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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.
Thank you again for participating today. And at this point I'll turn the meeting over to our Chairman, Arthur Keiser.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well good morning, everyone. Welcome to day two. We'd like to begin by having the members of the committee introduce themselves to you.

So, we will start with Amanda, our student representative. Amanda, introduce yourself.

MS. DELEKTA: Good morning. I am Amanda Delekta and I am a rising 2L student at Michigan State University College of Law.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Anne?

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

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude?

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Claude Pressnell, President of the Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: David?

DR. EUBANKS: Good morning. David
Eubanks at Furman University.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill?

DR. DERBY: Senior Consultant, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Jill Derby.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?

DR. ALIOTO: Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, educational advocate for children from birth to five.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?

DR. PETRISKO: Mary Ellen Petrisko, Educational Consultant.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Michael?

DR. LINDSAY: Hi, I'm Michael Lindsay. I serve as the President of Gordon College in Boston.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Rick?

MR. O'DONNELL: Rick O'Donnell, Education Entrepreneur.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Steven?

DR. VANAUSSDE: Steven VanAudsle, President Emeritus, Walla Walla Community
College.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Wallace?

DR. BOSTON: Wally Boston, President of the American Public University System.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Last, but on the bottom without a camera is Paul.

DR. LEBLANC: Paul LeBlanc, President of Southern New Hampshire University. Sorry, I didn't put my camera back on.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: And my name is Arthur Keiser. I'm Chancellor of Keiser University in Florida. And welcome, everybody who is joining us.

We have a couple of institutions that we're going to be dealing with and some topics of discussion. First, I would like to -- did somebody say something?

DR. FRENCH: Yes. This is George French. I'm on the call and on the screen.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Oh, George.

DR. FRENCH: President of Clark Atlanta University.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were not on the screen for some reason. George, introduce yourself. Go ahead.

DR. FRENCH: Okay, thank you. George French, President, Clark Atlanta University.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were on earlier you were not on --

DR. FRENCH: I was on earlier and now the little thing is going on a circle. So, what I do is I'll sign off and sign back on because it's going in a circle. I'm sure the host can help me. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, thank you. I'm sorry to have missed you. I also would like to introduce George Smith who will introduce his team, which I think is him.

DR. SMITH: You mean Herman Bounds.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I thought I was going to, George, don't you have you and Donna?

DR. SMITH: Donna is -- go ahead, Donna. You can introduce yourself. She is part of OGC.
MS. MANGOLD: Donna Mangold, from the Office of General Counsel of the Department of Education.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: And then Herman?

MR. BOUNDS: Yes. This is Herman Bounds. I'm the director of the accreditation group. And the accreditation staff that should be on today are Mike Stein, Karmon Sanders-Coates, Charity Helton, Stephanie McKissic, Nicole Harris, Valerie Lefor, Reha Mallory, Elizabeth Daggett. And we also have an intern that worked with us this summer, Angela Chiang.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, thank you, Herman. Again, thanks to the whole staff for their hard work.

Before we get started let me go over what we normally do in terms of our standard review process. We have primary readers who are assigned to each agency to look at the report.

The primary readers introduce the 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
quality for initial renewal applications. Any
questions?

Hopefully everybody is comfortable
with this process. It's been going on for a long
time.

At which point now I'd like to
introduce, we are going to be reviewing the New
York State Board of Regents, State Education
Department, Office of Profession, specifically
Nursing Education.

Our primary readers are Wally Boston
and Anne Neal. And I will turn it over to you
folks. You're muted, Anne.

MS. NEAL: Yes. Wally, do you want to
start or you want me to?

DR. BOSTON: Go ahead, I'll yield.

MS. NEAL: Okay. Just to summarize,
we are starting with the New York State Board of
Regents. They are here for a petition for
continued recognition.

The Regents were established by state
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 include 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-site reviews to all registered RN programs as part of its periodic review of those programs.

There are representatives from the State of New York here today to respond to your questions.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'd like to introduce Renee Gecsedi, the Associate of Nursing Education to talk to us about the New York State board admission. Ms. Gecsedi?

EVENT PRODUCER: Please hold on one moment, Renee. You should be able to speak now.

MS. GECSEDI: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Keiser and members of the NACIQI committee. My name is Renee Gecsedi and I am one of two associates in nursing education at the Department of Education in New York State.

To the point that, I think Charity was discussing, when we submitted our response to the initial analysis we understood that we were focusing on the visit that occurred during our last term of approval.

And we have been doing either eight
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.

We would review all the documentation
that was submitted in to us.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is that your report?

Just to remind the members of the committees if
they have questions to use the hand at the bottom
of the participant list.

And then of course when we vote we'll
use the megaphone for that. And we're going to
do it a little slower today because they were
having a hard time getting the counts on the
votes.

So, if you have questions, Jill, then
Anne and then Wally. Actually, I'm sorry, Wally
and Anne first and then Jill. Go ahead.

MS. NEAL: So, Renee, welcome. Just
to clarify, are you saying that in fact you have
followed and are in compliance with the
requirement that you do site visits within an
eight and ten year calendar?

MS. GECSEDI: Yes.

MS. NEAL: So, you disagree -- so
you're saying that you disagree with the staff's analysis of your website and your visit?

      MS. GECSEDI: Yes, because what we had submitted in response we understood we were just focusing in the four year period. Our website, as I said, is relatively new.

