentation I can 15 16 understand why the Department believes that 17 you're not visiting every eight to ten years. 18 Is there a master list that you 19 maintain that's just not published? 20 MS. GECSEDI: I didn't catch the 21 question, I'm sorry.

DR. BOSTON:

22

I said is there a master

1 list that you maintain that doesn't match the one 2 that was published? MS. GECSEDI: We do have a separate 3 4 documentation that we do keep which prior to 5 going on our website is what we maintained. And again, like I said we understood 6 7 that we were only looking at the school, updating 8 on our website at the point the schools that we 9 had visited during our previous term. DR. BOSTON: Which means this is the 10 master list? 11 12 MS. GECSEDI: Right. CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill then Kathleen 13 14 unless, Wally, do you have another question? I'm sorry if you do. 15 16 DR. BOSTON: I'm good for now, thank 17 you. 18 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill. 19 DR. DERBY: Yes. This is maybe more 20 of a general question. Eight to ten years seems 21 like a long span. But now we're in a new world with coronavirus when it comes to site visits and 22

virtual site visits.

How are you doing those? How are you planning to do those? How do you compensate for the fact that you're not going to be physically there?

MS. GECSEDI: For virtual visits we've actually just recently done several of them. We arrange to meet with the administration, excuse me.

We set up a schedule and we arrange to meet with the administration. We meet also with all of the support services personnel, all the faculty.

We have met with students and it's all been via Zoom. And the one I recently did, actually the nursing administrator went back on campus and with his camera did a video image of the space where the school -- where the nursing program is.

So, we could get a decent sense of the space where the program is offered.

DR. DERBY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?

DR. ALIOTO: Well, first of all,
Charity, I think it's great that you picked up
this seeming long time between visits.

And I guess that if it's in your bylaws that you just make a visit once every ten years that to me seems a little frightening with all the changes that are going on, even before the coronavirus.

You know, with the opioid crisis and now of course this. And I do think that you oversee the host of angels in our midst who are taking such courageous care of us in the nation and the world which is all the more reason that your analysis of what's going on is so critical.

So, when I saw these dates I thought, do you have those rules as part of your bylaws because the rates of -- graduation rates, student default rates are so low or the graduation rates are so high or how do you know what the students success and quality is of what's going on in your programs if you only visit once every ten years

1 or once every 30 years? 2 MS. GECSEDI: I appreciate that. Actually, what we have done is nursing has 3 national programmatic accreditation also. 4 5 So, depending on which of the national 6 programmatic accreditors the school has, we 7 follow their schedule. So, we've been doing 8 So, one is eight years and one is ten that. 9 years, excuse me. In the meantime though the schools are 10 11 having to give us annual reports. So, we monitor 12 them through that. If they make changes to, 13 we're always in touch with the programs. 14 If they change, want to change a program or offer a new program oftentimes that 15 16 warrants us going out and conducting a site 17 visit. So, although it might be -- let's say a 18 ten year period we are aware of what's going on 19 at the school constantly. 20 And we are oftentimes on campus more 21 than just once every ten years.

DR. ALIOTO: When I looked at the

documents, I must admit I did not go to the scorecard to find out how each one of these schools is doing. But can you tell us how they're doing?

I mean how do we -- in the documents that you submitted to us, to the Department -- the documents were primarily historical documents talking about the Board of Regents and, you know, a lot of discussion about the system under the Board of Regents and having taken the Regents exams as a kid, if that all is still around.

But that's not what we're interested in. We're interested in the quality of the programs and that does not come through and particularly not with this it's so far between. But I'm glad, so we could get all of that information through the national accreditors or regional accreditors and not through you?

MS. GECSEDI: Well, we collect all of the same things. That's why we align our site visits with the national programmatic accreditors because we look at all the same things.

And I think in some ways we scrutinize 1 2 it a little bit more. But we have all of that information and we keep records of that at the, 3 4 in the office, yes. I'm sorry. DR. ALIOTO: What is your record? 5 What is your graduation record? 6 7 MS. GECSEDI: I would have to go back 8 into looking that up. It's been very good. 9 national -- our pass rates on our NCLEX, the licensing exam is above the national average. 10 11 DR. ALIOTO: Glad to hear that, 12 congratulations. Okay. 13 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Ms. Gecsedi, I have 14 a question. And I still didn't think you answered Wally's question. 15 16 Adelphi, I was looking on your, the 17 information you submitted and they were not on --18 Adelphi was not on the summary chart. Were they 19 last visited in 2003? 20 I don't see a response to the concern 21 of the staff. When was their last visit prior to 22 us bringing it to your attention?

1 So, they had a site MS. GECSEDI: 2 visit in 2013. And then we were on campus again for a master plan amendment review for 3 institutional readiness in 2015. So, they're not 4 5 due for another visit until 2023. Okay, because I 6 CHAIRMAN KEISER: 7 didn't see that documentation. That was what 8 seems to be missing from the report. 9 MS. GECSEDI: I'm sorry. 10 CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were saying something. 11 12 MS. GECSEDI: Yes. The list that we 13 provided in response to the staff analysis was 14 just the schools that we had visited during this 15 last approval period that we've had. 16 It was not encompassing of all of our 17 schools. 18 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude? 19 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes, thank 20 Could you talk to us more about interim you. 21 reporting? And maybe you touched on it a little bit. 22

But just further explain what you 1 2 expect the institutions to submit to you between visits and whether or not there is an annual 3 4 review of, you know, passing grades or other 5 success measures and so forth that you get on a 6 regular basis that might throw a flag that would necessitate a visit. 7 8 So, could you talk more about what 9 happens between the visits and reporting. 10 MS. GECSEDI: Sure. I'm also going to 11 ask that my colleague, Jeanne-Marie Havener come 12 on here too because she's the one, I mean, we 13 both look at the annual reports. 14 But she's the one that actually does 15 the analysis of them. But we look at faculty 16 staff ratio. We look at pass rates. We look at 17 retention. Jeanne-Marie, what else do we look 18 at? 19 MS. HAVENER: Sorry, I was muted. Can 20 you hear me now? 21 MS. GECSEDI: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes.

MS. HAVENER: So, on an annual basis we ask all of the schools to report to us information about their current director, their current director's level of experience in running a program and in higher education and in practice.

We ask them information about their faculty. Numbers of faculty, qualifications of faculty, level of education, years of experience, the areas in which they are teaching.

Admissions information, enrollment information, demographic information related to their students. We look at student retention, graduation rates and of course pass rates, certification pass rates.

We ask for their annual budget. And on a semi-annual basis we ask them for an audited financial statement. Can you think of other things, Renee?

It's a pretty complex report. Also, we also ask them for a copy of their systematic evaluation plan and a summary of their systematic

evaluation for the year for each of the programs. 1 2 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay. this is required annually on behalf of every 3 institution that you accredit? 4 5 MS. HAVENER: Yes. VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: 6 And you do annual reviews. So, a couple more quick 7 8 questions related to this. 9 Has there ever been an instance that based on the annual report it necessitated or it 10 arose to the cause of a visit and how did that 11 12 play out? 13 MS. HAVENER: Sure. Well, I can just, 14 I can just give you a very recent example in 15 which we have a school that has had some financial difficulties. 16 17 So, their composite score is less than 18 1.5. And so, we have been in communication with 19 that school. We have asked them for a report 20 within 30 days. 21 And based on the findings of that 22 report we will either move on with continued

reporting or we will conduct a visit. So, that's an example of how things might be driven by information that's an annual report.

We have schools that have a drop in their NCLEX pass rates to provide us with an action plan for how it is they will improve this. Looking not just at what students will be required to do, but does this perhaps require them to think about different resources that are needed, faculty needs in terms of faculty development, et cetera.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: That's really helpful. One last question. And again, I assume you get very diverse programs. You've got some that are cast to larger institutions and you make them freestanding programs so that adds some complexity on the finance side.

But now here we are in the midst of a pandemic which is really transforming what education looks like.

What planning has the accrediting agency taken on to make adjustments to take a

look at institutional health and programmatic health in the midst of this pandemic because there are so many shifting pieces?

Can you kind of just enlighten us a little bit as to what planning you're doing around this crisis situation?

MS. HAVENER: So, we have been providing schools with guidance with regard to COVID-19 and in particular how it is to handle the clinical teaching experience for students using of course some guidance that comes out of the Governor's executive orders.

We have also been working with higher education running regional meetings, Zoom meetings with schools from each of the regions in New York State to try and determine what are some of the particular barriers that they are experiencing in trying to perhaps reopen.

What are some of the successes they have been experiencing and asking them to share with others how it is that they might also think about doing things differently given the current

pandemic.

I do know that other offices have certainly been involved and engaged in schools at the higher level. We're oftentimes more engaged at a programmatic level in the Office of Professions.

But I do know that the Office of College and University Education are, you know, that they are working with the schools as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes. I appreciate the fact that you're doing things that support the institution.

Is there any, is your Board considering any -- what about as an accreditor of the institutions are you thinking through any adjustments you may need to make say for temporary policy adjustments or anything like that in light of the reality of --

MS. HAVENER: Certainly. We have, the guidance documents that we have provided to the institutions have allowed them to provide alternative clinical experiences during COVID-19.

And we're continuing to evolve that guidance as we move forward. You know, we've been having discussions around virtual simulation, simulation, telehealth, social distancing guidelines for getting back onto the campus and working in the lab and simulation settings.

Many schools have been asking us about how it is that they can continue to provide classroom education, particularly with the larger schools and looking at all sorts of creative ways in which they can continue to engage their learners and while also doing forms of or sort of hybridized forms of education.

So, lots and lots of conversation. I think that Renee and I probably respond to at least ten or so communications per day.

And I think that we've handled somewhere over 400 proposals for alternative types of experiences during the spring and summer semesters.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay, thank

you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. Please do me a favor. If you've asked a question lower your hand so I can make sure that and if you want me to call you again raise it.

But I right now have Mary Ellen and George and if everybody would drop their hands I would be most appreciative unless you want to speak. So, Mary Ellen, you're up.

DR. PETRISKO: Thank you. I may have missed it. Forgive me if you introduced the topic and answered it and somehow I was paying attention to a different facet or issue.

The analysts final comments in this note that there was not any clarification about why some of the programs listed on the website have less than (audio interference) over ten years ago.

You addressed Adelphi which in fact had a review and it wasn't somehow registered.

Are there now institutions that you know had a review more than ten years ago?

Is there a list of those institutions 1 2 and what are you planning to do to catch up with whatever site visits that have to happen? 3 4 have a second question after that. 5 Sure. Like I said, we MS. GECSEDI: 6 do have a master list. And we really, I'm 7 looking at the master list right now. 8 And there really aren't really any 9 true outliers that are beyond ten years. Jeanne-Marie, can you think of any off the top of your 10 11 head? 12 MS. HAVENER: I think that we have 13 maybe one school that we visited at 11 years, 14 maybe. And some of that, I think, were just 15 scheduling issues for them as well as for us and 16 the fact that they had a new program that they 17 were trying to bring up and we were trying to 18 coincide with those issues. 19 But my recollection is that we're in 20 compliance. 21 DR. PETRISKO: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?

1 So, this kind of DR. PETRISKO: Yes. 2 goes on to Claude's question, I think as well about future planning. 3 Not so much about the institutions. 4 5 But if you have site visits that were formerly scheduled --6 7 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen, you just 8 froze. 9 Yes, my whole computer DR. PETRISKO: 10 just died for some reason. But you can still 11 hear me, I can still ask my question. 12 So, site visits that would happen now 13 or this year, what are you doing about those? 14 Are those being postponed? I mean, the point seems to be that a virtual visit doesn't count. 15 16 So, how are you addressing that? 17 MS. GECSEDI: Well, for right now we 18 are doing, planning to do virtual visits, keep 19 them on schedule. 20 But then as soon as we're able to 21 travel again and be on campus then we'll make a 22 point of going to these schools and following up

with the virtual visit. 1 2 DR. PETRISKO: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN KEISER: 3 George? 4 DR. FRENCH: Thank you. I have a very 5 brief question. It sounds like the information is gathered institutionally as far as the budgets 6 7 and the institutional health is quite thorough. 8 Could you speak more, however, to your 9 measures for student success? I heard you say 10 graduation and retention. Do we build any deeper 11 into SLOs, Student Learning Outcomes or any other 12 measures of student success? 13 MS. HAVENER: Sure. So, this is 14 Jeanne-Marie. And we do ask each program to provide us with a systematic evaluation plan. 15 16 And we do allow them, I mean there are 17 certain things that everybody has to report on. 18 And those are, have to do with student retention 19 and graduation and certification or licensure of 20 examination pass rates. 21 But beyond that, programs are required

to provide us with their Student Learning

1 Outcomes or program outcomes. And in their 2 systematic evaluation plan they provide us with benchmarks that they are using to determine 3 4 whether or not the students are meeting those 5 outcomes. And in their annual report they 6 7 provide us with a summary of where they are in 8 terms of meeting those benchmarks and if they're 9 not meeting the benchmarks what their plan is to 10 make systematic improvements. 11 It's very individualized. 12 school, of course, is different. 13 DR. FRENCH: No, you've answered it. 14 That's exactly what I was looking for. Thank 15 you. 16 (Simultaneous speaking.) 17 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen, I don't 18 know if you're still on. Do you have your hand 19 raised? 20 Anne, you have your hand raised. 21 you have a question? Okay. And Jeanne-Marie, 22 you can lower your hand too.

1 Since there are no more questions, I 2 would like to call Charity back to discuss the Charity? report of the Commission. 3 MS. HELTON: Good morning. 4 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Do you have any 5 comments concerning the report? 6 In my discussions with 7 MS. HELTON: 8 the nursing staff and their responses to our 9 draft staff analysis they did indicate that they had a plan to update their website and that part 10 11 of the confusion was due to the website being out 12 of date. 13 And so, that -- those updates that have occurred did not occur in time to make it 14 15 into the final staff analysis. And so, our staff 16 haven't had a chance to review those. 17 But I can see looking at the website 18 today that some of the changes have been made to 19 it and it does look as if there has been some 20 part of that process of updating the website with 21 more recent data.

CHAIRMAN KEISER:

22

Herman, you have a

comment?

MR. BOUNDS: Yes, I do. I just wanted to make one other comment too. I know the agency talked about the review being of the four year period.

But I just wanted to remind everyone, you know, part of our reviews are kind of fluid. So, in that process again if we go to a website to verify things if there are things out of date regardless of whether that is inside or outside of the recognition period we would make note of that.

But I just think the other issue was the issue of the desk reviews. We just wanted to make sure that the desk reviews were not taking the place of an actual virtual site visit or a site visit.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any questions for the staff from the readers? Kathleen, you had a question.

DR. ALIOTO: Yes. Thank you again, Charity, for your due diligence on this (audio

interference) Department and State of New York. 1 2 I wanted to, in terms of your analysis did you -- beyond the problem of the distance 3 between visits. Did you have other concerns 4 5 about the quality of what's going on in these colleges and institutions? 6 7 MS. HELTON: So, you were a little bit 8 But I believe your question was if I muffled. 9 had concerns about the quality of what's happening in the institutions. 10 11 And certainly no concerns of that 12 nature were identified in the staff analysis, no. 13 DR. ALIOTO: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Wally, do you have a question? 15 16 DR. BOSTON: Yes, I do. So, Charity, 17 did you resolve the issue that was documented in 18 the files about the quality of the desk review 19 versus the on-site visit? 20 MS. HELTON: So, the concern was not 21 related to the quality of the desk review, but related to the fact that the nursing registration 22

regulations specifically require on-site visits.

And it uses that term on-site visits.

So, the fact that some of the periodic program renewals were taking place through a desk review rather than an on-site visit didn't seem to meet that requirement.

Of course, at this point in time all accrediting agencies have temporary flexibility so that at this time virtual site visits are allowed. At the time they were occurring they were not.

DR. BOSTON: Right. And that was, my follow up question to that was going to be if we were to vote in favor of your recommendation for the 12 month extension so all the documentation is correct, on a theoretical basis they wouldn't be able to come into compliance if COVID keeps them from doing on-site visits, right?

MS. HELTON: Any site visits that occur virtually at this time would be compliant site visits. So, it's a difficult issue.

Washington DC

DR. BOSTON: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay, I'm sorry. 2 Folks, if you would please raise or lower your hands after you ask a question. Herman, do you 3 4 have something you wanted to say? 5 Yes, I do. I just wanted MR. BOUNDS: to add that remember the virtual site visits are 6 7 adequate to replace an on-site visit. 8 At some point in time you have to go 9 back out and conduct an on-site visit. The issue here was whether the desk reviews were equivalent 10 to what a virtual site visit would be. 11 12 So, I think that's the issue. was the extent of these desk reviews? Are they 13 14 adequate in the place of a virtual site visit or an on-site visit? Not that the desk audits were 15 16 somehow equal to or the same thing as a virtual 17 site visit. 18 CHAIRMAN KEISER: I would be remiss to 19 say that there were no third party commenters. 20 So, it's not that I skipped that, but there were 21 no third party commenters.

Any further questions of staff?

1	Sensing none, either Wally or Anne, would you
2	like to make a motion?
3	DR. BOSTON: Anne, I'm glad to unless
4	you go ahead.
5	MS. NEAL: All right. I move that we
6	approve the staff recommendation to continue the
7	agency's recognition at this time and require the
8	agency to come into compliance within 12 months
9	in terms of its reporting and submit a compliance
10	report due 30 days thereafter.
11	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is there a second?
12	DR. BOSTON: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Herman, do you have
14	a question or a comment?
15	MR. BOUNDS: I'm sorry. There we go.
16	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any discussion? Is
17	there discussion?
18	DR. PETRISKO: This is Mary Ellen. I
19	did not wave my hand because I was thrown out of
20	the participants.
21	So, I have a screen here but I can't
22	chat, I can't raise my hand and I have no video.

1 So, if somebody could let me back in I'll be able 2 to vote. Okay. 3 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Do you have 4 a question? Ralph, is that you? 5 MR. WOLFF: Yes, it is me. But I'm 6 listed as an attendee. I don't know why I'm not, 7 I don't know if that enables for you to see me 8 when I raise my hand. 9 CHAIRMAN KEISER: You are still, I see 10 your hand. I don't see you. But, Candace, would 11 you fix that for him, please? Do you have a 12 question, Ralph, or a comment? I do. 13 MR. WOLFF: And that is I 14 support the motion. It's not a problem with 15 that. 16 But I just would like to make sure 17 that the agency addresses in the next response to 18 us that the ten year period, that there's an 19 adequate, that it addresses the issue that several people have raised, including Claude that 20 21 during the interim period, ten years is a long

time.

That during the interim period there 1 2 is an adequate interaction with the programs and demonstrations where there are problems that they 3 4 have addressed those problems. CHAIRMAN KEISER: David, you had a 5 6 comment. DR. EUBANKS: Yes, thank you. 7 I have 8 a couple of comments too. I'm in favor of the 9 motion. I think there's a couple of questions 10 11 that need to be clarified. One is that the 12 agency places some importance on public communication and accreditation status and that 13 14 they take seriously the recordkeeping in the 15 background. 16 I didn't get a sense of confidence 17 from that discussion. And secondly, the 18 statement was made that the pass rates were higher than national averages. 19 20 But Appendix 14 in their presentation 21 seems to contradict that. So, they might want to

22

clear that up.

1	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Will that be
2	as part of the motion or is just a supplemental
3	for the staff to follow up on?
4	DR. EUBANKS: I would accept that as
5	just supplemental.
6	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. I had also,
7	from my perspective, I think I have a real
8	concern that there are still outliers beyond 11,
9	you know, ten years.
10	I don't think the fact that the school
11	is scheduled should dictate whether the visit is
12	done prior to the expiration point. So, I think
13	they need to be more careful with that.
14	But again, I support the motion also.
15	Is there any further discussion? I don't see
16	anybody's. Okay. I'll call the question.
17	Now, what we do is there is a
18	megaphone at the bottom corner. Hello. Did
19	somebody say something?
20	DR. PETRISKO: I am still unable to
21	vote. I'm going to reset this. I'm sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are you in favor of

the motion or not because --1 2 DR. PETRISKO: I'm in, this is Mary Ellen and I'm in favor of the motion. Thank you. 3 4 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Would you get 5 that, go to the megaphone and vote for yes or no. 6 No is against the motion, yes is for the motion? 7 Kathleen, you have not voted yet. If you want to 8 vote. 9 DR. ALIOTO: I'm doing, there it is. 10 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Does the 11 staff have what they need? George? 12 DR. SMITH: Let's see. So, she's 13 typing now. Angela, are you on? Can you hear 14 us? 15 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just to explain, 16 yesterday was a little fast for the person who is 17 taking all the notes. So, this is what is taking 18 us a little bit of extra time. 19 DR. SMITH: She may not be able to 20 So, what you see or perhaps what the Webex see. 21 representative sees, we'll need a call of those

numbers so that she can record it.

1	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Well, it
2	looks unanimous. So
3	DR. SMITH: Okay, great.
4	DR. ALIOTO: Arthur, you didn't vote.
5	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay, well thank
6	you. What?
7	DR. ALIOTO: You didn't vote.
8	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, you voted. I
9	see it.
10	DR. ALIOTO: You didn't.
11	CHAIRMAN KEISER: I don't normally
12	vote. Okay. Thank you. Let's move to the next
13	
14	EVENT PRODUCER: Can you just hold on
15	just one more moment? Okay, thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. We'll move to
17	the next Agency. Now, I was one of the primary
18	readers.
19	So, I'm going to turn the gavel over
20	to Claude who is our Vice Chair. Claude, you are
21	now in charge.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: All right.

Thank you, Art. So, the Agency now up for review is the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College which is undergoing a substantive change and curriculum change.

I might mention ahead of time here that NACIQI is in a position of privilege to not only review these but also serve as the accreditor for these federal agencies. And so, and that's where the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College falls under.

The primary readers to introduce are Amanda Delekta and Art Keiser. And, Amanda, I think you're going to be primary on this.

MS. DELEKTA: Yes. So, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College is a graduate school for United States Army and sister service officers, interagency representatives and international military officers.

CGSC is a unique institution with a mission focused on the tactics and operations associated with ground warfare. CGSC currently offers a master's of military arts and sciences,

which is a thesis-driven master's program in 1 2 which over 1,100 students enroll in each cohort. But CGSC is only able to confer 150 3 4 master degrees to graduates in a single year 5 because thesis work is so labor intensive for faculty. 6 7 The subject of this review is to 8 expand the scope of CGSC's recognition to 9 recognize a new, non-thesis master's program, the master's of operational studies, which unlike the 10 11 existing program is based on military operations 12 instead of being research focused. And with 13 that, I can yield to Valerie. 14 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay, very 15 good. Yes, Valerie is the Department staff. 16 And, Valerie, you want to provide your briefing. 17 MS. LEFOR: Good morning. Happy to do 18 so. 19 Good morning, Mr. Vice Chair and For the record, I am Valerie Lefor and 20 Members. 21 I will be providing an update for NACIQI

regarding a substantive change request for an

existing degree granting institution.

