CLAUDE O. PRESSNELL, JR.

ROBERT SHIREMAN STEVEN VanAUSDLE

(202) 234-4433

FRIDAY MARCH 5, 2021 + + + + + teleconference, at 9:00 a.m. EST, Arthur E. Keiser, Chair, presiding. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: ARTHUR E. KEISER, Chair KATHLEEN SULLIVAN ALIOTO ROSLYN CLARK ARTIS JENNIFER L. BLUM RONNIE L. BOOTH WALLACE E. BOSTON JILL DERBY DAVID A. EUBANKS PAUL J. LeBLANC ROBERT MAYES ANNE D. NEAL RICHARD F. O'DONNELL MARY ELLEN PETRISKO

MEETING

+ + + + +

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

+ + + + +

The advisory committee met via video-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT: GEORGE ALAN SMITH, NACIQI Executive Director, Designated Federal Official HERMAN BOUNDS, Director, Accreditation Group ELIZABETH DAGGETT LAUREN FRIEDRICH NICOLE S. HARRIS CHARITY HELTON JASS HOLT VALERIE LEFOR REHA MALLORY DONNA MANGOLD STEPHANIE McKISSIC ANGELA SIERRA KARMON SIMMS-COATES MICHAEL STEIN ACCREDITATION AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation (COMTA) DAWN HOGUE, Executive Director CLIFFORD KORN National Accrediting Commission of Career Arts and Sciences (NACCAS) Inc. TONY MIRANDO, Executive Director

DARIN M. WALLACE, Director of Govt. Relations LOUIS SARITA, Former Treasurer, NACCAS THERESE VOGEL, Former Chairwoman, NACCAS

PUBLIC COMMENTERS: FRED JONES, Professional Beauty Federation of California

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 9:11 a.m. Welcome to the National 3 THE OPERATOR: 4 Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and 5 Integrity Meeting. Thank you for joining us today. 6 7 Please note you may open the 8 participant and chat panels on Webex by using the 9 associated icons located at the bottom of your 10 screen. If you require technical assistance, 11 12 please send a private chat message to the producer. With that, I'll turn the conference 13 14 over to Dr. Smith, the Executive Director. 15 Thank you, Candice. DR. SMITH: Good 16 morning, and welcome everyone. This is the 17 meeting of the National Advisory Committee on 18 Institutional Quality and Integrity, also known 19 as NACIQI. 20 I'm George Alan Smith, the Executive 21 Director and designated federal official of 22 NACIQI.

1	
1	NACIQI was established by Section 114
2	of the higher education Act of 1965 as Amended,
3	or HEA, and it's also governed by provisions of
4	the Federal Advisory Committee Act as Amended, or
5	FACA, which sets forth standards for the
6	formation and use of Advisory Committees.
7	Sections 101(c)and 487(c-4) of the HEA
8	and Section 36(b) of the public health service
9	act, 41 U.S.C Section 2966 require the Secretary
10	to publish lists of the state approval agencies,
11	nationally recognized accrediting agencies and
12	state approval and accrediting agencies for nurse
13	education that the Secretary determines to be
14	reliable authorities as to the quality of
15	education provided by the institutions and
16	programs they accredit.
17	Eligibility of the educational
18	institutions and programs for participating in
19	various federal programs requires accreditation
20	by an Agency listed by the Secretary.
21	As provided in HEA Section 114, the
22	NACIQI advises the Secretary in the discharge of

1	these functions and is also authorized to provide
2	advice regarding the process of eligibility and
3	certification of institutions of higher education
4	for participation in the federal student aid
5	programs, authorized under Title IV of the HEA.
6	In addition to these charges, NACIQI
7	authorizes academic graduate degrees from federal
8	agencies and institutions.
9	This authorization was provided by
10	letter from the Office of Management and Budget
11	in 1954 and this letter is available on the
12	NACIQI website along with all the other records
13	related to NACIQI's deliberations.
14	Again, thank you for joining us. I'll
15	now turn it to the Chairperson. Thank you.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, George.
17	Good morning, everyone. welcome to Day 3 of the
18	National Advisory Committee on Institutional
19	Quality and Integrity Meeting.
20	We have a busy day today and we want
21	to get finished as early as we can but we will
22	spend the appropriate time in reviewing the

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

different agencies.

We have a little difference in our
agenda. I'd like to discuss that for a second.
We will start with the renewal of recognition for
COMTA.
We will then continue our discussion
on Accrediting Commission of Independent Colleges

8 and Schools, and then we'll finally work with the
9 renewal of recognition for the National
10 Accrediting Commission in Career Arts and
11 Sciences, NACCAS.

12 At this point, I'd like to introduce 13 the members of the National Advisory Committee. 14 I'll start by having them introduce themselves. 15 Kathleen?

DR. ALIOTO: Hello, I'm KathleenSullivan Alioto.

For the last 15 years I have taught, researched, and read programs at all levels and become dedicated to the proposition that the years from birth to three are critical to brain development and ensure a future of quality.

2	CHAIR KEISER: Is Roslyn here? Is she
3	supposed to be here today? I don't see her.
4	DR. ARTIS: I am.
5	CHAIR KEISER: There you are, good.
6	DR. ARTIS: Good morning, colleagues.
7	I am Roslyn Artis, I'm president of Benedict
8	College in Columbia, South Carolina, a small,
9	private liberal arts college and university.
10	This is my eighth year as a college
11	president and I am honored to have the
12	opportunity to sit on this Committee.
13	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the
14	opportunity to be introduced.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Welcome. Jennifer?
16	MS. BLUM: I'm Jennifer Blum, I'm
17	happy to be back for a third day. I am an
18	attorney that has focused on higher education
19	policy, development, and compliance.
20	And I'll leave it at that.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
22	DR. BOOTH: Ronnie Booth, President

Emeritus of Tri-County Technical College in South 1 2 Carolina. Wally? 3 CHAIR KEISER: 4 DR. BOSTON: Wally Boston, President 5 Emeritus of American Public University System. CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. 6 Jill? 7 DR. DERBY: Yes, I apologize, my video 8 doesn't seem to be working. 9 But I'm here, Jill Derby, Senior Consultant with the Association of Governing 10 Boards of Universities and Colleges. 11 David? 12 CHAIR KEISER: 13 DR. EUBANKS: Good morning, everyone, 14 I'm David Eubanks. I work at Furman University 15 where I am assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Paul? 17 18 DR. LeBLANC: Paul LeBlanc, President 19 of Southern New Hampshire University. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Michael? 21 DR. SMITH: Michael is out today. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Robert Mayes?

[
1	MR. MAYES: Good morning, Robert
2	Mayes, CEO of Columbia Education Group and
3	Columbia Southern University and Waldorf
4	University.
5	CHAIR KEISER: Anne?
6	MS. NEAL: Anne Neal, Senior Fellow of
7	American Council of Trustees and Alumni.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
9	MD. O'DONNELL: Rick O'Donnell,
10	Founder of Skills Fund.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
12	DR. PETRISKO: Mary Ellen Pastriko,
13	past President of the WASC Senior College and
14	University Commission and Higher Education
15	Accreditation Consultant.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
17	DR. PRESSNELL: Claude Pressnell,
18	President of the Tennessee Independent Colleges
19	and Universities, and Vice Chair of the
20	Committee.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Robert Shireman?
22	MR. SHIREMAN: Bob Shireman, I am

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Senior Fellow and Director of Higher Education at 1 2 the Century Foundation. And Stephen? 3 CHAIR KEISER: DR. VanAUSDLE: Stephen Van Ausdle, 4 5 President Emeritus of Walla Walla Community College and Westman State. 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: And George, would you 8 like introduce your team that's with you? 9 Yes, I'm supported today DR. SMITH: 10 by two of our OGC representatives, Angela Sierra and Donna Mangold and Valerie Lefor is also on 11 12 the line. Thanks. 13 CHAIR KEISER: And Herman, if you 14 would like to introduce your team? 15 MR. BOUNDS: Sure, good morning, my 16 name is Herman Bounds. I'm the Director of the 17 Accreditation Group. 18 Our accreditation staff here today are 19 Elizabeth Daggett, Reha Mallory, Nicole Harris, 20 Stephanie McKissic, Charity Helton, Karmon Simms-21 Coates, Mike Stein, and Jass Holt, who is here to 22 offer any technical support to Committee Members

with the erecognition system.

Thank you.

1

2

3 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Herman, and 4 welcome again everybody. I apologize for the 5 fact that this is not in person, which makes it a 6 little bit more complicated, especially with the 7 Webex and telephone system.

8 So, please work with us as we go through 9 the process. I want to talk about our standard 10 review procedures.

11 What we do with the Agency, we start 12 with the primary readers who are assigned by the 13 Staff to introduce the Agency application. We 14 then have the Department Staff provide a briefing 15 regarding the petition.

16 The Agency's representatives are 17 provided the opportunity to present comments and 18 there will be questions by the NACIQI Members 19 followed by the response and comment from the 20 Agency.

There will be third-party comments, ifthere are any and then the Agency will have the

1	opportunity to respond to third-party comments.
2	And then the Department Staff responds to the
3	Agency and the third-party comments, and then we
4	go to a discussion and a vote.
5	So, it is our normal structure and we
6	will start today with the renewal of recognition
7	for the Commission on Massage Therapy
8	Accreditation, or COMTA.
9	The primary readers are Ronnie Booth and
10	Paul LeBlanc. The Department Staff, Ronnie,
11	Paul, it's yours, the agenda is yours.
12	DR. LeBLANC: Thank you, Art. So,
13	before us is the Commission on Massage Therapy
14	Accreditation. They were last before us in 2016
15	when they were renewed for five years.
16	They had petitioned for a rule for
17	another five years. COMTA accredits 38
18	institutions and 15 programs in 32 states in
19	Costa Rica.
20	So, Michael Stein is the Staff who
21	assigned and conducted the review. Michael, do
22	you have any comments?

1	MR. STEIN: Yes, good morning, Mr. Chair
2	and Members of the Committee. For the record, My
3	name is Mike Stein and I am providing a summary
4	of the Petition of Renewal for Recognition for
5	the Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation,
6	or COMTA.
7	The Staff recommendation to the senior
8	department official is to renew the Agency's
9	recognition as a nationally recognized
10	accrediting Agency and require a compliance
11	report in 12 months on issues identified on the
12	Staff report, which I will summarize in a moment.
13	The Department Staff also recommend the
14	Agency submit a monitoring report for the next
15	three years of the recognition period. A
16	monitoring report must demonstrate that the
17	Agency's staffing and financial resources are
18	sufficient to carry out its accrediting
19	responsibilities.
20	These recommendations are based on a
21	review of the Agency's petition and supporting
22	documentation as well as two observations that

1 included a site visit attended with the Agency in 2 January of 2020 and an observation of the Agency's April 2020 Commission meeting that was 3 conducted online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. 4 The Agency has not had any complaints or 5 third-party comments submitted to the Department 6 7 since its last review. 8 As previously mentioned, Department 9 Staff identified several outstanding issues that the Agency needs to address in the recognition 10 areas of administrative and fiscal 11 12 responsibilities, student achievement, monitoring, and development of standards. 13 14 First, as it relates to monitor the Agency's staffing and financial resources, 15 16 Department Staff finds the Agency substantially 17 compliant with 34 C.F.R. 602 15(a)(1). 18 Department Staff found no evidence that 19 the Agency is unable to carry out its accrediting 20 activity in light of its staffing and financial 21 resources. 22 However, the Agency described challenges

1	in the massage education market that led to
2	several measures by the Agency to ensure its
3	financial stability during the recognition
4	period, including a temporary Staff reduction as
5	well as entering into a joint management
6	agreement with another accrediting Agency.
7	COMTA recently returned to self
8	management and currently employs only one Staff
9	Member.
10	Based on these facts and because the
11	Agency is entitled to a gatekeeper, Staff feels
12	it's prudent to monitor the Agency's financial
13	and staffing resources for a period of three
14	years.
15	Second, there are a number of remaining
16	issues related to organizational and
17	administrative requirements the Agency must
18	address.
19	The Agency must address compliance of
20	its own biological lead as the number and tenure
21	of Commissioners, documentation of training of
22	Commissioners, Staff, and peer reviewers, and

qualifications of peer reviewers as it relates to the roles on site evaluation teams.

Third, as it relates to student 3 achievement, the Agency must provide more 4 5 information that demonstrates how the Agency ensures its student achievement benchmarks are 6 sufficiently vigorous to ensure the Agency is a 7 8 reliable authority regarding the quality of the 9 education or training provided by the institutions or program it accredits. 10

Fourth, the Agency must submit further evidence demonstrating how it analyzes and acts on the fiscal information it collects from its accredited members in accordance with its policies and procedures.

Finally, the Agency must demonstrate That it consistently requires institutions to come into compliance with its standards or take adverse actions in accordance with the timeline and regulations.

21 We believe the Agency can resolve the 22 issues identified in the Staff report and

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

demonstrate its compliance in a written report in a year's time.

Therefore, as I've stated earlier, 3 Department Staff is recommending to the senior 4 5 department officials to renew the Agency's recognition as a nationally recognized 6 accrediting Agency at this time, subject to the 7 8 submission and review of the compliance report due in 12 months and a review and decision on the 9 compliance report as well as monitoring report to 10 11 be submitted annually for the next three years. 12 In the event recognition is continued 13 following a decision on compliance report, the 14 period of recognition will not exceed five years 15 from the date of the decision if the renewal of 16 accreditation is issued by the senior department 17 official. 18 There is a representative here from the 19 organization so I'll be happy to take any 20 questions you may have. Thank you. 21 DR. LeBLANC: Thank you, Michael. One 22 of the themes of this meeting seems to be around

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

capacity. You said you have obviously flagged 1 2 what appears to be some diminished capacity 3 resources. 4 Could you just reassure us that what you 5 saw did not transfer to diminished capacity resources, for example, did not translate into --6 7 how did that review feel to you in terms of 8 rigor? MR. STEIN: 9 Yes, thank you for that So, we did not find any evidence that 10 question. 11 their small size, the budget or the one Staff 12 Member was negatively impacting their ability to conduct their accreditation activity. 13 14 So, we've had no complaints, no third-party comments, we've received no 15 16 controlled correspondence or letters from 17 constituents that may have come from Members of 18 Congress. 19 And the Agency stated in its letter that it has not had to delay any site visits or 20 21 Commission meeting, and we found no evidence of 22 delay of Commission meetings.

Nevertheless, we recognize the Agency's 1 2 small size has led to challenges in the past. I'm not sure we have seen an Agency that had just 3 4 one Staff Member in the past. 5 But because we found no evidence that 6 their size had a negative impact on their 7 accrediting activities, we couldn't find them 8 non-compliant. 9 However, we're still concerned which is why we're recommending the monitoring report and 10 the finding is substantially compliant. 11 12 DR. LeBLANC: Thank you. 13 DR. BOOTH: I've got a couple questions. 14 He can maybe answer it if we could hear from Dawn 15 and her statements and then I'll pass my 16 questions. 17 DR. LeBLANC: Let me introduce the 18 Executive Director of the Agency, Dawn Hogue, and 19 then to Michael Ross for introductions. 20 MS. HOGUE: Thank you so much. Good 21 morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee. 22 My name is Dawn Hogue and I have the

1 pleasure of serving the Executive Director for 2 the Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation, COMTA. 3 I'm sorry, I don't know if you can see 4 5 me, I can't see myself on the video. DR. LeBLANC: We do not at the moment 6 7 but we can hear you loud and clear. 8 There we go, I think it's MS. HOGUE: 9 coming on now. Thank you for your consideration of our application for renewal of COMTA's 10 11 recognition. 12 I've been in my position since June 2019 13 and prior to that had had a long relationship 14 with the Agency. 15 I started with COMTA in 2007 as a 16 volunteer peer reviewer, site visitor, and also served as a team leader for onsite evaluation 17 18 teams. 19 In 2012 I was elected as a Member of the 20 Commission in the role of an administrator, and 21 in 2014 my fellow Commissioners nominated and elected me to serve as Chair of the Commission 22

1	until 2017 when I was appointed to serve as
2	acting Executive Director, at which time I
3	resigned from my role as a Commissioner.
4	In 2019 the Commission hired me to
5	permanently assume the Executive Director
6	position full time.
7	Prior to my current position with COMTA,
8	I was a school director for over ten years at a
9	COMTA-accredited private, proprietary massage
10	therapy school in Virginia Beach, Virginia.
11	I've been a licensed massage therapist
12	in the Commonwealth of Virginia since 1998. I
13	have a bachelor's degree from Virginia Tech
14	University in Blacksburg, Virginia and a master's
15	degree from Naropa University in Boulder,
16	Colorado.
17	I'm very proud to represent the Agency
18	here today and on behalf of our Commissioners,
19	our school members, volunteers, massage therapy
20	and body work and aesthetics professions, I'm
21	proud to affirm our mission and version.
22	COMTA elevates and upholds standards of

excellence in massage therapy, body work, and
 aesthetics education to a specialized
 accreditation benefitting students in schools,
 practitioners, and the public.

Our version is that all quality massage therapy, body work, and aesthetics institutions or programs are accredited by COMTA.

8 And I'd also like to acknowledge that 9 although I am the designated representative to 10 address the Committee and answer your questions, 11 our Commission Chair is in attendance today and 12 he, along with our entire Board, shares my 13 commitment to the Agency and passion for our 14 purpose.

15 As the new Executive Director, I 16 anticipate that the renewal of recognition 17 process would be a valuable opportunity for my 18 thorough engagement with the recognition criteria 19 and for the Agency's self-review and continued assessment of areas in which we can improve and 20 21 enhance our policies and procedures and 22 operations.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

5

6

1	I welcomed the experience of providing
2	responses to the draft analysis that enabled me
3	to better understand how to present detailed
4	descriptions and relevant evidence that would
5	effectively address the recognition criteria and
6	reflect how we work to maintain our compliance.
7	That said, I also welcome the
8	opportunity to provide follow-up compliance
9	reports to demonstrate to the Committee that
10	COMTA is committed and dedicated to taking
11	actions that will support our Agency's continued
12	quality and integrity, and in turn, our role in
13	supporting the quality and integrity of our
14	member institutions and programs.
15	And we recognize, as was just mentioned,
16	there are a number of criteria from the final
17	analysis that were highlighted requesting
18	additional information.
19	We've already taken steps to address and
20	demonstrate compliance with several that are what
21	I would consider more straightforward.
22	For example, with Section 602.15(a)(4),

1	our Commissioner Chair has just appointed a new
2	Commissioner to fill the open employer position.
3	And that individual is scheduled to be in
4	attendance for our April 2021 Commission meeting.
5	Another example is with regards to
6	Section 602.15 (a)(2), we have now established a
7	formalized and consistent training cycle that
8	will be implemented for current Commissioners and
9	peer reviewers regarding their roles and
10	responsibilities related to the standards of
11	accreditation, policies, procedures, and
12	decision-making, as well as update or institute
13	training procedures for new Commissioners and
14	peer reviewers.
15	We've also designed a process of
16	specific recordkeeeping of those training and
17	orientation sessions.
18	Although we were not able to implement
19	evidence of those updates in time for this
20	review, I share this to demonstrate that we are
21	taking action over mediation as swiftly as we are
22	able.

1	Additionally, during our recent February
2	2021 Commission meeting, we had extensive dialog
3	about Sections 602.16(a)(1)(I), 602.19(b),
4	602.20(a) and 602.20(b).
5	I chose to mention these sections
6	specifically, however, the Commission discussed
7	and addressed each item referenced in the final
8	analysis.
9	The Commission as a whole and the
10	Executive Committee of the focus group of which I
11	am a member will be working together to ensure
12	that we come into full compliance with the
13	criteria as outlined efficiently and effectively.
14	Before I address your questions, I would
15	like to close with my appreciation and gratitude
16	for this opportunity to introduce myself and
17	provide these opening comments, to the Department
18	Staff, in particular Mike Stein, for his
19	assistance throughout this process, and to the
20	Committee Members to the higher education
21	community and for the work and attention that you
22	put into providing thoughtful advice and

recommendations, the Department officials on
COMTA's recognition and each Agency appearing
before you.
Thank you.
DR. LeBLANC: Thank you so much. Before
I turn it over to Ronnie, would you like to
introduce your Board Chair and we can invite him
to turn his video on as well?
Dawn, would you like to introduce your
Board Chair?
MS. HOGUE: Sorry, our Board Chair is
Cliff Korn and he is in the audience today.
DR. LeBLANC: Mr. Korn, you're invited
to turn on your video if you would like to join
the conversation. Why don't you take it away?
DR. BOOTH: Thanks, Paul, thanks, Dawn.
Let me first say I'm glad to say that one of your
graduates is an integral part of our family
healthcare team.
And thanks for pointing out that you're
addressing already some of the concerns raised by
the report. But given the recommendations to

1 date, can you talk to us a little bit about your 2 staffing?

One of the concerns was what I'll call
succession planning, long-term staffing,
planning, given that you're not using quite as
extensively as you have in the past with the
other accrediting agency.

8 They told us a little bit about how 9 you're staffing, how you get things done, your 10 long-term plan there, if you will.

MS. HOGUE: Yes, sir. Thank you for the question and I'm happy to address that. We anticipate that question would arise through this process and recognize that it is rather unique to have a full-time Staff of one.

I have to go back in time just a little IT bit. COMTA has always had a small staff, an Executive Director, and a position, an accreditation content specialist.

That was noted in the final draft analysis of the currently open positions. So, we have a history of being a small Agency, I'd like

to say small but mighty, and we've always 1 2 utilized third-party servicers to help support our operations, such as payroll servicing, 3 4 accounting services. 5 Obviously, we have an auditor that we work with very closely that's a third-party 6 7 service. We have our legal counsel that we 8 utilize as a third-party support system. 9 And so it started I would say around 10 2015, our massage therapy in particular industry. 11 There was some shrinkage that was taking place, 12 schools closing and COMTA in particular had a significant number of corporately owned 13 institutions that closed and closed rather 14 15 abruptly. 16 And so that contributed to a bit of a 17 domino effect in terms of just our financial 18 resources and that sparked this consideration of 19 joining with ACCSE, another accrediting Agency to 20 provide some management support, enter into this 21 management agreement, and also explored this 22 opportunity for dual accreditation, for

institutions accredited by that Agency to become programmatically accredited with COMTA.

3 So, there were a number of conditions 4 taking place at that time that gave us a 5 direction to enter into that management 6 agreement.

7 Of course, again, that would provide 8 additional operational and program support by 9 virtue of their additional staffing and it was at 10 that same time that our Executive Director 11 position became vacant.

12 And so that kind of opened up for the 13 Commission to consider what action needed to be 14 taken at that time to have someone representing 15 that position, which is why they nominated me to 16 fill the role as an acting Executive Director.

And knowing that we had two plus one years in that management agreement with ACCSE, we knew we had some time to assess how that was going to work and how that might unfold if that might become a long-term situation or not. And so as we proceeded through that

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

1 management agreement, ironically enough we were 2 in a period where we did not have a number of renewals, schools going through the renewal 3 4 process. 5 And that's sort of an interesting space that we were in to, I guess, again not have any 6 adverse action in terms of our timelines with a 7 8 small Staff. 9 As we moved through that management agreement and we started to welcome in new 10 11 members applicants, it became clear to us that 12 COMTA's goal was to return to self management. 13 We appreciated the support from ACCSE 14 very, very much and wanted to ensure that we were 15 able to operate successfully on our own as we 16 had. 17 We've been very fortunate to receive 18 wonderful support from our professional allies in 19 the field. 20 We're a part of a coalition of massage 21 therapy organizations and one of those organizations has provided great support for new 22

schools to enter into the accreditation process with COMTA.

3	So, we just completed that management
4	agreement with ACC, I say just because COVID last
5	year was such a time warp that it was actually
6	March last year that we completed that agreement.
7	And so for the past year, we have been
8	re-establishing our processes, our procedures,
9	analyzing our budget, getting through that budget
10	year and ensuring that we had a positive net
11	income, which we did.
12	Again, no renewals so we were not
13	burdened in that way with maybe a workload that
14	might normally be in other years.
15	We are coming into that now as we go
16	through this year and we have budgeted for this
17	current Fiscal Year the hiring of another Staff
18	Member.
19	So, that's already factored into our
20	budget, again, recognizing that need for
21	additional administrative staff.
22	One other piece I'd like to add, and I

1

hope I'm not giving you too much detail but I 1 2 want to just speak to the fact that our Commission and our Executive Director, the 3 Executive Committee, have always had a very close 4 working relationship. 5 And I really don't know how that 6 7 compares to other agencies and their Boards, but 8 with regular communication, weekly and monthly 9 meetings. And so when I was serving as Chair, I 10 was very much acquainted and familiar with the 11 12 operational procedures, needs, issues, that were 13 taking place for the Executive Director. 14 That is the same relationship that I have with Mr. Korn, who I referenced earlier, and 15 16 that he is very much in the loop with everything 17 that I am working on week to week. 18 And so if there were an emergency 19 situation related to my position and my ability to fulfil my function, the Chair could step into 20 21 assume certain aspects that would keep the business moving forward, contract signing, access 22

1 to bank records, et cetera.

But we recognize that just for those
emergency purposes, having that additional Staff
to be the backup when needed but also to help
manage the operational and administrative
responsibilities as our business increases as we
go through this year.

8 We're very pleased that we've had that 9 positive net revenue and again, I think its comes 10 down to a matter of timing, that we just happened 11 to have that window of time where we were able to 12 maneuver through and manage through that last 13 couple of years, with the support of ACCSE.

We're on our feet now, we're doing well, we have support of our allies of our Board and we are projecting forward to resume with that additional staff member.

18 And in the future, hopefully growing
19 into additional staff beyond that. Hope that
20 answers your question. I'm happy to give you
21 more details.

DR. BOOTH: You did answer my question

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1 and you touched on one other related to capacity 2 financially, so you've already got that budgeted for that Staff Member so I'm good with that. 3 4 I do have another question and you 5 touched on this a bit. You filled the Commissioner slot which 6 7 you needed to fill, you are working on the 8 training, but one of the questions that arose was 9 finding appropriate evaluators as you do go out and do site visits. 10 11 So, can you address that? 12 MS. HOGUE: Yes, I can. There we go, I 13 was getting a note about my video so I hope it will come back on momentarily. 14 15 So, as the Staff Member, I'm the one who 16 schedules the site visits and assigns the peer reviewers to those visits. 17 18 We have our peer reviewer manual and our 19 categories of peer reviewers that we are required to fill for our institutional site visits and our 20 programmatic site visits. 21 22 And one thing that is acknowledged in

the draft analysis is that we have a role for a designated practitioner on our site teams both for institutional visits and programmatic visits.

That individual can be served by another role, a visitor, a team member who is serving another role.

7 And so that is I think a piece the 8 Commission and I need to look at in more detail 9 and see how we can come into full compliance, 10 again designating each member of the team with 11 their own specific role.

Up to this point, though, we have not had any issues with filling each visit with the number of visitors that's required and with the area of expertise that relates to their standards.

17So, we had a number of visits scheduled18for this year too and I'm actually in that very19process right now of assigning teams for about20five visits coming up in the summer.21And so, in light of this analysis, I'm

particularly mindful of the qualifications of

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

5

1 each of those peer reviewers.

2 And to what I just mentioned specifically, maintaining a cycle of training, as 3 4 I interpret it, what was referenced in the 5 analysis was that our documentation of ongoing training for peer reviewers and Commissioners 6 7 could be enhanced and improved. 8 And so we are going to, as I said, 9 implement a regular cycle of updates of training for current peer reviewers and Commissioners and 10 11 implement that same cycle as the new 12 Commissioners and peer reviewers come on board. 13 DR. BOOTH: Okay, good, I think it's 14 worth considering as you move into the future and 15 do field visits and site visits to actually document the roles of various evaluators are 16 17 filling this for your own purposes and for 18 purposes of clarity later during questions. 19 Those are my questions, I'll toss it 20 back to you. 21 DR. LeBLANC: Thank you, Ronnie. Can you address some of the capacity staffing 22

training questions? You alluded to a set of other questions that I might put under the umbrella of general rigor.

You said a little bit less about that.
Can you give me examples, for example, where a
review has moved institutions from non-compliance
into compliance and examples of what was that
around?

Where did that occur?

MS. HOGUE: Yes, thank you for thatquestion. It occurs in a number of areas.

We have a category of Commission action that we call condition and so anytime a school is a new accreditation applicant or even a renewal applicant, if they meet all of the standards, maybe except for one or two areas, then we put a condition on that standard and require the school to do follow-up reporting.

One example that we've recently
encountered was with a new Applicant and they had
not yet had an opportunity for their PAC, their
Professional Advisory Committee, to have a

1

2

3

1

synchronous meeting.

2 And so we put a condition on Standard 8, which is program effectiveness, and gave them a 3 period of time in which they needed to provide 4 5 information documenting that their PAC has had their meeting as required. 6 7 Sometimes the conditions relate to a piece of documentation from the faculty file. 8 9 If, for example, a continuing education requirement was not able to be verified in a 10 11 faculty file document, then we would put a 12 condition on Standard 3, as it relates to that 13 item, and require, again, that follow-up 14 reporting and proof of evidence that that piece of continuing education has been taken and 15 16 fulfilled and verify our standard. 17 In the petition I provided some examples 18 relating to our annual reporting, which relates 19 to student benchmarks, student achievement. And 20 so I'll speak to that included in this question. 21 We collect annual reports each year, 22 February 1st, from our institutions and programs

www.nealrgross.com

and they are required to on a chart that we give them provide their completion rate and their placement rates from a particular reporting period.

5 If the Staff reviews those, the Staff 6 does the first review, and if those rates are low 7 then the Commission reviews those and takes the 8 appropriate action, what would typically be, 9 again, a follow-up report acknowledging that the 10 rate, for example, of placement was below the 11 benchmark.

We give them a particular deadline in which they need to follow up and provide that documentation, that they have gathered additional evidence on placement and resubmit the chart, and resubmit the rates, and that is re-evaluated.

17 A condition would be removed in the
18 situations where the issue has been resolved or
19 the condition may be continued but additional
20 time is required.

21 DR. LeBLANC: Have you had instances of 22 adverse action? I think you do now --

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

(Simultaneous Speaking.) 1 2 I'm sorry, do you do about five reviews a year, is that the average? 3 MS. HOGUE: For renewals that is about 4 5 This year in particular we have the average. about six to eight at different points throughout 6 our Fiscal Year but five to six is the average. 7 8 And we've been averaging about eight new 9 schools per year as well. And yes, we do take adverse action. There's one example in the 10 11 petition that has had some very unique 12 circumstances. 13 Adverse action has been taken, timelines 14 have been extended, and we are aware of our extension beyond what is considered the maximum 15 timeframe for that institution. 16 17 That really, I would say, is an outlier 18 in terms of our consistency of monitoring 19 timelines and requiring institutions and programs 20 to come into compliance within the required 21 timeframe. Adverse actions can include probation, 22

of course revocation, which fortunately has happened very rarely. We have had one instance of revocation in the last two years because of a school precipitously closing and probation showed cause.

We don't designate show-cause as an
adverse action but it's an action that requires
the school to show us why their accreditation
should not be revoked.

10And so we do take those actions when the11school is just extremely deficient and we see12that they are unable to come into compliance.

DR. LeBLANC: Dawn, how do you know yourstandards work?

Do you have an evidence base that says this makes a demonstrable difference in the quality of programs?

18 I'll talk more about that in a moment
19 but could you respond to that?
20 MS. HOGUE: Well, we do internal

analysis. Obviously, we do data collection withour annual reporting.

1

2

3

4

I would also add to that question 1 2 several years back we had a research study done by an independent organization so that was a 3 great source of data for us for COMTA accredited 4 5 schools in comparison to non-accredited schools or accredited schools from other agencies. 6 7 The result of that research was that it was shown to be a benefit, COMTA accreditation 8 9 did show evidence that students graduates had 10 better performing outcomes. 11 I reference that study even though it's 12 a few years old because to your question, we also 13 receive great support from, I referenced earlier, 14 our coalition partners, professional partners. Specifically I'm going to reference one, 15 16 the Federation of State Massage Therapy Board. That organization includes member 17 18 licensing Boards from across the country and in 19 2019 at their annual meeting, they presented 20 evidence that they had conducted that showed 21 COMTA accredited schools having much higher than 22 average, for example, pass rates on the Emblex

1 that required licensure for massage therapy 2 license. COMTA-accredited schools had a much 3 4 higher pass rate than the national and even state 5 averages. So, we do collect data, again internally 6 and from our partners that help us recognize that 7 8 our specialized focus, especially with regards to 9 our curriculum competencies and our curriculum standards and faculty qualifications are working, 10 11 as you said. 12 DR. LeBLANC: Dawn, I read that article 13 and was impressed. The one thing I was struck by 14 is it's a very, very small percentage of schools that actually pursue content accreditation. 15 16 Am I right? Even with the decrease in 17 the number of programs nationally. Do you have 18 that percentage? It is tiny. 19 MS. HOGUE: It is very tiny. Oh, gosh, 20 and every year we have another --21 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 22 -- analysis of how many schools are

1 operating in the profession.

I think that number, again just anecdotally, is hovering around 1,200. So, we're maybe less than ten percent of that in terms of our accredited schools and programs.

A challenge that we've faced and we hope 6 there might be some change in the professional 7 8 landscape in the years to come, there's certainly 9 a lot of allies and our own Board and school is working towards that, is that very few states 10 require Applicants or massage therapy or a 11 12 aesthetics licenser to have attended an 13 accredited program.

And so that leaves many schools in the arena of if I don't need it, why should I pursue it? And the cost and small staffing and resources, time, so we try to address those hurdles.

We try to make our process as clear and direct for schools and to provide assistance to them through that. But we recognize that's an inherent challenge and until there might be a tip

1 in that scale, we will likely remain a small 2 percentage. But we affirm that will grow, our 3 4 version that all programs, quality programs, will 5 be accredited by COMTA. That's a significant 6 factor, our small number. DR. LeBLANC: For sure, and I would say, 7 8 though, having read through some of the reviews 9 and institutional reports, I was impressed by the detail and thoroughness of them. 10 11 Final question for the sake of 12 economizing how much time to give you. Are any of your members paid on the Board? 13 14 MS. HOGUE: By COMTA? 15 DR. LeBLANC: I'm asking for a friend. 16 MS. HOGUE: No, sir, all of our 17 Commissioners are volunteers and of course our 18 peer reviewers are volunteers. Yes, I'm the only 19 paid Staff. 20 DR. LeBLANC: Thank you, Dawn. Mr. 21 Korn, do you have any comments you'd like to make 22 before we open up?

1	MR. KORN: I do not really have comments
2	other than to say how pleased I am to have opened
3	the job because I think she did an excellent job
4	of explaining the perfect storm we went through
5	maybe three years ago.
6	And I think the steps we're taking right
7	now to overcome that and get to an actual
8	position of growth, that has a positive bottom
9	line and she's a large part of that. And I
10	consider myself smart for offering her the job.
11	But I think we really are at a place now
12	where we can be proud and I think the profession
13	is part of what COMTA's doing.
14	As you mentioned, one of the
15	organizations that's actually helping to fund
16	first-year schools into accreditation because
17	they think it's important to growth of the
18	profession.
19	So, yes, we are small and until there's
20	some sort of required accreditation in the
21	educational system of massage therapy and
22	aesthetics, we will likely remain small.

1	But our percentage is growing and I
2	think our market share is growing. So, I think
3	we're on a very good path right now. We do have
4	plans to support our growth with additional
5	staffing and that's really all I would like to
6	say.
7	So, I thank you for your oversight
8	because the report we got has discussed that at
9	length by the COMTA Commission.
10	And I think the next time you see us
11	there if you have a consent agenda my guess is
12	this will be on it.
13	DR. LeBLANC: Thank you very much.
14	We'll open it to my colleagues.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Paul. Please
16	raise your hands if you have any questions?
17	David then Bob.
18	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you, I appreciate
19	the remarks and the explanations. As far as
20	Dawn, I thought I heard you say that a couple of
21	schools closed unexpectedly or under unusual
22	circumstances.

ĺ	
1	If that's the case, can you describe
2	were you alerted before they closed? What
3	happened to students and what did you learn from
4	that experience?
5	MS. HOGUE: Thank you, David.
6	I did reference a large number of
7	corporately owned and operated schools that
8	closed several years ago, which directly impacted
9	our financial budget and, therefore, our
10	exploration of entering into the management
11	agreement.
12	In those situations, we did have
13	notification and so we weren't blindsided by that
14	but the notification was not such that it gave us
15	a timeline of, say, another year to plan and
16	project.
17	Their closure was, rather, short term or
18	within several months or six months. And so,
19	again, any kind of financial impact we were not
20	able to project for that.
21	That was prior to my role on Staff. I
22	was part of the Commission but I think that

reflects a bit of a wave, if you will, that was
 taking place at that time.

A large corporate entity had purchased 3 some very well-known proprietary and privately 4 5 owned massage therapy schools across the country. And maybe it speaks to the quality of 6 7 those programs, the expense of those programs, 8 the financial burden on those programs to achieve 9 enrollment levels that would continue to support 10 them. 11 It all contributed to their having to 12 close and not having the financial resources to 13 support them. 14 We in the last year or two have had --I can probably count on one hand the number of 15 16 schools that have closed. 17 And in those instances, again, one was 18 a rather short notice and came in conjunction 19 with some communication with the financial 20 student aid department. One school that I referenced whose 21 accreditation status we revoked, that school we 22

www.nealrgross.com

1 did not have notice of.

2	That was a very unfortunate situation
3	with a change of ownership and the new owners,
4	through our process of verification and approval
5	of the new opening statement, became unavailable.
6	They did not return correspondence and
7	also through communication with the State Board
8	that was in Florida, we were alerted to the fact
9	that there were some concerns about their
10	operation.
11	And so that happened in a very quick
12	timeframe, the action we took in response to the
13	notification we received.
14	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Bob?
16	MR. SHIREMAN: Thank you, Dawn, for your
17	very thoughtful and thorough responses to the
18	Staff and the Staff report and to the questioning
19	today. This is a question for you or maybe for
20	Clifford.
21	Among other things, Section 602.15
22	requires content to have qualified and competent

1 representatives of the public on all 2 decision-making bodies. Another regulation describes what that 3 4 is not but there's no description of what a 5 representative of the public is or should not be. Can you tell us a bit about how your 6 Agency interprets that mandate that your 7 8 decision-making be guided in part by 9 representatives of the public? And feel free to tell us about the 10 11 public members that you have on your Board. 12 Thanks. 13 MS. HOGUE: Thank you for the 14 opportunity. 15 I'm proud to talk about our Commissioner 16 Members any opportunity that I get and I will 17 certainly defer to Cliff if he wants to add any 18 comments. 19 We have two Members, public Members, on our Commission, both of whom are from the higher 20 21 education community. 22 That is a requirement at least one of

1	our public Members, as well as having some
2	experience with distance education in a higher
3	education setting.
4	Of course, we prevent that our public
5	Member had any Association with another
6	professional Association, another partner of ours
7	in the professional landscape of massage or
8	aesthetics.
9	So, they really do have to come from
10	outside of our profession and be able to give us
11	that perspective of someone who's not from the
12	inside because most of us, in fact all of us, are
13	in some way, shape, or form.
14	And so from the fact that they also
15	bring that perspective from higher education is
16	very valuable to us.
17	And so our guidelines for the public
18	Members, I don't have my dialog up on the
19	computer in front of me, but they are in line
20	with the Department's criteria.
21	And we have two excellent ones right
22	now, one of whom is a professor at Drexel

1 University and the other of whom is a professor 2 at an online university, and the name is escaping me at this moment. 3 I think it's Thomas 4 MR. SHIREMAN: 5 Edison State University, is that right? That's right, yes. Jeffrey 6 MS. HOGUE: 7 Hawkins, yes. Cliff, would you like to add 8 anything? 9 MR. KORN: I think you answered it well. I will say once in the past we had a 10 11 public Member who was associated with an 12 institution that started to develop a massage program and we had to ask her for her service and 13 14 she was a Commissioner from the public. 15 So, we follow the dialogs quite strictly 16 on that and right now I too am very pleased with 17 the public Members we have. 18 They're very engaged, very smart and are 19 involved in all our decision-making. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Any other 21 questions from Members of the Committee? 22 Hearing none, thank you very much Ms.

1 Hogue and I'll call Michael back to answer any 2 questions by the Committee or observations. There are no third-party observers. 3 Are there any questions for Mike Stein? 4 5 (Simultaneous Speaking.) I have no further MR. SHIREMAN: 6 7 comments. 8 DR. LeBLANC: I think we're good. If 9 you're ready I'll make a motion? 10 CHAIR KEISER: I guess I am ready 11 because there's no more conversation so Paul, 12 you're up. 13 DR. LeBLANC: I'd like to move for a 5-14 year renewal subject to a compliance report in 12 15 months and an annual monitoring report for the 16 next three years that will focus on capacity, 17 specifically finance and staffing. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Do you have that, 19 Valerie? 20 MS. LEFOR: Just one minute. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second to the motion? 22

DR. BOOTH: Art, this is Ronnie, I'll 1 2 second. CHAIR KEISER: The motion has been made 3 and seconded. We're waiting for Valerie to get 4 5 the information up and then we will have any discussion on the motion. 6 7 It appears there's no CHAIR KEISER: 8 discussion. Let's go for a roll call vote. Can 9 you bring it down? Okay. Anne? Yes but I will say I'm glad 10 MS. NEAL: there are conditions on this. I think there's a 11 12 number of questions so I'm glad we will be 13 hearing more reporting. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Claude? 15 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 16 CHAIR KEISER: David? 17 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 19 Actually, I had my hand MS. BLUM: Yes. 20 up, you just didn't see it but I would say 21 exactly what Anne said. This is essentially what 22 I was suggesting the other day so I'm happy to

1	see it there.
2	CHAIR KEISER: I did not see your hand,
3	I'm sorry. And I'm sorry I didn't see Roslyn's
4	hand either.
5	MS. BLUM: I really raised it.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, I'll get to you
7	when we go down the list. Jill?
8	DR. DERBY: Yes.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
10	DR. ALIOTO: I concur with Anne and
11	Jennifer and say yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: That's a yes. Mary
13	Ellen?
14	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Paul?
16	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
18	MD. O'DONNELL: Yes.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
20	MR. MAYES: Yes.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Robert Shireman?
22	MR. SHIREMAN: Yes.

1 CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie Booth? 2 DR. BOOTH: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: You ended up being last 3 this time. Before you were first. Roslyn? 4 5 DR. ARTIS: Yes. The motion passes, thank 6 CHAIR KEISER: you Agency and congratulations. 7 8 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 9 DR. BOSTON: I vote yes also, Art. CHAIR KEISER: Oh, Wally, did I miss 10 11 you? 12 (Simultaneous Speaking.) DR. VanAUSDLE: And this is Steve. 13 I'11 14 vote yes. 15 You're not even on this CHAIR KEISER: 16 one. 17 DR. VanAUSDLE: What's the deal? 18 CHAIR KEISER: Valerie, where's she? 19 Okay, Steve has now been added in and you voted Did I miss anybody else? Well, thank you 20 yes. 21 all. 22 Okay, we're now moving to the discussion

1 from yesterday that's back on the table. I will 2 introduce Mary Ellen Patrisko to set us up. Thank you. Art, I think 3 DR. PETRISKO: 4 first we are going to have a comment about the IG 5 report before we move on to the specifics of the 6 current review. 7 So, I don't know how you want to handle 8 the IG? 9 CHAIR KEISER: That's fine, this is you and Claude. So, how would you like to go ahead 10 11 with the IG report? 12 DR. BOOTH: I need to recuse myself. Ronnie and I think Bob is 13 CHAIR KEISER: 14 also going to recuse himself. We'll call you 15 back when we're ready. Okay, Mary Ellen, you're 16 leading the discussion. 17 DR. PETRISKO: Thank you. So, first I'd 18 like to note that we agreed yesterday that the IG 19 report which dealt with the 2019 review and the 20 2018 decision of the Department would be reviewed 21 by the Committee. 22 And we would take that into

consideration for the conversation and vote today 1 2 would occur. Having read that report last night, I agree that the final statement the 3 review does not actually affect this decision --4 5 the four reviews that we have done are not affected by what the IG found in that report, 6 7 which really was focused on how the 2016 decision 8 and very importantly, the 2018 decision was made 9 with regards to ACICS.

10 So, although that report provided further insight into those actions, that insight 11 12 does not affect what we have seen and heard in 13 the evidence that we have currently with these 14 four reviews. So, what I would say there, I don't know, if others would love to 15 16 comment on that? I would like to go on with a 17 statement about ACICS now if that's appropriate. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Well, does anybody else 19 have a comment? Bob, did you raise your hand? 20 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes, I do. I want to

agree with Mary Ellen that the report explicitly indicated that the decisions being made today are

21

22

not impacted or weren't included in the report analysis.