      So, the list -- we gave, we submitted in to the staff a list of the schools that was not encompassing of all of our schools. It was just the schools that we had conducted a site review during this last term.

      I know that there was a comment made in the final report that, for example, one of the schools, from her vantage point, it appeared that we hadn't visited it in 30 years. And the fact of the matter is that it had been visited and it was a ten year renewal.

      It was visited in 2015. So, they're not going to be reviewed again until 2000- whatever, 25.

      MS. NEAL: Thank you for that clarification.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, Wally?

DR. BOSTON: I have a question on that exhibit too. So, this is Wally Boston. The Office of the Professions Nursing Accreditation Programs and Nursing Accreditation, I think the example cited by the department was Adelphi. The listing clearly says the last visit spring of 2003. And I don't believe that is the only one. Adirondack Community College says spring of 2005.

So, you know, without reviewing the 50 page list which, you know, I can understand you have a substantial number of institutions that you're evaluating. But at the same time, if this is the evidence and the documentation I can understand why the Department believes that you're not visiting every eight to ten years.

Is there a master list that you maintain that's just not published?

MS. GECSEDI: I didn't catch the question, I'm sorry.

DR. BOSTON: I said is there a master
list that you maintain that doesn't match the one that was published?

MS. GECSEDI: We do have a separate documentation that we do keep which prior to going on our website is what we maintained.

And again, like I said we understood that we were only looking at the school, updating on our website at the point the schools that we had visited during our previous term.

DR. BOSTON: Which means this is the master list?

MS. GECSEDI: Right.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill then Kathleen unless, Wally, do you have another question? I'm sorry if you do.

DR. BOSTON: I'm good for now, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Jill.

DR. DERBY: Yes. This is maybe more of a general question. Eight to ten years seems like a long span. But now we're in a new world with coronavirus when it comes to site visits and
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
or once every 30 years?

MS. GECSEDI: I appreciate that.

Actually, what we have done is nursing has national programmatic accreditation also.

So, depending on which of the national programmatic accreditors the school has, we follow their schedule. So, we've been doing that. So, one is eight years and one is ten years, excuse me.

In the meantime though the schools are having to give us annual reports. So, we monitor them through that. If they make changes to, we're always in touch with the programs.

If they change, want to change a program or offer a new program oftentimes that warrants us going out and conducting a site visit. So, although it might be -- let's say a ten year period we are aware of what's going on at the school constantly.

And we are oftentimes on campus more 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 it a little bit more. But we have all of that information and we keep records of that at the, in the office, yes. I'm sorry.

DR. ALIOTO: What is your record? What is your graduation record?

MS. GECSEDI: I would have to go back into looking that up. It's been very good. Our national -- our pass rates on our NCLEX, the licensing exam is above the national average.

DR. ALIOTO: Glad to hear that, congratulations. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Ms. Gecsedi, I have a question. And I still didn't think you answered Wally's question.

Adelphi, I was looking on your, the information you submitted and they were not on -- Adelphi was not on the summary chart. Were they last visited in 2003?

I don't see a response to the concern of the staff. When was their last visit prior to us bringing it to your attention?
MS. GECSEDI: So, they had a site visit in 2013. And then we were on campus again for a master plan amendment review for institutional readiness in 2015. So, they're not due for another visit until 2023.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay, because I didn't see that documentation. That was what seems to be missing from the report.

MS. GECSEDI: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You were saying something.

MS. GECSEDI: Yes. The list that we provided in response to the staff analysis was just the schools that we had visited during this last approval period that we've had.

It was not encompassing of all of our schools.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Claude?

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes, thank you. Could you talk to us more about interim reporting? And maybe you touched on it a little bit.
But just further explain what you expect the institutions to submit to you between visits and whether or not there is an annual review of, you know, passing grades or other success measures and so forth that you get on a regular basis that might throw a flag that would necessitate a visit.

So, could you talk more about what happens between the visits and reporting.

MS. GECSEDI: Sure. I'm also going to ask that my colleague, Jeanne-Marie Havener come on here too because she's the one, I mean, we both look at the annual reports.

But she's the one that actually does the analysis of them. But we look at faculty staff ratio. We look at pass rates. We look at retention. Jeanne-Marie, what else do we look at?

MS. HAVENER: Sorry, I was muted. Can you hear me now?

MS. GECSEDI: Yes.

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.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay. So,

this is required annually on behalf of every

institution that you accredit?

MS. HAVENER: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: And you do

annual reviews. So, a couple more quick

questions related to this.

Has there ever been an instance that

based on the annual report it necessitated or it

arose to the cause of a visit and how did that

play out?

MS. HAVENER: Sure. Well, I can just,

I can just give you a very recent example in

which we have a school that has had some

financial difficulties.

So, their composite score is less than

1.5. And so, we have been in communication with

that school. We have asked them for a report

within 30 days.

And based on the findings of that

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
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 and what are you planning to do to catch up with whatever site visits that have to happen? And I have a second question after that.

MS. GECSEDI: Sure. Like I said, we do have a master list. And we really, I'm looking at the master list right now.

And there really aren't really any true outliers that are beyond ten years. Jeanne-Marie, can you think of any off the top of your head?

MS. HAVENER: I think that we have maybe one school that we visited at 11 years, maybe. And some of that, I think, were just scheduling issues for them as well as for us and the fact that they had a new program that they were trying to bring up and we were trying to coincide with those issues.

But my recollection is that we're in compliance.