Specifically, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, hereafter referred to as CGCS, has submitted a request for modification of an existing degree granting authority to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

NACIQI has designated the review committee for matters concerning degree granting authority of military educational institutions as outlined in the U.S. Department of Defense Instruction 5545-04 and the federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by federal agencies and institutions.

Department of Defense Guidance 5545.04 from April 2, 2011, recommends notification of NACIQI in regards to changes when seeking to modify an existing degree granting authority.

It explains that the institution should submit notification to the Department of Education when there are changes that are made by the military educational institution.

The process outlined in this guidance

explains that a copy of the substantive change request within 60 days of its submission also goes to the applicable accrediting agency.

Under this guidance recommendations by the U.S. Secretary of Education regarding substantive change requests submitted by military educational institutions will be included with subsequent notification to the House and Senate Armed Service Committees.

Department staff and a subgroup of NACIQI members have reviewed the information submitted by CGCS and determined that the change is related to a curriculum change, the master's of operational studies, or MOS degree.

The MOS degree was derived from the master of military arts and science program and then the AS degree to better meet the needs of the Army and its officers as they further their graduate level education.

The aspects of the existing degree granting program meet the standards for the master's degree which is encompassed in the

existing accreditation of the institution by the Higher Learning Commission.

Since notification to NACIQI is required this report serves as the means of formal notification. The recommendation is to accept the report with the curriculum change with any additional comments provided by the NACIQI.

Further requested is the retroactive approval status of the curriculum change for those who are currently enrolled in this program.

I'll be happy to answer any questions that you have and I believe that there is a representative from the institution also here and will receive your questions. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Thank you,
Valerie. So, it's my honor at this time to
introduce Jim Martin who is the head of academics
for the U.S. Army Command and General Staff
College. Jim, are you with us?

EVENT PRODUCER: Just one moment. If you could please press pound 2 on your phone.

DR. MARTIN: I raised my hand. I

apologize. I was trying to unmute myself. 1 2 you see me, sir? VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: 3 Not yet, but 4 I'm sure we'll get it. And, Jim, I don't know if 5 you have any staff with you that, if you could reintroduce yourself and if you do have other 6 7 introductions to make that would be great. 8 Yes, sir. DR. MARTIN: I have no one 9 I'm working from my home office. with me. Because of COVID we are still in a distributed 10 11 mode. 12 Mr. Vice Chairperson, Members of the 13 NACIQI Committee, public attendees, I am Dr. James Martin, the Dean of Academics for U.S. Army 14 Command and General Staff College located at Fort 15 16 Leavenworth, Kansas. 17 The college tracks its history back to 18 the creation of the first U.S. Army school of 19 professional military education in 1881 by General William Tecumseh Sherman. 20 21 Since that time the college has 22 educated the Army's leaders for over 130 years

for service to our country. Yesterday a Member of this Committee maintained that one important measure of quality in institutions of higher learning is what its graduates can do.

I would submit that such a measure should put the Army Staff College on positive ground. Our graduates have led American military formations in every conflict since the Spanish American War and during the intervening periods of peace.

In World War II they included most of the senior Army officers who led our forces, including MacArthur, Eisenhower, Bradley,
Marshall, Arnold and Patten.

Since then they have included other well-known figures such as Colin Powell and H.R. McMaster who have served our country in the military and civilian roles. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chief Staff of the Army are both graduates.

Beyond just our American graduates our college has thousands of international military

students who have studied at Fort Leavenworth including 27 foreign heads of state.

More important to me, my son has just finished a deployment from the Middle East and all three of his senior leaders were graduates of this institution. Though a relatively small student body comes to Fort Leavenworth, we believe that our education has an impact on our nation.

Since the legislation authorized the awarding of a graduate degree, a master's of military art and science in 1974, the college was accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

After a change in federal legislation in 2011, the institution has expanded its degree offerings at appropriate times. Previously, NACIQI and the Department of Education have approved the renaming of two graduate degree programs at the college.

And the college has added an undergraduate degree for enlisted soldiers.

Today I am here to speak to our request to add a

new graduate degree to our authorization.

The master's of military art and science is a degree focused on discipline and military science at the operational level of war. And since its inception in 1974 has included full thesis and an oral comprehensive examination. It is based on the course work of the year-long Command and General Staff Officer Course which educates approximately 1,200 students each year and results in between 140 and 150 graduate degrees each year.

After changes in legislation in 2011, the college has been modifying the curriculum and staff officers course to move towards the ability to offer a professional degree to a larger number of students.

The college has a strong assessment program, data from which has driven us to add additional components to the course such as a universal oral and written comprehensive examination, increased writing requirements and improved experiential program in military art and

science.

At this time we have achieved a level of rigor and resources where we're comfortable to offer our students a graduate degree opportunity on a broader basis and a desire to add the master's of operational studies, a non-thesis option of the master of military art and science through our authorization.

We wish to move forward with the thesis-based option with a research focused and non-thesis option which is a professional degree. We have asked that the class which studied in '19 through '20 that has just graduated be grandfathered as they went through the curriculum that is under consideration.

Thank you for your time today and I stand ready to answer any questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Thank you,
Dr. Martin. I appreciate that very much.
Questions from the primary readers, Amanda or
Art?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I have no questions.

1 MS. DELEKTA: I have no questions 2 either. VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: 3 Okay. 4 Questions from the rest of the Committee? Well, 5 isn't this one easy or easier anyway. Okay, Kathleen, I see your hand. 6 Thank you. 7 DR. ALIOTO: Sorry. I have two 8 First, I was curious that you have questions. 9 150 graduates a year when you're training 1,200 10 people. 11 Is that because people are doing this 12 part-time like a community college situation? 13 Why is that? 14 DR. MARTIN: Ma'am, that's because the graduate degree program, the master of military 15 16 arts and science is an optional program. So, 17 students are going through a military education 18 program for which they get a military credential. 19 But they have the opportunity to take 20 the thesis-based master's degree. We are trying 21 to open that up to a non-thesis based master's

degree for a broader audience of students.

1	DR. ALIOTO: All right. So, when
2	somebody is serving our country and they're
3	taking one set of training plus they're taking
4	one or two courses, is that it? How long does it
5	take them to get through the 1,200 or however
6	presently?
7	DR. MARTIN: Ma'am, they come to
8	school at Fort Leavenworth at the present time.
9	That is their job. And they are with us for a
10	year.
11	DR. ALIOTO: So, can you get more than
12	1,200 through then? I mean, more than 150?
13	DR. MARTIN: No, ma'am. We put 1,200
14	through overall. But right now 150, generally,
15	on average, choose to pursue the master's degree.
16	The others can pursue master's degree from
17	multiple universities which teach in the evening
18	in our building.
19	DR. ALIOTO: I see, okay. Now, let me
20	go to this other.
21	When you're talking about what the
22	requirements are in CGSC Bulletin 690, Appendix

B, you say because of this unique situation the standard in graduate programs is to -- either hiring a new civilian faculty member with a terminal degree which you later say is a PhD or hire a civilian faculty member with a master's degree and the formal stipulation that they will undertake a terminal degree and finish within a six year time frame.

I wondered about that when you have people who have given their lives to service. I mean, I would think that people would know things that are far beyond doctors.

I love my doctorate, but I think that when people have service in the military that they probably have other qualifications that might be more pertinent to the lives of leading other members of the military.

So, have you thought about having other qualifications beyond what you're having for the master's degree presently? Have you thought about a degree in what you actually do? Do you see what I'm saying?

DR. MARTIN: Yes, ma'am.

DR. ALIOTO: I'm saying why does somebody have to have a doctorate to be teaching in this program? I would argue that there would be an in service doctorate in kind for heroism or --

DR. MARTIN: Ma'am, also in 690

Appendix B, you will find that we talk about

hiring people based on tested experience. Tested

experience is exactly what you're talking about.

I will hire a former brigade commander who has a master's degree but not a doctorate but who basically has an experiential doctorate in war fighting. They have led soldiers in combat and they have the knowledge.

For our tactics department, there is no doctorate in tactics in America. Now, there is nowhere for me to send them to get that preparation. That preparation is experiential in nature.

As to the question of why don't we have our own degree in that vein, actually you

won't see me because I'm going to require it.

But you will see my successor somewhere down the road probably with a discussion of a professional doctorate for the military.

But that's under discussion at this time. But our accreditor says that to teach in a graduate program you must have the degree higher or tested experience. So, we require a doctorate.

DR. ALIOTO: Well, I think that is exactly my point. I did not see that in the documents. But I'm very glad to hear and thank you very much for your service to our nation.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Wally, do you have questions?

DR. BOSTON: Yes, yes. I just ask for one clarification which I think this may or may not be a staff question.

But the request is also for us to grandfather the graduating class that, I guess, graduated in June since they went through this program.

And since, you know, we had not the 1 2 exact issue yesterday, but yesterday we had an issue about backdating accreditation the 3 4 institution is already accredited. 5 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes, why 6 don't we -- can we bring Valerie back up because 7 I think you're right. This is probably more of a 8 staff and Herman question. 9 And maybe Valerie can explain whether or not that's actually a formal portion of the 10 request of the agency as well. Does that make 11 12 sense? 13 DR. BOSTON: Yes. 14 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay, thank Any other questions though for, Dr. Martin? 15 16 Okay, seeing none my understanding is there are 17 no third party comments. 18 And so, I think, Valerie, if we could 19 have you come back then and answer Wally's 20 question and then have any final comments before

MS. LEFOR: Yes, no problem.

we -- thank you, Valerie.

21

22

So, to

answer the question this has actually been sort of common practice with our federal degree granting.

We've done it with other entities in the past just due to timing and how the process works in order to get through all of the different steps and the reviews and all of that.

More often than not the institution has started the process with their institutional accreditor.

They started the substantive change process under the traditional regulations that you're used to. And then they're also working on the process with you all for the NACIQI federal degree granting process.

And because of the amount of time that it takes we have in the past grandfathered those other classes in previously. And so, this is not an uncommon request.

We've done it previously and for other federal degree granting institutes.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Before I call on George and other questions, can you tell

me what's HLC's position on this particular 1 2 request? So, HLC issued a letter 3 MS. LEFOR: stating that they did not to do an additional 4 5 petition, that they felt this degree and content information had been reviewed under the master of 6 military arts and science program. 7 8 It was just the removal of the thesis 9 And so, they approved the request but they did not do an additional review because they 10 11 felt they had already encompassed that. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Great, thank 13 you. Herman? 14 Yes. So, I just wanted MR. BOUNDS: to bring up that the military degree granting 15 16 role is not covered under any of the regulations 17 in 602 or the Higher Education Act in general. 18 So, the retroactive accreditation 19 issue, you know, is not an applicable issue for 20 military degree granting. 21 The other thing to bring up and, Val, you can correct me if I'm wrong. 22 But this

process is more associated with the state 1 2 authorization role of establishing an institution. 3 So, we're performing that function for 4 5 the military organization. They still have to go to the accrediting body to be accredited. 6 we're performing that role as the authorizer. 7 8 We're saying that, yes, this degree 9 is, you know, it's college level and it's, you know, a higher education, it would qualify as a 10 11 higher education program with these special needs 12 that can't be established in regular institutions. 13 14 I just wanted to make that 15 distinction. VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: 16 Yes, thank 17 you very much, Herman. Any other questions for 18 the staff for Valerie or for Herman? 19 Seeing none, Amanda or Arthur, do you have a recommendation, a motion to make? 20 21 DR. DERBY: I move that we grant the 22 staff recommendation for the expansion of scope.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay. Is
2	there a second?
3	CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'll second that.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Thank you,
5	Art. Any comments, questions, discussion among
6	the Members?
7	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just, if I may just
8	add a little. One of the biggest issues that
9	came up in this review, and Kathleen kind of
LO	focused on it a lot, is the need to have the
L1	comparability between a regular degree and a
L2	military degree and that was a discussion that
L3	was fully vetted by staff.
L 4	And Valerie did a great job doing
L5	that. So, I just wanted that to be aware.
L6	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: All right.
L7	Thank you, Art. Any other questions or points of
L8	discussion, comments?
L9	All right. Seeing none, if you would
20	go to your megaphone and all in favor of the
21	motion vote, yes. Those opposed vote, no.
22	Everybody make sure you cast your

And would the staff record the votes? 1 votes. 2 And let me know when you feel like you've got it. Have the votes been recorded? George, do you 3 4 know? 5 DR. SMITH: I cannot see it. (Simultaneous speaking.) 6 7 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Here it is. The Board just lit up. We've got it. All right. 8 9 Thank you all very much. And thank you, Dr. Martin, for your 10 presentation today and thank you, Valerie as 11 well. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to turn the gavel 12 13 back to you. 14 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, Claude, 15 for an outstanding job. Appreciate that. 16 move to our last recognition requirement, the 17 Reorganization and Curriculum Change by Federal 18 Agencies and Institutions. 19 This is the National Intelligence 20 University: Undergoing Substantive Change from 21 Department of Defense to the Director of National

The two primary readers are David

Intelligence.

Eubanks and Claude Pressnell. 1 2 The departmental staff is Valerie Lefor. David, Claude, you're up. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes. 4 got this one, Art, thank you. 5 So, just to introduce the Agency, the 6 National Intelligence University is the only 7 8 higher education institution in the nation whose 9 primary mission is to educate and conduct intelligence research at the classified level. 10 11 The university aligns its curriculum 12 with mission-specific requirements provided by the Director of National Intelligence and the NIU 13 14 curriculum provides classic academic learning 15 outcomes informed by the professional 16 competencies articulated by the intelligence 17 community. 18 First, recognized in April of 2012 by 19 a team visit by NACIQI and also the U.S. 20 Department of Education, the National

Intelligence University has gone through the

degree granting process and has met those

21

requirements.

And to offer graduate level, master's level programs NIU is providing an update to NACIQI as a result of Public Law Number 116-93 as part of the National Defense Authorization Act of the Fiscal Year 2020.

The law changes who is in control of the institution as the executive agency transfers from the Department of Defense to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

So, this request is a change in control and it's a substantive change that needs to be brought before NACIQI. And so, I'll turn it over to Valerie.

MS. LEFOR: Great. Thank you, Claude. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Committee Members.

For the record, I am Valerie Lefor and I will be providing updates for NACIQI regarding a substantive change request for an existing degree granting institution.

Specifically, the National

Intelligence University has submitted a request

for modification of existing degree granting authority to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

The NACIQI has designated the review committee for matters concerning degree granting and the federal policy governing the granting of the academic degrees by federal agencies and institutions.

The guidance recommends notification of the NACIQI in regards to changes when seeking to modify an existing degree granting authority and explains that the institution should submit notification to the Department of Education when there are changes that are made by the military educational institution.

Upon review, staff recommendation by the U.S. Secretary of Education regarding the substantive change is submitted to, by the military educational institution and will be provided to subsequent notification of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee.

Department staff and a subgroup of NACIQI Members have reviewed the information

submitted by NIU and have determined that this change is related to a reorganization at the institution.

This request of the substantive change is in the form of control of the institution as the executive agency transfers NIU from the Department of Defense to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

The aspects of the existing degree program meet the standard for the master's degree which is encompassed in the accreditation of the institution by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Department staff was notified of a letter from Middle States to NIU approving them of the reorganization and indicating their plan to conduct the site visit within six months.

Since notification of NACIQI is required, this report serves as means of formal notification.

The recommendation is to accept the report with additional comments from NACIQI.

We'll be happy to take any questions that you

have and there are members from the institution 1 2 who are also here who will receive your 3 questions. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. Any 5 questions? I'd like to introduce J. Scott Cameron, President of the National Intelligence 6 7 University. President Cameron? 8 MR. CAMERON: Good morning. Audio 9 check, can you hear me? 10 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes. We can hear you fine. 11 12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, excellent. Thank 13 Good morning, everyone. And thank you for you. 14 the privilege of speaking with you today. 15 I'm Scott Cameron, President of the 16 National Intelligence University. I am honored 17 to be here. But just to let you know, I had 18 emergency surgery 48 hours ago to reattach all 19 the tendons of my right hamstring. 20 So, any pained look on my face is on 21 my end. It's nothing to do with you. Bear with me if I'm not on my A-game. But I have a great 22

team with me here today.

So, allow me a few minutes to introduce myself, my team and my institution. I began my career in academia as a scientist who in the 1980s and 1990s led efforts globally to understand the biology of plants and conserve genetic resources worldwide with a goal of ending world hunger, high consequence science in a role that took me around the world.

After 9/11, I came to the intelligence community to strengthen the foundations of science and analysis dealing with high consequence national security threats in another role that took me around the world.

For 14 years, my 24/7 at the strategic policy and tactical operational level is to prevent terrorists from acquiring biological, chemical, radiological and nuclear weapons.

During this part of my career I've had the honor of working with thousands of outstanding women and men of the national security enterprise.

I've known true heroes whose stories

will never be public and I've mourned the loss of my friends and colleagues who fell in the line of duty. Whether in crisis or state operations nothing deters the commitment and hard work of those who are sworn to protect this nation.

That's why there is no other organization I'd rather lead and no more inspiring mission to oversee than preparing the next generation of national security leaders at a university whose primary goal is to support the intellectual development of those who have dedicated themselves to defend the nation while helping them to maintain decisions advantaged in the future.

So, on behalf of the women and men of NIU, please accept our heartfelt thanks for your help, your support and your encouragement during this critical moment of transition in our institution's history.

As you know, any change such as this should first do no harm. And beyond the many ways the proposed change will greatly strengthen

our institution, I want you to also know that NIU has greatly benefitted from the process itself in ways that while perhaps less visible to you are no less impacting.

As we've worked through the substantive change process with you our institution has become even more self-aware, more student-centered. We have a greater for our institution's future since its founding 58 years ago and even more so today than when we first were designated as a university in 2011.

Our institution has been part of the Department of Defense for 58 years and has its roots in the Eisenhower Administration in a study that was commissioned to better understand the organizational and management structure of U.S. foreign intelligence.

In 1961, the Department of Defense consolidated training and education in a manner that led to the creation of the Defense Intelligence School in 1962. Regional accreditation was attained in 1983 and the

institution was rechartered as the Defense Intelligence College.

The college continued to chart its

focus on intelligence education research and it

was renamed the Joint Military Intelligence

College in 1993. In 2006, it became the National

Defense Intelligence College.

The institution's ongoing intelligence focus drove discussion in the Department of Defense on transitioning the college to a university with even greater focus on research and engagement with stakeholders to further the goals of national security education.

In 2010, the Director of National
Intelligence, the DNI and the Secretary of
Defense agreed to build one national university
under the DNI for intelligence education,
research and engagement.

In 2011, the National Defense

Intelligence College was renamed the National

Intelligence University. The DNI then asked the

Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA

to serve as NIU's executive agent.

I would like to offer my personal thanks to DIA Director Lieutenant General Bob Ashley for his commitment to my institution, its mission, its academic freedom and to our students. General Ashley understands NIU very well.

He was a graduate student here 30 years ago and today is a proud alum. More than 80,000 of our graduates have gone on to lead in positions across the military, including Secretary of Defense.

And in the intelligence community our graduates have served as directors of the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA; National Security

Agency, NSA; the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, NGA as well as the Director of National Intelligence.

The current directors of DIA, General Bob Ashley and NSA, General Paul Nakasone are both proud alumni. That brings me to today.

Why does the nation need a National

Intelligence University and why should its governance structure be moved under the Director of National Intelligence?

Our unique mission is to serve as the nation's regionally accredited university focused primarily on the profession of intelligence and the classified mission of the U.S. intelligence enterprise.

We're committed to serving as the intelligence community's knowledge bank and our institution is dedicated to harvesting intellectual capital in our closed community while allowing its people to reflect and think strategically.

Our community has been working at a very high operational tempo for many years and our students play a critical role in helping us to understand how the mission of defending our nation's security is evolving given that they are on the front lines of the intelligence, military and law enforcement and diplomatic missions to come together to form the backbone of our

nation's security.

We give them the time to step away from that high ops tempo to learn, reflect and then build, envision and build a stronger foundation for the nation's security.

Our faculty serve as educators, subject matter experts and guides to elicit information and knowledge from our students and intelligence community experts and our community's thought leaders.

It's a meld with the knowledge and expertise of our higher education partners worldwide. After a decade under the Secretary of Defense it is time to move NIU's national intelligence mission under the Director of National Intelligence.

It sets the standards for education and workforce development across the 17 agencies engaged in the U.S. intelligence mission. Our commitment to the men and women of the military will never change.

But as the institution's primary

responsibility is to harvest intellectual capital of that intelligence enterprise our mission and our military partners will even be better served by NIU as we work from the center of the hub of the intelligence community.

The work of our community flows from the intelligence cycle. In order to bank and integrate that knowledge every agency, every mission, every functional discipline and every voice of our community must be representative of the mission of diversity.

In order to fully accomplish this goal NIU must be more central to our community. And this change will allow more direct access and integration across our landscape of stakeholders while strengthening our education, research and engagement missions.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be here on a conversation about our university's future and I offer you my sincere thanks for all of your help and support during this process. Thank you.

I would like to introduce the Chairman of our Board of Visitors, Dr. John Gannon.

DR. GANNON: Thank you, Mr. President.

And I want to say it's an honor for me to be able

to speak to you folks and I appreciate your time.

I have been a member of the Board of Visitors for the National Intelligence University since 2011. And now, the past year the Chairman at a very critical period in the transition to, from the agency of the Defense Agency to the DNI.

When I became a member of the Board,
I looked back on the history that Scott has well
spoken to back to 1962 when the Defense
Intelligence School really was a traditional
military school where you had a block of
knowledge that was codified and taught in
prepared lesson plans to students and created a
graduate that was informed as DoD and
intelligence wanted.

But in the period in the 1980s there was a conscious decision to want to move to a situation where we were not just talking about

the training in an upscale sense but also in education where you were expanding the consciousness and the challenge to those students to research.

And that's when the master's degree program was introduced and the oversight of the NSCAT was introduced in a very positive instructive way that continues to serve this university.

I've mentioned that in 1993 and then in the period of a very productive President

Dennis Clift, almost a 15 year period that he was President of this school. Again, strength to strength in terms of building research capabilities and a dedication to diversity.

Again, in 2011 when I came on board we were also as a Board that was constituted with members, former members of the intelligence community, largely senior level folks some from academia and several from outside.

Again, that emphasis was on building capability as a research institution. Then in

the period after 9/11 however, there were some significant developments that affected the mission of the university.

We had the 9/11 Commission itself which was eventually decommissioned. And then the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act or established in 2004 and implemented beginning in 2005.

And it was inherent in those conditions and reports a criticism of the intelligence community it was not being integrated enough with regard to the various intelligence capabilities and producing professional intelligence officers that did not have the kind of unified sense of intelligence as a profession.

So, there was a need indicated in all those reports for intelligence community to dedicate itself more to the development of intelligence professionals who had kind of a holistic experience in education about the capabilities they were integrating in their work.