3	The only question I would have for the
4	Staff so that we don't repeat what happened in
5	2016 is that is there any other information that
6	has been filed regarding these four reports by
7	the Agency that we have not been able to
8	consider?
9	Because that's the crux of the IT
10	report, that the criticism of the Department and
11	the criticism of the decision was around that
12	there was a very large amount of evidence that
13	were not considered in the decisions.
14	So, let me just ask that point blank.
15	In the considerations that we have on these four
16	reports, is there any additional information that
17	we have not considered?
18	Herman?
19	MR. BOUNDS: Yes, I can tell you I'm not
20	aware of any.
21	They have some comments but I'm not
22	aware of any additional information that's not

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

1	included in the record before this meeting.
2	CHAIR KEISER: I'm sorry, go ahead.
3	MS. DAGGETT: I don't know, did you want
4	me to respond there?
5	As far as I'm aware, any documentation
6	that was provided by ACICS in response to these
7	four inquiries and reports are included in all
8	the documentation that you have before you that
9	was included in the erecognition system.
10	DR. PRESSNELL: Thank you. The only
11	other comment I would make is that the decisions
12	we're making based on these four reports are
13	consistent with what the IG report found as
14	legitimate inquiries.
15	As a result again, I do agree with Mary
16	Ellen that based on the answers we received from
17	the Department here today, the report, although
18	informative, does not have direct bearing on the
19	consideration of these four reports.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
22	MS. BLUM: Oh, I thought I was moving.

Go ahead. I'm here, can you hear me? 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: I can hear you, get closer though. 3 4 MS. BLUM: So, I agree with the point 5 that Claude just said about we need to get the process right this time. And that's what I've 6 7 been struggling with a little bit. 8 I do have a couple of other questions 9 for the Department, I don't want to necessarily ask them now but I'm just wondering if there's 10 11 going to be that opportunity or not about their 12 process on these four matters. 13 CHAIR KEISER: Right now we're 14 discussing the IG report. MS. BLUM: Okay, so I just want to 15 16 second what Claude said, which is that I think 17 the most important thing now is the IG report is 18 the findings around the process case and the 19 need. 20 It just puts more urgency on us or on 21 the process. I just wanted to say that. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Yes, and Anne, you'd like

1

to make a comment?

-	
2	MS. NEAL: I just want to be certain
3	this is part of the record. I do feel it deals
4	directly with the 2016 and 2018 actions and those
5	are a critical piece of where we've gotten today.
6	So, I think in that regard it's quite
7	relevant to our consideration. It's an important
8	part of the background behind this situation and
9	so I do feel it should be in the record.
10	And to the argument made yesterday by
11	the accreditor's attorney, it will be up to the
12	senior department official to assess what the
13	weight and value of the report is.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Herman, is your hand
15	still up or is that just from before?
16	MR. BOUNDS: That's just from before,
17	sorry. Let me take it down.
18	CHAIR KEISER: I'd like to agree with
19	Anne in that discussion. I think the negative
20	action taken in 2016 has colored the debate and
21	colored the discussion.
22	It certainly has been referred to

1 multiple times and I think the IG certainly 2 brought questions about the efficacy of our decision that we made in 2016. 3 I also believe there's a lot of 4 5 information in the materials that were presented 6 to us that refer back to 2016 and 2018 and, therefore are relevant in terms of where the IG 7 8 report went. 9 So, I don't think we can avoid it but I think we need to take that into consideration and 10 11 it's certainly in our discussion. 12 Was there somebody else? Mary Ellen, 13 I'm going back to you and you had a comment you 14 wanted make. 15 Yes, I'd actually like to DR. PETRISKO: read a statement and it is as follows. 16 17 Before moving to propose that we move to 18 vote up or down on the Staff recommendations the 19 ACICS be found out of compliance, the criteria 20 cited in the final Staff report on these four 21 reviews. 22 Claude and I would both like to say the

1 following.

2	After reviewing the voluminous material
3	provided to the Committee, I'll cite it as 9000-
4	some pages, and hearing the Agency responses to
5	the Committee's question, we asked ourselves how
6	would we evaluate this Agency if it's name were
7	not ACICS?
8	Our response is we would evaluate it in
9	the same manner. We're not convinced by the
10	evidence and the response we have seen and heard
11	that significant reforms have been made.
12	Reforms, for example, that would no
13	longer allow for what we have seen as an
14	insufficient process to determine eligibility for
15	accreditation and institutions ongoing compliance
16	of eligibility criteria.
17	We did not hear that the Agency would
18	not allow for deferral after deferral of a new
19	institution's application for accreditation,
20	contradicting promises for more stringent
21	decisions and an emphasis on compliance over
22	improvement.

We have seen evidence of our process for 1 2 the review of findings resulting from evaluate visits that gives confidence in institutions 3 4 having addressed those findings. 5 We have not seen the fulfilment of a promise made nearly five years ago to work with 6 7 veterans groups and the State Attorney General, 8 nor did we hear or see support from any students 9 for the Agency as we did the last time the agency was before us. 10 11 Even though the Agency was given an 12 additional 12 months in 2018 to come into 13 compliance with all recognition criteria, two 14 years after the 2016 of permanent recognition, it 15 had not done so by the end of 2019. 16 Although we were told of many changes 17 that the Agency has made over the last years, we 18 do not believe based on what we have seen in 19 evidence provided in 2020 and heard yesterday 20 that we have been provided sufficient grounds to 21 make a recommendation based on those statements 22 of change.

1 So, with that, I would move to propose 2 that we go to the votes on the four... Thanks, Mary Ellen. 3 CHAIR KEISER: Is The motion is what? 4 there a motion? 5 MS. NEAL: I'm sorry, I thought yesterday we were told we could still ask 6 7 questions. 8 CHAIR KEISER: Well, we will once we get 9 the motion on the floor. Then we can ask all the 10 questions we want. 11 MS. NEAL: No, I don't mean folks here, 12 I mean of the Staff and the Agency. CHAIR KEISER: There will be time for 13 14 that. 15 MS. BLUM: Anne had her hand up and gave 16 it a break, and then we came back and 17 decided...the seconding. 18 CHAIR KEISER: I don't remember that. 19 I thought we finished our discussion. 20 DR. SMITH: Yes, so it's my 21 understanding that Anne or any Committee Member can ask our Department Staff a question but you 22

1 couldn't bring the Agency back.

2 If you recall, Anne did have her hand up at the very end of the discussion. 3 So, Anne can 4 answer questions along the way. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Is there anybody from the mission on the line? 6 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 7 -- opportunity. 8 9 MS. NEAL: I am happy then just to affirm it. Just particularly in light of the 10 11 capacity question we just had with the one person 12 and challenging issues, I want to get back to the capacity issue for this one. 13 14 Since we're dealing with the consistency of application of rules and regulations and we 15 16 heard from two IG reports that this is a 17 continuing problem within the Department. 18 And I feel after attending the last 19 three days that it is a continuing problem. So, yesterday we learned about the 20 21 Department having a trend analysis of the 22 finances notwithstanding the audit report.

1 I just wanted to ask Herman, is it true 2 that in November of 2020 that you found they had sufficient financial resources? 3 4 MR. BOUNDS: Which Agency are you 5 referring to, Anne? MS. NEAL: I'm referring to ACICS, the 6 one we're talking about now. 7 8 Beth can probably give you MR. BOUNDS: 9 better details about the financial position in 2020 as she conducted the report. So, I would 10 11 ask her to respond to that. 12 No, but I'm asking you MS. NEAL: 13 because I believe you were the one who made the 14 statement. 15 MR. BOUNDS: A statement in 2020? 16 MS. NEAL: Yes, it was in the record 17 that you found that they had the financial 18 wherewithal and sufficient financial resources. 19 MR. BOUNDS: Anne, I'm sorry I'm not 20 clear on what statement you're referring to that 21 I made a statement they were stable in 2020. 22 MS. NEAL: Well, I would have to go find

1 it in the record.

2	MR. BOUNDS: I'm not aware of any
3	statement I made saying they were stable in 2020.
4	If you look at the review that was just
5	conducted, it does show a decline in assets over
6	the past few years.
7	I don't know where that stability part
8	came into play.
9	MS. NEAL: Let me say it again. In
10	November of 2020 I believe you were on the record
11	saying that you found that they had sufficient
12	financial resources.
13	MR. BOUNDS: I'm saying, Anne, I do not
14	recall that statement. If you can show that to
15	me then I may be able to respond to it.
16	MS. NEAL: I'll have to go back to the
17	9000 pages and see if I can find it.
18	MR. BOUNDS: Okay, because I'm unaware
19	of that statement. We can call back
20	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
21	MS. NEAL: because I do believe it is
22	in the record.

1 MS. DAGGETT: There's too many buttons, 2 sorry about that. I'm not aware of anything that was transmitted in November of 2020. 3 I'm sorry. 4 MS. NEAL: I didn't say it was 5 transmitted. He's on the record of as saying it. I'm not sure what that is. 6 MS. DAGGETT: MS. NEAL: I will try to find it. 7 8 Let me ask you, Herman, also I know that 9 you are cautioned against speculating and when we talked to the funeral service people earlier and 10 we raised some concerns, we were told not to be 11 speculating about the particular challenges. 12 13 And so I guess I want to ask you -- I'm 14 concerned when I see Staff reports which say, which could be or likely are the reasons. Or say 15 16 it's still inexplicable. 17 I'm hoping that going forward, when we 18 receive Staff reports they are factual and that 19 they are not speculating and that they are not 20 using adjectives and descriptors. 21 But rather, they're trying to present to us the facts on which we can make our decision. 22

I know this has been raised back in 2016 that
Staff reports often were filled with
characterizations.
And I guess I remain concerned that
still is the case.
MR. BOUNDS: So, I will say in a Staff
analysis, with the differences in accrediting
agencies, there are 64 accrediting organizations
right now that the Secretary recognizes.
They are all different, they are of all
different sizes and they have all different
missions.
We conduct a fact-based, what we would
call objective review of when we can but you
aren't going to be able to root out all of the
subjectivity out of a recognition review.
They are something that are just not cut
and dry, that's why there's the two-step process.
We have Department Staff that conduct the review,
we do the best job that we can to determine the
compliance of the Agency with each of the
criteria.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1And then you have NACIQI, which is an218-member body who can gauge on opinion from 183different people. And then those recommendations4go to the senior department official.5It's the same thing with most of us who6have taught in classrooms. You can't take out7all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't8design a rubric to fix all things. There is9still going to be some subjectivity there.10We will do the best we can, that's why11I'm very happy that we have this two-part12process, where we have Staff review and then we13have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty14of the recognition process.15And then the senior department official16will look at both of those recommendations and	
 different people. And then those recommendations go to the senior department official. It's the same thing with most of us who have taught in classrooms. You can't take out all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't design a rubric to fix all things. There is still going to be some subjectivity there. We will do the best we can, that's why I'm very happy that we have this two-part process, where we have Staff review and then we have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. 	
 go to the senior department official. It's the same thing with most of us who have taught in classrooms. You can't take out all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't design a rubric to fix all things. There is still going to be some subjectivity there. We will do the best we can, that's why I'm very happy that we have this two-part process, where we have Staff review and then we have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. And then the senior department official 	
5 It's the same thing with most of us who 6 have taught in classrooms. You can't take out 7 all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't 8 design a rubric to fix all things. There is 9 still going to be some subjectivity there. 10 We will do the best we can, that's why 11 I'm very happy that we have this two-part 12 process, where we have Staff review and then we 13 have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty 14 of the recognition process. 15 And then the senior department official	t
 have taught in classrooms. You can't take out all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't design a rubric to fix all things. There is still going to be some subjectivity there. We will do the best we can, that's why I'm very happy that we have this two-part process, where we have Staff review and then we have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. And then the senior department official 	t
 all subjectivity from the classroom and you can't design a rubric to fix all things. There is still going to be some subjectivity there. We will do the best we can, that's why I'm very happy that we have this two-part process, where we have Staff review and then we have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. And then the senior department official 	t
 design a rubric to fix all things. There is still going to be some subjectivity there. We will do the best we can, that's why I'm very happy that we have this two-part process, where we have Staff review and then we have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. And then the senior department official 	t
 9 still going to be some subjectivity there. 10 We will do the best we can, that's why 11 I'm very happy that we have this two-part 12 process, where we have Staff review and then we 13 have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty 14 of the recognition process. 15 And then the senior department official 	
10We will do the best we can, that's why11I'm very happy that we have this two-part12process, where we have Staff review and then we13have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty14of the recognition process.15And then the senior department official	
11I'm very happy that we have this two-part12process, where we have Staff review and then we13have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty14of the recognition process.15And then the senior department official	
12 process, where we have Staff review and then we 13 have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty 14 of the recognition process. 15 And then the senior department official	
 have NACIQI review. I think that is the beauty of the recognition process. And then the senior department official 	
14 of the recognition process. 15 And then the senior department official	
15 And then the senior department official	
-	
16 will look at both of those recommendations and	
17 that person then will have to make the final	
18 recognition decision.	
19 But you're going to have some	
20 subjectivity in a Staff analysis. We try to	
21 limit it but some's going to be there.	
22 MS. NEAL: Well, I just hope going	

73

forward that it is limited because I haven't seen 1 2 it in other contexts. Can I also just have some clarification? 3 There were third parties which provided 4 5 their response to your -- and you submitted a 6 Federal Register notice. I think it was vis a 7 vis the monitoring report, and this was 8 surprising to me. 9 I was not aware of the Federal Register notice and I wasn't aware of the ability of 10 11 third-party comments from when there is a 602.33. 12 Could you explain to me what's been happening 13 there? 14 So, there are two Federal MR. BOUNDS: Register notices that go out in association with 15 16 a NACIQI meeting. The first notice that goes out 17 is of the accreditation group or is of the Staff. 18 That notice to the public that you have 19 agencies that are currently under review that are 20 going to appear in the NACIQI meeting. Because 21 of the margin, we have found some non-compliant 22 issues.

Then there is the later notice that now 1 2 the new regulations require. It's published 30 days prior to the NACIQI meeting. 3 4 And that notice is more in the purview 5 of the FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee, which maybe George can speak to. 6 7 But that notice invited oral commenters 8 to come to the meeting. 9 MS. NEAL: I'm asking about your end location of 602.33 which became central to your 10 11 analysis of ACICS, which allowed public comments 12 to come in in response to some reports. 13 And I guess I'm just not aware of the 14 public comment responding to that rule. MR. BOUNDS: Our notice doesn't allow 15 16 for public comment, it allows for written 17 third-party comments so they have to write in. 18 When those comments come in, they become 19 part of the Staff analysis and then the analyst who is conducting that review will review those 20 21 third-party comments and make note within the 22 petition for recognition.

1 Or in this case the monitoring report or 2 the compliance report. But if you were doing a mid-3 MS. NEAL: 4 cycle review, you're saying that whenever there's 5 a 602.33 you will be requesting public comments? Because I'm aware of 602.33 reviews that 6 did not request public comment. 7 8 MR. BOUNDS: If the 602.33 9 investigations require a NACIQI appearance, if 10 you have to appear before NACIQI, there has to be 11 an announcement of that appearance, an 12 announcement of those agencies under review if we 13 are planning to bring that Agency before NACIQI. 14 And if you need further collaboration, 15 Angela and Donna are on the phone. They can 16 explain too but if you're going to bring in an 17 agency into a -- for a NACIQI review, they need 18 to be on that Federal Register notice to inform 19 the public. 20 MS. NEAL: Thank you. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Is that it, Anne? Okay, Rick and then Jennifer, and then I'd like to 22

1 speak.

2	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes, my question is for
3	Beth, it's similar to Anne's but slightly
4	different. Could you clarify?
5	I think I heard the Agency say yesterday
6	that the draft Staff report did not have a
7	concern about their financial solvency and the
8	final Staff report did.
9	So, I'm curious if that's accurate? And
10	what prompted the change between the draft and
11	the final Staff report regarding their final
12	financial situation?
13	MS. DAGGETT: I think what they're
14	referencing is well, actually, I'm not sure
15	exactly which report because there's always a ton
16	of them.
17	I think it's a mindframe report and in
18	the draft we did say that it appeared that they
19	had let's see, I'm sorry.
20	What we said in the draft report,
21	although the documentation indicates the Agency
22	is currently operating at a deficit and it's

projected to do so until 2023, the ACICS reported 1 2 sufficient reserves to cover this operating deficit and a level of those reserves are in line 3 with other similarly-sized accrediting agencies. 4 But then further, beyond that, we ask 5 for specific documentation because we only had 6 the reserve account through November of 2019. 7 8 We asked for specific investment 9 statements and any plans to address any operating deficits with regards to the negative impact of 10 anything related to the coronavirus. 11 12 We then also asked for their financial production included within their budget to 13 14 include their operating results, their operating budgets, and audit of financial statements. 15 16 So, based on the information they 17 initially provided, we had continued questions 18 but we were hoping the information and 19 documentation that we provided would answer those 20 continued questions and provide a definitive 21 answer. But instead they turned in a different 22

1 direction.

2 MR. O'DONNELL: Thank you for your 3 clarification.

Jennifer? 4 CHAIR KEISER: 5 Thanks, Art. So, I just MS. BLUM: 6 wanted to say from the conversation yesterday 7 that I did find both Herman and Beth more 8 compelling on the answers around questions around 9 consistency. Having said that, I have some follow-up questions about process and 10 11 decision-making. Which one do I want to do 12 first? I'll do the training one first.

So, Beth, you said yesterday that I
asked about the four different reports and
whether they each stand alone or whether it's the
aggregate, and you answered that each of them
stand alone for legal purposes.

So, I want to go back to that and I
think you also said that of all of those, the
compliance one was the most disturbing. And
frankly, I'll just be honest, I do get a little
confused from all these reports and they are

1 overlapping.

2	So, let me just ask this question for
3	myself before I ask the two questions. Am I
4	correct that the compliance report, the meat of
5	the well, not the meat but a substantial
6	portion of the compliance report is related to
7	the training questions or issues in non-
8	compliance that you found?
9	I just wanted to make sure I had the
10	right report. So, you mentioned that was one of
11	the most serious concerns. I just want to ask
12	first a process question.
13	They gave you that report and they
14	responded I think in December of 2019. That
15	report didn't come up at a meeting at the July
16	meeting of NACIQI last year.
17	Why is it coming up now when we know
18	there's a full petition this July which will be
19	frankly a more complete record coming in six
20	months?
21	And to the extent that we're concerned
22	about the Agency sending this report back. So,

if that was the most serious finding and it
 stands alone, how come the Department didn't
 bring it up last year?

MS. DAGGETT: The only answer I can say is that a practical decision was made by the DeVos administration to try to consolidate all the reports together because they felt like it was not appropriate to have one report at one time when other reports were in process.

10 MS. BLUM: I just needed an answer on 11 that because to me I keep talking about it and my 12 head will always be an attorney head on this and 13 due process.

And I'm not here to sit here to defend the Agency and I keep saying I'm new, I'm very late to this party, this consideration.

And that will definitely inform how I
handle voting but I'm weighing and I'm seeing
this process issue. So, I just wanted that on
tape.

21 And then I had a second question, which 22 is more to the substance of that decision. So, I

guess the concern and the frustration -- and I 1 2 again want to say what I said yesterday, Beth. The work of the Staff at the Department 3 4 is yeoman's work. You guys are doing yeoman's 5 work. So, I also just want to make sure that 6 it's clear that I'm not questioning the really 7 8 hard work and dedication of the Department Staff 9 but I do want to ask the question about this 10 particular one. 11 So, I'm a little confused whether the 12 finding against ACICS here on the training is a 13 frustration that they were non-responsive about 14 their training or whether it's that they didn't 15 train. 16 To me, if they didn't train, that would be a very serious concern. 17 I'm not saying it's 18 not frustrating and really concerning, because it 19 is also concerning that they didn't respond. 20 We're talking about removal here and 21 we're talking about 48,000 students. So, I just 22 want to understand is the training that they were

non-responsive for a year or is it that they 1 2 didn't train? MS. DAGGETT: I believe they didn't 3 train. 4 5 They did not provide the documentation but Dr. Teneyuca and Dr. Minore and forgive me, I 6 7 don't have the name of the person who had the 8 just-in-time training, they provided statements 9 that the just-in-time training was provided, that they didn't provide any documentation or 10 11 anything to demonstrate even what they talked 12 about with that person. 13 And then for Dr. Teneyuca and Dr. 14 Minore they relied solely on the paper 15 qualifications, which I went back to the 16 Secretary's decision, which referenced the SDO 17 recommendation which directly said that paper 18 qualification was not enough and the refresher 19 training was required. 20 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 21 MS. BLUM: That's great. To be honest 22 with you, the record to me is not clear on that

1	so I felt an importance to make it clear.
2	But I do have one other question because
3	I think they said yesterday and this would be
4	extremely helpful I think they referenced
5	yesterday.
6	I might be getting confusing standards
7	and things so correct me again if I'm wrong. I
8	think Ray said something along the lines of
9	and I think I might be blurring qualifications
10	with training.
11	But at least it related to one of the
12	people the Department said wasn't trained. I
13	think part of their argument back was this person
14	had been trained many times or had lots of
15	experience before, something to that effect.
16	There was a requirement both
17	qualification and training. Do those standards
18	require a continual update?
19	Or in fairness to them, is there sort of
20	a place where if the visitors or whoever it is
21	involved in the Department or at the Agency were
22	good enough?

1	I just want to understand that piece and
2	also to the extent that you are really kicking
3	the tires and I understand why you're kicking
4	the tires really hard on this issue with ACICS.
5	But do we kick the tires just as hard as
6	all of the other agencies on this 11th-hour need
7	to have a fill-in site visitor and those types of
8	issues?
9	MS. DAGGETT: I think the difference
10	here is that when we ask the question, it depends
11	on the answer that we get. The answer that we
12	got wasn't sufficient in this particular regard.
13	If they were to answer the question and
14	said we provided the training, and in fact their
15	answer was we have 100 percent, we've trained
16	everybody using the refresher training.
17	And we never acquired it prior to any of
18	those site visitors being on a site visit team.
19	They provided the documentation that
20	said that was their requirement, they provided
21	the documentation of who attended which webinar,
22	but they didn't demonstrate that all of the

I

www.nealrgross.com

individuals who had served on site teams that they said it was a requirement had met that requirement.

4 So, I provided that response in the 5 draft, Staff's analysis saying there were five 6 people that didn't appear on any of those. And 7 they responded back with the individuals that 8 they had not done the training or they had paper 9 qualifications.

10 So, I go by what the information is they 11 provide and the documentation they provide to 12 determine whether or not they're in compliance or 13 not.

14 And it's not just what I said before, 15 the regulations, but also what are the policies 16 and procedure that the Agency put in place and 17 they should be held accountable to? 18 MS. BLUM: That's helpful, thank you. 19 Elizabeth, I have a CHAIR KEISER: 20 couple of questions. I looked everywhere and I 21 have not been able to see audited financial statements for 2020. 22

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

1	What I do see is unaudited statements
2	and they show a balance in their Harris Bank
3	Account of \$8,345,000.
4	Where did you get the \$2 million balance
5	that you talked about yesterday?
6	MS. DAGGETT: I'm sorry, I don't think
7	I said a \$2 million balance, I said they had a
8	\$2.2 million negative change in net onset from
9	operations.
10	And I got that from the June 30, 2020
11	audited financial statements, which are included
12	as an analyst upload.
13	They're not under the Agency documents,
14	I uploaded them separately.
15	CHAIR KEISER: And I would have found
16	that where?
17	MS. DAGGETT: It would have been in
18	Section 602.15(a)(1) under the monitoring report,
19	which is the report that was dated 2/24/2020 on
20	the report and the erecognition system.
21	CHAIR KEISER: I've looked and I cannot
22	find it. 2/22/21, final review and the staffing

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 87

do not meet I assume the last one. 1 2 MS. DAGGETT: It's 602.15(a)(1). CHAIR KEISER: I don't have any 3 4 documents, no files uploaded. I'm sorry, I just 5 haven't...But did the auditor in that statement use then a qualified statement? 6 7 Did they consider them a risk of ongoing -- normally, the ongoing entity, they cannot 8 9 continue. MS. DAGGETT: I don't believe they did. 10 11 So, if the auditors did CHAIR KEISER: 12 not feel they could not meet their future 13 requirements, why does the Department not feel 14 that? 15 Especially after the last review where 16 we had a school or an Agency that had a problem 17 and certainly with a lot less resources than \$8 18 million in the bank and considering them 19 financially unsound. 20 To look at four years down the line, 21 certainly, as the IG talked about speculation, 22 that would be speculating they wouldn't meet

their financial requirements four years down the
 line.

How do we justify that?

MS. DAGGETT: I can speak to ACICS in that it's a continual downward trend and it's not a little bit of money.

\$2.2 million change in net assets from
operations in one year is significant and this
has been an ongoing trend in that direction.

10 And if you look at their reserve 11 accounts, they themselves said I think it was 12 \$8.5 million in their statements. The \$2.2 13 million, that's only a couple of years of them 14 being able to do that.

15 I believe Steve also asked them about
16 their plans for increasing any kind of membership
17 and they had three that they just added since the
18 moratorium was lifted in 2018.

19 They have three that are getting ready 20 for on site reviews and then 18 that could 21 potentially be accredited by them. But then they 22 also are making their assumptions based on

3

maintaining where they are.

1

2

3

4

5

6

And I went back and looked and since their submission of the monitoring report when they said had 100 campuses, they're down to around 75 U.S. campuses. So, this just is not sustainable.

7 CHAIR KEISER: Doesn't the IG kind of 8 suggest that when we withdrew their recognition, 9 it would have caused significant economic 10 hardships on them because all of their schools 11 had to move, make a decision to stay and take the 12 risk of staying with them or with an 18-month-13 period had to leave.

So, many of their schools had to leave and again, assuming that they're still under this sword over their neck, is it not understandable that they are potentially -- that they would have lost money?

Which is more significant, unlike COMTA,
they kept a significant staff for almost the same
number of schools. They had ten people in Staff
and yet we can criticize them for that yet COMTA,

which is also an institutional accreditor, has
 only one.

I just don't understand the consistency and I don't understand the speculation that four years from now they may be in trouble. I just find that hard to understand and that seems to be the most important thing, other than the second question.

9 It seems and the IG picked it up to that 10 the things that are shadowing this Agency are 11 three institutional potential deficiencies. One 12 was Reagan National, two was the San Diego 13 school, and three was the Virginia school.

Now, my understanding is there are licensing boards in all three states that is usually the requirement of the licensing board, they're the primary consumer protection group.

18 They didn't identify the school closure 19 and since they had withdrawn the accreditation 20 prior to the school closure, why are we holding 21 them accountable for the closed school and their 22 behavior?

1 MS. DAGGETT: I'm not sure. Are you 2 talking about RNU? 3 CHAIR KEISER: Yes, RNU. MS. DAGGETT: Well, because they were 4 5 accrediting them all the way up until that point 6 and they had just been to that institution in October, the few months prior to when the 7 8 institution allegedly closed. 9 (Simultaneous Speaking.) I wasn't looking at their closure, we're 10 11 looking at the process that they used and whether 12 or not they used all the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms they had in place in order 13 14 to be able to try to, as Ron talked about, being 15 able to figure out this is what would probably 16 happen. 17 CHAIR KEISER: But as COMTA talked 18 about, schools do close. Schools close without 19 notifying an institution, whether it be in us or 20 whether it be in other agencies. That happens. 21 The question is did the October visit by ACICS, did you review the documents to see that 22

1 the people who were on that visit were just 2 fabricating the material and saying the school did not exist? 3 Or did the school just shut the doors 4 5 and lock it up and is ACICS to be held accountable for that? 6 MS. DAGGETT: I think ACICS is 7 8 accountable to their processes and procedures and 9 making sure they follow their policies and making 10 sure that those processes, procedures, and 11 policies are able to pick up on issues that could 12 be seen or should be seen by an accrediting 13 Agency who's trying to determine educational 14 quality. 15 Didn't they put the CHAIR KEISER: 16 school in show-cause and then ultimately before 17 they closed, the U.S.A. Today article, didn't 18 they withdraw the accreditation prior to that 19 That's what I heard. research? 20 MS. DAGGETT: No, what I understood is 21 that the school went through accreditation prior 22 to having to answer to the show-cause.

1	CHAIR KEISER: So, you're holding them
2	accountable after the accreditation was
3	withdrawn? That's what I'm trying to figure out.
4	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
5	MS. DAGGETT: We're holding ACICS
6	accountable for their policies and procedures and
7	whether or not they're implementing them and
8	whether or not they have effective on-site
9	reviews, whether or not they have effective
10	monitoring approaches, whether or not they're
11	doing the things they say they're going to do and
12	what are required by the regulations?
13	CHAIR KEISER: Don't we also require due
14	process, which it sounded like they were
15	following and giving the school a show-cause
16	order, at which point the school decided it was
17	not able to make show-cause requirements?
18	MS. DAGGETT: No, we do require due
19	process, however, our regulations actually don't
20	require a show-cause order at all.
21	Our regulations say that if an
22	institution or program is out of compliance with

any standard, if you look at 602.20, they could 1 2 automatically -- once they were to notify them via the on-site evaluation report, they could 3 make a decision at that first Commission meeting. 4 5 Instead of a show-cause they could terminate accreditation at that point. 6 7 They don't have to offer a show-cause, at least not by our regulations. 8 9 CHAIR KEISER: But they did, which sort 10 of indicates that they were concerned. Let's move to the second one, which the IG talked about 11 12 was San Diego. 13 Now, the Commission says they just had 14 an application and there was never an accrediting action on that school, is that correct? 15 16 MS. DAGGETT: No, there was not an 17 accrediting action on that school. 18 CHAIR KEISER: So, why are we concerned 19 about it? 20 MS. DAGGETT: Because again, we're 21 looking at the processes and procedures that 22 ACICS uses in evaluating not just the

1 institutions that are up for renewal of 2 accreditation but we also look at the processes they use for initial accreditation. 3 4 CHAIR KEISER: But they didn't even go 5 through the process of initial accreditation SO 6 why are we concerned about that? MS. DAGGETT: Because we're looking at 7 8 educational quality and whether or not ACICS is 9 meeting the recognition requirements that we have 10 as a Department. 11 It doesn't matter if they have --12 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 13 -- or not. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Let's go to the third one, which is Virginia. 15 16 Now, I understand our concern is the fact that the State issued a show-cause order to 17 18 the school and somehow, some way, ACICS did not 19 respond appropriately to that. 20 Now, in Florida I know for a fact 21 Florida has rules that are very different for their schools than the accrediting agencies. 22

1	And Florida takes action with or without
2	the accrediting agency and sometimes the triad
3	works and sometimes the triad doesn't work.
4	What specifically was the concern with
5	the SCHEV report as it relates to ACICS?
6	MS. DAGGETT: The SCHEV provided their
7	audits, which were significant and included
8	significant details regarding the failure of
9	the very concerning issues of the distance
10	education program that they were offering.
11	And that ACICS did not do any kind of
12	action to review whether or not those same
13	distance education issues would be in compliance
14	or not in compliance with their own standards.
15	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
16	CHAIR KEISER: licensor of that
17	school?
18	MS. DAGGETT: Their ultimate action was
19	not to provide licensure but to put a three-year
20	moratorium on any distance education at that
21	particular institution?
22	CHAIR KEISER: Now, my understanding was

that the school was put on show-cause by ACICS, 1 2 that's what they said yesterday? Yes, they did that after 3 MS. DAGGETT: 4 SCHEV production. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Would that not be supportive of the state action? 6 7 MS. DAGGETT: It would be but what what 8 are looking at is the fact that ACICS, as we 9 noted in the monitoring, it appeared that many of their actions were taken in response to other 10 11 accrediting or approval entity actions. 12 CHAIR KEISER: Now, it's my understanding that this whole issue of Staff and 13 14 competency of accrediting commissions are related 15 to these three issues, is that correct? 16 I didn't see any others come up. 17 MS. DAGGETT: For the competency of the 18 Staff? Well, mainly the questions and their 19 ability to fulfil their accrediting activities 20 based on the examples provided. That's correct. 21 CHAIR KEISER: These were the three. 22 And all three of these were from the newspaper

1	and from the people who spoke against the
2	accrediting agency.
3	How were they brought to the attention
4	of the Department?
5	MS. DAGGETT: The capacity to report was
6	initiated in June of 2019 based off of reports
7	from Michelle Edwards' own testimony at the CHEA
8	Recognition Committee regarding the financial
9	struggles that ACICS is having.
10	And then also, yes, one of the reports
11	included the Virginia international University
12	and San Diego Institution in that.
13	And so we were directed to open an
14	inquiry into those issues.
15	CHAIR KEISER: I did read in the
16	reports, though, you mentioned multiple times the
17	complaints by the third party who sent you
18	letters.
19	They seem to be the same people who
20	spoke out yesterday. Is that correct?
21	MS. DAGGETT: I'm required by the
22	regulations to take in any third-party comments

1	
1	that are submitted and include them within the
2	analysis and wherever it seemed appropriate or
3	match that information.
4	That's where I put that.
5	CHAIR KEISER: I've been on this
6	Committee a long time. I don't ever remember
7	that the third-party comments were used as a
8	basis for our analysis.
9	MS. DAGGETT: They're not used as a
10	basis.
11	They were used as supplementary
12	information and documentation of other concerns
13	had been raised and so we raised those so that
14	there was due process for ACICS to be able to
15	respond to those specific issues.
16	CHAIR KEISER: And did you verify the
17	legitimacy of the complaints?
18	MS. DAGGETT: As their comments I'm not
19	required to verify any legitimacy. The Federal
20	Register notice requests the comments and we're
21	required to include those as part of our analysis
22	

1	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
2	CHAIR KEISER: Aren't they usually used
3	and set aside at the end? The third-party
4	comments I saw within the report, the use of the
5	third-party comments, as evidence. Am I missing
6	that?
7	MS. DAGGETT: It was not evidence in
8	that the third-party comments did not trigger any
9	of these inquiries.
10	Those third-party comments were provided
11	as part of the record, which is what we were
12	required to do in the recognition requirements.
13	And I have whenever there are third
14	party comments and they are applicable to the
15	areas that we have reviewed, I have included
16	those in prior reports.
17	CHAIR KEISER: I'm sorry it took so
18	long. I don't normally do that. Kathleen was
19	next but I have other hands up.
20	If they are from before, let me know.
21	If they are, drop them. If you want to ask a
22	question, I will let you do that. The next one

1

2	DR. ALIOTO: First of all, I wanted to
3	thank Elizabeth for her incredible work on this
4	and also to Mary Ellen and Claude, whom I have
5	great respect for your experience and wisdom.
6	You are supporting what the Committee
7	wants to do on this. I wonder if in terms of
8	process, we can consider that we give the ACICS
9	another shot at this?
10	Would you consider that to be the thing
11	that we had seen before this Agency? I think
12	when you look at 48,000 students, we don't want
13	48,000 students to be enrolled or down on their
14	own.
15	But you also want to guide them,
16	hopefully educationally, and make them as robust
17	as possible. So, Elizabeth, did you consider
18	some of these other draconian measures?
19	Or was it just a question of either and
20	their accreditation
21	MR. BOUNDS: Is that question for me,
22	Kathleen, or was that for you're a little

1 broken up.

4

2 DR. ALIOTO: Well, Herman, it's 3 basically for you --

MR. BOUNDS: Okay.

DR. ALIOTO: And for Jennifer in terms 5 of (audio interference) that you would consider, 6 7 I mean, (audio interference) possibilities. But 8 I know that they've been given so many different 9 chances since 2016 that to consider doing that along with the fact that they just -- they're 10 11 making countless promises and just didn't deliver 12 on them, the rationale for this, for your decision. 13

14 Yeah, so I think Beth may MR. BOUNDS: have talked about it earlier in her presentation 15 16 I think on the first day. The first thing for us 17 was, number one, was the compliance report. And 18 the compliance report has shown systemic issues 19 of noncompliance with those criteria over the 20 past several years.

21 So based on that, there was no 22 justification for an extension for good cause because the agency has been out of compliance for
 quite a long time already. That was demonstrated
 in several years prior, including under the
 previous administration's review.

5 So in our mind, there was no option for 6 an extension for good cause. We'd never given an 7 extension for good cause for over a year. And I 8 did some research on that yesterday and I just 9 couldn't find one. So that really was not, you 10 know, an option for us.

11 And then I think as Beth said in her 12 presentation it's kind of the totality of 13 everything thrown together which, you know, helps 14 to drive our decision, that each one of those 15 reports was, you know, was determined on its own 16 weight and value, you know.

But at the end, you know, we had to consider, you know, we had to consider, you know, the issues, you know, identified in each one of those reports. So we just didn't think there was a lesser option, a viable option for us to take in our recommendation.

(202) 234-4433

MS. DAGGETT: Can I add one (audio 1 2 interference), can I add one thing? In addition, there was no time available as there is a five-3 4 year period of recognition which would expire 5 during this year. So there was not time for us to entertain any further action. 6 7 MR. BOUNDS: Thanks, Beth, that's true. Well, I think that that is 8 DR. ALIOTO: 9 the kind of the kernel of this, that it's a 10 systemic issue and that the system, even with a 11 new leadership, that the system itself has not 12 changed enough to warrant accrediting them for 13 another five years. 14 So thank you. That's it. 15 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Rick and then 16 Jennifer. Anne dropped her hand, okay, Rick and 17 then Jennifer. 18 MR. O'DONNELL: Thanks, Art. Beth, I 19 want to just pick up a little bit on what Art was 20 discussing. And in the monitoring report on 21 financial issues, it references the letter from the state attorney general as, you know, 22

important things they require. But the letter from the state attorney general doesn't actually provide any documentation around the financial issues. The only mention of it is a mention of the Secretary's 2018 decision.

So I am confused, because I've been on 6 this (audio interference) a long time and don't 7 8 recall ever seeing third-party comments put in 9 the staff recommendation for us to refer to. And yet when I referred to the attorney general's 10 11 letter, it seems to have no relevance to the 12 financial section, because it provides no 13 information except to reference the department's 14 own information. So I see (audio interference) 15 what it's saying.

So can you just elaborate a little bit
more about why third-party comments that may
actually not be germane to the specific issue
have been included in the staff's
recommendations?
MS. DAGGETT: Well, for this specific

thing, actually if you go to the actual third --

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

5

so there is an analysis of third-party comments that's at the end of every report. And at the end of it, you'll see that it says that all three of the commenters tied the areas of alleged noncompliance -- I'm sorry, does somebody not have their phone muted? It's coming back and I can't really hear.

8 All three of the comments tied --9 commenters tied their areas of alleged 10 noncompliance to Section 602.15(b)(1), necessary 11 criteria for recognition, and those comments are 12 referenced in the relevant sections of the 13 department's staff analysis.

14 So they include -- they reference that specific section, and we are required by 15 16 regulation to review the public comments and note 17 them where they are applicable. And since they 18 specifically note that section, and I put that in that section so that these two teed up for the 19 20 Agency so that they would be able to respond to 21 any of the concerns that they have in that area. 22 MR. O'DONNELL: Okay, thank you.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer.
MS. BLUM: Thanks, Art. And sorry
people start asking questions and then it gets
me. So I just want to go back to something that
Art said first with regard to the three schools.
And I keep really focusing on the fact that there
are four reports, and whether they stand on their
own or not, and so I'll get to that in a second.
But as relates to the three schools, two
of them weren't Title IV. And so I just want to
throw that out there because I have to tell you
where my head is. I'm kind of discounting those
findings because honestly, for two reasons. One
is they weren't Title IV, so I'm a little I
have a question around department authority
there.
And then the second thing at least I
think they weren't Title IV, so correct me if I'm
wrong. But I don't think they were at least
RNU wasn't eligible yet, so it couldn't have
been.
And then the other thing is this has

been a year of sudden school closures by lots of different schools, nonprofit, for-profit. We have like -- I mean, it's a very sad thing. But the last couple of years, even pre-pandemic.

5 And so I think it was Anne, or I can't remember who other, somebody else brought this 6 7 But I'm a little concerned about holding up. 8 that entirely -- holding that to the extent of 9 removal for an accrediting agency. I'm not saying it's not something of concern or it should 10 11 be looked at. And I guess that there's -- so 12 this is a good segue. I guess that there is also 13 the amalgamation of problems here.

14 So I want to say something also because 15 Kathleen referenced the statement by Mary Ellen 16 and by Claude, which I just want to say my 17 questions aren't so much about how I feel about 18 the agency. I just want to say that again. It's 19 about the process to make sure we get it right. 20 And so I'm very focused on the compliance report, 21 partly because that (audio interference) sort of 22 told me yesterday I should be.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

1 So I'm really focused on that piece, and 2 I'm confused. I guess I'm just going to say this 3 again, and it's a question, I'm confused because 4 Herman, just now, you talked about the totality, 5 the totality of the record. But then Beth and 6 reports themselves both say that they stand on 7 their own.

8 So I am confused about whether we're 9 looking at these reports in the totality or whether we're looking at them standalone. 10 And so 11 I am concerned about that process and 12 decisionmaking, and so maybe that's a Herman or maybe it's Counsel (audio interference) who can 13 14 help me out a little bit on am I focused on each report for consideration, or am I looking at the 15 16 amalgamation over time.

17 Oh, and I did want to say one more 18 thing. The IG, in my view, that report is 19 absolutely relevant as to the compliance report, 20 because the compliance report is a follow-on from 21 all of this from 2016. So I just cannot ignore, 22 you know, the IG specific to the compliance

(202) 234-4433

report.

1

2 So I just wanted to -- that was the other comment I had, that I do want to allow 3 4 Herman and Beth, or maybe it's Counsel, an 5 opportunity of are we looking at this in the totality, or are we looking at this report by 6 7 report. 8 Okay, well, I want to MS. DAGGETT: 9 address a couple of the issues. First of all, for the compliance report, the -- I understand 10 11 that, you know, there was a review by the OIG on 12 that specific, this 2016 and the 2018 review. 13 Please note, all of those throughout that, those 14 two areas were considered noncompliant. So, you 15 know, this is multiple levels of review where 16 that was found noncompliant. 17 Second, I think he brought up, you know, 18 why are we looking at things that are not Title 19 IV related. Our -- why doesn't -- you know, in 20 602.1, why does the Secretary recognize 21 accrediting agencies. 22 That is, the Secretary recognizes

accrediting agencies to ensure that these agencies are for the purposes of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, or for other federal purposes reliable authorities regarding the quality of education or training offered by the institutions or programs they accredit.

7 And it's, you know, one important thing 8 for you to remember, Jennifer, is that, you know, 9 Title IV, even though ACICS is a gatekeeper for 10 Title IV, that is not the only major federal 11 program. One of the other ones is access to the 12 SEVP program.

So if you want to go back to some of those, the one that wasn't even accredited by us -- that wasn't yet accredited by ACICS, they were a participant in the SEVP program, I believe through their asset accreditation.

And they had on their campus -- their CAR, the campus accountability report form, I believe it was 2016, they had 2016 graduates and completers, but only -- but 209 of those were not available because they were on visas. VIU in

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1	
1	their 2018 team report they, there's actually
2	there's a statement at the beginning that says
3	that they reduced from 95% international students
4	to 90% international students.
5	So our charge is not just looking at,
6	you know, Title IV eligibility and the
7	maintenance of Title IV funds, it's also looking
8	at accessibility and whether or not those
9	programs and institutions should access any
10	federal program.
11	As to the individual reports, I
12	understand (audio interference) that they stand
13	on their own. So those I was trying to answer
14	all your questions, so there you go.
15	MS. BLUM: No, that's so they do each
16	stand on their own, even though we should
17	probably have a conversation about the totality.
18	But I just want to just say that that was a very
19	helpful answer on the visa piece because I'd
20	forgotten that element, so that's an extremely
21	helpful piece.
22	I would, though, fall back on the fact

1	that there have been, particularly in the
2	Northeast by the way, a number of nonprofits
3	pretty kind of sudden closures. And I certainly
4	wouldn't suggest that that's on the accreditors.
5	So I just I'm just putting that out there.
6	But I do, I just worry about the
7	going right to removal. And I am going to make
8	this about a totality of the statement for a
9	second. What I'm concerned about is the totality
10	of this process problem. And so those are my
11	concerns that are completely process-oriented.
12	I'm certainly not defending this agency. So I
13	just want to be really clear about that before I
14	close out.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Jennifer. I
16	have David and then Anne and then Herman.
17	DR. EUBANKS: Thank you, Art. I wanted
18	to go back to something Herman said a minute ago
19	about the role of subjectivity and having 18, you
20	know, informed opinions. We heard a lot
21	yesterday about checkbox compliance, that the
22	maybe ACICS got in trouble partly because its

1

review processes were too perfunctory.