DR. PETRISKO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?
DR. PETRISKO: Yes. So, this kind of goes on to Claude's question, I think as well about future planning.

Not so much about the institutions.

But if you have site visits that were formerly scheduled --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen, you just froze.

DR. PETRISKO: Yes, my whole computer just died for some reason. But you can still hear me, I can still ask my question.

So, site visits that would happen now or this year, what are you doing about those? Are those being postponed? I mean, the point seems to be that a virtual visit doesn't count. So, how are you addressing that?

MS. GECSEDI: Well, for right now we are doing, planning to do virtual visits, keep them on schedule.

But then as soon as we're able to travel again and be on campus then we'll make a point of going to these schools and following up.
with the virtual visit.

DR. PETRISKO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: George?

DR. FRENCH: Thank you. I have a very brief question. It sounds like the information is gathered institutionally as far as the budgets and the institutional health is quite thorough.

Could you speak more, however, to your measures for student success? I heard you say graduation and retention. Do we build any deeper into SLOs, Student Learning Outcomes or any other measures of student success?

MS. HAVENER: Sure. So, this is Jeanne-Marie. And we do ask each program to provide us with a systematic evaluation plan.

And we do allow them, I mean there are certain things that everybody has to report on. And those are, have to do with student retention and graduation and certification or licensure of examination pass rates.

But beyond that, programs are required to provide us with their Student Learning
Outcomes or program outcomes. And in their systematic evaluation plan they provide us with benchmarks that they are using to determine whether or not the students are meeting those outcomes.

And in their annual report they provide us with a summary of where they are in terms of meeting those benchmarks and if they're not meeting the benchmarks what their plan is to make systematic improvements.

It's very individualized. Every school, of course, is different.

DR. FRENCH: No, you've answered it. That's exactly what I was looking for. Thank you.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen, I don't know if you're still on. Do you have your hand raised?

Anne, you have your hand raised. Did you have a question? Okay. And Jeanne-Marie, you can lower your hand too.
Since there are no more questions, I would like to call Charity back to discuss the report of the Commission. Charity?

MS. HELTON: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Do you have any comments concerning the report?

MS. HELTON: In my discussions with the nursing staff and their responses to our draft staff analysis they did indicate that they had a plan to update their website and that part of the confusion was due to the website being out of date.

And so, that -- those updates that have occurred did not occur in time to make it into the final staff analysis. And so, our staff haven't had a chance to review those.

But I can see looking at the website today that some of the changes have been made to it and it does look as if there has been some part of that process of updating the website with more recent data.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Herman, you have a
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.

I wanted to, in terms of your analysis
did you -- beyond the problem of the distance
between visits. Did you have other concerns
about the quality of what's going on in these
colleges and institutions?

MS. HELTON: So, you were a little bit
muffled. But I believe your question was if I
had concerns about the quality of what's
happening in the institutions.

And certainly no concerns of that
nature were identified in the staff analysis, no.

DR. ALIOTO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Wally, do you have
a question?

DR. BOSTON: Yes, I do. So, Charity,
did you resolve the issue that was documented in
the files about the quality of the desk review
versus the on-site visit?

MS. HELTON: So, the concern was not
related to the quality of the desk review, but
related to the fact that the nursing registration
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.

DR. BOSTON: Okay.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay, I'm sorry.

Folks, if you would please raise or lower your hands after you ask a question. Herman, do you have something you wanted to say?

MR. BOUNDS: Yes, I do. I just wanted to add that remember the virtual site visits are adequate to replace an on-site visit.

At some point in time you have to go back out and conduct an on-site visit. The issue here was whether the desk reviews were equivalent to what a virtual site visit would be.

So, I think that's the issue. What was the extent of these desk reviews? Are they adequate in the place of a virtual site visit or an on-site visit? Not that the desk audits were somehow equal to or the same thing as a virtual site visit.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I would be remiss to say that there were no third party commenters. So, it's not that I skipped that, but there were no third party commenters.

Any further questions of staff?
Sensing none, either Wally or Anne, would you like to make a motion?

        DR. BOSTON:  Anne, I'm glad to unless you -- go ahead.

        MS. NEAL:  All right. I move that we approve the staff recommendation to continue the agency's recognition at this time and require the agency to come into compliance within 12 months in terms of its reporting and submit a compliance report due 30 days thereafter.

        CHAIRMAN KEISER:  Is there a second?

        DR. BOSTON:  Second.

        CHAIRMAN KEISER:  Herman, do you have a question or a comment?

        MR. BOUNDS:  I'm sorry. There we go.

        CHAIRMAN KEISER:  Any discussion? Is there discussion?

        DR. PETRISKO:  This is Mary Ellen. I did not wave my hand because I was thrown out of the participants.

        So, I have a screen here but I can't chat, I can't raise my hand and I have no video.
So, if somebody could let me back in I'll be able to vote.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Do you have a question? Ralph, is that you?

MR. WOLFF: Yes, it is me. But I'm listed as an attendee. I don't know why I'm not, I don't know if that enables for you to see me when I raise my hand.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You are still, I see your hand. I don't see you. But, Candace, would you fix that for him, please? Do you have a question, Ralph, or a comment?

MR. WOLFF: I do. And that is I support the motion. It's not a problem with that.

But I just would like to make sure that the agency addresses in the next response to us that the ten year period, that there's an adequate, that it addresses the issue that several people have raised, including Claude that during the interim period, ten years is a long time.
That during the interim period there is an adequate interaction with the programs and demonstrations where there are problems that they have addressed those problems.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: David, you had a comment.