Then, of course in response to that we had in 2010 and 2011, Jim Clapper who was the new DNI. Bob Gates was the Secretary of Defense to redesignate the NDIC as the NIU.

And that was going to incorporate the commitment to response to the criticisms that we had received in the various commissions and also, and critically that we were going to move from largely a defense community benefitting from this university to the full intelligence community.

And it was regarded as a critical, imperative but also very difficult challenge.

The President of the university, Dave Ellison responded also in late 2016 with the development of a strategic plan for the university which again incorporated all the goals that were set by the critiques in the various commissions I have mentioned.

And with the intention of building a more capable faculty, more dedication to research and more engagement to a larger intelligence community of 17 members. In that period under

the strategic plan the stress on science and technology.

Again, responding to the critiques that the university had received to developing three schools, one for science and technology, one for strategic intelligence and the other for the center of strategic research again emphasizing research as a critical component of this university in producing critically thinking leaders for the community.

The BOV that I'm a member of now again constitutes, is constituted with senior members of or members of the intelligence community including a former Commandant of the Coast Guard, Thad Allen.

We have Chris Inglis a former Deputy
Director of the NSA. Joanne Isham, former Deputy
Director of the National, NGA, National Defense,
Joanne Isham, National Defense Intelligence.

And then Ron Milton who is the former,
Ron is the former Director of Operations at NSA.

Carmen Medina, senior CIA. Matt Olsen formerly

the Director of the National Terrorism Center.

John Pistole who is the President of a university in Indiana but also a former Executive Director for CIA. Harvey Rishikof, former intelligence community leader and consultant and particularly in legal affairs and Timothy Sands who is now the President of Virginia Tech.

A tremendous group of leaders who have brought great expertise to bear on recent years in building this university in the direction that now Scott is so committed to in making a former research institution dealing with the priorities of the intelligence community in response to the DNI's guidance and making it a university that the graduates will see themselves as intelligence community officers, not just coming from the stove pipe.

So, we are now involved in the transition. And I believe that the Board is quite pleased with how it is proceeding. One thing I should also mention is that the Congress

has been engaged and very supportively in this effort.

And in 2017, this comes after the NIU developed its first plan, the NIU gave us a congressionally directed panel made up of outsiders which included Don Yader (phonetic) from the National Defense University, Bruce Hoffman who launched the security program at Georgetown University, Jeremy Basu (phonetic) a senior office at both CIA and DoD.

Eliot Cohen, a military analyst scholar. At Johns Hopkins University Erin Watkins who had been most recently the Deputy Undersecretary for the Department of Homeland Security but also a senior intelligence officer in the Defense Intelligence Agency.

So, that group, by the way, made the decision that while the strategic plan was to be commended, the panel of outsiders did not believe that the university would be able to achieve the noble goals of that plan under the agency of the DIA. So, because the larger community regarded

its home and DIA as really a defense, exclusively a defense program, and the employees and the staff really the DIA employees.

So, it was a impediment to doing the evangelical work that was needing to be done around the community to build support for the university as a community wide institution.

And at the same time the House of
Representatives was concerned about the HPSCI the
staff was concerned that DIA perhaps had taken on
too many responsibilities and there is a
possibility that it would want to be considered
by another agency.

So, what the congressional panel recommended was that the DNI was the logical place to bring this university so that it could fulfill its larger goal to be an IC wide institution serving both and the intelligence community.

And it would be clear there outside of the DIA structure to build a high quality staff committed to research and to academic freedom and

all those qualities that the institution has long 1 2 inspired to have as standards. So, that is the recommendation. 3 And 4 that report circulated around the community did 5 foster, I think, a concentrated debate. And now here we are. And I'm very 6 7 proud to be moving into what is really an 8 opportunity for the National Intelligence 9 University to achieve its longstanding ambition to be a community wide institution that really 10 11 codifies intelligence as a profession and 12 produces critically thinking leaders who can make this community, make this university the center 13 of academic excellence. 14 So, I will stop there. 15 But again, 16 thank you for the opportunity to talk with you 17 today. 18 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Gannon, for 19 the remarks and for your service to the nation. 20 To quickly wrap up, I'd like to turn to our 21 Provost, Dr. Terry Markin. Terry. 22 DR. MARKIN: Thank you, Scott.

Provost of the National Intelligence University 1 2 it is my great honor to be here today. I would like to thank the Department 3 of Education staff and Members of the Committee 4 5 for their time and support extended on behalf of us getting to this point. This is a monumental 6 effort. 7 8 And we could not have done it without 9 your assistance. NIU provides a unique education focused on national security and the transition 10 to the Office of the Director of National 11 Intelligence will bolster our position in the 12 13 intelligence community. 14 We look forward to any comments or questions you may have. 15 Thank you. 16 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Markin. And last but not least, Assistant Provost Dave Smith. 17 18 Dave. 19 DR. SMITH: Thank you, sir. I echo 20 all the previous comments thus far. It is my 21 honor as well to represent NIU here today. I am an Assistant Provost and also 22

NIU's accreditation liaison officer to Middle States Commission on Higher Education. And I've had the pleasure of working closely with our liaison there as well as the Department of Education staff throughout this endeavor. We have received outstanding support and guidance throughout this, throughout the entirety of this process and look forward to continuing the relationship with the finalized transition. And we look forward to any comments or questions you may have. Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dave. In summary, we're a smaller institution. We have a lot to say because our mission has gone on for 58 years and we're looking forward to the future. And we really do appreciate all your

And we really do appreciate all your help and support through this process as we move into the future under DNI. Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, President Cameron. We have questions from the Panel.

David Eubanks first.

DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. Claude, if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you have questions you would like to start with 1 2 I'll defer to you otherwise I can go ahead. VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: 3 No, go 4 ahead. I'll follow you. Thanks, Dave. 5 DR. EUBANKS: Okay. Thank you for that introduction and also for the lucid pros and 6 7 the substantive change document; any failure to understand is on my part. 8 9 I just had some questions about the nuts and bolts of the transition. I think I 10 understand the reasons for it. 11 12 One of my questions was about the role 13 of the Board of Visitors. And some places it's 14 described as advisory. But also the document says that it approved the strategic plan which 15 16 hints at executive oversight. 17 So, could you just say a few words 18 about what the role of that Board is? 19 Thanks for the question, MR. CAMERON: 20 great question. I'll put something on the front 21 end here and turn it over to my Board Chair for

his perspective.

But I do want to say that, you know, we are under DoD or a FACA Board. Under ODNI we would still be a FACA Board. We are well into the conversation with ODNI about how we will operate our Board there.

We see no changes. We will continue to strengthen our ties to our stakeholders through being more centrally located with our stakeholders.

I would like to ask Dr. Gannon to please comment.

DR. GANNON: I think, first of all, that's an excellent question and I think we will be in the coming weeks actually working with the DNI staff to clarify the charter for the Board.

The Board really has functioned, I think particularly with regards to the strategic goals of the university are a lot of engagement. I chaired the panel, the congressional hearing to the panel.

We, the Board has seen itself and I think the charter enabled it to see itself as not

subservient to the university but subservient to all the stakeholders which include USDI Defense and defense programs for which the university is responsible, also to the intelligence community, writ large and particularly to the DNI.

So, the DNI actually was providing guidance since 2011 to the Board and we were taking that guidance. And the guidance always was for the Board to act as, in response to all the stakeholders, and by the way, including Congress in that.

And to conduct oversight over
particularly the strategic plan and
implementation of that plan of the university.

And part of it -- because we need to get ahead of
this with the DNI in the coming weeks, but
because of the stature of the people on the Board
and the way they were carefully selected and
their particular commitment, the Board has
probably punched above its weight, to some
extent, but punching in a very conservative way
and assisting the administration of the

1	university to move ahead in the constructive
2	direction that it has moved.
3	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. Just briefly
4	
5	MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Gannon. Go
6	ahead.
7	DR. EUBANKS: I just have a quick
8	follow up. Does the Board approve budgets and
9	staffing?
LO	DR. GANNON: It does not approve. It
L1	does not have that mission or authority. The
L2	President has consulted us and sought the
L3	consultation and approval of such, but he is not
L 4	obliged to do so.
L5	DR. EUBANKS: Okay, thank you. I
L6	appreciate that.
L7	MR. CAMERON: I would add that
L8	sorry. Claude, I would just add that
L9	VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes. I
20	guess one recommendation I would make, because
21	I've got the same kind of confusion that Dave
22	has, is that in the future you might move away

from governing language and use, instead of approve, maybe affirm or something. That if they have no governing authority, if they're really truly more of Board of Advisors, Board of Visitors, then I would just say, you know, just be careful on what language you use in terms of what role they play.

They still play an incredibly significant role. I'm not trying to diminish that. But if it's not a governance role then you might want to be careful in what language you use in terms of what they're voting on and so forth.

But you wanted -- Mr. President, you wanted to follow up on that as well.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, sorry, not to interrupt. Thank you. That's really helpful and constructive.

It's a bit of a hybrid situation to some degree, because we will bring -- we're transparent about what we're doing about our budget, about our staffing, about our programs.

And what's really powerful about the

Board, as you suggest, in an advisory role, maybe it's advisory plus, is to be able to look at the strategic guidance that the Director of National Intelligence provides to the university.

as we bring programs to them as we develop the university kind of along with that strategic guidance, they provide that oversight and validate back to the DNI and to the leadership of Defense as to whether we're actually hitting those goals, meeting those objectives, and calling that out.

And we will keep them very heavily engaged during this transition, because oversight of this transition and landing safely on the other side strong and secure is their highest goal as well as ours.

So, they're playing a very incredible role in kind of that oversight to make sure the moving parts are all working together. Thanks for that.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Right. You

know, you've dealt with Middle States. I'm sure you're aware that their requirements on governance need to be -- need for the institution to be exceptionally clear who is the master, if you will.

In other words, who is the governing Board, and then who is those that provide affirmation or advise for visitor input on it?

And so, and I know Middle States is working with you on this transition as well.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill?

DR. GANNON: I think that's an excellent recommendation, and it actually reflects some of the concerns that I have already expressed to our staff about the need for absolute clarity, because to some extent I think the Board has operated with much greater authority than its charter would provide and that is not a healthy way to proceed as we're moving.

So, we will be in the coming weeks, I think, addressing the issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill?

DR. DERBY: Yes. So, I have really two kinds of questions. But the first one is about -- what is it that precludes the Board of Visitors from providing governance?

Claude, you talked about advising.

There is quite a difference between governance and advising. So, what is it about the particular structure that precludes this Board of Visitors from being a governing Board?

MR. CAMERON: Dr. Gannon?

DR. GANNON: So, basically the charter doesn't provide us with that authority. What has actually happened in practice is when you have former senior members of the intelligence community who have led major agencies and we now have the, you know, several of them on the Board now, they are naturally consulted and their advice is naturally presented and often taken simply because of its prominence.

But that does need to be, that needs to be clarified in terms of basic responsibilities that the Board has and what

authority it has to provide either advice or 1 2 direct -- having direct authority over 3 governance. 4 MR. CAMERON: So, can I add to that --5 thanks, John. I could add to that. But budget approval is at the agency level. 6 7 As we get our budget, as we invest --8 we're going through some modernization -- as we 9 invest we inform our Board, talk to them about 10 those investments, and that is kind of part of 11 how we meet our objectives for -- under the DNI 12 as well. 13 DR. DERBY: I ask the question because 14 there is an important component of academic integrity and oversight and quality that boards 15 16 play an important role in. 17 And I just wondered about the 18 distinction between advising and governing in 19 that regard, because it being an academic 20 institution that's an important issue. 21 Was there anything you want to add? 22 MR. CAMERON: Yes. For us, the

1	arrangement we've had, under the Defense
2	Intelligence Agency, is one of a high level of
3	autonomy. And that same level of autonomy is
4	being structured under the ODNI. And as we write
5	the charter for that, for our Board with Dr.
6	Gannon, these are things that we really need to
7	kind of work through, absolutely.
8	DR. DERBY: Good, okay. But I would
9	reiterate
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Go ahead, Jill.
12	DR. GANNON: This is John. This is a
13	very important issue.
14	But as we began the transition earlier
15	this year, I did send a memo out to all the
16	stakeholders, which simply said you've got a
17	Board here with tremendous expertise and
18	experience, it needs to be engaged as we move
19	along. And the response I got, whether we had
20	the authority or not, was quite positive.
21	I think we saw some constructive
22	responses, particularly from the Defense

1 Intelligence Agency and some, and the DNI 2 organization. But again, it's because I think of the heft of the people that are on this Board 3 that they have been able to punch above the 4 5 weight of the charter. The charter has got to catch up with 6 7 the, actually, authorities you want the Board to 8 have. By the way, I am one of the ones that 9 support --(Simultaneous speaking.) 10 11 Because I think issues DR. GANNON: 12 like academic freedom are critical ones as the 13 university proceeds in the direction that it is 14 going in. And when it encounters the other major 15 16 agencies who have great sensitivities about 17 sources and methods but have less experience with 18 the issue of academic freedom. 19 So, we've got to be, the Board has got 20 to be champions, I think, of the strategic in 21 this new environment.

DR. DERBY: Good.

22

I appreciate that

reassurance about academic freedom. It's central and critical.

The other thing I wanted to ask is really rather a general question. You know, from public perception too often there is a sense that there is a great deal of siloing among the different aspects of national defense.

And I'm wondering if there are ties and relationships with the State Department, people in the State Department that are really regional experts that bring that kind of cultural expertise that I think is such an important component when we're talking about national intelligence. Can you speak to that, please?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. Thanks for the question. And I'm sorry I didn't actually cover that in my opening remarks, because it is very important. So, thanks for bringing it up now.

Seventeen agencies in the intelligence community. The national security landscape is much broader than that, as you know, all the way out to USDA, HHS, who have classified programs,

you know, as part of the infrastructure of how we 1 2 understand to respond to threats against the nation. 3 4 So, for us we're looking at 17 IC partners, 22-plus, different other agencies that 5 work with us. So, while we have each department 6 7 8 (Simultaneous speaking.) 9 PARTICIPANT: Someone needs to mute 10 their phone, please. 11 PARTICIPANT: Yes, there is background 12 interference. Please, go on. 13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. While we 14 have 22 plus partners in national security beyond 15 the 17 intelligence agencies, NGA, State 16 Department, the FBI, law enforcement, they all 17 need to be there. They have to be part of this 18 mix, right? 19 So, as a result of getting people from 20 the State Department it's not just from their 21 intelligence bureau. It's from their regional 22 It's their -- it is people who go out in

the field who have contacts in diplomacy for a greater sense of how the national security enterprise operates. So, we not only draw students from these other areas for familiarization, and that is really one of the most important things that we do.

We have analysts sitting next to collectors sitting next to operators sitting next to policy people sitting next to diplomats and law enforcement officials sitting next to pilots.

And we kind of put that mix together, the conversation about how national security is evolving is a very rich discussion. And we have to elicit that and we have to adjudicate that in a classroom.

And so, the more voices in the better we are. And that is exactly what our goal is.

And I believe this move to ODNI in that way will make us more central for all of those people and allow us to even have a greater landscape of participation from all of those partners. So, thanks for the question.

1 DR. DERBY: Yes. Thanks for your 2 I find it reassuring to hear about the response. efforts at integration that you've laid out and 3 4 also just all the history, the evolution of this 5 institution, it sounds very promising. 6 you. 7 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen? You're 8 muted, Kathleen. Kathleen, you're still muted. 9 DR. ALIOTO: Better? 10 CHAIRMAN KEISER: There you go. 11 DR. ALIOTO: What does the Department 12 of Defense think about this? 13 MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you for the 14 question. This has been a two-year conversation. 15 There is a policy document in DoD 3305.01 which 16 describes the relationship between the USDI, the 17 Undersecretary for Defense Intelligence, the 18 Director of DIA, the DNI and the President of 19 National Intelligence University. 20 So, these four parties are described 21 as having very distinct roles in how we work together and how we, kind of, provide assurances 22

that we're meeting the missions of each our stakeholders.

From the beginning, the Department of Defense has been very committed to this because, if you think about it, in order for those in the military to get a very rich understanding of what we call decision advantage, right, decisions based on intelligence in real time, I have often been told by military leaders at many levels that sending their best and brightest future leaders to our institution to have that entire-enterprise perspective on how intelligence is collected, gathered, analyzed, and then put to policymakers, how decision making happens so that when they hit their second, third star they will be able to not have their decision space shrink.

To be able to maintain decision advantage because they are able to, as John said before, think critically. They understand the basics of what the system is.

So, this is a very value-added program for the military in particular. And we have

joint professional military education level one, which actually is kind of a little bit beyond level one because it's also, they get a master's degree from their time. And they also get to integrate themselves with the entire intelligence community. So, they look quite unique in that way and it broadens the perspectives of the military.

Their big concern, to be fair, was that the joint professional education, military education would continue under ODNI the way it has. And that has been signed off on and that is the plan.

In essence, I would wrap that up saying I described to my colleagues in the military that in order -- we need to kind of pull away a bit from them in order to center ourselves in the intelligence community to continue to make our knowledge bank and our education to be even of greater value to DoD as they send our folks to NIU.

So, this has been a very good

1	conversation. It's actually enriched the
2	conversation in how we serve all of our
3	stakeholders, in particular the military.
4	But this has been signed off, as John
5	noted before, by the Secretary of Defense. Thank
6	you.
7	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, President
8	Cameron. Any other questions?
9	DR. ALIOTO: Yes. You also indicated
10	that Congress was involved. Was there a vote
11	from Congress in terms of this involvement?
12	MR. CAMERON: Yes. I'll turn to Dr.
13	Gannon for that. He's been very heavily
14	involved. John?
15	DR. GANNON: Yes. I'm sorry, I missed
16	the question. We got muted. Could you repeat
17	the question, please?
18	MR. CAMERON: So, as John described
19	earlier both of the House and Senate Intelligence
20	Committees have been tracking this for two years.
21	John described in detail the study
22	that was done that was commissioned by the Senate

Select Committee on Intelligence in 2016. 1 2 led that panel, did an amazing job. That process of actually studying 3 4 ourselves, I was just coming on board when the 5 study started, and it asked a series of pretty deep questions of the institution. And that was 6 7 a gift to me because in starting I was able to 8 kind of start with this framework of having 9 people understand where we were and where we were 10 going. 11 So, that study then started a two-year 12 conversation on the Hill about the future of the 13 institution. And that has been a very productive 14 and positive conversation throughout. 15 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. Any 16 other questions from the Committee? 17 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Art, I have 18 19 (Simultaneous speaking.) 20 DR. ALIOTO: Was there a vote? 21 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are there any other 22 questions from the Committee?

1 DR. EUBANKS: Yes, Art. I've got two 2 more questions. 3 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Who is that, David? 4 5 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. David, go ahead. 6 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Sorry, I just have --7 DR. EUBANKS: 8 you know, in the name of due diligence I just 9 have a couple more questions. I imagine that this operation is like taking the plumbing out of 10 one building and transplanting it into another 11 12 building. 13 It's got to be complicated. I think 14 I understand the Board now. Your exposition of how the budget change works is very clear. 15 16 understand that. 17 You note that the student policies 18 about admissions and retentions and so forth will 19 not change, and that's very important. I did 20 want to ask about the other, there must be a lot 21 of other kinds of policies that you have port 22 from the Department of Defense over.

So, could you just give me a very 1 2 brief status report on how that is going? Thanks for the question. 3 MR. CAMERON: And I like the plumbing analogy. There is a --4 part of this is very, as you can imagine, a very 5 inter-governmental transition, right. 6 7 We're transferring budgets, the things 8 that you mentioned, and that has all gone very 9 We have a very, very detailed transition well. 10 plan for this, as you can imagine. 11 And one of those, one part of that, 12 was to review all policies in ODNI as they related to all policies related to DIA. 13 those number in the hundreds. 14 So, we have combed through hundreds of 15 16 policies to look for differences and ODNI is 17 making adjustments. Their lawyers were working 18 with them and they are making adjustments to 19 accommodate whatever unique needs that were in 20 those policies before we joined them. 21 So, that has been part of a 22 painstaking process as well, but a very

1	educational one.
2	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. That helps
3	me understand the scope of the problem. I
4	appreciate that.
5	My last question is will the do you
6	anticipate that the current NIU leadership will
7	persist through this transition?
8	MR. CAMERON: Yes. We have
9	structurally and functionally we have been placed
10	in the org chart at ODNI.
11	We are I am a direct report to the
12	Director of National Intelligence and our
13	institution is not melded into or with any of the
14	other business units of ODNI. We are a
15	standalone organization in that sense. So,
16	essentially, lock, stock, barrel, as we are, that
17	was congressional language, as well: move the
18	university as is.
19	And I am very heartened by ODNI
20	leadership's warm reception for our arrival in
21	the near future.

DR. EUBANKS: Great. I greatly

appreciate your comments. Thank you very much. 1 2 Art, I'm finished. This is John Gannon. 3 DR. GANNON: Can 4 you hear me, folks? Can I make an additional 5 comment here? Hello? Go ahead, John. 6 MR. CAMERON: 7 CHAIRMAN KEISER: You may. Yes, John Gannon, back 8 DR. GANNON: 9 with the BOV. A couple of comments. One is that, again, whatever the 10 11 charter actually says about the BOV that, when I 12 made a request to be engaged in the transition, 13 Scott, partly because of his own inclinations, 14 has kept us extremely well informed as the progression has moved ahead. 15 16 Also, the Office of the DNI has done And it was a little harder to get that 17 the same. 18 communication going, but we've done it. And the 19 Board is quite satisfied that we are not only 20 being well informed but we're being engaged with 21 the idea that the Board does have expertise and

experience to bring to bear on the decisions that

are being made.

So, again I think the stature of the Board has delivered results through this transition, which we hope to get incorporated in a new charter for the Board as we move ahead under the DNI.

I got muted before and I wanted to add to Scott's comment that when we were conducting the interviews with the stakeholders during the congressionally-directed panel, there was concern at DoD expressed by the USDI about JPME, Joint Military Program of Education and how it would be able to continue to prosper under DNI management.

That was a real concern in the beginning. What I saw was that worked out very well in the discussions that occurred, and ultimately led to the recommendations to move ahead fully with the integration that have occurred in the most recent Intelligence Authorization Act.