2 And I feel like from a lot of the discussion here that we are sort of reverting to 3 4 checkboxes. And I think that beyond the 602 dot 5 dot dot criteria, that generate principle that Elizabeth mentioned has to be our guiding light, 6 that the Agency standards should ensure the 7 8 education or training the schools offers is of 9 sufficient quality to achieve its stated objective for the duration of the accreditation 10 11 period. 12 That is, it's not enough to explain away 13 disasters using technicalities. Quality 14 assurance should prevent the disasters. And of course no accreditor, as we've seen, can 15 16 quarantee that. However, signature of an agency 17 that wants to prevent disasters is self-18 reflection and transparency about what went wrong 19 and how to prevent it next time. That's what I 20 was looking for yesterday in the testimony, and I 21 didn't see it. 22

And I think Mary Ellen's comments are

right on point with some specifics for handling and deferrals, not compelling evidence that institutions are actually improving. Promises unfulfilled to the state's attorney general and (audio interference) associations. And lots of statements about change, but not about why the change originated.

8 For example, the VIU situation, I would 9 have thought that having read that report from SCHEV -- I don't know if you read it but you 10 should if you haven't. I would think the 11 12 accreditor would have been horrified and would 13 have run back and said, well, we've got these 30 14 questions that are supposed to ensure the quality of online education. 15

16 Obviously, that wasn't enough. We need 17 at least one more question. Let's figure out 18 what that is and then let's go to our other 19 institutions that have online learning. 20 Obviously I'm just making up stuff here, but I 21 wanted to see something like that, and I didn't. 22 And one particular piece of evidence

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

pointed in completely the other direction, and that was the issue of the surveys. So if checkbox compliance is merely having the appearance of standards, and something 4 substantive is more than just the appearance, the discussion about the surveys said to me that even now, it's really just about appearances.

8 The idea that we would only ask an 9 institution to sample ten percent of its students 10 and have the responses, whatever they happened to get from that ten percent of their students, that 11 12 that is in any way a meaningful exercise is to me 13 ridiculous, and I work with surveys all the time.

14 So I agree with Claude and Mary Ellen's assessment and I support their motion. 15

16 CHAIR KEISER: I'm not sure there has 17 been a motion. But then Anne, you have your hand 18 up?

Yes, I wanted just to raise 19 MS. NEAL: 20 another issue in the context of Mary Ellen and 21 Claude's preview of where they would like to go. 22 Basically over the last two and a half days, we

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

5

6

have been made aware, unfortunately we were made aware, they were not presented to us before, of two OIG reports, both of which substantially say that the Accreditation Bureaus has serious problems of subjective and inconsistent application of its standards.

7 And I think in the course of the last two and a half days, we have raised repeated 8 9 questions about consistent application of standards in the context of ACICS, so that the 10 11 issue has not been resolved, and in fact these 12 two IG reports -- or one has been I guess 13 addressed. The other one, the 30-day response 14 period's not started to go into place. But 15 nevertheless, pretty strong statement that 16 there's an inconsistency problem here.

And I guess in light of that, which seems to have been fairly significantly agreed to by many of us that is there some other approach rather than terminating, such as simply insisting that they not be allowed to have any additional members, knowing that they're coming up in July

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

for renewal.

2	So I just want to understand, given what
3	appears to be fairly significant evidence of due
4	process violations, of why we would not consider
5	alternatives.
6	MS. DAGGETT: Anne, I would just like to
7	say I don't I disagree with that
8	characterization of the particular IG reports
9	that just came out. I don't think that it paints
10	a broad brush of process issues.
11	I think it, as it specifically stated,
12	it only review the 2016 process of review for
13	ACICS and then the 2018 SDO review and
14	recommendation, and even that was only limited to
15	six of our 21 sections. So I don't think that
16	the broad brush that you're using is applicable
17	here.
18	And they've specifically noted that any
19	conclusions that they made in their report cannot
20	be projected onto the recognition criteria that
21	they didn't review, or to the evidence that the
22	SDO did not cite in their review. And they

specifically noted their report is not applicable 1 2 to the reports that are before you today. No, but Elizabeth, my point 3 MS. NEAL: is that both reports have said that there is 4 inconsistency and subjectivity in the application 5 of standards by the Bureau, and that this needs 6 7 to be addressed. So I'm not speaking in the context of ACICS, I'm just speaking in the 8 9 context the two general reports have said, and it is that conclusion. 10 11 Well, the issue of MS. DAGGETT: 12 subjectivity in the most recent one was actually 13 related to the fact that the SDO was only a one-14 level review of that recommendation, the recommendation of -- recognition recommendation 15 that was made, and that the OIG stated that 16 17 additional levels or such as what we normally

and then the SDO review or ultimately Secretary
review, was a much better option in order to
eliminate that subjectivity.

CHAII

CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Anne, anything

have, which is the OPE staff, the NACIQI meeting,

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

18

1 else? Herman, did you want to comment? Your
2 hand's up, and Jennifer, your hand's back up, or
3 is it down?

4 MR. BOUNDS: Yes, mine is up, Art. Ι 5 just wanted to, you know, to make a -- let me just make another comment about I think was the 6 7 question that Jennifer had asked about, you know, the totality. I just wanted to be clear, you 8 9 know, we did look at each one of these reports individually, but they all did play off of one 10 11 another.

I also wanted to just jump over to what, you know, what Beth just said, one of the key findings here in the -- in the OIG reports and, you know, Anne just referred to it. It talked about that single level of review being with that March 2018 decision. But it also noted that staff should have been involved in that.

So I think the report puts out both, you
know, both some positive things and some things
that staff need -- that not only staff need to
work on, but the department needs to work on.

(202) 234-4433

And that's why I mentioned yesterday to please read the entire report and come up with a, you know, with an understanding of what the report did actually, is actually saying.

5 If I may, again, respond CHAIR KEISER: I tend to look at the financials as a 6 to that. very important consideration when we're looking 7 at the competency or the -- in terms of the 8 9 agency. And exactly what the OIG report said was there's a lack of objectivity in determining what 10 is a -- an agency that's financially responsible. 11

Now, if you use the audits, this -- and use the composite score that is the way we look at institutions, the Agency would have a significantly good composite score because of the eight and a half million dollars in reserve.

17 So I think we've got to look at it all, 18 but I think we're finished with the discussion. 19 And I think we need to bring back Mary Ellen to, 20 we're going to go through five votes, then four 21 in terms of the reports. And then those will 22 just be an approval or a not approval of the

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

report. And then the final one would be a motion 1 2 on accreditation. (Simultaneous speaking.) 3 4 DR. PETRISKO: I'm going to turn that 5 over to Claude. Claude --DR. PRESSNELL: So as the Chairman 6 indicated, the attorneys have advised us that the 7 8 best way to handle this is to accept or reject 9 the staff recommendation on each individual report. Each individual report recommendation 10 11 from the staff was termination, and so that was 12 the stand-alone comments that that addressed. 13 So we're going to vote on each one of 14 those, and then there will be a fifth vote on the 15 ultimate action. 16 OPERATOR: Hold on, please. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, there you are, 18 you're back. 19 Okay, we can continue. OPERATOR: 20 DR. PRESSNELL: Thanks. So again, just 21 to remind everyone, each individual report staff recommendation was for termination. What we're 22

going to do is we are going to take a vote on 1 2 each report, and then there will be a fifth vote on our recommendation for the agency. So if I 3 4 could have Beth with us again. 5 And the motion is that we accept the staff's recommendation that ACICS be found out of 6 7 compliance with the cited criteria in the final 8 staff report on the compliance report. And so 9 the first one is on the compliance report. And I wanted Beth to make sure in 10 11 summary to articulate that report so that you 12 know precisely what you're voting on, and she 13 will do so on each report. But that's the 14 motion, and we need a second. 15 Is there a second? CHAIR KEISER: 16 DR. DERBY: I second. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Who was that? 18 DR. DERBY: Jill. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Jill, okay. And 20 Elizabeth, could you restate specifically the 21 recommendation of the department? 22 MS. DAGGETT: Yes, the recommendation is

1 terminate recognition. But I believe what we're
2 asked --

CHAIR KEISER: No, focus on the 3 4 compliance report, not the termination. 5 MS. DAGGETT: Right, the compliance report, we found them out of compliance with 6 7 Section 602.15(a)(2), which is in relation to the 8 competency of their representatives. And this 9 was a issue specifically about the training of their site team visitor. 10 11 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, is there 12 discussion? 13 MS. DAGGETT: Also, want to know also 14 that this is the issue that they've been out of 15 compliance with for four years. Is there discussion? 16 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen, you have your hand up. 17 18 DR. ALIOTO: Well, it's just I wanted to 19 read into the record what the report has said 20 about that that report had nothing to do with our 21 deficient (audio interference), as Mary Ellen had already said. But I just (audio interference) 22

1

read it. That's all.

2	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Jennifer.
3	MS. BLUM: Yeah, I just had a topical
4	question. I'm sorry, part of because I'm new.
5	But to find a agency out of compliance is not
6	that's why you're separating this, right? There
7	are other things you can do other than removal if
8	you find an agency out of compliance, is that
9	correct? I just want to make sure that I
10	understand what I'm setting up.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Yeah, that is correct,
12	yeah, that is correct.
13	MS. BLUM: Who answered that, just so I
14	know?
15	CHAIR KEISER: (Audio interference)
16	George or Herman be one
17	(Simultaneous speaking.)
18	CHAIR KEISER: Does not mean
19	termination, right? George, Herman?
20	MS. BLUM: Can somebody answer that?
21	Because like if we vote something out of
22	compliance, it doesn't mean that we're

1 necessarily voting to remove.

2 MR. BOUNDS: Right, we are focusing on the compliance report in this particular motion. 3 4 MS. MANGOLD: Hi, this is Donna Mangold. 5 It's a compliance report related to the Secretary's decision in 2018. So she gave them, 6 7 in 2018, X number, you know, a year to come into 8 9 MS. BLUM: That's not what I'm asking, 10 Donna. Donna's, it's not what I'm asking. I'm asking that on any motion, forget that it's the 11 12 compliance. It happens that we're using the word 13 compliance twice, sorry about this. This should 14 be a different report (audio interference) the 15 RNU report, just so we don't use the word 16 compliance multiple times. 17 If it were the RNU report that we were 18 voting on, if we accept that something is out of 19 -- that the agency is out of compliance right 20 now, we're not necessarily voting to terminate 21 recognition because you have that final vote, right? So this is just simply to say we agree 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

that they're out of compliance but not
 necessarily that we agree that they should be
 terminated.

MS. MANGOLD: This is just on out of compliance. This vote is, that's correct. The distinction I'm trying to make, though, is that on the compliance report, that was something that if you find them out of compliance on that, there are more significant consequences.

10 This compliance report is different than 11 the other report because the compliance report 12 arises from the other -- from the prior 13 secretarial decision, when she only gave them a 14 year to come into compliance. So that's the 15 significance of that. That's a little different.

MS. BLUM: That's really significant.
Sorry, Donna, for interrupting before. Now I
understand what your point was. Apologize.

MS. MANGOLD: No apology necessary,
 Jennifer.
 CHAIR KEISER: And my understanding now,

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Elizabeth, is the issue of the compliance is a

training issue of three people. 1 2 MS. DAGGETT: Yes, primarily yes. MR. O'DONNELL: Art this, is Rick, can 3 4 I ask a quick process question. Before we --5 CHAIR KEISER: Who said that? MR. O'DONNELL: If we vote to accept 6 7 this compliance motion that says terminate 8 recommendation, but hypothetically the final 9 fifth vote does not terminate recognition. Does this report still go -- I don't understand with 10 11 the fifth vote is for. So is this -- I 12 understand like what happens if this -- if we approve this motion but we defeat a fifth motion 13 14 to termination recommendation, what happens? 15 CHAIR KEISER: Donna? 16 MS. MANGOLD: Everything will go to the 17 SDO anyway. So, and the SDO will have the 18 benefit of your recommendation. 19 MR. O'DONNELL: But I don't understand. 20 So why is there a fifth vote? 21 CHAIR KEISER: Rick, we've voting on 22 (Simultaneous speaking.) go ahead, I'm sorry.

MS. MANGOLD: We're also trying to do it 1 2 for purposes of keeping the record as clean as possible for due process purposes for ACICS to 3 4 make sure that there is a separate -- you know, 5 it depends on how you will vote on any of these things and then to make it clear what your 6 recommendation is based on the totality. 7 8 MR. O'DONNELL: But if we approve this 9 specific motion, we're recommending terminate recommendation, regardless of the subsequent four 10 11 votes, correct? 12 MS. MANGOLD: That is correct. 13 PARTICIPANT: So I'm sorry, go ahead. 14 DR. PRESSNELL: Well, we're at -- what 15 we're saying is that we're -- the motion is to 16 accept the staff's recommendation that ACICS be 17 found out of compliance. We're not necessarily 18 making the motion to accept their conclusion of 19 termination until the fifth vote. Is that not 20 correct? 21 MS. BLUM: Actually, that's not. Ι think it's Jennifer. I feel like John has just 22

told us that on this particular one it's more 1 2 grave because it's been going on. The department only gave them a year to get into compliance. 3 4 MS. MANGOLD: Potentially we could, you 5 know, there are limitations or suspensions, although, you know, suspension hasn't been used 6 7 much. 8 MS. BLUM: Can I ask a question, Donna? 9 MS. MANGOLD: Yeah. 10 MS. BLUM: Let me just cut to the chase, and Anne alluded to it I think before. 11 If we 12 voted to accept this motion right here, the out 13 of compliance on the compliance report, could we 14 then later -- and I'm not suggesting this is going to happen, I'm just using this as an 15 16 example, could we then move that this all gets to 17 pushed to July when that decision is up? Or is 18 that not an option? 19 Let me talk internally here. I don't 20 want to --21 MS. DAGGETT: I don't believe it's an 22 option under 604.34, your procedures require you

to come up with a recommendation that's listed 1 2 there, and deferral is not one of those options. DR. PRESSNELL: 3 Yeah. MS. BLUM: So in effect, this motion is 4 5 a -- and our option if we vote for it in the effect is termination. So can I, I know I'm 6 complicating things, but in a way, this is like 7 8 an endgame vote, and it's the first one. (Audio 9 interference). Jennifer, this is 10 DR. PRESSNELL: 11 Claude. We've talked about this ad nauseam. And 12 my first impression was your impression that if 13 this one -- if we accept the staff recommendation 14 on this report, then it mutes all other reports. So when we were trying to figure out how 15 16 can we work on this so that we can agree that 17 they're out of compliance in the report but not 18 necessarily agree to the action of termination. 19 Even though one report may weigh heavier than 20 another report, then the fifth vote would give us 21 our action recommendation to the SDO. 22 Now, again, this is a little convoluted,

you know, in terms of how we're doing it. 1 But 2 the goal here was for us to consider each report and not let one report just negate all the other 3 4 They could just simply act on whether reports. 5 or not, or make a decision on whether on not we believe that the staff conclusion of compliance 6 7 or noncompliance is true but not necessarily 8 recommend their action until that fifth vote. 9 In other words, we can say out of compliance, out of compliance, in compliance, out 10 11 of compliance. All right, now what do we want to 12 do with this? That's my understanding of where 13 we've landed. If I'm not correct, I would be 14 happy to stand corrected. MS. MANGOLD: Yes, and potentially we 15 16 could have -- I'm sorry, this is Donna, we could 17 potentially have a limitation as a potential 18 option at the end too. 19 CHAIR KEISER: I have Anne Neal's hand 20 raised. Is that correct? 21 MS. NEAL: Yes, just following up on 22 what Claude said. I'm still profoundly confused,

because as I just heard the staff attorney, it was my impression that we're not voting to accept the staff's recommendation that they're out of compliance, we are voting to terminate recognition.

6 And so there seems to be some confusion 7 as to those who are giving the motion and those 8 who are interpreting how we're voting. And so 9 I'm not clear, based on what I just heard, as to 10 why we wouldn't vote on each report and then vote 11 on terminate recognition at the end them, but 12 that's not what I just heard from staff counsel.

13 MS. MANGOLD: Yeah, I was trying to 14 respond to Jennifer's question. And in terms of compliance -- compliance, and I just, what I was 15 16 trying to say is that this compliance report 17 relates to 2018. But it's not as though you can 18 put them on another compliance report based on 19 some finding of noncompliance on this compliance 20 report. Because this comes out of Secretary 21 DeVos's decision.

22

1

2

3

4

5

So that you would have -- so that if we

found them out of compliance on this one, it 1 2 would have more impact in terms of your recommendation. And so, you know, it wouldn't 3 4 necessarily be termination, it could be 5 limitation. But I --PARTICIPANT: Mary Ellen? 6 7 MS. MANGOLD: But the sure (audio 8 interference) you're doing all -- we want all 9 four to be done individually in terms of the findings of noncompliance or compliance in the 10 11 separate report. 12 MS. NEAL: Anne, I don't ever recall 13 voting on a monitoring report, so I'm very 14 confused. Why are we voting on a monitoring 15 report? 16 MS. DAGGETT: Because there was -- it 17 was a process via our, via Section 602.33, and 18 then it was a monitoring report that was required 19 by that same decision by Secretary DeVos in 2018. And we found that there were areas of 20 21 noncompliance, and so we moved it forward for an 22 SEP (audio interference) review.

It was called a monitoring report 1 2 because that's how Secretary DeVos referenced it. Anne? Is that it? Mary 3 CHAIR KEISER: Ellen? 4 5 DR. PETRISKO: If we're beyond the -- I 6 just would like to note that if we actually look 7 at 602.15(a)(2), which is what's at question 8 here, this is bigger than the training of three 9 This is about (audio interference) people. individuals across the board working at different 10 11 agencies on their responsibilities, they're 12 appropriate for their roles. These are the standard (audio 13 14 interference) policies, etc. So it's not just --I mean, we're asked to do our own read of this 15 16 and look at the evidence and prevent it. So I 17 just wanted to be sure that people weren't 18 thinking this is about only about those three. 19 This criterion is a broad criterion 20 about the capacity of all of the individuals that 21 are working with this -- for this agency to do this work. Wanted to make that clarification. 22

MS. DAGGETT: Yes, thank you, Mary 1 2 Ellen. Yes, I was trying to find my notes of what I specifically said, and what I said is that 3 the ACICS failed to demonstrate that it 4 5 consistently trained its representatives for 6 their roles and followed its own policies and 7 procedures as regarded by regulation in this 8 Section 602.15(a)(2). 9 CHAIR KEISER: And just out of curiosity, was -- did that just -- didn't that 10 apply to the three highlighted institutions? 11 Is 12 that what we're still talking about? 13 MS. DAGGETT: We're just talking about 14 what's in the compliance report, the training in 15 the compliance report. 16 CHAIR KEISER: The training, the 17 evidence of the training with three people, 18 right? 19 MS. DAGGETT: Well, I'm -- the three 20 specific people they did not provide training to, 21 but it was a broader, as what Mary Ellen said, it was saying that they had failed to demonstrate 22

1

4

5

6

that they consistently train their

2 representatives for their roles and follow their3 own policies and procedures.

CHAIR KEISER: Okay, I see no more hands up. There is a motion, there is a second. Anne, is your hand still up?

7 DR. SMITH: Art, I just want to address 8 -- this is George -- address a question that Mary 9 Ellen raised yesterday about people who perhaps did not participate in yesterday's robust 10 11 conversation about the agency. Our expectation 12 would be as the both as we, as the motions, you 13 know, progress that the people who did not 14 participate would abstain during the vote. Thank 15 you.

16 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, well, I wasn't 17 aware of that, but that please make sure when I 18 get to your name, just say you were not here. I 19 can try to remember. I think Roslyn might be the 20 only one.

Okay, all in -- people voting on the
motion. Anne? Anne? We're doing a roll call.

1 I lose Anne? You're on mute. Anne 2 Neal. I can't hear you. 3 Can we go to Claude, I can't hear Anne. 4 5 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 6 CHAIR KEISER: David. 7 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. 8 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer. Jennifer? 9 MS. BLUM: Yeah, I'm here, I'm here. Ι 10 am going to say yes. 11 CHAIR KEISER: Jill. 12 DR. DERBY: Yes. 13 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen. 14 DR. ALIOTO: Yes. 15 CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen. 16 DR. PETRISKO: Yes. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Paul. 18 DR. LeBLANC: Yes. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Rick. 20 MR. O'DONNELL: Yes. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Robert Mayes. 22 MR. MAYES: No.

1 CHAIR KEISER: Can you keep going down? 2 Thank you. Ronnie. You recuse. Roslyn, you were not here, so you're recused. 3 Steven. 4 DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes. 5 CHAIR KEISER: And Wally. DR. BOSTON: 6 Yes. 7 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, we go to the second 8 one, which is on -- we need a motion --9 I'm sorry, Art, I guess I was MS. NEAL: 10 left out. Sorry, I vote yes. 11 CHAIR KEISER: You were not left out, we 12 just couldn't hear you. 13 MS. NEAL: Sorry. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Voting yes or no, or? 15 MS. NEAL: Yes. 16 DR. PRESSNELL: Okay, Mr. Chairman, we 17 have a motion on the second report. We move, or 18 I move that NACIQI accepts the staff's 19 recommendation that ACICS be found out of compliance with the criteria cited in the final 20 21 staff report on the monitoring report. And if I could get a second, we would like to have Beth 22

come up and describe that report again. 1 2 DR. ALIOTO: Second. CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Elizabeth. 3 4 MS. DAGGETT: So the monitoring -- yes, 5 the monitoring report was the report that found ACICS out of compliance with two areas. 6 They were Sections 602.15(a)(1), which is ACICS failed 7 8 to demonstrate that it has the financial 9 resources to carry out its accrediting responsibilities based on a review of financial 10 11 statements over a five-year period and related 12 documents. And the second section was Section 13 14 602.19(b), that the ACICS failed to demonstrate 15 that it has effective monitoring and evaluation 16 approaches because using the oversight expert the 17 agency cited, ACICS still did not uncover the 18 serious areas of noncompliance identified by 19 other accrediting or approval agencies. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, is there 21 discussion? Jennifer? Just a technical one, sorry. 22 MS. BLUM:

But on this one, this one is subsequent. 1 This is 2 not like the one we just did on the compliance report, is that right? In terms of timing? 3 4 MS. DAGGETT: I'm sorry, subsequent? 5 MS. BLUM: Well, in terms of the 6 Secretary giving one year. 7 MS. DAGGETT: Well, I mean, the whole 8 point of a monitoring report was that they were 9 found substantially compliant. And now based on the monitoring report, we're finding them out of 10 11 compliance. MS. BLUM: Okay, thank you for that 12 clarification. 13 14 CHAIR KEISER: I would object. And even 15 though I don't vote, the fact is the financial 16 reports do not show that they are not capable of 17 operating, and in fact they have an unqualified 18 opinion in the last three audits. So I really, I 19 feel uncomfortable with that, so that's my 20 opinion. 21 DR. PRESSNELL: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I have a comment to that. 22 This is Claude. Ι

understand your concern about 602.1 --1 2 602.15(a)(1), but they were clearly, my position, they're clearly out of compliance on the 3 4 monitoring fees. I mean, I think Reagan 5 National, VIU indicated that they are -- they don't have the capacity to do effective 6 7 monitoring. 8 So just wanted to make that clear as to 9 why I'm voting the way I am and why (audio 10 interference). 11 CHAIR KEISER: But they are -- do you 12 feel they are out of compliance financially? DR. PRESSNELL: I think that the 13 14 (Simultaneous speaking.) Apples and oranges 15 comparison over the last few days between them. 16 I think that they are in a fiscal spiral, 17 downward spiral that is unsustainable. 18 When we look at some of the other 19 agencies, even though the resources may have been 20 slimmer, significantly slimmer even, their 21 operations were, and they weren't showing that 22 they were in kind of a death spiral, they were

1

showing that they had stability in the resources.

2	And we were looking at programmatic
3	versus institution, we looked at institutional.
4	So there were it was a lot of different
5	comparisons. I think the concern is is the rapid
6	decline of their assets in a short period of time
7	and whether or not they'd be sustainable over,
8	you know I think it raises concern for sure.
9	But I'm mostly in agreement that the that they
10	are out of compliance on the monitoring fees.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen.
12	DR. PETRISKO: Maybe it was noticed when
13	I was talking with the agency, I asked no
14	questions about the finances and I didn't raise
15	any issues about the finances in the statement
16	that I made this morning. I would second what
17	Claude said, or I agree with what Claude. And my
18	position here is on the monitoring report and the
19	seriousness (audio interference) of the
20	monitoring issues.
21	So I'm agnostic about the finances,
22	although I understand the arguments that are

being made, I'm agnostic about that. (Audio 1 2 interference). CHAIR KEISER: Okay, any further 3 4 discussion? I see no hands. 5 DR. BOSTON: Yeah, Art. CHAIR KEISER: Oh, Wally, yes, please. 6 7 You're at the bottom. 8 Yeah, so I tend to concur DR. BOSTON: 9 with you about the audit report. And I would also note that there have been a number of 10 11 articles not just talking about accrediting 12 bodies in general and the reporting of finances, 13 but even the department's own fiscal ratios for 14 Title IV approval that there's such a delay on 15 that that if you have a tuition-dependent 16 institution, it's almost impossible to forecast 17 exactly when it's going to go under. 18 So I'm curious about this one, let's put 19 it that way. Or doubtful. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Any other conversations? 21 (Simultaneous speaking.) 22 MR. MAYES: So you have the financial

situation, which we kind of talked about, and (audio interference) things very subjective and good points have been made both ways. So if a person -- or if lean toward, okay, the audit doesn't show a growing concern, but this -- you take the longest section in this report, which is about basically about RNU and VIU.

8 And while there's, it seems there should 9 have been or could have been a better job dealing 10 with RNU mainly up front, you know, if more 11 front-loading in process and making it a little 12 bit more difficult for a school with such -- many 13 compliance findings to get through it and go to 14 deferrals.

I'm not so sure did they not meet the 15 16 standard in what they did, though. And of course 17 if the school ends up closing that's problematic, 18 I don't like that situation at all how the whole 19 went. But it's kind of questionable, okay, but 20 did they still meet the standard in how they did. 21 And it's just a bad circumstance and happens. And the VIU situation seems to also be 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

very subjective on should they have found more or not. And even the training part, you know, we just hit earlier. You know, they have training, they show they have training. And were those issues really related to training, or is there more of it's a process problem.

7 So all that said to come down to if you 8 find, yeah, there's one, there's a concern for 9 maybe one of these, or maybe you're not so sure, or the others are way subjective and -- or maybe 10 11 you feel that they did come into compliance on 12 finance and your recommendation is wrong. Is it 13 all or none or what with this report? 14 CHAIR KEISER: Robert, is that a question to the (audio interference)? 15 16 MR. MAYES: Yeah, it's a question. 17 CHAIR KEISER: I assume Donna probably 18 best to answer that. We're back to the same 19 question. Is this individual or should we look 20 at it in totality. That's still the question. 21 Does somebody from staff want to talk about that

22 again? And then --

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	MS. MANGOLD: I think that the there
2	is no prohibition of looking at it one way or the
3	other. Whatever (audio interference) the
4	Committee thinks they're going to the best, the
5	most articulated motion is probably the best way
6	to do it. I don't think that there's any
7	there's nothing in the rules that would require
8	you to do it one way or the other.
9	MR. MAYES: Okay, that's an estimated
10	five-year from me.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Elizabeth, how do you
12	respond to that, because the rules don't say
13	which way. That if they did it one way (audio
14	interference) were, then there's no prescription
15	on how to respond to those oversights? Is that
16	what Donna just said?
17	MS. DAGGETT: No, I think she was
18	answering the (audio interference) question of
19	whether or not you have to find out of compliance
20	out of the whole report, or whether you could go
	criteria by criteria, I believe. Yes.
21	ciferia by ciferia, i berieve. Tes.

I

wanted to preserve findings of particular 1 2 criteria, I think you could draft a motion that does deal with it more specifically. (Audio 3 interference) in that there are lots of different 4 5 moving parts in each of these reports. I don't mean to drag down the process 6 7 longer, but it would be up to the Committee if 8 they wanted to articulate out some of the 9 criteria if this one is, you know, causing problems to try to deal with together. 10 11 DR. PRESSNELL: Mr. Chairman, so we 12 could -- I would be fine, as the person making the motion of course, I don't remember who 13 seconded it -- whoever seconded it would have to 14 agree -- to withdraw the motion and take two 15 16 votes on this report, one related to the finance 17 and one related to the monitoring capacity. 18 I would be fine with that. So, what, 19 602.15(a)(1) and 602.19(b). So if that's what we 20 would like to do, I would be happy to entertain 21 that. Is that (Simultaneous speaking.) I 22 withdraw my motion. Did whoever made the second

needs to withdraw --1 2 CHAIR KEISER: You don't need to, you can just have the second agree to the amendment. 3 DR. PRESSNELL: I don't want to amend 4 5 it, I think just --CHAIR KEISER: No, just go ahead and 6 7 make a motion on report two that --8 DR. PRESSNELL: But there is a motion 9 and a second on the floor. You'd have to vote on 10 -- it's just as easy to accept it as a amendment. 11 CHAIR KEISER: All right, we'll split 12 (audio interference) the motion. Go ahead and 13 make your amendment. DR. PRESSNELL: We made it. System 14 capacity and monitoring, it's on the screen. 15 16 Does the second approve that? That was Mary 17 Ellen? 18 DR. PETRISKO: It wasn't me. I would 19 note that (audio interference) --20 DR. PRESSNELL: It was Kathleen. 21 DR. ALIOTO: Yes. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Do you approve the

1 amendment -- okay. So all in favor of the 2 amendment -- well, we'll just go by signifying 3 with aye.

MS. BLUM: But Art, I have my -- this is Jennifer, I've had my hand up to ask a question about this motion, either, whichever motion. Can I ask it? Or make a -- not, I'm sorry, not ask a question, but (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 CHAIR KEISER: We have a motion and a 10 second to amend the motion. And it's a friendly 11 amendment, so we can move on and Jennifer, you 12 can ask a question.

13 MS. BLUM: I just want to say the 14 monitoring piece of this, though, distinctly relates to -- I actually think we should keep 15 16 them together, because the monitoring piece of 17 this relates pretty directly to actually another 18 report which is, I think, because the monitoring 19 questions arise from the other -- from the three institutions. 20

21 So I feel like by separating them, we're 22 going to be voting -- I'm just a little confused

about the findings of the monitoring report. Are the findings on the monitoring out of compliance that aren't related to the three institutions that?

5 MS. DAGGETT: Well, the monitoring 6 report was related to the VIU review, but also 7 more broadly in that they provided their at-risk 8 institutions group report. But it still did not 9 demonstrate that they uncovered the serious areas 10 of noncompliance.

It was financial capability or educational quality standards that were identified by other accrediting or approval agencies. So it's not totally limited to an institutional review.

16MS. BLUM: Okay, thank you.17CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen, you have your

18 hand up?

1

2

3

4

DR. PETRISKO: I just want to note that 15(a)(1) is administrative capacity, so it's not just fiscal, it's administrative as well. So in checking them both that you're voting on both of those things. Thank you.

1

2 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, any other questions 3 or comments?

DR. PETRISKO: Are they two separate
motions? I'm not clear what we're talking about.

6 CHAIR KEISER: Yeah, two separate 7 motions. We do separate votes is what -- and so 8 just to be clear, we're going to vote -- the 9 motion is that we find, we agree with staff 10 recommendation that they are out of compliance 11 with both 602.15(a)(1), and then there will be a 12 separate vote.

13 Just to be clear, we are saying they are 14 out of compliance with 602.19(b). So (audio 15 interference) two votes. Those are the motions. 16 Any other questions? I don't know, Jennifer, is 17 your hand up or has it been up? It's down. 18 MS. BLUM: Sorry. 19 CHAIR KEISER: We'll move the motion, we'll move the first motion about administrative 20 21 and fiscal capacity. Anne.

MS. NEAL: No.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	CHAIR KEISER: Claude.
2	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes.
3	CHAIR KEISER: David.
4	DR. EUBANKS: No.
5	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer.
6	MS. BLUM: No.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Jill.
8	DR. DERBY: Yes.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen.
10	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen.
12	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
14	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Rick.
16	MR. O'DONNELL: No.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Robert.
18	MR. MAYES: No.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie no. Roslyn's
20	not Steven.
21	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Wally. Wally.

1 DR. BOSTON: No. 2 CHAIR KEISER: What's the number? 3 (Simultaneous speaking.) CHAIR KEISER: What's the tally? 4 5 DR. SMITH: It's six yes, six no, can you verify that, Valerie? 6 7 I get to vote. CHAIR KEISER: That's 8 amazing. I'll vote no, so that fails. 9 Okay, we move to the next one, the 10 motion about the monitoring and the monitoring 11 report. Anne. 12 MS. NEAL: Yes. 13 CHAIR KEISER: Can we move down, Valerie? Claude. 14 15 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 16 CHAIR KEISER: David. 17 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer. 19 MS. BLUM: No. Jill. 20 CHAIR KEISER: 21 DR. DERBY: Yes. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen.

1	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen.
3	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
5	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Rick.
7	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Robert.
9	MR. MAYES: No.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Steven.
11	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Wally.
13	DR. BOSTON: No.
14	CHAIR KEISER: It looks like that
15	passed.
16	Claude, do you have another motion to
17	(audio interference)?
18	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
19	move that NACIQI accept the staff recommendation
20	that ACICS be found out of compliance with
21	criteria cited in the final staff report on the
22	capacity inquiry.

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second?
3	DR. ALIOTO: Second.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen, second.
5	Elizabeth, specifically.
6	MS. DAGGETT: So the capacity increase,
7	ACICS failed to demonstrate compliance with four
8	sections, Sections 602.15(a)(1), Section
9	602.16(c), Section 602.16 17(c), I'm sorry,
10	.17(c), and 602.17(e).
11	For 602.16(c), ACICS did not demonstrate
12	that a standard effectively addressed the quality
13	of an institution's distance education in the
14	review of VIU. For 602.17(c), ACICS did not
15	demonstrate that it obtained specific information
16	to determine compliance during an onsite review
17	with respect to the review of VIU.
18	For Section 602.17(e), ACICS failed to
19	demonstrate that it conducts its own analysis of
20	the institutional information and documentation
21	to determine compliance with the standards in the
22	review of the SDUIS.

And the 602.15(a)(1) was in relation to 1 2 the oversight failures revealed in reviews of VIU and SDUIS do not demonstrate that the 3 4 accreditation review and monitoring processes 5 used by ACICS are adequate to identify compliance 6 concerns and calls into the question the agencies' administrative and/or fiscal 7 8 capabilities. 9 DR. KEISER: Are there questions or comments? I certainly have one. How do we 10 include SDI -- the San Diego school when in fact 11 12 they were never accredited? 13 MS. DAGGETT: Because we're looking at 14 the accrediting agencies' processes and 15 procedures and whether they're implementing them. And so those would be in effect whether or not 16 17 the school is seeking initial accreditation or 18 renewal of accreditation. 19 CHAIR KEISER: And what process was that 20 specifically at the San Diego school? 21 MS. DAGGETT: It was -I'm sorry, I'm It was at -- it was that ACICS received 22 sorry.

public comments and 400 pages of response from 1 2 SDUIS but failed to demonstrate that they reviewed the comments (audio interference) a 3 required by their policies and procedures. 4 They didn't provide any examples to 5 demonstrate that they conducted their own 6 7 analysis of the information and documentation as required by their policies and procedures. 8 9 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, thank you. Mary 10 Ellen, do you have a comment? 11 DR. PETRISKO: There is also the issue of the responsibility to verify other accrediting 12 13 bodies actions that are probationary or denial of 14 accreditation. So there was the question of how 15 they handled the asset, withdrawal or denial of 16 accreditation of the part of that institution. 17 MS. DAGGETT: That's (audio 18 interference), sorry, thank you. 19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 20 went off the record at 11:59 a.m.) 21 CHAIR KEISER: Robert. 22 DR. PETRISKO: On the regulation what do

1 they do with other agencies?

2

CHAIR KEISER: Robert.

MR. MAYES: Okay. I just want to walk 3 through these for a minute and ask some questions 4 5 because this is all very important matters. So, let's take the first one, that was 6 7 adequate administrative staff and financial 8 And we're really all about the VIU resources. 9 versus SCHEV review for the most case. And ACICS 10 also came up in that one.

For the SDUIS, the San Diego school we know didn't, didn't really get very far in the process. So I kind of washed that one out. So, I don't see that as problematic as I do maybe other ones could be.

16 On the VIU review that ACICS did versus 17 the SCHEV review, the question was, you know, 18 ACICS must have missed some things that SCHEV 19 found. And the vote between ACICS and the 20 department seem to mean ACICS said that, well, 21 ours tended to differ and they didn't overlap. 22 And (unintelligible) that they did.

(202) 234-4433

Because do you think (unintelligible) 1 2 the possible, what, what standard did overlap? What did SCHEV say did not meet (unintelligible) 3 because they were very close to direct overlaps? 4 5 MS. DAGGETT: Well, I mean, the specific areas that were cited in the SCHEV audit was that 6 7 they found significant areas of concern regarding 8 faculty/student interaction, peer-to-peer 9 interaction, academic rigor at the graduate level, and the comparability of distance 10 11 education per residential offering. 12 And those are the areas where there should be or there seems to be at least concerns 13 14 dealing with educational quality, that there 15 would be overlap in the review between ACICS and 16 SCHEV. 17 MR. MAYES: Okay, peer-to-peer I don't 18 (unintelligible) requirement we have to have 19 peer-to-peer (unintelligible). 20 Was this a Title IV program? 21 MS. DAGGETT: Yeah, it was, it was a 22 Title IV. It is a Title IV position, or I

believe they were at the time.

2	MR. MAYES: Well, in even Title IV I
3	think it is more about interaction between
4	faculty and student. I'm not sure peer-to-peer
5	is actually a requirement, is it, for an
6	institution that's accredited?
7	MS. DAGGETT: I'm not an expert on FSA
8	regulations. I'm an expert on accreditation
9	regulations. And I do know usually accrediting
10	agencies require expectations in these particular
11	areas and on those particular areas. And if they
12	were to see that another agency were to have
13	issues, then they would, I think, also have
14	concern and would investigate those issues.
15	MR. MAYES: Okay. Can you list those
16	ones again? Apologies, I don't have that
17	document in front of me.
18	MS. DAGGETT: It is specific
19	significant areas of faculty/student interaction,
20	peer-to-peer interaction, academic rigor at the
21	graduate level, and comparability of the distance
22	education to residential offerings.

I	
1	MR. MAYES: Okay. And the ACICS review
2	that was done didn't find any issues with any of
3	that; is that correct?
4	MS. DAGGETT: No. The only issues that
5	were found in the team report that was done, it
6	was done in January of 2018, and the SCHEV review
7	was done in August of 2018, the only issue
8	regarding distance education was that the
9	distance education plan was not included in that
10	sample's effectiveness plan.
11	I'd have to pull out other doc Let me
12	see. I have too many folders.
13	MR. MAYES: I understand.
14	(Pause.)
15	MR. BOUNDS: I'm looking, too, Beth.
16	Maybe you might find it before I do, though.
17	MS. DAGGETT: I'm trying to find the
18	specific paper that I'm looking for.
19	MR. MAYES: Yeah.
20	MS. DAGGETT: And I don't I'd have to,
21	I'd have to pull it up in the system. Sorry.
22	DR. PETRISKO: I have a copy of the SCHEV

1 report here, if that's helpful. 2 MS. DAGGETT: I was actually looking for it in, I believe it's in, it's either in Exhibit 3 4 11 or 12. And it's the sheet, the summary sheet 5 of the VIU report. I believe it's Exhibit 11. 6 And it gives the summary of what the ACICS team 7 found. 8 I believe it was the -- their educate --9 their distance education plan was insufficient. DR. PRESSNELL: Robert, do you happen to 10 have another question to direct while they're 11 12 looking that up? 13 MR. MAYES: Sure. 14 So, the next part after 17(c), which is about they have to conduct at least one onsite 15 16 review of the institution. And that, I believe, 17 really hit on the same issue that the VIU review 18 wasn't adequate. Is that correct? 19 MS. DAGGETT: I'm sorry, could you please 20 repeat the question? I just found the other 21 paper by the way, so. 22 MR. MAYES: Okay. Well, go ahead and

wrap up that up if you can.

1

2 MS. DAGGETT: Okay. So, the only issue they found was that the distance education plan 3 4 is not appropriately integrated into the campus 5 effectiveness plan. Anything else related to in a classroom, such as the things that I talked 6 7 about in SCHEV. 8 The other item about distance education 9 was that it doesn't have a distance education plan that includes the rationale, resources, 10 11 source program and different content or student 12 assessments. 13 And then they have that there is just 14 not a separate section for graduate admissions procedures in the catalog. 15 16 And they were the only things related 17 to, like, the areas that we talked about. 18 MR. MAYES: Okay. The next part, 17, dot 19 17(c), it's about conducting at least one onsite review of the institution. 20 In that the narrative talks about he reviewed about the same VIU review 21 22 issue not being adequate. Is that right?

MS. DAGGETT: That's correct. 1 2 MR. MAYES: Okay. And then the last, well, I guess it's not last, is the 17(e), 3 4 conducts its own analysis of the SCHEV study. 5 So, this one referenced the SDUIS reviews. In my 6 notes at least I mentioned that. But I may have 7 got that wrong. 8 But this, well yeah, this one was about 9 lack of reviewing the third party comments related to this English language center and 10 11 amnesty (unintelligible). They didn't look at 12 that, it showed that they didn't create a document, they looked at that information as part 13 14 of their initial application process. And, again, but that school didn't get 15 16 very far either in that process. 17 And then 602.28, dot 28, that we're back 18 to you have to have regard to the decision of 19 states or agencies back to the VIU and SCHEV 20 matter. 21 MS. DAGGETT: Right. But we actually did not find a lot of (unintelligible) with that 22

1 section. 2 MR. MAYES: Okay. It appears they --Okay. 3 4 MS. DAGGETT: It was only on a 5 technicality. It's only because that particular 6 section doesn't say state agency. Otherwise we 7 would have. 8 MR. MAYES: Okay, gotcha. 9 And on this one, you know, they did, I guess this goes back up to 602.16, they did do a 10 11 show cause where they -- if I remember correctly, 12 they did do a show cause and they did have the 13 schools before them, and answered questions, and 14 looked at the areas of non-compliance. So, I 15 don't know that we can say they didn't do 16 anything as far as their own review, they just 17 they waited until after SCHEV's board or 18 commission made a decision. Correct? 19 MS. DAGGETT: Well, if you look at the show cause order and the continued show cause 20 21 order, they actually only reference the SCHEV

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

actions and whether or not whatever the action is

there to either terminate their licensure, or 1 2 whatever the agreement would be. There wasn't actually any, any 3 4 description that they were actually looking at 5 the educational quality issues that were raised, that were raised in the SCHEV audit. 6 7 MR. MAYES: Okay. Good point. I think, I think that's all for 8 Okay. me, Chairman. 9 Thank you. CHAIR KEISER: I think I have Mary Ellen, 10 and then Jennifer, and then Anne. 11 12 DR. PETRISKO: Thank you very much. 13 I think it's important to note that also included in the SCHEV review was that the 14 15 institution was not collecting all items 16 justifying admission. And it noted that VIU was 17 not collecting relevant and proper documentation 18 to prove that students are meeting its admissions policy. The following students also were deemed 19 20 found to be missing documents. 21 And what they cited is in three 22 students, no proof of English proficiency.

And on one, two, three, four, five, six 1 2 foreign country not evaluated for equivalency. Which are issues that have come up elsewhere also 3 for the (unintelligible). 4 So, an unqualified registrar, which 5 could contribute to the problems with records. 6 7 And then there are other things with regard to academic quality I won't even go into. 8 9 But some of the ones, really obvious things with regard to standards of accreditation that should 10 11 be checked by an accreditor: admissions, whether 12 students have appropriate documentation, whether 13 they (unintelligible) to participate in English, 14 and whether their foreign degree has actually been checked. Those are substantial issues. 15 And 16 they do not show up in the VIU report that had 17 happened in January, when this audit happened in 18 August. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer. 20 MS. BLUM: Yeah. I just want to say 21 that, so, on this, this one's a hard one to be

honest, in my view. And, again, it's partially

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

process and bundling of the different types of issues.

I just, I guess I will just say I really feel like with the entirety of the record with a full petition, this would be much more transparent and much more clear as a basis to handle.

8 With regard to VIU, you know, I'm 9 struggling with this relationship. And also, the department's reliance in some of the steps. 10 I, 11 there's a purpose for the triad. It's not 12 actually to duplicate, it's, you know, -- it is possible to have similar standards on how one 13 14 regulator will find one way and to have another 15 regulator find another way.