DR. EUBANKS: Yes, thank you. I have a couple of comments too. I'm in favor of the motion.

I think there's a couple of questions that need to be clarified. One is that the agency places some importance on public communication and accreditation status and that they take seriously the recordkeeping in the background.

I didn't get a sense of confidence from that discussion. And secondly, the statement was made that the pass rates were higher than national averages.

But Appendix 14 in their presentation seems to contradict that. So, they might want to clear that up.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Will that be as part of the motion or is just a supplemental for the staff to follow up on?

DR. EUBANKS: I would accept that as just supplemental.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. I had also, from my perspective, I think I have a real concern that there are still outliers beyond 11, you know, ten years.

I don't think the fact that the school is scheduled should dictate whether the visit is done prior to the expiration point. So, I think they need to be more careful with that.

But again, I support the motion also. Is there any further discussion? I don't see anybody's. Okay. I'll call the question.

Now, what we do is there is a megaphone at the bottom corner. Hello. Did somebody say something?

DR. PETRISKO: I am still unable to vote. I'm going to reset this. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are you in favor of
the motion or not because --

DR. PETRISKO: I'm in, this is Mary
Ellen and I'm in favor of the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Would you get
that, go to the megaphone and vote for yes or no.
No is against the motion, yes is for the motion?
Kathleen, you have not voted yet. If you want to
vote.

DR. ALIOTO: I'm doing, there it is.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Does the
staff have what they need? George?

DR. SMITH: Let's see. So, she's
typing now. Angela, are you on? Can you hear
us?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just to explain,
yesterday was a little fast for the person who is
taking all the notes. So, this is what is taking
us a little bit of extra time.

DR. SMITH: She may not be able to
see. So, what you see or perhaps what the Webex
representative sees, we'll need a call of those
numbers so that she can record it.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Well, it looks unanimous. So --

DR. SMITH: Okay, great.

DR. ALIOTO: Arthur, you didn't vote.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay, well thank you. What?

DR. ALIOTO: You didn't vote.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, you voted. I see it.

DR. ALIOTO: You didn't.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I don't normally vote. Okay. Thank you. Let's move to the next --

EVENT PRODUCER: Can you just hold on just one more moment? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. We'll move to the next Agency. Now, I was one of the primary readers.

So, I'm going to turn the gavel over to Claude who is our Vice Chair. Claude, you are now in charge.

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
which over 1,100 students enroll in each cohort.

But CGSC is only able to confer 150
master degrees to graduates in a single year
because thesis work is so labor intensive for
faculty.

The subject of this review is to
expand the scope of CGSC's recognition to
recognize a new, non-thesis master's program, the
master's of operational studies, which unlike the
existing program is based on military operations
instead of being research focused. And with
that, I can yield to Valerie.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay, very
good. Yes, Valerie is the Department staff.
And, Valerie, you want to provide your briefing.

MS. LEFOR: Good morning. Happy to do
so.

Good morning, Mr. Vice Chair and
Members. For the record, I am Valerie Lefor and
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. Can you see me, sir?

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Not yet, but I'm sure we'll get it. And, Jim, I don't know if you have any staff with you that, if you could reintroduce yourself and if you do have other introductions to make that would be great.

DR. MARTIN: Yes, sir. I have no one with me. I'm working from my home office. Because of COVID we are still in a distributed mode.

Mr. Vice Chairperson, Members of the NACIQI Committee, public attendees, I am Dr. James Martin, the Dean of Academics for U.S. Army Command and General Staff College located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

The college tracks its history back to the creation of the first U.S. Army school of professional military education in 1881 by General William Tecumseh Sherman.

Since that time the college has 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
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.
MS. DELEKTA: I have no questions either.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay.

Questions from the rest of the Committee? Well, isn't this one easy or easier anyway. Okay, Kathleen, I see your hand. Thank you.

DR. ALIOTO: Sorry. I have two questions. First, I was curious that you have 150 graduates a year when you're training 1,200 people.

Is that because people are doing this part-time like a community college situation? Why is that?

DR. MARTIN: Ma'am, that's because the graduate degree program, the master of military arts and science is an optional program. So, students are going through a military education program for which they get a military credential.

But they have the opportunity to take the thesis-based master's degree. We are trying to open that up to a non-thesis based master's degree for a broader audience of students.
DR. ALIOTO: All right. So, when somebody is serving our country and they're taking one set of training plus they're taking one or two courses, is that it? How long does it take them to get through the 1,200 or however presently?

DR. MARTIN: Ma'am, they come to school at Fort Leavenworth at the present time. That is their job. And they are with us for a year.

DR. ALIOTO: So, can you get more than 1,200 through then? I mean, more than 150?

DR. MARTIN: No, ma'am. We put 1,200 through overall. But right now 150, generally, on average, choose to pursue the master's degree. The others can pursue master's degree from multiple universities which teach in the evening in our building.

DR. ALIOTO: I see, okay. Now, let me go to this other.

When you're talking about what the 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 exact issue yesterday, but yesterday we had an issue about backdating accreditation the institution is already accredited.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes, why don’t we -- can we bring Valerie back up because I think you’re right. This is probably more of a staff and Herman question.

And maybe Valerie can explain whether or not that’s actually a formal portion of the request of the agency as well. Does that make sense?

DR. BOSTON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay, thank you. Any other questions though for, Dr. Martin? Okay, seeing none my understanding is there are no third party comments.