So, that's an example. So, again it's good to note that there was discussion about some

1 of these. There was concern. We had ultimately 2 a very good collaboration and the Board played a role in this too. 3 4 And I think we're in a very good 5 position now, not by accident, not because of anything random, but because people and leaders 6 7 engaged in a very constructive way to get us in a 8 very positive position with regard to this 9 transition. 10 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. 11 Kathleen, you had another question? 12 (Simultaneous speaking.) 13 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Excuse me, Kathleen, 14 you had another question? DR. ALIOTO: Well, you may have just 15 16 answered this. Was this included in intelligence 17 legislation? 18 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Thank you, 19 Kathleen. I'm really sorry I missed the question 20 earlier. I didn't pick up on what you were 21 saying. 22 But, yes. This was a part of the

1	Intelligence Authorization Act that was voted
2	into law. So, this is public law and that was
3	yes.
4	DR. ALIOTO: All right. Thank you
5	very much.
6	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are there any more
7	questions? If you still have your hands up,
8	please pull them down, if you can. Valerie
9	thank you, gentlemen and I'd like to invite
10	Valerie back on to make any comments or
11	observations.
12	MS. LEFOR: Thank you. I thought
13	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just one second.
14	I'm sorry, Valerie. There are no third party
15	commenters that I'm aware of and so now we can go
16	to you, Valerie.
17	MS. LEFOR: No problem. I was just
18	going to say I thought it was really good
19	conversation. I do not have any additional
20	comments at this time.
21	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any questions for
22	Valerie?

1 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. I do have a quick 2 question, Art. 3 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is that you, David? 4 Okay. 5 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. So, for the 6 record, the Middle States requires formal 7 approval by the Department of Education and the 8 Department of Education requires formal approval 9 by Middle States. So, there is this logical 10 contradiction that has to be resolved for 11 12 anything to move forward. So, my understanding 13 is that we have accepted the Middle States 14 preliminary approval, which then will lead to a 15 site visit and so forth, that resolves this 16 catch-22. I just wanted to verify that this is the case and that it was on the record. 17 18 MS. LEFOR: Yes, that is the case. 19 So, we refer to this, kind of, as our chicken and egg situation. Who goes first in terms of 20 21 seeking approval and what does that look like?

So, we work very closely with the

institutional accreditor, whoever that may be, throughout the process. We did get approval from Middle States to move forward with -- they had done a review on paper.

The remaining part for them is the six months, within six months from that approval, which happened in March, of course, so I'm not sure due to COVID if there will be any delays in that. But they would conduct a site visit with the institution and then sort of do a final approval.

And that timing coincides, traditionally letters from the NACIQI meeting have been issued 90 days following a NACIQI meeting.

And so, by the time we get ready to have the final letters that come from the FCO and the Secretary, in this particular instance, there is usually that completed process with the accrediting agencies, so that we can have like a final, final letter as well as the NACIQI recommendation and Secretary's letter that then

go back over to Congress for their review. 1 2 DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. Last question, when the statute expires in 2022, where 3 4 the Department of Education -- sorry, the 5 Department of Defense is appointing the Board of Visitors and it transitions over, does NIU have 6 7 to resubmit a substantive change, or does this 8 just go forward and they're done? 9 That is a good question. MS. LEFOR: I'm not sure I know the answer to that. 10 I don't know, Herman, if you had any insights into that? 11 12 MR. BOUNDS: No, I don't. I think 13 it's something we'll have to look at, you know, 14 at that time. I'm not clear if that will require 15 some change at this point. 16 DR. EUBANKS: Okay. This was a 17 comment, I would say, based on the conversation 18 today, personally I would be comfortable with that change going forward without another round 19 20 of paperwork. But of course that's all up to 21 you.

And finally, thank you very much,

Valerie and others at the Department for 1 2 supporting me and helping me do this review. Your communication was clear and 3 4 timely and really helped me understand these 5 complicated issues. Thank you. You're welcome. 6 MS. LEFOR: 7 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, thank you. 8 Any other questions for Valerie? Thank you, 9 Valerie. David, and I guess, Claude, would you like to make a motion? Do you have a motion to 10 11 make? 12 VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: We have a 13 motion to make, Mr. Chairman. And the motion is 14 to approve the realignment and substantive change request of NIU. 15 16 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is there a second? 17 DR. EUBANKS: I second. 18 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Second by David. 19 Any questions, comments, concerns? 20 Sensing none, if you would then vote 21 on the motion. The motion is to accept the 22 report. Go to your megaphone and begin the

1 voting process.

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I guess we'll know what the votes are when she puts it on the page.

Are we going to get that? There it is.

Okay, great. Thank you, the motion passes. And we are finished our formal business. We now move to a subcommittee and then a report, or presentation.

The first is the Subcommittee on Governance. And I want to say to Rick and to all the members, you did a phenomenal job. There was a lot of work done, a lot of back and forth, and again, I think the whole Committee should be appreciative of that work.

Rick, it's yours now.

MR. O'DONNELL: Art, thank you, appreciate that. And I would just echo my thanks to the entire subcommittee, Kathleen, Jill, Paul, Anne, Ralph, and Art for their work and their time and attention.

We have a several-page report, which

has been posted online and should have been distributed to all the members. I'm not going to read it. I just want to kind of quickly highlight a few things and then if there is discussion among the full Committee and the full subcommittee we can have that discussion.

We've heard from a number of accrediting agencies and a number of related associations. We tried to hear from, what I would call, state officials, and for scheduling and other reasons we weren't able to hear from them.

And what we heard primarily from the accrediting agencies was that over the last decade or more they don't believe there has really been very many instances of accrediting agencies weighing into issues of governance over political interference.

There was a sense that sometimes these come up when people are, when boards are appointing presidents, and politicians may weigh in, but they tend to resolve themselves with more questions.

And that when accrediting agencies are concerned about governance issues it tends to be tied into other matters, such as financial insolvency or fraud, where maybe poor governance has led to other problems.

We did hear from one non-agency witness who disagreed with the accrediting agencies and thought that there -- and asserted that there had been a number of times when accrediting agencies interfered in governance of institutions and they cited a number of examples again, typically around the appointment of presidents.

I think the subcommittee spent a lot of time kind of discussing and acknowledging that the owner of institutions vary, whether it be a state government, a tribe, a religious order or just an independent for-profit or non-profit, that the governance of institutions varies and that accreditors need to be aware of that, of those varying structures, particularly with religious and tribal owned or run colleges that

have unique needs in their governing boards.

We also spent some time just kind of acknowledging that, in some cases, you see state legislators or government bodies setting budgets for our institutions, and that right now it will probably increase.

But that at time accreditors need to understand that, you know, their job is to, if the state makes substantive changes to the budget allocation for a university, it's a fair question to ask how those changes may impact quality of education at that university.

But that's really not the accreditor's job to inform state legislators of how to set their budgets, and then just to be cognizant of the different lines and the triads.

And then we spent some time talking about the fact that governance is not a criteria for Title IV in the HEA Act or in the Department regulations and that it's very clear that accrediting agencies can have standards beyond those ten that are in the Act.

I think, and we spent a lot of time on the subcommittee debating, you know, is there a plausible scenario where an accrediting agency could revoke accreditation based on a governance standard, and that the Department and NACIQI would not be able to review that because it's outside the ten enumerated Acts.

I think the Committee thought that, you know, the chances of that happening might be low. There were some Committee members who were very concerned that it seems strange that the law would allow Title IV to be revoked on standards that can't be reviewed by the Department or NACIQI, even though that's sort of been the way it's been for quite some time.

And I think, you know -- that's where I'll stop there. I think that's a summary.

Again, it was a good -- we had multiple meetings, multiple discussions. There was not unanimous -- unanimity on the subcommittee on every point, but we were working collegially and I really appreciate every one's hard work on this issue.

1	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, Rick.
2	Anybody have any questions or comments?
3	I think everybody is getting tired.
4	Well, Rick, again well done. Do we
5	want to make a motion to send this to the
6	Secretary?
7	MR. O'DONNELL: Mr. Chair, was there a
8	question from Jill, or did they just Jill and
9	Ralph had their hand up.
10	CHAIRMAN KEISER: I didn't see that.
11	I'm sorry.
12	DR. DERBY: No, just quickly. I just
13	wanted to really thank Rick and acknowledge, I
	wanted to really thank Rick and acknowledge, I think that the Committee went through a very big
13 14 15	
14	think that the Committee went through a very big
14 15 16	think that the Committee went through a very big process and had a very good and searching kind of
14 15	think that the Committee went through a very big process and had a very good and searching kind of deliberation at the end.
14 15 16 17	think that the Committee went through a very big process and had a very good and searching kind of deliberation at the end. I think the report reflects all that.
14 15 16 17	think that the Committee went through a very big process and had a very good and searching kind of deliberation at the end. I think the report reflects all that. And thanks, Rick, for his leadership in all of
14 15 16 17 18	think that the Committee went through a very big process and had a very good and searching kind of deliberation at the end. I think the report reflects all that. And thanks, Rick, for his leadership in all of it.

1 having to deal -- you can imagine having to deal 2 with me on that committee. And he was so patient and followed through on everything. 3 4 We spent hours on trying to listen to 5 people on the phone and see them on the, you know, and it was complicated and it was also 6 7 complicated in terms of our thinking. 8 So, I would like to thank him and also 9 the other members of the Committee and Anne and everybody who was so really flexible about having 10 our judgments questioned. 11 12 And I think this may be my last 13 meeting. So, I also wanted to thank you, Art, 14 and everybody else on the Committee. It's been a real pleasure working with you. 15 16 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Absolutely a 17 pleasure to work with you, Kathleen. Ralph, you 18 have your hand up. 19 I do. Can you hear me? MR. WOLFF: 20 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes. 21 MR. WOLFF: Okay, great. Then I'll 22 just add my thanks to the Committee members and

to Rick for dealing with all the multiple edits that we made.

But the one point I wanted to make was, we started off with the whole issue of political interference. And the issue as we understood it became much more complicated. And there are church-sponsored institutions. The whole issue of governance, not just on the selection of presidents. But as we saw in the case of Alaska where there are budget issues.

And so, I think our report reflects that we started at one point but expanded to raise a set of issues that I think are really important and we would agree that accreditors need to be sensitive to.

So, with that again I thank all the Committee Members and, I guess, Rick, you can move acceptance by the full Committee.

MR. O'DONNELL: Thanks, Ralph. Yes, I would make a motion that we move the subcommittee's report be accepted by the full Committee and forwarded on to the Secretary for

1	her review.
2	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is there a second?
3	DR. DERBY: I second the motion.
4	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Second was Jill
5	Derby. Any further discussion?
6	All in favor, hit your megaphone.
7	(Pause.)
8	DR. SMITH: It looks unanimous. There
9	is no scribe for this. We did it for the
LO	agencies. I can't hear you, Art. I think you're
L1	muted.
L2	CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'm sorry. Again,
L3	thank you for that. Again, thank you, Rick, and
L 4	everybody on the Committee.
L5	The next, one of our new members put
L6	together an incredibly deep and thoughtful report
L7	on student success. David, would you like to
L8	make a presentation?
L8 L9	make a presentation? DR. EUBANKS: Thank you, yes. And
	_
L9	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you, yes. And

very brief.

And the purpose is to bring to the Committee's attention, I think a quite extraordinary opportunity we have related to the new quidance in the 2019 handbook.

So, the Student Achievement Rule,
602.16, requires accreditors to set clear student
achievement standards, as you know. And the new
guidance in the handbook for accreditors
emphasizes transparency in publishing those
standards, the standards for review; so, what
institutions have to do to get reviewed.

As well as flexibility for those institutions to meet those obligations and data that's suitable to the mission. This guidance is much needed.

For many institutions seeking accreditation, student achievement standards are reviewed with criteria that are in fact much more specific than what's in the published standards. And I'll just give you one example of several I can give you.

But the most important one probably is that course grades are almost uniformly banned as a primary data source about student learning when evaluating academic programs.

This prohibition does not appear in the published standards, as far as I've been able to tell, and it's not clear to me if it's supported by policy at all.

Now, one cannot simultaneously believe that course grades are worthless as learning data, and believe that transcripts contain useful information. So, this contradiction is an example of what might be illuminated under the new guidance.

The ban on grades as data has been, however, a boon to a service industry that has sprung up to produce a report on the kind of secondary grades, with the electronic system to maintain them, that the accreditation reviewers like to see.

The secondary grading system costs colleges a lot of money. And ironically, in most

cases doesn't even produce good data.

So, the current situation is unfortunate, but it is also understandable.

Accrediting agencies have had to negotiate a sometimes difficult regulatory environment in recent times, especially with respect to student achievement. And it's probably inevitable that compromises had to be made. My purpose in bringing this matter forward is twofold.

First, as a collegial signal to agencies that they have the freedom to reimagine student achievement measures.

And secondly, I'd like to propose to the NACIQI that a subcommittee be appointed to investigate the transparency and flexibility guidance as cited, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Committee so those intentions will be realized.

Collectively, we have an extraordinary opportunity to help students, institutions, and accreditors by helping to realign the goals for student success measures with effective and

1	modern techniques for achieving those goals.
2	That's it, Mr. Chairman.
3	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, David.
4	Unless there is an objection, I would recommend
5	that we do appoint a subcommittee, David being
6	the chair, and anybody who would be interested in
7	serving on the committee please notify David or
8	myself and we would move forward with that,
9	because I think that would be a very interesting
10	and important report.
11	I don't think we need a motion for
12	that, but if there are any objections please let
13	me know. With that
14	DR. DERBY: Art, I have a question.
15	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, sure.
16	DR. DERBY: Yes. I just wanted to ask
17	David, this sounds really great and I support the
18	idea of a subcommittee and would like to be on
19	it.
20	Where can we access the new handbook
21	for the guidance for the accreditors?
22	DR. EUBANKS: It's posted online. I

1	can just email you a copy. That might be the
2	easiest thing.
3	DR. DERBY: Great, thanks.
4	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Just
5	Kathleen, you had your hand raised.
6	DR. ALIOTO: Yes. I wondered, David,
7	if you had looked at the report that was created
8	by NACIQI over the last, well it was not last
9	year but the four years before that: a study on
10	this subject on student achievement. Have you
11	looked at that?
12	DR. EUBANKS: I'm familiar with some
13	of the resources, but maybe not all of them. So,
14	thank you for pointing that out. I'll have to do
15	some more research.
16	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?
18	DR. ALIOTO: I wasn't sure if they
19	were on the Committee.
20	DR. PETRISKO: Thank you. First I
21	want to thank you, David, and I want to volunteer
22	also to go on the group.

I want to be clear on what -- I don't know how to even ask this. What's our authority with doing these kinds of reports and recommendations that would be going out so that institutions could see what our thinking is and what our expectations are, what our understanding is of what student achievement is?

What status does it have? What authority does it have?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen, and again, Herman, you can correct me or, George, the purpose of these is to provide advisory information to the Secretary.

Prior to this last reauthorization, we did not have that kind of ability to do it. But since the last reauthorization we have involved ourselves in a number of different areas.

And this is one that is appropriate, where we would send a report like Rick will do and that will go to the Secretary for just advice and counsel, not necessarily for any regulatory authority.

DR. PETRISKO: Although it could 1 2 result in that if there were things presented, where the Secretary would say that actually is 3 4 really good, we should be more explicit or change 5 these things so that we're giving good guidance as to what our requirements are for agencies. 6 7 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Right, or she would then maybe set up a negotiated rulemaking, 8 9 because I think that's what would follow next. But we certainly could raise the questions. 10 doesn't have to take the advice, or she can. 11 12 DR. PETRISKO: Great. Well, again --13 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any other comments? 14 DR. PETRISKO: -- I would be happy to 15 be on a group. Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Great, thank you. Ι 17 think we're finished, almost. Two things I want 18 to say. 19 First, remember during our training we 20 went through an issue in the media training. And 21 we are not able to speak on behalf of NACIQI. Ιf 22 you get a media contact, please refer it to

George who will refer to the Department's PR people.

If, at any time you don't refer yourself in terms of speaking for NACIQI or even as a member of NACIQI, that doesn't mean you can't speak on your own personal issues. But if you are going to comment on any action we've taken please refer -- from the press, please refer that to George and he will then send it to the appropriate people to respond.

Any questions on that? George, anything you want to comment on that?

DR. SMITH: Yes. Just if we get anything -- if you get anything media related, clearly, just refer them to me and I'll refer them to the appropriate people in our press office.

I've gotten some communication from our committee management officer who is under the impression that it might be a good idea just to go ahead and vote on a subcommittee to make it a part of the record, rather than just forming it,

you know, generally. 1 2 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. We've not done that before, but we certainly can. 3 If you 4 would like that subcommittee, go ahead and vote. DR. SMITH: 5 Yes. DR. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that 6 we create the -- this is George French. 7 I move that we create the subcommittee as recommended. 8 9 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Great. And that's a 10 motion. Is there a second? DR. PETRISKO: I'll second it. 11 12 CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. I think Mary 13 Ellen or Jill, but Mary Ellen. Any other 14 discussion? Go ahead and vote. Ralph, go ahead 15 and vote -- or, you have discussion? 16 MR. WOLFF: Just one question. 17 would appreciate that a charge to the Committee -18 - subcommittee be developed and circulated just 19 so we, and following up on Mary Ellen's question, 20 just so what the charge is and what the scope is 21 and it would be very helpful. 22 If I could, I will join the committee.

1	But I'll write to David directly. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. David did do
3	a very well thought out paper, that should be the
4	basis of the subcommittee's charge. Okay.
5	Okay. Do you have enough, George, on
6	the votes? It looks unanimous. Anne hasn't voted.
7	DR. SMITH: Okay, let's see, 13, 15,
8	16. It's unanimous. So, it is unanimous.
9	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Again, I want to
10	thank everybody for being so cooperative. This
11	has been an interesting experience working with
12	Webex.
13	I thank the Webex people for helping
14	us and, George and Herman, thank you so much for
15	your staff and the work that they do. And I
16	would entertain a motion to adjourn.
17	DR. FRENCH: So moved.
18	CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. I think
19	that's unanimous. I'm ready. Thanks. Bye, bye,
20	everybody. Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
22	went off the record at 11:38 a.m.)

A
A-game 77:22
a.m 1:11 5:2 145:22 ability 60:14 141:15
able 17:11 38:20 44:17
47:1 50:19 53:3 86:4
92:20 102:2 107:4
112:15,17,18 115:7
120:13 128:11 131:6
137:6 142:21
above-entitled 145:21
absolute 103:16
absolutely 106:7
133:16
academia 78:4 87:20 academic 6:16 54:12
73:14 75:6 82:5 93:22
94:14 105:14,19
107:12,18 108:1
137:4
academics 3:10 56:17
57:14
accept 49:4 56:6 76:20
79:16 126:21 acceptance 134:18
accepted 14:21 123:13
134:21
access 15:3 85:14
139:20
accident 121:5
accommodate 117:19
accomplish 85:12 accredit 6:3 14:1 31:4
accreditation 2:12,18
6:6 11:6,7 15:2 21:4,5
25:4 48:13 56:1 67:3
69:18 76:11 80:22
96:1 131:4 136:18
137:19
accredited 59:13 67:4
70:6 83:5
accrediting 5:20,21 32:21 44:8 55:3 70:6
124:20 128:8,13,15
129:1,7,10 130:21
131:3 138:4
accreditor 34:14 52:8
66:6 68:9 124:1
accreditor's 130:13 accreditors 25:6 26:17
26:18,21 129:20
130:7 134:14 136:7,9
138:21 139:21
achieve 92:20 94:9
achieved 61:2
achievement 136:6,8
136:18 138:7,12

```
achieving 139:1
acknowledge 132:13
acknowledging 129:15
  130:3
acquiring 78:17
act 5:11,13,18 69:17
  74:5 88:7 99:9 120:20
  122:1 130:19,22
Acting 2:15
action 32:6 143:7
Acts 131:7
actual 18:19 42:16
add 45:6 59:22 60:18
 61:5 71:8 100:17,18
 105:4,5,21 120:7
  133:22
added 59:20
addition 6:15
additional 56:7 60:19
 69:4,10 76:21 119:4
  122:19
addressed 36:19 48:4
addresses 47:17,19
addressing 38:16
 103:21
adds 32:16
Adelphi 21:6 27:16,18
 36:19
adequate 45:7,14 47:19
 48:2
Adirondack 21:9
adjourn 145:16
Adjournment 4:21
adjudicate 110:14
adjustments 32:22
  34:16,17 117:17,18
administration 23:8,11
 80:14 99:22
administrator 23:16
admission 17:9
admissions 30:11
 116:18
admit 26:1
adopted 12:8
advance 12:14
advantage 112:7,18
advantaged 79:13
advice 6:11 104:18
  105:1 141:20 142:11
advise 103:8
advises 6:9
advising 104:5,7
  105:18
Advisor 1:15
Advisors 101:4
advisory 1:4,11,13 5:5
 5:13,15 97:14 102:1,2
  141:12
```

```
advocate 8:8
affairs 91:6
affirm 101:2
affirmation 103:8
agencies 4:12,15 5:19
  5:20,21 6:17 15:21
  44:8 52:8 54:13 72:18
  75:6 84:18 104:15
  107:16 108:19 109:5
  109:15 124:20 128:8
  128:13,16 129:1,8,10
  130:21 135:10 138:4
  138:11 142:6
agency 2:18 6:7 11:20
  12:2,6,12,15,17 15:16
  16:5,11 32:22 42:3
  46:8 47:17 48:12
  51:17 52:1 55:3 67:11
  73:6 74:8 76:6 81:22
  82:15,16,17 85:8
  86:10,10 92:16,21
  93:13 105:6 106:2
  107:1 131:3
agency's 11:22 12:20
  15:12,15,19 16:1,9
agent 82:1
ago 36:18,22 77:18
  80:10 82:9
agree 134:14
agreed 81:16
ahead 10:3,20 13:16
  19:15 46:4 52:5 97:2
  97:4 99:15 100:1,6
  106:11 116:6 119:6
  119:15 120:5,18
  143:21 144:4,14,14
aid 6:13
Alan 2:11 5:8
Alaska 134:10
align 26:20
aligns 73:11
Alioto 1:15 8:7,7 24:2
  25:22 27:5,11 42:21
  43:13 50:9 51:4,7,10
  62:7 63:1,11,19 65:2
  66:10 111:9,11 114:9
  115:20 121:15 122:4
  132:21 140:6,16,18
Allen 90:15
allocation 130:10
allow 39:16 78:2 85:14
  110:20 131:12
allowed 34:21 44:10
allowing 83:13
alternative 34:22 35:19
alum 82:9
alumni 2:4 7:16 82:21
```

Amanda 1:18 7:8,9,12 52:12,12 61:20 70:19 amazing 115:2 ambition 94:9 **amended** 5:12,14 **amendment** 18:17,21 28:3 America 65:17 **American** 1:17 2:4 7:16 9:4 58:7,9,21 amount 68:15 analogy 117:4 **analysis** 15:22 17:19 20:2 24:15 28:13 29:15 41:9,15 43:2,12 78:12 analyst 2:13,13,14,14 2:15,16,17 92:11 analysts 36:14 110:7 analyzed 112:13 Angela 11:12 50:13 angels 24:12 **Anne** 2:4 7:14,15 13:12 13:13 19:14,15 40:20 46:1,3 127:20 133:9 145:6 annual 25:11 29:3.13 30:1,16 31:7,10 32:3 40:6 annually 31:3 answer 56:11 61:17 67:19 68:1 125:10 **answered** 27:15 36:12 40:13 121:16 anticipate 118:6 anybody 132:2 139:6 **anybody's** 49:16 anyway 62:5 apologize 57:1 appear 12:14 137:5 appeared 14:18 20:14 **Appendix** 48:20 63:22 65:8 applicable 55:3 69:19 application 11:22 12:20 applications 12:9 13:1 appoint 139:5 appointed 138:14 appointing 125:5 128:20 appointment 129:12 appreciate 25:2 34:11 61:19 72:15 85:18 86:5 96:16 100:16 107:22 118:4 119:1 127:18 131:22 144:17 appreciative 36:8 127:15