So, I'm a little bit -- and I'm not new to the procedure. I'm actually struggling with that. Where would that be, you know, on the SDU piece -- and I'm glad Mary Ellen reminded me just now, or us of the asset piece, because to me that's quite troubling, irrelevant.

So, I just, I just feel like the

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

compiling and putting all these together in this 1 2 way is -- it makes it difficult, honestly, because it just makes it more difficult than I 3 think if we had the entirety of a record that's 4 5 coming, or would have been coming I guess, in six months, until we look at that. 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Jennifer. 8 Anne. 9 MS. NEAL: My only question was whether or not we were going to break it out. But I see 10 11 now that we're breaking it out by rule. So, that 12 was my only request. 13 I don't know that that's what you said, 14 Claude, but I'd like a requirement to do that. 15 DR. PRESSNELL: Yeah, that would need an 16 amendment to do it. And I'm fine with that. She 17 was just simply listing the different sections, 18 not necessarily that we would vote on them 19 separately. 20 But you're making an amendment that we 21 vote on each criteria separately? 22 MS. NEAL: Yes, please.

	-
1	DR. PRESSNELL: I'd consider that a
2	friendly amendment that we do that.
3	MS. NEAL: Thank you.
4	MS. BLUM: Can I ask a question. This is
5	Jennifer. I know I'm jumping in, but can I just
6	ask a technical question?
7	CHAIR KEISER: Before you do that,
8	Jennifer. Kathleen, do you approve to the
9	friendly amendment? Kathleen?
10	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
12	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, thank you.
14	The amendment's been accepted.
15	Okay, now you can go, Jennifer.
16	MS. BLUM: Can I just ask on that same
17	schedule, or maybe just staff, for each of these
18	can we do a, can we do, like, a parenthetical of
19	which school, like, what's the underlying, like
20	literally could we say, like, VIU, or VIU and
21	SDU, just to help keep I mean, I don't know
22	about everybody else but it definitely helps

1 keep my head straight about what the problems
2 were with each, under each of the regulatory
3 measures?

MS. DAGGETT: I'm sorry, so you want me
to go under each of these regulations and let you
know if there was any of the institutions'
involvement in these determinations?

8 MS. BLUM: Well, they were; right? I 9 mean, not if it's not accurate. But for each of 10 these criteria where there were violations, they 11 were called on, at least inquired on VIU or SDU; 12 right?

MS. DAGGETT: That's correct.

MS. BLUM: Okay. So that's, yes, what I'm asking for because I just need to know we're -- especially if we're breaking it out into however many different breakdowns there were.

MS. DAGGETT: Okay. So, section
602.15(a)(1) it's specifically the reason that
these -- that we had issues with and found them
non-compliant with that section relates to
administrative and/or fiscal suitability is due

to the oversight failures that were revealed in their reviews of VIU and SDUIS, and that they don't demonstrate if there's adequate accreditation review and monitoring processes to identify compliance issues. It's speaks to their capability.

7 CHAIR KEISER: So, what you're doing is 8 you say based on VIU and SD, whatever it is, this 9 would-be -- just put that in parentheses on the 10 motion for the first one. Right? Is that what 11 you're saying, Elizabeth?

MS. DAGGETT: Well, I was trying to
answer Jennifer's question. And so I don't know
if she wants that added there or not. I think
she just wanted a recap of how (unintelligible).
But, correct me if I'm wrong.

MS. BLUM: Either way. It would just be helpful for each one. It could be you could say it. I don't care whether it's in --CHAIR KEISER: Well, I would prefer not to have it in there. But that's okay, if that's okay with you, Jennifer?

1	MS. BLUM: Yeah. I think it would be
2	helpful to hear it one more time.
3	MS. DAGGETT: 602.16, 602.16(c) was
4	related to the failure to uncover the significant
5	areas of non-compliance by VIU regarding its
6	distance education which was revealed by the
7	SCHEV audit, which we've gone over those in
8	detail.
9	And then 602.17(c) was that ACICS didn't
10	demonstrate that it had obtained sufficient
11	information to determine compliance for an onsite
12	review with the review of VIU.
13	And then 17(e) was that they failed to
14	demonstrate that they conduct their own analysis
15	of institutional information and documentation to
16	determine compliance with the standards in the
17	review of SDUIS, based on their own policies and
18	procedures in that area.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Elizabeth.
20	Okay. Any other discussion? Anne, your
21	hand is up. Is that?
22	MS. NEAL: Left over. Sorry.

1	CHAIR KEISER: Okay. We'll move on the
2	first motion which is the 602.15(a)(1).
3	Anne?
4	MS. NEAL: No.
5	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
6	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes.
7	CHAIR KEISER: David.
8	DR. EUBANKS: Yes.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Please mute yourself if
10	you're not up.
11	Jennifer?
12	MS. BLUM: Yeah. Can I just ask if the
13	event producer could somehow mute all of us and
14	then just unmute each of us when we vote or
15	something?
16	PARTICIPANT: People have come in and
17	out.
18	MS. BLUM: Okay. I'm going to vote no.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
20	MS. BLUM: Yeah, I'm voting no. Can you
21	hear me?
22	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?

1	DR. DERBY: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
3	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
5	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
7	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
9	MR. O'DONNELL: No.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
11	MR. MAYES: No.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Steven?
13	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
15	DR. BOSTON: Yes.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Okay. It looks like the
17	motion passes.
18	We move to the second motion. Is there
19	any discussion on that? I hope not.
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIR KEISER: Okay. This is in regards
22	to 602.16(c).

1	Anne.
2	MS. NEAL: Yes.
3	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
4	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes.
5	CHAIR KEISER: David.
6	DR. EUBANKS: Yes.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
8	MS. BLUM: Yeah.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
10	DR. DERBY: Yes.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
12	DR. ALIOTO: Yes.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
14	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
16	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Rich, Rick?
18	MR. O'DONNELL: Yep.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
20	MR. MAYES: Yes.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Steven?
22	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.

I

1	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
2	DR. BOSTON: Yes.
3	CHAIR KEISER: That motion passes.
4	The third one thank you the third
5	one has to do with 602.17(c). Any discussion?
6	Wally, you have your hand up?
7	DR. BOSTON: Yes. What is 602.17(c)? I
8	just want to make sure I know.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Elizabeth?
10	MS. DAGGETT: (No audible response.)
11	CHAIR KEISER: Elizabeth?
12	MS. DAGGETT: Sorry. I was, I got muted.
13	What was the question? I'm sorry.
14	I'm sorry, what was the question?
15	CHAIR KEISER: 601.17(c), what does that
16	specifically refer to?
17	MS. DAGGETT: That's providing the
18	failure of ACICS did not demonstrate that it
19	obtained sufficient information to determine
20	compliance with the onsite review with respect to
21	the review of VIU.
22	DR. BOSTON: Thank you.

1 CHAIR KEISER: Does that answer your 2 question, Wally? 3 DR. BOSTON: It did. Thank you. 4 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. Any other 5 discussion? 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIR KEISER: I'm sensing none. Don't 8 see any hands. 9 Anne? 10 MS. NEAL: Yes. 11 CHAIR KEISER: Claude? 12 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 13 CHAIR KEISER: David. 14 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. 15 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 16 MS. BLUM: No. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 18 MS. BLUM: I think I said no. Did you 19 hear me? CHAIR KEISER: I hear it now. 20 21 Jill? 22 DR. DERBY: Yes.

1	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
2	DR. ALIOTO: Yeah.
3	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
4	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
5	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
6	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
8	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
10	MR. MAYES: Yes.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Steve?
12	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
14	DR. BOSTON: Yes.
15	CHAIR KEISER: That motion passes.
16	We'll go to the fourth one, 602.17(e).
17	Just, Elizabeth, what is that specifically, to
18	just make sure everybody knows.
19	MS. DAGGETT: That was the failure to
20	demonstrate that they conduct their own analysis
21	of institutional information and documentation to
22	determine compliance with the standards of review

1 of SDUIS. 2 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. No hands. 3 Anne. 4 MS. DAGGETT: I'm sorry. Just really 5 quickly, that also includes the review of the assets accreditation. 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. Anne. 8 MS. NEAL: No. CHAIR KEISER: Claude? 9 10 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 11 CHAIR KEISER: Claude. 12 David? 13 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 14 15 MS. BLUM: Yes. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Jill? 17 DR. DERBY: Yes. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? 19 DR. ALIOTO: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen? 20 21 DR. PETRISKO: Yes. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Paul.

1	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
3	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
5	MR. MAYES: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Steven?
7	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: And Wally?
9	DR. BOSTON: Yes.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. That passes,
11	too. We move to the next one.
12	I know everybody needs to take a
13	bathroom break. We're going to try to get
14	through this next one, and then we'll wait for
15	the last one, at which point we will then have us
16	finalize this thing. Okay?
17	Is there a motion, Claude?
18	DR. PRESSNELL: There is a motion.
19	I move that NACIQI accepts the staff
20	recommendation (unintelligible)
21	(Simultaneous conversation.)
22	CHAIR KEISER: Please mute yourselves.

Okay, Claude, go ahead. 1 2 DR. PRESSNELL: Thank you. I guarantee this only one motion, not multiple repeats. 3 4 Anyway, I move that NACIQI accepts the 5 staff's recommendation that ACICS be found out of compliance with the criterion cited in the final 6 staff report of the Reagan National University 7 8 inquiry. 9 And if we could get a second, we'll have Elizabeth come up and explain that one. 10 11 CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second? 12 DR. LeBLANC: I second. Paul. I second. 13 It's Paul. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Paul seconds it. 15 Elizabeth, explain it. 16 MS. DAGGETT: Yes. So, this one is 17 particular to five areas that ACICS failed to 18 demonstrate compliance with section 602.15(a)(1), 19 602.15(a)(2), 602.17(c), 602.18(c), and 20 602.19(b). 21 And I'm going to start at 602.15(a)(2) 22 is that they failed to demonstrate that they have

competent and knowledgeable individuals trained 1 2 for their roles as site visitors, members of the decision-making body, or other agency 3 representatives in their review of RNU. 4 5 They also did not provide information or documentation regarding the training of those 6 7 agency representatives. 8 For 602.17(c), ACICS failed to demonstrate that it had obtained sufficient 9 information to determine compliance with the 10 11 standards during its onsite review of -- it's 12 onsite reviews of RNU. 602.18(c) is that ACICS failed to 13 demonstrate that it based its accreditation 14 15 decisions on published standards in its review of 16 RNU. Section 602.19(b) is that ACICS failed 17 18 to demonstrate that it has effective monitoring 19 and evaluation approaches in the review of the 20 RNU. 21 And then 602.15(a)(1) is related to the 22 administrative and capabil -- administrative

and/or fiscal capabilities and that the numerous 1 2 worker site failure or the review of RNU did not demonstrate that they had the accreditation 3 4 review and monitoring processes that are adequate 5 to identify compliance issues. CHAIR KEISER: There's a motion and a 6 7 second. 8 Is there any further discussion? 9 MR. MAYES: I have a question. I also would like to go back, did we miss 602.2(h) of 10 11 the capacity report that has to -- Gosh, where 12 did it go? I had it up there. Had to do with regards to a decision to 13 14 state whether -- were we supposed to break that 15 one out, too? 16 MS. DAGGETT: That, that was not found as 17 a non-compliance issue in the final staff report. 18 MR. MAYES: Because of technicality. 19 Okay. My question's answered. Thank you. CHAIR KEISER: Okay. We'll call the 20 21 question. 22 Anne.

1	MS. NEAL: Just a question on this. So
2	this was not a Title IV decision. Correct?
3	MS. DAGGETT: No, it was not.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Anne? Yes, no?
5	MS. NEAL: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
7	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: David.
9	DR. EUBANKS: Yes.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
11	MS. BLUM: Yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
13	DR. DERBY: Yes.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen?
15	DR. ALIOTO: Yeah.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
17	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
19	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
21	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?

1	MR. MAYES: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: Steve?
3	DR. VanAUSDLE: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
5	DR. BOSTON: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Okay. We go to the last
7	one. This one's a different, different motion.
8	Claude?
9	DR. PRESSNELL: Yes.
10	Mr. Chairman, in light of the reports
11	received and in light of the actions on the first
12	one, the compliance report, the monitoring
13	report, the capacity report, and the RNU inquiry,
14	I hereby move that NACIQI recommend that ACICS'
15	recognition be terminated on the grounds that
16	ACICS did not comply with the criteria for
17	recognition identified in, again, the compliance
18	report, in 601.19(b) of the monitoring report,
19	and the capacity report, and of the Reagan
20	National inquiry. And there is sufficient
21	evidence that the agency did not bring itself
22	into compliance in a timely manner.

1 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. There is a motion. 2 Is there a second? 3 DR. ALIOTO: Second. 4 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? 5 DR. ALIOTO: Second. 6 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you again. 7 Is there discussion? Anne? 8 MS. NEAL: Again I just want to make sure I understand. Is this the final that we're 9 looking at now? 10 11 CHAIR KEISER: Yes. 12 DR. PRESSNELL: It is. It's the final 13 motion on the agency. MS. NEAL: So this is the terminate or 14 15 not? 16 CHAIR KEISER: Yes. 17 DR. PRESSNELL: That's correct. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 19 MS. BLUM: I have two things, one's a technical. 20 I think we voted down one of them. 21 22 Didn't we vote something down?

1 DR. PRESSNELL: We did. And I did not 2 include it in the motion. MS. BLUM: Oh, okay. So, I'm missing 3 4 that. 5 DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. On the second, on 6 the monitoring report, that's where I cited the 7 602.19(b). 8 MS. BLUM: Got it. 9 DR. PRESSNELL: Only I did not -- Yeah, 10 thank you. 11 MS. BLUM: Got it. Sorry. I just needed 12 to make sure I understood that. 13 And then I guess I want to, I guess I 14 just want to say that -- I just won't say it. Ι 15 was going to say that I really respect the 16 department on what they've been having to deal 17 with. I wish there weren't so many concerns 18 about the process. I'll just leave it at that. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Any further discussion? 20 I'm glad I'm not voting. 21 Anne. 22 MS. NEAL: I'm going to vote yes because

I have spent many years demanding that accreditors do a fantastic job of ensuring educational quality to protect students and taxpayers, and have found almost all of them wanting.

I am concerned that there have been some process issues here which have been less than fair. But having said that, I think we need to hold our accreditors to a high standard.

But I'm also, in voting yes, calling on all of this body, and Congress for that matter, to insist that we apply the same standards of rigor that we are applying to ACICS, that we do to everyone else that comes before us.

And since 90 percent of our schools are accredited by other bodies which have been given an easy run in the past, I'm hoping that this is the start of a new, more rigorous application of standards to all of the accrediting bodies.

20 And I'm hoping it's also a start of 21 Congress taking a look at what seems to be a 22 system that does not do a very good job of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

protecting students and taxpayers. 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: Claude? DR. PRESSNELL: Yes. 3 4 CHAIR KEISER: David. 5 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 6 7 MS. BLUM: I'm going to vote yes. But I 8 also want to a little bit echo Anne. I really 9 hope that this is a decision that is a final decision, because I really am concerned that the 10 11 students are once again going to be in a yo-yo 12 situation. And I want to echo Anne about that. 13 But I am going to vote yes because there 14 is a long history of concerns there, and so I am 15 voting yes. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? 17 I'm sorry. Jill? 18 DR. DERBY: Yes. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? 20 DR. ALIOTO: My eyes filled up with tears 21 when Anne was speaking. And I hope that we not 22 only look for this kind of action with others,

1	but also with ourselves as a body. And I think
2	we are doing that today.
3	Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
5	DR. PETRISKO: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Paul.
7	DR. LeBLANC: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Rick?
9	MR. O'DONNELL: I am voting yes.
10	And to echo some of the other comments,
11	I also hope that what I believe is a double-
12	standard that certain institutions and their
13	creditors are treated differently based on their
14	tax status or ownership structure ends, and that
15	double-standard, the whole process is gone, all
16	institutions, including publics, and private non-
17	profits and their creditors, are held to the same
18	rigorous standard.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
20	MR. MAYES: This is a tough one. We had
21	the, we had the Obama administration denial, the
22	one that was in first. The OIG report just came

(202) 234-4433

out, and ultimately what's considered the DeVos 1 2 decision was correct. And the items that have come up in this compliance report, others are 3 4 somewhat subjective. 5 There are some definite areas that are issues that we have just voted yes on here in the 6 In the context of all of it, and the fact 7 past. 8 that there is a review will be coming up mid-year 9 that can look at the whole thing, I have a little hard time today voting no and from the 10 11 recommendation based off these reports and the 12 totality of the whole situation. 13 So, I'm going to vote no. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Steven? 15 DR. VanAUSDLE: I just want to say, Anne, 16 I appreciate your statement. And I agree with 17 you. 18 And I vote yes. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Wally? 20 DR. BOSTON: I concur --21 CHAIR KEISER: Wally? 22 DR. BOSTON: I concur with Anne and

Rick's statement, and I vote yes. CHAIR KEISER: Okay. The motion carries. We are at 12:31. If you don't mind, I'm going to give you a half hour for lunch. And we will convene at 1:01, if that's okay with you. Thank you very much. We'll be back at 1:01. (Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the aboveentitled matter went off the record, and reconvened at 1:05 p.m.)

	197
1	AFTERNOON SESSION
2	(1:05 p.m.)
3	CHAIR KEISER: Well, welcome back from
4	lunch, everybody. We have one more recognition
5	to do. The recognition is for the renewal of
6	recognition by the National Accrediting
7	Commission of Career Arts and Sciences Inc.,
8	NACCAS.
9	The primary readers are Wally Boston and
10	Jill Derby, and the department staff is Karmon
11	Simms-Coates.
12	Jill, I understand you are going to be
13	the one leading off?
14	DR. DERBY: Yes. So, let me introduce
15	the agency. We are going to be reviewing the
16	National Accreditation Commission of Career Arts
17	and Sciences which is the acronym is NACCAS, for
18	brevity.
19	And it is the national accreditor. So,
20	the scope of recognition is the accreditation
21	throughout the United States of post-secondary
22	schools and departments of cosmetology arts and

1 sciences, and massage therapy.

2	The agency reports that it currently
3	accredits 1,210 institutions, offering programs
4	in the cosmetology arts and science and/or
5	massage therapy. Several of the schools which
6	are accredited by NACCAS use the agency's
7	accreditation to establish eligibility to
8	participate in the department's Title IV
9	programs.
10	And just a word of history. The
11	department has been accrediting NACCAS since
12	1970. And most recently in 2015, the NACIQI and
13	the ED staff recommended continuing the agency's
14	recommendation for five years. And that was
15	approved by the SDO as well.
16	So, I welcome Karmon to give us the
17	staff review.
18	MS. SIMMS-COATES: Good afternoon, Mr.
19	Chair, and members of the committee. My name
20	again is Karmon Simms-Coates, and I have a
21	summary of the review of a petition for renewal
22	of recognition for the National Accrediting

Commission of Career Arts and Sciences, or NACCAS.

The staff recommendation for the senior 3 4 department officials for NACCAS is to renew the 5 agency's recognition for a period of five years. This recommendation is based on our review of the 6 agency's petition and its supporting 7 8 documentation, as well as two observations, which 9 were a site visit and a virtual board meeting in 2020. 10

11 The department received one complaint 12 from a petition during the recognition period 13 regarding the agency's decision to withdraw an 14 institution's accreditation. After conducting a 15 thorough investigation, the department determined 16 the agency's (unintelligible) were consistent 17 with the secretary's recognition criteria.

18 There were no third-party comments
19 submitted to the department during this review.
20 There are representatives from the
21 agency that are here today to respond to your
22 questions.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

CHAIR KEISER: Any questions for Karmon? 1 2 DR. DERBY: Karmon, let me ask you this: I know in the draft report I read there 3 4 were many, many, 18 or 19 citations. And I 5 wondered, given now you're recommending quite a clean report, do you feel satisfied that they met 6 7 all those citations? 8 MS. SIMMS-COATES: Yes. In the draft 9 report it was mostly information that needed to be clarified or missing documentation. 10 There was 11 no (unintelligible) --12 (Telephone interference.) 13 DR. DERBY: Okay. Thank you. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Please mute your phone. Please mute your phone if you're not speaking. 15 16 Are there any other questions for 17 Karmon? 18 (No response.) 19 CHAIR KEISER: Sensing none, I'd like to 20 invite the agency representatives to come 21 forward, Dr. Tony Mirando and Darin Wallace. 22 DR. MIRANDO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and

NACIQI committee members.

1

2	Good morn or good afternoon now. On
3	behalf of NACCAS' chairwoman Commissioner
4	Stimmer, the other members of our Board of
5	Commissioners, and myself, I want to thank every
6	member of the NACIQI, Executive Director Dr.
7	Smith, and the Department of Education officials
8	for the work you do, especially during these
9	complex times.
10	I would also like to offer a special
11	thank you to our analyst, Karmon Simms-Coates,
12	who was just so amazing during this process.
13	Karmon was effective and available whenever we
14	had any questions and/or concerns that required
15	clarification.
16	And a special thank you as well to
17	Herman Bounds, the director of the accreditation
18	group, for his assistance throughout our whole
19	petition process.
20	It was a tough process, but as many of
21	you know, also rewarding and insightful process.
22	As you know, I am Tony Mirando. I have

been the executive director for the National Accrediting Commission of Career Arts and Sciences for the past 13 years, and began my 14th year just yesterday.

On the call with me today are Darin Wallace, who is NACCAS' Director of Government Affairs and Legal, and from our Re-recognition Committee we have Therese Vogel and Louis Starita, both whom are former NACCAS commissioners. Ms. Vogel is a former chairwoman 10 of the commissioner. 11

12 I would also like to knowledge Mike 13 Bouman, another former commission chair, and 14 current chair of the NACCAS Re-recognition Committee . Unfortunately, he was unable to be 15 16 here today due to a personal matter.

17 These are trying times, and I appreciate 18 your willingness to meet virtually. Many of you 19 don't know me well, but I am generally an 20 optimistic individual. But it has been a hectic 21 12 months. And I am sure you will agree with me 22 when I say that I am looking forward to the day

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

when we can all meet in person again and resume 1 2 some form of normalcy in everything that we do. As I just mentioned, I am in my 14th 3 4 year now with NACCAS. And I know many of you 5 either from a prior re-recognition process or from my service as a primary, non-federal 6 7 negotiator in two previous negotiated rulemaking meetings, one back in 2009 and '10 on program 8 9 integrity, and then again in 2017-'18 on gainful 10 employment. 11 For those of you who I have not met 12 before, it is my pleasure and honor to do so 13 today. 14 I am a non-nonsense leader, with effective day-to-day processes in place to ensure 15 16 NACCAS' success as an accreditor, and for the 17 success of the students enrolled in the schools 18 we accredit. I am known by the schools we 19 accredit, the different regional Department of 20 Education offices, and the licensing boards 21 across the country as a very tough but fair 22 individual. I have a professional and personal

2 I also believe that there is no better gift to give another human being than the gift of 3 4 knowledge. Providing for an environment which 5 enables students to enroll at NACCAS accredited 6 7 schools, to obtain the knowledge and the skills they need to pass their state boards so that they 8 9 may go out and earn a living as a trade professional, is essential. 10 There is no better I am a very lucky individual to work for 11 career. 12 an agency in a leadership position that embraces 13 those tenets. 14 To have a job that ultimately helps over 100,000 students annually change their lives by 15 16 the education they receive is truly a humbling 17 experience. 18 I also have a strong commitment to 19 building and maintaining crucial relationships 20 with the Department of Education officials 21 throughout the different regions of the U.S., and 22 in Washington, D.C., and with state regulatory

belief that right is right, and wrong is wrong.

agencies. NACCAS takes this responsibility as one of the legs on a three-legged stool very seriously.

I once again believe this is a win/win for the students we serve and protect.

This has been a very long few days for 6 7 all of you. And I'm sure you are looking forward 8 to completing the important work here this week. 9 With that said, I have been listening to your deliberations over the last two days, and it is 10 11 clear to me that many of you have questions 12 concerning two important topics: public members and student outcomes. 13

So, to save some time, I am going toaddress those issues now.

16 NACCAS' Board of Commissioners has 13
17 members, of which two are public members. Both
18 of our current public members have a bachelor's
19 degree and a master's degree. Both truly
20 understand their crucial role of representing
21 Jane and John Doe.

22

1

2

3

4

5

I say this because at every meeting one

or both of our public members is singled out and 1 2 asked: As a public member, what do you think? The commission believes that keeping our 3 4 public members' perspectives as representatives 5 of the public is a vital component of the commission's decision-making process. 6 7 One of our public members has over 32 years of experience in secondary education, and 8 9 provides vital perspective to the commission, in addition to being outsider representing the 10 11 public. 12 Our other public member also has 13 experience in education as a teacher. However, 14 he also brings experience to the commission as a trade professional, specifically as a 15 16 professional bartender. These two commissioners 17 are true public members and they take their positions on the commission very seriously, as 18 19 they should. 20 As many of you know, NACCAS is a very 21 busy accreditor. On average, our commissioners, including our public members, spend a minimum of 22

1

45 to 50 days a year on NACCAS business.

2 Their time commitment ranges from 3-hour monthly commission calls, to multiple monthly 3 committee calls of similar length, to full-day, 4 multi-day participation in NACCAS workshops, the 5 commission's quarterly face-to-face meetings, and 6 service on its final review committee. 7 And that does not count the endless hours spent reviewing 8 9 files and agendas in preparation for all of those 10 meetings. Our commissioners are volunteers. 11 None 12 of them are compensated as employees. 13 With that said, NACCAS does provide all 14 commissioners, including our public members, when they put in a full day of deliberation, with a 15 16 modest \$250 honorarium to compensate them for 17 their time and potential loss of earnings. 18 In addition, if any of those 8-hour days 19 takes place in a face-to-face environment, 20 meaning away from their home, NACCAS provides 21 them with an additional \$100 per diem for meals 22 and similar away-from-home expenses. Both the

honorarium and per diem policies are reasonable and in compliance with applicable IRS regulation governing the operations of a non-profit agency, and the department's regulations governing recognized accrediting agencies.

With respect to NACCAS' student 6 7 achievement outcome rates requirements and how they were developed, I have been asked this 8 9 question before, but unfortunately had the same answer: those rates were first adopted by the 10 commission long before I joined NACCAS, and I 11 12 have no insight into how they were originally 13 developed.

14 However, I can say that over the past 13 15 years NACCAS, as required from the department, 16 has had frequent and many more informal meetings, 17 discussions, and evaluations pertaining to those 18 standards and rates. Those thresholds have been 19 considered in light of how our institutions are 20 faring in relation to their mission of providing 21 new students the tools they need to obtain a 22 license to practice their new profession.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

Obtaining this license gives their students the confidence, the power, and the opportunity to launch into an exciting new career, the career they signed up for. I can say our institutions are doing a great job in achieving that goal.

7 In the past three years, NACCAS' Advisory Committee on Standards has twice 8 reviewed this issue and concluded that NACCAS's 9 current minimum required rate of 50 percent for 10 graduation, 70 percent for licensure, and 60 11 12 percent for placement are appropriate for the schools we accredit in light of the programs they 13 14 offer and the student populations they serve, and are consistent with the requirements of 15 16 accreditors serving comparable schools, taking into account differences in the calculation 17 18 methodologies.

Notwithstanding those conclusions,
NACCAS' commission had planned a comprehension
evaluation discussion of these issues during its
summer 2020 meeting. But because of COVID, that

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

was put on hold to deal wit more pressing issues. That discussion is now planned for the commission's summer 2021 meeting.

I would like to add that, as you know, 4 NACCAS is a specialized national accreditor, 5 accrediting for the most part institutions' 6 7 working programs in the study, in the field of cosmetology and barbery. Most of you might say 8 9 this seems very straightforward. Actually, the population of students who attend NACCAS 10 accredited schools is made up of a very diverse 11 12 set of cohorts, with complex student living 13 environments, and for whom an array of personal 14 and socio-economic factors play a huge role in their ability to succeed. 15

All of these factors in turn have been, and will continue to be, important in the commission's evaluation of whether its current threshold rate remains appropriate.

20 We all need cosmetologists and barbers. 21 These important fields are a part and feature of 22 our lives. NACCAS plays an important role in the

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

www.nealrgross.com

success of these students.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

20

In closing, NACCAS continues to strive towards being the best it can, taking every day's challenges as a vehicle for growth and improvement. I can personally say everyone at NACCAS works as hard as they do in order to make a difference to every student who is in one of our accredited institutions.

9 It was a very challenging year for 10 NACCAS to go through both the re-recognition 11 process and COVID. So, when we received the 12 department's notification stating that the staff 13 recommendation for the senior department official 14 was to renew the agency's recognition for five 15 years, we were happy to see that our hard work 16 did not go unnoticed.

17Thank you again for allowing us to18present today. We are available for those of you19who have further questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Mr. Mirando - Dr. Mirando.

1 Would you turn your camera on if you 2 can, sir. 3 DR. MIRANDO: Sure. There we go. Thank 4 you. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Jill or Wally, do you have particular questions of the agency? 6 7 DR. DERBY: Yeah. Let me start off. 8 I was struck by your 50 percent 9 graduation rates. And pleased to hear you are planning for this next summer an intense kind of 10 11 discussion about student success standards that 12 you have. But I wanted to ask particularly because 13 there's been a lot of concern about student debt 14 ratio to their earnings when they get out. 15 You 16 know, and speaking particularly about cosmetology 17 programs, it seems that, you know, they cost 18 maybe 19, 20 thousand, 21 thousand, somewhere in 19 that range. And you can correct me if I'm wrong 20 about that. 21 But there has been some publicity about the amount of debt that students have upon 22

graduation and their inability to pay that off comfortably because they go into a marketplace of earning maybe \$9 or \$10 an hour. And, eventually, over years can work up to much higher salaries.

6 But, there are too many accounts of 7 students that struggle after graduation. And I wonder, your 50 percent graduation rate concerns 8 9 me, I'm wondering about those students that have taken out loans and then do not graduate, and can 10 imagine their situation. 11

12 But I want to ask, zero in on one 13 particular issue. And this relates particularly 14 to the cosmetology schools.

And that is about their standards 15 16 required that the students spend so many hours in 17 their salon with chair time. And during that 18 period it's part of their training, the students 19 aren't paid but the salon's charge their 20 customers who come in for lesser rates, and so 21 make a good profit on that.

22

1

2

3

4

5

Because of some questionable practices

213

stretching the hours required for these students 1 2 to work in the salons, quite a few members, quite a few states, actually, have introduced 3 legislation to lower the number of hours required 4 5 for the certificate in cosmetology. Understandably, the salons do well, and 6 7 it is part of students' training, but there's quite a variation with some salons requiring 8 9 maybe, say, 1,000 hours of floor time -- this is separate from the rest of the instructional time 10 11 they have -- is adequate. 12 And then some schools, I know Iowa has 13 been noted as having excessive requirements of 14 over 2,000 hours. And I wondered if you could speak to 15 16 that. Is that something you look at? 17 And, generally, I'm curious about your, 18 the whole issue of debt to earnings and the loan 19 debt that students have upon graduation. Is that 20 something that you look at? 21 DR. MIRANDO: Okay. Well, I'll start 22 with the first one and then you might have to

remind me again of the other, the other question. 1 2 So, yeah, so this is, as I was mentioning in my report, the student graduation 3 4 rate and student placement is a very complex And I wish that it was, as Member Blum 5 process. had said, was a little bit more scientific. 6 We, 7 too, would love for it to be a bit more scientific. 8 9 Unfortunately, there are lots of 10 extenuating circumstances that are way beyond the 11 schools' control that create a process of keeping 12 students in their programs. And, unfortunately, 13 there's not much anyone can do about it, 14 including students. We receive, you know, complaints from 15 16 students. They love to complain to their 17 accreditor. And we address them all the time. 18 And I've got to say, that's at the bottom of the 19 list. 20 It typically isn't that they are not 21 receiving the education they want, and so, you 22 know, when I speak to, when I speak to my schools

-- because I teach a class in how to improve 1 2 student outcomes. And it's a pretty aggressive class, and we hold it all the time and our 3 4 schools really enjoy it. But what I hear a lot 5 is exactly that, is that, you know, students come in, they can't afford to stay there. 6 They're single moms. They don't have anybody to watch 7 8 the kids. They have transportation problems. 9 And they just can't finish the program. They beg all kinds of 10 They want to. ways can we figure out. 11 They just can't get 12 through the program. 13 The good news is our schools do very 14 well when they get them through the program in passing their boards, so, their mission to get 15 16 those who can go through the program out to the

world and working. And we find that the most important factor.

And so, if you look at the 50 percent
graduation rate and, you know, you compare it to
others, you know, we have very few exemptions.
You know, some institutions through other

17

18

accreditors are given, you know, other exemptions to take out of the number. We don't. It's pretty straightforward.

And we have a couple, you know, one of who which, unfortunately, the student died. Nobody wants to hear that but, you know, again, can't hold the institution responsible for that.

We have a 50 percent. And, again, we're 8 9 going to be looking at this again this summer. And we hope to get some kind of a rubric that's a 10 little bit more scientific. But what we're 11 12 hearing is, again, you know, you look at some of 13 these institutions and if you raise that bar too 14 high, then you're really preventing many students from being able to attend their institution. 15 You 16 know, the institution then won't be in compliance These students 17 to meet their accreditation. 18 won't have those opportunities.

And it's an important opportunity to
give these students a way to find alternative
ways to make a living for their families. It's a
very complex process. And I wish there was an

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

easier solution.

1

2

3

4

5

6

Again, we're going to look into this. And I hope that we will be able to come up with something a little bit more scientific. I wish there was a better metrics, and I think we have a problem with that metrics.

7 I think your second question had to do with on the rounds of gainful employment. 8 You 9 know, they come to school. Our institutions 10 charge anywhere in the, you know, \$11,000, \$12,000. We have some that are, you know, 11 12 \$16,000, \$17,000. And then some are in the 20s. 13 And the reason for, I believe -- and again very 14 anecdotal -- is because we have a variety of different number of hours. 15

You know, in New York, New York state
law for cosmetology and sit for the exam is 1,000
hours.

19Where we then look at, you know, Utah or20Oregon and it's up closer to 2,000 hours.21And I say, hey, what's the difference

between the two? We're an institutional

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

accreditor, we're not a programmatic accreditor. We don't set those hours. That's set by state law.

And so our job is to ensure that the institution is providing the education in accordance with their state law. We look at the institution to say, hey, these are NACCAS' standards, these are our criteria, these are our outcomes. And we absolutely expect you to adhere to not only NACCAS' standards and criteria, but we absolutely require you to follow your state law.

And so there's that variation. 13 But when 14 you look at the student outcomes with respect to 15 the debt and the gainful employment situation, as 16 I just mentioned, I was on the negotiated 17 rulemaking on gainful employment, and so I'm very 18 familiar with that. And I was very, very vocal 19 at the time. And probably, you know, there's 20 probably very few people who don't agree that, 21 you know, gainful employment is an important issue. 22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

You now, nobody wants to see a student, 1 2 especially me, especially my commission, I can tell you that, go through a program, put 3 themselves in debt, and then get out into the 4 5 real world and not be able to afford to live and pay off their debt. Can't have the problem. 6 We still have the same thing, it's a very complex 7 8 problem. And the accreditor is not going to 9 solve this. I'm not even so sure that the Department of ED can solve this, take gainful 10 11 employment off the table.

12 And, of course, we all know there is 13 lots of politics in this, and there's lots of 14 reasons why this happens. But I want to believe 15 that the members at the last negotiated 16 rulemaking made a point, and that is the metrics 17 that they were using, right, which basically goes 18 by the BLS numbers of what the students claim on 19 their income taxes, right. And, again, I said 20 this more than once, right is right, and wrong is 21 wrong. And if the metrics sets that were being used, which is based on what an individual 22

actually claims on their income taxes is what is going to be used to determine an institution's, you know, ability to show that this outcome is an issue.

Well, if the student isn't claiming 5 their income, and, you know, there's a lot of 6 7 underground problems going to students working, and booth rentals, not claiming their tips, there 8 9 is a lot of problems. And so, you know, I was very vocal in saying, hey, gainful employment is 10 11 important, but you're going to have to come up 12 with a scientific metric, just like everything 13 else we do, right? I mean, that's what 14 accreditation should be about and, you know, setting a standard, being able to validate it. 15 16 But if you can't validate the metrics 17 you're using, then we have a problem. 18 I hope that answers your question.

DR. DERBY: Thank you. I appreciate it.
I'll invite my -- Wally, do you have any followups? And from there, any other of my colleagues?
DR. BOSTON: Yes, I do, Jill.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

So, I noticed in the report that your agency accredits over 1,200 institutions, and actually 18 of them offer programs using distance education. And I clearly understand why those programs don't comprise more than 50 percent of the clock hours offered.

7 But I'm a little curious. I, you know, 8 tried to find the qualifications that were cited 9 for the expertise of your members. And I just 10 I'm curious if you have data that separates the 11 outcomes for the graduates of those programs 12 offering distance education?

By outcomes, you know, are they similar or greater in terms of pass rates, in terms of licensure rates, and in terms of employment, placement, so?

DR. MIRANDO: So that's a really good question, a very excellent question as a matter of fact. And I would say again, my answer is going to be somewhat anecdotal, because yes, we are actually collecting that data. But it has not yet been, it's actually in this year.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

We really had very limited schools doing 1 2 the distance ed. And it literally was just a minimal amount of hours, because state boards 3 4 don't allow or didn't, you know, things have changed, right, did not allow for distance 5 education. 6 7 So yes, when we visited the schools, we did actually request and require them to follow 8 9 our policy on distance education which included making sure teachers understood and they were 10 trained to do so. 11 12 But I could say right now, in those few 13 schools, we did not notice any difference in the 14 student outcome rates and, of course, the performance that these students did on their 15 16 licensure. 17 We have a very high licensure rate with 18 our graduates which, again, leads us to believe 19 that not only the institution is going well but, 20 of course, we want to pat ourselves on the back. 21 Because we require the students to adhere and the institutions to adhere to our standards and our 22

criteria.

1

2	CHAIR KEISER: Wally
3	DR. BOSTON: In other words, those
4	schools have the same standards, they meet the
5	same standards as everybody else and, at the same
6	time, you haven't collected, as yet, and
7	aggregated the rates for those institutions that
8	offer distance education programs.
9	DR. MIRANDO: I can say to you, yes, in
10	the past that was the case. But during 2020, the
11	Commission had a comprehensive review of our
12	distance education and we have begun a separation
13	of that.
14	We're also going to be, and we've
15	implemented this already, where institutions will
16	now have to separate out their programs via
17	distance education from that of brick and mortar.
18	So we will have that information, but we just
19	don't have it as of right now.
20	DR. BOSTON: Then lastly, do you have
21	qualifications for people on your staff with
22	distance education experience?

So on our staff, I would say we have 1 2 some people here who have, you know, personally themselves, including myself, have taken 3 4 education, via distance education. But I can say 5 to you on the individuals who make the decisions, which includes our Commission, yes, we have quite 6 7 a few of our commissioners who have extensive experience in distance education. 8 9 In 2020, all of our commissioners were 10 required to be present during a week-long 11 distance education training. And so, yes, we 12 feel very confident that we have the training 13 necessary to make the appropriate decisions on distance education. 14 DR. BOSTON: One last question, who 15 16 provided that training for distance education to 17 your commissioners? 18 DR. MIRANDO: So we had two individuals 19 from DEAC who, as you know, was an accreditor on distance education. One of them is the current 20 executive director, and the other one was a past 21 22 board member and is well respected throughout the

country in distance education gualifications. 1 2 DR. BOSTON: Okay, thank you. Okay, Anne Neal, then Bob 3 CHAIR KEISER: 4 Shireman. Anne? 5 MS. NEAL: I don't have any questions. No questions. 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: Bob? Bob Shireman? 8 MR. SHIREMAN: Yes, thank you, Tommy. 9 Do you have a lobbyist, or do you hire a lobbying firm? 10 DR. MIRANDO: 11 No, we do not. 12 MR. SHIREMAN: Okay, thank you. Ι 13 wanted to suggest that, in response to Jill's 14 questioning, you said that there was nothing you could do about some of the excessive hours that 15 16 some states have, seat time, that add to the 17 amount of student debt that they take on and then 18 have trouble repaying their loans. 19 One step that you could take, and there 20 are things that you could do, one step you could 21 take would be to lobby. And you don't need to 22 hire a lobbyist to do that. You can write a

letter or have the Commission take an action in support of some of the efforts to reform those numbers of hours.

Have you tried to take on those kinds of actions to kind of try to address the excessive debt that students are taking on in relation so the amount that they earn?

8 DR. MIRANDO: That, again, is also a 9 very excellent question. I would say, Bob, that 10 again NACCAS, you know, we try to stay out of the 11 politics.

12 As an institutional creditor, our job is 13 to ensure institutions, as you know, and it's 14 probably not the answer you want to hear, that they receive the education that they signed up 15 16 for, that they are in compliance with the state 17 laws, that they are afforded the opportunity to 18 go before the state boards for their 19 opportunities to get the licensure and get out there in the real world. 20 21 Again, I'm not hearing a lot of

complaints about students who put themselves into

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

debt, \$15,000 over, you know, whether it be a one year program or whether it's an 18 month program, or whether it's a two year program. And then they get out into the real world making decent money.

Again, a lot of what people are hearing is what the BLS is being published. And that isn't necessarily what we're hearing and seeing based on our conversations with salon owners, and some of the salon chains out there, and so on, and so forth.

MR. SHIREMAN: Could you track, in
regard to that, you know, one indication would be
default rates, but not just default rates,
because a lot of schools game those rates by
putting people on forbearance. Do you track
forbearance rates along with default rates on
student loans for your institutions?

19DR. MIRANDO: I don't feel like I know20that answer. I don't know. Mr. Wallace, you21might actually have a little bit more to say. I22don't think we do. I think we really just follow

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

the cohort default rates. But, Mr. Wallace do 1 2 you want to say something on that? I'd be happy to. 3 MR. WALLACE: And the 4 answer is pretty simple. No, we don't. We 5 obtain cohort default rate information directly from the U.S. Department of Education every year 6 7 when they announce their rate. 8 I don't believe we have the capacity to 9 track that information, because it relates to payments being made by students on their federal 10 11 That's not documentation we have. loans. We 12 can't require students to provide us with that 13 information. And U.S. Department of Education is 14 not about to do that for privacy reasons. So we can't really track that. 15 16 What we do do is monitor whether or not the Department has determined that an institution 17 18 has unacceptably high cohort default rates, in 19 which case we then have a process for monitoring 20 what they are doing to come back into compliance

22

21

MR. SHIREMAN: Okay. So rates of

with the Department's requirements.

delinquency and forbearance are available. So I do recommend that that's something that you should take a look at.

I gather, Tony, you said that you teach a class on student outcomes. And you said your focus is on education. Do you not consider the ability to repay loans, and earning a good living, and tracking that in your students, do you not consider that to be an outcome? Is that part of your class or not?

No, not really. 11 DR. MIRANDO: But, you 12 know, again, I'm a teacher at heart. And so I do 13 think it's an important aspect. And when I am 14 given the opportunity to get on my soapbox, I actually tell our schools that, that they need to 15 16 balance out what they're charging their students, 17 and they need to balance out what they know 18 they're going to make when they get out there in 19 the real world.

Again, I think you all would be surprised, and there are probably many of you there who go to a cosmetologist, you get your

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

hair done, you give them a great tip, even the barbers, you know, I go get my hair cut. I pay 20 bucks for a hair cut, and then I give them an extra \$5 that goes right into their pocket. I mean, it's just a reality.

MR. SHIREMAN: So a few minutes ago on your soapbox, you said that students love to complain to their accreditor. I realize you may have been kidding a little bit, but I have to say that my experience with students, by the time they complain, two things are true.

12 One is the number who actually complain 13 is a very low percentage of the number who are 14 struggling and having problems, that many, many 15 more never figured out who to complain to. They 16 don't know what an accreditor is. They don't 17 know who to complain to.

And anyone in that situation actually, if they even have gotten to complain to an accreditor, they're in a tough situation. They are struggling. Their lives, in any case, they feel have been messed up by a school.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

And I am concerned that you would joke about students complaining to their accreditor in the context of the kind of students who are, as you said, trying to improve their lives, and the importance of helping them to do that and being, you know, vigorous in our efforts.

I wonder, you know, it made me wonder if you've been there too long and have become insensitized to what students are actually facing.

So, again, these are very 11 DR. MIRANDO: 12 important topics. And I apologize if you took my 13 smile about students complaining. I was meaning 14 we get quite a few complaints about institutions. 15 And we handle every one of them very, very 16 seriously. I mean, we literally have a full time 17 That's all they do. person.

And I could tell you that, no, I don't think I've gotten desensitized to it. Because if you call our institutions and you have them tell you, they'll tell you I'm very tough on them. I pick up the phone myself, literally myself, and I

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

will get the student on the line on another phone, and the institution, and I definitely bring everybody to the carpet.

And no, I think that's not a fair representation of who I am as a person. I think my reputation, for those who know me, and I know that you don't really know me very well, Bob, I hope one day you will get to know me, you'll know that I am definitely a student-centered type individual, that I go to bat for students all the time, every day, all day long.

12 MR. SHIREMAN: Thank you. So thank you 13 for predicting the other question I was going to 14 ask about. So your financials indicate that you 15 pay all of your board members upwards of \$15,000 16 a year which is far, far, far out of proportion to anything paid by, as far as I'm aware, any 17 18 other accrediting agencies, and that includes 19 your public members.

I am not alleging that such is a
violation of any particular law. But I think it
does raise questions about whether your board

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

members are really, in the case of public board 1 2 members, whether they can serve as representatives of the public raising the kind of 3 4 questions that Jill, and I, and others perhaps, raised today as opposed to seeing their positions 5 as a bit of extra income. 6 7 Especially given that, at least in the case of the public board member who, by his own 8 9 claims, is a full-time bartender, the \$15,000-10 plus is, I'm guessing, a pretty large proportion of his total income. 11 12 Do you feel, so you provided resumes 13 that are available to us as members, resumes of 14 your board members. The resume of the board

member who is a full-time bartender says 15 16 educator, educator, educator, educator. It mentions licensed bartender somewhere in there. 17 18 Do you feel that the resume that you provided us 19 was an accurate depiction of the person who 20 serves as your public board member? 21 DR. MIRANDO: Yes. So again, I would 22 like to first address the money that we pay them.

I can tell you, I belong to a group of 1 2 accreditors, and we get together all the time. Everybody on the phone, everybody when we get 3 together realizes NACCAS is one of the most 4 5 active accrediting agencies in the country. Our board members meet very, very often. 6 7 There's been more time, you know, working with NACCAS and doing the work of NACCAS 8 9 far beyond, I think, most of the other accreditors that you may be alluding to spend 10 with their boards. 11 12 And so again, for the amount of hours 13 that they put in, we're very, very picky. Trust 14 me, I have a reputation of being very, very picky on giving out money, because that's our 15 16 institutions. And for the amount of time that 17 they're putting in, we do not feel like that is 18 exorbitant and well beyond what they deserve. 19 With respect to our board members, the 20 pubic members, yes, I believe that what they told 21 us is the truth. I have no reason to think differently. The gentleman that's a bartender, 22

or that said that he was a professional 1 2 bartender, no longer is a bartender. He's now retired. He's an older gentleman. 3 4 And we appreciate his effectiveness on 5 the Commission. He asks the greatest questions, representing, like I said, John and Jane Doe, 6 7 asking good, solid questions, why NACCAS does 8 this, and why did NACCAS do that? And is this 9 really effective? So no, I actually stand by our I think they do an awesome job. 10 public members. And I am very proud of them. 11 12 And I'm proud of NACCAS for the way we do our work. You know, we do a lot for what we 13 14 We have a very, very active visit take in. 15 schedule. We have very, very active board 16 meetings. I mean, they meet every month. Very 17 few accreditors meet every month. 18 And, you know, if you talk with our 19 analyst from the Department who is there for our 20 board meetings, she could tell you we're very 21 efficient. We're very, very fluid in what we do. And I feel confident and comfortable with our 22

1 stance on that policy. 2 MR. SHIREMAN: Thank you. Bob, is that it? 3 CHAIR KEISER: 4 MR. SHIREMAN: That's it. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. Then we have Jennifer, Kathleen and, Ann, I don't know if your 6 7 hand's still up or it's, you would be the third. 8 Jennifer? 9 Thanks, Art. Hi, Tony. MS. BLUM: 10 DR. MIRANDO: Hi, Jen. So I'll follow-up just real 11 MS. BLUM: 12 fast. Well, I'm going to follow-up on a lot of 13 what Bob said, but I want to follow-up very 14 immediately. In addition to the fact that you all 15 16 meet monthly which is actually pretty impressive, 17 and I think most, if I remember, a lot of the 18 institutionals, I'm calling them purposely all 19 now institutional and not regional or national, 20 all institutional, are more like, you know, a few 21 times a year, three to four times a year. 22 So I just wanted to -- but I also had

another question that related. What's your 1 2 maximum renewal period for one of your schools? Like, what's the best renewal period that one of 3 4 your school's could get? 5 DR. MIRANDO: Six years. 6 MS. BLUM: Okay. So, I mean, that's one 7 of the reasons that you're meeting monthly is 8 that you have a turnover, I mean, not turnover 9 but you're constantly reviewing, right. Okay. Ι 10 just want to, so there is more work involved. Τ 11 just wanted to mention that. 12 And then I wanted to go back to the 13 questions that Jill and Bob, I don't want to go 14 too far down this rabbit hole but, Bob, are you talking -- well, let me just start, Tony, am I 15 16 correct that NACCAS is non-profit? 17 DR. MIRANDO: Of course. 18 MS. BLUM: Yes. So asking them whether 19 they have lobbyists is probably not a great 20 question. Because they are very restrictive on 21 what they can do in terms of advocacy. So I just wanted to --22

	23
1	DR. MIRANDO: I sign a quarterly report
2	
3	(Simultaneous speaking.)
4	DR. MIRANDO: I just wanted to
5	MR. SHIREMAN: I am very familiar with
6	the lobbying rules. And non-profits are allowed
7	to lobby, and they do lobby. But in any case
8	it's not really
9	MS. BLUM: It's not to lobby, but this
10	will take me to my next point which is the issue
11	that I think Tony was talking about in terms of
12	clock hours and the licensure issue which I'm
13	really, really actually very sympathetic to. And
14	I'll tell you why in a minute.
15	It's very much the school's issue more
16	than it is an accrediting agency issue and is not
17	just a cosmetology or clock hours problem. I
18	just know from a lot of experience on this that
19	at graduate level, you know, you could take
20	psychology, you could take any number of
21	professions at the graduate level. And you will
22	find the same exact problem where, even at the

course level, licensure boards require a certain number of credit hours and a certain type of courses.

And then you go to the next state. And the next state says, oh yes, we don't need that course, we need a different course. Oh, and we don't need so many credit hours.

So this is a systemic, I won't call it 8 9 a problem necessarily. It's sort of a state's 10 rights thing. But it's a systemic issue that's 11 not just, A, at the clock hour level, or the 12 cosmetology level. And B, in my view, even though I went down this rabbit hole, not really 13 14 questions for accrediting agencies but much more 15 of a policy-related question as to how the 16 Department deals with issues around debt, you 17 know, with regard to sort of the institution.

I will say, and ask the question, on the issue of cost to your students, to the students that attend your institution, when you're looking at the financial capacity and administrative capacity of your school, so when you're doing

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

that, do you look at sort of, you know, not really the cost, because I know that's not really academic, but do you kind of try to put it all together in terms of making sure that, you know, that they're thoughtful about what their costs are and how they're managing themselves at institutions?

8 So that's basically a two-DR. MIRANDO: 9 part question. The first part is do we look at how much institutions charge the student. 10 No, we do not. We're, again, as an institutional 11 12 accreditor, our focus is not on how much they charge their students. I think that the fair 13 14 market on that is it will play itself out. If they're overcharging, they'll have a hard time 15 16 getting students. I believe that.

But with respect to do we look at how institutions do, with respect to the amount of money they make, absolutely. I mean, it's one of our standards, standards that are in Criterion 1. There's multiple aspects to that. And we're very picky. Those of you who are business

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

people know, the number one reason why schools and businesses go out of business is cash flow. And we're very sensitive to that.

And we not only are sensitive to that, but we actually have our director of finance, who happens to be an ex-auditor, who's very, very picky, and we have a finance committee. And we actually do look at all of our schools with respect to money. And if there's an issue, you know, then they have to respond to that problem.

MS. BLUM: And my one other comment is, just as it relates to things like cohort default rates and forbearance, I mean, I'm a real believer in the triad, and I definitely think that that's the Department's responsibility.

I appreciated your colleague's answer
which was that you track what the Department does
with regard to those items. And I hope you do
that really, you know, carefully and closely.
Because that is, I share Bob's view on cohort
default rates and forbearance issues and
problems.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

l	24 I
1	But I do also believe that those are
2	primarily, and if you look the triad
3	responsibility, it's primarily the responsibility
4	of the Department. And the accrediting agency is
5	only to pick up after the Department has dealt
6	with the problem.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? You're muted,
8	Kathleen.
9	DR. ALIOTO: She just finally unmuted
10	me. My question is about distance education
11	which you referred to earlier. But it's not
12	clear to me how you teach somebody to cut hair.
13	And also, one of my colleagues earlier
14	talked about the difficult distance education
15	period that he and I both find it difficult to
16	learn online. And I know thousands of students
17	in America, they don't have any other choice now.
18	But are you doing anything with all of
19	your schools to help them, whether it's hair or
20	whatever it is, so that they can get through it
21	and get their certificate or degrees?
22	DR. MIRANDO: Yes. That's, again, an

awesome question. And I have to tell you, 2020 was a very difficult year, not only for NACCAS but it's difficult for our schools and unbelievably difficult for our students. And as a result of the Department of

Education giving the accreditors some flexibility, you know, we dealt with, you know, allowing our schools to utilize the temporary distance education. And we learned a lot.

I mean, prior to COVID, very, very few 10 schools used distance education, because most 11 12 state laws don't allow for it. As you just said, 13 how do you give a, you know, provide an education 14 to students about cutting hair when that's very 15 tactile, right. You've got to learn how to do 16 things and work on people. And it was very difficult. 17

What the Commission decided, because we don't really have distance ed in our scope, and I don't want to get into that. The Department allows you, at least they did, allows accreditors who don't have it in their scope to allow up to

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1

50 percent of the program.

2 You know, we have ourselves, in our policies, cannot do practical work via distance 3 4 And that's right now. I mean, there are ed. some experts in the distance ed world who would 5 say no, come on, you got to be more contemporary. 6 7 There are logistical ways to allow that. And yes, we have to be open to it. 8 You 9 know, I pride myself in the ability to learn and And I have grown a lot in this past year. 10 grow. If my board was here, they would be telling you 11 that Tony did a good job in learning. 12 Because I'm an in-person, collaborative individual that 13 14 likes to be in groups. And this whole virtual thing that we're doing even right now, a year ago 15 16 I would have said there's no way this could work. 17 But I'm watching it. It's working. It's working 18 well. 19 But I still personally but, you know, I don't make these final decisions. 20 That's what we 21 have a Commission for, who have experts on them, on distance education. Right now the Commission 22

doesn't believe that allowing for practical work 1 2 in a distance education environment is to the best interest of the students right now. 3 4 DR. ALIOTO: Okay, finished. I'm done. Okay. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Anne, do you have Anne, do you have your hand up? 6 your hand up? 7 MS. NEAL: Obviously out of control. CHAIR KEISER: You're out of control? 8 9 (Simultaneous speaking.) 10 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, we do have a third 11 party presenter, Mr. Fred Jones. Are you on the 12 line? 13 **OPERATOR:** Please go ahead, sir. 14 I am, Chairman Keiser. MR. JONES: 15 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, you have three 16 minutes, Mr. Jones. 17 MR. JONES: Very well. Thank you for 18 this opportunity. My name is Fred Jones. I 19 serve as legal counsel for the Professional 20 Beauty Federation of California. We try to give 21 voice to our over 615,000 licensed individuals, 22 over 53,000 licensed establishments, and a couple

of hundred beauty colleges and barbery colleges. 1 2 So we are a huge industry here in our state. But we've been hearing some 3 4 disconcerting things about NACCAS and their treatment of some of our schools. And so we 5 actually did a couple of mailings nationwide to 6 7 the well over 1,200 NACCAS accredited beauty colleges in the nation. 8 9 And we've come up with some issues that 10 we would have preferred to provide in writing, but there was an abbreviated written testimony 11 12 window back in May during the height of the COVID 13 lockdowns. And so it wouldn't surprise me that 14 you did not receive any full written comments for this round of hearings. 15 16 Over the last five years, NACCAS has

published 126 proposed changes to their rules,
and practices, and procedures since 2016. Fiftytwo of those, or 41 percent, were published under
emergency action, meaning they were taking effect
immediately without any real notice to schools.
Two percent of those were actually back

dated, so retroactively applied. And then the remaining 59 percent, or 74 changes, the final changes actually went into effect anywhere from 25 days to only one day in advance of the public notice. So from a procedural vantage point, that has been very difficult for some schools to deal with.

Now we are dealing with virtual
resubmittal visits. And for some strange reason,
NACCAS only provides up to 30 minutes per student
file to pull the files of NACCAS chosen students
and record and upload those in NACCAS chosen
formats by these very tight arbitrary deadlines
during the actual visits.

And if a school doesn't meet that
arbitrary deadline --

CHAIR KEISER: One minute.

18 MR. JONES: -- NACCAS will reject all of 19 the work and will send a new set of student files 20 they have to pull, and the process repeats 21 itself. So this is requiring schools to actually 22 reformat all of their student files so that they

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

will be ready for these snap audit requests and 1 2 be able to get them in on time. Again, procedurally, these convoluted 3 4 time sensitive and arbitrary procedures were 5 never vetted by schools before they were adopted by NACCAS. And they never went out for public 6 7 comment. 8 There are a disturbing number of one-off 9 applications, and each of those with 10 corresponding fees. So rather than offer 11 systemic reforms to address this unprecedented 12 COVID crisis, NACCAS has created these one-off 13 relief applications and new fees associated with 14 each. And notwithstanding Dr. Mirando's 15 16 statement today that he is institutional 17 accreditor, not a programmatic accreditor ---18 Okay, I'd be happy to provide the 19 committee more information if given an 20 opportunity from our communications with over 21 1,200 schools nationwide. Thank you.

CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. I'd like to

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

have the Agency respond to the concerns.

2 DR. MIRANDO: Yes, thank you, Mr. Yes, I've had some communication with 3 Chairman. Mr. Jones. And his communication to NACCAS 4 originally was sponsored by himself and four or 5 five other state associations where they 6 7 requested us to submit answers to a number of questions with respect to how we're handling 8 9 things through the COVID process.

We answered those. I think our answers 10 11 were very, very effective, and transparent, and 12 And since then, I think that he sent out true. notices to all the schools. He included these 13 14 other agencies. Those other agencies have 15 contacted me and said we are not part of that. 16 We were very satisfied with your answers.

17 And so, you know, I tried reaching out 18 to Mr. Jones and say, hey, how can we have a 19 conversation? Look, we're trying to deal with 20 the COVID pandemic just like everybody else. And 21 I think we've done a really, really good job with 22 that. The Commission, yes, has done an enormous amount of changes, but it's again to effectively help students, help institutions get through this process. All of our changes, even if they were under emergency action, went out for call for comments as required by the Code of Federal Regulations, and we responded to those opinions.

9 You know, I have a meeting actually in two weeks with a large number of state 10 I'm giving them all an opportunity 11 associations. 12 to express their concerns about what institutions 13 are going through right now. But, you know, at 14 the end of the day, we are an accrediting agency that has a set of standards and criteria. 15 And we 16 know that we're going to have institutions that 17 are not going to be happy with what we do.

18 Our Commission makes decisions based on
19 what it believes to be the most effective methods
20 and mechanisms in order to ensure high quality -21 (Telephonic interference.)
22 DR. MIRANDO: Sometimes that doesn't

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

make institutions happy. But we have a very 1 2 effective methodology of having webinars, conference calls, and our workshops where we try 3 4 as effectively as we can to help institutions 5 understand what it is that we're doing and why we're doing them. 6 7 I hope that answers, that response. 8 CHAIR KEISER: That's fine. Thank you. 9 And if I may call Karmon back. Do you have any 10 comments on the third party commenter or anything 11 else you'd like to comment on from the Agency 12 review? MS. SIMMS-COATES: 13 No, I do not have any 14 comments at this time. 15 CHAIR KEISER: Are there any questions 16 to Karmon from the committee or from the primary 17 readers? 18 MR. SHIREMAN: Yes. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Bob, is that you? 20 MR. SHIREMAN: Yes, thank you. Karmon, 21 thank you. Karmon, you reviewed the resumes of 22 the members of the Board. Was it clear to you

that Mr. Roddy, that his actual career was as a 1 2 bartender and not as much as an educator? MS. SIMMS-COATES: He does have a 3 4 bachelor's degree and a master's degree. And 5 yes, he has been (audio interference), however he does have experience as a special needs teacher 6 as well. So I did evaluate that (audio 7 interference). 8 9 Again, it's pointed out early on during the committee meeting, I think it was the first 10 11 day we had a public representative. And as you 12 mentioned as well, there's a lot of things that 13 are prohibited in terms of being a public member, 14 but there's no stipulation as to what a public member should be. So there was no indication 15 16 that person could not serve as, or wasn't 17 registered (audio interference) as a public 18 member. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. MR. SHIREMAN: 20 Okay. Yes, I think on 21 this, what I'm interested in, and this may be 22 simply something in the future, is that it

appears that we're basically only doing sort of a check box on the question of whether they are not paid by a school or something like that but not asking how has an agency determined that under 602.15 that they are competent and qualified for the role as a representative of the public.

7 And I recognize that that is not something that has previously been asked. 8 But it 9 does seems that it, that it feels to me 10 inadequate to only ask the question about the other section of the regulations rather than also 11 12 the question here about the competence and 13 qualifications for being a representative of the 14 public, mindful of the fact that there are a lot 15 of ways to answer that question. Thank you very 16 much.

17 CHAIR KEISER: Good question, Bob. Let 18 me speak to Herman. Do you want to address that? 19 Yes, I do, real quickly. MR. BOUNDS: 20 You know, the Department doesn't define educator, 21 practitioner, academic, you know, or, yes, educator, academic, administrator, there's no 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

definition. And there's really not a, you know, 1 2 public member can be a stand alone person. Ι mean, you can be a public member and then not 3 4 also serve as an academic, or an administrator, or an educator, or practitioner. 5 So, you know, without a person being 6 7 disqualified by our definition of public member, then there would be nothing that we would have in 8 9 this case to say that this person who was a bartender could not serve in that public member 10 11 role. He doesn't have to be a public 12 member/educator, or a public member/academic, or 13 a public member/administrator. 14 Okay, thank you, Herman. CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer, you look like you're the last one. 15 16 MS. BLUM: Yes, I just wanted to agree 17 with Bob on this, not for the purposes of NACCAS, by the way, but because from a procedural 18 19 standpoint, to not change policy or change 20 interpretation on a dime. 21 But I do agree with Bob on this, that to me it's a combination of, you know, is the person 22

I	
1	a public member, and that is, as Bob states,
2	rightly or wrongly, unfortunately the definition
3	is a negative of what it's not.
4	But then there is sort of the
5	capabilities piece that, to me, is pretty
6	important. And so I agree with Bob on a go
7	forward basis about, you know, whether there's a
8	way to further this dialogue and conversation.
9	But I'm not going to belabor it today. I just
10	wanted to mention that I agree with Bob on this
11	one.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Are there any other
13	comments, because we're starting to lose members,
14	and we're going to lose a quorum pretty soon.
15	Any other questions, concerns? If not, I'd ask
16	the primary readers to make a motion if it'd be
17	possible.
18	DR. DERBY: I move that the NACIQI
19	recommend that NACCAS' recognition be renewed for
20	five years.
21	CHAIR KEISER: There's a motion, is
22	there a second?

256

DR. ALIOTO: 1 Second. 2 PARTICIPANT: I second. 3 CHAIR KEISER: Second. My number one seconder, Kathleen. Any discussion? 4 5 I don't see anybody's hand up. Okay, thank you. I'll do a roll call. Ann? 6 7 MS. NEAL: No. 8 CHAIR KEISER: David? 9 DR. EUBANKS: Yes. 10 CHAIR KEISER: Is that a yes? Jennifer? 11 MS. BLUM: Yes. 12 CHAIR KEISER: Jill? 13 DR. DERBY: Yes. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Kathleen? 15 DR. ALIOTO: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: 16 Mary Ellen? Mary Ellen? 17 I thought we had her. I saw her thing up. 18 Michael? Michael Lindsay? 19 DR. SMITH: Michael is out. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. Paul? 21 DR. PETRISKO: Mary Ellen said, sorry, 22 Mary Ellen said yes to (audio interference).

1	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Paul.
2	DR. SMITH: Paul's dropped off (audio
3	interference).
4	CHAIR KEISER: And Rick?
5	DR. SMITH: And Rick is no longer with
6	us.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Robert Mayes?
8	MR. MAYES: Yes.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Robert Shireman?
10	MR. SHIREMAN: No.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie Booth,
12	DR. SMITH: Ronnie left early.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIR KEISER: Steven? Steven?
16	(No audible response.)
17	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
18	DR. VanAUSDLE: The answer is yes.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Yes, yes for Steven.
20	Wally?
21	DR. BOSTON: Yes, for me.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Okay. How many do we

Do we have enough for a quorum? 1 have? 2 DR. SMITH: Yes, that was two nos and Is that right, Valerie? Valerie, 3 eight yeses. 4 clarify that if you can? 5 CHAIR KEISER: So it did pass? It 6 passed? 7 DR. SMITH: Yes. 8 Okay, folks. You guys CHAIR KEISER: 9 did a phenomenal job. This was a tough one. I have one more item on the agenda that Bob 10 11 Shireman wants to ask a question or make a 12 comment. Bob? 13 MR. SHIREMAN: Sure. Yes, a couple of 14 things have come up in this whole process and I really appreciate the learning that I've done 15 16 with the help of staff, et cetera. 17 I wanted to suggest that we ask the 18 Department two things. One is to restore the 19 accreditor dashboard, and second to assess the options for making more documents available to 20 21 the public earlier in the process. We saw a lot of situations where outside folks were kind of 22

having to comment in a vacuum about agencies, 1 2 because they didn't have access to items. So I'm not asking -- so I guess the 3 4 Department could, staff could either just tell 5 us, you know, yes, they'll do those things. Or we could, I guess they're not in their power 6 7 necessarily to say they'll they restore the accreditor dashboard. 8 9 But I would be open to the idea of us having a resolution asking that. So would that

10 be appropriate, Mr. Chairman? 11 In other words, a 12 resolution that would say the committee requests that the Department staff restore the, or the 13 14 Department restore the accreditor dashboard and assess the options for making more documents 15 16 available to the public earlier in the process. 17 DR. ALIOTO: Yes.

18 CHAIR KEISER: I think it's great. I'm 19 going to just ask George or Herman. Is there any 20 reason that the Department cancelled that? Or is 21 there something -- because I have no problem. I 22 think it's a good resolution with a very helpful

tool.

1

2	MR. BOUNDS: This is Herman. I think
3	the resolution is fine. I would just like to say
4	that, you know, currently the new regulatory
5	process requires us to produce the draft staff
6	analysis and all the information that was part of
7	that analysis 30 days prior to the NACIQI
8	meeting. It used to be, you know, it used to be
9	seven days. So that's a big improvement there.
10	Again, with the accreditor dashboards,
11	that would be a Department leadership problem, I
12	mean, not a problem, a Department leadership
13	decision.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Bob, I'd entertain a
15	motion if you want to make one to
16	MR. SHIREMAN: Okay, great. So my
17	motion is to resolve that the committee request
18	that the Department restore the accreditor
19	dashboard and, okay, I'm seeing a third, and
20	explore and assess making more documents
21	available earlier to the public.
22	DR. ALIOTO: Yes, I'll second the

I

1

2 CHAIR KEISER: I just think, is there any opposition to that? Because I just think we 3 can make it unanimous unless there's opposition. 4 Hearing none, it's by acclamation, Bob. 5 Beautiful, thank you. 6 MR. SHIREMAN: 7 CHAIR KEISER: And then ---8 DR. ALIOTO: Bravo. 9 CHAIR KEISER: Did Herman's explanation 10 on the 30 day, on the draft document, did that 11 meet your needs? 12 MR. SHIREMAN: I think that's been 13 enormously helpful. Obviously I can't imagine 14 what it was like for you folks when you had a 15 week instead of 30 days. So that was completely, 16 that was crazy. So I get more of the more documents issue on more agencies earlier. 17 18 My thought on that is I think a lot of 19 the documents could be made public basically when 20 they're uploaded by the agencies and that they 21 could take responsibility for any private 22 information. But obviously that takes some folks

1

kind of thinking that through.

2	That's the way that the non-profit
3	audits, for example, are handled at OMB where it
4	doesn't require any government person having to
5	go through them and figure things out basically.
6	It's just goes up. And anybody can look at them.
7	So it seems to me that a lot of the
8	documents could become public or available to the
9	public basically when they are uploaded. But I'm
10	not suggesting that specifically here, but that's
11	the kind of thing I'd like for the Department to
12	consider.
13	CHAIR KEISER: I think we could ask
14	George or Herman to look into that and see is
15	it's feasible. I don't know if it is.
16	MR. SHIREMAN: Yes.
17	CHAIR KEISER: But I would be, as Chair,
18	I would be glad to ask them, which I just did, to
19	see if it is possible. If it's not, that's fine
20	too. It depends on staff time and the equipment
21	that's available, technology too.
22	MR. SHIREMAN: Right.

1 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. Is there anything 2 else, Bob? Nothing else for me. 3 MR. SHIREMAN: 4 CHAIR KEISER: Anything else (audio 5 interference) order from anybody? Oh, Kathleen? I just want to thank you 6 DR. ALIOTO: 7 all for your customary leadership. 8 This is so hard trying to CHAIR KEISER: 9 figure out what's going on just using my mouse. But thank you for all being so effective and 10 11 cooperative. And I felt that details that we went through this meeting were extraordinarily 12 13 good. 14 And staff, thank you, thank you. And, members, have a great, I guess we won't see each 15 16 other until July or August, whenever the next 17 meeting is. 18 George, do we know when the next meeting 19 is? 20 DR. SMITH: Not yet, but of course, I'll 21 poll you within the next few weeks. Thank you 22 all. Have a good weekend.

		20
1	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, thank you, George.	
2	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter	
3	went off the record at 2:23 p.m.)	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
	Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.	

			266
Α	169:10 174:4 182:6	137:4 140:19 141:6,7	118:13 120:7 123:12
a.m 1:11 3:2 159:20	185:14 186:3 197:16	141:14,17 156:20	157:12
	197:20 198:7 199:14	157:7,11,14,18 158:5	addressing 26:21
abbreviated 247:11	201:17 217:17 221:14	158:22 160:9,16,18	adequate 158:5 160:7
ability 18:12 32:19	accredited 16:14 22:7	160:19,20 161:15	164:18 165:22 174:3
74:10 98:19 210:15	29:1,2 42:4,6,21 44:5	163:1 164:6 175:9	186:4 214:11
221:3 230:7 245:9	44:13 45:5 89:21	179:18 184:5,17	adhere 219:9 223:21,22
able 24:18,22 30:15	112:14,15 158:12	185:8,13,17 188:16	adjectives 71:20
33:11 38:10 48:20	162:6 191:16 198:6	191:13	administration 81:6
52:10 60:7 70:15	204:6 210:11 211:8	ACICS' 188:14	193:21
72:15 86:21 89:14	247:7	acknowledge 22:8	administration's 104:4
92:14,15 93:11 94:17	accrediting 2:12 4:11	acknowledged 34:22	administrative 14:11
100:14 107:20 217:15	4:12 6:7,10 13:10,18	acknowledging 39:9	15:17 31:21 33:5
218:3 220:5 221:15	14:19 15:6 17:7 19:7	acquainted 32:11	152:20,21 153:20
249:2	27:7 28:19 72:7,8	acquired 85:17	158:7 160:7 173:22
above- 195:8	78:4 92:5 93:12 95:14	acronym 197:17	185:22,22 240:21
above-entitled 159:19	95:17 96:22 97:2	act 4:2,4,9 112:3 133:4	administrator 20:20
265:2	98:11,14,19 99:2	acting 21:2 29:16	254:22 255:4
abruptly 28:15	105:12 109:9 111:21	action 24:21 29:13 30:7	admission 168:16
absolutely 110:19	112:1 141:9,19	37:12 39:8,22 40:10	admissions 165:14
219:9,11 241:19	145:11 152:13 158:14	40:13 41:7,7 50:12	168:18 169:11
abstain 138:14	159:12 162:9 191:19	63:20 95:15,17 97:1	adopted 208:10 249:5
academic 5:7 161:9	197:6 198:11,22	97:12,18 98:6 105:6	advance 248:4
162:20 169:8 241:3	202:2 208:5 210:6	123:15 132:18,21	adverse 16:19 30:7
254:21,22 255:4	233:18 235:5 239:16	133:8 167:22 192:22	39:22 40:10,13,22
ACC 31:4	240:14 243:4 251:14	227:1 247:20 251:5	41:7
accept 123:8 124:5	accreditor 91:1 115:15	actions 16:19 23:11	advice 5:2 25:22
127:18 129:6 130:16	116:12 169:11 197:19	40:22 41:10 59:11	advised 123:7
130:18 131:12 132:13	203:16 206:21 210:5	63:4 98:10,11 159:13	advises 4:22
134:2 150:10 156:19	215:17 219:1,1 220:8	167:22 188:11 227:5	advisory 1:4,11,13 3:4
accepted 172:14	225:19 231:8,16,20	active 235:5 236:14,15	3:17 4:4,6 5:18 6:13
accepts 140:18 183:19	232:2 241:12 249:17	activities 19:7 98:19	37:22 75:5 209:8
184:4	249:17 259:19 260:8	activity 14:20 18:13	advocacy 238:21
access 32:22 112:11	260:14 261:10,18	acts 16:12	aesthetics 21:20 22:2,6
113:9 260:2	accreditor's 63:11	actual 46:7 106:22	44:12 46:22 52:8
accessibility 113:8	accreditors 114:4	248:14 253:1	Affairs 202:7
acclamation 262:5	191:2,9 209:16 217:1	ad 132:11	affect 59:4,12
account 78:7 87:3	235:2,10 236:17	add 31:22 42:1 51:17	affirm 21:21 45:3 68:10
209:17	244:6,21	53:7 105:1,2 210:4	afford 216:6 220:5
accountability 112:19	accredits 12:17 16:10	226:16	afforded 227:17
accountable 86:17	198:3 222:2	added 57:19 89:17	afternoon 198:18 201:2
91:21 93:6,8 94:2,6	ACCSE 28:19 29:18	174:14	agencies 4:10,11,12
accounting 28:4	30:13 33:13	addition 5:6 105:2	5:8 6:1 32:7 42:6 72:8
accounts 89:11 213:6	accurate 77:9 173:9	206:10 207:18 237:15	74:19 76:12 78:4 85:6
accredit 4:16 112:6	234:19	additional 23:18 29:8,9	92:20 96:22 111:21
203:18,19 209:13	achieve 49:8 115:9	31:21 33:3,17,19	112:1,2 136:11
accreditation 2:2,9,10	achievement 14:12	39:14,19 47:4 60:16	141:19 143:19 152:14
4:19 9:15 10:17,18	16:4,6 38:19 208:7	60:22 66:12 118:21	160:1 162:10 166:19
12:8,14 13:5 17:16	achieving 209:6	120:17 207:21	205:1 208:5 233:18
18:13 20:2 22:3 24:11	ACICS 59:9,17 61:6	Additionally 25:1	235:5 240:14 250:14
27:19 28:22 31:1	64:19 65:7 69:6 75:11	address 14:10 15:18,19	250:14 260:1 262:17
	78:1 82:12 85:4 89:4	22:10 23:5,19 25:14	262:20
37:14 41:8 42:8 43:15			agencies' 158:7,14
46:16,20 49:22 65:15		27:12 34:11 36:22	
46:16,20 49:22 65:15 65:19 74:17 91:19	92:22 93:5,7 94:5	27:12 34:11 36:22 44:17 78:9 111:9	
46:16,20 49:22 65:15 65:19 74:17 91:19 93:18,21 94:2 95:6	92:22 93:5,7 94:5 95:22 96:8,18 97:5,11	44:17 78:9 111:9	agency's 11:16 13:8,17
46:16,20 49:22 65:15 65:19 74:17 91:19 93:18,21 94:2 95:6 96:2,3,5 102:20	92:22 93:5,7 94:5 95:22 96:8,18 97:5,11 98:1,8 99:9 100:14	44:17 78:9 111:9 138:7,8 205:15	agency's 11:16 13:8,17 13:21 14:3,15 15:12
46:16,20 49:22 65:15 65:19 74:17 91:19 93:18,21 94:2 95:6 96:2,3,5 102:20 112:17 115:10 118:4	92:22 93:5,7 94:5 95:22 96:8,18 97:5,11 98:1,8 99:9 100:14 102:8 112:9,15	44:17 78:9 111:9 138:7,8 205:15 215:17 227:5 234:22	agency's 11:16 13:8,17 13:21 14:3,15 15:12 17:5 19:1 22:19 23:11
46:16,20 49:22 65:15 65:19 74:17 91:19 93:18,21 94:2 95:6 96:2,3,5 102:20	92:22 93:5,7 94:5 95:22 96:8,18 97:5,11 98:1,8 99:9 100:14	44:17 78:9 111:9 138:7,8 205:15	agency's 11:16 13:8,17

agenda 6:3 12:11 47:11 259:10 agendas 207:9 aggregate 79:16 aggregated 224:7 aggressive 216:2 agnostic 144:21 145:1 ago 46:5 48:8 66:6 114:18 231:6 245:15 agree 59:3,21 61:15 62:4 63:18 117:14 127:22 128:2 132:16 132:18 144:17 149:15 150:3 153:9 194:16 202:21 219:20 255:16 255:21 256:6,10 agreed 58:18 118:18 agreement 15:6 28:21 29:6,18 30:1,10 31:4 31:6 48:11 144:9 168:2 ahead 58:10 61:2 62:1 129:22 130:13 150:6 150:12 164:22 184:1 246:13 aid 5:4 49:20 Alan 2:1 3:20 alerted 48:2 50:8 **Alioto** 1:14 6:16,17 56:10 102:2 103:2,5 105:8 125:18 139:14 141:2 150:21 154:10 156:1 157:3 172:10 172:12 177:3 178:12 181:2 182:19 187:15 189:3,5 192:20 243:9 246:4 257:1,15 260:17 261:22 262:8 264:6 alleged 107:4,9 allegedly 92:8 alleging 233:20 allies 30:18 33:15 44:9 allow 65:13,18 75:15 111:3 223:4,5 244:12 244:22 245:7 allowed 75:11 118:21 239:6 allowing 211:17 244:8 246:1 allows 75:16 244:21,21 alluded 37:1 131:11 alluding 235:10 alternative 217:20 alternatives 119:5 **Alumni** 9:7 amalgamation 109:13 110:16

amazing 155:8 201:12 amend 150:4 151:10 amended 4:2,4 112:3 amendment 150:3,10 150:13 151:1,2,11 171:16,20 172:2,9 amendment's 172:14 America 243:17 American 8:5 9:7 amnesty 166:11 amount 60:12 212:22 223:3 226:17 227:7 235:12,16 241:18 251:2 analysis 23:2,17 25:8 27:21 35:1,21 36:5 41:21 43:22 60:2 68:21 72:7 73:20 75:11,19 86:5 100:2,8 100:21 107:1,13 157:19 159:7 166:4 175:14 181:20 261:6 261:7 analyst 75:19 87:12 201:11 236:19 analvzes 16:12 analyzing 31:9 and/or 158:7 173:22 186:1 198:4 201:14 anecdotal 218:14 222:20 anecdotally 44:3 Angela 2:7 10:10 76:15 **Ann** 237:6 257:6 Anne 1:18 9:5.6 55:9.21 56:10 62:22 63:19 67:15,21 68:2,3 69:5 69:19 70:13 76:21 105:16 109:5 114:16 117:17 119:6 120:22 121:15 131:11 133:19 135:12 136:3 138:5 138:22,22 139:1,1,3 153:21 155:11 168:11 171:8 175:20 176:3 178:1 180:9 182:3,7 186:22 187:4 189:7 190:21 192:8,12,21 194:15,22 226:3,4 246:5,6 Anne's 77:3 announce 229:7 announcement 76:11 76:12 annual 38:18,21 41:22 42:19 54:15 annually 17:11 204:15 answer 19:14 22:10

33:22 54:1 68:4 78:19 78:21 81:4,10 85:11 85:11,13,15 93:22 113:13,19 126:20 147:18 174:13 180:1 208:10 222:19 227:14 228:20 229:4 242:16 254:15 258:18 answered 53:9 79:16 126:13 167:13 186:19 250:10 answering 148:18 answers 33:20 61:16 79:8 221:18 250:7,10 250:16 252:7 anticipate 22:16 27:13 anybody 57:20 59:18 68:5 216:7 263:6 264:5 anybody's 257:5 anytime 37:13 anyway 129:17 184:4 Apologies 162:16 apologize 8:7 11:4 128:18 232:12 apology 128:19 appear 74:20 76:10 86:6 appearance 76:9,11 117:4.5 appearances 117:7 appeared 77:18 98:9 appearing 26:2 appears 18:2 55:7 119:3 167:2 254:1 **Apples** 143:14 applicable 101:14 107:17 119:16 120:1 208:2 applicant 37:14,15,20 applicants 30:11 44:11 application 11:13 20:10 65:19 68:15 95:14 118:6.9 120:5 166:14 191:18 applications 249:9,13 applied 248:1 **apply** 137:11 191:12 **applying** 191:13 appointed 21:1 24:1 appreciate 47:18 194:16 202:17 221:19 236:4 259:15 appreciated 30:13 242:16 appreciation 25:15 **approach** 118:19 approaches 94:10

141:16 185:19 appropriate 5:22 34:9 39:8 59:17 81:8 100:2 136:12 169:12 209:12 210:19 225:13 260:11 appropriately 96:19 165:4 approval 4:10,12 50:4 98:11 122:22,22 141:19 145:14 152:13 approve 129:13 130:8 150:16,22 172:8 approved 198:15 April 14:3 24:4 arbitrary 248:13,16 249:4 area 35:15 107:21 175:18 areas 14:11 22:20 37:11,16 101:15 107:4,9 111:14 135:20 141:6,18 152:9 161:6,7,12 162:11,11,19 165:17 167:14 175:5 184:17 194:5 arena 44:15 argument 63:10 84:13 arguments 144:22 arises 128:12 arose 34:8 array 210:13 Art 12:12 55:1 57:9 58:3 79:5 105:18,19 108:2 108:5 114:17 121:4 129:3 138:7 140:9 145:5 151:4 237:9 Arthur 1:11,13 article 43:12 93:17 articles 145:11 articulate 124:11 149:8 articulated 148:5 Artis 1:14 7:4,6,7 57:5 arts 2:13 6:10 7:9 197:7 197:16,22 198:4 199:1 202:2 aside 101:3 asked 65:5 78:8,12 79:14 89:15 121:7 125:2 136:15 144:13 206:2 208:8 254:8 asking 45:15 69:12 75:9 108:3 127:9,10 127:11 173:15 236:7 238:18 254:4 260:3 260:10 asks 236:5 aspect 230:13

aspects 32:21 241:21 assess 29:19 63:12 259:19 260:15 261:20 assessment 22:20 117:15 assessments 165:12 asset 112:17 159:15 170:20 assets 70:5 89:7 144:6 182:6 assigned 11:12 12:21 assigning 35:19 assigns 34:16 assistance 3:11 25:19 44:20 201:18 assistant 8:15 associated 3:9 53:11 249:13 association 8:10 52:5,6 74:15 associations 116:5 250:6 251:11 assume 21:5 32:21 88:1 147:17 assuming 90:15 assumptions 89:22 assurance 115:14 at-risk 152:7 attend 210:10 217:15 240:20 attendance 22:11 24:4 attended 14:1 44:12 85:21 attending 68:18 attention 25:21 99:3 attorney 7:18 63:11 66:7 81:12 105:22 106:2,10 116:4 134:1 attorneys 123:7 audible 179:10 258:14 258:16 audience 26:12 audio 103:6,7 105:1 106:7,14 109:21 110:13 113:12 116:5 125:21,22 126:15 127:14 132:8 135:7 135:22 136:9,13 143:9 144:19 145:1 146:2 147:15 148:3 148:13,18 149:3 150:12,19 153:14 156:17 159:3,17 253:5,7,17 257:22 258:2 264:4 audit 68:22 78:15 145:9 146:4 161:6 168:6 169:17 175:7 249:1

audited 86:21 87:11 auditor 28:5 88:5 auditors 88:11 audits 97:7 122:12 142:18 263:3 August 163:7 169:18 264:16 Ausdle 10:4 authorities 4:14 112:4 authority 16:8 108:15 authorization 5:9 authorized 5:1,5 authorizes 5:7 automatically 95:2 available 5:11 105:3 112:22 201:13 211:18 230:1 234:13 259:20 260:16 261:21 263:8 263:21 average 40:3,5,7 42:22 206:21 averages 43:5 averaging 40:8 **avoid** 64:9 aware 40:14 60:20.22 61:5 70:2 71:2 74:9 74:10 75:13 76:6 118:1,2 138:17 233:17 away-from-home 207:22 awesome 236:10 244:1 aye 151:3 В **B** 240:12 bachelor's 21:13 205:18 253:4 back 7:17 27:16 34:14 36:20 42:2 54:1 58:1 58:15 64:6,13 67:16 68:1,12 70:16,19 72:1 79:18 80:22 83:15 84:13 86:7 90:2 107:6 108:4 112:13 113:22 114:18 116:13 121:2 122:19 123:18 147:18 166:17,19 167:10 186:10 195:6 197:3 203:8 223:20 229:20 238:12 247:12,22 252:9 background 63:8 **backup** 33:4 bad 146:21 balance 87:2,4,7 230:16,17 bank 33:1 87:2 88:18

bar 217:13 barbers 210:20 231:2 barbery 210:8 247:1 bartender 206:16 234:9 234:15,17 235:22 236:2,2 253:2 255:10 base 41:15 based 13:20 15:10 61:12,16 66:18,21 78:16 89:22 98:20 99:6 103:21 130:7 134:9,18 141:10 142:9 174:8 175:17 185:14 193:13 194:11 199:6 220:22 228:9 251:18 basically 103:3 117:22 146:7 220:17 241:8 254:1 262:19 263:5,9 **basis** 100:8,10 170:6 256:7 bat 233:10 **bathroom** 183:13 Beach 21:10 **bearing** 61:18 Beautiful 262:6 beauty 2:16 73:13 246:20 247:1,7 **beg** 216:10 **began** 202:3 beginning 113:2 begun 224:12 behalf 21:18 201:3 behavior 91:22 belabor 256:9 **belief** 204:1 **believe** 16:21 64:4 66:18 69:13 70:10,21 83:3 88:10 89:15 112:16,20 125:1 131:21 133:6 148:21 162:1 164:3,5,8,16 193:11 204:2 205:4 218:13 220:14 223:18 229:8 235:20 241:16 243:1 246:1 believer 242:14 believes 206:3 251:19 belong 235:1 benchmark 39:11 benchmarks 16:6 38:19 Benedict 7:7 benefit 42:8 129:18 benefitting 22:3 best 72:20 73:10 123:8 147:18 148:4,5 211:3 238:3 246:3 Beth 69:8 77:3 79:7,13

82:2 103:14 104:11 105:7,18 110:5 111:4 121:13 124:4,10 140:22 163:15 better 23:3 42:10 69:9 120:20 146:9 204:2 204:10 218:5 beyond 33:19 40:15 78:5 115:4 136:5 215:10 235:9,18 **big** 261:9 bigger 136:8 biological 15:20 birth 6:21 bit 11:6 27:1,8,17 28:16 34:5 37:4 49:1 51:6 62:7 89:6 105:19 106:16 110:14 146:12 170:16 192:8 215:6,7 217:11 218:4 228:21 231:9 234:6 Blacksburg 21:14 blank 60:14 blindsided 48:13 BLS 220:18 228:7 Blum 1:15 7:16.16 55:19 56:5 61:22 62:4 62:15 67:15 79:5 81:10 83:21 86:18 108:2 113:15 126:3 126:13.20 127:9 128:16 130:21 131:8 131:10 132:4 139:9 141:22 142:5,12 151:4,13 152:16 153:18 154:6 155:19 169:20 172:4,16 173:8,14 174:17 175:1 176:12,18,20 178:8 180:16,18 182:15 187:11 189:19 190:3,8,11 192:7 215:5 237:9,11 238:6 238:18 239:9 242:11 255:16 257:11 blurring 84:9 board 22:12 26:7,10,11 33:15 36:12 42:16 44:9 45:13 50:7 51:11 91:16 136:10 167:17 199:9 201:4 205:16 225:22 233:15,22 234:1,8,14,14,20 235:6,19 236:15,20 245:11 252:22 boards 8:11 32:7 42:18 91:15 203:20 204:8 216:15 223:3 227:18