And so, I think, Valerie, if we could have you come back then and answer Wally’s question and then have any final comments before we -- thank you, Valerie.

MS. LEFOR: Yes, no problem. 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 request?

MS. LEFOR: So, HLC issued a letter stating that they did not to do an additional petition, that they felt this degree and content information had been reviewed under the master of military arts and science program.

It was just the removal of the thesis option. And so, they approved the request but they did not do an additional review because they felt they had already encompassed that.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Great, thank you. Herman?

MR. BOUNDS: Yes. So, I just wanted to bring up that the military degree granting role is not covered under any of the regulations in 602 or the Higher Education Act in general.

So, the retroactive accreditation issue, you know, is not an applicable issue for military degree granting.

The other thing to bring up and, Val, you can correct me if I'm wrong. But this
process is more associated with the state
authorization role of establishing an
institution.

So, we're performing that function for
the military organization. They still have to go
to the accrediting body to be accredited. But
we're performing that role as the authorizer.

We're saying that, yes, this degree
is, you know, it's college level and it's, you
know, a higher education, it would qualify as a
higher education program with these special needs
that can't be established in regular
institutions.

I just wanted to make that
distinction.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes, thank
you very much, Herman. Any other questions for
the staff for Valerie or for Herman?

Seeing none, Amanda or Arthur, do you
have a recommendation, a motion to make?

DR. DERBY: I move that we grant the
staff recommendation for the expansion of scope.
VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Okay. Is there a second?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'll second that.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Thank you, Art. Any comments, questions, discussion among the Members?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just, if I may just add a little. One of the biggest issues that came up in this review, and Kathleen kind of focused on it a lot, is the need to have the comparability between a regular degree and a military degree and that was a discussion that was fully vetted by staff.

And Valerie did a great job doing that. So, I just wanted that to be aware.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: All right. Thank you, Art. Any other questions or points of discussion, comments?

All right. Seeing none, if you would go to your megaphone and all in favor of the motion vote, yes. Those opposed vote, no.

Everybody make sure you cast your
votes. And would the staff record the votes?

And let me know when you feel like you've got it.

Have the votes been recorded? George, do you know?

    DR. SMITH: I cannot see it.

    (Simultaneous speaking.)

    VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Here it is.

The Board just lit up. We've got it. All right.

Thank you all very much.

    And thank you, Dr. Martin, for your presentation today and thank you, Valerie as well. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to turn the gavel back to you.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, Claude, for an outstanding job. Appreciate that. We move to our last recognition requirement, the Reorganization and Curriculum Change by Federal Agencies and Institutions.

    This is the National Intelligence University: Undergoing Substantive Change from Department of Defense to the Director of National Intelligence. The two primary readers are David
Eubanks and Claude Pressnell.

The departmental staff is Valerie Lefor. David, Claude, you're up.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes. I've got this one, Art, thank you.

So, just to introduce the Agency, the National Intelligence University is the only higher education institution in the nation whose primary mission is to educate and conduct intelligence research at the classified level.

The university aligns its curriculum with mission-specific requirements provided by the Director of National Intelligence and the NIU curriculum provides classic academic learning outcomes informed by the professional competencies articulated by the intelligence community.

First, recognized in April of 2012 by a team visit by NACIQI and also the U.S. Department of Education, the National Intelligence University has gone through the degree granting process and has met those
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
who are also here who will receive your
questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. Any
questions? I'd like to introduce J. Scott
Cameron, President of the National Intelligence
University. President Cameron?

MR. CAMERON: Good morning. Audio
check, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes. We can hear
you fine.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, excellent. Thank
you. Good morning, everyone. And thank you for
the privilege of speaking with you today.

I'm Scott Cameron, President of the
National Intelligence University. I am honored
to be here. But just to let you know, I had
emergency surgery 48 hours ago to reattach all
the tendons of my right hamstring.

So, any pained look on my face is on
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
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
inspired to have as standards.

So, that is the recommendation. And
that report circulated around the community did
foster, I think, a concentrated debate.

And now here we are. And I'm very
proud to be moving into what is really an
opportunity for the National Intelligence
University to achieve its longstanding ambition
to be a community wide institution that really
codifies intelligence as a profession and
produces critically thinking leaders who can make
this community, make this university the center
of academic excellence.

So, I will stop there. But again,
thank you for the opportunity to talk with you
today.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Gannon, for
the remarks and for your service to the nation.
To quickly wrap up, I'd like to turn to our
Provost, Dr. Terry Markin. Terry.

DR. MARKIN: Thank you, Scott. As the
Provost of the National Intelligence University
it is my great honor to be here today.

I would like to thank the Department
of Education staff and Members of the Committee
for their time and support extended on behalf of
us getting to this point. This is a monumental
effort.

And we could not have done it without
your assistance. NIU provides a unique education
focused on national security and the transition
to the Office of the Director of National
Intelligence will bolster our position in the
intelligence community.

We look forward to any comments or
questions you may have. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Markin. And
last but not least, Assistant Provost Dave Smith.

Dave.

DR. SMITH: Thank you, sir. I echo
all the previous comments thus far. It is my
honor as well to represent NIU here today.

I am an Assistant Provost and also
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 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
you have questions you would like to start with
I'll defer to you otherwise I can go ahead.

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: No, go
ahead. I'll follow you. Thanks, Dave.