140:10 141:7

appropriate 59:16 assume 32:14 basis 29:6 30:1.17 13:11,16 21:2,3,22 138:16 141:18 143:10 Assurance 2:9 44:16 61:5 145:4 22:10,16 43:16 44:12 143:16 assurances 111:22 **Basu** 92:9 44:22 46:3,12 66:16 Atlanta 2:1 9:22 10:5 bear 77:21 91:10 approval 5:19,20 17:21 28:15 56:9 100:13 attained 80:22 119:22 **bottom** 9:6 19:6 49:18 105:6 123:7,8,14,21 attendee 47:6 began 78:4 106:14 **Bounds** 2:12 10:17 124:2,6,11 attendees 57:13 **beginning** 88:8 112:3 11:5,6 42:2 45:5 **approve** 46:6 100:8,10 attention 27:22 36:13 120:15 46:15 69:14 125:12 127:21 136:3 **begins** 12:5 101:2 126:14 **BOV** 90:11 119:9,11 approved 59:18 69:9 audience 62:22 behalf 31:3 79:15 95:5 **Bradley** 58:13 audio 36:17 42:22 77:8 97:15 142:21 brief 39:5 117:2 136:1 audited 30:17 believe 21:8 43:8 56:12 approving 76:15 **briefing** 12:1 53:16 approximately 60:9 audits 45:15 59:8 91:20 92:19 briefly 100:3 **April** 54:15 73:18 authorities 6:1 107:7 110:18 128:14 137:9 brigade 65:11 area 14:16 authority 13:22 54:5,9 137:11 brightest 112:10 believes 21:16 areas 30:10 110:4 54:17 75:2,10 100:11 **bring** 37:17 67:6 69:15 141:17 101:3 103:18 104:12 **benchmarks** 40:3,8,9 69:21 93:16 101:19 argue 65:4 105:1,2 106:20 141:2 benefitted 80:2 102:6 108:11 119:22 136:2 **Armed** 55:9 75:20 141:9.22 benefitting 89:9 best 112:10 bringing 27:22 108:18 **Army** 3:9 52:2,9,14,16 authorization 6:18 60:1 61:8 70:2 74:5 120:20 54:2 55:18 56:18 **better** 55:17 80:15 85:3 138:9 110:16 111:9 brings 82:21 57:14,18 58:6,12,20 Army's 57:22 authorized 6:10,14 beyond 37:9 39:21 43:3 broadens 113:7 **Arnold** 58:14 59:10 49:8 58:21 64:12,19 **broader** 61:5 62:22 authorizer 70:7 79:21 109:14 113:2 arose 31:11 108:21 authorizes 6:16 130:21 **brought** 74:13 91:10 arrange 23:8,10 arrangement 106:1 **autonomy** 106:3,3 **big** 113:9 132:14 **Bruce** 92:7 arrival 118:20 available 6:20 biggest 71:8 budget 6:19 30:16 **art** 52:1,12 59:12 60:2 average 27:10 63:15 biological 78:17 101:21 105:5,7 60:22 61:7,21 71:5,17 averages 48:19 biology 78:6 116:15 130:9 134:10 73:5 115:17 116:1 awarding 59:11 birth 8:8 **budgets** 39:6 100:8 119:2 123:2 127:17 aware 25:18 71:15 bit 27:2 28:22 33:5 43:7 117:7 130:4.15 103:2 122:15 129:20 127:20 133:13 135:10 50:18 101:18 113:2 **build** 39:10 81:16 84:4 139:14 113:17 84:4 93:6,21 В Arthur 1:11.14 7:3 9:11 block 86:15 **building** 63:18 87:14,21 51:4 70:19 **B** 64:1 65:8 board 2:19 3:14 13:8,18 89:19 91:11 116:11 articulated 73:16 back 9:9 10:10 18:6,11 14:16 17:9 26:8,10 116:12 arts 52:22 55:16 62:16 18:14 23:16 27:7 35:5 34:13 72:8 86:2,6,11 Bulletin 63:22 69:7 41:2 45:9 47:1 57:17 87:16,17 91:20 97:13 bureau 109:21 **Ashley** 82:4,6,20 67:6,19 72:13 86:12 97:18,21 98:2,3,5,15 business 118:14 127:7 asked 14:20 31:19 36:3 86:13 102:9 119:8 98:16,21 99:7,9,17,19 **bye** 145:19,19 61:12 81:21 115:5 122:10 125:1 127:13 100:8 101:4,4 102:1 **bylaws** 15:20 24:6,17 asking 12:6 33:20 35:8 backbone 83:22 103:7,17 104:3,8,9,16 C aspects 55:20 76:9 backdating 67:3 104:22 105:9 106:5 108:7 background 48:15 106:17 107:3,7,19 **C** 5:16 asserted 129:8 109:11 115:4 116:14 119:19 **C-4** 5:16 assessment 1:21 60:17 **ban** 137:15 119:21 120:3,5 121:2 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 4:4 bank 83:10 85:7 113:19 calendar 19:20 assigned 11:20 125:5 boards 1:19 8:4 105:15 assistance 95:9 **banned** 137:2 call 9:19 36:5 41:2 49:16 50:21 68:22 128:19 130:1 **Assistant** 1:20 2:15 **barrel** 118:16 3:16 95:17,22 barriers 33:17 **Bob** 82:3,20 89:3 112:7 128:10 based 12:1 16:22 31:10 assisting 99:22 **bodies** 130:4 calling 102:12 **Associate** 2:20,21 17:7 **body** 59:7 70:6 31:21 53:11 60:7 camera 9:6,9 23:17 associated 52:21 70:1 **bolster** 95:12 62:21 65:9 112:8 **Cameron** 3:13 77:6,7,8 **bolts** 97:10 associates 17:15 125:17 131:4 77:12,15 94:18 95:16 **Association** 1:19 2:5,8 basic 104:21 **boon** 137:16 96:12,20 97:19 100:5 basically 65:13 104:11 **BOOTH** 1:16 100:17 101:15 104:10 associations 128:9 **basics** 112:20 **Boston** 1:17 8:16 9:3,3 105:4,22 108:15

109:13 111:13 114:8 114:12,18 117:3 118:8 119:6 121:18 **campus** 23:17 25:20 28:2 35:6 38:21 **Candace** 47:10 capabilities 87:15 88:13,22 capability 87:22 capable 89:20 capital 83:12 85:1 care 24:13 career 78:4,19 careful 49:13 101:6,11 carefully 99:18 **Carmen** 90:22 case 123:17,18 134:10 cases 16:19,21 130:3 138:1 cast 32:15 71:22 catch 21:20 37:2 107:6 catch-22 123:16 cause 31:11 center 85:4 90:7 91:1 94:13 113:17 central 82:14 85:13 108:1 110:19 centrally 98:8 **CEO** 1:14 2:5 certain 39:17 certainly 34:3,19 43:11 142:10 144:3 certification 6:12 30:15 39:19 cetera 32:11 **CGCS** 54:4 55:12 **CGSC** 4:12 52:19,21 53:3 63:22 CGSC's 53:8 chair 1:12,14 3:14 14:12 51:20 53:19 74:16 97:21 132:7 139:6 chaired 98:19 Chairperson 57:12 **challenge** 87:3 89:12 champions 107:20 **chance** 41:16 **Chancellor** 1:14 9:11 **chances** 131:9 change 4:11,14 18:17 25:14,14 52:3,4 53:22 55:1,6,12,13 56:6,9 59:14 68:10 72:17,20 74:11,12,19 75:17 76:2,4 79:20,22 80:6 84:21 85:14 97:7 116:15,19 125:7,15

125:19 126:14 142:4 **changes** 24:8 25:12 41:18 54:16,20 60:12 74:7 75:9,13 98:6 130:9,11 **charge** 51:21 144:17,20 145:4 charges 6:15 **Charity** 2:14 11:9 14:10 14:13 17:17 24:3 41:2 41:3 42:22 43:16 **chart** 27:18 81:3 118:10 **charter** 98:15,22 103:18 104:11 106:5 107:5,6 119:11 120:5 **chat** 46:22 **check** 77:9 chemical 78:18 **Chiang** 11:13 **chicken** 123:19 **Chief** 58:19 **Chiefs** 58:19 children 8:8 chime 132:22 **choose** 63:15 **Chris** 90:16 church-sponsored 134:7 **CIA** 82:15 90:22 91:4 92:10 circle 10:9.11

circulated 94:4 144:18 cited 21:6 129:11 138:16 civilian 58:18 64:3,5 Clapper 89:2 clarification 20:22 36:15 66:17 clarified 48:11 104:21 **clarify** 19:17 98:15 **clarity** 103:16 Clark 2:1 9:21 10:5 class 61:12 66:20 classes 68:17 classic 73:14 classified 73:10 83:7 108:22 classroom 35:10 110:15

28:18 47:20 51:20,20 72:14 73:1,3 74:15 96:22 100:18 104:5 126:9 Claude's 38:2 clear 17:1 48:22 93:20

Claude 2:7 7:17,18

Claude's 38:2 clear 17:1 48:22 93:20 103:4 116:15 125:14 126:3 130:20 136:7

137:7 141:1 **clearly** 21:7 143:15 **Clift** 87:12 clinical 33:10 34:22 close 18:20 **closed** 83:12 **closely** 96:3 123:22 Coast 90:14 codified 86:16 codifies 94:11 cognizant 130:15 Cohen 92:11 cohort 53:2 coincide 37:18 coincides 124:12 Colin 58:16 collaboration 121:2 colleague 29:11 colleagues 79:2 113:15 **collect** 26:19 collected 112:12 Collectively 138:19 collectors 110:8 college 1:16,18 2:3,9 3:9 7:13 8:15 9:1 21:9 34:8 52:3.10.15 54:3 56:19 57:15,17,21 58:6,22 59:12,19,20 60:13,17 62:12 70:9 81:2,3,6,7,10,20 **colleges** 1:20 2:7 7:20 8:5 43:6 129:22 137:22 collegial 138:10 collegially 131:21 combat 65:14 **combed** 117:15

combed 117:15 come 15:17 26:14 29:11 44:17 46:8 63:7 67:19 83:22 124:17 128:19 comes 22:22 33:11 59:7 92:3 comfortable 13:3 61:3 125:18 coming 91:17 98:14 99:16 103:20 115:4

57:15 60:8 Commandant 90:14 commander 65:11 commended 92:19

Command 3:9 52:2,9

52:15 54:2 56:18

comment 12:11 20:12 42:1,3 46:14 47:12 48:6 98:11 119:5 120:8 125:17 143:7 143:12 commenters 45:19,21 122:15 comments 12:3,12,16

12:18 16:6 36:14 41:6 48:8 56:7 67:17,20 71:5,18 76:21 95:14 95:20 96:10 119:1,9 122:10,20 126:19 132:2 142:13

Commission 41:3 56:2 59:13 76:12 88:4 96:2 commissioned 80:15 114:22

commissions 89:7,17 commitment 79:4 82:4 84:20 89:6 99:19 committed 83:9 91:12

93:22 112:4

committee 1:4,11,13
5:5,13 7:6 12:10,19
14:13 17:14 54:8
57:13 58:2 62:4 74:16
75:4,20 95:4 115:1,16
115:22 127:14 128:5
131:8,10 132:14
133:2,9,14,22 134:17
134:18,22 135:14
138:17 139:7 140:19
143:19 144:17,22

Committee's 136:3

committees 5:15 19:5 55:9 114:20 common 68:2 Commons 2:9 communication 31:18 48:13 119:18 126:3 143:18

communications 35:17 community 2:9 8:22 21:9 62:12 73:17 78:11 82:13 83:12,15 84:9 85:5,6,10,13 87:19 88:11,18 89:9 89:10,22 90:10,13 91:5,14,17 92:22 93:6 93:7,19 94:4,10,13 95:13 99:4 104:15 108:20 113:6,18 community's 83:10

84:10 comparability 71:11 compensate 23:3 competencies 73:16 complaints 16:5 completed 124:19 complex 30:20 complexity 32:17 compliance 14:21

dedication 87:15 89:20

15:17,18,20 19:18 37:20 44:17 46:8,9 compliant 44:20 complicated 116:13 126:5 133:6,7 134:6 component 90:8 105:14 108:13 components 60:19 composite 31:17 comprehensive 60:6 60:20 compromises 138:8 computer 38:9 concentrated 94:5 concern 27:20 43:20 49:8 113:9 120:10,14 **concerned** 93:9,10 129:2 131:11 **concerning** 41:6 54:8 75:4 concerns 43:4,9,11 103:14 126:19 conditions 88:10 conduct 18:18 32:1 45:9 73:9 76:17 99:12 124:9 conducted 20:10 conducting 25:16 120:8 confer 53:3 confidence 48:16 conflict 58:8 confusion 41:11 100:21 congratulations 27:12 Congress 91:22 99:11 114:10,11 125:1 congressional 93:14 98:19 118:17 congressionally 92:5 congressionally-dire... 120:10 conscious 86:21 consciousness 87:3 consequence 78:8,13 conservative 99:21 conserve 78:6 consideration 61:15 considered 93:12 considering 34:14 consisted 15:22 consolidated 80:19 constantly 25:19 constituted 87:17 90:12 constitutes 90:12 constructive 100:1 101:17 106:21 121:7

consultant 1:15,19 2:6 8:3.12 91:6 consultation 100:13 consulted 100:12 104:17 contact 142:22 contacts 110:1 contain 137:11 content 69:5 continue 15:15 35:9,12 46:6 98:6 113:11,18 120:13 continued 13:20 31:22 81:3 continues 87:8 **continuing** 35:1 96:9 contradict 48:21 contradiction 123:11 137:12 control 74:7,12 76:5 conversation 35:15 85:19 98:4 110:12 111:14 114:1,2 115:12,14 122:19 125:17 cooperative 145:10 **copy** 30:21 55:1 140:1 **corner** 49:18 **coronavirus** 22:22 24:9 **correct** 44:16 69:22 141:11 costs 137:21 **Council** 2:4 7:16 counsel 2:16 11:2 141:21 count 38:15 country 58:1,17 63:2 counts 19:11 **County 1:16 couple** 9:14 31:7 48:8 48:10 116:9 119:9 courageous 24:13 course 19:8 24:11 30:14 33:11 40:12 44:7 60:7,8,14,19 89:1 124:7 125:20 137:2,10 courses 63:4 cover 108:16 covered 69:16 **COVID** 16:4 44:17 57:10 124:8 COVID-19 33:9 34:22 create 144:7,8 created 86:17 140:7 creation 57:18 80:20

creative 35:11

credential 62:18

crisis 24:10 33:6 79:3 **criteria** 15:20 130:18 136:19 **critical** 24:15 79:18 83:17 86:9 89:11 90:8 107:12 108:2 critically 89:8 90:9 94:12 112:19 criticism 88:10 criticisms 89:6 critiques 89:17 90:3 cultural 108:11 curious 62:8 current 15:16 30:3,4 33:22 58:18 82:19 118:6 138:2 **currently** 52:21 56:10 curriculum 4:11,14 52:4 55:13 56:6,9 60:13 61:14 72:17 73:11,14 cycle 16:10 85:7

D **D** 2:3 Daggett 2:13 11:11 data 41:21 60:18 136:14 137:3,11,15 138:1 date 41:12 42:9 dates 24:16 Dave 89:13 95:17,18 96:12 97:4 100:21 David 1:20 3:16 7:21,22 48:5 72:22 73:3 96:21 116:4,6 123:3 126:9 126:18 135:17 139:3 139:5,7,17 140:6,21 145:1,2 day 5:4 7:5 35:17 days 15:18 31:20 46:10 55:2 124:14 deal 108:6 133:1,1 dealing 9:15 18:2 78:12 91:13 134:1 dealt 103:1 **Dean** 3:10 57:14 **debate** 94:5 debating 131:2 decade 84:13 128:14 **decent** 23:20 decision 86:21 92:18 112:7,14,16,17 decisions 79:13 112:7 119:22 decommissioned 88:5 dedicate 88:19 dedicated 79:12 83:11

deep 115:6 135:16 **deeper** 39:10 default 24:19 defend 79:12 defending 83:18 defense 54:10,14 72:21 74:5,9 76:7 80:13,18 80:20 81:1,7,10,16,19 81:22 82:12 84:14 86:10,13 89:3,9 90:18 90:19 92:7,16 93:1,2 99:2,3 102:10 106:1 106:22 108:7 111:12 111:17 112:4 114:5 116:22 125:5 defer 97:2 deficiencies 18:13 degree 54:1,5,8,17 55:14,15,17,20,22 59:11,15,18,21 60:1,3 60:15 61:4,11 62:15 62:20,22 63:15,16 64:4,6,7,20,21 65:12 65:22 66:7 68:2,14,20 69:5,15,20 70:8 71:11 71:12 73:22 74:19 75:1,4,10 76:9,10 87:5 101:19 113:4 degrees 6:16 53:4 54:12 60:11 75:6 delays 124:8 **Delekta** 1:18 7:11,12 52:12.14 62:1 deliberation 132:16 deliberations 6:22 delivered 120:3 demographic 30:12 demonstrate 16:17 demonstrates 15:19 demonstrations 48:3 **Dennis** 87:12 department 1:1 2:11,19 11:2 12:1,17 13:9 14:10 15:15 16:2,7 17:16 21:6,16 26:6 43:1 53:15 54:10,14 54:19 55:10 59:17 65:16 72:21 73:20 74:9 75:12,21 76:7,14 80:13,18 81:9 92:14 95:3 96:4 108:9,10 109:6,16,20 111:11 112:3 116:22 123:7,8 125:4,5 126:1 130:19 131:5,13 Department's 143:1

departmental 73:2

depending 16:15 18:1 107:13 50:9 62:11 71:14 93:4 62:2 64:2 105:1 25:5 directly 145:1 101:20 102:5 141:3 electronic 137:18 director 2:12,12 5:9 **Don** 92:6 deployment 59:4 **elicit** 84:7 110:14 11:6 30:3 72:21 73:13 **Deputy** 2:15 90:16,17 **Donna** 2:15 10:19,20,21 eligibility 6:4,11 92:13 74:10 76:8 81:14,22 **Eliot** 92:11 11.1 **Derby** 1:19 8:3,5 22:19 82:3,17 83:2 84:15 draft 41:9 Elizabeth 2:13 11:11 23:22 70:21 104:1 90:17,18,21 91:1,4 draw 110:3 Ellen 2:6 8:10,11 36:6,9 105:13 106:8 107:22 95:11 102:3 111:18 driven 32:2 60:18 37:22 38:7 40:17 111:1 132:12 135:3,5 46:18 50:3 140:17 118:12 drop 32:4 36:7 139:14,16 140:3 director's 30:4 drove 81:9 141:10 144:13,13 Ellen's 144:19 derived 55:15 directors 82:14,19 due 16:4 28:5 41:11 described 97:14 111:20 disagree 19:22 20:1 42:22 46:10 68:5 **Ellison** 89:13 113:15 114:18,21 disagreed 129:7 116:8 124:8 email 140:1 describes 111:16 discharge 6:9 **duty** 79:3 emergency 77:18 Emeritus 1:16 2:8 8:22 description 16:17 **discipline** 60:3 85:9 Ε designated 2:12 5:9 discuss 15:13 41:2 emphasis 87:21 54:7 75:3 80:11 discussing 17:18 E 1:11,14,17 emphasizes 136:10 earlier 10:6.8 106:14 **desire** 61:5 129:15 emphasizing 90:8 desk 16:12,20 18:15 discussion 9:16 12:20 114:19 121:20 employees 93:2,3 enabled 98:22 42:14,15 43:18,21 26:9 46:16,17 48:17 easier 62:5 44:4 45:10,13,15 49:15 66:3,5 71:5,12 **easiest** 140:2 enables 47:7 detail 114:21 encompassed 55:22 71:18 81:9 110:13 **East** 59:4 detailed 117:9 120:22 128:5,6 135:5 easy 62:5 69:11 76:11 determination 15:11 144:14,15 encompasses 15:6 echo 95:19 127:18 **determine** 33:16 40:3 discussions 35:3 41:7 encompassing 20:9 edits 134:1 determined 55:12 76:1 120:16 131:19 educate 73:9 28:16 determines 5:22 distance 43:3 educated 57:22 encounters 107:15 deters 79:4 distancing 35:5 educates 60:9 encouragement 79:17 develop 102:6 distinct 15:6 111:21 endeavor 96:5 **education** 1:1,2 2:6,10 **developed** 92:4 144:18 distinction 70:15 2:11.19.20.20.21 5:11 enforcement 83:21 developing 90:4 105:18 5:22 6:2,12 8:19 11:3 109:16 110:10 13:8,10 14:5,17 15:5 development 32:11 distributed 57:10 128:2 engage 35:12 79:11 84:18 88:19 diverse 32:14 15:7 17:8,15,16 30:5 engaged 34:3,4 84:19 89:14 diversity 85:11 87:15 30:9 32:20 33:14 34:8 92:1 102:14 106:18 developments 88:2 **DNI** 81:15,17,21 86:10 35:10,14 54:6,20 55:5 119:12,20 121:7 **DIA** 81:22 82:3,19 92:22 89:3 93:15 96:18 55:19 57:19 59:8,17 engagement 81:12,18 93:1,3,10,21 111:18 98:15 99:5,6,16 102:9 62:17 69:17 70:10,11 85:17 89:21 98:18 enlighten 33:4 117:13 105:11 107:1 111:18 73:8,20 75:2,12,16 dictate 49:11 119:16 120:6,13 76:13 80:19 81:4,13 enlisted 59:21 died 38:10 **DNI's** 91:15 81:17 84:12,17 85:16 enriched 114:1 difference 104:6 doctorate 64:13 65:3,5 87:2 88:21 95:4,9 enroll 53:2 enrolled 56:10 differences 117:16 65:12,13,17 66:4,9 96:2,5 113:1,10,11,19 different 32:9 36:13 doctors 64:12 120:12 123:7,8 125:4 enrollment 30:11 40:12 68:7 108:7 **enterprise** 78:21 83:8 document 97:7.14 130:12 109:5 130:16 141:17 111:15 **educational** 6:4 8:8,12 85:2 110:3 documentation 16:2,17 entertain 145:16 differently 33:22 14:1,2 54:9,21 55:7 difficult 44:21 89:12 16:22 19:2 21:15 22:4 entire 113:5 127:19 75:14,18 118:1 138:5 28:7 44:15 educators 84:6 entire-enterprise documentations 16:19 difficulties 31:16 effective 138:22 112:11 entirety 96:8 documented 16:11 diligence 42:22 116:8 Effectiveness 1:22 diminish 101:9 43:17 effort 92:2 95:7 entities 68:4 diplomacy 110:1 documents 26:1,5,7,7 **efforts** 16:18 78:5 111:3 Entrepreneur 8:19 34:20 66:12 enumerated 131:7 diplomatic 83:21 egg 123:20 **DoD** 86:18 92:10 98:2 environment 107:21 diplomats 110:9 eight 16:14 17:22 19:20 direct 85:14 105:2,2 111:15 113:20 120:11 21:17 22:20 25:8 138:5 envision 84:4 118:11 doing 17:22 23:2 25:7 Eisenhower 58:13 26:3,4 33:5,22 34:11 directed 92:5 **equal** 45:16 80:14 direction 91:11 100:2 35:13 38:13,18 44:18 either 17:22 31:22 46:1 equivalent 45:10