235:11 240:1 Bob 9:22 47:17 50:15 58:13 59:19 226:3,7,7 227:9 233:7 237:3,13 238:13,14 252:19 254:17 255:17,21 256:1,6,10 259:10,12 261:14 262:5 264:2 Bob's 242:20 bodies 51:2 145:12 159:13 191:16,19 **body** 21:20 22:1,6 73:2 185:3 191:11 193:1 booth 1:15 7:22,22 12:9 19:13 26:16 33:22 36:13 55:1 57:1,2 58:12 221:8 258:11 Boston 1:16 8:4,4 57:9 140:6 145:5,8 155:1 156:13 177:15 179:2 179:7,22 180:3 181:14 183:9 188:5 194:20,22 197:9 221:22 224:3,20 225:15 226:2 258:21 bottom 3:9 46:8 145:7 215:18 Boulder 21:15 **Bouman** 202:13 Bounds 2:2 10:15,16 60:19 63:16 69:4.8,15 69:19 70:2,13,18 72:6 74:14 75:15 76:8 102:21 103:4.14 105:7 121:4 127:2 163:15 201:17 254:19 261:2 **box** 254:2 brain 6:21 Bravo 262:8 break 67:16 171:10 183:13 186:14 breakdowns 173:17 breaking 171:11 173:16 brevity 197:18 brick 224:17 briefing 11:14 bring 52:15 55:9 68:1 76:13,16 81:3 122:19 188:21 233:3 brings 206:14 broad 119:10,16 136:19 broader 137:21 broadly 152:7 broken 103:1 **brought** 64:2 99:3 109:6 111:17 brush 119:10,16

bucks 231:3 budget 5:10 18:11 31:9 31:9,20 48:9 78:13 budgeted 31:16 34:2 budgets 78:15 building 204:19 bundling 170:1 burden 49:8 burdened 31:13 Bureau 120:6 Bureaus 118:4 business 32:22 33:6 207:1 241:22 242:2 businesses 242:2 busy 5:20 206:21 buttons 71:1 С C.F.R 14:17 calculation 209:17 California 2:17 246:20 call 27:3 37:13 54:1 55:8 58:14 70:19 72:14 138:22 186:20 202:5 232:20 240:8 251:6 252:9 257:6 called 136:1 173:11 calling 191:10 237:18 calls 158:6 207:3,4 252:3 camera 212:1

campus 112:18,19 165:4 campuses 90:4,5 cancelled 260:20 Candice 3:15 capabil 185:22 capabilities 158:8 186:1 256:5 capability 152:11 174:6 capable 142:16 capacity 18:1,2,5 34:1 36:22 54:16 68:11,13 99:5 136:20 143:6 149:17 150:15 152:20 153:21 156:22 157:6 186:11 188:13,19 229:8 240:21,22 CAR 112:19 care 174:19 career 2:13 6:10 197:7 197:16 199:1 202:2 204:11 209:4,4 253:1 carefully 242:19 **Carolina** 7:8 8:2 carpet 233:3 carries 195:2 carry 13:18 14:19 141:9 case 48:1 62:18 72:5 76:1 160:9 224:10 229:19 231:21 234:1 234:8 239:7 255:9 cash 242:2 catalog 165:15 categories 34:19 category 37:12 cause 41:5 103:22 104:6,7 167:11,12,20 167:20 caused 90:9 causing 149:9 cautioned 71:9 center 166:10 central 75:10 **Century** 10:2 **CEO** 9:2 certain 32:21 63:2 193:12 240:1,2 certainly 44:8 51:17 63:22 64:1,11 88:17 88:21 114:3,12 158:10 certificate 214:5 243:21 certification 5:3 cetera 33:1 259:16 chains 228:10 **Chairman** 7:13 123:6 140:16 142:21 149:11 156:18 168:9 188:10 200:22 211:20 246:14 250:3 260:11 Chairperson 5:15 chairwoman 2:15 201:3 202:10 **challenge** 44:6,22 challenges 14:22 19:2 71:12 211:4 challenging 68:12 211:9 chances 103:9 change 44:7 50:3 66:22 77:10 87:8 89:7 116:6 116:7 204:15 255:19 255:19 changed 105:12 223:5 changes 66:16 247:17 248:2,3 251:2,4 characterization 119:8 characterizations 72:3 charge 113:5 213:19 218:10 241:10,13 charges 5:6 charging 230:16 **Charity** 2:4 10:20 chart 39:1,15 chase 131:10

chat 3:8.12 **CHEA** 99:7 check 254:2 checkbox 114:21 117:3 checkboxes 115:4 checked 169:11,15 checking 152:22 choice 243:17 chose 25:5 chosen 248:11.12 circumstance 146:21 circumstances 40:12 47:22 215:10 citations 200:4,7 cite 65:3 119:22 cited 64:20 124:7 140:20 141:17 156:21 161:6 168:21 184:6 190:6 222:8 claim 220:18 claiming 221:5,8 claims 221:1 234:9 clarification 74:3 79:3 136:22 142:13 201:15 clarified 200:10 clarify 77:4 259:4 clarity 36:18 **CLARK** 1:14 **class** 216:1,3 230:5,10 classroom 73:7 165:6 classrooms 73:6 **Claude** 1:20 9:16,17 55:14 58:10 62:5,16 64:22 102:4 109:16 117:14 123:5.5 132:11 133:22 139:3 142:22 144:17,17 154:1 155:14 156:16 171:14 176:5 178:3 180:11 182:9,11 183:17 184:1 187:6 188:8 192:2 Claude's 117:21 clean 130:2 200:6 clear 20:7 30:11 44:19 69:20 82:7 83:22 84:1 114:13 121:8 130:6 134:9 143:8 153:5,8 153:13 170:6 205:11 243:12 252:22 clearly 143:2,3 222:4 Cliff 26:12 51:17 53:7 **Clifford** 2:11 50:20 clock 222:6 239:12,17 240:11 close 25:15 32:4 49:12 92:18,18 114:14 161:4

closed 28:14.14 47:21 48:2,8 49:16 91:21 92:8 93:17 closely 28:6 242:19 closer 62:3 218:20 closing 28:12 41:4 146:17 211:2 closure 48:17 91:18,20 92:10 closures 109:1 114:3 coalition 30:20 42:14 Coates 10:21 Code 251:6 cohort 229:1,5,18 242:12,20 cohorts 210:12 collaboration 76:14 collaborative 245:13 colleague's 242:16 **colleagues** 7:6 47:14 221:21 243:13 collect 38:21 43:6 collected 224:6 collecting 168:15,17 222:21 collection 41:21 collects 16:13 college 7:8,9,10 8:1 9:13 10:6 colleges 6:7 8:11 9:18 247:1.1.8 **Colorado** 21:16 colored 63:20,21 **Columbia** 7:8 9:2.3 combination 255:22 come 16:18 18:17 25:12 34:14 35:9 36:12 40:20 41:12 44:8 52:9 66:12 75:8 75:12,18 80:15 81:2 98:16 122:2 127:7 128:14 132:1 141:1 147:7,11 169:3 176:16 184:10 194:3 200:20 213:20 216:5 218:3,9 221:11 229:20 245:6 247:9 259:14 comes 33:9 134:20 191:14 comfortable 236:22 comfortably 213:2 coming 20:9 31:15 35:20 80:17,19 107:6 118:22 171:5,5 194:8 comment 11:19 58:4 59:16,19 61:11 63:1 64:13 75:14,16 76:7

111:3 121:1,6 142:22 159:10 242:11 249:7 252:11 259:12 260:1 commenter 252:10 commenters 2:16 75:7 107:4,9 comments 11:17,21 12:1,3,22 14:6 18:15 25:17 45:21 46:1 51:18 54:7 60:21 74:11 75:11,17,18,21 76:5 99:22 100:7,18 100:20 101:4,5,8,10 101:14 106:8,17 107:1,8,11,16 115:22 123:12 153:3 158:10 159:1,3 166:9 193:10 199:18 247:14 251:6 252:10,14 256:13 commission 2:10,12 6:7,10 9:14 12:7,13 13:5 14:3 18:21,22 20:2,20,22 21:4 22:11 24:4 25:2,6,9 29:13 32:3 35:8 37:12 39:7 47:9 48:22 51:20 95:4 95:13 167:18 197:7 197:16 199:1 202:2 202:13 206:3,9,14,18 207:3 208:11 209:20 220:2 224:11 225:6 227:1 236:5 244:18 245:21,22 251:1,18 commission's 206:6 207:6 210:3.18 commissioner 21:3 24:1,2 34:6 51:15 53:14 201:3 202:11 commissioners 15:21 15:22 20:21 21:18 24:8,13 36:6,10,12 45:17 201:5 202:10 205:16 206:16,21 207:11,14 225:7,9,17 commissions 98:14 commitment 22:13 204:18 207:2 committed 23:10 **committee** 1:4,11,13 3:4,17 4:4 5:18 6:13 7:12 9:20 10:22 13:2 19:21 22:10 23:9 25:10,20 32:4 37:22 53:21 54:2 58:21 65:3 67:21 75:5 99:8 100:6 102:6 148:4 149:7 198:19 201:1 202:8 202:15 207:4,7 209:8

242:7 249:19 252:16 253:10 260:12 261:17 Committee's 65:5 **Committees** 4:6 Commonwealth 21:12 communication 32:8 49:19 50:7 250:3,4 communications 249:20 community 10:5 25:21 51:21 comparability 161:10 162:21 comparable 209:16 compare 216:20 compares 32:7 comparison 42:5 143:15 comparisons 144:5 compelling 79:8 116:2 compensate 207:16 compensated 207:12 competence 254:12 competencies 43:9 **competency** 98:14,17 122:8 125:8 competent 50:22 185:1 254:5 compiling 171:1 complain 215:16 231:8 231:11,12,15,17,19 complaining 232:2,13 **complaint** 199:11 complaints 14:5 18:14 99:17 100:17 215:15 227:22 232:14 complete 80:19 completed 31:3,6 completely 114:11 117:1 262:15 completers 112:21 completing 205:8 completion 39:2 complex 201:9 210:12 215:4 217:22 220:7 compliant 14:17 19:11 142:9 complicated 11:6 complicating 132:7 comply 188:16 component 206:5 composite 122:13,15 comprehension 209:20 comprehensive 224:11 comprise 222:5 computer 52:19 **COMTA** 2:10 6:5 12:8 12:17 13:6 15:7 20:3

20:15 21:7,22 22:7 23:10 27:17 28:12 29:2 31:2 42:4,8,21 45:5,14 47:9 90:19,22 92:17 COMTA's 20:10 26:2 30:12 46:13 COMTA-accredited 21:9 43:3 concern 77:7 82:1,17 96:16 97:4 109:10 143:1 144:5,8 146:5 147:8 161:7 162:14 212:14 concerned 19:9 71:14 72:4 80:21 95:10,18 96:6 109:7 110:11 114:9 191:6 192:10 232:1 concerning 82:18,19 97:9 205:12 concerns 26:21 27:3 50:9 71:11 80:11 100:12 107:21 114:11 158:6 161:13 190:17 192:14 201:14 213:8 250:1 251:12 256:15 concluded 209:9 conclusion 120:10 130:18 133:6 conclusions 119:19 209:19 concur 56:10 145:8 194:20.22 condition 37:13,17 38:2 38:12 39:17,19 conditions 29:3 38:7 55:11 conduct 18:13 72:13,19 164:15 175:14 181:20 conducted 12:21 14:4 42:20 69:10 70:5 159:6 conducting 75:20 165:19 199:14 conducts 157:19 166:4 conference 3:13 252:3 confidence 66:3 209:2 confident 225:12 236:22 confused 79:22 82:11 106:6 110:2,3,8 133:22 135:14 151:22 confusing 84:6 confusion 134:6 congratulations 57:7 Congress 18:18 191:11 191:21

conjunction 49:18 consent 47:11 consequences 128:9 consider 23:21 29:13 46:10 60:8 88:7 102:8 102:10,17 103:6,9 104:18,18 119:4 133:2 172:1 230:6,9 263:12 consideration 20:9 28:18 59:1 61:19 63:7 64:10 81:16 110:15 122.7 considerations 60:15 considered 40:15 60:13 60:17 111:14 194:1 208:19 considering 36:14 88:18 consistency 40:18 68:14 79:9 91:3 consistent 24:7 61:13 118:9 199:16 209:15 consistently 16:17 137:5 138:1 consolidate 81:6 constantly 238:9 constituents 18:17 **Consultant** 8:10 9:15 consumer 91:17 contacted 250:15 contemporary 245:6 content 27:19 43:15 50:22 165:11 context 117:20 118:10 120:8,9 194:7 232:3 contexts 74:2 **continual** 84:18 89:5 continue 6:6 49:9 88:9 123:19 210:17 continued 17:12 22:19 23:11 39:19 78:17,20 167:20 continues 211:2 **continuing** 38:9,15 68:17,19 198:13 contract 32:22 contradicting 65:20 contribute 169:6 contributed 28:16 49:11 control 215:11 246:7,8 controlled 18:16 convene 195:5 conversation 26:15 54:11 59:1 79:6 113:17 138:11 183:21 250:19 256:8

(202) 234-4433

conversations 145:20 228:9 convinced 65:9 convoluted 132:22 249:3 cooperative 264:11 copy 163:22 coronavirus 78:11 corporate 49:3 corporately 28:13 48:7 correct 80:4 84:7 95:15 98:15,20 99:20 108:18 126:9,11,12 128:5 130:11,12,20 133:13,20 163:3 164:18 166:1 167:18 173:13 174:16 187:2 189:17 194:2 212:19 238:16 corrected 133:14 correctly 167:11 correspondence 18:16 50:6 corresponding 249:10 cosmetologist 230:22 cosmetologists 210:20 cosmetology 197:22 198:4 210:8 212:16 213:14 214:5 218:17 239:17 240:12 cost 44:16 212:17 240:19 241:2 Costa 12:19 costs 241:5 Council 9:7 counsel 28:7 110:13 111:4 134:12 246:19 count 49:15 207:8 countless 103:11 country 42:18 49:5 169:2 203:21 226:1 235:5 couple 19:13 33:13 47:20 62:8 86:20 89:13 109:4 111:9 217:4 246:22 247:6 259:13 course 29:7 41:1 45:17 52:4 115:15 118:7 146:16 149:13 220:12 223:14,20 238:17 240:1,6,6 264:20 courses 240:3 cover 78:2 **COVID** 31:4 209:22 211:11 244:10 247:12 249:12 250:9,20 COVID-19 14:4

crazy 262:16 create 166:12 215:11 created 249:12 credit 240:2,7 creditor 227:12 creditors 193:13,17 crisis 249:12 criteria 22:18 23:5,16 25:13 52:20 64:19 65:16 66:13 72:22 103:19 107:11 115:5 119:20 124:7 140:20 148:21,21 149:2,9 156:21 171:21 173:10 188:16 199:17 219:8 219:10 224:1 251:15 criterion 136:19,19 184:6 241:20 critical 6:21 63:5 criticism 60:10,11 criticize 90:22 crucial 204:19 205:20 crux 60:9 curiosity 137:10 curious 77:9 145:18 214:17 222:7.10 current 21:7 24:8 31:17 36:10 58:6 202:14 205:18 209:10 210:18 225:20 currently 15:8 27:21 59:13 74:19 77:22 198:2 261:4 **curriculum** 43:9,9 customary 264:7 customers 213:20 cut 72:17 131:10 231:2 231:3 243:12 cutting 244:14 cycle 24:7 36:3,9,11 76:4 D **D** 1:18 D.C 204:22 Daggett 2:3 10:19 61:3 71:1,6 77:13 81:4 83:3 85:9 87:6,17 88:2,10 89:4 92:1,4 93:7,20 94:5,18 95:16 95:20 96:7 97:6,18 98:3,7,17 99:5,21 100:9,18 101:7 105:1 106:21 111:8 119:6 120:11 124:22 125:5 125:13 129:2 131:21 135:16 137:1,13,19

141:4 142:4,7 148:17

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

152:5 157:6 158:13 158:21 159:17 161:5 161:21 162:7,18 163:4,17,20 164:2,19 165:2 166:1,21 167:4 167:19 173:4,13,18 174:12 175:3 179:10 179:12,17 181:19 182:4 184:16 186:16 187:3 Darin 2:14 200:21 202:5 dashboard 259:19 260:8,14 261:19 dashboards 261:10 data 41:21 42:4 43:6 222:10,21 date 17:15 27:1 dated 87:19 248:1 David 1:17 8:12,14 47:17 48:5 55:16 114:16 139:6 154:3 155:16 176:7 178:5 180:13 182:12 187:8 192:4 257:8 Dawn 2:11 19:14.18.22 26:9.16 41:13 43:12 45:20 47:20 50:16 day 5:17,20 7:17 55:22 103:16 202:22 207:15 233:8,11,11 248:4 251:14 253:11 262:10 day's 211:3 day-to-day 203:15 days 68:19 75:3 117:22 118:8 143:15 205:6 205:10 207:1,18 248:4 261:7,9 262:15 **DEAC** 225:19 deadline 39:12 248:16 deadlines 248:13 deal 57:17 149:3,10 190:16 210:1 248:6 250:19 dealing 68:14 146:9 161:14 248:8 deals 63:3 240:16 dealt 58:19 243:5 244:7 death 143:22 debate 63:20 debt 212:14,22 214:18 214:19 219:15 220:4 220:6 226:17 227:6 228:1 240:16 **December** 80:14 decent 228:5 decided 67:17 94:16 244:18 decision 17:9,13,15

58:20 59:4,7,8 60:11 64:3 71:22 73:18 81:5 81:22 83:16 90:11 95:4 103:13 104:14 106:5 121:17 127:6 128:13 131:17 133:5 134:21 135:19 166:18 167:18 186:13 187:2 192:9,10 194:2 199:13 261:13 decision-making 24:12 51:2,8 53:19 79:11 185:3 206:6 decisionmaking 110:12 decisions 59:22 60:13 61:11 65:21 185:15 225:5,13 245:20 251:18 decline 70:5 144:6 **decrease** 43:16 dedicated 6:20 23:10 dedication 82:8 deemed 168:19 default 228:14,14,17 229:1,5,18 242:12,21 defeat 129:13 defend 81:14 defending 114:12 defer 51:17 deferral 65:18,18 132:2 deferrals 116:2 146:14 deficiencies 91:11 deficient 41:11 125:21 deficit 77:22 78:3 deficits 78:10 define 254:20 **definite** 194:5 definitely 81:17 172:22 233:2,9 242:14 definition 255:1,7 256:2 definitive 78:20 degree 21:13,15 169:14 205:19,19 253:4,4 degrees 5:7 243:21 delay 18:20,22 145:14 deliberation 207:15 deliberations 5:13 205:10 delinquency 230:1 deliver 103:11 demanding 191:1 demonstrable 41:16 demonstrate 13:16 16:16 17:1 23:9,20 24:20 83:11 85:22 137:4,22 141:8,14 152:9 157:7,11,15,19 158:3 159:2,6 174:3

175:10,14 179:18 181:20 184:18,22 185:9,14,18 186:3 demonstrated 104:2 demonstrates 16:5 demonstrating 16:12 denial 159:13,15 193:21 department 1:1 2:1 11:14 12:2,10 13:8,13 14:6,8,16,18 17:4,5 17:16 25:17 26:1 49:20 58:20 60:10 61:17 62:9 63:12 67:22 68:17,21 72:19 73:4,15 81:2 82:3,8 84:12,21 88:13 96:10 99:4 108:15 121:22 124:21 131:2 160:20 190:16 197:10 198:11 199:4,11,15,19 201:7 203:19 204:20 208:15 211:13 220:10 229:6 229:13,17 236:19 240:16 242:17 243:4 243:5 244:5.20 254:20 259:18 260:4 260:13,14,20 261:11 261:12,18 263:11 department's 52:20 106:13 107:13 145:13 170:10 198:8 208:4 211:12 229:21 242:15 departments 197:22 depends 85:10 130:5 263:20 depiction 234:19 **Derby** 1:16 8:7,9 56:8 124:16,18 139:12 154:8 155:21 177:1 178:10 180:22 182:17 187:13 192:18 197:10 197:14 200:2,13 212:7 221:19 256:18 257:13 describe 48:1 141:1 described 14:22 describes 51:3 description 51:4 168:4 descriptions 23:4 descriptors 71:20 desensitized 232:19 deserve 235:18 design 73:8 designate 41:6 designated 2:2 3:21 22:9 35:2 designating 35:10

designed 24:15 detail 32:1 35:8 45:10 175:8 detailed 23:3 details 33:21 69:9 97:8 264:11 determinations 173:7 determine 65:14 72:20 86:12 93:13 157:16 157:21 175:11,16 179:19 181:22 185:10 221:2 determined 104:15 199:15 229:17 254:4 determines 4:13 determining 122:10 develop 53:12 developed 208:8,13 development 6:22 7:19 14:13 DeVos 81:6 135:19 136:2 194:1 DeVos's 134:21 dialog 25:2 52:18 dialogs 53:15 dialogue 256:8 died 217:5 Diego 91:12 95:12 99:12 158:11,20 160:11 diem 207:21 208:1 differ 160:21 difference 6:2 41:16 85:9 211:7 218:21 223:13 differences 72:7 209:17 different 6:1 40:6 72:10 72:11,11 73:3 77:4 78:22 79:14 96:21 103:8 109:2 127:14 128:10,15 136:10 144:4 149:4 165:11 170:1 171:17 173:17 188:7,7 203:19 204:21 218:15 240:6 differently 193:13 235:22 difficult 146:12 171:2,3 243:14,15 244:2,3,4 244:17 248:6 dime 255:20 diminished 18:2,5 direct 44:20 61:18 161:4 164:11 directed 99:13 direction 29:5 79:1 89:9 117:1 directly 48:8 63:4 83:17

151:17 229:5 director 2:1,2,11,13,14 3:14,21 10:1,16 19:18 20:1 21:2,5,8 22:15 27:18 29:10,16 32:3 32:13 201:6,17 202:1 202:6 225:21 242:5 disagree 119:7 disasters 115:13,14,17 discharge 4:22 disconcerting 247:4 discounting 108:12 discuss 6:3 discussed 25:6 47:8 discussing 62:14 105:20 discussion 6:6 12:4 55:6,8 57:22 58:16 63:19,21 64:11 67:19 68:3 115:3 117:6 122:18 125:12,16 141:21 145:4 175:20 177:19 179:5 180:5 186:8 189:7 190:19 209:21 210:2 212:11 257:4 discussions 208:17 disgualified 255:7 distance 52:2 97:9,13 97:20 157:13 161:10 162:21 163:8,9 164:9 165:3,8,9 175:6 222:3 222:12 223:2,5,9 224:8,12,17,22 225:4 225:8,11,14,16,20 226:1 243:10,14 244:9,11,19 245:3,5 245:22 246:2 distinction 128:6 distinctly 151:14 disturbing 79:20 249:8 diverse 210:11 doc 163:11 document 36:16 38:11 162:17 166:13 262:10 documentation 13:22 15:21 36:5 38:8 39:14 61:5,877:2178:6,19 83:5,10 85:19,21 86:11 100:12 106:3 157:20 159:7 168:17 169:12 175:15 181:21 185:6 199:8 200:10 229:11 documenting 38:5 documents 87:13 88:4 92:22 141:12 168:20 259:20 260:15 261:20

262:17,19 263:8 **Doe** 205:21 236:6 doing 33:14 46:13 76:3 82:4 94:11 103:9 133:1 135:8 138:22 174:7 193:2 209:5 223:1 229:20 235:8 240:22 243:18 245:15 252:5,6 254:1 dollars 122:16 domino 28:17 Donna 2:6 10:11 76:15 127:4,10 128:17 129:15 131:8 133:16 147:17 148:16 Donna's 127:10 doors 93:4 dot 115:4,5,5 165:18 166:17 double- 193:11 double-standard 193:15 doubtful 145:19 downward 89:5 143:17 draconian 102:18 draft 23:2 27:20 35:1 77:6.10.18.20 86:5 149:2 200:3,8 261:5 262:10 drag 149:6 Drexel 52:22 drive 104:14 drop 101:21 dropped 105:16 258:2 dry 72:18 dual 28:22 due 14:4 17:9 81:13 94:13,18 100:14 119:3 130:3 173:22 202:16 duplicate 170:12 duration 115:10 Ε E 1:11,13,16 197:1,1 earlier 17:3 32:15 42:13 71:10 103:15 147:3 243:11,13 259:21 260:16 261:21 262:17 early 5:21 253:9 258:12 earn 204:9 227:7 earning 213:3 230:7 earnings 207:17 212:15 214:18 easier 218:1 easy 150:10 191:17 echo 192:8,12 193:10

economizing 45:12 ed 198:13 220:10 223:2 244:19 245:4,5 Edison 53:5 educate 164:8 education 1:1,2 2:1 4:2 4:13,15 5:3 7:18 9:2 9:14 10:1 15:1 16:9 22:2 25:20 38:9,15 51:21 52:2,3,15 97:10 97:13,20 112:3,5 115:8 116:15 157:13 161:11 162:22 163:8 163:9 164:9 165:3,8,9 175:6 201:7 203:20 204:16,20 206:8,13 215:21 219:5 222:4 222:12 223:6,9 224:8 224:12,17,22 225:4,4 225:8,11,14,16,20 226:1 227:15 229:6 229:13 230:6 243:10 243:14 244:6,9,11,13 245:22 246:2 educational 4:17 46:21 93:13 96:8 152:12 161:14 168:5 191:3 educationally 102:16 educator 234:16,16,16 234:16 253:2 254:20 254:22 255:5 Edwards' 99:7 effect 28:17 84:15 132:4.6 158:16 247:20 248:3 effective 94:8,9 141:15 143:6 185:18 201:13 203:15 236:9 250:11 251:19 252:2 264:10 effectively 23:5 25:13 157:12 251:3 252:4 effectiveness 8:16 38:3 163:10 165:5 236:4 efficacy 64:2 efficient 236:21 efficiently 25:13 efforts 227:2 232:6 eight 40:6,8 122:16 259:3 eighth 7:10 either 56:4 102:19 151:6 164:3 166:16 168:1 174:17 203:5 260:4 elaborate 106:16 **elected** 20:19,22 element 113:20 elevates 21:22

eligibility 4:17 5:2 65:14,16 113:6 198:7 eligible 108:20 eliminate 120:21 Elizabeth 2:3 10:19 86:19 102:3,17 115:6 120:3 124:20 128:22 141:3 148:11 157:5 174:11 175:19 179:9 179:11 181:17 184:10 184:15 Ellen 1:19 9:11,12 56:13 58:2,15 59:21 61:16 64:12 67:3 102:4 109:15 117:20 122:19 125:21 135:6 136:4 137:2,21 138:9 139:15 144:11 150:17 152:17 154:11 156:2 159:10 168:10 170:19 177:4 178:13 181:3 182:20 187:16 193:4 257:16,16,21,22 Ellen's 115:22 117:14 **Emblex** 42:22 embraces 204:12 emergency 32:18 33:3 247:20 251:5 Emeritus 8:1,5 10:5 emphasis 65:21 **employees** 207:12 employer 24:2 employment 203:10 218:8 219:15,17,21 220:11 221:10 222:15 employs 15:8 enabled 23:2 enables 204:6 encountered 37:20 ended 57:3 endgame 132:8 endless 207:8 ends 146:17 193:14 engaged 53:18 engagement 22:18 English 166:10 168:22 169:13 enhance 22:21 enhanced 36:7 enjoy 216:4 enormous 251:2 enormously 262:13 enroll 204:6 enrolled 102:13 203:17 enrollment 49:9 ensure 6:22 15:2 16:7 25:11 30:14 112:1 115:7 116:14 203:15

219:4 227:13 251:20 ensures 16:6 ensuring 31:10 191:2 enter 28:20 29:5 31:1 entering 15:5 48:10 entertain 105:6 149:20 261:14 entire 22:12 122:2 entirely 109:8 entirety 170:4 171:4 entitled 15:11 195:9 entity 49:3 88:8 98:11 environment 204:5 207:19 246:2 environments 210:13 equipment 263:20 equivalency 169:2 erecognition 11:1 61:9 87:20 escaping 53:2 especially 11:6 43:8 88:15 173:16 201:8 220:2,2 234:7 essential 204:10 essentially 55:21 EST 1:11 establish 198:7 established 4:1 24:6 establishments 246:22 estimated 148:9 et 33:1 259:16 Eubanks 1:17 8:13.14 47:18 50:14 55:17 114:17 139:7 154:4 155:17 176:8 178:6 180:14 182:13 187:9 192:5 257:9 evaluate 65:6,8 66:2 253:7 evaluated 169:2 evaluating 95:22 evaluation 16:2 20:17 92:13 95:3 141:15 185:19 209:21 210:18 evaluations 208:17 evaluators 34:9 36:16 event 17:12 176:13 eventually 213:4 everybody 11:4 85:16 172:22 181:18 183:12 197:4 224:5 233:3 235:3,3 250:20 evidence 14:18 16:12 18:10,21 19:5 23:4 24:19 38:14 39:15 41:15 42:9,20 59:13 60:12 65:10 66:1,19 101:5,7 116:2,22

economic 90:9

119:3.21 136:16 137:17 188:21 ex-auditor 242:6 exact 239:22 exactly 55:21 77:15 122:9 145:17 216:5 exam 218:17 example 18:6 23:22 24:5 37:5,19 38:9 39:10 40:10 42:22 65:12 116:8 131:16 263:3 examples 37:5,7 38:17 98:20 159:5 exceed 17:14 excellence 22:1 excellent 46:3 52:21 222:18 227:9 excessive 214:13 226:15 227:5 exciting 209:3 **executive** 2:1,11,13 3:14,20 19:18 20:1 21:2,5 22:15 25:10 27:18 29:10,16 32:3,4 32:13 201:6 202:1 225:21 exemptions 216:21 217:1 exercise 117:12 **Exhibit** 164:3.5 exist 93:3 exorbitant 235:18 expect 219:9 expectation 138:11 expectations 162:10 expense 49:7 expenses 207:22 **experience** 23:1 48:4 52:2 84:15 102:5 204:17 206:8,13,14 224:22 225:8 231:10 239:18 253:6 expert 141:16 162:7,8 expertise 35:15 222:9 experts 245:5,21 **expire** 105:4 explain 74:12 76:16 115:12 184:10,15 explaining 46:4 explanation 262:9 explanations 47:19 explicitly 59:21 exploration 48:10 explore 261:20 explored 28:21 express 251:12 extended 40:14

extension 40:15 103:22 104:6,7 extensive 25:2 225:7 extensively 27:6 extent 80:21 85:2 109:8 extenuating 215:10 extra 231:4 234:6 extraordinarily 264:12 extremely 41:11 84:4 113:20 eyes 192:20

F **F** 1:19 197:1 fabricating 93:2 **FACA** 4:5 75:5 face-to-face 207:6,19 faced 44:6 facing 232:10 fact 11:5 32:2 50:8 52:12,14 85:14 96:17 96:20 98:8 103:10 108:6 113:22 118:11 120:13 142:15,17 158:11 194:7 222:19 237:15 254:14 fact-based 72:13 factor 45:6 216:18 factored 31:19 factors 210:14.16 facts 15:10 71:22 factual 71:18 faculty 38:8,11 43:10 162:4 faculty/student 161:8 162:19 failed 137:4,22 141:7 141:14 157:7,18 159:2 175:13 184:17 184:22 185:8,13,17 fails 155:8 failure 97:8 175:4 179:18 181:19 186:2 failures 158:2 174:1 fair 191:8 203:21 233:4 241:13 fairly 118:18 119:3 fairness 84:19 fall 113:22 familiar 32:11 219:18 239:5 families 217:21 family 26:18 fantastic 191:2 far 47:19 61:5 160:12 166:16 167:16 233:16 233:16,16,17 235:9 238:14

faring 208:20 fast 237:12 favor 151:1 feasible 263:15 feature 210:21 February 25:1 38:22 federal 2:2 3:21 4:4,19 5:4,7 74:6,9,14 75:5 76:18 100:19 112:4 112:10 113:10 229:10 251:7 Federation 2:16 42:16 246:20 feel 18:7 51:10 63:3,9 68:18 88:12,13 109:17 115:2 130:22 142:19 143:12 147:11 151:21 170:4,22 200:6 225:12 228:19 231:22 234:12,18 235:17 236:22 feels 15:11 254:9 fees 143:4 144:10 249:10,13 feet 33:14 fellow 9:6 10:1 20:21 felt 81:7 84:1 264:11 field 30:19 36:15 210:7 fields 210:21 fifth 123:14 124:2 129:9 129:11.13.20 130:19 132:20 133:8 **Fifty-**247:18 figure 92:15 94:3 116:17 132:15 216:11 263:5 264:9 figured 231:15 file 38:8,11 248:11 filed 60:6 files 88:4 207:9 248:11 248:19,22 fill 24:2 29:16 34:7,20 fill-in 85:7 filled 34:6 72:2 192:20 filling 35:13 36:17 final 23:16 25:7 27:20 45:11 59:3 64:20 73:17 77:8,11,11 87:22 123:1 124:7 127:21 129:8 140:20 156:21 184:6 186:17 189:9,12 192:9 207:7 245:20 248:2 finalize 183:16 finally 6:8 16:16 243:9 finance 54:17 147:12 149:16 242:5,7 finances 68:22 144:14

144:15,21 145:12 financial 13:17 14:15 14:20 15:3,12 28:17 48:9,19 49:8,12,19 69:3,9,17,18 70:12 77:7,12 78:12,15 86:21 87:11 89:1 99:8 105:21 106:3,12 141:8,10 142:15 145:22 152:11 160:7 240:21 financially 34:2 88:19 122:11 143:12 financials 122:6 233:14 find 18:10 19:7 69:22 70:17 71:7 79:7 87:22 91:6 104:9 126:5,8 128:8 137:2 147:8 148:19 153:9 163:2 163:16,17 166:22 170:14,15 216:17 217:20 222:8 239:22 243:15 finding 19:11 34:9 81:1 82:12 134:19 142:10 findinas 62:18 66:2.4 108:13 121:14 135:10 146:13 149:1 152:1,2 finds 14:16 fine 58:9 149:12,18 171:16 252:8 261:3 263:19 finish 216:9 finished 5:21 67:19 122:18 246:4 firm 226:10 first 14:14 26:17 39:6 57:4 58:4,17 74:16 79:12,12 80:12 95:4 102:2 103:16,16 108:5 111:9 124:9 132:8,12 153:20 160:6 174:10 176:2 188:11 193:22 208:10 214:22 234:22 241:9 253:10 first-year 46:16 fiscal 14:11 16:13 31:17 40:7 143:16 145:13 152:21 153:21 158:7 173:22 186:1 five 12:15,17 17:14 35:20 40:2,7 66:6 86:5 105:13 122:20 169:1 184:17 198:14 199:5 211:14 247:16 250:6 256:20 five- 105:3

five-vear 141:11 148:10 fix 73:8 flagged 18:1 flexibility 244:7 floor 67:9 150:9 214:9 Florida 50:8 96:20,21 97:1 flow 242:2 fluid 236:21 focus 25:10 43:8 54:16 125:3 230:6 241:12 focused 7:18 59:7 109:20 110:1,14 focusing 108:6 127:2 folders 163:12 folks 67:11 259:8,22 262:14,22 follow 39:13 53:15 93:9 138:2 219:11 223:8 228:22 follow- 221:20 follow-on 110:20 follow-up 23:8 37:18 38:13 39:9 79:10 237:11.12.13 followed 11:19 137:6 following 17:13 65:1 94:15 133:21 168:19 follows 64:16 for-profit 109:2 forbearance 228:16,17 230:1 242:13,21 forecast 145:16 foreign 169:2,14 forget 127:11 forgive 83:6 forgotten 113:20 form 52:13 112:19 203:2 formalized 24:7 formation 4:6 formats 248:13 former 2:14,15 202:9 202:10.13 forth 4:5 228:11 fortunate 30:17 fortunately 41:1 forward 32:22 33:16 71:17 74:1 135:21 200:21 202:22 205:7 256:7 found 14:18 18:21 19:5 59:6 61:13 64:19 69:2 69:17 70:11 74:21 80:8 87:15 111:16 124:6 125:6 130:17 135:1,20 140:19 141:5 142:9 147:1

156:20 160:19 161:7 163:5 164:7,20 165:3 168:20 173:20 184:5 186:16 191:4 Foundation 10:2 Founder 9:10 four 59:5,14 60:6,15 61:7,12,19 62:12 64:20 67:2 79:14 88:20 89:1 91:4 108:7 122:20 125:15 130:10 135:9 157:7 169:1 237:21 250:5 fourth 16:11 181:16 frankly 79:21 80:19 Fred 2:16 246:11,18 free 51:10 frequent 208:16 FRIDAY 1:8 FRIEDRICH 2:3 friend 45:15 friendly 151:10 172:2,9 front 52:19 146:10 162:17 front-loading 146:11 frustrating 82:18 frustration 82:1.13 FSA 162:7 fulfil 32:20 98:19 fulfilled 38:16 fulfilment 66:5 full 21:6 25:12 35:9 80:18 170:5 207:15 232:16 247:14 full-day 207:4 full-time 27:15 234:9,15 function 32:20 functions 5:1 fund 9:10 46:15 funds 113:7 funeral 71:10 **Furman** 8:14 further 16:11 54:6 59:11 76:14 78:5 105:6 145:3 186:8 190:19 211:19 256:8 future 6:22 33:18 36:14 88:12 253:22 G

gainful 203:9 218:8

221:10

game 228:15

gather 230:4

gauge 73:2

gathered 39:14

219:15,17,21 220:10

gatekeeper 15:11 112:9

105:22 106:2 116:4 120:9 145:12 general's 106:10 generally 202:19 214:17 generate 115:5 gentleman 235:22 236:3 George 2:1 3:20 5:16 10:7 75:6 126:16,19 138:8 260:19 263:14 264:18 265:1 germane 106:18 getting 31:9 34:13 84:6 89:19 241:16 gift 204:3,3 give 33:20 37:5 39:1,12 45:12 52:10 69:8 102:8 132:20 195:4 198:16 204:3 217:20 231:1,3 244:13 246:20 given 26:22 27:5 66:11 103:8 104:6 119:2 191:16 200:5 217:1 230:14 234:7 249:19 gives 66:3 164:6 209:1 giving 32:1 94:15 134:7 142:6 235:15 244:6 251:11 glad 26:17 55:10,12 170:19 190:20 263:18 goal 30:12 133:2 209:6 **gosh** 43:19 186:11 gotcha 167:8 gotten 63:5 231:19 232:19 governed 4:3 governing 8:10 208:3,4 government 202:6 263:4 Govt 2:14 graduate 5:7 161:9 162:21 165:14 213:10 239:19,21 graduates 26:18 42:9 112:20 222:11 223:18 graduation 209:11 212:9 213:1,7,8 214:19 215:3 216:20 gratitude 25:15 grave 131:2 greater 222:14 greatest 236:5 grounds 66:20 188:15 group 2:2 9:2 10:17 25:10 74:17 91:17

general 37:3 66:7

152:8 201:18 235:1 groups 66:7 245:14 grow 45:3 245:10 growing 33:18 47:1,2 146:5 grown 245:10 growth 46:8,17 47:4 211:4 guarantee 115:16 184:2 guess 30:6 47:11 54:10 71:13 72:4 75:13 82:1 109:11,12 110:2 118:12,17 140:9 166:3 167:10 170:3 171:5 190:13,13 260:3,6 264:15 guessing 234:10 guide 102:15 guided 51:8 guidelines 52:17 guiding 115:6 н hair 231:1,2,3 243:12 243:19 244:14 half 117:22 118:8 122:16 195:4 Hampshire 8:19 hand 49:15 55:19 56:2 56:4 59:19 63:14 67:15 68:2 105:16 117:17 125:17 133:19 138:6 151:5 152:18 153:17 175:21 179:6 246:6.6 257:5 hand's 121:2,2 237:7 handle 58:7 81:18 123:8 170:7 232:15 handled 159:15 263:3 handling 116:1 250:8 hands 47:16 101:19 138:4 145:4 180:8 182:2 happen 92:16 131:15 164:10 happened 33:10 41:2 48:3 50:11 60:4 117:10 169:17,17 happening 74:12 happens 92:20 127:12 129:12,14 146:21 220:14 242:6 happy 7:17 17:19 27:12 33:20 55:22 68:9 73:11 133:14 149:20 211:15 229:3 249:18 251:17 252:1 hard 82:8 85:4,5 91:6

169:21 194:10 211:6 211:15 241:15 264:8 hardships 90:10 Harris 2:4 10:19 87:2 Hawkins 53:7 HEA 4:3,7,21 5:5 head 81:12,12 108:12 173:1 health 4:8 healthcare 26:19 hear 19:14 20:7 62:1,2 65:17 66:8 107:7 139:2,3 140:12 175:2 176:21 180:19,20 212:9 216:4 217:6 227:14 heard 47:20 59:12 65:10 66:19 68:16 77:5 93:19 114:20 134:1,9,12 hearing 53:22 55:13 65:4 217:12 227:21 228:6,8 247:3 262:5 hearings 247:15 heart 230:12 heavier 132:19 hectic 202:20 height 247:12 held 86:17 93:5 193:17 Hello 6:16 help 28:2 33:4 43:7 110:14 172:21 243:19 251:3,3 252:4 259:16 helpful 84:4 86:18 113:19,21 164:1 174:18 175:2 260:22 262:13 helping 46:15 232:5 helps 104:13 172:22 204:14 Helton 2:4 10:20 Herman 2:2 10:13,16 11:3 60:18 63:14 69:1 71:8 79:7 103:2 110:4 110:12 111:4 114:16 114:18 121:1 126:16 126:19 201:17 254:18 255:14 260:19 261:2 263:14 Herman's 262:9 hey 218:21 219:7 221:10 250:18 Hi 127:4 237:9,10 high 191:9 217:14 223:17 229:18 251:20 higher 4:2 5:3 7:18 9:14 10:1 25:20 42:21 43:4 51:20 52:2,15 112:2

213:4 highlighted 23:17 137:11 hire 226:9,22 hired 21:4 hiring 31:17 history 27:22 192:14 198:10 hit 147:3 164:17 Hogue 2:11 19:18,20,22 20:8 26:11 27:11 34:12 37:10 40:4 41:20 43:19 45:14,16 48:5 51:13 53:6 54:1 hold 123:16 191:9 210:1 216:3 217:7 holding 91:20 94:1,5 109:7,8 hole 238:14 240:13 Holt 2:5 10:21 home 207:20 honest 79:21 83:21 169:22 honestly 108:13 171:2 honor 203:12 honorarium 207:16 208:1 honored 7:11 hope 32:1 33:19 34:13 44:6 73:22 177:19 192:9.21 193:11 217:10 218:3 221:18 233:8 242:18 252:7 hopefully 33:18 102:16 hoping 71:17 78:18 191:17,20 horrified 116:12 hour 195:4 213:3 240:11 hours 207:8 213:16 214:1,4,9,14 218:15 218:18,20 219:2 222:6 223:3 226:15 227:3 235:12 239:12 239:17 240:2,7 hovering 44:3 huge 210:14 247:2 human 204:3 humbling 204:16 hundred 247:1 hurdles 44:18 hypothetically 129:8

icons 3:9 idea 117:8 260:9 identified 13:11 14:9 16:22 104:19 141:18

152:13 188:17 identify 91:18 158:5 174:5 186:5 **IG** 58:4,8,11,18 59:6 61:13 62:14,17 64:1,7 68:16 88:21 90:7 91:9 95:11 110:18,22 118:12 119:8 ignore 110:21 imagine 213:11 262:13 immediately 237:14 247:21 impact 19:6 48:19 78:10 135:2 impacted 48:8 60:1 impacting 18:12 implement 24:18 36:9 36:11 implemented 24:8 224:15 implementing 94:7 158:15 importance 84:1 232:5 important 46:17 62:17 63:7 91:7 106:1 112:7 122:7 160:5 168:13 205:8.12 210:17.21 210:22 216:18 217:19 219:21 221:11 230:13 232:12 256:6 importantly 59:8 impossible 145:16 impressed 43:13 45:9 **impression** 132:12,12 134:2 impressive 237:16 improve 22:20 216:1 232:4 improved 36:7 improvement 65:22 211:5 261:9 improving 116:3 in-person 245:13 inability 213:1 inadequate 254:10 include 40:22 78:14 100:1,21 107:14 158:11 190:2 included 14:1 38:20 60:1 61:1,7,9 78:13 87:11 97:7 99:11 101:15 106:19 163:9 168:14 223:9 250:13 includes 42:17 165:10 182:5 225:6 233:18 including 15:4 104:3 193:16 206:22 207:14 215:14 225:3

income 31:11 220:19 221:1,6 234:6,11 inconsistency 118:16 120:5 inconsistent 118:5 increase 157:6 increases 33:6 increasing 89:16 incredible 102:3 independent 6:7 9:18 42:3 indicate 233:14 indicated 59:22 123:7 143:5 indicates 77:21 95:10 indication 228:13 253:15 individual 24:3 35:4 113:11 123:9,10,21 147:19 202:20 203:22 204:11 220:22 233:10 245:13 individually 121:10 135:9 individuals 86:1.7 136:10.20 185:1 225:5.18 246:21 industry 28:10 247:2 inexplicable 71:16 inform 76:18 81:17 informal 208:16 information 16:5.13 23:18 38:5 55:5 60:5 60:16,22 64:5 78:16 78:18 86:10 100:3,12 106:13,14 157:15,20 159:7 166:13 175:11 175:15 179:19 181:21 185:5,10 200:9 224:18 229:5,9,13 249:19 261:6 262:22 informative 61:18 informed 114:20 inherent 44:22 initial 96:3,5 158:17 166:14 initially 78:17 initiated 99:6 inguired 173:11 inquiries 61:7,14 101:9 inquiry 99:14 156:22 184:8 188:13,20 insensitized 232:9 inside 52:12 insight 59:11,11 208:12 insightful 201:21 insist 191:12 insisting 118:20