DR. EUBANKS: Okay. Thank you for
that introduction and also for the lucid pros and
the substantive change document; any failure to
understand is on my part.

I just had some questions about the
nuts and bolts of the transition. I think I
understand the reasons for it.

One of my questions was about the role
of the Board of Visitors. And some places it's
described as advisory. But also the document
says that it approved the strategic plan which
hints at executive oversight.

So, could you just say a few words
about what the role of that Board is?

MR. CAMERON: Thanks for the question,
great question. I'll put something on the front
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
university to move ahead in the constructive
direction that it has moved.

        DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. Just briefly
--

        MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dr. Gannon. Go
ahead.

        DR. EUBANKS: I just have a quick
follow up. Does the Board approve budgets and
staffing?

        DR. GANNON: It does not approve. It
does not have that mission or authority. The
President has consulted us and sought the
consultation and approval of such, but he is not
obliged to do so.

        DR. EUBANKS: Okay, thank you. I
appreciate that.

        MR. CAMERON: I would add that --
sorry. Claude, I would just add that --

        VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Yes. I
guess one recommendation I would make, because
I've got the same kind of confusion that Dave
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.

And then they look at what we're doing 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
direct -- having direct authority over
governance.

MR. CAMERON: So, can I add to that --
thanks, John. I could add to that. But budget
approval is at the agency level.

As we get our budget, as we invest --
we're going through some modernization -- as we
invest we inform our Board, talk to them about
those investments, and that is kind of part of
how we meet our objectives for -- under the DNI
as well.

DR. DERBY: I ask the question because
there is an important component of academic
integrity and oversight and quality that boards
play an important role in.

And I just wondered about the
distinction between advising and governing in
that regard, because it being an academic
institution that's an important issue.

Was there anything you want to add?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. For us, the
arrangement we've had, under the Defense
Intelligence Agency, is one of a high level of
autonomy. And that same level of autonomy is
being structured under the ODNI. And as we write
the charter for that, for our Board with Dr.
Gannon, these are things that we really need to
kind of work through, absolutely.

DR. DERBY: Good, okay. But I would
reiterate --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Go ahead, Jill.

DR. GANNON: This is John. This is a
very important issue.

But as we began the transition earlier
this year, I did send a memo out to all the
stakeholders, which simply said you've got a
Board here with tremendous expertise and
experience, it needs to be engaged as we move
along. And the response I got, whether we had
the authority or not, was quite positive.

I think we saw some constructive
responses, particularly from the Defense
Intelligence Agency and some, and the DNI organization. But again, it's because I think of the heft of the people that are on this Board that they have been able to punch above the weight of the charter.

The charter has got to catch up with the, actually, authorities you want the Board to have. By the way, I am one of the ones that support --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

DR. GANNON: Because I think issues like academic freedom are critical ones as the university proceeds in the direction that it is going in.

And when it encounters the other major agencies who have great sensitivities about sources and methods but have less experience with the issue of academic freedom.

So, we've got to be, the Board has got to be champions, I think, of the strategic in this new environment.

DR. DERBY: Good. 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 understand to respond to threats against the nation.

So, for us we're looking at 17 IC partners, 22-plus, different other agencies that work with us. So, while we have each department --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

PARTICIPANT: Someone needs to mute their phone, please.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, there is background interference. Please, go on.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. While we have 22 plus partners in national security beyond the 17 intelligence agencies, NGA, State Department, the FBI, law enforcement, they all need to be there. They have to be part of this mix, right?

So, as a result of getting people from the State Department it's not just from their intelligence bureau. It's from their regional shops. 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.
DR. DERBY: Yes. Thanks for your response. I find it reassuring to hear about the efforts at integration that you've laid out and also just all the history, the evolution of this institution, it sounds very promising. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen? You're muted, Kathleen. Kathleen, you're still muted.

DR. ALIOTO: Better?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: There you go.

DR. ALIOTO: What does the Department of Defense think about this?

MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you for the question. This has been a two-year conversation. There is a policy document in DoD 3305.01 which describes the relationship between the USDI, the Undersecretary for Defense Intelligence, the Director of DIA, the DNI and the President of National Intelligence University.

So, these four parties are described as having very distinct roles in how we work together and how we, kind of, provide assurances
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
conversation. It's actually enriched the
conversation in how we serve all of our
stakeholders, in particular the military.

But this has been signed off, as John
noted before, by the Secretary of Defense. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, President
Cameron. Any other questions?

DR. ALIOTO: Yes. You also indicated
that Congress was involved. Was there a vote
from Congress in terms of this involvement?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. I'll turn to Dr.
Gannon for that. He's been very heavily
involved. John?

DR. GANNON: Yes. I'm sorry, I missed
the question. We got muted. Could you repeat
the question, please?

MR. CAMERON: So, as John described
earlier both of the House and Senate Intelligence
Committees have been tracking this for two years.

John described in detail the study
that was done that was commissioned by the Senate
Select Committee on Intelligence in 2016. John led that panel, did an amazing job.

That process of actually studying ourselves, I was just coming on board when the study started, and it asked a series of pretty deep questions of the institution. And that was a gift to me because in starting I was able to kind of start with this framework of having people understand where we were and where we were going.

So, that study then started a two-year conversation on the Hill about the future of the institution. And that has been a very productive and positive conversation throughout.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you. Any other questions from the Committee?

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: Art, I have --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

DR. ALIOTO: Was there a vote?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are there any other questions from the Committee?
DR. EUBANKS: Yes, Art. I've got two more questions.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Who is that, David?