Erin 92:12 **expanded** 59:15 134:12 135:6 133:3 following 38:22 124:14 especially 138:6 expanding 87:2 **FBI** 109:16 **ESQ** 2:15 expansion 70:22 **FCO** 124:17 144:19 expect 29:2 **February** 15:10 for-profit 129:18 **essence** 113:14 essentially 118:16 expectations 141:6 federal 2:12 4:12,15 5:9 forces 58:12 established 5:10 13:21 experience 30:4,9 5:13 6:6,13,17 52:8 foreign 59:2 80:17 70:12 88:7 33:10 65:9,10 66:8 54:11,13 59:14 68:2 Forgive 36:11 88:21 106:18 107:17 establishing 70:2 68:13,20 72:17 75:5,6 form 76:5 83:22 119:22 145:11 feel 72:2 135:21 formal 56:5 64:6 67:10 et 32:11 Eubanks 1:20 7:22 8:1 experiences 34:22 **fell** 79:2 76:19 123:6,8 127:7 Fellow 2:4 7:15 48:7 49:4 73:1 96:21 35:20 formation 5:15 experiencing 33:18,20 felt 18:5 69:5,11 96:22 97:5 100:3,7,15 formations 58:8 116:1,5,7 118:2,22 experiential 60:22 field 110:1 former 65:11 87:18 123:1,5 125:2,16 65:13,19 fighting 65:14 90:14,16,17,20,21 126:17 135:19 139:22 **expertise** 84:12 91:10 **figures** 58:16 91:3,5,12 104:14 106:17 108:12 119:21 140:12 files 43:18 formerly 38:5 90:22 evaluating 21:14 137:4 **experts** 84:7,9 108:11 final 20:13 36:14 41:15 forming 143:22 evaluation 30:22 31:1 forms 35:13,14 expiration 49:12 67:20 124:10,17,21 Fort 57:15 59:1,7 63:8 39:15 40:2 **expires** 125:3 124:21 **explain** 29:1 50:15 67:9 finalized 96:9 evangelical 93:5 forth 5:14 29:5 101:12 evening 63:17 **explains** 54:18 55:1 finally 125:22 116:18 123:15 127:13 **EVENT** 17:10 51:14 75:11 **finance** 32:17 forward 35:2 61:9 95:14 explicit 142:4 financial 30:18 31:16 96:8,10,15 123:12 56:20 eventually 88:5 exposition 116:14 129:3 124:3 125:8,19 138:9 **everybody** 9:12 13:3 expressed 103:15 find 26:2 65:8 111:2 139:8 36:7 39:17 71:22 120:11 findings 12:2,4 31:21 forwarded 134:22 132:3 133:10.14 extended 95:5 fine 77:11 foster 94:5 135:14 145:10,20 extension 44:15 finer 12:21 found 18:12 evidence 21:15 extent 45:13 99:21 finish 64:7 foundation 84:5 evolution 111:4 103:16 finished 59:4 119:2 foundations 78:11 evolve 35:1 extra 50:18 127:7 142:17 Founder 2:5 evolving 83:19 110:13 extraordinary 136:4 first 9:16 19:15 24:2 founding 80:9 exact 67:2 138:19 57:18 62:8 73:18 four 20:5 42:4 111:20 **exactly** 40:14 65:10 extremely 119:14 79:21 80:10 92:4 140.9 66:11 110:17 96:21 98:12 104:2 frame 16:14 64:8 F **exam** 27:10 123:20 127:10 138:10 **frames** 18:7 **examination** 39:20 60:6 **F** 2:5 140:20 142:19 framework 115:8 FACA 5:14 98:2,3 Fiscal 74:6 60:21 fraud 129:4 **example** 20:13 21:6 face 77:20 **five** 8:9 freedom 82:5 93:22 31:14 32:2 120:21 facet 36:13 fix 47:11 107:12,18 108:1 136:21 137:13 fact 19:17 20:15 23:4 flag 29:6 138:11 34:11 36:19 37:16 **examples** 129:11 flexibility 44:8 136:13 freestanding 32:16 **exams** 26:11 43:22 44:3 49:10 138:15 French 2:1 9:18,19,21 excellence 94:14 **flexible** 133:10 10:4,5,8 39:4 40:13 130:18 136:19 excellent 77:12 98:13 Florida 9:12 144:6,7 145:17 faculty 23:13 29:15 103:13 flows 85:6 friends 79:2 30:8,8,9 32:10,10 fluid 42:7 frightening 24:7 exceptionally 103:4 53:6 64:3,5 84:6 exclusively 93:1 89:20 focus 81:4,9,11 front 83:20 97:20 excuse 23:8 25:9 failure 97:7 focused 52:20 53:12 froze 38:8 121:13 fair 113:9 130:10 60:3 61:10 71:10 83:5 **fulfill** 93:17 full 60:5 89:10 128:5,5 **executive** 2:11 5:9 falls 52:10 95:10 33:12 74:8 76:6 82:1 familiar 140:12 focusing 17:20 20:5 134:18,21 91:4 97:16 folks 13:13 45:2 86:5 fully 71:13 85:12 familiarization 110:5 exhibit 21:3 87:19 113:20 119:4 120:18 **far** 26:15 39:6 64:12 follow 25:7 44:13 49:3 function 70:4 **existing** 53:11 54:1,5 95:20 137:6 97:4 100:8 101:14 functional 85:9 54:17 55:20 56:1 **fast** 50:16 74:19 75:1,10 76:9 favor 36:3 44:14 48:8 142:9 functionally 118:9 expand 53:8 49:22 50:3 71:20 followed 12:11 19:18 functioned 98:16

functions 6:10 **Fund** 2:6 Fundraiser 1:15 Furman 1:22 8:1 further 6:15 29:1 45:22 49:15 55:18 56:8 81:12 135:5 future 38:3 79:14 80:9 85:20 96:15.18 100:22 112:10 115:12 118:21 G **Gannon** 3:14 86:2,3 94:18 98:10,12 100:5 100:10 103:12 104:10 104:11 106:6,12 107:11 114:13,15 119:3,3,8,8 **Gates** 89:3 gathered 39:6 112:13 gavel 51:19 72:12 Gecsedi 2:20 17:7,9,12 17:14 19:21 20:3 21:20 22:3,12 23:6 25:2 26:19 27:7,13 28:1,9,12 29:10,21 37:5 38:17 general 2:16 3:9 11:2 22:20 52:2.10.15 54:3 56:18 57:15,20 60:8 69:17 82:3,6,19,20 108:4 generally 63:14 144:1 generation 79:9 genetic 78:7 gentlemen 122:9 George 2:1,11 5:8 9:18 9:20 10:2,4,15,19 36:7 39:3 50:11 68:22 72:3 141:11 143:1,9 143:11 144:7 145:5 145:14 Georgetown 92:9 Geospatial-Intelligen... 82:16 getting 19:11 35:5 95:6

93:17 102:17 110:17 goals 81:13 89:16 92:21 98:18 102:11 138:21 139:1 Gordon 2:3 8:15 gotten 143:18 **governance** 4:17 83:2 101:10 103:3 104:4,6 105:3 127:11 128:16 129:2,4,10,19 130:18 131:4 134:8 governed 5:12 **governing** 1:19 8:4 54:12 75:5 101:1,3 103:6 104:9 105:18 130:1 government 129:17 130:4 Governor's 33:12 grades 29:4 137:2,10 137:15,18 **grading** 137:21 graduate 6:16 52:15 55:19 59:11,18 60:1 60:10 61:4 62:15 64:2 66:7 74:2 82:8 86:18 graduated 61:13 66:21 graduates 53:4 58:4,7 58:20,21 59:5 62:9 82:10,14 91:16 graduating 66:20 graduation 24:18,19 27:6 30:14 39:10,19 grandfather 66:20 grandfathered 61:14 68:16 grant 70:21 granted 13:22 granting 54:1,5,8,12,17 55:21 68:3,14,20 69:15,20 73:22 74:20 75:1,4,5,10 greater 80:8 81:11 103:17 110:2,20 113:20 greatly 79:22 80:2 85:18 118:22 ground 52:21 58:7 group 2:12 11:7 91:9 92:17 140:22 142:15 **Guard** 90:14 guess 24:5 66:20 100:20 126:9 127:3 134:17

quidance 33:8,11 34:20

75:8 91:15 96:7 99:7

99:8,8 102:3,8 136:5

35:2 54:14,22 55:4

136:9,15 137:14 138:16 139:21 142:5 guidelines 35:5 guides 84:7

Н H.R 58:16 Hampshire 2:2 9:8 hamstring 77:19 hand 19:6 36:4 40:18 40:20,22 46:19,22 47:8,10 56:22 62:6 132:9 133:18 140:5 handbook 136:5,9 139:20 **handle** 33:9 **handled** 35:18 hands 36:7 45:3 122:7 happen 37:3 38:12 happened 104:13 124:7 happening 43:10 131:9 happens 29:9 112:14 happy 53:17 56:11 76:22 142:14 hard 11:16 19:11 79:4 131:22 harder 119:17 harm 79:21 **Harris** 2:13 11:10 harvest 85:1 harvesting 83:11 **Harvey** 91:4 **Havener** 2:21 29:11,19 30:1 31:5,13 33:7 34:19 37:12 39:13 **HEA** 5:12,16 6:8,14 15:3 130:19 head 37:11 56:17 heads 59:2 health 5:17 33:1,2 39:7 healthy 103:19 hear 27:11 29:20 38:11 50:13 66:12 77:9,10 111:2 119:4 128:9.11 129:6 133:19 135:10 heard 39:9 128:7,12 hearing 98:19 heartened 118:19 heartfelt 79:16 heavily 102:13 114:13 heft 107:3 **held** 16:3 **Hello** 49:18 119:5 help 10:12 79:17 85:21 96:17 138:20 **helped** 126:4 helpful 32:13 101:16

helping 79:13 83:17 126:2 138:21 145:13 **helps** 118:2 **Helton** 2:14 11:9 14:10 14:12,14 41:4,7 43:7 43:20 44:19 Herman 2:12 10:17 11:4,5,15 41:22 45:3 46:13 67:8 69:13 70:17,18 125:11 141:11 145:14 **heroes** 78:22 heroism 65:5 **HHS** 108:22 Hi 8:14 high 24:20 78:8,12 83:16 84:3 93:21 106:2 higher 2:10 5:11 6:12 30:5 33:13 34:4 48:19 56:2 58:3 59:13 66:7 69:17 70:10,11 73:8 76:13 84:12 96:2 highest 102:16 highlight 128:4 Hill 115:12 hints 97:16 hire 64:5 65:11 hiring 64:3 65:9 historical 26:7 **history** 57:17 79:19 86:12 111:4 hit 112:14 135:6 hitting 102:10 **HLC** 69:3 **HLC's** 69:1 Hoffman 92:8 **hold** 17:10 51:14 holding 135:21 holistic 88:21 home 57:9 93:1 Homeland 92:14 honor 56:16 78:19 86:4 95:2.21 honored 77:16 hope 120:4 Hopefully 13:3 **Hopkins** 92:12 host 10:11 24:12 hostage 135:22 hours 77:18 133:4 House 55:8 75:19 93:8 114:19 **HPSCI** 93:9 hub 85:4 hundreds 117:14,15 hunger 78:8 hybrid 101:18

144:21

109:19 132:3

given 33:22 64:10

give 14:11 25:11 31:14

glad 26:16 27:11 46:3

goal 78:7 79:10 85:12

84:2 117:1 136:21,22

gift 115:7

83:19

66:12

giving 142:5

globally 78:5

hybridized 35:14	32:3 39:5 55:11 69:6	73:21 74:10,22 76:8	issue 15:12 16:8 36:13
	75:22 84:8 137:12	77:6,16 78:10 80:17	42:13,14 43:17 44:21
<u> </u>	141:13	80:21 81:2,4,5,7,8,15	45:9,12 47:19 67:2,3
IC 93:17 109:4	informed 73:15 86:18	81:17,20,21,22 82:13	69:19,19 103:21
idea 119:21 139:18	119:14,20	82:15,18 83:1,3,6,7	105:20 106:13 107:18
143:20	infrastructure 109:1	83:10,20 84:9,15,16	131:22 134:4,5,8
identified 15:11 43:12	Inglis 90:16	84:19 85:2,5,7 86:7	142:20
II 58:11	inherent 88:9	86:14,19 87:18 88:6	issued 69:3 124:14
illuminated 137:13	initial 12:8 13:1 17:19	88:11,13,14,15,18,20	issues 37:15,18 71:8
image 23:17	input 103:8 inside 42:10	89:10,21 90:6,13,19 91:5,14,16 92:15,16	107:11 126:5 128:16 129:2 134:10,13
imagine 116:9 117:5,10 133:1	insights 125:11	93:18 94:8,11 95:1,12	143:6
impact 59:8 130:11	insolvency 129:4	95:13 99:4 102:4	IV 6:14 15:3 130:19
impacting 80:4	inspired 94:2	104:14 106:2 107:1	131:12
impediment 93:4	inspiring 79:8	108:14,19 109:15,21	101.12
imperative 89:12	instance 31:9 124:18	111:17,19 112:8,12	J
implementation 99:14	instances 128:15	113:5,18 114:19	J 2:2 3:13 77:5
implemented 88:7	institutes 68:20	115:1 118:12 120:19	J.D 2:9
importance 48:12	institution 31:4 34:12	121:16 122:1	James 57:14
important 58:2 59:3	52:19 54:1,18,21 56:1	intensive 53:5	Jeanne- 37:9
105:14,16,20 106:13	56:13 59:6,15 67:4	intention 89:19	Jeanne-Marie 2:21
108:12,18 110:6	68:8 70:3 73:8 74:8	intentions 138:18	29:11,17 39:14 40:21
116:19 134:14 137:1	74:20 75:11,14,18	inter-governmental	Jeremy 92:9
139:10	76:3,5,12 77:1 78:3	117:6	Jill 1:19 8:2,5 19:13,15
impression 143:20	80:1,7,12 81:1 82:4	interaction 48:2	22:13,18 103:11,22
improve 32:6	83:11 87:22 91:13	interagency 52:17	106:11 127:19 132:8
improved 60:22	93:7,18 94:1,10 96:13	interested 26:12,13	132:8,22 135:4
improvements 40:10	103:3 105:20 111:5	139:6	144:13
improving 12:22	112:11 115:6,13	interesting 139:9	Jim 3:10 56:17,19 57:4
in-person 16:18	118:13 124:10	145:11	89:2
inception 60:5	institution's 79:19 80:9	interfered 129:10	Joanne 90:17,19
inclinations 119:13	81:8 84:22	interference 36:17 43:1	job 63:9 71:14 72:15
include 99:2	institutional 1:4,21 5:6	109:12 128:17 134:5	115:2 127:12 130:8
included 55:7 58:11,15	28:4 33:1 39:7 68:9 124:1	interim 28:20 47:21 48:1	130:14
60:5 92:6 121:16		intern 11:12	John 3:14 86:2 91:2
includes 15:3 including 12:7 16:12	institutionally 39:6 institutions 4:12,15 6:2	international 52:18	105:5 106:12 112:18 114:4,14,18,21 115:1
47:20 58:13 59:2	6:5,12,17 9:14 14:3	58:22	119:3,6,8
82:11 90:14 99:10	21:13 29:2 32:15	interrupt 101:16	Johns 92:12
incorporate 89:5	34:15,21 36:21 37:1	intervening 58:9	join 144:22
incorporated 89:16	38:4 43:6,10 54:9,13	interviews 120:9	joined 117:20
120:4	55:7 58:3 70:13 72:18	introduce 7:7,9 10:2,15	joining 9:13
increase 130:6	75:7 129:11,16,19	10:15,21 11:21 13:7	joint 58:19 81:5 113:1
increased 60:21	130:5 134:7 136:12	17:7 52:11 56:17 73:6	113:10 120:11
incredible 102:18	136:14,17 138:20	77:5 78:3 86:1	JPME 120:11
incredibly 101:8 135:16	141:5	introduced 36:11 87:6	JR 2:1,7
independent 2:7 7:19	instruction 12:22 54:11	87:7	judgments 133:11
129:18	instructive 87:8	introduction 14:8 97:6	JULY 1:9
Indiana 91:3	integrate 85:8 113:5	introductions 57:7	June 66:21
indicate 41:9	integrated 88:12	invest 105:7,9	
indicated 88:17 114:9	integrating 88:22	investigate 138:15	K
indicating 76:16	integration 85:15 111:3	investments 105:10	Kansas 57:16
individualized 40:11	120:18	invite 122:9	Karmon 11:8
industry 137:16	integrity 1:4 5:6 105:15	involved 34:3 91:19	Kathleen 1:15 8:6,7
inevitable 138:7	intellectual 79:11 83:12	114:10,14 141:16	22:13 24:1 42:19 50:7
inform 105:9 130:14	85:1	involvement 114:11	62:6 71:9 111:7,8,8
information 26:17 27:3 27:17 30:3,7,11,12,12	intelligence 3:12 72:19 72:22 73:7,10,13,16	ironically 137:22 Isham 90:17,19	121:11,13,19 127:19
	1 7:3::3:3 7:3: / 1() 1:2 16	i ienam un:1 / 10	132:20 133:17 140:5

keep 22:4 27:3 38:18 123:18 125:9 126:6 41:17 96:15 109:4 McMaster 58:17 102:13 **legal** 91:6 looks 32:20 51:2 135:8 mean 10:17 26:5 29:12 keeps 44:17 legislation 59:10,14 145:6 38:14 39:16 63:12 **kept** 119:14 60:12 121:17 **loss** 79:1 64:11 143:5 kid 26:11 legislators 130:4,14 **lot** 26:9 71:10 96:14 means 22:10 56:4 kinds 104:2 116:21 98:18 116:20 127:13 **lesson** 86:17 76:19 141:3 **let's** 18:8 25:17 50:12 127:13 129:14 131:1 measure 58:3,5 knowledge 65:15 83:10 51:12 145:7 137:22 measures 29:5 39:9,12 lots 35:15.15 84:8,11 85:8 86:16 **letter** 6:19,20 69:3 138:12.22 76:15 124:21,22 **love** 64:13 media 142:20,22 113:19 known 5:6 78:22 **letters** 124:13,17 **low** 24:19 131:10 143:14 lower 36:3 40:22 45:2 **level** 30:4,9 34:4,5 **Medina** 90:22 55:19 60:4 61:2 70:9 **lucid** 97:6 meet 23:8,11,11 44:6 L 1:16 73:10 74:2,3 78:16 55:17,21 76:10 М lab 35:6 87:19 105:6 106:2,3 105:11 136:14 meeting 1:6 5:5 7:2 113:1,3 labor 53:5 ma'am 62:14 63:7,13 laid 111:3 levels 112:9 65:1,7 15:10 40:4,8,9 102:11 MacArthur 58:13 **landing** 102:15 liaison 96:1,4 112:1 124:13,15 licensed 14:7 15:8 landscape 85:15 maintain 21:19 22:1 133:13 meetings 33:14,15 108:20 110:21 licensing 27:10 79:13 112:17 137:19 language 101:1,6,11 licensure 14:5 39:19 **maintained** 22:5 58:2 131:18 megaphone 19:9 49:18 118:17 Lieutenant 82:3 major 104:15 107:15 light 34:18 making 91:12,15 50:5 71:20 126:22 large 99:5 limited 15:8 135:6 largely 87:19 89:9 112:14 117:17,18 meld 84:11 larger 32:15 35:10 **Lindsay** 2:3 8:14,14 **Mallory** 2:15 11:11 line 79:2 management 6:19 melded 118:13 60:15 89:21 92:22 93:17 lines 83:20 130:16 80:16 120:13 143:19 member 1:18 58:1 64:3 late 89:14 list 19:7 20:7,8 21:12,18 Mangold 2:15 11:1,1 64:5 86:6,11 90:11 22:1,11 28:12 37:1,6 **manner** 80:19 143:5 launched 92:8 law 1:18 7:13 13:22 March 124:7 members 1:13 7:6 74:4,7 83:21 109:16 listed 6:7 16:13 36:16 **Marie** 37:10 14:13 17:13 19:5 Markin 3:15 94:21,22 110:10 122:2,2 47:6 53:20 55:11 57:12 131:11 listen 133:4 95:16 64:17 71:6 74:16 **lawyers** 117:17 listing 21:7 Marshall 58:14 75:22 77:1 87:18,18 lead 79:7 82:10 123:14 lists 5:19 Martin 3:10 56:17.22 89:22 90:12,13 95:4 135:20 lit 72:8 57:8,14 61:19 62:14 104:14 127:12 128:2 leader 91:5 little 10:9 19:10 24:7 63:7,13 65:1,7 67:15 131:10 133:9,22 leaders 57:22 59:5 79:9 27:2 28:21 33:5 43:7 72:10 134:17 135:15 84:10 90:10 91:9 50:16,18 71:8 113:2 Mary 2:6 8:10,11 36:6,9 memo 106:15 94:12 112:9,10 121:6 119:17 37:22 38:7 40:17 men 78:21 79:15 84:20 46:18 50:2 140:17 **leadership** 14:4 102:9 lives 64:10,16 mention 52:5 91:22 118:6 132:18 mentioned 87:10 89:18 located 57:15 98:8 141:10 144:12,13,19 leadership's 118:20 lock 118:16 master 18:17,21 21:18 117:8 met 1:11 23:14 73:22 leading 64:16 logical 93:15 123:10 21:22 22:11 28:3 37:6 learn 84:3 long 13:4 22:21 24:4 37:7 53:4 55:16 61:7 methods 107:17 47:21 63:4 94:1 learners 35:13 62:15 69:6 103:4 Michael 2:3,17 8:13,14 learning 39:11,22 56:2 135:21 master's 52:22 53:1,9 Michigan 1:18 7:13 58:4 59:13 73:14 longstanding 94:9 53:10 55:13,22 59:11 Middle 59:4 76:12,15 96:1 103:1,9 123:6,9 137:3,10 look 11:20 26:22 29:13 60:2 61:6 62:20,21 29:15,16,16,17 30:13 Leavenworth 57:16 123:13 124:3 63:15,16 64:5,20 33:1 41:19 77:20 midst 24:12 32:18 33:2 59:1,7 63:8 65:12 74:2 76:10 87:5 **LeBLANC** 2:2 9:7,7 95:14 96:8,10 102:2,5 113:3 Mike 11:8 113:6 117:16 123:21 military 52:18,22 53:11 led 58:7,12 65:14 78:5 match 22:1 125:13 80:20 104:15 115:2 **Matt** 90:22 54:9,21 55:6,16 57:19 looked 25:22 86:12 120:17 129:5 matter 20:16 84:7 138:9 58:7,18,22 59:12 60:2 **Lefor** 2:14 11:10 53:17 140:7,11 145:21 60:4,22 61:7 62:15,17 53:20 67:22 69:3 73:3 looking 22:7 27:8,16 matters 54:8 75:4 129:3 62:18 64:14,17 66:4 74:15,17 122:12,17 32:7 35:11 37:7 40:14 McKISSIC 2:16 11:10 69:7,15,20 70:5 71:12