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

instance 41:2 instances 39:21 49:17 institute 24:12 institution 40:16 53:12 92:6,8,19 94:22 97:21 99:12 117:9 144:3 145:16 159:16 162:6 164:16 165:20 168:15 217:7,15,16 219:5,7 223:19 229:17 233:2 240:17,20 institution's 65:19 157:13 199:14 221:2 institutional 1:4 3:4,18 5:18 8:16 34:20 35:3 45:9 91:1,11 144:3 152:15 157:20 175:15 181:21 218:22 227:12 237:19,20 241:11 249:16 institutionals 237:18 institutions 4:15,18 5:3 5:8 12:18 16:10,17 22:6 23:14 28:14 29:1 37:6 38:22 40:19 65:15 66:3 96:1 112:6 113:9 116:3.19 122:14 137:11 151:20 152:3,8 193:12,16 198:3 208:19 209:5 211:8 216:22 217:13 218:9 222:2 223:22 224:7,15 227:13 228:18 232:14,20 235:16 241:7,10,18 251:3,12,16 252:1,4 institutions' 173:6 210:6 instructional 214:10 insufficient 65:14 164:9 integral 26:18 integrated 165:4 integrity 1:4 3:5,18 5:19 23:12,13 203:9 intense 212:10 interaction 161:8,9 162:3,19,20 interest 246:3 interested 253:21 interesting 30:5 interference 103:6,7 105:2 106:7,14 109:21 110:13 113:12 116:5 125:21,22 126:15 127:14 132:9 135:8,22 136:9,14 143:10 144:19 145:2 146:2 147:15 148:3

148:14,18 149:4 150:12,19 153:15 156:17 159:3,18 200:12 251:21 253:5 253:8,17 257:22 258:3 264:5 internal 41:20 internally 43:6 131:19 international 99:11 113:3.4 interpret 36:4 interpretation 255:20 interpreting 134:8 interprets 51:7 interrupting 128:17 introduce 6:12,14 10:8 10:14 11:13 19:17 25:16 26:7,9 58:2 197:14 introduced 7:14 214:3 introductions 19:19 investigate 162:14 investigation 199:15 investigations 76:9 investment 78:8 invite 26:7 200:20 221:20 invited 26:13 75:7 involved 53:19 84:21 121:18 238:10 involvement 173:7 lowa 214:12 ironically 30:1 irrelevant 170:21 IRS 208:2 issue 39:18 68:13 81:19 85:4 98:13 105:10 106:18 117:2,20 118:11 120:11 125:9 125:14 128:22 129:1 159:11 163:7 164:17 165:2,22 186:17 209:9 213:13 214:18 219:22 221:4 239:10 239:12,15,16 240:10 240:19 242:9 262:17 issued 17:16 96:17 issues 13:11 14:9 15:16 16:22 32:12 35:13 68:12 74:22 80:7 85:8 93:11 97:9,13 98:15 99:14 100:15 103:18 104:19 105:21 106:4 111:9 119:10 144:15 144:20 147:5 162:13 162:14 163:2,4 168:5 169:3,15 170:2 173:20 174:5 186:5

191:7 194:6 205:15 209:21 210:1 240:16 242:21 247:9 it'd 256:16 item 25:7 38:13 165:8 259:10 items 168:15 194:2 242:18 260:2 IV 5:5 108:10,14,18 111:19 112:9,10 113:6,7 145:14 161:20,22,22 162:2 187:2 198:8 J **J** 1:17 Jane 205:21 236:6 January 14:2 163:6 169:17 Jass 2:5 10:21 Jeffrey 53:6 Jen 237:10 Jennifer 1:15 7:15,16 55:18 56:11 61:21 76:22 79:4 103:5 105:16,17 108:1 112:8 114:15 121:2,7 126:2 128:20 130:22 132:10 139:8,8 141:21 151:5.11 153:16 154:5 155:18 168:11 169:19 171:7 172:5,8,15 174:22 176:11,19 178:7 180:15,17 182:14 187:10 189:18 192:6 237:6,8 255:15 257:10 Jennifer's 134:14 174:13 **Jill** 1:16 8:6,9 56:7 124:18,19 139:11 154:7 155:20 176:22 178:9 180:21 182:16 187:12 192:17 197:10 197:12 212:5 221:22 234:4 238:13 257:12 Jill's 226:13 job 46:3,3,10 72:20 146:9 191:2,22 204:14 209:5 219:4 227:12 236:10 245:12 250:21 259:9 John 130:22 205:21 236:6 ioin 26:14 joined 208:11 joining 3:5 5:14 28:19

ioint 15:5 joke 232:1 Jones 2:16 246:11,14 246:16,17,18 248:18 250:4,18 JR 1:20 **July** 80:15,18 118:22 131:17 264:16 jump 121:12 jumping 172:5 June 20:12 87:10 99:6 just-in-time 83:8,9 justification 103:22 justify 89:3 justifying 168:16 Κ Karmon 2:8 10:20 197:10 198:16,20 200:1,2,17 201:11,13 252:9,16,20,21 Kathleen 1:14 6:15.16 56:9 101:18 102:1,22 109:15 125:17 139:13 150:20 154:9 155:22 157:4 172:8.9.11 177:2 178:11 181:1 182:18 187:14 189:4 192:16,19 237:6 243:7,8 257:4,14 264:5 keep 32:21 81:11,15 108:6 140:1 151:15 172:21 173:1 keeping 130:2 206:3 215:11 kept 90:20 kernel 105:9 key 121:13 kick 85:5 kicking 85:2,3 kidding 231:9 kids 216:8 kinds 216:10 227:4 knew 29:19 knowing 29:17 118:22 knowledge 202:12 204:4,7 knowledgeable 185:1 known 3:18 203:18 knows 181:18 Korn 2:11 26:12,13 32:15 45:21 46:1 53:9 L L 1:15.15 lack 122:10 166:9 landed 133:13

277

landscape 44:8 52:7 language 166:10 large 46:9 48:6 49:3 60:12 234:10 251:10 lastly 224:20 late 81:16 launch 209:3 LAUREN 2:3 law 218:17 219:3,6,12 233:21 laws 227:17 244:12 lead 15:20 leader 20:17 203:14 leadership 105:11 204:12 261:11,12 264:7 leading 58:16 197:13 leads 223:18 lean 146:4 learn 48:3 243:16 244:15 245:9 learned 68:20 244:9 learning 116:19 245:12 259:15 leave 7:20 90:13,14 190:18 leaves 44:14 LeBLANC 1:17 8:18,18 12:10,12 17:21 19:12 19:17 20:6 26:5,13 36:21 39:21 41:13 43:12 45:7,15,20 47:13 54:8,13 56:16 139:18 154:14 156:5 177:7 178:16 181:6 183:1 184:12 187:19 193:7 led 15:1 19:2 Lefor 2:5 10:11 54:20 **left** 140:10,11 175:22 258:12 legal 28:7 79:17 202:7 246:19 legislation 214:4 legitimacy 100:17,19 legitimate 61:14 legs 205:2 length 47:9 207:4 lesser 104:21 213:20 let's 55:8 77:19 95:10 96:14 116:17,18 145:18 160:6 letter 5:10,11 18:19 105:21 106:1,11 227:1 letters 18:16 99:18 level 78:3 120:14 121:16 161:10 162:21

239:19,21 240:1,11 240:12 levels 6:19 49:9 111:15 120:17 liberal 7:9 license 43:2 208:22 209:1 licensed 21:11 234:17 246:21,22 licenser 44:12 licensing 42:18 91:15 91:16 203:20 licensor 97:16 licensure 43:1 97:19 168:1 209:11 222:15 223:16,17 227:19 239:12 240:1 lifted 89:18 light 14:20 35:21 68:10 115:6 118:17 188:10 188:11 208:19 209:13 likes 245:14 limit 73:21 limitation 133:17 135:5 limitations 131:5 limited 74:1 119:14 152:14 223:1 Lindsay 257:18 line 10:12 46:9 52:19 68:6 78:3 88:20 89:2 233:1 246:12 lines 84:8 list 56:7 162:15 215:19 listed 4:20 132:1 listening 205:9 listing 171:17 lists 4:10 literally 172:20 223:2 232:16,22 little 6:2 11:6 27:1,8,16 37:4 62:7 79:21 82:11 89:6 102:22 105:19 106:16 108:14 109:7 110:14 128:15 132:22 146:11 151:22 170:16 192:8 194:9 215:6 217:11 218:4 222:7 228:21 231:9 live 220:5 lives 204:15 210:22 231:21 232:4 living 204:9 210:12 217:21 230:8 loan 214:18 loans 213:10 226:18 228:18 229:11 230:7 lobby 226:21 239:7,7,9 lobbying 226:9 239:6

lobbyist 226:9,22 **lobbyists** 238:19 located 3:9 location 75:10 lock 93:5 lockdowns 247:13 logistical 245:7 long 20:13 100:6 101:18 104:2 106:7 192:14 205:6 208:11 232:8 233:11 long-term 27:4,10 29:21 longer 65:13 149:7 236:2 258:5 longest 146:6 look 35:8 70:4 73:16 88:20 89:10 95:1 96:2 102:12 121:9 122:6 122:13,17 136:6,16 143:18 147:19 166:11 167:19 171:6 191:21 192:22 194:9 214:16 214:20 216:19 217:12 218:2,19 219:6,14 230:3 241:1.9.17 242:8 243:2 250:19 255:15 263:6,14 looked 86:20 87:21 90:2 109:11 144:3 166:13 167:14 looking 92:10,11 95:21 96:7 98:8 110:9,10,15 111:5,6,18 113:5,7 115:20 122:7 144:2 148:2 158:13 163:15 163:18 164:2,12 168:4 189:10 202:22 205:7 217:9 240:20 looks 156:14 177:16 **loop** 32:16 lose 139:1 256:13,14 loss 207:17 lost 90:18 lot 44:9 64:4 88:17 114:20 115:2 144:4 166:22 212:14 216:4 221:6,9 227:21 228:6 228:15 236:13 237:12 237:17 239:18 244:9 245:10 253:12 254:14 259:21 262:18 263:7 lots 84:14 109:1 116:5 149:4 215:9 220:13 220:13 loud 20:7 Louis 2:14 202:8 love 59:15 215:7,16

231:7 low 39:6 231:13 lower 214:4 lucky 204:11 lunch 195:4 197:4 Μ M 2:14 mailings 247:6 maintain 23:6 maintaining 36:3 90:1 204:19 maintenance 113:7 major 112:10 making 61:12 89:22 93:9,9 103:11 116:20 130:18 146:11 149:12 171:20 223:10 228:4 241:4 259:20 260:15 261:20 Mallory 2:6 10:19 manage 33:5,12 management 5:10 15:5 15:8 28:20,21 29:5,18 30:1,9,12 31:3 48:10 managing 241:6 mandate 51:7 maneuver 33:12 Mangold 2:6 10:11 127:4.4 128:4.19 129:16 130:1,12 131:4,9 133:15 134:13 135:7 148:1 148:22 manner 65:9 188:22 manual 34:18 March 1:9 31:6 121:17 margin 74:21 market 15:1 47:2 241:14 marketplace 213:2 Mary 1:19 9:11,12 56:12 58:2,15 59:21 61:15 64:12 67:3 102:4 109:15 115:22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 117:14,20 122:19

137:1,21 138:8

125:21 135:6 136:3

139:15 144:11 150:16

152:17 154:11 156:2

159:9 168:10 170:19

182:20 187:16 193:4

177:4 178:13 181:3

257:16,16,21,22

30:20 42:16 43:1

massage 2:10 12:7,13

13:5 15:1 20:2 21:9

21:11,19 22:1,5 28:10

44:11 46:21 49:5 52:7 53:12 198:1,5 master's 21:14 205:19 253:4 match 100:3 material 65:2 93:2 materials 64:5 matter 33:10 96:11 159:19 166:20 191:11 195:9 202:16 222:18 265:2 matters 62:12 160:5 maximum 40:15 238:2 Mayes 1:18 8:22 9:1,2 56:20 139:21,22 145:22 147:16 148:9 154:18 156:9 160:3 161:17 162:2,15 163:1,13,19 164:13 164:22 165:18 166:2 167:2,8 168:7 177:11 178:20 181:10 183:5 186:9,18 188:1 193:20 258:7,8 McKISSIC 2:7 10:20 MD 9:9 56:18 meals 207:21 mean 67:11,12 103:7 109:3 126:18,22 136:15 142:7 143:4 149:6 160:20 161:5 172:21 173:9 221:13 231:5 232:16 236:16 238:6,8 241:19 242:13 244:10 245:4 255:3 261:12 meaning 207:20 232:13 247:20 meaningful 117:12 measures 15:2 102:18 173:3 meat 80:4,5 mechanisms 92:13 251:20 mediation 24:21 meet 37:15 88:1,12,22 146:15,20 161:3 202:18 203:1 217:17 224:4 235:6 236:16 236:17 237:16 248:15 262:11 meeting 1:6 3:5,17 5:19 14:3 17:22 18:21 24:4 25:2 38:1,6 42:19 61:1 74:16,20 75:3,8 80:15,16 95:4 96:9 120:18 168:18 199:9 205:22 209:22 210:3

238:7 251:9 253:10 261:8 264:12,17,18 meetings 18:22 32:9 203:8 207:6,10 208:16 236:16,20 member 15:9 18:12 19:4 20:19 23:14 25:11 31:18 33:17 34:3,15 35:5,10 42:17 52:5 53:11 67:21 201:6 206:2,12 215:5 225:22 234:8,15,20 253:13,15,18 255:2,3 255:7,10 256:1 member/academic 255:12 member/administrator 255:13 member/educator 255:12 members 1:13 6:13 10:22 11:18 13:2 16:14 18:17 19:21 21:19 25:20 30:11 45:13 51:11,16,19,19 52:1.18 53:17.21 118:22 185:2 198:19 201:1,4 205:12,17,17 205:18 206:1,7,17,22 207:14 214:2 220:15 222:9 233:15.19 234:1,2,13,14 235:6 235:19,20 236:10 252:22 256:13 264:15 members' 206:4 membership 89:16 mention 25:5 106:4,4 238:11 256:10 mentioned 14:8 23:15 36:2 46:14 80:10 99:16 115:6 122:1 166:6 203:3 219:16 253:12 mentioning 215:3 mentions 234:17 merely 117:3 message 3:12 messed 231:22 met 1:11 86:2 200:6 203:11 methodologies 209:18 methodology 252:2 methods 251:19 metric 221:12 metrics 218:5,6 220:16 220:21 221:16 Michael 2:8 8:20,21 12:20,21 17:21 19:19

54:1 257:18,18,19 Michelle 99:7 **mid-** 76:3 mid-year 194:8 mighty 28:1 Mike 10:21 13:3 25:18 54:4 202:12 million 87:4,7,8 88:18 89:7,12,13 122:16 mind 104:5 195:3 mindframe 77:17 mindful 35:22 254:14 mine 121:4 minimal 223:3 minimum 206:22 209:10 Minore 83:6,14 minute 54:20 114:18 160:4 239:14 248:17 minutes 231:6 246:16 248:10 Mirando 2:13 200:21,22 201:22 211:21,22 212:3 214:21 222:17 224:9 225:18 226:11 227:8 228:19 230:11 232:11 234:21 237:10 238:5,17 239:1,4 241:8 243:22 250:2 251:22 Mirando's 249:15 missed 160:18 missing 101:5 168:20 190:3 200:10 mission 21:21 68:6 208:20 216:15 **missions** 72:12 modest 207:16 moment 13:12 20:6 41:18 53:3 momentarily 34:14 moms 216:7 money 89:6 90:18 228:5 234:22 235:15 241:19 242:9 monitor 14:14 15:12 229:16 monitoring 13:14,16 14:13 17:10 19:10 40:18 54:15 74:7 76:1 87:18 90:3 92:12 94:10 98:9 105:20 135:13,14,18 136:1 140:21 141:4,5,15 142:8,10 143:4,7 144:10,18,20 149:17 150:15 151:14,16,18 152:1,2,5 155:10,10

158:4 174:4 185:18 186:4 188:12,18 190:6 229:19 month 228:2 236:16,17 monthly 32:8 207:3,3 237:16 238:7 months 13:11 17:9 48:18,18 54:15 66:12 80:20 92:7 171:6 202:21 moratorium 89:18 97:20 morn 201:2 morning 3:16 5:17 7:6 8:13 9:1 10:15 13:1 19:21 144:16 mortar 224:17 motion 54:9,22 55:3,6 57:6 67:4,4,9 117:15 117:17 123:1 124:5 124:14 127:3,11 129:7,13,13 130:9,15 130:18 131:12 132:4 134:7 138:5,22 140:8 140:17 148:5 149:2 149:13.15.22 150:7.8 150:12 151:6.6.9.10 153:9,19,20 155:10 156:16 174:10 176:2 177:17,18 179:3 181:15 183:17,18 184:3 186:6 188:7 189:1,13 190:2 195:2 256:16,21 261:15,17 262:1 motions 138:12 153:5,7 153:15 mouse 264:9 move 36:14 54:13 58:5 64:17 67:1 90:11 95:11 131:16 140:17 140:18 151:11 153:19 153:20 155:9,13 156:19 176:1 177:18 183:11,19 184:4 188:14 256:18 moved 30:9 37:6 135:21 moving 32:22 57:22 61:22 64:17 149:5 multi-day 207:5 multiple 64:1 99:16 111:15 127:16 184:3 207:3 241:21 **mute** 139:1 176:9,13 183:22 200:14,15 muted 107:6 179:12 243:7

mutes 132:14	182:8 187:1,5 189:8 189:14 190:22 226:3	167:14 175:5 186:17 non-compliant 19:8	numerous nurse 4:12
N	226:5 246:7 257:7	74:21 173:21	
N 197:1,1,1	Neal's 133:19	non-federal 203:6	
NACCAS 2:13,14,15	nearly 66:6	non-nonsense 203:14	O 1:20 19
6:11 197:8,17 198:6	necessarily 62:9 127:1	non-profit 208:3 238:16	O'Donnel
198:11 199:2,4 202:9	127:20 128:2 130:17	263:2	56:18 7
202:14 203:4 204:6	132:18 133:7 135:4	non-profits 239:6	105:18
205:1 206:20 207:1,5	171:18 228:8 240:9	non-responsive 82:13	129:6,19
207:13,20 208:11,15	260:7	83:1	139:20
210:5,10,22 211:2,6	necessary 107:10	noncompliance 103:19	177:9 1
211:10 227:10 235:4	128:19 225:13	107:5,10 133:7	183:3 1
235:8,8 236:7,8,12	neck 90:16	134:19 135:10,21	Obama 19
238:16 244:2 247:4,7	need 31:20 35:8 39:13	141:18 152:10	object 14
247:16 248:10,11,12	44:15 58:12 62:5,19	noncompliant 111:14	objective
248:18 249:6,12	64:10 76:14,17 85:6	111:16	objectivit
250:4 255:17	116:16 121:21,21	nonprofit 109:2	observat
NACCAS' 201:3 202:6	122:19 124:14 140:8	nonprofits 114:2	observat
203:16 205:16 208:6	150:2 171:15 173:15	normal 12:5	54:2 19
209:7,20 219:7,10	191:8 204:8 208:21	normalcy 203:2	observer
256:19	210:20 226:21 230:15	normally 31:14 88:8	obtain 20
NACCAS's 209:9	230:17 240:5,6,7	101:18 120:17	229:5
NACIQI 2:1 3:19,22 4:1	needed 29:13 33:4 34:7	Northeast 114:2	obtained
4:22 5:6,12 11:18	38:4 81:10 190:11	nos 259:2	179:19
73:1,13 74:16,20 75:3	200:9	note 3:7 34:13 58:18	Obtaining
76:9,10,13,17 80:16	needs 14:10 32:12	75:21 107:16,18	obvious ²
120:18 140:18 156:19	120:6 121:22 150:1	111:13 136:6 145:10	obviously
183:19 184:4 188:14	183:12 253:6 262:11	150:19 152:19 168:13	41:21 1
198:12 201:1,6	negate 133:3	noted 27:20 98:9	246:7 2
256:18 261:7	negative 19:6 63:19	119:18 120:1 121:17	occur 37:
NACIQI's 5:13	78:10 87:8 256:3	168:16 214:13	occurs 37
name 10:16 13:3 19:22	negatively 18:12	notes 137:2 166:6	October 9
53:2 65:6 83:7 138:18	negotiated 203:7	notice 49:18 50:1 74:6	offer 10:2
198:19 246:18	219:16 220:15	74:10,16,18 75:1,4,7	209:14
Naropa 21:15	negotiator 203:7	75:15 76:18 100:20	249:10
narrative 165:20	net 31:10 33:9 87:8	223:13 247:21 248:5	offered 1
nation 247:8	89:7	noticed 144:12 222:1	offering 4
national 1:4 2:12 3:3,17	never 85:17 95:14	notices 74:15 250:13	161:11
5:18 6:9,13 43:4	104:6 158:12 231:15	notification 48:13,14	offerings
91:12 143:5 184:7	249:5,6	50:13 211:12	offers 115
188:20 197:6,16,19	nevertheless 19:1	notify 95:2	Office 1:2
198:22 202:1 210:5	118:15	notifying 92:19	offices 20
237:19	new 8:19 22:15 24:1,13	notwithstanding 68:22	official 2:
nationally 4:11 13:9	30:10,22 36:11 37:14	209:19 249:15	17:17 6
17:6 43:17	37:20 40:8 50:3,5	November 69:2 70:10	211:13
nationwide 247:6	65:18 75:2 81:15	71:3 78:7	officials 1
249:21	105:11 126:4 170:16	number 15:15,20 23:16	199:4 2
nauseam 132:11	191:18 208:21,22	28:13 29:3 30:2 35:14	OGC 10:1
Neal 1:18 9:6,6 55:10	209:3 218:16,16	35:17 37:11 43:17	OIG 111:1
63:2 67:5,11 68:9	248:19 249:13 261:4	44:2 45:6 48:6 49:15	120:16
69:6,12,16,22 70:9,16	news 216:13	55:12 90:21 103:17	193:22
70:21 71:4,7 73:22	newspaper 98:22	114:2 127:7 145:10	old 42:12
75:9 76:3,20 117:19	Nicole 2:4 10:19	155:2 214:4 217:2	older 236
120:3 133:21 135:12	night 59:3	218:15 231:12,13	OMB 263
139:2 140:9,13,15	nominated 20:21 29:15	239:20 240:2 242:1	on-site 94
153:22 155:12 171:9	non- 80:7 193:16	249:8 250:7 251:10	once 53:1
171:22 172:3 175:22	non-accredited 42:5	257:3	192:11
176:4 178:2 180:10	non-compliance 37:6	numbers 220:18 227:3	one's 169

280 numerous 186:1 **O** 1:20 197:1,1,1 **O'Donnell** 1:19 9:9,9 56:18 77:2 79:2 105:18 107:22 129:3 129:6,19 130:8 139:20 154:16 156:7 177:9 178:18 181:8

0

183:3 187:21 193:9 **Obama** 193:21 object 142:14 objective 72:14 115:10 objectivity 122:10 observation 14:2 observations 13:22 54:2 199:8 observers 54:3 obtain 204:7 208:21 229:5 obtained 157:15 175:10 179:19 185:9 Obtaining 209:1 **obvious** 169:9 obviously 18:1 28:5 41:21 116:16,20 246:7 262:13,22 occur 37:9 59:2 occurs 37:11 October 92:7,21 offer 10:22 95:7 201:10 209:14 222:3 224:8 249:10 offered 112:5 222:6 offering 46:10 97:10 161:11 198:3 222:12 offerings 162:22 offers 115:8 Office 1:2 5:10 offices 203:20 official 2:2 3:21 13:8 17:17 63:12 73:4,15 211:13 officials 17:5 26:1 199:4 201:7 204:20 **OGC** 10:10 OIG 111:11 118:3 120:16 121:14 122:9 193:22 old 42:12 older 236:3 **OMB** 263:3 on-site 94:8 95:3 once 53:10 67:8 95:2 192:11 205:4 220:20 one's 169:21 188:7

189:19 one- 120:13 one-off 249:8,12 ones 52:21 112:11 160:15 162:16 169:9 ongoing 36:5 65:15 88:7,8 89:9 online 14:4 53:2 116:15 116:19 243:16 onset 87:8 onsite 20:17 157:16 164:15 165:19 175:11 179:20 185:11.12 **OPE** 120:18 open 3:7 24:2 27:21 45:22 47:14 99:13 245:8 260:9 opened 29:12 46:2 opening 25:17 50:5 operate 30:15 operated 48:7 operating 44:1 77:22 78:2,9,14,14 142:17 operation 50:10 operational 29:8 32:12 33:5 operations 22:22 28:3 87:9 89:8 143:21 208:3 **OPERATOR** 3:3 123:16 123:19 246:13 opinion 73:2 142:18,20 opinions 114:20 251:8 opportunities 217:18 227:19 opportunity 7:12,14 11:17 12:1 22:17 23:8 25:16 28:22 37:21 51:14,16 62:11 68:8 111:5 209:3 217:19 227:17 230:14 246:18 249:20 251:11 opposed 234:5 opposition 262:3,4 optimistic 202:20 option 104:5,10,21,21 120:20 131:18,22 132:5 133:18 options 132:2 259:20 260:15 oral 75:7 oranges 143:14 order 92:13 94:16,20 96:17 120:20 167:20 167:21 211:6 251:20 264:5 **Oregon** 218:20 organization 17:19

42:3.17 organizational 15:16 organizations 30:21,22 46:15 72:8 orientation 24:17 originally 208:12 250:5 originated 116:7 outcome 208:7 221:3 223:14 230:9 outcomes 42:10 205:13 216:2 219:9,14 222:11,13 230:5 outlier 40:17 outlined 25:13 outside 52:10 259:22 outsider 206:10 outstanding 14:9 overcharging 241:15 overcome 46:7 overlap 160:21 161:2 161:15 overlapping 80:1 overlaps 161:4 oversight 47:7 141:16 158:2 174:1 oversights 148:15 owned 28:13 48:7 49:5 owners 50:3 228:9 ownership 50:3 193:14 Ρ P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 3:1 **p.m** 195:8,10 197:2 265:3 **PAC** 37:21 38:5 pages 65:4 70:17 159:1 paid 45:13,19 213:19 233:17 254:3 paints 119:9 pandemic 14:4 250:20 panels 3:8 paper 83:14,17 86:8 163:18 164:21 parentheses 174:9 parenthetical 172:18 part 26:18 30:20 46:9 46:13 48:22 51:8 63:3 63:8 70:7 75:19 84:13 100:21 101:11 126:4 147:2 159:16 164:14 165:18 166:13 210:6 210:21 213:18 214:7 230:10 241:9,9 250:15 261:6 partially 169:22 participant 3:8 112:16 130:13 135:6 176:16

257:2 participate 138:10,14 169:13 198:8 participating 4:18 participation 5:4 207:5 particular 25:18 28:10 28:12 39:3,12 40:5 71:12 82:10 85:12 97:21 116:22 119:8 127:3 131:1 149:1 162:10,11 167:5 184:17 212:6 213:13 233:21 particularly 35:22 68:10 114:1 212:13 212:16 213:13 parties 74:4 partly 109:21 114:22 partner 52:6 partners 42:14,14 43:7 parts 149:5 party 81:16 99:17 101:14 166:9 246:11 252:10 pass 19:15 42:22 43:4 204:8 222:14 259:5 passed 156:15 259:6 passes 57:6 177:17 179:3 181:15 183:10 passing 216:15 **passion** 22:13 Pastriko 9:12 pat 223:20 path 47:3 Patrisko 58:2 Paul 1:17 8:17,18 12:10 12:11 26:16 47:15 54:11 56:15 139:17 154:13 156:4 177:6 178:15 181:5 182:22 184:12,13,14 187:18 193:6 257:20 258:1 Paul's 258:2 Pause 163:14 pay 213:1 220:6 231:2 233:15 234:22 payments 229:10 payroll 28:3 peer 15:22 16:1 20:16 24:9,14 34:16,18,19 36:1,6,10,12 45:18 peer-to-peer 161:8,17 161:19 162:4,20 people 71:10 73:3 84:12 86:6 90:21 93:1 99:1,19 108:3 129:1 136:9,17 137:17,20 138:9,13,21 176:16

219:20 224:21 225:2 228:6,16 242:1 244:16 percent 44:4 85:15 117:9,11 191:15 209:10,11,12 212:8 213:8 216:19 217:8 222:5 245:1 247:19 247:22 248:2 percentage 43:14,18 45:2 47:1 231:13 perfect 46:4 performance 223:15 performing 42:10 perfunctory 115:1 period 13:15 15:4,13 17:14 30:2 38:4 39:4 90:13 105:4 115:11 141:11 144:6 199:5 199:12 213:18 238:2 238:3 243:15 period's 118:14 permanent 66:14 permanently 21:5 person 11:5 68:11 73:17 83:7.12 84:13 146:4 149:12 203:1 232:17 233:5 234:19 253:16 255:2,6,9,22 263:4 personal 202:16 203:22 210:13 personally 211:5 225:2 245:19 perspective 52:11,15 206:9 perspectives 206:4 pertaining 208:17 petition 11:15 13:4,21 38:17 40:11 75:22 80:18 170:5 198:21 199:7,12 201:19 petitioned 12:16 PETRISKO 1:19 9:12 56:14 58:3,17 64:15 123:4 136:5 139:16 144:12 150:18 152:19 153:4 154:12 156:3 159:11,22 163:22 168:12 177:5 178:14 181:4 182:21 187:17 193:5 257:21 phenomenal 259:9 phone 76:15 107:6 200:14,15 232:22 233:2 235:3 pick 93:11 105:19 232:22 243:5

picked 91:9 **picky** 235:13,14 241:22 242:7 piece 31:22 35:7 38:8 38:14 63:5 85:1 110:1 113:19,21 116:22 151:14,16 170:19,20 256:5 place 28:11 29:4 32:13 46:11 49:2 84:20 86:16 92:13 118:14 203:15 207:19 placement 39:3,10,15 209:12 215:4 222:16 plan 27:10 48:15 163:9 163:10 164:9 165:3,5 165:10 planned 209:20 210:2 planning 27:4,5 76:13 212:10 plans 47:4 78:9 89:16 play 70:8 121:10 210:14 241:14 plays 210:22 please 3:7,12 11:8 47:15 111:13 122:1 123:16 138:17 145:6 164:19 171:22 176:9 183:22 200:14,15 246:13 pleased 33:8 46:2 53:16 212:9 pleasure 20:1 203:12 plus 29:17 234:10 pocket 231:4 point 6:12 35:12 60:14 62:4 92:5 94:16 95:6 116:1 120:3 128:18 142:8 168:7 183:15 220:16 239:10 248:5 pointed 117:1 253:9 pointing 26:20 points 40:6 146:3 policies 16:15 22:21 24:11 86:15 93:9,11 94:6 136:14 137:6 138:3 159:4,8 175:17 208:1 245:3 policy 7:19 168:19 223:9 237:1 255:19 policy-related 240:15 politics 220:13 227:11 poll 264:21 population 210:10 populations 209:14 portion 80:6 position 20:12 21:6,7 24:2 27:18 29:11,15

32:19 46:8 69:9 143:2 144:18 161:22 204:12 positions 27:21 206:18 234:5 positive 31:10 33:9 46:8 121:20 possibilities 103:7 possible 102:17 130:3 161:2 170:13 256:17 263:19 post-secondary 197:21 **POSTSECONDARY** 1:2 potential 91:11 133:17 207:17 potentially 89:21 90:17 131:4 133:15,17 power 209:2 260:6 practical 81:5 245:3 246:1 practice 208:22 **practices** 213:22 247:18 practitioner 35:2 254:21 255:5 practitioners 22:4 pre-pandemic 109:4 precipitously 41:4 precisely 124:12 predicting 233:13 prefer 174:20 preferred 247:10 preparation 207:9 prescription 148:14 present 1:13 2:1,9 11:17 23:3 71:21 211:18 225:10 presentation 103:15 104:12 presented 42:19 64:5 118:2 presenter 246:11 preserve 148:22 149:1 president 7:7,11,22 8:4 8:15,18 9:13,18 10:5 presiding 1:12 pressing 210:1 Pressnell 1:20 9:17,17 55:15 59:20 61:10 123:6,20 130:14 132:3,10 139:5 140:16 142:21 143:13 149:11 150:4,8,14,20 154:2 155:15 156:18 164:10 171:15 172:1 176:6 178:4 180:12 182:10 183:18 184:2 187:7 188:9 189:12 189:17 190:1,5,9

192:3 pretty 114:3 118:15 151:17 216:2 217:3 229:4 234:10 237:16 256:5,14 prevent 52:4 115:14,17 115:19 136:16 preventing 217:14 preview 117:21 previous 104:4 203:7 previously 14:8 254:8 pride 245:9 primarily 129:2 243:2,3 primary 11:12 12:9 91:17 197:9 203:6 252:16 256:16 principle 115:5 prior 20:13 21:7 48:21 75:3 85:17 91:20 92:7 93:18,21 101:16 104:3 128:12 203:5 244:10 261:7 privacy 229:14 private 3:12 7:9 21:9 193:16 262:21 privately 49:4 probably 49:15 69:8 92:15 113:17 147:17 148:5 219:19,20 227:14 230:21 238:19 probation 40:22 41:4 probationary 159:13 problem 68:17,19 88:16 114:10 118:16 147:6 218:6 220:6.8 221:17 239:17,22 240:9 242:10 243:6 260:21 261:11,12 problematic 146:17 160:14 problems 109:13 118:5 149:10 169:6 173:1 216:8 221:7,9 231:14 242:22 procedural 248:5 255:18 procedurally 249:3 procedure 86:16 170:17 procedures 11:10 16:15 22:21 24:11,13 31:8 32:12 93:8,10 94:6 95:21 131:22 137:7 138:3 158:15 159:4,8 165:15 175:18 247:18 249:4 proceeded 29:22 process 5:2 11:9 22:17

24:15 25:19 27:14 30:4 31:1 35:19 44:19 50:4 62:6,12,18,21 65:14 66:1 72:18 73:12,14 79:10 80:12 81:9,13,19 92:11 94:14,19 96:5 100:14 102:8 109:19 110:11 114:10 119:4,10,12 129:4 130:3 135:17 146:11 147:6 149:6 158:19 160:13 166:14 166:16 170:1 190:18 191:7 193:15 201:12 201:19,20,21 203:5 206:6 211:11 215:5 215:11 217:22 229:19 248:20 250:9 251:4 259:14,21 260:16 261:5 process-oriented 114:11 processes 31:8 93:8,10 95:21 96:2 115:1 158:4.14 174:4 186:4 203:15 produce 261:5 producer 3:13 176:13 production 78:13 98:4 profession 44:1 46:12 46:18 52:10 208:22 professional 2:16 30:18 37:22 42:14 44:7 52:6,7 203:22 204:10 206:15.16 236:1 246:19 professions 21:20 239:21 professor 52:22 53:1 proficiency 168:22 profit 213:21 profits 193:17 profoundly 133:22 program 16:10 29:8 38:3 44:13 53:13 94:22 97:10 112:11 112:12,16 113:10 161:20 165:11 203:8 216:9,12,14,16 220:3 228:2,3,3 245:1 programmatic 34:21 35:3 144:2 219:1 249:17 programmatically 29:2 programs 4:16,18,19 5:5 6:19 12:18 22:7 23:14 38:22 40:19 41:17 43:17 44:5 45:4

			283
45:4 49:7,7,8 112:6	159:1 205:12,17,18	45:11 50:19 60:3 65:5	raised 26:21 56:5 71:11
113:9 198:3,9 209:13	206:1,2,4,5,7,11,12	67:22 68:11 77:2 80:2	72:1 100:13,13 118:8
210:7 212:17 215:12	206:17,22 207:14	80:12 81:21 82:9 84:2	133:20 138:9 168:5,6
222:3,5,11 224:8,16	233:19 234:1,3,8,20	85:10,13 91:8 92:21	234:5
progress 138:13	236:10 248:4 249:6	101:22 102:19,21	raises 144:8
prohibited 253:13	253:11,13,14,17	108:15 110:3 116:17	raising 234:3
prohibition 148:2	254:6,14 255:2,3,7,10	121:7 126:4 129:4	range 212:19
project 48:16,20	255:11,12,13 256:1	131:8 134:14 136:7	ranges 207:2
projected 78:1 119:20	259:21 260:16 261:21	138:8 147:15,16,19	rapid 144:5
projecting 33:16	262:19 263:8,9	147:20 148:18 151:5	rarely 41:2
promise 66:6	publicity 212:21	151:8,12 158:6	rate 39:2,10 43:4
promises 65:20 103:11	publics 193:16	159:14 160:17 164:11	209:10 210:19 213:8
116:3	publish 4:10	164:20 171:9 172:4,6	215:4 216:20 223:17
prompted 77:10	published 75:2 185:15	174:13 179:13,14	229:5,7
proof 38:14 168:22	228:7 247:17,19	180:2 186:9,21 187:1	rates 39:3,6,16 42:22
proper 168:17	pull 163:11,21 248:11	208:9 215:1 218:7	208:7,10,18 212:9
proportion 233:16	248:20	221:18 222:18,18	213:20 222:14,15
234:10	purchased 49:3	225:15 227:9 233:13	223:14 224:7 228:14
propose 64:17 67:1	purpose 22:14 170:11	238:1,20 240:15,18	228:14,15,17,17
proposed 247:17	purposely 237:18	241:9 243:10 244:1	229:1,18,22 242:13
proposition 6:20	purposes 33:3 36:17,18	254:2,10,12,15,17	242:21
proprietary 21:9 49:4	79:17 112:2,4 130:2,3	254.2, 10, 12, 15, 17	ratio 212:15
protect 191:3 205:5	255:17	question's 186:19	rationale 103:12 165:10
protecting 192:1	pursue 43:15 44:15	questionable 146:19	ratios 145:13
		213:22	
protection 91:17	purview 75:4		Ray 84:8
proud 21:17,21 46:12	pushed 131:17	questioning 50:18 82:7 226:14	re-establishing 31:8 re-evaluated 39:16
51:15 236:11,12 prove 168:18	put 25:22 37:2,16 38:2 38:11 86:16 93:15	questions 11:18 17:20	
	97:19 98:1 100:4	•	re-recognition 202:7,14
provide 5:1 11:14 16:4		19:13,16 22:10 25:14	203:5 211:10
23:8 25:17 28:20 29:7	106:8 107:18 134:18	34:8 36:18,19 37:1,2	reaching 250:17
38:4 39:2,13 44:20	145:18 174:9 207:15	47:16 53:21 54:2,4	read 6:19 43:12 45:8
78:20 83:5,10 86:11	210:1 220:3 227:22	55:12 62:8 64:2 67:7	59:2 64:16 99:15
86:11 97:19 106:3	235:13 241:3	67:10 68:4 78:17,20	116:9,10 122:2
137:20 159:5 185:5	puts 62:20 121:19	79:8,10 80:3,7 86:20	125:19 126:1 136:15
207:13 229:12 244:13	putting 114:5 171:1	98:18 108:3 109:17	200:3
247:10 249:18	228:16 235:17	113:14 116:14 118:9	readers 11:12 12:9
provided 4:15,21 5:9	Q	144:14 151:19 153:2	197:9 252:17 256:16
11:17 16:9 30:22		153:16 158:9 160:4	ready 54:9,10 58:15
38:17 59:10 61:6 65:3	qualification 83:18	167:13 199:22 200:1	89:19 249:1
66:19,20 74:4 78:17	84:17	200:16 201:14 205:11	Reagan 91:12 143:4
78:19 83:8,9 85:14,19	qualifications 16:1	211:19 212:6 226:5,6	184:7 188:19
85:20 86:4 97:6 98:20	35:22 43:10 83:15	233:22 234:4 236:5,7	real 220:5 227:20 228:4
101:10 152:7 225:16	84:9 86:9 222:8	238:13 240:14 250:8	230:19 237:11 242:13
234:12,18	224:21 226:1 254:13	252:15 256:15	247:21 254:19
provides 106:12 206:9	qualified 50:22 88:6	quick 50:11 129:4	reality 231:5
207:20 248:10	254:5	quickly 182:5 254:19	realize 231:8
providing 13:3 23:1	quality 1:4 3:4,18 4:14	quite 27:5 53:15 63:6	realizes 235:4
25:22 179:17 204:5	5:19 6:22 16:8 22:5	104:2 170:21 200:5	reason 173:19 218:13
208:20 219:5	23:12,13 41:17 45:4	214:2,2,8 225:6	235:21 242:1 248:9
provisions 4:3	49:6 93:14 96:8 112:5	232:14	260:20
prudent 15:12	115:9,13 116:14	quorum 256:14 259:1	reasonable 208:1
psychology 239:20	152:12 157:12 161:14		reasons 71:15 108:13
pubic 235:20	168:5 169:8 191:3	R	220:14 229:14 238:7
public 2:16 4:8 8:5 22:4	251:20	R 197:1	reassure 18:4
51:1,5,9,11,19 52:1,4	quarterly 207:6 239:1	rabbit 238:14 240:13	recall 68:2 70:14 106:8
52:17 53:11,14,17	question 18:10 27:12	raise 47:16 59:19	135:12
74:18 75:11,14,16	27:13 33:20,22 34:4	117:19 144:14 217:13	recap 174:15
76:5,7,19 107:16	37:11 38:20 42:1,12	233:22	receive 30:17 42:13
	I	I	I
	Neal R. Gross	and Co., Inc.	

71:18 204:16 215:15 227:15 247:14 **received** 18:15 50:13 61:16 158:22 188:11 199:11 211:11 receiving 215:21 recognition 6:4,9 12:6 13:4,9,15 14:10 15:3 17:6,12,14 20:11 22:16,18 23:5 26:2 66:13,14 72:16 73:14 73:18 75:22 90:8 96:9 99:8 101:12 105:4 107:11 119:20 120:15 125:1 127:21 129:9 134:5,11 188:15,17 197:4,5,6,20 198:22 199:5,12,17 211:14 256:19 recognize 19:1 23:15 27:14 33:2 43:7 44:21 111:20 254:7 recognized 4:11 13:9 17:6 208:5 recognizes 72:9 111:22 recoanizina 31:20 recommend 13:13 133:8 188:14 230:2 256:19 recommendation 13:7 66:21 83:17 104:22 106:9 119:14 120:14 120:15,15 123:9,10 123:22 124:3,6,21,22 129:8,14,18 130:7,10 130:16 132:1,13,21 134:3 135:3 140:19 147:12 153:10 156:19 183:20 184:5 194:11 198:14 199:3,6 211:13 recommendations 13:20 26:1,22 64:18 73:3.16 106:20 recommended 198:13 recommending 17:4 19:10 130:9 200:5 reconvened 195:10 record 13:2 61:1 63:3,9 69:16 70:1,10,22 71:5 80:19 83:22 101:11 110:5 125:19 130:2 159:20 170:4 171:4 195:9 248:12 265:3 recordkeeeping 24:16 records 5:12 33:1 169:6 **recuse** 58:12,14 140:2 recused 140:3

reduced 113:3 reduction 15:4 refer 64:6 106:9 179:16 reference 42:11,15 48:6 106:13 107:14 167:21 referenced 25:7 32:15 36:4 42:13 49:21 83:16 84:4 107:12 109:15 136:2 166:5 references 105:21 referencing 77:14 **referred** 63:22 106:10 121:15 243:11 referring 69:5,6,20 reflect 23:6 reflection 115:18 reflects 49:1 reform 227:2 reformat 248:22 reforms 65:11,12 249:11 refresher 83:18 85:16 regard 63:6 85:12 108:5 166:18 169:8,10 170:8 228:13 240:17 242:18 regarded 137:7 regarding 5:2 11:15 16:8 24:9 60:6 77:11 97:8 99:8 112:4 161:7 163:8 175:5 185:6 199:13 regardless 130:10 regards 24:5 43:8 59:9 78:10 177:21 186:13 regional 203:19 237:19 regions 204:21 **Register** 74:6,9,15 76:18 100:20 registered 253:17 registrar 169:5 regular 32:8 36:9 regulation 51:3 107:16 137:7 159:22 208:2 regulations 16:20 68:15 75:2 86:15 94:12,19,21 95:8 99:22 162:8,9 173:5 208:4 251:7 254:11 regulator 170:14,15 regulatory 173:2 204:22 261:4 Reha 2:6 10:19 reject 123:8 248:18 relate 38:7 related 5:13 15:16 24:10 32:19 34:1 78:11 80:6 84:11

98:14 111:19 120:13 127:5 141:11 147:5 149:16,17 152:3,6 165:5,16 166:10 175:4 185:21 238:1 relates 14:14 16:1,3 35:15 38:12,18 97:5 108:9 134:17 151:15 151:17 173:21 213:13 229:9 242:12 relating 38:18 relation 125:7 158:1 208:20 227:6 Relations 2:14 relationship 20:13 32:5 32:14 170:9 relationships 204:19 relevance 106:11 relevant 23:4 63:7 64:7 107:12 110:19 168:17 reliable 4:14 16:8 112:4 reliance 170:10 relied 83:14 relief 249:13 remain 45:1 46:22 72:4 **remaining** 15:15 248:2 remains 210:19 remarks 47:19 remember 67:18 100:6 109:6 112:8 138:19 149:13 167:11 237:17 remind 123:21 215:1 **reminded** 170:19 removal 82:20 109:9 114:7 126:7 remove 127:1 removed 39:17 renew 13:8 17:5 199:4 211.14renewal 6:4,9 12:6 13:4 17:15 20:10 22:16 30:3 37:14 54:14 96:1 119:1 158:18 197:5 198:21 238:2.3 renewals 30:3 31:12 40:4 renewed 12:15 256:19 rentals 221:8 repay 230:7 repaying 226:18 repeat 60:4 164:20 repeated 118:8 repeats 184:3 248:20 reported 78:1 reporting 37:18 38:14 38:18 39:3 41:22 55:13 145:12 reports 23:9 38:21 45:9

60:6,16 61:7,12,19 68:16 71:14,18 72:2 75:12 79:14,22 81:7,9 99:6,10,16 101:16 104:15,20 108:7 110:6,9 113:11 118:3 118:12 119:8 120:2,4 120:9 121:9,14 122:21 132:14 133:4 142:16 149:5 188:10 194:11 198:2 represent 21:17 representation 233:5 representative 17:18 22:9 51:5 253:11 254:6,13 representatives 2:9 10:10 11:16 51:1,9 125:8 137:5 138:2 185:4,7 199:20 200:20 206:4 234:3 representing 29:14 205:20 206:10 236:6 reputation 233:6 235:14 request 76:7 171:12 223:8 261:17 requested 250:7 requesting 23:17 76:5 requests 100:20 249:1 260:12 require 3:11 4:9 13:10 37:17 38:13 44:11 75:2 76:9 84:18 94:13 94:18.20 106:1 131:22 148:7 162:10 219:11 223:8,21 229:12 240:1 263:4 required 34:19 35:14 38:6 39:1,20 40:20 43:1 46:20 83:19 94:12 99:21 100:19 100:21 101:12 107:15 135:18 159:4.8 201:14 208:15 209:10 213:16 214:1,4 225:10 251:6 requirement 38:10 51:22 84:16 85:20 86:2,3 91:16 161:18 162:5 171:14 requirements 15:17 88:13 89:1 94:17 96:9 101:12 208:7 209:15 214:13 229:21 requires 4:19 16:17 41:7 50:22 261:5 requiring 40:19 214:8

248:21 research 42:2,7 93:19 104:8 researched 6:19 reserve 78:7 89:10 122:16 reserves 78:2,3 residential 161:11 162:22 resigned 21:3 **resolution** 260:10,12 260:22 261:3 resolve 16:21 261:17 resolved 39:18 118:11 resources 13:17 14:15 14:21 15:13 18:3,6 28:18 44:17 49:12 69:3,18 70:12 88:17 141:9 143:19 144:1 160:8 165:10 respect 102:5 157:17 179:20 190:15 208:6 219:14 235:19 241:17 241:18 242:9 250:8 respected 225:22 respond 12:1 41:19 61:4 69:11 70:15 82:19 96:19 100:15 107:20 122:5 134:14 148:12,15 199:21 242:10 250:1 responded 80:14 86:7 251:7 responding 75:14 responds 12:2 response 11:19 50:12 61:6 65:8,10 74:5 75:12 86:4 98:10 118:13 159:1 177:20 179:10 180:6 200:18 226:13 252:7 258:14 258:16 responses 23:2 50:17 65:4 117:10 responsibilities 13:19 14:12 24:10 33:6 136:11 141:10 responsibility 159:12 205:1 242:15 243:3,3 262:21 responsible 122:11 217:7 rest 214:10 restate 124:20 restore 259:18 260:7,13 260:14 261:18 restrictive 238:20 resubmit 39:15,16

resubmittal 248:9 result 42:7 61:15 244:5 resulting 66:2 **results** 78:14 resume 33:16 203:1 234:14,18 resumes 234:12,13 252:21 retired 236:3 retroactively 248:1 return 30:12 50:6 returned 15:7 revealed 158:2 174:1 175:6 revenue 33:9 reverting 115:3 review 11:10 12:21 13:21 14:7 17:8,9 18:7 24:20 37:6 39:6 58:6,19 59:4 66:2 70:4 72:14,16,19 73:12,13 74:19 75:20 75:20 76:4,12,17 87:22 88:15 92:22 97:12 104:4 107:16 111:11,12,15 115:1 119:12,12,13,21,22 120:14,19,20 121:16 135:22 141:10 152:6 152:15 157:14,16,17 157:22 158:4 160:9 160:16,17 161:15 163:1,6 164:16,17 165:20,21 167:16 168:14 174:4 175:12 175:12,17 179:20,21 181:22 182:5 185:4 185:11,15,19 186:2,4 194:8 198:17,21 199:6,19 207:7 224:11 252:12 reviewed 58:20 101:15 159:3 165:21 209:9 252:21 reviewer 20:16 34:18 reviewers 15:22 16:1 24:9,14 34:17,19 36:1 36:6,10,12 45:18 reviewing 5:22 65:2 166:9 197:15 207:8 238:9 reviews 39:5,7 40:2 45:8 59:5,14 64:21 76:6 89:20 94:9 158:2 166:5 174:2 185:12 revocation 41:1,3 **revoked** 41:9 49:22 rewarding 201:21

Rica 12:19 **Rich** 178:17 **RICHARD** 1:19 **Rick** 9:8,9 56:17 76:22 105:15,16 129:3,21 139:19 154:15 156:6 177:8 178:17 181:7 183:2 187:20 193:8 258:4.5 Rick's 195:1 ridiculous 117:13 **rightly** 256:2 **rights** 240:10 rigor 18:8 37:3 161:9 162:20 191:13 rigorous 191:18 193:18 risk 88:7 90:12 **RNU** 92:2,3 108:20 127:15,17 146:7,10 185:4,12,16,20 186:2 188:13 Robert 1:18,20 8:22 9:1 9:21 56:19,21 139:21 147:14 154:17 156:8 159:21 160:2 164:10 177:10 178:19 181:9 183:4 187:22 193:19 258:7,9 **robust** 102:16 138:10 **Roddy** 253:1 role 20:20 21:3 23:12 29:16 35:1,5,6,11 48:21 114:19 205:20 210:14,22 254:6 255:11 roles 16:2 24:9 36:16 136:12 137:6 138:2 185:2 roll 55:8 138:22 257:6 **Ron** 92:14 **Ronnie** 1:15 7:21,22 12:9,10 26:6 36:21 55:1 57:1 58:13 140:2 154:19 258:11,12 root 72:15 Roslyn 1:14 7:2,7 57:4 138:19 140:2 258:13 Roslyn's 56:3 154:19 **Ross** 19:19 round 247:15 rounds 218:8 rubric 73:8 217:10 rule 12:16 75:14 171:11 rulemaking 203:7 219:17 220:16 rules 68:15 96:21 148:7 148:12 239:6 247:17 run 116:13 191:17

S **S** 2:4 197:1,1,1 sad 109:3 sake 45:11 salaries 213:5 salon 213:17 228:9.10 salon's 213:19 salons 214:2,6,8 sample 117:9 sample's 163:10 **San** 91:12 95:12 99:12 158:11,20 160:11 **SARITA** 2:14 satisfied 200:6 250:16 save 205:14 saw 18:5 101:4 257:17 259:21 saying 70:3,11,13 71:5 76:4 81:15 82:17 86:5 93:2 106:15 109:10 122:4 130:15 137:22 153:13 174:11 221:10 says 41:15 95:13 107:3 113:2 129:7 234:15 240:5 scale 45:1 schedule 172:17 236:15 scheduled 24:3 35:17 schedules 34:16 **SCHEV** 97:5,6 98:4 116:10 160:9,17,18 161:3,6,16 163:6,22 165:7 166:4,19 167:21 168:6,14 175:7 SCHEV's 167:17 school 21:8.10.19 37:13,17 41:4,8,11 44:9 49:21,22 88:16 91:13,13,18,20,21 93:2,4,16,21 94:15,16 95:15,17 96:18 97:17 98:1 109:1 146:12,17 158:11,17,20 160:11 166:15 172:19 218:9 231:22 240:22 248:15 254:3school's 238:4 239:15 schools 6:8 22:3 28:12 30:3 31:1 40:9 42:5,5 42:6,21 43:3,14,22 44:5,14,20 46:16 47:21 48:7 49:5,16 90:10,14,21 92:18,18 96:22 108:5,9 109:2 115:8 167:13 191:15 197:22 198:5 203:17

203:18 204:7 209:13 209:16 210:11 213:14 214:12 215:22 216:4 216:13 223:1,7,13 224:4 228:15 230:15 238:2 242:1,8 243:19 244:3,8,11 247:5,21 248:6,21 249:5,21 250:13 schools' 215:11 **science** 198:4 sciences 2:13 6:11 197:7,17 198:1 199:1 202:3 scientific 215:6,8 217:11 218:4 221:12 scope 197:20 244:19 244:22 score 122:13,15 screen 3:10 150:15 **SD** 174:8 **SDI** 158:11 **SDO** 83:16 119:13,22 120:13,19 129:17,17 132:21 198:15 SDU 170:18 172:21 173:11 SDUIS 157:22 158:3 159:2 160:11 166:5 174:2 175:17 182:1 seat 226:16 second 6:3 15:15 54:21 55:2 62:16 81:21 91:7 95:11 108:8,17 111:17 114:9 124:14 124:15,16 138:5 140:7,17,22 141:2,13 144:16 149:22 150:3 150:9,16 151:10 157:2,3,4 177:18 184:9,11,12,12 186:7 189:2,3,5 190:5 218:7 256:22 257:1,2,3 259:19 261:22 secondary 206:8 seconded 55:4 149:14 149:14 seconder 257:4 seconding 67:17 seconds 184:14 secretarial 128:13 **Secretary** 4:9,13,20,22 72:9 111:20,22 120:19 134:20 135:19 136:2 142:6 secretary's 83:16 106:5 127:6 199:17 section 4:1,8,9,21

23:22 24:6 50:21 87:18 106:12 107:10 107:15,18,19 125:7 135:17 137:8 141:13 141:13 146:6 157:8,9 157:18 165:14 167:1 167:6 173:18,21 184:18 185:17 254:11 sections 4:7 25:3,5 107:12 119:15 141:7 157:8,8 171:17 seeing 81:18 106:8 228:8 234:5 261:19 seeking 158:17 seen 19:3 59:12 65:10 65:13 66:1,5,18 74:1 93:12,12 102:11 115:15 segue 109:12 self 15:7 30:12 self- 115:17 self-review 22:19 send 3:12 248:19 sending 80:22 senior 8:9 9:6,13 10:1 13:7 17:4.16 63:12 73:4,15 199:3 211:13 sensing 180:7 200:19 sensitive 242:3,4 249:4 sent 99:17 250:12 SEP 135:22 separate 130:4 135:11 153:4,6,7,12 165:14 214:10 224:16 separately 87:14 171:19.21 separates 222:10 separating 126:6 151:21 separation 224:12 serious 80:11 81:1 82:17 118:4 141:18 152:9 seriously 205:3 206:18 232:16 seriousness 144:19 serve 20:22 21:1 205:5 209:14 234:2 246:19 253:16 255:4.10 served 20:17 35:4 86:1 serves 234:20 service 4:8 28:7 53:13 71:10 203:6 207:7 servicers 28:2 services 28:4 servicing 28:3 serving 20:1 32:10 35:5 209:16

sessions 24:17 set 37:1 58:2 101:3 210:12 219:2,2 248:19 251:15 sets 4:5 220:21 setting 52:3 126:10 221:15 seven 261:9 SEVP 112:12.16 shadowing 91:10 shape 52:13 **share** 24:20 47:2 242:20 shares 22:12 sheet 164:4,4 Shireman 1:20 9:21,22 9:22 50:16 53:4 54:6 56:21,22 226:4,7,8,12 228:12 229:22 231:6 233:12 237:2,4 239:5 252:18,20 253:20 258:9,10 259:11,13 261:16 262:6,12 263:16,22 264:3 **short** 48:17 49:18 144:6 **shot** 102:9 **show** 41:8 42:9 70:5,14 87:2 142:16 146:5 147:4 167:11,12,20 167:20 169:16 221:3 **show-cause** 41:6 93:16 93:22 94:15,17,20 95:5,7 96:17 98:1 showed 41:4 42:20 166:12 showing 143:21 144:1 **shown** 42:8 103:18 shrinkage 28:11 **shut** 93:4 Sierra 2:7 10:10 sign 239:1 **signature** 115:16 signed 209:4 227:15 significance 128:15 significant 28:13 45:5 65:11 89:8 90:9,19,20 97:7,8 119:3 128:9,16 161:7 162:19 175:4 significantly 118:18 122:15 143:20 signifying 151:2 signing 32:22 similar 77:3 170:13 207:4,22 222:13 similarly-sized 78:4 Simms- 10:20 Simms-Coates 2:8 197:11 198:18,20

200:8 201:11 252:13 253:3 **simple** 229:4 simply 118:20 127:22 133:4 171:17 253:22 Simultaneous 40:1 43:21 54:5 57:8,12 68:7 70:20 83:20 92:9 94:4 96:12 97:15 101:1 123:3 126:17 129:22 143:14 145:21 149:21 151:8 155:3 157:1 183:21 239:3 246:9 single 121:16 216:7 singled 206:1 sir 27:11 45:16 212:2 246:13 sit 7:12 81:14 218:17 site 14:1 16:2 18:20 20:16 34:10,16,20,21 35:2 36:15 85:7,18,18 86:1 89:20 125:10 185:2 186:2 199:9 situation 29:21 32:19 50:2 63:8 77:12 116:8 146:1.18.22 192:12 194:12 213:11 219:15 231:18,20 situations 39:18 48:12 259:22 **six** 40:6,7 48:18 80:19 119:15 155:5,5 169:1 171:5 238:5 size 18:11 19:2.6 sizes 72:11 skills 9:10 204:7 slightly 77:3 slimmer 143:20,20 slot 34:6 small 7:8 18:11 19:2 27:17,22 28:1 30:8 43:14 44:16 45:1,6 46:19.22 smart 46:10 53:18 smile 232:13 Smith 2:1 3:14,15,20 8:21 10:9 67:20 138:7 155:5 201:7 257:19 258:2,5,12 259:2,7 264:20 snap 249:1 soapbox 230:14 231:7 socio-economic 210:14 solely 83:14 solid 236:7 solution 218:1

solve 220:9.10 solvency 77:7 some's 73:21 somebody 64:12 107:5 109:6 126:20 147:21 243:12 somewhat 194:4 222:20 soon 256:14 sorry 20:4 26:11 40:2 56:3,3 61:2 63:17 67:5 69:19 71:2,3 77:19 87:6 88:4 101:17 107:5 108:2 126:4 127:13 128:17 129:22 130:13 133:16 140:9,10,13 141:22 142:4 151:7 153:18 157:9 158:21,22 159:18 163:21 164:19 173:4 175:22 179:12 179:13,14 182:4 190:11 192:17 257:21 sort 30:5 46:20 84:19 95:9 109:21 115:3 240:9.17 241:1 254:1 256:4 sounded 94:14 source 42:4 165:11 South 7:8 8:1 Southern 8:19 9:3 space 30:5 sparked 28:18 speak 32:2 38:20 75:6 77:1 89:4 214:15 215:22,22 254:18 speaking 40:1 43:21 54:5 57:8,12 68:7 70:20 83:20 92:9 94:4 96:12 97:15 101:1 120:7,8 123:3 126:17 129:22 143:14 145:21 149:21 151:8 155:3 157:1 192:21 200:15 212:16 239:3 246:9 speaks 49:6 174:5 special 201:10,16 253:6 specialist 27:19 specialized 22:2 43:8 210:5 specific 24:16 35:11 78:6,8 100:15 106:18 106:21 107:15 110:22 111:12 130:9 137:20 157:15 161:5 162:18 163:18 specifically 25:6 36:3 42:15 54:17 97:4

107:18 119:11,18 120:1 124:20 125:9 137:3 149:3 157:5 158:20 173:19 179:16 181:17 206:15 263:10 specifics 58:5 116:1 speculating 71:9,12,19 88:22 speculation 88:21 91:4 spend 5:22 206:22 213:16 235:10 spent 191:1 207:8 **spiral** 143:16,17,22 split 150:11 **spoke** 99:1,20 sponsored 250:5 stability 15:3 70:7 144:1 stable 69:21 70:3 staff 2:1 10:18 11:13,14 12:2,10,20 13:7,12,13 14:9,16,18 15:4,8,11 15:22 16:22 17:4 18:11 19:4 25:18 27:15,17 30:8 31:17 31:21 33:3,17,19 34:3 34:15 39:5,5 45:19 48:21 50:18,18 60:4 64:18,20 67:12,22 71:14,18 72:2,6,19 73:12,20 74:17 75:19 77:6,8,11 82:3,8 90:20,21 98:13,18 106:9 107:13 120:18 121:18,21,21 123:9 123:11,21 124:8 132:13 133:6 134:1 134:12 140:21 147:21 153:9 156:19,21 160:7 172:17 183:19 184:7 186:17 197:10 198:13,17 199:3 211:12 224:21 225:1 259:16 260:4.13 261:5 263:20 264:14 staff's 86:5 106:19 124:6 130:16 134:3 140:18 184:5 staffing 13:17 14:15,20 15:13 27:2,4,9 29:9 36:22 44:16 47:5 54:17 87:22 stance 237:1 stand 79:15,17 108:7 110:6 113:12,16 133:14 236:9 255:2 stand-alone 123:12 standalone 110:10

standard 11:9 37:17 38:2,12,16 95:1 136:13 146:16,20 157:12 161:2 191:9 193:12,18 221:15 standards 4:5 14:13 16:18 21:22 24:10 35:16 37:15 41:14 43:10 84:6,17 97:14 115:7 117:4 118:6,10 120:6 152:12 157:21 169:10 170:13 175:16 181:22 185:11,15 191:12,19 208:18 209:8 212:11 213:15 219:8,10 223:22 224:4,5 241:20,20 251:15 standpoint 255:19 stands 81:2 Starita 202:9 start 6:4,14 11:11 12:6 108:3 184:21 191:18 191:20 212:7 214:21 238:15 started 20:15 28:9 30:10 53:12 118:14 starting 256:13 state 4:10,12 10:6 42:16 43:4 50:7 53:5 66:7 96:17 98:6 105:22 106:2 167:6 186:14 204:8,22 218:16 219:2,6,11 223:3 227:16,18 240:4,5 244:12 247:2 250:6 251:10 state's 116:4 240:9 stated 17:3 18:19 115:9 119:11 120:16 statement 50:5 59:3,17 64:16 69:14,15,20,21 70:3,14,19 88:5,6 109:15 113:2 114:8 118:15 144:15 194:16 195:1 249:16 statements 19:15 66:21 78:9,15 83:8 86:22 87:1,11 89:12 116:6 141:11 states 12:18 44:10 91:15 166:19 197:21 214:3 226:16 256:1 stating 211:12 status 49:22 193:14 stay 90:11 216:6 227:10 **staying** 90:12 Stein 2:8 10:21 12:20

13:1,3 18:9 25:18 54:4 step 32:20 226:19,20 **Stephanie** 2:7 10:20 **Stephen** 10:3,4 steps 23:19 46:6 170:10 Steve 57:13,19 89:15 181:11 188:2 Steven 1:21 140:3 154:20 156:10 177:12 178:21 183:6 194:14 258:15,15,19 Stimmer 201:4 stipulation 253:14 stool 205:2 storm 46:4 straight 173:1 straightforward 23:21 210:9 217:3 strange 248:9 stretching 214:1 strictly 53:15 stringent 65:20 strive 211:2 strong 118:15 204:18 struck 43:13 212:8 structure 12:5 193:14 struggle 213:7 struggles 99:9 struggling 62:7 170:9 170:17 231:14,21 student 5:4 14:12 16:3 16:6 38:19,19 49:20 162:4 165:11 205:13 208:6 209:14 210:12 211:7 212:11,14 215:3,4 216:2 217:5 219:14 220:1 221:5 223:14 226:17 228:18 230:5 233:1 241:10 248:10,19,22 student-centered 233:9 students 22:3 42:9 48:3 66:8 82:21 102:12,13 113:3,4 117:9,11 168:18,19,22 169:12 191:3 192:1,11 203:17 204:6,15 205:5 208:21 209:2 210:10 211:1 212:22 213:7,9,16,18 214:1 214:19 215:12,14,16 216:5 217:14,17,20 220:18 221:7 223:15 223:21 227:6,22 229:10,12 230:8,16 231:7,10 232:2,3,9,13

233:10 240:19.19 241:13,16 243:16 244:4,14 246:3 248:11 251:3 students' 214:7 study 42:2,11 166:4 210:7 stuff 116:20 subject 17:7 54:14 subjective 118:5 146:2 147:1,10 194:4 subjectivity 72:16 73:7 73:9,20 114:19 120:5 120:12.21 submission 17:8 90:3 submit 13:14 16:11 250:7 submitted 14:6 17:11 74:5 100:1 199:19 subsequent 130:10 142:1,4 substance 81:22 substantial 80:5 169:15 substantially 14:16 19:11 118:3 142:9 substantive 117:5 succeed 210:15 success 203:16,17 211:1 212:11 successfully 30:15 succession 27:4 sudden 109:1 114:3 sufficient 13:18 66:20 69:3.18 70:11 78:2 85:12 115:9 175:10 179:19 185:9 188:20 sufficiently 16:7 suggest 90:8 114:4 226:13 259:17 suggesting 55:22 131:14 263:10 suitability 173:22 Sullivan 1:14 6:17 summarize 13:12 summary 13:3 124:11 164:4,6 198:21 summer 35:20 209:22 210:3 212:10 217:9 supplementary 100:11 support 10:22 23:11 28:2,8,20 29:8 30:13 30:18,22 33:13,15 42:13 47:4 49:9,13 66:8 117:15 227:2 supported 10:9 supporting 13:21 23:13 102:6 199:7 supportive 98:6

supposed 7:3 116:14 186:14 surprise 247:13 surprised 230:21 surprising 74:8 surveys 117:2,6,13 suspension 131:6 suspensions 131:5 sustainable 90:6 144:7 swiftly 24:21 sword 90:16 sympathetic 239:13 synchronous 38:1 system 8:5 11:1,7 28:8 46:21 61:9 87:20 105:10,11 150:14 163:21 191:22 systemic 103:18 105:10 240:8,10 249:11 Т

T 197:1 table 58:1 220:11 tactile 244:15 taken 23:19 29:14 38:15 40:13 63:20 98:10 213:10 225:3 takes 39:7 97:1 205:1 207:19 262:22 talk 11:9 27:1 41:18 51:15 131:19 147:21 236:18 talked 71:10 83:11 87:5 88:21 92:14.17 95:11 103:15 110:4 121:15 132:11 146:1 165:6 165:17 243:14 talking 69:7 81:11 82:20,21 92:2 137:12 137:13 144:13 145:11 153:5 238:15 239:11 talks 165:21 tally 155:4 tape 81:20 taught 6:18 73:6 tax 193:14 taxes 220:19 221:1 taxpayers 191:4 192:1 teach 216:1 230:4 243:12 teacher 206:13 230:12 253:6 teachers 223:10 team 10:8,14 20:17 26:19 35:5,10 85:18 113:1 125:10 163:5 164:6

teams 16:2 20:18 35:2 35:19 86:1 tears 192:20 **Tech** 21:13 technical 3:11 8:1 10:22 141:22 172:6 189:20 technicalities 115:13 technicality 167:5 186:18 technology 263:21 teed 107:19 teleconference 1:11 telephone 11:7 200:12 Telephonic 251:21 tell 51:6,10 60:19 108:11 220:3 230:15 232:18,20,21 235:1 236:20 239:14 244:1 260:4 telling 245:11 temporary 15:4 244:8 ten 21:8 44:4 90:21 117:9,11 tend 122:6 145:8 tended 160:21 tenets 204:13 **Teneyuca** 83:6,13 Tennessee 9:18 tenure 15:20 term 48:17 terminate 95:5 125:1 127:20 129:7,9 130:9 134:4,11 168:1 189:14 terminated 128:3 188:15 terminating 118:20 termination 123:11,22 125:4 126:19 129:14 130:19 132:6,18 135:4 terms 18:7 28:17 30:7 40:18 44:4 64:7 102:7 103:5 122:8,21 133:1 134:14 135:2,9 142:3 142:5 222:14,14,15 238:21 239:11 241:4 253:13 testimony 99:7 115:20 247:11 thanks 10:12 26:16,16 26:20 51:12 67:3 79:5 105:7,18 108:2 123:20 237:9 themes 17:22 therapist 21:11 therapy 2:10 12:7,13

13:5 20:2 21:10.19 22:1,6 28:10 30:21 42:16 43:1 44:11 46:21 49:5 198:1,5 Therese 2:15 202:8 they'd 144:7 things 27:9 50:21 73:8 84:7 91:10 94:11 106:1 111:18 121:20 121:20 126:7 130:6 132:7 146:2 153:1 160:18 165:6,16 169:7,9 189:19 223:4 226:20 231:11 242:12 244:16 247:4 250:9 253:12 259:14,18 260:5 263:5 thinks 148:4 third 7:17 16:3 74:4 96:14 99:17 101:13 106:22 166:9 179:4,4 237:7 246:10 252:10 261:19 third-party 11:21 12:1,3 14:6 18:15 28:2,6,8 54:3 74:11 75:17,21 99:22 100:7 101:3,5,8 101:10 106:8,17 107:1 199:18 **Thomas** 53:4 thorough 22:18 50:17 199:15 thoroughness 45:10 thought 47:20 61:22 67:5,19 116:9 257:17 262:18 thoughtful 25:22 50:17 241:5 thousand 212:18,18 thousands 243:16 three 6:21 13:15 15:13 17:11 46:5 54:16 68:19 89:17,19 91:11 91:13,15 98:15,21,22 107:3,8 108:5,9 129:1 136:8,18 137:11,17 137:19 142:18 151:19 152:3 168:21 169:1 209:7 237:21 246:15 three-legged 205:2 three-year 97:19 threshold 210:19 thresholds 208:18 throw 108:11 thrown 104:13 tied 107:4,8,9 tight 248:13 timeframe 40:16,21

50:12 timeline 16:19 48:15 timelines 30:7 40:13,19 timely 188:22 times 64:1 84:14 99:16 127:16 201:9 202:17 237:21,21 timing 33:10 142:3 tiny 43:18,19 tip 44:22 231:1 tips 221:8 tires 85:3,4,5 **Title** 5:5 108:10,14,18 111:18 112:9,10 113:6,7 145:14 161:20,22,22 162:2 187:2 198:8 today 3:6 5:20 7:3 8:21 10:9,18 12:6 21:18 22:11 26:12 50:19 59:1,22 61:17 63:5 93:17 120:2 193:2 194:10 199:21 202:5 202:16 203:13 211:18 234:5 249:16 256:9 told 27:8 66:16 67:6 71:11 109:22 131:1 235:20 **Tommy** 226:8 ton 77:15 Tony 2:13 200:21 201:22 230:4 237:9 238:15 239:11 245:12 tool 261:1 tools 208:21 topical 126:3 topics 205:12 232:12 toss 36:19 total 234:11 totality 104:12 110:4,5 110:9 111:6 113:17 114:8,9 121:8 130:7 147:20 194:12 totally 152:14 touched 34:1,5 tough 193:20 201:20 203:21 231:20 232:21 259:9 track 228:12,16 229:9 229:15 242:17 tracking 230:8 trade 204:9 206:15 train 82:15,16 83:2,4 138:1 trained 84:12,14 85:15 137:5 185:1 223:11 training 15:21 16:9 24:7 24:13,16 34:8 36:3,6

36:9 37:1 79:12 80:7 82:12,14,22 83:8,9,19 84:10,17 85:14,16 86:8 112:5 115:8 125:9 129:1 136:8 137:14,16,17,20 147:2,3,4,5 185:6 213:18 214:7 225:11 225:12.16 transfer 18:5 translate 18:6 transmitted 71:3,5 transparency 115:18 transparent 170:6 250:11 transportation 216:8 Treasurer 2:14 treated 193:13 treatment 247:5 trend 68:21 89:5,9 Tri-County 8:1 triad 97:2,3 170:11 242:14 243:2 tried 222:8 227:4 250:17 triaaer 101:8 trouble 91:5 114:22 226:18 troubling 170:21 true 69:1 105:7 133:7 206:17 231:11 250:12 truly 204:16 205:19 Trust 235:13 Trustees 9:7 truth 235:21 try 44:17,19 71:7 73:20 81:6 92:14 138:19 149:10 183:13 227:5 227:10 241:3 246:20 252:3 trying 71:21 93:13 94:3 113:13 128:6 130:1 132:15 134:13,16 137:2 163:17 174:12 202:17 232:4 250:19 264:8 tuition-dependent 145:15 turn 3:13 5:15 23:12 26:6,8,14 123:4 210:16 212:1 turned 78:22 turnover 238:8,8 twice 127:13 209:8 **two** 10:10 13:22 29:17 37:16 41:3 49:14 51:19 52:21 66:13 68:16 74:14 80:3

91:12 107:19 108:9 108:13 111:14 117:22 118:3,8,12 120:9 141:6 149:15 150:7 153:4,6,15 169:1 189:19 199:8 203:7 205:10,12,17 206:16 218:22 225:18 228:3 231:11 247:19.22 251:10 259:2,18 two- 241:8 two-part 73:11 two-step 72:18 type 233:9 240:2 types 85:7 170:1 typically 39:8 215:20 U **U.S** 1:1 90:5 204:21 229:6,13 **U.S.A** 93:17 **U.S.C** 4:9 ultimate 97:18 123:15 ultimately 93:16 120:19 194:1 204:14 umbrella 37:2 unable 14:19 41:12 202:15 unacceptably 229:18 unanimous 262:4 unaudited 87:1 unavailable 50:5 unaware 70:18 unbelievably 244:4 uncomfortable 142:19 **uncover** 141:17 175:4 uncovered 152:9 underground 221:7 underlying 172:19 understand 23:3 82:22 85:1,3 91:3,4,6 96:16 111:10 113:12 119:2 126:10 128:18 129:10 129:12,19 143:1 144:22 163:13 189:9 197:12 205:20 222:4 252:5 understandable 90:16 Understandably 214:6 understanding 67:21 91:14 97:22 98:13 122:3 128:21 133:12 understood 93:20 190:12 223:10 unexpectedly 47:21 unfold 29:20 unfortunate 50:2 unfortunately 118:1

202:15 208:9 215:9 215:12 217:5 256:2 unfulfilled 116:4 unintelligible 160:22 161:1,3,18,19 166:11 166:22 169:4,13 174:15 183:20 199:16 200:11 unique 27:14 40:11 United 197:21 **Universities** 8:11 9:19 **university** 7:9 8:5,14,19 9:3,4,14 21:14,15 53:1,2,5 99:11 184:7 unmute 176:14 unmuted 243:9 unnoticed 211:16 unprecedented 249:11 ungualified 142:17 169:5 **unsound** 88:19 unsustainable 143:17 unusual 47:21 update 24:12 84:18 updates 24:19 36:9 upholds 21:22 upload 87:12 248:12 uploaded 87:14 88:4 262:20 263:9 ups 221:21 upwards 233:15 urgency 62:20 **use** 4:6 88:6 96:3 101:4 122:12,13 127:15 198:6 uses 95:22 **usually** 91:16 101:2 162:9 Utah 218:19 utilize 28:8 244:8 utilized 28:2 v vacant 29:11 vacuum 260:1 Valerie 2:5 10:11 54:19 55:4 57:18 155:6,14 259:3.3 validate 221:15,16 valuable 22:17 52:16 value 63:13 104:16 Van 10:4 VanAUSDLE 1:21 10:4

www.poolrgross.com

154:21 156:11 177:13

178:22 181:12 183:7

188:3 194:15 258:18

57:13,17 140:4

vantage 248:5

variation 214:8 219:13 variety 218:14 various 4:19 36:16 vehicle 211:4 verification 50:4 verified 38:10 verify 38:16 100:16,19 155:6 159:12 version 21:21 22:5 45:4 versus 144:3 160:9,16 veterans 66:7 **vetted** 249:5 viable 104:21 Vice 8:15 9:19 video 8:7 20:5 26:8,14 34:13 video- 1:11 view 110:18 169:22 240:12 242:20 vigorous 16:7 232:6 violation 233:21 violations 119:4 173:10 Virginia 21:10,10,12,13 21:14 91:13 96:15 99:11 virtual 199:9 245:14 248:8 virtually 202:18 **virtue** 29:9 **vis** 74:6.7 visa 113:19 visas 112:22 visit 14:1 35:13 85:18 92:21 93:1 199:9 236:14 visited 223:7 visitor 20:16 35:5 85:7 125:10 visitors 35:14 84:20 85:18 185:2 visits 18:20 34:10,16,17 34:20,21 35:3,3,17,20 36:15,15 66:3 248:9 248:14 vital 206:5,9 VIU 112:22 116:8 143:5 146:7,22 152:6 157:14,17 158:2 160:8,16 164:5,17 165:21 166:19 168:16 169:16 170:8 172:20 172:20 173:11 174:2 174:8 175:5,12 179:21 vocal 219:18 221:10 Vogel 2:15 202:8,10 voice 246:21 voluminous 65:2

volunteer 20:16 volunteers 21:19 45:17 45:18 207:11 **vote** 12:4 55:8 57:9,14 59:1 64:18 123:13,14 124:1,2 126:21 127:21 128:5 129:6,9 129:11,20 130:5,19 132:5,8,20 133:8 134:10,10 138:14 140:10 142:15 150:9 153:8,12 155:7,8 160:19 171:18,21 176:14,18 189:22 190:22 192:7,13 194:13,18 195:1 voted 57:19 131:12 189:21 194:6 votes 67:2 122:20 130:11 149:16 153:7 153:15 voting 81:18 124:12 127:1,18,20 129:21 134:2,4,8 135:13,14 138:21 140:14 143:9 151:22 152:22 176:20 190:20 191:10 192:15 193:9 194:10 w wait 183:14 waited 167:17 waiting 55:4 Waldorf 9:3 walk 160:3 Walla 10:5.5 Wallace 1:16 2:14 200:21 202:6 228:20 229:1.3 Wally 8:3,4 57:10 140:5 145:6 154:22,22 156:12 177:14 179:1 179:6 180:2 181:13 183:8 188:4 194:19 194:21 197:9 212:5 221:20 224:2 258:17 258:20 wanted 30:14 62:21 64:14 69:1 79:6 80:9 81:19 102:2 111:2 114:17 116:21 117:19 121:5,8,12 124:10 125:18 136:17,22 143:8 149:1,8 174:15 212:13 226:13 237:22 238:11,12,22 239:4 255:16 256:10 259:17 wanting 191:5

wants 51:17 102:7 115:17 174:14 217:6 220:1 259:11 warp 31:5 warrant 105:12 **WASC** 9:13 washed 160:13 Washington 204:22 wasn't 74:10 84:12 85:12 92:10 108:20 112:14,15 116:16 138:16 150:18 164:18 168:3 253:16 watch 216:7 watching 245:17 wave 49:1 way 31:13 52:13 68:4 92:5 96:18 114:2 117:12 122:13 123:8 132:7 143:9 145:19 147:10 148:2,5,8,13 148:13 164:21 170:14 170:15 171:2 174:17 215:10 217:20 236:12 245:16 255:18 256:8 263:2 ways 146:3 216:11 217:21 245:7 254:15 Webex 3:8 11:7 webinar 85:21 webinars 252:2 website 5:12 week 32:17,17 205:8 262:15 week-long 225:10 weekend 264:22 weekly 32:8 weeks 251:10 264:21 weigh 132:19 weighing 81:18 weight 63:13 104:16 welcome 3:3,16 5:17 7:15 11:4 23:7 30:10 197:3 198:16 welcomed 23:1 well-known 49:4 went 46:4 64:8 83:15 90:2 93:21 115:18 146:19 159:20 195:9 240:13 248:3 249:6 251:5 264:12 265:3 weren't 48:13 60:1 108:10,14,18 136:17 143:21 190:17 Westman 10:6 wherewithal 69:18 whichever 151:6 willingness 202:18

win/win 205:4 window 33:11 247:12 wisdom 102:5 wish 190:17 215:5 217:22 218:4 wit 210:1 withdraw 93:18 149:15 149:22 150:1 199:13 withdrawal 159:15 withdrawn 91:19 94:3 withdrew 90:8 wonder 102:7 213:8 232:7,7 wondered 200:5 214:15 wonderful 30:18 wondering 62:10 213:9 word 127:12,15 198:10 words 133:9 224:3 260:11 work 6:8 8:14 11:8 21:20 22:1,6 23:6 25:21 28:6 29:20 41:14 66:6 82:3,4,5,8 97:3 102:3 117:13 121:22,22 132:16 136:22 201:8 204:11 205:8 211:15 213:4 214:2 235:8 236:13 238:10 244:16 245:3 245:16 246:1 248:19 worker 186:2 working 8:8 25:11 32:5 32:17 34:7 43:10 44:10 136:10,21 210:7 216:17 221:7 235:8 245:17.17 workload 31:13 works 97:3 211:6 workshops 207:5 252:3 world 216:17 220:5 227:20 228:4 230:19 245:5 worry 114:6 worth 36:14 would-be 174:9 wouldn't 88:22 114:4 134:10 135:3 247:13 wrap 165:1 write 75:17 226:22 writing 247:10 written 17:1 75:16 247:11,14 wrong 84:7 108:19 115:18 147:12 166:7 174:16 204:1,1 212:19 220:20,21 wrongly 256:2

			29.
X	100,000 204:15	106:5 111:12 113:1	602.15(a)(1) 87:18 88:2
X 127:7	101(c)and 4:7	119:13 121:17 127:6	141:7 143:2 149:19
X 121.1	11 164:4,5	127:7 134:17 135:19	153:11 157:8 158:1
Y	11,000 218:10	163:6,7	173:19 176:2 184:18
•	11:59 159:20	2019 20:12 21:4 42:19	185:21
year 7:10 31:5,6,7,10	114 4:1,21	58:19 66:15 78:7	602.15(a)(2) 125:7
31:16,17 33:7 35:18	11th-hour 85:6	80:14 99:6	136:7 137:8 184:19
38:21 40:3,5,7,9	12 13:11 17:9 54:14	2020 14:2,3 66:19 69:2	184:21
43:20 48:15 49:14	66:12 164:4 202:21	69:10,15,21 70:3,10	602.15(a)(4) 23:22
54:14 80:16 81:3 83:1	12,000 218:11	71:3 86:22 87:10	
89:8 104:7 105:4,5			602.15(b)(1) 107:10
109:1 127:7 128:14	12:31 195:3	199:10 209:22 224:10	602.16 157:9 167:10
131:3 142:6 202:4	12:35 195:8	225:9 244:1	175:3
203:4 207:1 211:9	126 247:17	2021 1:9 24:4 25:2	602.16(a)(1)(l) 25:3
222:22 228:2,3 229:6	13 202:3 205:16 208:14	210:3	602.16(c) 157:9,11
233:16 237:21,21	14th 202:3 203:3	2023 78:1	175:3 177:22
244:2 245:10,15	15 6:18 12:18	209 112:21	602.17(c) 157:14 175:9
year's 17:2	15(a)(1) 14:17 152:20	20s 218:12	179:5,7 184:19 185:8
years 6:18,21 12:15,17	15,000 228:1 233:15	21 119:15 212:18	602.17(e) 157:10,18
13:15 15:14 17:11,14	15,000- 234:9	25 248:4	181:16
21:8 29:18 31:14	16,000 218:12	250 207:16	602.18(c) 184:19
33:13 41:3 42:2,12	17 165:18	28 166:17	185:13
,	17(c) 157:9,10 164:14	2966 4:9	602.19(b) 25:3 141:14
44:8 46:5 48:8 54:16	165:19		149:19 153:14 184:2
66:6,14,17 70:6 88:20	17(e) 166:3 175:13	3	185:17 190:7
89:1,13 91:5 103:20	17,000 218:12	3 5:17 38:12	602.2(h) 186:10
104:3 105:13 109:4	18 73:2 89:20 114:19	3-hour 207:2	602.20 95:1
125:15 191:1 198:14			
199:5 202:3 206:8	200:4 222:3 228:2	30 75:2 87:10 116:13	602.20(a) 25:4
208:15 209:7 211:15	18-member 73:2	248:10 261:7 262:10	602.20(b) 25:4
213:4 238:5 247:16	18-month- 90:12	262:15	602.28 166:17
256:20	19 200:4 212:18	30-day 118:13	602.33 74:11 75:10 76:
yeoman's 82:4,4	1954 5:11	32 12:18 206:7	76:6,8 135:17
yeses 259:3	1965 4:2 112:3	34 14:17	604.34 131:22
yesterday 58:1,18	1970 198:12	36(b) 4:8	615,000 246:21
63:10 66:19 67:6	1998 21:12	38 12:17	64 72:8
68:20 77:5 79:6,13	1st 38:22		
82:2 84:3,5 87:5 98:2		4	7
99:20 104:8 109:22	2	400 159:1	70 209:11
	2 24:6 87:4,7	41 4:9 247:19	74 248:2
114:21 115:20 122:1	2,000 214:14 218:20	45 207:1	75 90:5
138:9 202:4	2.2 87:8 89:7,12	48,000 82:21 102:12,13	
yesterday's 138:10	2/22/21 87:22	487(c-4) 4:7	8
yo-yo 192:11	2/24/2020 87:19	487(0-4)4.7	
York 218:16,16		5	8 38:2 88:17
	2:23 265:3		8-hour 207:18
Z	20 212:18 231:3	5 1:9 231:4	8,345,000 87:3
zero 213:12	2007 20:15	5- 54:13	8.5 89:12
	2009 203:8	50 207:1 209:10 212:8	
0	2012 20:19	213:8 216:19 217:8	9
	2014 20:21	222:5 245:1	9 213:3
1	2015 28:10 198:12	53,000 246:22	9:00 1:11
1,000 214:9 218:17	2016 12:14 59:7 60:5	59 248:2	9:11 3:2
	63:4,20 64:3,6 66:14		90 191:15
1,200 44:3 222:2 247:7	72:1 103:9 110:21	6	90% 113:4
249:21	111:12 112:20,20	60 209:11	9000 70:17
1,210 198:3	119:12 247:18	601.17(c) 179:15	9000- 65:3
	2017 21:1		
1:01 195:5,7		601.19(b) 188:18	95% 113:3
1:05 195:10 197:2		COD 4 4.47 4 4 5.4	
	2017-'18 203:9	602 14:17 115:4	
1:05 195:10 197:2		602 14:17 115:4 602.1 111:20 143:1 602.15 24:6 50:21 254:5	

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity

Before: U.S. DED

Date: 03-05-21

Place: teleconference

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

near Rans &

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433