DR. EUBANKS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: David, go ahead.

DR. EUBANKS: Sorry, I just have -- you know, in the name of due diligence I just have a couple more questions. I imagine that this operation is like taking the plumbing out of one building and transplanting it into another building.

It's got to be complicated. I think I understand the Board now. Your exposition of how the budget change works is very clear. I understand that.

You note that the student policies about admissions and retentions and so forth will not change, and that's very important. I did want to ask about the other, there must be a lot of other kinds of policies that you have port from the Department of Defense over.
So, could you just give me a very brief status report on how that is going?

MR. CAMERON: Thanks for the question. And I like the plumbing analogy. There is a part of this is very, as you can imagine, a very inter-governmental transition, right.

We're transferring budgets, the things that you mentioned, and that has all gone very well. We have a very, very detailed transition plan for this, as you can imagine.

And one of those, one part of that, was to review all policies in ODNI as they related to all policies related to DIA. And those number in the hundreds.

So, we have combed through hundreds of policies to look for differences and ODNI is making adjustments. Their lawyers were working with them and they are making adjustments to accommodate whatever unique needs that were in those policies before we joined them.

So, that has been part of a painstaking process as well, but a very
educational one.

DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. That helps me understand the scope of the problem. I appreciate that.

My last question is will the -- do you anticipate that the current NIU leadership will persist through this transition?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. We have -- structurally and functionally we have been placed in the org chart at ODNI.

We are -- I am a direct report to the Director of National Intelligence and our institution is not melded into or with any of the other business units of ODNI. We are a standalone organization in that sense. So, essentially, lock, stock, barrel, as we are, that was congressional language, as well: move the university as is.

And I am very heartened by ODNI leadership's warm reception for our arrival in the near future.

DR. EUBANKS: Great. I greatly
appreciate your comments. Thank you very much.
Art, I'm finished.

DR. GANNON: This is John Gannon. Can
you hear me, folks? Can I make an additional
comment here? Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, John.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: You may.

DR. GANNON: Yes, John Gannon, back
with the BOV. A couple of comments.

One is that, again, whatever the
charter actually says about the BOV that, when I
made a request to be engaged in the transition,
Scott, partly because of his own inclinations,
has kept us extremely well informed as the
progression has moved ahead.

Also, the Office of the DNI has done
the same. And it was a little harder to get that
communication going, but we've done it. And the
Board is quite satisfied that we are not only
being well informed but we're being engaged with
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
of these. There was concern. We had ultimately
a very good collaboration and the Board played a
role in this too.

And I think we're in a very good
position now, not by accident, not because of
anything random, but because people and leaders
engaged in a very constructive way to get us in a
very positive position with regard to this
transition.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you.
Kathleen, you had another question?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Excuse me, Kathleen,
you had another question?

DR. ALIOTO: Well, you may have just
answered this. Was this included in intelligence
legislation?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. Thank you,
Kathleen. I'm really sorry I missed the question
earlier. I didn't pick up on what you were
saying.

But, yes. This was a part of the
Intelligence Authorization Act that was voted into law. So, this is public law and that was -- yes.

DR. ALIOTO: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Are there any more questions? If you still have your hands up, please pull them down, if you can. Valerie -- thank you, gentlemen and I'd like to invite Valerie back on to make any comments or observations.

MS. LEFOR: Thank you. I thought --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Just one second. I'm sorry, Valerie. There are no third party commenters that I'm aware of and so now we can go to you, Valerie.

MS. LEFOR: No problem. I was just going to say I thought it was really good conversation. I do not have any additional comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any questions for Valerie?
DR. EUBANKS: Yes. I do have a quick
question, Art.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is that you, David?

Okay.

DR. EUBANKS: Yes. So, for the
record, the Middle States requires formal
approval by the Department of Education and the
Department of Education requires formal approval
by Middle States.

So, there is this logical
contradiction that has to be resolved for
anything to move forward. So, my understanding
is that we have accepted the Middle States
preliminary approval, which then will lead to a
site visit and so forth, that resolves this
catch-22. I just wanted to verify that this is
the case and that it was on the record.

MS. LEFOR: Yes, that is the case.

So, we refer to this, kind of, as our chicken and
egg situation. Who goes first in terms of
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.

DR. EUBANKS: Thank you. Last question, when the statute expires in 2022, where the Department of Education -- sorry, the Department of Defense is appointing the Board of Visitors and it transitions over, does NIU have to resubmit a substantive change, or does this just go forward and they're done?

MS. LEFORD: That is a good question. I'm not sure I know the answer to that. I don't know, Herman, if you had any insights into that?

MR. BOUNDS: No, I don't. I think it's something we'll have to look at, you know, at that time. I'm not clear if that will require some change at this point.

DR. EUBANKS: Okay. This was a comment, I would say, based on the conversation today, personally I would be comfortable with that change going forward without another round of paperwork. But of course that's all up to you.

And finally, thank you very much,
Valerie and others at the Department for
supporting me and helping me do this review.

Your communication was clear and
timely and really helped me understand these
complicated issues. Thank you.

MS. LEFOR: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Well, thank you.

Any other questions for Valerie? Thank you,
Valerie. David, and I guess, Claude, would you
like to make a motion? Do you have a motion to
make?

VICE CHAIRMAN PRESSNELL: We have a
motion to make, Mr. Chairman. And the motion is
to approve the realignment and substantive change
request of NIU.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is there a second?

DR. EUBANKS: I second.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Second by David.

Any questions, comments, concerns?

Sensing none, if you would then vote
on the motion. The motion is to accept the
report. Go to your megaphone and begin the
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 accredditor'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.
CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, Rick. Anybody have any questions or comments?
I think everybody is getting tired.
Well, Rick, again well done. Do we want to make a motion to send this to the Secretary?

MR. O'DONNELL: Mr. Chair, was there a question from Jill, or did they just -- Jill and Ralph had their hand up.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I didn't see that.
I'm sorry.

DR. DERBY: No, just quickly. I just wanted to really thank Rick and acknowledge, I 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.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Kathleen?

DR. ALIOTO: I would like to, once again, chime in with Jill and thank Rick because
having to deal -- you can imagine having to deal 
with me on that committee. And he was so patient 
and followed through on everything.

We spent hours on trying to listen to 
people on the phone and see them on the, you 
know, and it was complicated and it was also 
complicated in terms of our thinking.

So, I would like to thank him and also 
the other members of the Committee and Anne and 
everybody who was so really flexible about having 
our judgments questioned.

And I think this may be my last 
meeting. So, I also wanted to thank you, Art, 
and everybody else on the Committee. It's been a 
real pleasure working with you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Absolutely a 
pleasure to work with you, Kathleen. Ralph, you 
have your hand up.

MR. WOLFF: I do. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes.

MR. WOLFF: Okay, great. Then I'll 
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
her review.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Is there a second?

DR. DERBY: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Second was Jill Derby. Any further discussion?

All in favor, hit your megaphone.

(Pause.)

DR. SMITH: It looks unanimous. There is no scribe for this. We did it for the agencies. I can't hear you, Art. I think you're muted.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: I'm sorry. Again, thank you for that. Again, thank you, Rick, and everybody on the Committee.

The next, one of our new members put together an incredibly deep and thoughtful report on student success. David, would you like to make a presentation?

DR. EUBANKS: Thank you, yes. And with that lead up, you might think that it's quite long. It's not. I feel like I'm holding you all hostage this morning, so this will be
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 guidance 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 reimage 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
modern techniques for achieving those goals.

That's it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Thank you, David.

Unless there is an objection, I would recommend that we do appoint a subcommittee, David being the chair, and anybody who would be interested in serving on the committee please notify David or myself and we would move forward with that, because I think that would be a very interesting and important report.

I don't think we need a motion for that, but if there are any objections please let me know. With that --

DR. DERBY: Art, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Yes, sure.

DR. DERBY: Yes. I just wanted to ask David, this sounds really great and I support the idea of a subcommittee and would like to be on it.

Where can we access the new handbook for the guidance for the accreditors?

DR. EUBANKS: It's posted online. I
can just email you a copy. That might be the easiest thing.

    DR. DERBY: Great, thanks.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. Just --

Kathleen, you had your hand raised.

    DR. ALIOTO: Yes. I wondered, David, if you had looked at the report that was created by NACIQI over the last, well it was not last year but the four years before that: a study on this subject on student achievement. Have you looked at that?

    DR. EUBANKS: I'm familiar with some of the resources, but maybe not all of them. So, thank you for pointing that out. I'll have to do some more research.

    DR. ALIOTO: Yes.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Mary Ellen?

    DR. ALIOTO: I wasn't sure if they were on the Committee.

    DR. PETRISKO: Thank you. First I want to thank you, David, and I want to volunteer 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 result in that if there were things presented, where the Secretary would say that actually is really good, we should be more explicit or change these things so that we're giving good guidance as to what our requirements are for agencies.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Right, or she would then maybe set up a negotiated rulemaking, because I think that's what would follow next. But we certainly could raise the questions. She doesn't have to take the advice, or she can.

DR. PETRISKO: Great. Well, again --

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Any other comments?

DR. PETRISKO: -- I would be happy to be on a group. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Great, thank you. I think we're finished, almost. Two things I want to say.

First, remember during our training we went through an issue in the media training. And we are not able to speak on behalf of NACIQI. If 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.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. We've not
done that before, but we certainly can. If you
would like that subcommittee, go ahead and vote.

    DR. SMITH: Yes.

    DR. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that
we create the -- this is George French. I move
that we create the subcommittee as recommended.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Great. And that's a
motion. Is there a second?

    DR. PETRISKO: I'll second it.

    CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. I think Mary
Ellen or Jill, but Mary Ellen. Any other
discussion? Go ahead and vote. Ralph, go ahead
and vote -- or, you have discussion?

    MR. WOLFF: Just one question. I just
would appreciate that a charge to the Committee -
- subcommittee be developed and circulated just
so we, and following up on Mary Ellen's question,
just so what the charge is and what the scope is
and it would be very helpful.

    If I could, I will join the committee.
But I'll write to David directly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Okay. David did do a very well thought out paper, that should be the basis of the subcommittee's charge. Okay.

Okay. Do you have enough, George, on the votes? It looks unanimous. Anne hasn't voted.

DR. SMITH: Okay, let's see, 13, 15, 16. It's unanimous. So, it is unanimous.

CHAIRMAN KEISER: Again, I want to thank everybody for being so cooperative. This has been an interesting experience working with Webex.

I thank the Webex people for helping us and, George and Herman, thank you so much for your staff and the work that they do. And I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

DR. FRENCH: So moved.


(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:38 a.m.)
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