75:13.18 81:5 82:11 83:20 84:20 85:3 86:15 92:11 112:6,9 112:22 113:1,8,10,16 114:3 120:12 Milton 90:20 minutes 78:2 missed 10:14 36:11 114:15 121:19 missing 28:8 mission 52:20 73:9 79:8 82:5 83:4,7,18 84:15,19 85:2,9,11 88:3 96:14 100:11 136:15 mission-specific 73:12 missions 83:21 85:17 112:1 mix 16:12 109:18 110:11 mode 57:11 modern 139:1 modernization 105:8 modification 54:4 75:1 **modify** 54:17 75:10 modifyina 60:13 moment 15:13 17:11 51:15 56:20 79:18 money 137:22 monitor 25:11 month 15:19 44:15 months 15:17 46:8 76:17 124:6,6 monumental 95:6 morning 5:3 7:4,11,22 14:12 17:13 41:4 53:17,19 74:16 77:8 77:13 135:22 **MOS** 55:14,15 motion 46:2 47:14 48:9 49:2,14 50:1,3,6,6 70:20 71:21 126:10 126:10,13,13,21,21 127:6 132:5 134:20 135:3 139:11 144:10 145:16 mourned 79:1 move 31:22 35:2 46:5 51:12.16 60:14 61:9 70:21 72:16 84:14 86:21 89:8 96:17 100:1,22 106:18 110:18 118:17 120:5 120:17 123:12 124:3 127:8 134:18,20 139:8 144:6,7 moved 83:2 100:2 119:15 145:17

moving 94:7 102:20 103:19 muffled 43:8 multiple 63:17 131:18 131:19 134:1 mute 109:9 muted 13:13 29:19 111:8,8 114:16 120:7 135:11

Ν **NACIQI** 2:11 5:7,10,10 6:8,16,21 12:8 14:19 14:22 15:10 17:14 52:6 53:21 54:7,16 55:11 56:3,7 57:13 59:17 68:13 73:19 74:4,13,18 75:3,9,22 76:18,21 124:13,14 124:21 131:5,14 138:14 140:8 142:21 143:4.5 **NACIQI's** 6:22 Nakasone 82:20 **name** 5:8 9:10 14:13 17:14 116:8 narrative 16:16 **nation** 24:13 59:9 66:13 73:8 79:5,12 82:22 94:19 109:3 nation's 83:5,19 84:1,5 national 1:4 2:4 3:12 5:5,20 25:4,5 26:17 26:21 27:9,10 48:19 72:19,21 73:7,13,20 74:5,10,21 76:8 77:6 77:16 78:13,21 79:9 81:6,13,14,16,19,20 82:15,16,17,22 83:3 84:14,16 86:7 90:18 90:18,19 91:1 92:7 94:8 95:1,10,11 102:3 108:7,13,20 109:14 110:2.12 111:19 118:12 **naturally** 104:17,18 **nature** 43:12 65:20 **NCLEX** 27:9 32:5 **NDIC** 89:4 Neal 2:4 7:15,15 13:12 13:14,17 19:16,22 20:21 46:5 near 118:21 necessarily 18:22 141:21 necessitate 29:7 necessitated 31:10

need 18:5 34:16 48:11

49:13 50:11,21 71:10 82:22 88:17 99:15 103:3,3,15 104:20 106:6 109:17 113:16 129:20 130:7 134:15 139:11 needed 32:10 136:16 needing 93:5 needs 32:10 55:17 70:11 74:12 104:20 106:18 109:9 117:19 130:1 negotiate 138:4 negotiated 142:8 never 79:1 84:21 new 2:2,19 9:8 13:7,18 14:3,15 17:4,8,16 18:3,16 20:6 22:21 25:15 33:16 37:16 43:1 53:9 60:1 64:3 89:2 107:21 120:5 135:15 136:5,8 137:14 139:20 NGA 82:17 90:18 109:15 **Nicole** 2:13 11:10 NIU 4:15 73:13 74:3 76:1,6,15 79:16 80:1 82:6 85:4,13 89:4 92:3,4 95:9,21 113:21 118:6 125:6 126:15 **NIU's** 82:1 84:14 96:1 **noble** 92:21 non-agency 129:6 non-profit 129:18 non-thesis 53:9 61:6,11 62:21 **normally** 11:18 51:11 note 36:15 42:11 116:17 120:22 **noted** 15:4 114:5 notes 50:17 notification 54:15,19 55:8 56:3,5 75:8,12 75:19 76:18,19 notified 76:14 **notify** 139:7 **NSA** 82:16,20 90:17,21 **NSCAT** 87:7 nuclear 78:18 **number** 21:13 60:15 74:4 117:14 128:7,8 129:9,11 141:17 **numbers** 30:8 50:22 **nurse** 5:21 nursing 2:19,20,21 13:10 14:17 15:2,5,8 16:12 17:7,15 21:4,5

23:16,18 25:3 41:8 43:22 **nuts** 97:10

0

O 2:7 **O'Donnell** 2:5 8:18,18 127:17 132:7 134:19 objection 139:4 objections 139:12 objectives 102:11 105:11 obligations 136:14 **obliged** 100:14 observations 122:11 observed 16:2 occur 16:21 41:14 44:20 occurred 17:20 41:14 120:16,19 occurring 44:10 **ODNI** 98:2.4 106:4 110:18 113:11 117:12 117:16 118:10,14,19 offer 25:15 60:15 61:4 74:2 82:2 85:20 offered 23:21 offerings 59:16 offers 52:22 office 1:2 2:19 6:19 11:2 13:9 21:4 27:4 34:5,7 57:9 74:9 76:7 92:10 95:11 119:16 143:17 officer 60:8 92:15 96:1 143:19 officers 52:17,18 55:18 58:12 60:14 88:14 91:17 offices 34:2 Official 2:12 5:10 officials 15:15 110:10 128:10 oftentimes 18:15 25:15 25:20 34:4 **OGC** 10:22 Olmsted 2:5 Olsen 90:22 on-17:1 on-site 15:12 16:12,21 43:19 44:1,2,5,18 45:7,9,15 once 24:6,22 25:1,21 132:21 one's 131:22 ones 107:8,12 ongoing 81:8

online 128:1 139:22

open 62:21 paper 124:4 145:3 person 18:16 50:16 point 7:2 11:22 12:2,13 **opening** 108:17 paperwork 125:20 personal 82:2 143:6 13:6 17:17 20:14 22:8 operate 98:5 **Parks** 2:5 personally 125:18 38:14,22 44:7 45:8 part 10:21 17:3 24:17 operated 103:17 personnel 23:12 49:12 66:11 95:6 **perspective** 49:7 97:22 125:15 131:20 134:3 operates 110:3 41:10,20 42:7 49:2 operation 116:10 74:5 78:19 80:12 97:8 134:12 112:12 operational 53:10 99:15 105:10 109:1 perspectives 113:7 pointing 140:14 55:14 60:4 61:6 78:16 109:17 117:5,11,21 pertinent 64:16 points 71:17 83:16 121:22 124:5 143:22 petition 13:19 14:15 policies 116:17,21 operations 52:20 53:11 **part-time** 62:12 16:1,8 69:5 117:12,13,16,20 **participant** 19:7 109:9 Petrisko 2:6 8:11,11 **policy** 34:17 54:11 75:5 79:3 90:21 operators 110:8 109:11 36:10 37:21 38:1,9 78:16 110:9 111:15 participants 46:20 39:2 46:18 49:20 50:2 137:8 **opioid** 24:10 opportunity 12:15 61:4 participating 6:5 7:1 140:20 142:1,12,14 policymakers 112:13 62:19 85:18 94:8,16 participation 6:13 political 128:17 134:5 144:11 **PhD** 64:4 136:4 138:20 110:21 politicians 128:20 **opposed** 71:21 particular 33:9,17 69:1 phenomenal 127:12 poor 129:4 port 116:21 ops 84:3 99:19 104:8 112:22 **phone** 56:21 109:10 option 61:7,10,11 69:9 114:3 124:18 133:5 portion 67:10 optional 62:16 particularly 26:15 **phonetic** 92:6,9 position 52:6 69:1 35:10 91:6 98:17 99:5 oral 60:6,20 physical 18:22 95:12 121:5,8 order 68:6 85:7,12 99:13 106:22 129:21 positions 82:11 physically 23:4 112:5 113:16,17 parties 111:20 pick 121:20 positive 58:6 87:7 129:17 picked 24:3 106:20 115:14 121:8 **partly** 119:13 orders 33:12 partners 84:12 85:3 **pieces** 33:3 possibility 93:12 ora 118:10 109:5.14 110:22 **pilots** 110:10 posted 128:1 139:22 organization 70:5 79:7 parts 102:20 **pipe** 91:18 postponed 38:14 party 12:12,16,18 16:6 107:2 118:15 Pistole 91:2 Postsecondary 1:2 organizational 80:16 45:19,21 67:17 place 42:16 44:4 45:14 2:10 outcomes 39:11 40:1,1 122:14 93:16 potentially 12:7,21 40:5 73:15 pass 27:9 29:16 30:14 **placed** 118:9 pound 56:21 outliers 37:9 49:8 30:15 32:5 39:20 **places** 48:12 97:13 **Powell** 58:16 48:18 outlined 54:10,22 **plan** 18:17,21 28:3 powerful 101:22 outside 42:10 87:20 **passes** 127:7 30:22 32:6 39:15 40:2 PR 143:1 93:20 131:7 passing 29:4 40:9 41:10 76:16 practical 15:8 patient 133:2 **outsiders** 92:6,19 89:15 90:1 92:4,18,21 **practice** 14:6 30:6 68:2 **outstanding** 15:12 16:8 **Patten** 58:14 97:15 99:13,14 104:13 practitioners 14:6 72:15 78:20 96:6 Paul 2:2 9:6,7 82:20 113:13 117:10 overall 63:14 planning 23:3 32:21 **precludes** 104:3,8 127:19 oversee 14:5 24:12 Pause 127:2 135:7 33:5 37:2 38:3,18 preliminary 123:14 79:8 paying 36:12 **plans** 86:17 preparation 65:19,19 oversight 87:6 97:16 plants 78:6 prepared 86:17 **peace** 58:10 99:12 102:8,14,19 **people** 47:20 62:10,11 plausible 131:3 preparing 79:8 play 31:12 83:17 101:7 105:15 64:10,11,14 65:9 present 1:13 2:11,18 owned 129:22 83:13 99:17 107:3 101:8 105:16 63:8 owner 129:16 presentation 4:19 108:10 109:19,22 **played** 121:2 110:9,20 115:9 121:6 **playing** 102:18 48:20 72:11 127:9 P 128:19 133:5 143:2 please 17:10 36:2 45:2 135:18 presented 104:18 142:2 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 143:10,16 145:13 47:11 56:21 79:16 98:11 108:14 109:10 perception 108:5 presently 63:6 64:20 109:12 114:17 122:8 **President** 1:16,17,20 page 21:12 127:4 performing 70:4,7 **pained** 77:20 period 15:19 20:5 25:18 139:7,12 142:22 2:1,2,3,4,7,8 3:13 28:15 42:5,11 47:18 143:8,8 painstaking 117:22 7:19 8:15,22 9:3,7,21 47:21 48:1 86:9,20 pleased 91:21 pandemic 16:4 32:19 10:5 77:6,7,15 86:3 pleasure 96:3 133:15 87:11,12 88:1 89:22 87:11,13 89:13 91:2,7 33:2 34:1 panel 92:5,19 93:14 **periodic** 17:3 44:3 133:17 96:19 100:12 101:13 96:20 98:19,20 115:2 plumbing 116:10 117:4 111:18 114:7 periods 58:9 persist 118:7 plus 63:3 102:2 109:14 presidents 128:20 120:10

129:13 134:9 presiding 1:12 press 56:21 143:8,16 **Pressnell** 2:7 7:18,19 28:19 31:2,6 32:12 34:10 35:22 51:22 53:14 56:15 57:3 61:18 62:3 66:14 67:5 67:14 68:21 69:12 70:16 71:1,4,16 72:7 73:1,4 97:3 100:19 102:22 115:17 126:12 pretty 30:20 115:5 prevent 78:17 Prevention 88:6 previous 22:9 95:20 previously 59:16 68:17 68:19 primarily 26:7 83:6 128:12 primary 11:19,21 12:5 13:11 51:17 52:11,13 61:20 72:22 73:9 79:10 84:22 137:3 prior 18:6 22:4 27:21 49:12 141:14 priorities 91:13 privilege 52:6 77:14 **probably** 35:16 64:15 66:3 67:7 99:20 130:6 137:1 138:7 problem 43:3 47:14 67:22 118:3 122:17 problems 48:3,4 129:5 Procedures 4:9 **proceed** 103:19 proceeding 91:21 **proceeds** 107:13 process 6:11 11:19 12:6 13:4 14:2 16:19 41:20 42:8 54:22 68:5 68:9,10,13,14 70:1 73:22 80:2,6 85:22 96:8,17 115:3 117:22 124:2,19 127:1 132:15 produce 137:17 138:1 **PRODUCER** 17:10 51:14 56:20 produces 94:12 producing 88:13 90:9 productive 87:11 115:13 profession 13:9 83:6 88:16 94:11 professional 57:19 60:15 61:11 66:3 73:15 88:14 113:1,10

professionals 88:20 professions 2:19 14:7 21:4 34:6 program 12:22 16:13 16:15 18:2,4 23:19,21 25:15,15 30:5 37:16 39:14 40:1 44:4 53:1 53:9,11 55:16,21 56:10 60:18,22 62:15 62:16,18 65:4 66:7,22 69:7 70:11 76:10 87:6 92:8 93:2 112:21 120:12 programmatic 25:4,6 26:21 33:1 34:5 programs 5:21 6:3,5,6 6:14 14:1 15:2,3,6,9 16:12 17:2,3 21:5 24:22 25:13 26:14

programmatic 25:4,6
26:21 33:1 34:5
programs 5:21 6:3,5,6
6:14 14:1 15:2,3,6,9
16:12 17:2,3 21:5
24:22 25:13 26:14
31:1 32:14,16 36:16
39:21 48:2 59:19 64:2
74:3 99:3 101:21
102:6 108:22 137:4
progression 119:15
prohibition 137:5
prominence 104:19
promising 111:5
proposals 35:19

proposed 79:22 pros 97:6 prosper 120:13 protect 79:5 proud 82:9,21 94:7 provide 6:10 16:18 32:5 34:21 35:9 39:15,22 40:2,7 53:16 102:8 103:7,18 104:12 105:1 111:22 141:12

propose 138:13

provided 6:2,8,18 16:16 16:19,22 28:13 34:20 56:7 73:12 75:19

provides 12:1,3 73:14 95:9 102:4

providing 14:14 17:1 33:8 53:21 74:3,18 99:6 104:4

provisions 5:13 Provost 3:15,16 94:21

95:1,17,22 **public** 1:17 5:17 9:4 48:12 57:13 74:4 79:1

108:5 122:2 publish 5:19

published 21:19 22:2 136:20 137:6 publishing 136:10

publishing 136:10 **pull** 113:16 122:8

punch 107:4 punched 99:20 punching 99:21 purpose 136:2 138:8 141:12 pursue 63:15,16 put 9:9 18:4 58:6 63:13 97:20 110:11 112:13 135:15 puts 127:4

Q

qualifications 30:8 64:15,19 qualify 70:10 qualities 94:1 quality 1:4 2:9 5:6 6:1 13:1 24:21 26:13 43:5 43:9,18,21 58:3 93:21 105:15 130:11 question 21:2,21 22:14 22:20 27:14.15 32:13 36:3 37:4 38:2,11 39:5 40:21 42:20 43:8 43:15 44:13 45:3 46:14 47:4.12 49:16 65:21 66:18 67:8,20 68:1 97:19,20 98:13 105:13 108:4.16 110:22 111:14 114:16 114:17 117:3 118:5 121:11,14,19 123:2 125:3,9 130:10 132:8 139:14 144:16,19 questioned 133:11 questions 12:6,7,10,22 13:2 17:5 19:6,13 31:8 41:1 42:18 45:22 48:10 56:11,14 61:17 61:20,22 62:1,4,8 66:15 67:15 68:22 70:17 71:5,17 76:22 77:3,5 95:15 96:11,20 97:1,9,12 104:2 114:8 115:6,16,22 116:2,9 122:7,21 126:8,19 128:22 132:2 142:10 143:11 quick 31:7 100:7 123:1 quickly 94:20 128:3 132:12 quite 39:7 91:21 104:6

R

106:20 113:6 119:19

131:15 135:21 136:3

radiological 78:18 raise 36:5 45:2 46:22

47:8 134:13 142:10 raised 40:19,20 47:20 56:22 140:5 **Ralph** 2:9 47:4,12 127:20 132:9 133:17 134:19 144:14 random 121:6 rates 24:18,18,19,19 27:9 29:16 30:14,14 30:15 32:5 39:20 48:18 ratio 29:16 read 128:3 reader 12:5 readers 11:19,21 13:11 42:19 51:18 52:11 61:20 72:22 readiness 28:4 ready 61:17 124:16 145:19 real 49:7 112:8 120:14 133:15 realign 138:21 realignment 126:14 **reality** 34:18 realized 138:18 reason 10:2 18:12.14 24:14 38:10 reasons 97:11 128:11 reassurance 108:1 reassuring 111:2 reattach 77:18 reauthorization 141:14 141:16 receive 56:13 77:2 received 89:7 90:4 96:6 reception 118:20 rechartered 81:1 recognition 13:20 14:15,19 15:1,5,7,16 42:11 46:7 53:8 72:16 recognize 53:9 recognized 73:18 recollection 37:19 recommend 139:4 recommendation 44:14 46:6 56:5 70:20,22 75:15 76:20 94:3 100:20 103:13 124:22 recommendations 55:4 120:17 138:17 141:4 recommended 15:14 93:15 144:8 recommends 54:15 75:8 record 27:5,6 50:22

53:20 72:1 74:17

123:6,17 143:22

145:22 renamed 81:5.20 resolves 123:15 recorded 72:3 renaming 59:18 **resources** 32:9 61:3 Renee 2:20 17:7,11,14 recordkeeping 48:14 78:7 140:13 records 6:21 27:3 19:16 30:19 35:16 respect 138:6 redesignate 89:4 renewal 12:8 13:1 respond 12:16 17:5 refer 123:19 142:22 14:15,19 18:1,5 20:17 35:16 109:2 143:10 143:1,3,8,9,15,15 renewals 44:4 responded 89:14 referred 54:3 reopen 33:18 responding 90:3 reflect 83:13 84:3 reorganization 4:11,14 responds 12:17 reflects 103:14 132:17 72:17 76:2,16 response 12:3,11 17:18 134:11 repeat 114:16 20:4 27:20 28:13 **Reform** 88:6 replace 45:7 47:17 89:1,6 91:14 regard 33:8 88:12 99:9 106:19 111:2 report 11:20 14:11,21 105:19 121:8 15:18 19:4 20:13 28:8 responses 41:8 106:22 regarded 89:11 92:22 30:2,20 31:10,19,22 responsibilities 93:11 32:3 39:17 40:6 41:3 104:22 regarding 6:11 53:22 55:5 74:18 75:16 41:6 46:10 56:4,6 responsibility 85:1 S 2:13 regardless 42:10 76:19,21 94:4 117:2 responsible 99:4 118:11 126:22 127:8 rest 12:10 62:4 regards 54:16 75:9 127:22 132:17 134:11 98:17 resubmit 125:7 result 18:6 74:4 109:19 **Regents** 2:19 13:8,19 134:21 135:16 137:17 139:10 140:7 141:19 142:2 13:21 14:4,16 26:8,10 reporting 28:21 29:9 results 60:10 120:3 26:10 regional 26:18 33:14 32:1 46:9 retention 29:17 30:13 80:21 108:11 109:21 reports 25:11 29:13 39:10.18 regionally 83:5 88:10.18 141:3 retentions 116:18 **regions** 33:15 represent 95:21 retroactive 56:8 69:18 representative 7:9 12:3 registered 16:11 17:2 review 4:9 11:19 15:4,9 50:21 56:12 85:10 16:1,7,10,21 17:3 36:20 registration 14:2 43:22 representatives 2:18 18:15 19:2 20:11 28:3 regular 29:6 70:12 17:4 52:17 93:9 29:4 36:20.22 41:16 71:11 request 53:22 54:4 55:2 42:4 43:18,21 44:5 regulations 44:1 68:11 59:22 66:19 67:11 52:1,7 53:7 54:7 68:18 69:2,9 74:11,19 69:16 130:20 69:10 71:9 75:3,15 regulatory 138:5 74:22 76:4 119:12 117:12 124:4 125:1 141:21 126:15 126:2 131:6 135:1 136:11 **Reha** 2:15 11:10 requested 12:14 56:8 reviewed 20:19 55:11 reimagine 138:11 requests 55:6 reintroduce 57:6 require 5:18 15:16 32:8 69:6 75:22 131:13 reiterate 106:9 44:1 46:7 66:1,8 136:12.19 related 6:22 14:3 15:12 125:14 reviewers 137:19 16:8 30:12 31:8 43:21 required 16:14 31:3 reviewing 13:7 21:11 43:22 55:13 76:2 32:8 39:21 56:4 76:18 reviews 16:13,20 17:2 18:1 31:7 42:7,14,15 117:13,13 128:8 requirement 19:19 44:6 136:4 143:14 72:16 45:10,13 68:7 relationship 96:9 requirements 60:21 **revoke** 131:4 111:16 63:22 73:12 74:1 revoked 131:12 relationships 108:9 103:2 142:6 rich 110:13 112:6 relatively 18:20 20:6 requires 6:6 123:6,8 RICHARD 2:5 136:7 59:6 Rick 8:17,18 127:11,16 reliable 6:1 research 53:12 61:10 132:1,4,13,18,22 religious 129:17,22 73:10 81:4,11,18 134:1,17 135:13 141:19 remaining 124:5 85:16 87:4,14,22 remarks 94:19 108:17 89:20 90:7,8 91:13 **rigor** 61:3 remember 45:6 142:19 93:22 140:15 Rishikof 91:4 remind 19:5 42:6 reset 49:21 **rising** 7:12 remiss 45:18 resolve 43:17 128:21 RN 15:6 17:2 removal 69:8 **resolved** 123:11 road 66:3

role 69:16 70:2,7 78:8 78:14 83:17 97:12,18 101:7,9,10 102:1,19 105:16 121:3 roles 58:18 111:21 Ron 90:20,21 RONNIE 1:16 roots 80:14 round 125:19 Rule 136:6 rulemaking 142:8 rules 24:17 run 129:22 running 30:4 33:14

S

safely 102:15 Sanders-Coates 11:9 **Sands** 91:7 satisfied 119:19 saw 24:16 106:21 120:15 134:9 saving 19:17 20:1 28:10 64:22 65:2 70:8 113:15 121:21 **says** 21:7,10 66:6 97:15 119:11 scenario 131:3 schedule 23:10 25:7 38:19 scheduled 38:6 49:11 scheduling 37:15 128:10 scholar 92:12 school 22:7 23:18 25:6 25:19 31:15,19 37:13 40:12 49:10 52:16 57:18 63:8 80:21 86:14,15 87:13 schools 20:8,9,10,14 22:8 25:10 26:3 28:14 28:17 30:2 32:4 33:8 33:15 34:3,9 35:8,11 38:22 90:5 **science** 55:16 59:12 60:3,4 61:1,7 62:16 69:7 78:8,12 90:1,5 sciences 52:22 scientist 78:4 **scope** 53:8 70:22 118:3 144:20 score 31:17 scorecard 26:2 **Scott** 3:13 77:5,15 86:12 91:12 94:22 119:13 Scott's 120:8

screen 9:19 10:2 46:21 **scribe** 135:9 scrutinize 27:1 searching 132:15 second 37:4 46:11,12 71:2,3 112:15 122:13 126:16,17,18 135:2,3 135:4 144:10,11 secondary 137:18,21 secondly 48:17 138:13 **Secretary** 5:18,22 6:7,9 54:6 55:5 75:2,16 81:15 82:12 84:13 89:3 114:5 124:18 132:6 134:22 141:13 141:20 142:3 Secretary's 124:22 **Section** 5:11,17,18 6:8 Sections 5:16 **secure** 102:16 **security** 78:13,21 79:9 81:13 82:15 83:19 84:1,5 92:8,15 95:10 108:20 109:14 110:2 110:12 seeing 67:16 70:19 71:19 seeking 54:16 75:9 123:21 136:17 seen 98:21 sees 50:21 Select 115:1 selected 99:18 selection 134:9 self-aware 80:7 semesters 35:21 semi-annual 30:17 **Senate** 55:8 75:20 114:19,22 send 65:18 106:15 113:20 132:5 141:19 143:9 sending 112:10 senior 1:19 2:4 7:15 8:3 15:14 58:12 59:5 87:19 90:12,22 92:10 92:15 104:14 sense 23:20 48:16 67:12 87:1 88:15 108:5 110:2 118:15 128:18 **Sensing** 46:1 126:20 sensitive 134:15 sensitivities 107:16 separate 22:3 **series** 115:5 seriously 48:14

83:4 84:6 87:8 114:2 served 58:17 82:14 85:3 serves 56:4 76:19 **service** 5:17 52:16 55:9 58:1 64:10,14 65:5 66:13 94:19 137:16 services 23:12 75:20 serving 63:2 83:9 93:18 139:7 **set** 5:14 12:21 23:10 63:3 89:16 130:14 134:13 136:7 142:8 sets 84:17 setting 130:4 settings 35:7 Seventeen 108:19 several-page 127:22 **share** 33:20 **Sherman** 57:20 shifting 33:3 **shops** 109:22 shorter 18:7 **shrink** 112:16 side 32:17 102:16 sian 10:10.10 **signal** 138:10 signed 12:13 113:12 114:4 **significant** 88:2 101:9 **siloing** 108:6 **simply** 104:19 106:16 simulation 35:4,4,6 Simultaneous 40:16 72:6 106:10 107:10 109:8 115:19 121:12 simultaneously 137:9 sincere 85:20 **single** 53:4 sir 10:12 57:2,8 95:19 sister 52:16 **site** 16:2,9,11,18,20 17:2 18:13,20 19:19 20:10 22:22 23:1 25:16 26:20 28:1 37:3 38:5,12 42:16,17 44:9 44:19,21 45:6,11,14 45:17 76:17 123:15 124:9 **sitting** 110:7,8,8,9,10 **situation** 33:6 62:12 64:1 86:22 101:18 123:20 138:2 six 64:8 76:17 124:5,6

Skills 2:6

skipped 45:20

SLOs 39:11

slower 19:10

small 59:6 **smaller** 96:13 **Smith** 2:11 3:16 5:3,8 10:15,17,20 50:12,19 51:3 72:5 95:17,19 135:8 143:13 144:5 145:7 social 35:4 soldiers 59:21 65:14 somebody 9:17 47:1 49:19 63:2 65:3 son 59:3 soon 38:20 **sooner** 18:6 **sorry** 9:8 10:14 19:14 21:21 22:15 27:4 28:9 29:19 45:1 46:15 49:21 62:7 100:18 101:15 108:16 114:15 116:7 121:19 122:14 125:4 132:11 135:12 sort 35:13 68:1 124:10 131:14 sorts 35:11 **sought** 100:12 sounds 39:5 111:5 139:17 **source** 137:3 **sources** 107:17 **Southern** 2:2 9:8 **space** 23:18,21 112:16 span 22:21 **Spanish** 58:8 speak 17:11 36:9 39:8 59:22 86:5 108:14 142:21 143:6 **speaking** 40:16 72:6 77:14 106:10 107:10 109:8 115:19 121:12 143:4 special 70:11 specific 136:20 specifically 13:9 44:1 54:2 74:21 spent 129:14 130:2,17 131:1 133:4 **spoken** 86:13 spring 16:3 21:8,10 35:20 **sprung** 137:17 **staff** 2:11,13,13,14,14 2:15,16,17 3:9 11:7 11:15 12:1,4,17 14:10 15:11,14,22 16:2 20:8 27:21 28:13 29:16 41:8,9,15,15 42:19 43:12 45:22 46:6 49:3 50:11 52:2,10,15

53:15 54:3 55:10 56:18 57:5,15 58:6,19 58:20 60:8,14 66:18 67:8 70:18,22 71:13 72:1 73:2 75:15,21 76:14 93:3,10,21 95:4 96:5 98:15 103:15 145:15 staff's 20:1 staffing 100:9 101:21 stakeholders 81:12 85:15 98:7,9 99:2,10 106:16 112:2 114:3 120:9 **stand** 61:17 standalone 118:15 **standard** 4:9 11:18 12:7 12:21 64:2 76:10 131:5 **standards** 5:14 55:21 84:17 94:2 130:21 131:12 136:8,11,11 136:18,20 137:6 star 112:15 start 7:8 13:15 97:1 115:8 started 11:17 68:8.10 115:5,11 134:4,12 starting 13:18 115:7 state 1:18 2:19,19 5:19 5:20 7:13 13:8,8,18 13:21 14:3,16,18,20 15:21 16:15,16 17:1,4 17:8,16 33:16 43:1 59:2 70:1 79:3 108:9 108:10 109:15,20 128:10 129:17 130:3 130:9,14 state's 15:1,5,7 statement 30:18 48:18 **States** 52:16 76:12,15 96:2 103:1,9 123:6,9 123:13 124:3 stating 69:4 stature 99:17 120:2 status 48:13 56:9 117:2 141:8 **statute** 125:3 Stein 2:17 11:8 **step** 84:2 **Stephanie** 2:16 11:9 steps 68:7 Steven 2:8 8:20,21 stipulation 64:6 stock 118:16 **stop** 94:15 131:17 **stories** 78:22 **stove** 91:18

serve 8:15 52:7 82:1

Teleconference 1:11 three 59:5 90:5 **strange** 131:11 substantial 21:13 **strategic** 1:15 78:15 **substantive** 52:3 53:22 telehealth 35:4 throw 29:6 89:15 90:1,6,7 92:18 55:1,6 68:10 72:20 tell 26:3 68:22 137:7 thrown 46:19 97:15 98:17 99:13 74:12,19 75:17 76:4 tempo 83:16 84:3 THURSDAY 1:8 102:3,7 107:20 80:6 97:7 125:7 temporary 34:17 44:8 tied 129:3 strategically 83:14 126:14 130:9 ten 16:14 18:1,4,10 ties 98:7 108:8 strength 87:13,14 success 4:19 24:21 19:20 20:17 21:17 timely 126:4 strengthen 78:11 79:22 29:5 39:9,12 135:17 22:20 24:6,22 25:8,18 times 59:16 129:9 25:21 35:17 36:17,22 98:7 138:22 138:6 strengthening 85:16 successes 33:19 37:9 47:18,21 49:9 timing 68:5 124:12 **stress** 90:1 successor 66:2 130:22 131:7 **Timothy** 91:7 strong 60:17 102:16 suggest 102:1 tend 128:21 tired 132:3 stronger 84:4 **suitable** 136:15 **tendons** 77:19 **Title** 6:14 15:3 130:19 structurally 118:9 **Sullivan** 1:15 8:7 tends 129:2 131:12 **structure** 80:16 83:2 **Tennessee** 2:7 7:19 summarize 13:17 today 7:2 11:8 14:8 term 17:21 20:11 22:9 93:21 104:8 **summary** 14:14 27:18 17:5 19:10 41:18 structured 106:4 30:22 40:7 96:13 44:2 59:22 61:16 72:11 structures 129:21 131:17 terminal 64:4,7 77:14 78:1 80:10 82:9 student 1:18 4:19 6:13 summer 11:12 35:20 terms 11:18 14:6 32:10 82:21 94:17 95:2,21 40:8 43:2 46:9 87:14 7:9,12 24:18 30:13 supplemental 49:2,5 125:18 39:9,11,12,18,22 59:7 **support** 23:12 34:12 101:6,12 104:21 **told** 112:9 82:8 116:17 135:17 47:14 49:14 79:10,17 114:11 123:20 133:7 top 37:10 136:6,7,18 137:3 85:21 93:6 95:5 96:6 143:4 topic 36:12 96:17 107:9 139:17 138:6,12,22 140:10 **TERRENCE** 3:15 **topics** 9:15 141:7 supported 137:8 **Terrorism** 88:6 91:1 touch 25:13 student-centered 80:8 **supporting** 16:1 126:2 terrorists 78:17 touched 28:21 students 23:14 24:20 supportively 92:1 **Terry** 94:21,21 tracking 114:20 30:13 32:7 33:10 40:4 tested 65:9,9 66:8 tracks 57:17 surgery 77:18 53:2 59:1 60:9,16 **Thad** 90:15 traditional 68:11 86:14 **sworn** 79:5 61:4 62:17,22 82:6 **system** 1:17 9:4 26:9 thanks 11:15 79:16 traditionally 124:13 83:17 84:8 86:17 87:3 112:20 137:18.21 82:3 85:21 94:18 training 62:9 63:3 80:19 110:4 138:20 systematic 30:21,22 95:16 96:18 97:4,19 87:1 142:19,20 **studied** 59:1 61:12 39:15 40:2,10 100:5 102:20 105:5 transcripts 137:11 **studies** 53:10 55:14 108:15,18 110:22 transferring 117:7 Т 61:6 111:1 117:3 127:18 transfers 74:8 76:6 **study** 80:14 114:21 **T** 2:1 132:18 133:22 134:19 transforming 32:19 140:3 145:19 115:5,11 140:9 tactical 78:16 transition 79:18 86:9 studying 115:3 tactics 52:20 65:16,17 theoretical 44:16 91:20 95:10 96:10 subcommittee 4:17 taken 26:10 32:22 thesis 53:5 60:6 69:8 97:10 102:14,15 127:8,10,19 128:6 93:10 104:18 143:8 thesis-based 61:10 103:10 106:14 117:6 129:14 131:2,20 takes 68:16 62:20 117:9 118:7 119:12 138:14 139:5,18 talk 17:8 28:20 29:8 thesis-driven 53:1 120:4 121:9 143:21 144:4,8,18 65:8 94:16 105:9 things 26:20,22 30:19 transitioning 81:10 subcommittee's 134:21 32:2 33:22 34:11 talked 42:4 104:5 transitions 125:6 145:4 39:17 42:9,9 64:11 transparency 136:10 talking 26:8 63:21 subgroup 55:10 75:21 106:6 110:6 117:7 138:15 65:10 86:22 108:13 transparent 101:20 **subject** 15:9 53:7 84:7 130:17 128:4 142:2,5,17 transplanting 116:11 140:10 third 12:12,16,18 16:6 taught 86:16 submission 55:2 teach 63:17 66:6 45:19,21 67:17 travel 38:21 teaching 30:10 33:10 tremendous 91:9 **submit** 14:21 15:18 112:15 122:14 29:2 46:9 54:19 58:5 thorough 39:7 106:17 65:3 **Tri-** 1:16 75:11 team 10:16 73:19 78:1 thought 10:18 24:16 **submitted** 16:6 17:18 64:18,21 84:10 triads 130:16 78:3 19:3 20:4,7 26:6 **Tech** 91:8 122:12,18 129:8 tribal 129:22 27:17 54:4 55:6,12 131:8 145:3 tribe 129:17 Technical 1:16 74:22 75:17 76:1 techniques 139:1 thoughtful 135:16 **tried** 128:9 technology 90:2,5 thousands 58:22 78:20 true 37:9 78:22 **subsequent** 55:8 75:19 subservient 99:1,1 Tecumseh 57:20 threats 78:13 109:2 truly 101:4

Trustees 2:4 7:16 try 33:16 trying 33:18 37:17,17 57:1 62:20 101:9 133:4 turn 7:2 13:12 51:19 72:12 74:13 94:20 97:21 114:12 two 5:4 7:5 17:15 59:18 62:7 63:4 72:22 104:2 114:20 116:1 142:17 two-year 111:14 115:11 twofold 138:9 type 16:15 18:2 types 35:20 typically 129:12 **typing** 50:13

U.S 1:1 3:9 52:2,9,14 54:2,6,10 55:5 56:18 57:14.18 73:19 75:2 75:16 80:16 83:7 84:19 ultimately 120:17 121:1 **unable** 49:20 unanimity 131:20 unanimous 51:2 131:19 135:8 145:6.8.8.19 uncommon 68:18 undergoing 52:3 72:20 undergraduate 59:21 Undersecretary 92:14 111:17 understand 21:12.16 78:6 80:15 83:18 97:8 97:11 109:2 112:19 115:9 116:14,16 118:3 126:4 130:8 understandable 138:3 understanding 67:16 112:6 123:12 141:6 understands 82:6 understood 17:19 20:4 22:6 134:6 undertake 64:7 unfortunate 138:3 unified 88:15 uniformly 137:2 unique 52:19 64:1 83:4 95:9 113:6 117:19 130:1 **United 52:16 units** 118:14 universal 60:20 universities 1:19 2:8 7:20 8:4 63:17

1:22 2:1,2 3:12 7:13 8:1 9:4,8,12,22 10:5 34:8 72:20 73:7,11,21 74:22 77:7,16 79:10 80:11 81:11,16,21 83:1,5 86:7 87:9 88:3 89:10,13,15 90:4,9 91:3,11,15 92:7,9,12 92:20 93:7,16 94:9,13 95:1 98:18 99:1,3,14 100:1 102:4,7 107:13 111:19 118:18 130:10 130:12 university's 85:20

university's 85:20 unmute 57:1 update 41:10 53:21 74:3 updates 41:13 74:18 updating 22:7 41:20 upscale 87:1

USC 5:18 USDA 108:22 USDI 99:2 111:16 120:11

use 5:15 19:6,9 101:1,6 101:11

useful 137:11 uses 44:2 usually 124:19

٧

Val 69:21 **Valerie** 2:14 11:10 53:13,15,16,20 56:16 67:6,9,18,21 70:18 71:14 72:11 73:2 74:14,17 122:8,10,14 122:16,22 126:1,8,9 validate 102:9 value 113:20 value-added 112:21 VanAUSDLE 2:8 8:21 8:21 vantage 20:14 varies 129:19 various 6:6 88:12 89:7 89:17 vary 129:16 varying 129:21 vein 65:22 verify 42:9 123:16 versus 43:19 **vetted** 71:13 Vice 1:20 7:18 28:19 31:2,6 32:12 34:10 35:22 51:20,22 53:14 53:19 56:15 57:3,12 61:18 62:3 66:14 67:5

67:14 68:21 69:12 70:16 71:1,4,16 72:7 73:4 97:3 100:19 102:22 115:17 126:12 video 1:11 23:17 46:22 Virginia 91:8 virtual 16:13,20 23:1,6 35:3 38:15,18 39:1 42:16 44:9 45:6,11,14 45:16 virtually 16:4 44:20 visible 80:3 visit 16:3,9 17:20 18:6 18:10,13,20,21,22 20:2 21:8 24:6,22 25:17 27:21 28:2,5 29:7 31:11 32:1 38:15 39:1 42:16,17 43:19 44:5 45:7,9,11,14,15 45:17 49:11 73:19 76:17 123:15 124:9 visited 20:15,16,18 22:9 27:19 28:14 37:13 visiting 21:17 visitor 103:8 Visitors 3:14 86:2.7 97:13 101:5 104:4,9 125:6 visits 15:13 16:11,18,20 18:16,16,19 19:19 22:22 23:1,6 24:4 26:21 29:3,9 37:3 38:5,12,18 43:4 44:1 44:2.9.18.19.21 45:6 vocational 15:7 voice 85:10 voices 110:16 volunteer 140:21 vote 12:20 19:8 44:14 47:2 49:21 50:5,8 51:4,7,12 71:21,21 114:10 115:20 126:20 143:21 144:4.14.15

W

voted 50:7 51:8 122:1

votes 19:12 72:1,1,3

voting 101:12 127:1

127:4 145:6

145:6

Walla 2:8,9 8:22,22 Wallace 1:17 9:2 Wally 9:3 13:11,14 19:14,14 21:1,3 22:14 43:14 46:1 66:14 Wally's 27:15 67:19 wanted 42:2,6,14 43:2

45:4.5 69:14 70:14 71:15 86:19 101:13 101:14 108:3 120:7 123:16 132:13 133:13 134:3 139:16 war 58:9,11 60:4 65:14 warfare 52:21 warm 118:20 warrant 18:13 warrants 25:16 wasn't 36:20 140:18 **Watkins** 92:13 wave 46:19 way 87:8 92:17 99:10 99:18,21 103:19 107:8 108:21 110:19 113:7,11 121:7 131:14 ways 27:1 35:11 79:22 80:3 **weapons** 78:18 Webex 50:20 145:12,13 website 6:21 18:3,9 20:2,5 22:5,8 36:16 41:10,11,17,20 42:8 weeks 98:14 99:16 103:20 weigh 128:20 **weighing** 128:16 weight 99:20 107:5 welcome 4:7 5:4 7:5 9:12 14:10 19:16 126:6 well-known 58:16 went 23:16 61:14 66:21 132:14 142:20 145:22 weren't 128:11 wide 93:7,17 94:10 William 57:20 wish 61:9 witness 129:7 **WOLFF** 2:9 47:5,13 133:19,21 144:16 women 78:20 79:15 84:20 wondered 64:9 105:17 140:6 wondering 108:8 words 97:17 103:6 work 11:16 53:5 60:7 79:4 85:4,6 88:22 93:5 106:7 109:6 111:21 123:22 127:13 127:15,20 131:22

university 1:14,17,18

133:17 145:15

worked 11:12 80:5

workforce 84:18

120:15

Ī		
working 33:13 34:9 35:6 57:9 68:12 78:20 83:15 96:3 98:14 102:20 103:9 117:17 131:21 133:15 145:11 works 68:6 116:15 world 22:21 24:14 58:11 78:8,9,14 worldwide 78:7 84:13 worthless 137:10 wouldn't 18:21 44:16 wrap 94:20 113:14 writ 99:5 write 106:4 145:1 writing 60:21 written 60:20 wrong 69:22 X Y Yader 92:6	12 4:9 15:17,18 44:15 46:8 127 4:17 13 145:7 130 57:22 135 4:19 14 48:20 78:15 140 60:10 145 4:21 15 87:12 145:7 150 53:3 60:10 62:9 63:12,14 16 145:8 17 84:18 89:22 109:4,15 1784 13:22 1787 14:2 1881 57:19 19 61:12 1954 6:20 1961 80:18 1962 80:21 86:13 1965 5:11	2L 7:12 3 30 1:9 15:18 20:15 25:1 31:20 46:10 82:8 3305.01 111:15 4 4 4:7 400 35:19 42 5:18 45 14:6 47 14:7 48 77:18 487 5:16 5 50 21:11 52 4:11 5545-04 54:11 5545.04 54:14 58 80:9,13 96:14
year 16:14 18:1,1,4,10 19:20 20:5,17 25:18 31:1 38:13 42:4 47:18 53:4 60:9,11 62:9 63:10 64:8 74:6 86:8 87:12 106:15 140:9 year-long 60:7 years 20:15 21:17 22:20 24:7,22 25:1,8 25:9,21 30:9 36:18,22 37:9,13 47:21 49:9 57:22 78:15 80:9,13 82:9 83:16 91:10 96:15 114:20 140:9 yesterday 50:16 58:1 67:2,2 yield 13:16 53:13 York 2:19 13:8,18 14:3 14:16 17:5,8,16 33:16 43:1	1974 59:12 60:5 1980s 78:5 86:20 1983 80:22 1990s 78:5 1993 81:6 87:10 2 2 54:15 56:21 20 61:13 2000- 20:19 2003 21:8 27:19 2004 88:7 2005 21:10 88:8 2006 81:6 2010 81:14 89:2 2011 54:15 59:15 60:12 80:11 81:19 86:8 87:16 89:2 99:7 2012 73:18 2013 28:2 2015 20:18 28:4	6 60 55:2 602 69:17 602.16 136:7 690 63:22 65:7 7 72 4:14 8 80,000 82:10 8016 5:17 9 9/11 78:10 88:1,4 9:00 1:11 9:03 5:2 90 124:14
Z Zoom 23:15 33:14 0 1,100 53:2 1,200 60:9 62:9 63:5,12 63:13 1.5 31:18 101 5:16 11 37:13 49:8 11:38 145:22 114 5:11 6:8 116-93 74:4	2016 14:20 89:14 115:1 2017 92:3 2018 14:22 18:9 2019 136:5 2020 1:9 15:10 16:3 74:6 2021 18:11 2022 125:3 2023 28:5 22 109:14 22-plus 109:5 24/7 78:15 25 20:20 27 59:2 2966 5:18	

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Institutional Quality and Integrity

National Advisory Committee Meeting

Before: US DED

Date: 07-30-20

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &