U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY JULY 20, 2022

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met via Videoconference, at 10:00 a.m. EST, Arthur E. Keiser, Chair, presiding.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT ARTHUR E. KEISER, Chair CLAUDE PRESSNELL, Vice Chair KATHLEEN SULLIVAN ALIOTO JENNIFER L. BLUM, ESQ. RONNIE BOOTH WALLACE E. BOSTON ROSLYN CLARK ARTIS JILL DERBY DAVID EUBANKS MOLLY HALL MARTIN D. MICHAEL LINDSAY ROBERT MAYES MARY ELLEN PETRISKO ROBERT SHIREMAN ZAKIYA SMITH ELLIS STEVEN VAN AUSDLE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT GEORGE ALAN SMITH, NACIQI Executive Director, Designated Federal Official HERMAN BOUNDS, Director, Accreditation Group LG CORDER PAUL FLOREK NICOLE S. HARRIS CHARITY HELTON DONNA MANGOLD STEPHANIE McKISSIC KARMON SIMMS-COATES MICHAEL STEIN ASSOCIATION FOR BIBLICAL HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION (ABHE) LISA BEATTY, Executive Director KEVIN HESTER, Chair MICHAEL JACKSON, Associate Director/Substantive Change Officer SHANE WOOD, Associate Director ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR PHARMACY EDUCATION (ACPE) J. GREGORY BOYER, RPh, PhD, Associate Executive Director and Director of Professional Degree Program Accreditation JANET P. ENGLE, PharmD, PhD (Hon), FAPhA, FCCP, FNAP, Executive Director REZA KARIMI, RPh, PhD, President, ACPE, Dean and Professor at Pacific University School of Pharmacy DAWN ZAREMBSKI, PharmD, BCPS, Assistant Director of Accreditation MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS (MSA-CSS) AUDRA CHIN, Director of Policy & Operations LORNA FAIRESS, Associate Vice President JAMES KRAFT, Chair GLEN MORT, Vice President DAN RUFO, Associate Vice President CHRISTIAN TALBOT, President

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION, COMMISSION ON DENTAL

ACCREDITATION (ADA-CODA)

CATHRYN ALBRECHT, Senior Associate General

Counsel

SANJAY MALLYA, Vice Chairman

SHERIN TOOKS, Director

```
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
Welcome and Introductions . . . .
                                   . . . 5
Renewal of Recognition:
Association for Biblical Higher Education,
Renewal of Recognition:
Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education
                                . . . . .98
(ACPE) . . . .
Renewal of Recognition:
Middle States Commission on Secondary Schools
(MSA-CSS). . . . . .
                                . . . . 175
Renewal of Recognition:
American Dental Association, Commission on Dental
```

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:00 a.m.
3	G.A. SMITH: Good morning and welcome,
4	everyone. This is the second day of the meeting
5	of the National Advisory Committee on
6	Institutional Quality and Integrity, also known
7	as NACIQI.
8	I'm George Alan Smith, the Executive
9	Director and Federal Official of NACIQI, which
10	was established by Section 114 of the Higher
11	Education Act of 1965, as amended, and is also
12	governed by provisions of the Federal Advisory
13	Committee Act, as amended, which sets forth
14	standards for the formation and use of advisory
15	committees.
16	Sections 101(c) and 487(c-4) of the
17	HEA and Section 8016 of the Public Health Service
18	Act, 42 USC Section 4966, require the Secretary
19	to publish lists of state approval agencies,
20	nationally recognized accrediting agencies, and
21	state approval and accrediting agencies for
22	programs of nurse education that the Secretary

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

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

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

In addition to these charges, NACIQI
authorizes academic graduate degrees from federal
agencies and institutions.

18 This authorization was provided by 19 letter from the Office of Management and Budget 20 in 1954 and this letter is available on the 21 NACIQI website along with all other records 22 related to NACIQI's deliberations.

1 At this time, I'll turn it over to our 2 Chairperson, Art Keiser. CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, George. 3 4 Good morning, everyone. Welcome again to the 5 second day of the summer 2022 meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional 6 Quality and Integrity. 7 8 At this time, I'd like to introduce 9 our members and have them introduce themselves, and we'll start with you, Wally. 10 11 W. BOSTON: Sure, Wally Boston, 12 President Emeritus of American Public University 13 System. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Molly? 15 (Native language spoken.) 16 M. HALL-MARTIN: My name is Molly 17 Hall-Martin and I serve as the student member. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Claude? 19 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Claude 20 Pressnell, the President of the Tennessee 21 Independent Colleges and Universities and Vice Chair of the committee. 22

1	CHAIR KEISER: David?
2	D. EUBANKS: Good morning, everyone,
3	Dave Eubanks. I work at Furman University.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
5	R. BOOTH: Ronnie Booth, President
6	Emeritus, Tri-County Technical College in South
7	Carolina.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
9	R. ARTIS: Roslyn Artis, Benedict
10	College, Columbia, South Carolina.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
12	R. MAYES: Good morning, Robert Mayes,
13	CEO of Columbia Southern Education Group.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Bob?
15	B. SHIREMAN: Bob Shireman with The
16	Century Foundation.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
18	J. DERBY: Jill Derby, Senior Fellow
19	with the Association of Governing Boards of
20	Universities and Colleges.
21	CHAIR KEISER: Steve? You're muted,
22	Steve.

1	S. VAN AUSDLE: Sorry. Steve Van
2	Ausdle, President Emeritus, Walla Walla Community
3	College in Washington State.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya?
5	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Zakiya Smith Ellis,
6	former Chief Policy Advisory to Governor Murphy
7	in New Jersey and student advocate.
8	CHAIR KEISER: And Jennifer?
9	J. BLUM: Jennifer Blum with Blum
10	Higher Education Advising.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Well, thank you and
12	appreciate everyone for being here. We are going
13	to go through the process of how we go through an
14	agency renewal and then we have three agencies so
15	far on the agenda and we may have a fourth.
16	So, the standard review procedures
17	start with the primary readers who are assigned
18	to introduce the agency's application. The
19	department staff then provides us with a
20	briefing.
21	The agency representatives are then
22	invited to provide comments on their petition,

1	then questions by NACIQI, followed by response
2	and comments from the agency. If we have third-
3	party commenters, we will then address those at
4	that time.
5	Then the agency has the opportunity to
6	respond to the third-party commenters, and then
7	the department staff responds both to the agency
8	and to the third-party commenters, and then the
9	committee has discussion and then a vote.
10	At this time, we will begin the
11	renewal of recognition for the Association for
12	Biblical Higher Education, their Commission on
13	Accreditation, ABHE.
14	Our primary readers are Molly Hall-
15	Martin and Robert Mayes. The department staff is
16	Nicole Harris. Molly and Robert, the floor is
17	yours.
18	M. HALL-MARTIN: Good morning. The
19	Commission on Accreditation of the Association
20	for Biblical Higher Education accredits Bible
21	colleges and institutions offering undergraduate
22	and graduate programs through both campus-based

instruction and distance education.

2	The agency is an institutional
3	accreditor and has 113 accredited and 13 pre-
4	accredited institutions located in the United
5	States and territories, along with accrediting
6	activities outside of its scope of recognition to
7	institutions in Canada.
8	The Commission on Accreditation has
9	been recognized by the Department of Education
10	since 1952, and its last renewal for recognition
11	was in 2017.
12	Since the agency's last review, the
13	department has received no complaints and one
14	third-party comment.
15	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. I was
16	remiss in not having the staff introduce
17	themselves. I will do that after we go through
18	this agency. Nicole, you are up. You're muted,
19	Nicole. Nicole, you're muted. You are still
20	muted.
21	N. HARRIS: Can you hear me now?
22	CHAIR KEISER: We can now.

	-
1	N. HARRIS: Okay, great, sorry for the
2	delay. Good morning, everyone, excuse me, Mr.
3	Chair and members of the committee. My name is
4	Dr. Nicole S. Harris and will be presenting
5	information regarding the renewal petition
6	submitted by the Association for Biblical Higher
7	Education, also referred to as ABHE or the
8	agency, a Title IV institutional accreditor
9	currently recognized by the department.
10	The department staff recommendation to
11	the senior department official is to renew the
12	agency's recognition for five years with the
13	inclusion of an expansion of scope for offering
14	via, I'm sorry, direct assessment within the
15	agency's scope of recognition.
16	The department staff recommendation is
17	based upon my review of the agency's renewal
18	petition, supporting documentation, and virtual
19	observations of the commission and annual
20	meetings in February 2021 and 2022, a training
21	workshop in September 2021, and evaluation site
22	visits in October 2021 and April 2022, along with

a file review conducted in March and April of
 2022 for the agency.

Based upon the above-mentioned review 3 of the agency's original submission and draft 4 5 staff analysis responses, supporting documentation, observations, and follow-up 6 7 communication with the agency, department staff 8 has determined the agency meets the requirements 9 of the Secretary's criteria for recognition with no remaining issues. 10

11 It should also be noted that the 12 agency has provided a request for an expansion of 13 scope for the inclusion of direct assessment 14 within the agency's scope of recognition as previously stated above. Although not reflected 15 16 in the scope of recognition within the final 17 staff analysis, this request is reflected in 18 602.16(d) of the petition.

Thus, the agency's scope of
recognition would read the accreditation and preaccreditation candidate status of institutions of
biblical higher education offering undergraduate

certificates, associate degrees, bachelor 1 2 degrees, graduate certificates, and master's degrees, including the accreditation of 3 educational programs offered via distance 4 5 education and direct assessment. This concludes my presentation. 6 There 7 are agency representatives present today and they 8 will be happy to respond to the committee's 9 questions. Thank you. 10 CHAIR KEISER: Are there any questions 11 for Ms. Harris, Nicole Harris? If not, I'd like 12 to introduce Dr. Lisa Beatty, the Executive Director of the ABHE Commission on Accreditation, 13 14 and if you would, please introduce the members of 15 your team. You are muted. Thank you. 16 L. BEATTY: Thank you. Thank you very much. 17 Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the 18 committee. We would like to thank you for this 19 opportunity to speak on behalf of the Association for Biblical Higher Education or ABHE. 20 21 My name is Lisa Beatty and I serve as the Executive Director of the ABHE Commission on 22

Accreditation. Prior to my service with ABHE, I 1 2 was an educator and academic vice president at an ABHE accredited college for 29 years, served one 3 term on the ABHE commission with two years as 4 5 chair, and my dissertation research focused on institutional outcomes of accreditation 6 7 processes. With me today is Dr. Kevin Hester, 8 9 Chair of the ABHE Commission on Accreditation, and Vice President for Institutional 10 Effectiveness and Dean of the School of Theology 11 12 at Welch College, Gallatin, Tennessee. Dr. Hester has served on the commission for seven 13 14 years and this is his third year as chair. 15 Also joining me are two members of the 16 commission professional staff. Dr. Shane Wood serves as Senior Associate Director and has been 17 18 at the commission for seven years. 19 Dr. Michael Jackson is the Associate 20 Director and Substantive Change Officer for the 21 Commission. Dr. Jackson served in a part-time 22 role for the past four years and has recently

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

1	joined us as full-time professional staff.
2	Both gentlemen have extensive prior
3	experience serving in leadership roles at ABHE-
4	accredited institutions.
5	We would like to express our sincere
6	appreciation to the department and particularly
7	to Dr. Nicole Harris for her support and
8	assistance throughout the review process.
9	As was noted yesterday, we were
10	looking at a new set of regulations, and so there
11	are some inherent challenges in that, but Dr.
12	Harris' knowledge of the regulations, her careful
13	review of our petition and supporting
14	documentation, and particularly her availability
15	when questions arose provide invaluable during
16	this process.
17	I would also like to acknowledge the
18	excellent work of Dr. Ron Kroll, the previous
19	commission director, in preparation of our
20	original petition.
21	This year, ABHE celebrated its 75th
22	anniversary. In 1952, just five years after its

founding, ABHE was recognized by the Department 1 2 of Education. So, we have a long history of ensuring quality and integrity in biblical higher 3 education through accreditation processes 4 empowered by peer review. 5 ABHE commission standards and policies 6 are focused on ensuring and advancing quality in 7 8 those institutions accredited and pre-accredited 9 by the agency. The credentials and accumulated 10 11 experience of the commission professional staff 12 provides our institutions with a wealth of 13 knowledge and expertise in accreditation and 14 institutional improvement processes. Our accreditation approach requires a 15 16 great deal of face to face engagement with 17 institutions. Between annual staff visits for 18 applicants and candidate institutions, additional location visits, assessment visits, and staff 19 20 support for evaluation team visits, the agency 21 averaged more than 50 on-campus staff visits 22 annually during the recognition period.

Our pool of 200 team evaluators 1 2 complete extensive training on ABHE standards and policies with the expectation of updated training 3 at least once every three years. 4 The agency is currently developing a 5 new evaluator training course hosted by CampusEdu 6 7 designed to increase engagement and provide just in time updates. Commission staff also provided 8 9 training at the February commission meeting and 10 at other meetings as needed. 11 I'm extremely proud of the work of our 12 commission. We have an experienced team of 18 volunteer commissions, 15 institutional members 13 14 elected by the delegate assembly, and three public members appointed by the executive 15 committee of the commission. 16 Members include institution 17 18 presidents, academic leaders, CFOs, and 19 institutional effectiveness, learning resource, 20 and student services professionals. Public 21 members currently include a CPA, a leader of a 22 parachurch ministry, and a student member.

1	Commissioners complete training on all
2	standards and policies prior to service. They
3	are careful readers and questioners, and
4	deliberate and consistent decision makers.
5	Team evaluators and commissioners sign
6	the agency's conflict of interest policy annually
7	and take great care to recuse themselves from
8	serving on a team or making a decision regarding
9	an institution with which they may have a
10	conflict.
11	In this introduction, we would like to
12	provide the information regarding performance
13	data, decision activities, student achievements,
14	and institutional quality, and please excuse me
15	if I need to take a drink. My voice is a little
16	rocky. I'm recovering from COVID. So, if I need
17	to take a drink, that's the reason why.
18	The ABHE Commission on Accreditation
19	is a specialized institutional accreditor of
20	colleges and universities that require a core of
21	biblical and theological studies and practical
22	field-based ministry formation for all students

1

regardless of academic program.

2	The agency accredits or pre-accredits
3	111 U.S. institutions in 36 states and U.S.
4	territory, and 17 institutions in six Canadian
5	provinces. Annualized head count for these
6	institutions is approximately 40,000 students.
7	ABHE accredited and pre-accredited
8	institutions include a significant number of
9	minority-serving institutions, including three
10	HBCUs and three Native American-serving
11	institutions. We are proud that our institutions
12	provide educational opportunities for many
13	underserved student populations.
14	The accreditor dashboard presents data
15	on institutions for which ABHE is the Title IV
16	gatekeeper, a total of 53 institutions serving
17	6,747 undergraduates and 1,158 graduate students,
18	for a total of 7,905 students or about 20 percent
19	of total students attending the 128 ABHE
20	accredited or pre-accredited institutions. These
21	53 institutions constitute just over 40 percent
22	of institutions accredited or pre-accredited by

ABHE.	
-------	--

2	Dashboard data for the 53 institutions
3	for which ABHE is the Title IV gatekeeper
4	indicates that 54 percent of ABHE undergraduates
5	at these institutions receive Pell and 32 percent
6	receive federal student loans.
7	ABHE's aggregate Title IV volume is
8	\$42 million, with an average per campus volume of
9	less than \$1 million per institution. Average
10	net price for these institutions, these 53
11	institutions is below \$15,000.
12	ABHE institutions serve a high
13	percentage of part-time students, transfer
14	students, and adult learners, leading to small
15	graduation cohorts of first-time full-time
16	students. The cohort size for graduation rate in
17	the current dashboard dataset is just 601
18	students.
19	This small cohort is due to the nature
20	of ministry programs, which often serve as a
21	second career rather than a first, and these
22	part-time adult learners often take more than 150

1	percent of program length to complete.
2	The dashboard reflects graduation
3	rates for 2020-2021 which will join 2019-20 as an
4	asterisk year due to the pandemic.
5	That said, the institutions with 150
6	percent graduate rates below 33 percent on the
7	accreditation dashboard include an institution on
8	heightened cash monitoring, an institution placed
9	on warning by the commission in February 2022,
10	and five institutions with graduation rate
11	cohorts of four or fewer students.
12	Ten of these institutions saw
13	improvements in graduation rates in the most
14	recent reporting year, with eight now above the
15	dashboard's 33 percent threshold. The average
16	graduation transfer out rate for all ABHE
17	accredited institutions in 2021 was 60.8 percent.
18	The commission monitors financial
19	responsibility composite scores as part of the
20	annual report process. The accreditor data file
21	indicates that two institutions scored below 1.0
22	for the reporting period. The first improved its

1	FRCS to 1.2 in 2020 and 1.7 in 2021, and the
2	second improved its FRCS to 1.1 in 2020 and 1.5
3	in 2021.
4	Overall, the average FRCS score for
5	ABHE accredited and pre-accredited institutions
6	improved by more than 0.3 from 2020 to 2021 to
7	approximately an average of 2.5 for FRCS scores
8	across our accredited and pre-accredited
9	institutions.
10	Now, I turn to decision activity.
11	Since the agency's 2017 appearance before NACIQI,
12	ABHE has granted pre-accredited status or
13	candidate status to 17 institutions, granted
14	initial accreditation to 18 institutions,
15	reaffirmed the accreditation of 51 institutions,
16	placed three institutions on probation, removed
17	one institution from probation, continued two
18	institutions on probation for a second year,
19	issued show-cause orders to two institutions,
20	removed accredited status from one institution,
21	pre-accredited status from one institution, and
22	applicant status from one institution, and

approved 241 substantive changes. The agency
 averages approximately 300 accreditation actions
 each year.

Commission assessment processes have identified two standards most referenced in action letters for needed improvement at ABHE institutions, standard 6b financial resources and standard 2 assessment planning.

As an accreditor of small faith-based
private institutions that rely heavily on
supporting churches and individuals rather than
high tuition revenues, we work with institutions
that have never experienced financial abundance,
but manage to thrive on very modest resources,
some now into a second century.

When an institution's data during the recognition period fell below the 1.5 monitoring threshold or an evaluation team identified a concern in the area of financial resources, the commission has taken the following range of actions during the commission recognition period, required progress reports, including the

1	development of a detailed financial recovery
2	plan, required updates regarding financial
3	recovery plan implementation, required staff
4	visits to review financial conditions, required
5	institutional representatives to appear before
6	the commission to discuss financial position,
7	deferred action on reinstatement, deferred action
8	on candidate status, deferred action on
9	reaffirmation of accreditation, placed
10	institutions on warning, on probation, on show
11	cause, and withdrew accredited status.
12	So, the commission is very diligent in
13	helping institutions as they work through issues
14	related to financial resources.
15	We also provide significant training
16	and coaching opportunities to assist institutions
17	in addressing issues of financial resources and
18	institutional improvement in that area.
19	These include a series of leadership
20	development conferences each fall for presidents,
21	enrollment leaders, advancement leaders, and
22	financial officers. In fall 2021, attendance at

1	just those four conferences totaled 91
2	individuals from 51 different institutions.
3	ABHE also provides financial training
4	through pre-conference forums and workshop tracks
5	for CFOs, advancement and enrollment
6	professionals at its February annual meeting.
7	Through attendance at fall conferences
8	and annual meeting workshop tracks, institutional
9	leaders can achieve certification through ABHE's
10	executive training and certification programs.
11	Support for financial stability is
12	also provided through the excellence in board
13	governance training program funded through a
14	grant from the Murdock Charitable Trust.
15	In the past three years, board cohorts
16	from 28 ABHE accredited and pre-accredited
17	institutions have completed this comprehensive
18	board training.
19	Now, with regard to standard two
20	assessment and planning, when the commission has
21	identified weakness in compliance, the commission
22	has taken a similar range of actions during the

recognition period, everything from progress 1 2 reports through placing institutions on sanctions, sending staff visits to address issues 3 4 of assessment, requiring focused evaluation visits, deferring substantive change. 5 In some cases, the commission has 6 7 required institutions with assessment issues to 8 host a staff visit to provide specific guidance 9 on assessment. This approach fosters a sense of 10 support and encouragement for the institution and 11 12 has been found to resolve concerns more quickly 13 than requiring a progress report without this 14 advisory assistance. To assist institutions in quality 15 16 improvement with regard to standard two, 17 particularly student achievement assessment and 18 outcome validation, ABHE presents annual meeting 19 workshops focused on best practices for 20 assessment. 21 Each fall, the accreditation journey conference includes a unit on developing and 22

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

1	implementing assessment plans, and for the first
2	time in fall 2021, ABHE offered a two-day
3	institutional assessment conference with 48
4	attendees. The conference will be offered again
5	this fall.
6	Annual staff consultation visits to
7	applicants and pre-accredited institutions focus
8	heavily on development of a comprehensive
9	assessment plan which is a prerequisite for
10	hosting an evaluation team for pre-accredited
11	status.
12	Let me say a few words about student
13	achievement. Informed by ABHE accreditation
14	standards one, mission and goals, and two,
15	assessment and planning, student achievement is
16	directly linked to mission fulfillment.
17	Some of our institutions focus on
18	preparation for professional ministry careers,
19	while others focus on lay ministry, avocation, or
20	life service, sometimes with a second career
21	preparation area.
22	Whether explicit or implicit in the

mission, all biblical higher education
 institutions regard achievement in foundational
 Bible knowledge and acquisition of ministry
 service skills. They make that a mission
 objective even if transfer out is the path to
 career fulfillment.

7 This diversity of mission means that 8 evaluation teams and the commission must honor 9 mission as paramount and exercise appropriate 10 flexibility in reviewing student outcomes in the 11 context of mission.

12 The ABHE Commission on Accreditation 13 places high emphasis on achievement of outcomes 14 related to mission. The policy on outcomes provides guidance to institutions concerning 15 16 commission review of institution and program 17 outcomes, and communication of outcomes to the 18 public in a meaningful and consumer friendly 19 fashion.

20 Institutions are required to publish 21 institutional goals and program objectives and 22 the resulting outcomes. Evaluation teams

evaluate institutional effectiveness based on 1 2 outcomes date demonstrating mission achievement. Over the past two years, the agency 3 has engaged in a comprehensive review of 4 institutional compliance with standard two and 5 the policy on outcomes. 6 At the conclusion of the project 7 8 anticipated by November 2022, the agency will have reviewed outcomes information available to 9 the public using a standardized rubric, either as 10 part of a scheduled evaluation team visit or 11 12 through staff review and reporting for all ABHE accredited institutions. 13 14 Evaluation team reports and staff 15 website outcomes reports are placed on the 16 commission agenda for review at the next 17 scheduled meeting. 18 Institutions with identified areas of 19 noncompliance are required to submit progress reports demonstrating with evidence that 20 assessment-related issues have been addressed. 21 22 Turning to institutional quality, the

ABHE's commission, I'm sorry, the ABHE 1 2 commission's definition of quality is communicated through the policy on academic 3 quality as related to institutional mission. 4 5 Because institutional missions within ABHE vary, the definition of quality must accommodate this 6 7 mission diversity. 8 The policy articulates four specific 9 qualities an institution must have to fulfill and sustain an improved academic quality. The first 10 is student learning outcomes are defined and are 11 12 being achieved. Educational programs, student 13 learning experiences, and support services meet 14 the needs of the student population served and result in student success. 15 16 Third, students engage with qualified 17 faculty in the learning experience, and fourth, 18 the institution procures and manages resources 19 necessary to fulfill its mission and sustain its 20 educational programs. The commission monitors these 21 22 indicators using data collected through the

1	annual report process, including enrollment,
2	retention rates, graduation rates, financial
3	responsibility composite score, faculty
4	credentials, and financial indicators.
5	If an indicator is tripped, the
6	institution is required to provide an explanation
7	for review by commission subcommittee at its next
8	scheduled meeting. If the explanation is not
9	acceptable, a progress report or action plan is
10	required.
11	The merit of asking for an explanation
12	as a first step has proved invaluable in
13	identifying data errors or extenuating
14	circumstances before assuming weakness.
15	To achieve accredited status with
16	ABHE, institutions must demonstrate substantial
17	compliance with 25 conditions of eligibility and
18	11 standards and related essential elements.
19	When an evaluation visit or
20	substantive change petition surfaces a weakness
21	for an accredited institution, the commission
22	asks for a progress report to address the issues.

1	A focused visit or staff visit may be
2	required as well, and where compliance with
3	standards is found to be deficient, sanctions are
4	applied.
5	The commission treats all applicant
6	and pre-accredited institutions as potentially at
7	risk and requires an annual staff visit and
8	progress report to monitor and/or assist these
9	institutions towards substantial compliance.
10	In February 2022, the commission
11	approved a change in policy requiring applicant
12	and pre-accredited institutions to complete a
13	standard self-assessment prior to annual visits.
14	This tool requires institutions to
15	self-assess their progress in achieving
16	compliance with the standards and essential
17	elements on a five point scale and accompanying
18	narrative, and thus focuses staff attention on
19	specific areas needed for institutional
20	development.
21	As noted in my earlier comments, ABHE
22	provides extensive continuing education

opportunities that support institutional quality 1 2 improvement, including leadership annual conferences, an annual meeting and webinars, fall 3 conferences not mentioned above include 4 5 conferences for academic and student development leaders, online education, Title IX, and 6 7 achieving accreditation standards. 8 The achieving accreditation standards 9 conference assists institutions in documenting compliance with standards and improving their 10 11 programs. 12 The conference provides an overview of all 11 institutional accreditation standards and 13 14 related essential elements, and provides examples of appropriate evidence for each essential 15 16 element. 17 And then as it relates to agency 18 effectiveness, the ABHE Commission on Accreditation is currently engaged in a 19 comprehensive review of standards. 20 The review 21 was launched in February 2022 with a listening 22 session at the annual meeting. We followed up

with three virtual listening sessions and a
 survey sent to all accredited and pre-accredited
 institutions.

4 Thus far, our institutions indicate 5 that the current standards are valued and that 6 work should focus on updates related to the 7 changing higher education environment such as 8 instructional modalities, technological 9 resources, diversity, and innovation. 10 In 2022, the commission made a

10 In 2022, the commission made a 11 substantial investment in a software platform to 12 assist in data collection and reporting to ensure 13 the quality of data collected and encourage 14 meaningful data engagement, and in addition, the 15 agency is currently developing a comprehensive 16 assessment plan to evaluate its own 17 effectiveness.

18 In conclusion, I want to assure the
19 committee that the ABHE Commission on
20 Accreditation has taken the recognition review
21 process very seriously.

22

The agency's review in light of the

new regulations resulted in policy changes,
 process improvements, and reflective questions
 about how best to assure the public of
 institutional and program quality at ABHE
 accredited institutions.

We are gratified by the department recommendation for renewal of recognition for five years with the addition of direct assessment in our scope of recognition.

This concludes our remarks, and once 10 again, on behalf of the Association for Biblical 11 12 Higher Education Commission on Accreditation and 13 staff, we would like to thank the department and 14 the committee for the opportunity to present additional information in support of our petition 15 16 of recognition. We would be happy to answer any 17 questions you may have.

18 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Molly, Robert, do19 you have questions for the agency?

20 R. MAYES: Molly, do you want to go 21 ahead?

22

M. HALL-MARTIN: Well, my first

question was fortunately answered within the 1 2 presentation. I was going to ask about how the comprehensive standard review process has been 3 4 going, but you shared an update there. 5 I think the one remaining question I have is could you -- you have an institution that 6 7 for better or for worse has made a couple of 8 headlines of late and I'm wondering if you could 9 speak to the situation at Olivet and any actions you took as an accreditor to ensure institutional 10 11 integrity? 12 L. BEATTY: Thank you very much for 13 that question. Even this last week, we have seen 14 some media reports regarding Olivet. Let me first start by saying that 15 16 standard three of the ABHE standards and 17 essential elements relates specifically to 18 institutional integrity, and so this is an area 19 that is very important as a standard at ABHE. The issues related to Olivet 20 21 University, and you'll understand that I'm 22 following policies on confidentiality that

relates to ABHE and also to the department's policies, but I will share what we have done that is public at this point as it relates to this particular institution.

5 So, there were some issues that 6 emerged related to Olivet in 2019, and commission 7 review of that situation led to the commission 8 placing the institution on probation status in 9 February 2020.

The institution continued to make 10 11 progress on those issues, but the commission did 12 not feel that sufficient progress had been made 13 by February 2021, and so the institution was 14 continued on probation in February 2021. Those action letters and the reasons for the sanctions 15 16 were posted, are still posted on the ABHE 17 website.

In 2021, following the February meeting, so that fall, the institution hosted a focused visit, and so there was on the ground scrutiny of the information related to the probation status, and based on that visit and the

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

1

2

3

resulting report, the institution was removed 1 2 from November, or, I'm sorry, removed from probation status in November of 2021. 3 Since that time, there have been 4 5 really two precipitating events that put the institution back on the agency's radar. One was 6 7 a news report, a media report in April of 2022. 8 The second was a letter from the State 9 of New York that indicated that the state was not renewing approval for the institution to operate 10 11 in the state, and those two items came to ABHE 12 actually on the same day. And based on that information, we 13 14 treat all media reports like an anonymous complaint, though we required the institution to 15 16 provide a response to the media report and to the 17 findings and observations of the letter from New 18 York State. 19 That happened in May of this year, so you can tell that the timeline here has been 20 21 tight. We have a meeting in June 2022. So, all 22 complaints and responses are placed on the agenda

1 for review at the next meeting. So, that review 2 took place in June 2022 of the institution. The commission has initiated an action 3 4 regarding the institution, but that action is 5 currently in our due process process at this It is not final, and so that action is 6 point. not public at this point. 7 8 Thank you. M. HALL-MARTIN: That's 9 all of my questions. Robert, did you have any? R. MAYES: Sure. Your website and 10 11 your documentation definitely shows you take 12 actions when appropriate. And I was just wondering also about 13 14 higher education has seen a downturn in 15 enrollment that has affected different sectors 16 differently over the last couple of years or 17 more, and of course, that's going to hit on your 18 financial standards. I'm just wondering how has 19 that been with your institutions and how have you dealt with that? 20 21 L. BEATTY: Thank you. That's a great question which we appreciate. 22 I think I

mentioned in the introduction that over the last 1 2 two years, we have actually seen some -- we have seen institutions overall see their FRCS scores 3 4 improve. 5 We don't know yet. We're looking at various data points, but we suspect that HEERF 6 funds and CARES Act funds have provided some 7 8 support for our institutions. Remember, these 9 are small institutions. If you do the math, for the 53 10 institutions that are on the dashboard and divide 11 12 out what the FTE is likely for those 13 institutions, they average less than 200 14 students, so funds from the federal government 15 for HEERF and CARES did have a position impact for some of those small institutions. 16 17 That said, we have not seen any sort 18 of deep decrease in enrollment. So, there have 19 been some decreases in enrollment over time, but 20 that has not been characteristic of many of our 21 institutions. 22 Many of them have been able to sort of hold steady and some of that is because small institutions can be nimble, and so they can make changes related to delivery in ways that can accommodate students.

5 And we've seen some creative 6 approaches, both through the pandemic based on 7 the flexibility provided by the department, and 8 then even after based on substantive change 9 requests to continue what they were doing as part 10 of their measures during the COVID period.

11 So, I would say that our institutions 12 do not have deep pockets. That would be, I think, unexpected for ministry-oriented 13 institutions, but I think that the mission of 14 15 these institutions is often supported, strongly 16 supported by churches and denominations, and that 17 has been a help for our institutions during this 18 time. Kevin or Shane, would you have anything to 19 add to that? Okay.

20 R. MAYES: Thank you for your answer 21 and also thank you for your mission and what you 22 do. I greatly admire it and appreciate it. All

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

1

2

3

1 right, that's all for me. We can't hear you, 2 Art. I wanted to make sure 3 CHAIR KEISER: 4 there's no external sounds coming in, so I was on mute, but we have Wally, then Michael, then Mary 5 Ellen, and then Jennifer. Wally? 6 7 W. BOSTON: Yes, thank you. So, I'd 8 like to commend you, Dr. Beatty, for such a great 9 presentation, particularly as you took the time to explain numbers on our most recently published 10 11 dashboard. 12 As you know, the dashboard was 13 suspended for a couple of years and then reinstituted with the new administration, and 14 we're looking at that in many different ways, and 15 16 so my questions do revolve around some items on the dashboard that I feel like you've done a 17 18 great job of explaining. 19 It's not a surprise, based on your 20 mission, that the median earnings are rather low 21 for the institutions, and I guess it was a 22 surprise, a pleasant surprise, I guess, that only

1 20 percent of your total student enrollment for 2 the institutions are surfacing on this report because there are a small percentage of people 3 4 who are participating in federal aid. 5 But I do have a question about the graduation rate and the transfer rate, 6 7 particularly as you look at it as an accrediting It's rather high compared to the 8 agency. 9 averages for four-year institutions. And you mentioned that you have 10 11 certain indicators on your annual report that are 12 triggers, and I'm wondering if one of them 13 relates to graduation rates and how you all view 14 that given the fact that you've cited a 60.8 percent transfer rate and didn't necessarily 15 16 indicate that that was bad, so --17 L. BEATTY: So, that's a great 18 question. Let me just make one clarification 19 about the dashboard which is fairly unique to an 20 agency like ABHE. We do have another 25 institutions. 21 Now, let me make sure I have that number right, 22

another 36 accredited institutions that 1 2 participate in Title IV, but they participate through another gatekeeper. 3 And then we have 39 institutions that 4 5 do not participate in Title IV, including all of our pre-accredited institutions. So, we don't 6 7 have any of our candidate institutions that are currently participating in Title IV. 8 9 Sometimes I think that is sort of It's just that we have some institutions 10 lost. with dual accreditation, so even though they 11 participate in Title IV, they're counted on 12 13 somebody else's dashboard, so I just wanted to 14 make sure that that was clear. 15 W. BOSTON: Okay. 16 L. BEATTY: We do, in fact, have 17 graduation -- what we collect on our dashboard, 18 and I don't want to confuse by using the term 19 dashboard, but on our annual report indicators is 20 graduation/transfer rate, so a combined 21 graduation/transfer rate, and that is the metric 22 that I gave you, Dr. Boston, at 60.8 percent for

1

accredited institutions.

2	And for ABHE, what that indicates is
3	we certainly have some first-time full-time
4	students. You saw that the number for the
5	dashboard was 601. That's a very small end.
6	So, but we certainly do have students
7	that come to our institutions intending to
8	complete a program, but we also have students
9	that come to do a one-year certificate or they
10	come to do a component, an academic component
11	that they intend to transfer elsewhere in order
12	to pursue a degree program that's not offered at
13	an ABHE institution.
14	And while we have more institutions
15	over time that are offering programs like
16	business, and IT, and counseling, and graphic
17	design just to name a few, we do have many
18	institutions, particularly the ones on the
19	dashboard, that are really focused on Bible and
20	ministry programs.
21	So, for ABHE, as we are tracking that,
22	our view is that the combined graduation/transfer

46

rate gives us a much clearer picture of that
 outcome at our ABHE institutions. Did I answer
 your question, Dr. Boston?

W. BOSTON: Yes, in other words, the data that comes from the college scorecard, particularly since it only represents first-time full-time students for certain aspects like graduation rates, is difficult to evaluate when you have a large part-time population and a large percentage of people doing certificates.

11 So, we have a separate project that's 12 under discussion and will be discussed on Friday under the current calendar, but I certainly 13 14 appreciate the thoroughness that you've done in reviewing this, and it sounds like it's most 15 16 appropriate to look at graduation plus transfer, 17 which is what you have on your indicators, so 18 thank you for your explanation.

L. BEATTY: Yeah, I would just follow
up and say we also are continuing to try to think
through how best for our institutions to be able
to provide data that is most meaningful to them,

(202) 234-4433

1	and so this is an ongoing conversation at the
2	commission level as well, so thank you. I'm glad
3	to hear NACIQI is discussing it.
4	W. BOSTON: Thanks.
5	CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
6	M. LINDSAY: Hi, Dr. Beatty. I'm
7	Michael Lindsay. I serve as the President of
8	Taylor University in Indiana, a faith-based
9	institution, and so I've been familiar with ABHE
10	for many years.
11	I was curious. I know that the faith-
12	based sector has been very involved with both
13	international student education and with first
14	generation students more so than other sectors of
15	higher ed, and I was curious.
16	I don't know what your institutions
17	experience, but in my part of the sector with
18	some of the Visa regulations that changed in
19	2016-2017, so many international students that
20	used to come and study at American institutions
21	were no longer able to do that.
22	Then the pandemic hit, and then you

have such full employment now that many students 1 2 who would normally be considering going into higher education are maybe staying in the 3 4 workforce. 5 I was just curious how your institutions were fairing with these three 6 7 different things that have happened in the last 8 five to six years and how that might be affecting 9 some of your standards as it relates to recruitment enrollment, and then, of course, that 10 also affects finances as well. 11 12 L. BEATTY: Right, thank you. Those are all issues that I think the higher education 13 14 sector as a whole are experiencing, but let me start with the issue of international students. 15 16 I think that our experience in our institutions 17 would be typical of the experience that you're 18 describing, Dr. Lindsay. 19 I think the institutions are 20 struggling with -- so they have students in other 21 countries who are ready to come to institutions 22 and are just not able to get either a Visa

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

www.nealrgross.com

1 interview or get approval to come, and so I think 2 there is actually quite a backlog for some institutions of students who would be here if 3 4 they were able to get a Visa. 5 As it relates to the pandemic itself, I mentioned earlier that I think ABHE 6 7 institutions have done a really amazing job of 8 addressing the quick change like many other 9 It was during our spring break that sectors. institutions had to make a decision about whether 10 11 or not they could make a quick change to distance 12 learning and they made those changes. I think ABHE institutions have good 13 14 experience with distance learning. It's been 15 part of our recognition since 2007, so many of 16 our institutions were already engaged in distance 17 learning, but I think all of us have had a great 18 deal to learn about ways to leverage those 19 instructional modalities over this period of time. 20 21 I do think that there are students 22 that we've been able to attract to our

institutions because of the flexibility of delivery that were perhaps not able to attend residential Bible institutes or colleges prior to that time, though I think there has been a continuing interest in the residential experience of life transformation as part of the process of education.

8 That is not to say that both of those 9 aspects have not had downward pressure on 10 enrollment at our institutions. I just think it 11 has been rather measured and we have seen some 12 bounce back as it relates to that.

13 As far as our standards are concerned 14 -- and if I'm missed something here, my apologies. We can go back, but as far as changes 15 16 to standards, you know, our conversations with our constituents as it relates to our standards 17 18 review, some of these issues like technological 19 resources, as we look at our standards, we think 20 there is work to do to improve our standards and 21 essential elements related to the technological resources that support the kind of education that 22

1

2

3

4

5

6

many of our institutions are now providing. 1 2 So, that would be a specific area where the commission is reviewing our current 3 4 standards in light of what we have been 5 experiencing over the last several years. Mary Ellen? And Wally, 6 CHAIR KEISER: 7 could you put your hand down, please? 8 Yeah, thank you for M. E. PETRISKO: 9 your presentation and bringing us up to date on a lot of the data --10 11 Mary Ellen, you need to CHAIR KEISER: 12 speak into your microphone because you kind of 13 balance out. 14 Okay, let me turn my M. E. PETRISKO: sound up a little bit here. 15 16 CHAIR KEISER: Yes, it's much better 17 when you get closer. 18 M. E. PETRISKO: Okay, I will try to 19 speak more clearly and distinctly and louder. 20 Thank you. 21 So, my questions are around the area of student achievement, and in particular, 22

looking at the petition and at the exhibits that 1 2 accompanied the petition, there were three institutions that were provided, I believe, by 3 the agency, and one that was the institutional 4 materials that were requested by the department 5 staff. 6 7 So, in looking specifically at the two 8 institutions, I'll just name them Institution A 9 and Institution B, I won't put their names in 10 here unless you want me to do that, it appeared to me that there was not a great deal of either 11 12 progress on what was anticipated in the standards 13 14 One was planning for assessment on student learning, and the same for administrative 15 16 work, and in the second case as well, that there 17 was not really documentation of having planned 18 outcomes integrated with course objectives and, 19 you know, a whole system of assessment and 20 getting results from that system.

It wasn't clear to me in the case of
Institution A, which was reaffirmed for ten years

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

in spite of concerns about student achievement, 1 2 how team members -- so how do your team members look at this? Although they were only planning 3 for assessment, this institution was deemed to be 4 moderately in compliance. 5 That's another question for me. 6 What 7 does minimally in compliance, moderately in 8 compliance, and substantially in compliance mean 9 for your team members? How are they trained to make those distinctions? 10 So, this institution was deemed 11 12 moderately in compliance in spite of the fact 13 that there was just planning and really no 14 carrying out. The letter to the institution said 15 16 that the achieving of learning needed to be 17 validated using that assessment plan and that a 18 progress report was asked for two years out. 19 Understandably, if the assessment work 20 hasn't been done, it has to be gathered, it has 21 to be evaluated, and it has to be acted on, that takes some time. So, moderately compliant, yet 22

not doing this progress report and a 1 2 reaffirmation for ten years. That's at institution one, I mean A. 3 Institution B, this is another case 4 5 where there was a ten-year reaffirmation and the reaffirmation letter was dated in March of 2020. 6 7 A progress report was asked within an eight-month 8 period asking for the development and 9 implementation of plans and what was happening with these plans. 10 11 So, only eight months was being given 12 when it was they literally weren't at any kind of a stage with achievement of what was intended. 13 I'll read it from the letter. 14 So, the reaffirmation for ten years 15 16 until 2030 was because of the judgment of the 17 agency that the institution was substantially 18 compliant with your standards, and I'm quoting, 19 including documentation of the appropriateness, 20 rigor, and achievement of student learning 21 outcomes. 22 Immediately thereafter, a progress

report is asked for documenting that 1 2 comprehensive student outcomes and institutional plans have been developed and implemented with 3 evidence that they are leading to the improvement 4 of teaching, learning, and institutional 5 improvement. 6 7 What I gather from that is that they 8 really didn't have this developed and 9 implemented, and yet a ten-year reaffirmation was given. A progress report is asked for within 10 11 eight months. And that same institution, in the action letter, there's a note about faculty 12 13 qualifications. 14 Now, this may be, as you were saying, 15 that with data that are questionable, the 16 institutions have an opportunity to either 17 correct those data, you know, or work with you 18 somehow to, you know, to get that in line. 19 The faculty qualifications noted in 20 that action letter were that it's required that 21 80 percent of faculty hold a master's degree for undergraduate or doctorate degree for graduate 22

work.

2	The percentage of qualified faculty
3	that this institution had for those programs was
4	fewer than 80 percent. It was listed as 9.4
5	percent, so if that was a mistake, which I'm
6	assuming and hoping it was, how would that have
7	been addressed? What would have been you
8	know, if it was still below 80 percent, what
9	would the action have been?
10	So, my question clearly has multiple
11	parts. How are team members trained to evaluate
12	compliance? What does minimally, moderately and
13	substantially compliant mean for your
14	organizations? And how were the institutions
15	In the three that I looked at, they
16	were all pretty nascent in their student learning
17	reviews and outcomes, and knowing that those have
18	been used, and yet they did not seem to be at any
19	kind of a stage of a warning, or probation, or
20	I'm assuming these standards have been
21	in place for some time. Many years ago, having
22	plans in place was acceptable, but at this stage,

I think that's rather unusual, so whatever
 enlightenment you can give us on that, I would
 appreciate it. Thank you.

4 L. BEATTY: Yeah, I appreciate the 5 question, and I would say first of all, that we have standardized the language of those motions 6 now based on a range of motions so that 7 8 substantial compliance is what is required for 9 reaffirmation of an institution. That does not mean that an institution wouldn't have some 10 11 weakness that needed to be addressed.

12 And that really speaks to the progress 13 report required in both of those cases. The 14 training of our evaluation team members, and I'm going to turn to Dr. Wood here in a moment, 15 16 regarding just the conversation about how our 17 evaluators are trained, how our commissioners are 18 trained with regard to this. But the requirement 19 is that an institution will have -- and again, 20 let me back up, and say our policy for outcomes 21 that I mentioned in the introduction was a new 22 policy in November 2020.

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

1	And the project that I mentioned,
2	where we have gone through now, and by November
3	of 2022, will have reviewed the outcomes
4	information available on institutional websites
5	for all of our accredited institutions goes back
6	to some of these questions that you're asking.
7	And the standardization of some of this for our
8	institutions.
9	But institutions for reaffirmation
10	have to demonstrate substantial compliance. We
11	might at this point use language other than
12	substantial compliance only for a pre-accredited,
13	for an institution gaining candidate status.
14	Because the idea in that case is that an
15	institution has shown sufficient progress that
16	the institution is deemed that they could be
17	receiving initial accreditation within five
18	years.
19	So, that language is not the language
20	that we are currently using based on the new
21	policy on outcomes. I'm going to turn to Dr.
22	Wood for just a moment, and have him talk a

little bit about training of our evaluators with
 regard to student achievement.

S. Wood: Yeah, and this identified 3 one of the things that we actually identified as 4 5 an agency in the training. Dr. Beatty's correct in that we have kind of standardized in the 6 7 policy on outcomes what we're training the 8 standard to when it comes not only to the 9 assessment of their student outcomes, and the communication of that to the commission, but also 10 11 how they're communicating that information to the 12 public, and to stakeholders.

13 In our training there are -- first of 14 all there's a walkthrough. We host an achieving accreditation standards conference for all year 15 16 one applicants, and we recommend anybody who 17 actually is not caught up with the standards of 18 where they are currently at, that we actually 19 walk through every standard, and essential element tied to what is involved in demonstrating 20 21 substantial compliance.

22

Our evaluators are exposed to that

1 information so that they're aware, and we walk 2 through not only what is expected, but how they 3 demonstrate that with evidence. The minimal, 4 marginal, moderate, it was an attempt to try to 5 communicate hey, look this agency has nothing, or 6 they are just in the very beginning stages to 7 they're fully developed in this area.

8 Weak is probably the word, it was a 9 weak attempt, but it was an attempt to try to communicate to the commission so the commission 10 would know this is where the institution is at in 11 12 the process, and in the assessment of its own Obviously with this new project we 13 outcome. become much more involved in that. We are 14 15 working on a new evaluator training system as 16 identified in the presentation with Campus EDU. One of the individuals involved in the 17

18 formation of that is actually an academic
19 evaluator, and it was actually a little bit of a
20 self assessment of the evaluators themselves
21 saying hey, we could use a little more guidance
22 on how we assess the institutions in regards to

1

2

these areas, and how what we would communicate ultimately is the decision of the commission.

So, the report that is produced, every 3 evaluation report that is now produced for the 4 5 commission has the rubric that is identifying the policy of outcome. That's actually a part of the 6 7 team evaluation report template, so that has to 8 be filled out with corroborating evidence that is 9 either pointed to, or is identified as missing. So, this commission has a pretty full picture 10 11 from the team evaluators, of this is where the 12 institution stands in this process.

13 Obviously it's an ongoing process, because it's fairly new, obviously hopefully that 14 would be an ongoing development, but that is a 15 16 process that we have been engaging, and that's 17 how we're trying to train our evaluators 18 increasingly upon our own self assessment, upon their own self assessment, how to improve that 19 20 part of the communication with a comprehensive 21 report about the overall institution to the commission. 22

1	M.E. PETRISKO: So, you're talking about
2	what's going to come out of this project, and
3	what will be then made public, I guess on the
4	institution's own websites, and perhaps on your
5	website as well. That's going above, and beyond
6	graduation rates, default rates, retention rates.
7	This is really about the learning outcomes that
8	are intended by those programs, and how those
9	outcomes are met, or not met.
10	S. Wood: Yes.
11	M.E. PETRISKO: That's the intention?
12	L. Beatty: So, the policy yeah,
13	I'm sorry. So, the policy on outcomes requires
14	that institutions publish their institutional
15	goals, and their program objectives for every
16	academic program that the institution offers, and
17	then the resulting outcomes. That really was the
18	change that came with the policy on outcomes that
19	required more information on the institutional
20	website than what had been previously required of
21	standard two.
22	At the same time as the policy on

outcomes was updated in late 2020, the standard was also updated to clarify exactly what you are mentioning, that it is about having the plan implemented, it is that you are collecting, and analyzing data, that the data is being reported to the specific stakeholders that need that information.

8 And that data is being used to make 9 changes, and improvements in the institution. So, the policy, and outcomes, the rubric that is 10 11 included now is very specific to institutions. 12 Telling institutions what it is that they need to do in order to be in compliance with -- I'm 13 14 sorry, in compliance with standard two, and with the policy on outcomes. 15

M.E. PETRISKO: So, I guess my last question will be when do you anticipate having finished this project, and actually having the results of what you've learned out there for us, and others to see?

L. Beatty: The project should be completed in November of 2022, and so we're

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

almost through that process. It's interesting, what I was looking for in my data, and I don't have the piece of paper right in front of me, was I was going to share with you the commission actions that have already resulted from the WOR project.

The Website Outcomes and Review 7 8 So, what happened was the staff member Project. for the institutions that did not have an 9 evaluation visit, if an institution had an 10 11 evaluation visit, it went to our regular process. 12 But for the institutions that did not have an evaluation visit, the staff member who did the 13 website review wrote a website outcomes review 14 15 report that was then submitted to the 16 institution, and to the commission.

The commission reviewed the report, and if an institution was out of compliance with the policy on outcomes, then they were asked to provide a progress report on the issues that were raised in the website outcomes review report. And I think what I would say, I don't have the

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

1

2

3

4

5

data in front of me, my apologies, but I believe
 about half of the website reviews in these last
 few meetings resulted in a follow up progress
 report with the institution.

5 Making sure that this information 6 required of the policy is now posted on the 7 institution's website.

Do you anticipate --8 M.E. PETRISKO: 9 I said that was my last question, but I lied. Do you anticipate that more institutions will be 10 11 facing harsher actions given the history on this, 12 and this project, and warnings, and many progress 13 reports on top of progress reports that finally 14 to say no at this stage, and it's not another 15 progress report?

L. Beatty: Right, and as you can see from my opening discussion, the agency definitely has used sanctions to help both alert the public, and alert the institution that they are out of compliance. And so as you say, this project has allowed us to get in a short period of time, instead of over a ten year period of evaluations,

it has given us the opportunity to see how our
 institutions are -- their compliance with this
 particular standard.

And so, I think that data will be very 4 5 helpful to the commission in looking at the range 6 of actions taken with regard to both the student 7 achievement side, and as I mentioned earlier, the 8 other area where institutions can sometimes 9 struggle in financial resources. So, our intention, I didn't mention this in our opening, 10 because it was already 25 minutes long, my 11 12 apologies.

But our June meeting is focused very specifically on assessment data from our institutions that we use to assess our own effectiveness as an agency. And so this is data that will be part of those conversations.

18 M.E. PETRISKO: Thank you very much.
19 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Jennifer?
20 J. BLUM: Sorry, it took me a second
21 to get off mute. So, I wanted to go back to
22 Molly's question about the one institution, or

the institution that had the recent state action.
 Have you required a teach out plan, and, or
 agreement for that institution?

4 L. Beatty: Yes, thank you. I should 5 have added this to my comments about the institution. On July 11th, following the receipt 6 7 of the letter, we sent a letter to the 8 institution indicating that they needed to 9 implement the teach out that was required by the state of New York. And we also removed --10 11 indicated to them that the sites -- they had 12 three extension sites.

13 So, offering less than 50 percent of 14 a program in the state of New York, it was not a 15 branch campus, or an additional location, but we indicated in that letter that those sites would 16 17 be removed from their fact sheet, and were no 18 longer approved sites in the state of New York. 19 J. BLUM: So, and had you previously 20 required, because they had previously been on 21 probation. So, had you previously required them

22

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

to have a plan, and now because of New York, they

1

have an agreement?

2 L. Beatty: Yeah. Okay, and then I noted as I 3 J. BLUM: 4 was going through, this sort of prompted my 5 interest, I'm always sort of intrigued by when agencies decide -- I know there are regulations 6 7 on this, but what prompts agencies to decide the 8 moment is right other than just what the federal 9 law says about teach out plans. And so, I just pulled up that section of your report. 10 11 I noticed that your exhibits, I 12 actually thought I might find that the exhibit was that institution that I found, I think there 13 14 were two, or three others. How many institutions 15 are you currently requiring to have teach out 16 plans? 17 L. Beatty: All of our candidate 18 institutions are required to have a teach out 19 We just do that as part of the candidacy plan. 20 Once they are given candidacy status, process. 21 because as I mentioned earlier, we continue to

monitor our candidate institutions, and shepherd

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

1 them through the process to reaffirmation, 2 they're all required to have a teach out. The other institutions that have a 3 4 required teach out right now are those listed as 5 being on sanction on our website. So, our 6 institutions that are on probation, and show 7 cause were required to have a teach out. 8 J. BLUM: And I know I can look this 9 up, and I will, but how many is that? Do you 10 happen to know? L. Beatty: We have one institution on 11 12 warning currently, but there's not a required teach out for warning. I think there are two 13 14 currently on probation, and one on show cause. 15 J. BLUM: Thanks. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you Jennifer. 17 I'm not aware of any third party comments. Dr. 18 Harris, do you have any comments? 19 N. Harris: I have nothing to add, 20 thank you. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you very much. 22 I will then ask the primary leaders Molly, and

1	Robert, if you would like to make a motion?
2	R. MAYES: Yes, we are good with the
3	motion that the staff made, and agree with it
4	should be that we move that NACIQI recommend the
5	senior department official approve the
6	Association for Biblical Higher Education for
7	review recognition for five years.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second to
9	the motion?
10	M. HALL-MARTIN: I'll second.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, there's a second
12	by Molly. Is there discussion? Herman, you have
13	a hand up?
14	H. BOUNDS: Yes, don't forget that the
15	recommendation also includes to approve the
16	agency's expansion should also include excuse
17	me, direct assessment in their scope of
18	recognition.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Do you accept that
20	Robert as a formal amendment?
21	R. MAYES: Yes, absolutely.
22	CHAIR KEISER: And Molly?

1	M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: And Mary Ellen had a
3	hand up, but it looked like it got dropped.
4	M.E. PETRISKO: No, I have it up again
5	because I'm not really comfortable with this
6	given the student achievement issue, and I would
7	like to see language that reflects the need to
8	have them come back to us after this project has
9	been completed with what they've learned, and
10	what they're actually doing about the
11	institutions meeting that standard.
12	I did not see it sounds like
13	they're going to be where they need to be, but
14	there's no evidence of that now, so I would want
15	to see some other kind of a report that would
16	come back to us to show that they actually know
17	where the institution stands with regards to
18	student achievement, and that they're taking
19	appropriate actions.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
21	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, Mary Ellen, I
22	thought you might be going there with your

questions earlier, and appreciate your line of 1 2 questions. So, I have a question about that, this type of situation. Are the scenarios -- and 3 I'm asking I guess, all of us in the department, 4 are the options to find them non-compliant with 5 the student achievement standard, and that would 6 prompt a compliance report in a year? 7 Or is there a substantial compliance 8 9 with a monitoring report in a year, or is it less than five years? And the reason I'm asking this 10 is not just stating the obvious, is I was 11 12 listening, trying to listen pretty carefully to 13 the time frames that the agency was saying, and 14 they felt like they would have more information come November. 15 16 But then I'm also thinking well gosh, 17 they'll have more information come November, but 18 if they're really moving forward student 19 achievement, sometimes it takes longer to 20 actually really understand what the impact is. 21 And so I'm not sure one year -- having them come back in a year makes a ton of sense either in 22

1 terms of learning anything.

2	And so, I'm just ruminating out loud
3	on purpose so that we can consider what options
4	there may be. And to me it seems like it's
5	either one year, or make a decision that they're
6	in compliance, but make it their next review less
7	than five years from now. But I do remember how
8	complicated that is for the department.
9	CHAIR KEISER: David?
10	D. EUBANKS: Yes, I just wanted to
11	comment, one of the things that I think we
12	learned in the subcommittee on student
13	achievement is that the student learning outcomes
14	are not required for the student achievement
15	standard. So, I'm questioning whether, or not
16	this would apply here. Herman could clarify
17	that.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Herman, and then Molly?
19	H. BOUNDS: Yes, I was going to say
20	two things. That the committee could find the
21	agency non-compliant with something not that
22	the staff did not find them non-compliant for.

And I think as Bob mentioned yesterday, that
 would kick in 602.35(c) where the agency would
 have a chance to respond, in addition to the
 senior department official.

5 But you have options to do either one, the department doesn't set, of course you all 6 know, any student achievement outcomes other than 7 what the agency requires for their particular 8 9 institution. So, if you all believe that the 10 agency is not applying its particular student 11 achievement standards to this particular -- to 12 the institutions they accredit, then if you 13 wanted to find them non-compliant in that area, 14 you could.

You could also, as you said, and I 15 16 quess legal counsel is here to take that on here. 17 But you could reduce the recognition period. 18 Just remember that the new regulations require 19 agencies to submit a petition of recognition two 20 years prior. So, anything less than two years 21 would not make -- would not I mean it would be 22 problematic. So, something in the range of three

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

www.nealrgross.com

1	years would be better operationally for staff to
2	review.
3	And then have the agency come back
4	before NACIQI if that's the route that you choose
5	to go off of.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
7	W. BOSTON: Thanks Art. I guess I
8	hear what Mary Ellen, and Jennifer are saying,
9	and I'm also listening to Herman, but I would be
10	inclined to consider this as a monitoring report,
11	and not a compliance report. Once again I go
12	back to being on record, that this agency did an
13	excellent job of addressing the data in the
14	dashboard, which just came back recently after
15	being taken down by the previous administration.
16	And it seems to me that they have a
17	pretty good focus on annual indicators, and
18	reviewing those, and what they've described as an
19	ongoing project that we're curious about. But
20	from my perspective, they're doing what they
21	should do. They're trying to go for continuous
22	improvement, and then so, if we're curious

about seeing the outcome of it, I'd voice my 1 2 preference for a monitoring report versus a compliance report. 3 CHAIR KEISER: Wally, would you like 4 5 to make that a motion -- or excuse me, modify the original motion? 6 W. BOSTON: Yes, if that's acceptable 7 8 to the two proposers, yes. 9 CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second to the amendment? 10 J. BLUM: I second that amendment. 11 12 CHAIR KEISER: Is that considered 13 friendly by the member of the motion? Robert? 14 R. MAYES: Yes. CHAIR KEISER: It is considered 15 16 friendly, same thing with you Molly? 17 R. MAYES: I think Mary Ellen though 18 has more discussion points on it. 19 The only thing I wanted to J. BLUM: 20 say was clarifying what my concern was. It 21 wasn't about the federal criterion, it was that 22 the standard was nothing applied by the agency

1 appropriately given what the materials showed of 2 how they were -- the teams, and the agency were evaluating compliance with that standard. 3 4 CHAIR KEISER: So, the monitoring 5 would be appropriate to see that they were applying it appropriately. Wally, is that your 6 7 feeling? 8 W. BOSTON: That was my feeling, but 9 you know. 10 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, so we have a motion that's been amended as a friendly 11 12 amendment. Angela, and Herman have their hands 13 up. 14 H. BOUNDS: I was just going to say 15 that yeah, you could use the statute compliance 16 too, and that would require the monitoring 17 report. I don't know if Angela had anything to 18 add, I'll take my hand down now. 19 A. SIERRA: Yeah, hi, this is Angela 20 Sierra, I'm sorry, I have to move over to where 21 the audio is in our room here. That's exactly 22 why I wanted to raise Herman, under 60234G, the

(202) 234-4433

78

committee could find that the agency is 1 2 substantially compliant with the criteria not recommended by the staff, and require -- or 3 recommend a monitoring report with a set 4 5 deadline. They could also find non-compliance, 6 7 and then recommend a compliance report. I think 8 that the committee could also find the agency 9 compliant, and still recommend a monitoring report, although that's not specifically 10 contemplated in the regulations. 11 12 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Claude, and Bob. 13 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Thanks. Again, 14 this is on the amendment obviously, so I'm I'm hearing Mary Ellen say that she 15 curious. 16 feels as if the agency is not compliant right 17 now, and I want to make sure that that's exactly 18 what she's saying. Because I want to be careful 19 not to punish the accrediting body for making movements towards accommodation of more direct 20 21 measurements. 22 And so, just because they haven't done

1 it yet, and are in the midst of doing it, I don't 2 want to come down, and say you're not compliant 3 when they say that they're working on it. I hope 4 that makes sense. So, Mary Ellen, you're saying 5 specifically they are out of compliance with that 6 criteria, is that correct?

M.E. PETRISKO: It looks to me like 7 8 based on what we have seen, they are not in 9 compliance. And I do understand that they have recognized themselves that there have been issues 10 11 in how they have evaluated student learning, and 12 they are currently in the process of a project to review all of their institutions to see what 13 14 those institutions are doing, and how they as an agency should move forward with that. 15

16 That hasn't happened yet, so that's my 17 concern. And I don't want to be too harsh 18 either. I appreciate the fact that the agency 19 itself discovered where improvement is needed, 20 but part of me says that is an indication that 21 there has been a problem, the problem still exists until it's fixed, and so yeah. 22 Ι

understand, absolutely your perspective, and 1 2 wanting to be understanding, and work with the 3 agency. 4 And recognize, and applaud improvement 5 efforts, and my concern is we're acting based on what we have now. 6 7 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Right, and in 8 terms of clarification, I was really looking for 9 because I will say based on their presentation, they've probably been the most direct in 10 11 addressing student measurement than anybody has 12 that we've seen before. But I think that in 13 light of doing that, they have discovered that. 14 So, thanks for that clarification. 15 M.E. PETRISKO: Thank you. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Bob, then David, then Ronnie, and then Angela. 17 18 B. SHIREMAN: Thank you. So, the 19 regulation that Herman mentioned, where it 20 triggers their ability to provide some additional 21 information has us finding either that the agency is non-compliant with something, or ineffective 22

in its application of that item. So, that tells me we don't actually have to -- to me it seems like the most important thing is that there's an area we're concerned about.

And we think there might be a problem 5 here, and it might require a monitoring report, 6 or a compliance report. 7 That we as the advisory committee want to raise that to the senior 8 9 department official. The senior department official can make the decision about whether it's 10 a compliance report, or a monitoring report. 11 So, 12 the language actually is kind of round, that the 13 general counsel suggested could work.

14 Where we add something, we could, if the makers of the motion want to do it, say 15 16 something like recommend that the senior 17 department -- wait, no, with the addition of a 18 compliance, or monitoring report as appropriate 19 regarding student achievement. And that way 20 we're raising the issue, it kind of causes the 21 senior department official to look at the 22 transcript, look at the question, and make that

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

1

2

3

4

1 decision for us.

2 On the other hand if we're sure it's non-compliance, and it should be compliance 3 4 report, we could suggest that. 5 CHAIR KEISER: Just to let you know Bob, that we do have a motion before, and it was 6 amended to include a monitoring report. 7 So, we 8 haven't voted on it, but that's where we are. 9 David? 10 D. EUBANKS: Yes, thank you. So, I'll 11 reiterate, and let Herman contradict me, that the 12 student learning is not required for student 13 achievement. The agency could simply just drop 14 all that, they don't have to put it in the presentation. The second thing is that if we 15 16 insist on it, and make them scramble around, and 17 try to answer that question, it could easily work 18 against student achievement in a practical sense. 19 And that's because these kinds of 20 reporting can be very burdensome for 21 institutions, especially institutions that don't 22 have a lot of resources to begin with. It costs

a lot of money, and time, and detracts from the
 actual student achievement work that they're
 doing with respect to grades, retention,
 graduation rates, tests, and that sort of thing
 they're already doing as evidenced in their
 exhibits.

And the final comment about that is in 7 some cases agencies go so far as to prohibit 8 9 research for example on types of data like 10 grades, because some consultants say grades don't measure learning, and that further takes them 11 12 away from the actual goal of student achievement. 13 So, I'm not in support of this amendment, because I think it actually has a chance of doing harm. 14 Ronnie? 15 CHAIR KEISER: 16 R. BOOTH: I'm going to echo what 17 David just said, he said it better than I could. 18 So, I have difficult requiring something beyond 19 even requiring the monitoring report. I think 20 this agency's done excellent work, are obviously 21 on the ball trying to do their work, and they did have a project underway, and truth be known, 22

every agency we vote on at some point in time is 1 2 transitioning from compliance, to non-compliance, back to compliance in a day, or overnight. 3 So, I am much in favor of the comments 4 5 David just made. I think renewing for five years with no monitoring report is the way we ought to 6 7 go. 8 Angela, then Nicole, CHAIR KEISER: 9 then Jennifer, I think will tie it up. A. SIERRA: Hi, Angela Sierra from the 10 11 Office of the General Counsel again. I thought 12 that I heard Mary Ellen say that it wasn't the student achievement regulation in 60216, but the 13 14 application of standards in 60217 that was the criteria she was concerned about. So, if there's 15 16 criteria that the committee wants to direct the 17 SDO's attention for a monitoring report, or a 18 compliance report to, I just want that to be 19 specified in the record. 20 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Nicole, 21 real quick? 22 N. Harris: Yes, can you hear me? Ι

1 was just going to comment -- thank you Angela, 2 that's also what I was trying to understand from 3 Mary Ellen. She said that they were non-4 compliant with the criteria, and as David has 5 echoed, as well as Ronnie about outcomes. The 6 regulation requires them to have standards, and 7 they demonstrated the application of standards.

And they have changed their policies, 8 9 and they're actually getting ready to do a review of their standards, which will possibly make this 10 standard for student achievement look different 11 12 again. So, I'm just trying to figure out the 13 time frame, and what exactly I would be looking 14 for when it comes back to me to bring to the table to make sure that I'm addressing the 15 16 concerns.

Because at this time it sounds as if it's out of my purview. So, just asking for clarity, and to remind the committee that the agency is reviewing their entire standards, which is required in 602 -- I think it's 27, or 26, for them to change their standards during a review,

and that will occur within the next time they're 1 2 up for recognition. So, again, this standard will be 3 4 touched upon again in conjunction with the research they're doing on this project. 5 Thank you. Quickly 6 CHAIR KEISER: 7 Jennifer, and Bob, and then we'll go to a vote. Sorry, I appreciate the 8 J. BLUM: 9 comments that Angela, and Nicole just made. To me, it's a combination, I do want to clarify 10 something that David said. I disagree with 11 12 David's position on this, and with regards to the student achievement standard, as the goals are 13 14 set, they are required to have one. So, it's whether, or not they include quantitative 15 16 measures, and whether they include student 17 learning. 18 But they are required to have a 19 student achievement standard where they're 20 demonstrating the success of the student, however 21 it is that they decide to do that. I applaud the 22 agency for the steps that they're taking to both

clarify their standards, and then implement it. But I think the agency itself sort of admitted that they're not quite there yet.

4 And so to me, this is the perfect 5 example of why substantially compliant may have come into existence by the department. 6 It makes 7 sort of sense, they've taken -- I applaud them 8 for noticing their own issue, they're addressing 9 it, but what we can't say, and I think this is where Mary Ellen is, and I think it's where I am, 10 what we can't say with certainty is that they're 11 12 applying that standard yet in a way that complies 13 with -- and I think Angela, good point, it might 14 be 602.17.

And not the question of whether they 15 16 have a standard, or not under 602.16. So, I 17 think that that's a good clarifying point, and 18 Nicole, I hope that helps you a little bit in 19 terms of what you would be looking for next year, 20 as to whether they're applying their new standard 21 in a compliant way. Which, I just don't think we have the answer to, which is why I think the 22

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

1

2

3

1	motion for a monitoring report indicating that
2	they're substantially compliant makes sense.
3	CHAIR KEISER: Bob, then we'll go for
4	the motion.
5	B. SHIREMAN: So, I am convinced by
6	David, and Ronnie's concerns that requiring a
7	monitoring report on this particular topic is the
8	wrong thing to do. It has been a terrible burden
9	on institutions with a lot of probations around
10	very silly, and ridiculous, and expensive
11	requirements around tracking so called student
12	learning outcomes that are completely
13	meaningless.
14	And many institutions have faced this,
15	and it probably was the topic that spurred the
16	subcommittee that we got on student achievement,
17	and so I would actually prefer that the makers of
18	the motion remove that portion. And I suppose I
19	would suggest that if they don't want to remove
20	the monitoring report, I'm interested in whether
21	anyone would second my motion to remove that
22	portion, and just go with a straight renewal of

five years.

1

2	CHAIR KEISER: So, excuse me, what
3	we'll do is vote on the motion with the
4	amendment, if we defeat the motion, we can then
5	vote on the motion without the amendment. That
6	would be the way we would do that.
7	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Mr. Chairman,
8	just a point of order. I thought we were just
9	discussing the amendment, and so we could vote
10	the amendment up, or down, and if we vote the
11	amendment on, then we have to go back, and vote
12	on the motion with the amendment. If we
13	CHAIR KEISER: The amendment was
14	accepted as friendly amendment by both the maker,
15	and the second.
16	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: But we still
17	need to vote on the amendment as a body, do we
18	not?
19	CHAIR KEISER: We vote on the whole,
20	with the amendment, and then if we defeat that,
21	we can vote on just the original motion.
22	R. MAYES: Art, this is Robert, I made

the motion, maybe for time sake, and I agree with 1 2 both points being made. Mary Ellen's points I think are real, and so are the others being made. 3 But I wouldn't mind maybe for time's sake, going 4 5 back to the original motion without any amendments if it's possible, and let that vote 6 7 out first, and then see what happens. Now, if I was going to 8 CHAIR KEISER: 9 be on my Robert's rules of order, we're talking an amendment that's already been approved. 10 While you were the maker of the amendment, would you 11 12 have a problem with that? We're asking Wally. 13 W. BOSTON: Yeah, I'm here, so I guess 14 if Robert is not accepting the friendly amendment, then we can see how this votes out for 15 16 five years without the monitoring report, or 17 whether we -- if it's not approved, then we go 18 back to the amendment. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, so we are now 20 voting on the original motion, which was to use 21 the agency's recognition for five years. Unless you have something that you want to add that 22

1	would change that, is that real critical for you
2	to get back in Bob, or Kathleen, or Zakiya?
3	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Just a clarifying
4	question to understand what we're doing right
5	now.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Right now we're doing
7	the original motion which was made, and that
8	would be as stated on the screen.
9	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes, but someone
10	mentioned the substantially the new piece that
11	is not at play here, this is just straight up
12	okay.
13	CHAIR KEISER: This is straight up
14	recognition, correct.
15	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Thank you.
16	R. MAYES: And is Molly okay with
17	voting this way first? I think she seconded.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Getting the thumbs up,
19	Kathleen, is there anything you need to add?
20	You're muted Kathleen.
21	K.S. ALIOTO: I would agree that the
22	agency has demonstrated more than any that we've

1 had before us what they are trying to do to get 2 into shape. So, I would support the motion as it Even though I totally agree with Jennifer. 3 is. 4 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, we're going to 5 have a vote, and you can make your comments as 6 you vote, and make those short comments if you'd 7 like. And the motion is as listed on the screen, 8 we'll go through the roll call. Kathleen, you 9 voted yes, you just said that, right? You're first. 10 11 K.S. ALIOTO: Yes, though that's not 12 perfection. 13 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, Roslyn? 14 R. ARTIS: Yes. 15 CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer? 16 J. BLUM: No, because I think they're 17 substantially compliant, and there should be a monitoring report. 18 19 CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie? 20 R. BOOTH: Yes. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Wally? 22 W. BOSTON: No, same reason as

Jennifer. 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie, you had a yes, 3 correct? 4 R. BOOTH: Yes. 5 W. BOSTON: I had a no. Okay, and Wally has a 6 CHAIR KEISER: no. Jill? 7 8 No, with a comment that I'm J. DERBY: 9 agreeing with Jennifer. But further comment that if we in fact had the flexibility to do what Bob 10 11 has proposed in the language, I think it would 12 solve the problem that we would want to signal the senior department officer to look more 13 14 carefully at this regarding the possibilities, and given the discussion that we've had today. 15 16 So, I want to speak in favor of the 17 language that Bob has proposed, so that it gives 18 us that kind of flexibility. Because I think for 19 all of us there's sort of a grey area here, and 20 if we had another option between yes, and no it 21 would be good. I'm voting no. 22 CHAIR KEISER: Okay. If you could in

1	your comments, keep them short, this is not the
2	time for discussion, we've already had that. And
3	if we vote it down, we can have more discussion.
4	David?
5	D. EUBANKS: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
7	M. LINDSAY: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Molly?
9	M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
11	R. MAYES: Yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Mary Ellen?
13	M.E. PETRISKO: No.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, keep going down,
15	Claude?
16	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Yes.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Bob?
18	B. SHIREMAN: Yes.
19	CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya?
20	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes.
21	CHAIR KEISER: And Steve?
22	S. VAN AUSDLE: Yes.

1	CHAIR KEISER: Okay, the motion
2	passes. Thank you all, thank you people from the
3	commission, we appreciate the hard work that
4	you've done. I'm recommending we take a five
5	minute break, and we'll return here at 11:46 if
6	that's okay with everybody.
7	R. MAYES: Yes, thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
9	went off the record at 11:41 a.m. and resumed at
10	11:49 a.m.)
11	CHAIR KEISER: Welcome back. I'm
12	remiss for not introducing the great staff that
13	we have both at the accrediting committee, and as
14	well as in the review committee. So, George,
15	would you introduce your team?
16	G.A. SMITH: Sure, so part of my team
17	is Monica Freeman, and we're also supported today
18	by members of OGC Donna Mangold, Angela Sierra,
19	and Soren Lagaard, I'll move to Herman.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you George.
21	H. BOUNDS: Thank you, good morning,
22	my name is Herman Bounds, I'm the director of the

1 accreditation group, and I'll introduce my staff. 2 Elizabeth Daggett, and Reha Mallory are not in attendance today. Nicole, I know you just spoke, 3 4 but can you introduce yourself again please? Ι 5 guess she is taking a break. Stephanie? S. McKissic: Good morning, my name is 6 7 Dr. Stephanie McKissic, and I'm an analyst with 8 the accreditation group. 9 H. BOUNDS: Charity? I'm Charity Helton, and I 10 C. HELTON: am an analyst with the accreditation group. 11 12 H. BOUNDS: Karmon? 13 K. Simms-Coates: Hello, I'm Karmon 14 Simms-Coates, and I'm an analyst with the 15 accreditation group. 16 H. BOUNDS: Mike? 17 M. Stein: Good morning, Mike Stein, 18 analyst with the accreditation group. 19 H. BOUNDS: LG? 20 L. Corder: LG Corder, analyst with 21 the accreditation group. 22 H. BOUNDS: Paul?

1	P. Florek: Paul Florek, analyst with
2	accreditation group.
3	H. BOUNDS: And Nicole, I saw your
4	picture back up.
5	N. Harris: Yeah, I'm sorry about
6	that. It's Dr. Nicole Harris again, sorry for my
7	tardiness.
8	H. BOUNDS: Thank you Art.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you Herman, and
10	again, thank you staff for the tremendous amount
11	of work that's done on behalf of the people of
12	the United States. We're now on our second
13	agency to review, and this is the Accrediting
14	Council for Pharmacy Education, ACPE, and the
15	primary readers are Jill Derby, and Robert
16	Shireman.
17	The department staff is Charity
18	Hilton. Jill, and Robert, the floor is yours.
19	B. SHIREMAN: All right, I will be
20	taking this one on. The Accreditation Council
21	for Pharmacy Education accredits, and pre-
22	accredits professional degree programs in

pharmacy leading to the doctor of pharmacy 1 2 degree. Currently the agency accredits approximately 114 programs, and pre-accredits 16 3 4 programs throughout the United States and Puerto 5 Rico. Those programs are within institutions 6 that are accredited by regional, and national 7 8 accrediting agencies recognized by the secretary. 9 Since ACPE is not an institutional accreditor, 10 and does not serve as a gate keeper for Title IV 11 funds, the agency is not required to meet the 12 secretary's separate, and independent 13 requirements. Is there another portion I'm 14 supposed to read, or go onto staff? No, I think you're 15 CHAIR KEISER: 16 fine. Charity? 17 C. HELTON: Good morning Mr. Chairman, 18 and the members of the committee. My name is 19 Charity Helton, and I am providing a summary of 20 the review of the petition for renewal of 21 recognition for the agency the Accrediting 22 Council for Pharmacy Education, hereafter

referred to as ACPE, or the agency. 1 I am 2 presenting this report on behalf of the agency's analyst Rhea Mallory who could not be here today. 3 The staff recommendation to the senior 4 5 department official for this agency is to renew the agency's recognition as a nationally 6 7 recognized accrediting agency at this time 8 subject to the submission of a compliance report 9 due in 12 months, and a review, and decision on the compliance report. 10 11 In the event that recognition is 12 continued following the decision on the 13 compliance report, the period of recognition will 14 not exceed five years from the date of the decision on the renewal of accreditation issued 15 16 by the senior department official. This recommendation is based on a review of the 17 18 agency's petition, and supporting documentation 19 in addition to a virtual board meeting observed 20 in February 2022. 21 Our review of the agency's petition 22 found one area where the agency is not in

compliance with the secretary's criteria. 1 2 602.26E requires that the agency provide brief summaries to the secretary of the reasoning for 3 4 its adverse actions within 60 days of those 5 decisions. The agency did not demonstrate that it regularly provided brief summaries to the 6 7 secretary during the review period as required by 8 this criterion. 9 There was one complaint filed during this review period, and after our review, 10 11 department staff found the agency to be in compliance with the policies, and procedures. 12 13 Lastly, there was one third party comment. 14 Representatives from the agency are here to 15 respond to your questions. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you Charity. Any 17 questions for the staff? 18 B. SHIREMAN: One question for the 19 staff, and Charity might not be able to handle 20 it, since Rhea I guess was the main person, but 21 we'll give it a shot. This agency, like the 22 others that we're seeing there were challenges on

some of the first round of questions, but then 1 2 with the staff feedback, was able to get everything done, except this one little item that 3 resulted in this compliance report 4 recommendation. 5 I spent a little time trying to figure 6 7 out exactly what the evidence was in this 8 situation, and it looked to me as if the agency

9 did provide -- it looked to me like they did 10 provide reasons in their notification to the 11 secretary by identifying the areas, the standards 12 that the score was deficient in. So, I was kind 13 of confused, there was an additional link to a 14 document that had even more detail. But I was 15 confused about why this was a deficiency.

16 C. HELTON: So, I am curious which of17 the exhibits you're looking at.

18B. SHIREMAN: R71.

C. HELTON: If I recall correctly,
that exhibit did demonstrate regular
notifications to the secretary, and other
relevant parties of the adverse actions. What we

were looking for were the brief summaries 1 2 describing why the agency took those actions. And as you noted, they would provide a list of 3 4 standards that were out of compliance, and they would state the term non-compliant. 5 We were looking for a summary, or some 6 7 discussions as required by the criteria. B. SHIREMAN: All right, so maybe I'll 8 9 take another look. When I looked at R71, I don't have it in front of me, I thought it listed the 10 standards that the school was found deficient in, 11 12 do you have it in front of you, is that right? 13 C. HELTON: That is my recollection as 14 well. But simply the list of the standards, we did not consider that to be a summary of the 15 16 reasons for why the agency found the school non-17 compliant with those issues, or with those 18 standards. They would simply list the standard, and then the term non-compliant, and we were 19 20 looking for some explanation about the standard. 21 B. SHIREMAN: Something beyond that, Okay, great, thank you. Okay, that's 22 I get it.

all the staff questions from me. 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: Great. Let me introduce Janet P. Engle, who is the executive 3 4 director of ACPE. Welcome Dr. Engle, if you 5 would introduce your team, and we're ready for your comments. 6 7 J. Engle: Great, good morning. I was 8 going to turn it turn it over to the president of 9 ACPE, Reza Karimi, but I am not certain he is on the Zoom. Can somebody verify that? I am not 10 11 seeing him on my screen. 12 R. Karimi: I'm there. 13 J. Engle: You're here. Okay, let me 14 turn it over to our president of ACPE, Dr. 15 Karimi. 16 R. Karimi: Thank you so much. Good 17 afternoon Chairman Keiser, and members of the 18 committee. We would like to thank you for this 19 opportunity to speak on behalf of the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education, or 20 21 ACPE. My name is Reza Karimi, and I serve as the 22 president of the ACPE board of directors. I am a

professor, and the dean of the School of Pharmacy at Pacific University in Oregon.

I want to first thank the department 3 staff for all their work on our petition. 4 We view the department as an important partner in 5 what we do, and we have tremendously valued their 6 7 input, and help throughout this process. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce my 8 9 colleagues. I am joined by Dr. Janet Engle, executive director of ACPE. 10 11 Dr. Engle was appointed executive 12 director in 2019 after extensive experience in

13 academia, including having rose through the ranks 14 to school professor with tenure, and serving as chair of her institution, Department of Pharmacy 15 16 Practice, and as executive associate dean, as 17 well as several other academic positions. She's 18 also elected by her peers as the president of the 19 American Pharmacy Association, and served that 20 organization as a volunteer in many roles. 21 I'm also joined by Dr. Greg Boyer, associate executive director of ACPE, and 22

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

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

director of professional academic program 1 2 activation. Dr. Boyer has been with ACPE for twenty years. I'm also joined by Dr. Dawn 3 4 Zarembski, she's been director of accreditation 5 at ACPE, who has been with ACPE for 22 years. Both are pharmacists with extensive experience in 6 7 the profession. 8 I would like to turn it over to Dr. 9 Janet Engle, to provide a brief overview of the 10 agency, thank you. 11 J. Engle: All right, I am Jan Engle, 12 and I am the executive director of ACPE. First, 13 I'd like to start out by expressing our 14 appreciation to Mr. Herman Bounds, and members of the accreditation group of the U.S. Department of 15 16 Education. We would particularly like to thank 17 Ms. Charity Helton, and Ms. Rhea Mallory for 18 reviewing our petition, and supporting materials, 19 and for providing guidance throughout the 20 process. 21 At ACPE we are firmly committed to our mission, which is to assure the quality of 22

pharmacy education, and training, and supporting the advancement of the pharmacy profession. We are the only accrediting agency for pharmacy programs in the United States. We have been recognized by the U.S. Department of Education since 1952.

7 Under its scope of recognition from 8 the department, ACPE grants accreditation, and 9 pre-accreditation to professional degree programs that lead to the doctor of pharmacy degree, or 10 PharmD program, including distance education 11 12 I should note that although not programs. 13 included in the scope of ACPE's recognition by 14 the department, ACPE also engages in additional 15 activities to ensure quality of pharmacy 16 education.

17 That is we accredit providers of 18 continuing pharmacy education, we certify 19 international pharmacy degree programs, and in 20 conjunction with the American Society of Health 21 System Pharmacists, we do accredit pharmacy 22 technician education, and training programs.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	Just to share some statistics with you, presently
2	ACPE accredits about 140 PharmD programs.
3	In 2021, there were approximately
4	53000 students enrolled in those programs. That
5	includes 13800 who were to graduate in the spring
6	of 2022. We are entirely a programmatic
7	accrediting agency, and all of our programs are
8	located within institutions that are accredited
9	by, or seeking accreditation from an
10	institutional accrediting agency recognized by
11	the department.
12	Because ACPE does not accredit
13	institutions, it is not a gatekeeper of Title IV
14	funds. ACPE is a programmatic accreditor, and as
15	such its link to federal recognition as required
16	by criterion 602.10 is through non-HEA federal
17	programs. Specifically accreditation by ACPE is
18	listed as an eligibility requirement for pharmacy
19	programs that participate in the health
20	professional student loans, and loans for
21	disadvantaged students grant programs available
22	through the U.S. Department of Health and Human

Services.

1

2	Health Resources and Services
3	Administration, and the Bureau of Health
4	Workforce. Review of the grant data that was
5	obtained through the HHS tracking accountability,
6	and government grants system website revealed
7	that since ACPE's previous review by the
8	department in 2017 over 230 grants totaling over
9	23 million dollars were awarded to roughly 56
10	pharmacy education programs.
11	We have a very diverse board comprised
12	of ten individuals including educators,
13	practitioners, and also a member of the public.
14	Our board is an exceptional group of
15	professionals who volunteer their time, their
16	invaluable expertise, and experiences, and their
17	perspectives to review programs for compliance
18	with ACPE standards.
19	I am supported by an extraordinarily
20	talented, and hard working staff. ACPE has 13
21	full time staff positions, and one part time
22	staff position. And that consists of both

professional, and administrative support staff. Six of our professional staff are licensed pharmacists with doctoral degrees from accredited U.S. pharmacy programs, and have experience working in pharmacy education, and practice settings.

7 While one of our professional staff members received his pharmacy degree in Zimbabwe. 8 9 They are also extremely dedicated to the mission 10 of ACPE. As Dr. Karimi mentioned, Dr. Boyer, who is with me today, has been with ACPE for over 20 11 12 And Dr. Zarembski has been with ACPE for vears. 13 22 years. We believe the long length of staff 14 tenure provides a high level of consistency, and 15 stability in the accreditation process.

16 Now I'd like to turn it over to Dr. 17 Greg Boyer to provide some additional information 18 about our accrediting activity, and to address 19 the final staff analysis from the department. 20 J.G. BOYER: Thank you very much. Ι 21 am Dr. Greg Boyer, and I am associate executive director of ACPE, and director of professional 22

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

degree program accreditation. First I would like
 to summarize ACPE's accreditation activities
 since it was last recognized by the department in
 2017. Since 2017, ACPE has conducted, and taken
 action on 88 comprehensive evaluations.

And those are those that require the 6 7 every eight years self study, and 73 focused evaluations, which are evaluations defined by 8 9 program status, particularly programs in 10 development, or those establishing a branch, or 11 new pathway. As well as when the board has 12 determined the need for additional information 13 for established programs.

14 In addition, ACPE has evaluated, and 15 taken action on 313 interim reports. Reports on 16 specific issues, and initiatives covered by the standards for which the board is in need of 17 18 additional information on development, new 19 initiatives, or adjustments to ensure continued compliance with the accreditation standards. 20 21 During this time 13 new programs were granted accredited status. 22

(202) 234-4433

ACPE currently has two additional 1 2 programs holding candidate status. Regarding adverse actions, since the last review by the 3 department, seven programs have been placed on 4 probation, two programs were withdrawn, one was 5 an accredited program, and one holding candidate 6 7 And one program was denied a prestatus. candidate status. 8 9 Another significant update since our

10 most recent recognition is that we have launched 11 a process to revamp our standards. Per ACPE 12 policy, we use a systematic program review to 13 ensure that our standards are appropriate for the 14 education preparedness of students, and are 15 adequate to evaluate the quality of the education 16 provided by the program.

17 The current standards were developed 18 with additional input from all ACPE stakeholders 19 through surveys, open hearings, and open comment 20 periods. These stakeholders included the 21 colleges, and schools of pharmacy, professional 22 pharmacy organizations, student pharmacy

organizations, and accrediting bodies as well as the public.

Our current standards were adopted in 3 January of 2015, and became effective July 1st of 4 5 2016 following a period of transition. In January of 2021, we announced our intention to 6 7 revise the doctor of pharmacy standards. 8 According to our projected time line, the new 9 standards, which are going to be known as standards 2025, will be released in 2024, and 10 11 implemented on July 1st of 2025. 12 I want to move to address the single 13 finding of the department's final staff analysis. 14 The finding is centered around the department's regulation 602.26E, which requires that for any 15 16 final decision to take an adverse action, ACPE is 17 required to make available to the secretary, and 18 other stakeholders no later than 60 days after 19 the decision a new statement summarizing the 20 reasons of the agency's decision. And the official comments that the 21 22 program may wish to make, or evidence that the

1

2

program was offered opportunity to provide such 1 2 comment. ACPE's initial petition for continued recognition submitted in September in 2020 3 referenced the final decision to withdraw 4 accreditation as stated in the July 2020 meeting. 5 We timely notified the secretary, and 6 all required other stakeholders, and the public 7 8 about the decision on the same day we took the 9 action, and made it public. In that notice, we specified the standards cited as the basis for 10 11 the adverse action. This note was submitted in 12 our April of '22 petition to address staff 13 analysis in Exhibit No. R71. 14 However the draft staff analysis stated that ACPE did not demonstrate it had 15 16 submitted to the secretary within 60 days a 17 statement summarizing the reasons for the adverse 18 action. ACPE posted on its website a narrative 19 statement summarizing the meeting beyond the 20 initial action that listed just the standards, 21 along with the program's response. While the full narrative statement was 22

available to the secretary, other state 1 2 governance, and the public on ACPE's website, we have determined the narrative statement was not 3 forwarded to the secretary within the required 60 4 5 day period. To address this, the ACPE has updated its adverse actions checklist to ensure 6 7 that going forward, the full narrative statement 8 is provided directly to the secretary, and all 9 required stakeholders within the 60 day period. This updated checklist was provided to 10 11 the department in response to the draft staff 12 analysis. In addition, ACPE has recently 13 demonstrated compliance with this requirement. 14 At the January 2022 board meeting, the board 15 denied pre-candidate status to a program. ACPE 16 timely submitted for the secretary, a narrative 17 statement summarizing the reasons for ACPE's 18 denial decision, and the official comments from 19 the program. 20 This information was also posted on 21 ACPE's website on the same day. The information

regarding this recent action was included in

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

22

ACPE's response to draft staff analysis as 1 2 Exhibit No. R81, and we believe that the information provided in the exhibit fully 3 4 addresses the requirement of the criterion 5 602.26E going forward. We respectfully request that the 6 7 committee, and the department consider our recent 8 efforts to demonstrate compliance with this 9 regulation, as demonstrated in Exhibit No. R81. We also want to assure the committee that we have 10 11 fully addressed this issue, and are confident 12 that we will continue to comply with the 13 requirement going forward. 14 Again, we thank the department staff or their guidance, and assistance through this 15 16 process. We look forward to answering questions 17 that the committee may have regarding our 18 petition. Thank you. 19 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you, Mr. Boyer, or 20 Dr. Boyer. 21 Permanent readers, Jill, Bob, do you 22 have questions for the agency?

1	
1	B. SHIREMAN: Yes, thank you very much.
2	Just in response to what Dr. Boyer just, just
3	said.
4	My inclination at this point is, is to
5	conclude that in fact, the one item that was
6	identified as an issue in the staff report, has
7	been, has been addressed pending, pending any
8	further discussion that may come from, from
9	questioning.
10	I wanted to start with the issue of
11	the structure of this agency, which is very
12	interesting.
13	And, Dr. Engle talked about the 10-
14	member board. This board is unlike many, or most
15	accrediting agencies, is actually not a majority
16	of schools.
17	It's state regulators and
18	practitioners, form, and a public member, form a
19	majority of, of the board.
20	Dr. Engle, has this, I mean you guys
21	have been around since 1952. Has this structure
22	been the structure all along? Or what is it that

prompted the creation of this kind of an
 approach?

J. ENGLE: This has been our structure since the very beginning. So, we have always wanted diversity on our board, to make sure that our standards are meeting the needs of the profession, and assuring quality in pharmacy education.

And, you know, obviously I was not
there back in 1932 when we started all of this,
but the idea was to have practitioners,
regulators, as well as academics and our public
member, to serve this organization well, and make
sure that we are making the best decisions we
can.

B. SHIREMAN: And, rather than being a
self-appointing board, you have these other
organizations, organizations of state regulators,
organizations of practitioners, et cetera, that
designate your particular board members.
I did want to ask about the public
member. Your public member position is appointed

by the American Council on Education. 1 2 A perfectly fine organization, but it does look from the people that they've tended to 3 name, is that they have tended to be from 4 academia, and not necessarily a consumer 5 orientation. 6 7 Has ACE always been the one appointing 8 the public member, or have you considered any 9 other, any different entity to appoint the public member? 10 11 J. ENGLE: As far as I'm aware, ACE has 12 always appointed the public member. I have to 13 say the public member has served us well because 14 as you mentioned, we don't have a heavy group of academicians on our board. 15 16 So having the public member with some 17 of that background, has been quite helpful. 18 B. SHIREMAN: Okay, thanks. But one of the big issues with a 19 20 degree like pharmacy where people are paying a 21 lot of tuition, and taking out a lot of loans, is 22 the hazard that they take out all those loans and

1 then can't, cannot get a job because they did not
2 pass the exams.

3	And, so I know that in some of the
4	disciplines, there's a real effort kind of along
5	the way, to make sure that if there's any
6	indication that the student is just not going to
7	make it, not going to be able to pass that exam,
8	that they are out early before they have taken on
9	huge amounts of debt.
10	I saw kind of mixed information in
11	your application about to what extent you track
12	the, those exams.
13	My understanding is there are two
14	exams and there's the pharmacy exam, and then a
15	kind of a pharmacy law exam, the jurisprudence
16	exam.
17	And, it looked like the passage rates
18	on the pharmacy jurisprudence exam, that they've
19	had a fairly high failure rate. So, some real
20	hazard that you've got people who are, who are
21	not passing.
22	Can you talk a little bit about how

1	you track such things, and how you help to ensure
2	that people don't end up with huge amounts of
3	debt, and no, and without the ability to work in
4	the profession?
5	J. ENGLE: All right, there's a
6	multifaceted answer. So, I'm going to start, and
7	then I'll have Greg kind of chime in.
8	But we look at a whole variety of
9	monitoring parameters throughout the curriculum.
10	So, we don't just look at board exams and whether
11	you pass.
12	We do look at annual monitoring
13	parameters, so for every year, for every program,
14	we look at things like their on time graduation
15	rate.
16	We look at their academic dismissals.
17	We look at withdrawals. We look at delayed
18	progression.
19	So what we try to do is catch these
20	issues early on so as you say, the students don't
21	end up incurring tons of debt.
22	On the other hand, there is a

responsibility of the program if they have 1 2 admitted a student, to do the very best they can to make that student successful. 3 4 And, so we do ask programs to look at 5 their annual monitoring, and if we see them meet one of our benchmarks where maybe their attrition 6 7 is higher than normal, or their progression, 8 whatever it is, we ask them to do a root cause 9 analysis, and let us know what they find. And, sometimes it's things outside of 10 the school's control. 11 So for example, you may 12 have attrition because somebody just decides 13 pharmacy wasn't for them. 14 Or it could be that something terrible happened, an accident or something where they've 15 16 had to withdraw. So we take all of that into 17 account. 18 Of course, we do look at the passage 19 rate for the board exams, and that's very 20 important, as well. 21 Because obviously if you can't pass 22 the board exam, you can't be a practicing

1	pharmacist, so that's an issue.
2	But I'll let Greg talk a little bit
3	more about how we handle passage rates for the
4	board exam.
5	J.G. BOYER: Well, thank you.
6	The methods passage rate is a critical
7	licensing requirement that we have for entering
8	the profession, and we monitor that very
9	carefully.
10	For many years, the benchmark for our
11	concern has been two standard deviations below
12	the mean, which takes into account changes in the
13	exam blueprint and testing parameters, that have
14	been put into place over the various time
15	periods.
16	So I think that parameter has served
17	us very well.
18	When a program hits a monitoring
19	threshold like the NAFLAC's certain pass rate, or
20	the monitoring thresholds, which have been fairly
21	stable over all these years that we've been using
22	them.

I

They're about two times the national 1 2 average, that has been reported by the various programs in the academy. 3 4 When a program hits that monitoring 5 threshold, they are asked by the board to provide a root cause analysis of what the problem might 6 7 be. 8 They can too, they provide a response 9 If they have not addressed that to that. concern, three years and five years we have a 10 rule we call the three and five year rule. 11 12 And, that means that if you hit an 13 annual monitoring parameter anytime within a, 14 three times within a five year period, you get the opportunity to meet with the board, to come 15 16 and talk about what you're doing, to hear ideas 17 from the board about what you might be doing 18 further. Those kind of things. 19 They've been very fruitful 20 discussions. Of course, that's an invitation 21 that no one wants to receive, but they have been 22 helpful in helping out programs address some of

their concerns.

1

2	And, then as we go through with that,
3	if programs fail to address those parameters
4	adequately, that leads to a non-compliance with
5	the accreditation standard, and we get into to
6	that kind of discussion later going forward.
7	But it's a very detailed and step-wise
8	process that we take to try to right the ship, if
9	you will, so that the root cause analysis can
10	identify the areas that might be of concern.
11	Is it enrollment parameters? Is it
12	curriculum content? Is it even instruction, and
13	faculty development might be the solution to some
14	of the problems.
15	So all those are very rich discussions
16	that we have, and the board takes all that into
17	consideration when it's making its action
18	decisions.
19	B. SHIREMAN: Thank you.
20	So just to confirm, so unlike, we've
21	seen some other agencies where they have, for
22	example, some specific, specific number in their

standards, or compliance guide or something where 1 2 if you hit it, something in particular, you know, you're out of compliance or something like that. 3 I think you say in your narrative that 4 5 the passage rates are not, not in and of themselves, used as a direct determinant of 6 7 compliance, or non-compliance. So you don't have a rate there, but 8 9 you sort of do in the sense that if they, if they 10 hit certain rates, a process begins. Is that 11 right? 12 J.G. BOYER: That's absolutely correct. 13 If they hit those thresholds, then 14 that puts things into play, in terms of action that needed to be taken to follow up. 15 16 And, it escalates if things are not 17 addressed in terms of what action is, is taken by 18 the board. 19 But it is an intricate process, with 20 opportunities to work with staff to help the 21 program address the issues that they have. 22 B. SHIREMAN: I noticed one part of

the, and I don't know if it's this process or 1 2 another process, but there is this public interest panel, which in the staff report 3 4 actually it said that this is essential, and I totally agree, really interesting component that 5 I have not seen at other accrediting agencies. 6 7 Where a panel of I think three people, 8 essentially public member types of people, who, 9 who review a lot of the items that end up coming before the board. 10 11 Can you talk about that? You or others on your team, talk about that? 12 The role 13 of that panel? 14 J.G. BOYER: I'm happy to do that. I love working with the public 15 16 interest panel, and so I'll preempt my boss and 17 take this one because it's an enjoyable part of 18 the conversation. 19 The public interest panel is a group 20 of people who have I think what you're looking 21 for, in terms of a real public perspective. They 22 may have health care background, but it isn't

1 pharmacy. 2 They are difficult to recruit, if you will. We seem to always have a really good lead 3 and it turns out that lo and behold, they have a 4 5 child who's in pharmacy school. Or some link that disqualifies them, 6 7 because there can be no family link to the 8 profession of pharmacy. 9 So we recruit these people from various areas of our other lives. Boards we've 10 11 served on and for non-profits, those kinds of 12 things. PTA areas have come to be public 13 members. 14 And, we've had all the way from HR representatives in major corporations, to 15 16 corporate lawyers. Ministers are good sources 17 for serving in this capacity, as you might 18 imagine. 19 And, so they review all of the 20 evaluation team reports, and the recommended 21 action documents before the board meeting., 22 Now they review it from a public

perspective. They're not making decisions or 1 2 anything like that. They're just looking at issues of consistency; and, I don't understand 3 4 this sentence; and, you know, this isn't clear to 5 me. And, so they really do have a quality 6 7 improvement component to what we do, as well. 8 But at the end of each of the public 9 interest panel meetings, which is about two hours or three, before each board meeting, we as staff, 10 11 will write a summarizing memo that characterizes 12 the conversations of, of the public interest 13 panel. 14 We will also highlight specific issues that they raise saying on the university of, this 15 16 particular area is, is not clear to us. Or it looks like it's out of line with 17 18 what we've been seeing either at this meeting, or 19 in past meetings. 20 The PIP members serve 5-year terms, 21 which is a long time. They see a number of 22 programs over the course of their five years, and

they can remember things because they are very public-minded, appreciating the role that they have.

In the initial staff analysis, I think 4 5 there was a little concern that the PIP might be overstepping their authority in terms of decision 6 7 making, but that, they have no role in that. 8 They just contribute to the 9 conversation, and the board does rely on that conversation to explore more fully, issues that 10 were of concern to the public interest panel. 11 12 And, maybe Jan you might add more. 13 Sorry. 14 J. ENGLE: No, I'm glad that you explained it. 15 16 I'm relatively new to ACPE, and for 17 me, the public interest panel has been very 18 helpful. They have observations as Greg said, 19 from a very public viewpoint, that helps us with 20 consistency and best practices. 21 So, I think that they play a very 22 important role. But as Greg said, they are just

1

2

3

www.nealrgross.com

	L
1	advisory to the board. They don't have any
2	decision making ability, or expectations.
3	But I think the board does really
4	value their input and, you know, they do take it
5	seriously.
6	B. SHIREMAN: Thank you. Yes, and I
7	think the public interest panel approach is a
8	model that other agencies should, should look at.
9	A really interesting way of bringing
10	in additional public perspective, make sure what
11	you're doing is as you say, not only quality and
12	the right thing to do, but also that it makes
13	sense to a layperson who's not, not from
14	pharmacy, pharmacy area.
15	In your monitoring, I am, I did not
16	see any indication that you monitor student debt
17	levels and earnings, of graduates.
18	Is that something that you do, or have
19	you discussed it, or rejected that?
20	J. ENGLE: I mean we look at it
21	overall. I can give you some statistics as to
22	where we are with that.

1	The American Association of Colleges
2	of Pharmacy does monitor it, and in 2021, the
3	average debt for a pharmacy student was
4	\$173,500.00.
5	But it ranged, depending on whether
6	you went to a public school versus a private
7	school, which is understandable.
8	The average starting salary based on
9	the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and this was
10	in May of 2021, was \$128,000.00.
11	In terms of debt default, I had
12	trouble, I was looking for that data, and what I
13	found was between maybe less than 1 percent to 3
14	percent. So it's fairly low.
15	So, I think there's indications that
16	student pharmacists when they graduate, they get
17	licensed. They are able to handle the debt load
18	that they have.
19	You know, the salaries are very good
20	for pharamcists. There's lots of opportunities
21	out there.
22	So it's not something that's specific

that we look at on a regular basis, but our other 1 2 organizations within pharmacy do keep track of that. 3 4 B. SHIREMAN: I do want to encourage 5 the, it used to be that it was difficult to get that kind of information on a, on a school 6 7 specific basis. 8 But with the advances in the federal 9 college scorecard, it is now, that data is now available on a school-by-school basis. 10 Debt 11 levels, earnings for many schools. 12 So I would encourage, encourage you to 13 make that something that you look at to catch 14 early, if there are schools where debt levels are soaring, or earnings are dropping. 15 16 J. ENGLE: Thank you. 17 B. SHIREMAN: Let me see, I think I had 18 one or two other items. 19 Ah, so student complaints appear to be 20 treated quite seriously. You gave an example of, 21 that you accept complaints through an electronic 22 process.

You made it really easy for people to
identify, it was a you could click on and see
what the standards were so that they could
identify like oh, okay, this is about the
academic environment, or the facilities, or
whatever else.
And, you gave an example about an
online program at a Florida institution not being
adequate.
And, I noticed that you didn't ask for
any further documentation from the complainant.
You sent the complaint to the institution for
them to respond to.
So it seemed like pretty open and easy
from the standpoint of the, the user, the
complainant.
How has your experience been? How has
that process evolved over, over time?
J.G. BOYER: Since we've gone to the
electronic version of the filing a complaint, it
is much easier for us to manage, and as you've
noted, for the complainant to zero in on things

1

that we can assist them with.

2	Even having said that though, the vast
3	majority of our complaints come from students who
4	want us to go in and change their grade.
5	And, so we spend a good bit of time
6	working with those students, to appreciate that
7	we are not the right authority for that.
8	We will address, direct them to the
9	appeals process within the university, which we
10	know they have, and we walk through all of that
11	process with them.
12	So we spend a fair amount of time on
13	the telephone with irate students, who are
14	working through the process.
15	When we do get a legitimate complaint
16	that is not change my grade, we do process that
17	very timely.
18	We have office discussions about the
19	content of the complaint, that I manage through
20	my, my desk.
21	And, then I go directly to the dean
22	with the charge, if you will, and ask for the

1

dean's response.

2	We get that response, and then that of
3	course, leads to sharing with the board. At
4	every board meeting we review all the complaints
5	that have occurred during the last semester.
6	At each site team, a comprehensive
7	review. We review all the complaints that have
8	been compiled for that particular program during
9	the eight year window, as required by the
10	regulations.
11	And, so we keep a running log of
12	active complaints at all times. So it is an
13	engaging activity, if you will, that does keep
14	everyone on their toes.
15	Program deans are very responsive to
16	the 30-day window we give them to respond to, to
17	the complaints.
18	And, in most cases, the complainant
19	has left out some key pieces of information that
20	the school is able to provide.
21	And, then we're able to put, you know,
22	the pieces of the puzzle together to give a more

comprehensive review of what the concern the
 student might be having.

Or actually faculty member in some 3 cases have had, and address that accordingly. 4 B. SHIREMAN: I really appreciate your 5 care and attention to the, the reality that 6 people who are submitting complaints, don't 7 8 necessarily know all of the pieces that they need 9 to put together. And that you follow up to kind of look into all of that. 10 11 All right, lastly, I have one very 12 easy question for Dr. Karimi, your president. So I knew nothing about Pacific 13 14 University until a month ago I stayed at the Grand Lodge in your neighborhood. And, outside 15 16 my room, there was a blurb on the wall about some of the history of Pacific University and the 17 18 local community. 19 So, my question is, have you seen that 20 blurb at the Grand Lodge nearby? 21 R. KARIMI: No, I don't, because our 22 pharmacy is in Hillsborough, 11 miles to the

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

www.nealrgross.com

1 east. 2 B. SHIREMAN: You should check it out. R. KARIMI: Thank you, but I'm happy 3 4 to hear you visited our university. 5 B. SHIREMAN: Was there something there? 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: I thought you were 8 finished. 9 B. SHIREMAN: I was going to see if Jill had anything. 10 11 CHAIR KEISER: That's where I was 12 going, to Jill. 13 J. DERBY: Thank you. I want to 14 compliment the Agency, I think it's been a joy 15 reading their report and the process that 16 followed on. I am going to have a question for 17 Staff and this follows up on the comment Bob 18 made. 19 It seems to me in reading it that this 20 Agency had made every effort to address the shortcoming of the notification of accreditation 21 22 decisions and I wondered if the compliance report

1

is still necessary.

2 This really probably speaks to the process and, Art, we can go to the next session 3 where we have the opportunity for the Staff to 4 5 respond. But it did strike me, I'm not sure this compliance report is necessary. 6 7 This Agency has made major effort to 8 address the shortcoming that was noted by the 9 Staff. That would be good, 10 CHAIR KEISER: 11 let's have everybody ask the Agency the questions 12 and then we come back to Charity, if that's okay 13 with you, Jill? 14 J. DERBY: That's fine and that would 15 be great. 16 CHAIR KEISER: I have Wally and Zakiya 17 lined up for questions. Wally? 18 W. BOSTON: Taking myself off of mute, 19 thanks, Art. 20 I noted when you reported just now 21 that you talked about, and I want to make sure that I heard this, that when schools are outside 22

of two standard deviations from the mean on the 1 2 licensure exam, you ask them for an explanation. That seem to me to be a pretty low 3 standard in the sense that what is that, out of 4 140 institutions, about 3 on an annual basis. 5 I'm curious, if you expand that to 6 7 let's just say the 10 percent of the outliers, which might be a maximum of 14, are there schools 8 9 that are consistently in that lower end area and then how do you address that with them if they 10 have consistently lower scores, given that would 11 impact the employability of their graduates. 12 13 And we did hear that the average loan 14 balance is about \$170,000 on an average salary of \$125,000 but that salary is dependent upon being 15 16 licensed. 17 J.G. BOYER: We work with programs, 18 there are certain program that are more 19 frequently on the list of programs that meet 20 those moderate thresholds for MATHX in particular 21 than other programs, some are never on that list. It does bounce around a little bit 22

though, often times shining a light on the issue 1 2 directs the program to take steps they have not taken to better prepare students. 3 4 They have heightened their efforts to 5 do MATHX preparation so that students during that final year are more engaged and thinking about 6 7 the exam, which is shown in some cases to be very, very helpful moving and borrowing a bit up. 8 9 We do that, we also then share what we know in terms of things that work like bootcamps 10 for students to come in with lower GPAs upon 11 12 entry, those kinds of things. I often say if you have a troubled situation it can't be business as 13 14 usual. 15 So, what are you doing as a program 16 that is not usual as you're working through this 17 issue you have in terms of improving MATHX pass 18 rates. 19 And so proving to have been fairly 20 successful in that, sometimes you're right, it's 21 only two or three programs, other times it's 22 seven of eight programs per year that we're

looking at to fit this threshold. 1 D. ZAREMBSKI: Greg, I would add that, 2 yes, it's typically more in the six to eight 3 4 range. We've had one year, we're only three 5 but it's usually up the six to eight range number 6 of programs and it's not often repeat programs 7 8 but if they are repeat, we do have that three and 9 five-year-old that Greg talked about before, where if they are outside of that benchmark three 10 years in a five-year period, they're called to 11 12 meet with the Board. 13 J.G. BOYER: The one thing I would 14 really like to look at in the future is we look at first-time pass rates and that's the number 15 16 you're looking at. 17 Programs or students are able to take 18 the MATHX exam three times in a year. When you 19 get into the multiple test-takers, they get much, 20 much better. 21 In fact, in the last three or four 22 years we're hearing reports from the program that

student graduates will sometimes take the MATHX 1 2 the first time as a practice, which I don't understand at all because if you don't do well, 3 4 you're not earning income. But it seems to be a mindset among at 5 least some of our recent graduates that all 6 7 important parameter of licensure as soon as possible is not absolutely essential to them. 8 9 So, I have a little trouble figuring out the impact of students who don't take the 10 11 MATHX as seriously the first time as we might 12 want them to but I think it's a current 13 phenomenon perhaps that we're working through. 14 But I would like to expand the parameter and we're having conversations with the 15 16 Board on looking at a broader parameter other 17 than just the first-time pass rate. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya? 19 I'm looking at the Z. SMITH ELLIS: 20 one standard that was in guestion in the 21 Department Staff report and the exhibits and it 22 sounded like from the discussion that the Agency

1	believes that it did submit materials.
2	But I'm looking on the system now at
3	the pieces that you mentioned and none of them
4	actually address that piece.
5	So, I see what the Department is
6	talking about so I'm kind of curious, if you can
7	in this moment provide a summary of why just one
8	institution it was a pretty extraordinary
9	action as the school was withdrawn.
10	It was a final action and so their
11	accreditation was withdrawn and they're I
12	understand going through a teach-out program and
13	it's a historically black college and one of the
14	few that has pharmacy programs, so pretty
15	significant.
16	I think the college itself took issue
17	with finding the purpose of the standard so that
18	the college and others have an understanding of
19	why the action was taken.
20	So, I'm curious if you can provide
21	that now or you mentioned that it's put on the
22	website. I Googled and can't find it on the

website, that explanation, so I'm just trying to 1 2 find that summary, not just pointing to the standards that they didn't meet, a more 3 4 explanatory summary of what they missed. 5 J.G. BOYER: In the history section of each program's website, a listing on our website, 6 If you click on the 7 there is a detailed history. 8 year the action was taken, it will say ECP 9 response and then scroll response on that particular program. 10 11 Those have been on our website within 12 the 60-day requirements. What we didn't do was 13 forward a direct copy of that to the Agency 14 within that 60-day window. You do have to look for it a little 15 16 bit but it's clearly once you get into the 17 history section below the program listing of the 18 name, address, those kinds of things. 19 Below that, you will see the click 20 here item within the year where the action is 21 taken. J. Engle: We did remedy that 22 with the subsequent withdrawal of another program

1	where we did have those materials sent to the
2	Department on time and that was Exhibit R81, I
3	think I'm correct, correct me if I'm wrong.
4	There was that issue with the first
5	program, the second one we did it as per the
6	regulations. We submitted documentation to that
7	effect and then we changed our policies
8	internally to have a checklist to make sure we
9	don't miss that in the future.
10	Since all of this happened, we did
11	change it and we do have documentation that we
12	changed it. Does that make sense?
13	Z. SMITH ELLIS: I understand that,
14	I'm saying if I'm looking now to say what
15	happened with that program, I'm not able to find
16	that in the record that's been provided, at least
17	to us. And I'm new so this is my
18	first meeting, and perhaps there's something in
19	the system and someone from the Department can
20	help me find that summary information that you
21	said that you provided subsequently but I don't
22	see that here.

1	And it may just be an issue with our
2	system but I thought I heard it mentioned that it
3	was online and just a Google in the search part
4	of your website of the institution's name, I
5	can't find the history that you're speaking
6	about.
7	So, I'm just thinking if the purpose
8	of this is transparency and whatnot and I have
9	access to this system and I'm trying to Google
10	what their rationale is, it may be a simple fix.
11	But I am trying to figure out what is
12	the more substantive summary of the actions, not
13	just the citation of this is the number that they
14	missed, but what's the reasoning behind it?
15	J.G. BOYER: That is in the history
16	section, as I mentioned, of the school listing as
17	you go to the state, I'll just walk you through
18	the website.
19	Z. SMITH ELLIS: That would be great.
20	J.G. BOYER: Go to the state listing
21	where you have the programs by state, do you see
22	that on the website?

	14
Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes.	
J.G. BOYER: Click on there, go down	
to the state in question and go down to the	
program in question.	
Once you get to the program in	
question, you will see the address information,	
who the Dean is, keep scrolling, and below there	
there is a history section.	
Z. SMITH ELLIS: I see.	
J.G. BOYER: And then you click here,	
the ACP statement which goes into greater detail	
about the particular standard that was	
problematic.	
Z. SMITH ELLIS: I see, thank you.	
D. ZAREMBSKI: You can also find that	
program under the withdrawn. So, we have	
programs and you can search them by their state	
or by their status. And if you look under	
withdrawn it would list that program there and	
you'll find the same information.	
Z. SMITH ELLIS: Thank you, I found	
it, I appreciate that.	
	J.G. BOYER: Click on there, go down to the state in question and go down to the program in question. Once you get to the program in question, you will see the address information, who the Dean is, keep scrolling, and below there there is a history section. Z. SMITH ELLIS: I see. J.G. BOYER: And then you click here, the ACP statement which goes into greater detail about the particular standard that was problematic. Z. SMITH ELLIS: I see, thank you. D. ZAREMESKI: You can also find that program under the withdrawn. So, we have programs and you can search them by their state or by their status. And if you look under withdrawn it would list that program there and you'll find the same information. Z. SMITH ELLIS: Thank you, I found

I	
1	CHAIR KEISER: David?
2	D. EUBANKS: I want to go back to
3	student achievement for a moment because I was
4	reading through the narrative I found.
5	Lots of direct pointers to exhibits
6	that had data in them and the data spans
7	students' careers really from recruitment where I
8	got to find out about how many students applied,
9	were admitted, enrolled and so forth, all the way
10	through the test scores.
11	So, I just want to compliment you on
12	the level of documentation. I was also surprised
13	by the two standard deviation thing, that seems
14	like an often lax standard but that's only true
15	if it's normal distribution.
16	So, using the data you provided I
17	plotted it and it's not a normal distribution.
18	There's a lot more than 2.5 percent in that lower
19	tail and I wanted to ask first, I think I have
20	three questions.
21	Those institutions in the lower tail
22	of performance by the licensee exam, do they

persist there and if they are, are they fixable? 1 2 Do they show improvement over time or are there some schools that seem like they're 3 4 just kind of struggling and struggling or in the 5 gray area? 6 J.G. BOYER: There are programs that 7 are characteristically on the lower end of that 8 tail. They do bounce around a little bit. We've 9 been hitting those parameters and not hitting 10 those parameters. And we work with them, like I said 11 12 earlier, we spend a good deal of time counseling 13 them, working with those programs to improve the 14 situation. In answer to your question, there are 15 certain programs that are customarily in that 16 tail. 17 J. Engle: Can I just add one thing to 18 that? 19 One of the reasons some of those 20 schools languish is some of the things they're 21 doing to fix their problems tend to be with 22 curriculum or with faculty development or things

that take a couple of years to see results. 1 2 So, they may identify that their students are not doing well on the MATHX exam 3 because of some curricular issue. 4 In order to 5 change the curriculum and go through all the mechanics that you have to do to do that, it 6 7 could take some time. 8 So, that may be why also you're seeing 9 certain schools in a certain area. We're waiting to see whether or not the root cause analysis and 10 then how they're going to solve their problems is 11 12 going to work. 13 So, we try to give them time to 14 effect those changes. Makes perfect sense. 15 D. EUBANKS: 16 Hypothetically, if there are schools in that 17 lower end, it seems like they're going to consume 18 a lot of your attention. Practically speaking, is it possible 19 20 to just yank their accreditation and have those 21 students go somewhere else with limited access? They'd probably be going to a better 22

1	school it sounds like.
2	J.G. BOYER: Often times the mission
3	of individual programs helps define, if you will,
4	the students that are enrolled there.
5	And so if you were to remove some of
6	those programs from the mix, I think you would be
7	creating a great advantage to some of the
8	students who may not be able to get into some of
9	our programs that are never on that watch list,
10	if you will.
11	They're always on the other end of the
12	tail. And so for the public good there's reasons
13	why we work carefully with these programs to
14	ensure they can do what they can do to address
15	the situation.
16	We have face-to-face programs, we have
17	programs that target first-generation college
18	students, which is always a challenge in lots of
19	cases. And so factoring their mission is really
20	an important element of where they are in that
21	tail sometimes.
22	And so we would not want to just

automatically yank their accreditation because 1 2 they're problematic. That would be really very defeating to the best interest of the public 3 4 actually. That's a great answer. 5 D. EUBANKS: I understand the access question, that 6 leads me to my next question. You mentioned that 7 some of the struggling schools, when they do this 8 9 root cause analysis, enrollment was something 10 that sometimes came up. 11 If that's true, would you mind to 12 elaborate on what sorts of enrollment problems and then assumed solutions were found? 13 14 D. ZAREMBSKI: I can start with this It's been discussed that 15 one, Greg, if you want. 16 if a program falls below that two standard deviation benchmark we reinitiate our process. 17 18 And I can give you one example of a 19 program that had made some admission changes, 20 they had lowered their bar for admission. And as 21 a result, the MATHX pass rate dropped. 22 So, when they observed that and had to

report back to us, lo' and behold they upped 1 2 their admission benchmarks again. So, looking at the quality of the 3 4 enrolled students is one thing that occurred and 5 then putting in additional measures to assist those students also occurred. Greg, if you want 6 7 to add onto that? 8 I really liked the J.G. BOYER: 9 example. We do see programs, and some of the 10 programs are struggling with enrollment right 11 now, the Applicant pool for pharmacy students is 12 a little tight, there are more choices for 13 students. 14 A number of students who would come to our profession in the past maybe are going to 15 16 other professions that have opportunities that 17 may not have quite so much time involved in 18 relaying the degree. 19 So, we've diluted the pool a little in 20 So, since then, programs have reacted that way. to that to maintain their enrollments sometimes 21 22 at their detriment. And lowering enrollments,

154

1 back to my comment earlier, when you do that what 2 are you doing differently?

Because it can't be business as usual 3 for this particular program because you're 4 bringing in a group of students who may be a 5 little bit weaker because of their lower GPA, and 6 7 so what are you doing to ensure their success? That's the first question we want to 8 9 ask everyone we see, a reduction in the GPA requirement for admission for programs to respond 10 11 to. 12 Because we don't want to get into the 13 situation, as Joan just mentioned, that four

14 years later we have a drop in MATHX because we 15 brought in weaker students, but then nothing more 16 to help them through the program for success.

D. EUBANKS: And I think you or something else said something that I think is inspiring, which is, and I'll paraphrase it, when we admit a student, we're responsible for them and responsible for their pathway to success, which I think is a great motto for higher

1

2	My last question is related to all
3	that and in your narrative you say that programs
4	are expected to routinely assess admissions
5	criteria as a component of the program's
6	evaluation plan.
7	I wasn't able to find in the
8	documentation one of those kinds of analysis,
9	either it's not there or I couldn't find it.
10	Could you comment on what goes into this analysis
11	of the program's admission criteria?
12	I assume it's pointing towards success
13	of students.
14	J.G. BOYER: It's part of our Standard
15	25 which has to do with the key element of
16	admissions criteria, that they be routinely
17	evaluated and certainly, in every self-study
18	that's done every eight years, the program will
19	have provided us a component of their assessment
20	plan where they're looking at various elements of
21	student success, given correlations with
22	admissions criteria.

I	
1	They'll look at feeder schools, that
2	kind of thing, maybe providing a large number of
3	students to them as undergraduates coming into
4	the professional program, get those students'
5	success, those kinds of things, and then make
6	appropriate adjustments based upon the outcomes
7	of the analysis of their assessment plan.
8	D. EUBANKS: Thank you very much, A
9	plus.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Seeing as there are no
11	more questions and I don't think there are any
12	third-party comments. Are there any other? I'm
13	not aware of any.
14	If not, go to the chat box to comment
15	on the Agency's responses and discussion and I
16	think, Jill, you had a question for the Staff?
17	J. DERBY: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: We can't hear you,
19	Charity. It looks like your microphone is on.
20	C. HELTON: Can you hear me now?
21	CHAIR KEISER: It's very low.
22	C. HELTON: I don't know why it is

problematic. 1 2 B. SHIREMAN: Talk loud because I can 3 tell what you're saying. 4 C. HELTON: Are you able to hear me 5 now? CHAIR KEISER: Almost. 6 7 C. HELTON: In response to the 8 question about the Agency's compliance with 602 9 26E, the Department's recommendation is based on a review of the Agency's compliance throughout 10 11 the review period. 12 The Agency did provide one sample case in Exhibit R81 of the Agency complying with 602 13 14 26E and the Agency did indicate its intention to comply with this regulation in the future, 15 16 however, this was just one instance of 17 compliance. 18 Since several other notifications of 19 adverse actions were reviewed and found non-20 compliant, Department Staff determined the Agency 21 was not in compliance with the criterion during the review period, so our recommendation was made 22

	-
1	based on that set of information.
2	I hope that was audible.
3	CHAIR KEISER: Any other comments
4	regarding the conversation by the Agency?
5	C. HELTON: No comments.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Jill, did that answer
7	your question?
8	J. DERBY: Yes, it did.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Are there any other
10	questions for the Staff? Thank you, Charity.
11	Sensing none, I would go to either Bob or Jill
12	for a motion to start the conversation.
13	B. SHIREMAN: My inclination on the
14	compliance question is that the prior
15	notifications that were identified as not
16	adequate involved a situation where there
17	actually was a link available to the information
18	with the reasons.
19	The R81 shows that they have addressed
20	that by now sending the reasons to the Department
21	of Education and have changed their policy or
22	checklist so that that will continue to happen in

1 the future. 2 So, my motion is to recommend that the senior department official renew the Agency for 3 4 five years and encourage the Agency to monitor 5 student loan debt and post-graduation earnings. So, in other words, my motion if seconded would 6 not include the compliance but would encourage 7 8 them to monitor debt and earnings. 9 CHAIR KEISER: I have a question about 10 that. You had encouraged them but it's not for 11 the Department to monitor? 12 B. SHIREMAN: Correct, the Agency to 13 monitor. 14 Yes, so, recommend that the senior department official renew the Agency for five 15 16 years and encourage the Agency to monitor student 17 loan debt and post-graduation earnings. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second to 19 the motion? 20 J. DERBY: I second the motion. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Jill seconds it, I have 22 Jennifer with a question or a concern or comment.

J. BLUM: I'm all for encouraging 1 2 agencies to do things but to me that feels like we're going back into why isn't that just a 3 4 comment on the vote? Why is that part of a 5 motion to encourage? And I would say that under 602.16 the 6 Department is pretty, and we are, limited in 7 8 spelling out if one were to consider that and 9 earnings to be outcome measures of student achievement. 10 11 I'm not sure why we're calling this 12 out on this Agency and not every other Agency and I think we're limited by law actually in our 13 14 ability to actually call out and encourage an 15 Agency to pick an outcome metric seems to be what 16 we're doing here. 17 So, I would say that it's a great 18 comment to make when voting yes for the five 19 years but I don't understand how it's making its 20 way into a motion. 21 CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya? 22 I'm going to address Z. SMITH ELLIS:

1 that point in support of the concept of 2 encouraging them to monitor this, even though it's a graduate degree that's very expensive and 3 4 our encouragement, recommendation, as far as I 5 understand from my training, doesn't actually require anything of them or of the senior 6 department official. 7 8 It's just making the point but I also 9 understand the point that maybe it's just a 10 comment. 11 But I would support that piece. My comment though, my reason for raising my hand, is 12 actually going back to the Staff recommendation 13 14 about the compliance report. I did go back and look at the website 15 16 and the history and I'm not sure, again, this 17 could be just because I'm new, I'm not sure what 18 was customary but the history does show all of the different times when they were partially 19 20 compliant, this institution, and the back and 21 forth. But each of those times when I 22

1 clicked, it just shows what the standard is
2 they're not meeting, it doesn't say what happened
3 that they didn't meet the standard, what was the
4 evidence?

So, maybe it's just customary that is 5 not provided but in case that is not customary, 6 7 I'm just suggesting that in this instance specifically, because I am new I will probably 8 9 defer to the Department's expertise here in 10 saying they maybe have a reason for asking for 11 more information here, just because this was an 12 extraordinary action.

And to go back, reading the history and not really seeing what is it the institution did specific to their students and their programs does feel like -- by all other accounts, this is an Agency-based meeting.

18 All the things to have this one piece
19 be tightened up doesn't seem unreasonable to me
20 given the extraordinary nature of what happened.
21 CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
22 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: I want to go

back. I support Jennifer's evaluation of the
 motion.

3	I think especially when we look at
4	these professional degrees, I'm thinking whether
5	it be pharmacy, optometry, those types of things,
6	those are typically very high-earning positions
7	and the default rates are really indicative that
8	the debt is corresponding to the wage earnings
9	and it's not a huge burden.
10	I don't have a problem with them
11	looking at it and I do understand why that's on
12	theirs because they were deferring to some other
13	associations to track that.
14	But I think it would be more
15	appropriate as a comment to the vote rather than
16	as a part of the motion.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Mary-Ellen?
18	M.E. PETRISKO: I would agree with
19	that and I think we need to be really careful in
20	looking across agencies and what we are and are
21	not putting into the recommendations, looking
22	over what we've done with agencies even within

this meeting.

1

2	I think it's better to just go without
3	the encouragement here for the reasons that
4	Jennifer noted and again, looking across agencies
5	in what we're putting into the recommendations.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Bob, do you accept that
7	or do you want to continue?
8	B. SHIREMAN: I'd like to keep it in,
9	I don't think there's any problem with an
10	encouragement and I'd like to keep it in the
11	motion.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Further discussion?
13	Sensing none, the recommendation would
14	be the motion is to remove the Agency's
15	recognition as a nationally accredited Agency for
16	five years and encourage the Agency to monitor
17	student loan debt and postgraduate earnings.
18	Kathleen, do you have a comment?
19	K.S. ALIOTO: I agree with the comment
20	that why do we put that in? I agree with the
21	comment that we perhaps shouldn't be monitoring -
22	_

1	CHAIR KEISER: Is that a no?
2	K.S. ALIOTO: that issue but I'm
3	still voting yes. Put that comment in.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
5	R. ARTIS: I will vote no because of
6	the comment.
7	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
8	J. BLUM: No because of the comment.
9	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
10	R. BOOTH: No because of the
11	extraneous comment.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
13	W. BOSTON: Yes.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
15	J. DERBY: Yes.
16	CHAIR KEISER: David?
17	D. EUBANKS: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
19	M. LINDSAY: Yes.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Molly?
21	M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Could you scroll up,

Monica, please? 1 2 J. BLUM: Nobody has been recording. VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: These need to 3 4 be recorded. 5 CHAIR KEISER: I thought she was doing 6 that, I'm sorry. 7 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Nothing is 8 happening. 9 CHAIR KEISER: Monica, are you there? 10 I've got one absent. 11 This is Soren with OGC, S. Lagaard: 12 we're in the room here. The phone unfortunately 13 dropped so we'll be joining here shortly, just 14 give us 30 seconds or so. CHAIR KEISER: We'll have to re-vote 15 16 then. 17 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Mr. Chairman, 18 I'm going to take advantage of this. Here we are 19 jeopardizing the recognition of an accrediting 20 body because of an extraneous comment. This is a 21 very dangerous place for us to be in. 22 B. SHIREMAN: There's no danger here,

	I
1	this is a recommendation to the SDO. The SDO can
2	do whatever but it indicates our interest in the
3	Agency and other agencies also monitoring student
4	loan debt.
5	It's not endangering. If it gets
6	voted down, we will have a next motion without
7	the additional information.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Bob, if I could ask a
9	question? Wouldn't we be able to say the same
10	thing about every agency because obviously,
11	student debt is a major issue?
12	B. SHIREMAN: A lot of agencies do
13	monitor debt and earnings and this one does not.
14	And this is, as was noted, a graduate program
15	with very high debt.
16	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
17	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer, do you have
18	a comment?
19	J. BLUM: Under the regulations and
20	under the statutes it's the Agency's prerogative
21	to choose which outcome standards they use for
22	student achievement. It's not our job to say you

1	should be doing this and not doing that.
2	Our obligation is to make sure they
3	have the standard and that they're applying the
4	standard that they have.
5	We can think whatever we want about
6	debt and earnings and one thing that I don't love
7	about this is I'm voting no because of your
8	comment.
9	Of course, I care about debt and
10	earnings but now the public somehow is going to
11	think that I don't care about debt and earnings.
12	Of course I care about debt and earnings and it's
13	muddying the waters on how we feel about the
14	agencies.
15	So, to me these are very worthwhile
16	comments to be made if you want to make the
17	comments during the discussion and as you vote,
18	but to assign us and to put us into this
19	predicament to me is a little bit manipulative of
20	the process.
21	And so I would like to be able to
22	support this Agency and its standard which it

1 does seem to be using appropriately but I'm 2 forced into a vote of no because of an extraneous comment that's frustrating. 3 4 CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn? 5 R. ARTIS: I echo Jennifer entirely. I will give in on this B. SHIREMAN: 6 7 and I guess those of us, depending on whether my 8 seconder will go along with it --9 Z. SMITH ELLIS: Aren't we in the middle of the vote? 10 11 B. SHIREMAN: I guess we are. 12 CHAIR KEISER: We're not because they 13 weren't taking our votes. We'd have to revote 14 all the way again, which we can do. If no one was 15 Z. SMITH ELLIS: 16 recording it, it --17 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 18 CHAIR KEISER: We're not recording. 19 R. ARTIS: Welcome, Zakiya, welcome. 20 CHAIR KEISER: You want to pull that. 21 Jill, do you agree with that? 22 J. DERBY: I agree with that.

-
CHAIR KEISER: The motion, which is
the old motion but now modified is remove the
Agency's recommendation as a nationally
recognized accrediting agency for five years.
Kathleen?
K.S. ALIOTO: Yes, much better.
CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
R. ARTIS: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
J. BLUM: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
R. BOOTH: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
W. BOSTON: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
J. DERBY: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: David?
D. EUBANKS: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
M. LINDSAY: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Molly?
M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
R. MAYES: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Mary-Ellen?
M.E. PETRISKO: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: Bob?
B. SHIREMAN: Yes, and I encourage the
Agency to monitor student debt and earnings.
CHAIR KEISER: Well said. Zakiya?
Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes, and encourage
the Agency to monitor student debt and earnings
and consider how transparent it is about the
reasons for withdrawal and other adverse actions.
CHAIR KEISER: Steven?
S: Yes.
CHAIR KEISER: The motion passes.
We are at 1:08 p.m. approximately and
I think it's too late to start a new agency so
I'm going to suggest we take a little longer
lunch today because I don't think we can do two
agencies this afternoon.

1	
1	So, we'll get back on the schedule
2	when we return at 2:00 p.m., have a real lunch
3	today, not an abbreviated one like yesterday, and
4	we will return to deal with the Middle States
5	Commission on Secondary Schools.
6	We're back on our regular schedule.
7	Back at 2:00 p.m. Eastern.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
9	went off the record at 1:09 p.m. and
10	resumed at 2:03 p.m.)
11	Welcome back, everyone. We're
12	continuing our meeting. Before we start with the
13	next agency, Bob Shireman had a question on
14	procedure?
15	B. SHIREMAN: During the kerfuffle
16	around my motion on the last agency, I had a
17	motion that some people did not like a piece of
18	it and I totally appreciate that they were put in
19	the awkward position of if they wanted to change
20	it, they had to vote down the entire thing making
21	it seem like they were opposed to the agency
22	being renewed at all.

I am not an expert on Robert's rules 1 2 of order but my experience with Robert's rules of order would suggest that normally there would be 3 a motion to amend the motion to remove the 4 5 section so you could vote just on that piece. But it is quite possible that it can 6 be done in whatever way they recognize it. 7 8 CHAIR KEISER: We can do it either way 9 but you have to actually remove the objection before we move to a vote. 10 11 B. SHIREMAN: I did but we had 12 established in a prior session that we were going 13 to do it by voting up or down on the entire 14 thing. So, I just wanted to clarify that it 15 might make --There was a friendly 16 CHAIR KEISER: 17 amendment to the motion which was adopted by the 18 person who made the motion and the second, so it 19 became part of the motion, it was not a separate 20 amendment. 21 B. SHIREMAN: People could have moved to remove it, is that right? 22

1
CHAIR KEISER: I think they could
have, yes.
B. SHIREMAN: Thank you.
CHAIR KEISER: Now we're going to be
looking at the Middle States Commission on
Secondary Schools, MSA-CSS.
Our primary leaders are Kathleen
Alioto and Claude Pressnell. Our Department
Staff is Karmon Sims-Coates and I will turn this
over to you, Kathleen and Claude.
K.S. ALIOTO: The Middle States
Commission on Secondary Schools, MSA-CSS, is one
of the three Commissions of the Middle States
Association of college and schools.
Primarily an accreditor of secondary
education institutions, the Agency also accredits
post-secondary non-degree grantee vocational
institutions.
These post-secondary institutions
provide training and vocational technical careers
within certificated and licensed professions such
as automotive technology, computer working,

1

cosmetology, and practical nursing.

2	The Agency's current scope of
3	recognition is for the accreditation of agencies
4	with post-secondary non-degree-granting career
5	and technology programs in Delaware, Maryland,
6	New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, The
7	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of
8	Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, including
9	Guam and those that offer all or part of their
10	educational programs via distance education
11	modalities.
12	The agencies federally link the Higher
13	Education Act Tunnel 4 Federal Student Aid
14	Program. Therefore, the Agency must meet the
15	Secretary's separate and independent
16	requirements.
17	Currently, the Agency accredits 58 post-
18	secondary non-degree granting institutions, of
19	which 7 are considered candidate institutions and
20	27 institutions intend to use its accreditation
21	to establish eligibility for Titel IV federal
22	student aid programs.

CHAIR KEISER: May the Staff make a 1 2 report of comments, any from Ms. Coates? Τ don't see her. Here she comes, there she is. 3 4 K. SIMMS-COATES: Yes, I'm here. Good 5 afternoon. Could you turn your 6 CHAIR KEISER: camera on, please? 7 8 K. SIMMS-COATES: My camera should be 9 on. 10 CHAIR KEISER: It's not, is there 11 somebody that can help you? 12 G.A. SMITH: Patrick, is there 13 something we can do here so Karmon Simms-Coates 14 can be viewed? The camera appears to be on, is 15 there a privacy filter? 16 Z. SMITH ELLIS: If you have a laptop and you don't have the laptop open, it's going to 17 the laptop camera. 18 19 K. SIMMS-COATES: I'm sorry, you're 20 right. You have to slide it over, I apologize. 21 Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, and Members of the 22 Committee.

1	My name is Karmon Simms-Coates and I
2	am providing a review of petition for renewal,
3	recognition for the Middle States Commission on
4	Secondary Schools.
5	The Staff recommendation to the senior
6	department official for the Agency is to renew
7	the Agency's recognition as a nationally
8	recognized accrediting agency subject to the
9	submission of a compliance report due in 12
10	months and a review and decision on the report.
11	If recognition is continued following
12	a decision on the compliance report, the period
13	of recognition will not exceed five years from
14	the due date the decision of renewal of
15	accreditation is issued by the senior department
16	official.
17	This recommendation is based on a
18	review of the Agency's petition and is supporting
19	documentation as well as three virtual
20	observations, a site visit, Board Meeting, and
21	file review.
22	The Agency's compliance report must

address two remaining issues. Under 60221B4 the
 Agency must provide documentation to demonstrate
 that it gave constituents an opportunity to
 review and provide input during the comprehensive
 review of standards.

6 And the Agency must also establish a 7 policy that complies with requirements of 602.21C 8 and 602.21D3 and provide documentation 9 demonstrating the application of his policies for 10 those sections.

11 The Department received one 12 third-party comment, however, the Department did 13 not receive any complaints during the recognition 14 This concludes my presentation. period. Representatives of the Agency are here today to 15 16 respond to your questions, thank you. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Questions for the Staff 18 at this point? Kathleen? Do you have a question 19 for the Staff? 20 K.S. ALIOTO: I just wondered, the 21 financial factors that you've presented in the 22 presentation made my stomach kind of knot up that

1 it isn't financially stable enough for us to 2 continue or to help them enlarge their accreditation services. 3 4 CHAIR KEISER: We can ask the 5 Commission about that, Kathleen. K.S. ALIOTO: It's the actual 6 7 documents that you presented in the proposal. 8 CHAIR KEISER: Let's go to the Agency 9 then and we can ask them about that, your you can 10 certainly. Representing the Agency, I'll 11 introduce Mr. Christian Talbot, who's the 12 President of MSA-CSS. And if you would introduce those who 13 14 are with you today and make your comments as it regards to your petition? 15 16 C. Talbot: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Ms. 17 Alioto, Ms. Simms-Coates, and to Members of the 18 NACIQI Committee for welcoming us today. I am 19 very pleased to represent the Middle States as 20 the new President. 21 I just joined July 1st so I'm still 22 getting my feet wet and I am here today in the

1	same room with our Executive Vice President, Dr.
2	Glenn Mort and Mr. Dan Ruffo, who is one of our
3	Assistant Vice Presidents of accreditation.
4	And in a separate screen you can see
5	Dr. Jim Kraft, who is the Chair of the Middle
6	States Association Commission on Secondary
7	Schools. Dr. Kraft will share some opening
8	statements.
9	J. KRAFT: Hello, everyone, I'm Dr.
10	James Kraft, Chair of the Secondary Commission
11	for the Middle States Association of colleges and
12	schools.
13	And again, today with me is again Mr.
14	Christan Talbot, who is our new President, Dr.
15	Glen Mort, Executive Vice President, and Mr. Dan
16	Ruffo, Associate Vice President, who are in
17	charge of the accreditation and coordinating the
18	accreditation of our post-secondary non-degree-
19	granting career institutions.
20	And we appreciate the opportunity to
21	speak with all of you today regarding our success
22	as a Titel IV gatekeeper and our petition for

l	
1	reauthorization. Since nearly 1900,
2	accreditation has held a major impact in the
3	field of American education.
4	Accreditation response to the public's
5	demands for improved quality and greater
6	accountability for institutions serving society
7	needs. Accreditation agencies enjoy a unique
8	public trust role in the United States.
9	In other words, accredited schools can
10	be trusted by the public to be what they claim to
11	be and do what they claim to do.
12	Whatever an accredited school says
13	about itself has both the sanction and the
14	confidence of its profession.
15	Accreditation rests on the dual
16	concepts of self-regulation and quality
17	improvement. A given field such as education
18	uses its own experts to define standards of
19	acceptable operations and performance for the
20	institutions and organizations within.
21	Thus, accreditation refers to a
22	standard-setting annual review process.

Accreditation of an educational organization is 1 2 an affirmation that the institution provides a quality of education that the community has a 3 right to expect and the educational world 4 endorses. 5 Accreditation is a means of showing 6 7 confidence in an institution's performance. When a Commission accredits an 8 9 educational institution, it is certifying that 10 the organization has met the prescribed qualitative and quantitative standards of the 11 12 Commission within the terms of the organization's 13 own stated philosophy and objectives. 14 Accreditation is granted on an institution-wide basis, not just one program or 15 16 course offering. Since our renewal in 2017, the 17 range in volume of our accreditation activities 18 has remained the same. 19 MSA-CSS accredits 69 post-secondary 20 non-degree-granting institutions, 47 of which 21 participate in Title IV. 22 Of these 47 institutions, 19 are

1	
1	small, private, for-profit career schools and we
2	currently have 32 institutions in candidacy
3	status for accreditation, 19 of which have a
4	desire to participate in Title IV.
5	So, as you can see, we are planning on
6	expanding our services. Early first actions have
7	been taken since the renewal of our petition and
8	overall, we have experienced favorable reports
9	resulting from the accreditation protocol used by
10	these institutions.
11	We also received and acted upon
12	requests for substantive F change from our
13	accredited institutions regarding addition,
14	deletion, and changes to certificate programs in
15	addition to discontinuation of campus locations.
16	Regarding standards and practices used
17	by MSA-CSS to address student achievement, MSA-
18	CSS requires all institutions to be in compliance
19	with the indicators of quality identified for
20	career and technology institutions for our 12
21	standards for institutional quality.
22	Additionally, the MSA has set program-

level thresholds for completion rates, licensing 1 2 pass rates, and job placement rates at 70 In our context as a national 3 percent. accreditor for non-degree-granting post-secondary 4 career institutions, this rate is based on 5 purpose requirements, as proven reasonable to 6 7 support consistent expectations for success with 8 respect to student achievement. Our accredited institutions find that 9 10 these expectations are challenging but 11 appropriate. 12 We just completed a five-year process 13 to update and revise our standards along with the 14 template for our protocol to make the materials 15 more user-friendly. 16 And we'll roll out the protocol on an 17 online platform later this year. 18 The challenge we most frequently see 19 regarding student performance is the lack of 20 supporting documentation provided by institutions 21 to demonstrate compliance at the time of the onsite evaluation, specifically regarding job 22

placement rates.

1

2 In our experience low job placement rates are often a function of the lack of 3 effective strategies at the institution, provide 4 documented evidence on the employment of program 5 completers. 6 7 This results in monitoring issues in 8 MSA-CSS requires institutions to demonstrate 9 compliance with the threshold in their annual 10 reports or submit improvement plans for any 11 program that's out of compliance. 12 MSA-CSS takes pride in the fact that 13 our accreditation protocol and reporting 14 requirements serve as tools for continuous 15 improvement and it's been our practice to work 16 with institutions to identify gaps and student 17 performance and to share current strategies and 18 activities to elimination those gaps. 19 Our evaluation process, based on peer 20 review and our annual reporting requirements reviewed by our Staff, reinforce the continuous 21 22 improvement model.

The monitoring process is in place,
annual documentation of the student performance
rates assisting the institution with
identification appropriate strategies and
activities to improve the rates and requiring
program-specific improvement plans.
It has worked well in correcting any
issues related to student achievement that have
been identified through an onsite evaluation or
in the annual data provided by the institutions
for Staff review.
Currently, MSA-CSS does not identify
any of our accredited post-secondary non-degree
granting career institutions at risk.
MSA-CSS monitors not only student
performance rates and loan default rates but
institutional viability and financial stability
by requiring an accredited institution to submit
annual enrollment reports and independent audit
reports.
MSA-CSS would identify an institution
at risk if aggregate student performance data

consistently falls below the established 1 2 threshold or if the enrollment or financial reports indicate instability. 3 If such cases were to arise, MSA-CSS 4 5 would employ the success of our current practice working with institutions to identify appropriate 6 7 remedies requiring improvement plans and 8 monitoring in annual progress. 9 Failure to demonstrate improvement 10 would make the institution be placed on a 11 probationary status. 12 Although MSA-CSS accredits only a 13 small number of post-secondary non-degree-14 granting institutions in our region for Title IV 15 purposes, our member schools appreciate the rigor 16 of the protocol and find that obtaining and 17 maintaining Middle States accreditation is 18 invaluable in supporting their mission and in 19 providing our own process for data-driven 20 decision-making that engages all stakeholders, 21 and continuous improvement to support the intended outcomes of student achievement. 22

We appreciate the opportunity to be of 1 2 service to these institutions and to the U.S. Department of Education and hope that you look 3 4 favorably on this service for approving our 5 petition for reauthorization. Finally, we would like thank Ms. 6 Karmon Simms-Coates, our Staff analyst, along 7 8 with Mr. Herman Bounds and their entire team for 9 their support and tireless work on behalf of Middle States and our member institutions. 10 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIR KEISER: Questions from the 13 primary readers, Kathleen, Claude? 14 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: You go, Kathleen, I'll follow up. 15 16 K.S. ALIOTO: First of all, you just said that there are 32 new institutions that want 17 18 to become part of you. 19 Where are those institutions now and 20 why have they chosen to go to you rather than 21 staying where they are? 22 J. KRAFT: I'm going to defer it this

time to Dr. Mort, our Executive Vice President, 1 2 to comment on the current technical schools and the fabulous work he's been doing to have them 3 come in the fold of Title IV or designed to be 4 5 Titel IV. Thank you, Dr. Kraft and 6 G. MORT: 7 Kathleen, for that question. Unfortunately, I 8 don't have at my disposal where all those 30-plus 9 schools are coming from. I will tell you that historically, 10 that's an approximate amount of schools that we 11 12 have reaching out to us on an annual basis. So, that number is not out of the ordinary for us. 13 14 If I could just kind of pat myself or ourselves on the back here a little bit I can 15 16 tell you that schools do seek us out because of 17 our long tenure and our reputation. If you have 18 a more specific question that maybe I can answer 19 I'd be more than happy to do so. 20 K.S. ALIOTO: I would like to know, 21 you went from being regional and I first saw 22 Middle States I was assuming that we were going

to be dealing with institutions in Ohio and the Midwest.

3 But you have recently -- when did you 4 actually become a United States accreditor rather 5 than a regional accreditor?

6 G. MORT: It happened shortly after 7 Secretary DeVos made the decision to strip away 8 the geographic areas, so we submitted that 9 information to Mr. Bounds and his team and that's 10 when we opened the Agency to obtain app locations 11 from outside of our lower piece region.

12 K.S. ALIOTO: Although you don't know 13 where these schools are coming from, they could 14 be coming from any place in the country or in the 15 Virgin Islands? All that you don't know, could 16 somebody come up with that?

17G. MORT: My colleague, Mr. Rufo, may18have some more specific information.

D. Rufo: A lot of the schools that we've been working with recently are coming out of Florida, Virginia, and I have two in Texas right now.

1

-
K.S. ALIOTO: What is the default way
that you what is the red line of loan default
has occurred with one of your institutions, what
is your cut-off from that since you say that no
school has had a problem?
G. MORT: We follow the Department's
protocol on that so during the annual report, we
ask the school to report to us if they have had
any findings from the department.
K.S. ALIOTO: I see, it's not you as
accreditors who are looking at that, you're
depending on the Department to do that?
G. MORT: We do look at it on an
annual basis but it is part of the external audit
that we look at and then we confirm that with the
institution.
K.S. ALIOTO: So, if the Department of
Education highlights any of your institutions as
having problem in that area, then you address
that point, rather than being proactive?
G. MORT: During the annual report,
during the desk audit of the annual report, if

the associated Vice President sees that there is 1 2 a consistent number that's fairly high, it will be addressed with the school. 3 K.S. ALIOTO: And how often has that 4 5 happened? G. MORT: I have not had any and Mr. 6 7 Rufo is shaking his head so neither one of us 8 have had any institutions that have fallen into 9 an at-risk category. 10 K.S. ALIOTO: If you turn to Exhibit 11 12 in the report, have you had an audit since 12 2019? 13 G. MORT: We have, we have an annual 14 audit done our organization every year. 15 So, that audit is not K.S. ALIOTO: 16 part of our record so the audit, which said that 17 you were okay, according to the audit in 2019 but 18 the exhibits which indicate financial concerns I 19 wondered what had happened. 20 You had some concerns in 2018, 2019 and with COVID-19 in 2020 and I'm wondering in 21 22 2021, is that your latest audit?

1	G. MORT: Yes, we are just about to
2	enter 2021's audit so 2020 would be the last year
3	that we had a full audit.
4	K.S. ALIOTO: That wasn't included in
5	the documents but what you said in Exhibit 12 is
6	investments are recovering and the limited
7	availability of mail access hampered the
8	depositing of cash flows.
9	What does that mean?
10	G. MORT: I'm going to have to defer
11	a little bit on this question only because our
12	finances were handled by our previous president
13	and as you can see from Mr. Talbot's presence
14	here in the room, Dr. Macoli is no longer
15	president of the organization.
16	I will tell you that we have put in
17	place since 2019 several new ways for schools to
18	make dues payments towards us. No longer do they
19	need to necessarily write a check and send it to
20	us.
21	A lot of this can be done
22	electronically through the lock box at the bank

through wire transfers and other avenues. 1 So, I 2 will tell you in the past two years I have not seen an obstacle to schools paying their dues. 3 You also indicated in 4 K.S. ALIOTO: 5 2012 that your budget had decreased \$150,000 due to school closings, 15 so far and more to follow. 6 7 But you had 20 new schools in the pipeline 8 seeking approval. 9 That gave me cause for concern. 10 G. MORT: If you remember back during 11 that time, we had several natural disasters, some 12 of which were in Puerto Rico, some of which were down in the United States Virgin Islands, which 13 14 affected quite a few schools that needed to close 15 during that time. 16 I will tell you that none of those were career and technical schools that would 17 18 utilize us for gatekeeping for Title IV. These 19 were all on the secondary side of the Commission. 20 K.S. ALIOTO: We also want to talk 21 about writing off bad debts. What were those debts? 22

1	G. MORT: That's where accumulated
2	over a few years and that schools just did not
3	pay their dues over a certain period of time.
4	Our previous president made the
5	decision that she was going to try to eliminate
6	that debt at that time and gave those schools an
7	opportunity to pay any outstanding dues, those
8	that did not we removed from our membership ranks
9	and that's the reason why that particular year
10	there was a spike in dues that were written off.
11	Kathleen, I didn't want to interrupt,
12	none of those schools were post-secondary non-
13	degree granting career and technical schools.
14	They were, again, all on the secondary side.
15	K.S. ALIOTO: It was natural
16	disasters rather than anything else that caused
17	all those colleges to close or institutions?
18	G. MORT: That's correct.
19	K.S. ALIOTO: They're not but they
20	were.
21	G. MORT: That's correct.
22	K.S. ALIOTO: So, then we come to

1	Exhibit 25. It indicates that investments came
2	in June. You invest your portfolio. What is
3	that about?
4	G. MORT: Whenever we have a surplus,
5	which we have had for the past several years, we
6	do take that money and invest it into investment
7	accounts.
8	K.S. ALIOTO: Was that a common
9	practice? Is that common practice among the
10	industry?
11	G. MORT: We've been doing it as long
12	as we've been granted accreditation by you guys
13	and probably before that.
14	K.S. ALIOTO: Then you said the PPP,
15	the saving grace, was the COVID-19 relief fund
16	and you were going to seek loan forgiveness on
17	that. Did you get loan forgiveness on that?
18	G. MORT: We did apply for the PPE
19	loan. We were granted that loan and we also
20	applied for forgiveness and we were granted
21	forgiveness.
22	K.S. ALIOTO: How much was that loan?

1	G. MORT: It was \$354,000.
2	J. KRAFT: There was one other major
3	cost savings during that time. Middle States
4	does accreditation in over 100 countries, there's
5	a lot of travel but during the COVID-19 era the
6	travel was curtailed.
7	So, there was a huge savings as well
8	that was part of that financial report or should
9	be part of the financial report for 2020 and
10	2021.
11	K.S. ALIOTO: They would see that?
12	J. KRAFT: Yes, correct.
13	K.S. ALIOTO: I hope you can
14	understand my sense of uneasiness when I was
15	reading those exhibits but perhaps, Claude, do
16	you have some other question sit down him?
17	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Yes, I
18	certainly do, thanks Kathleen. Those were good
19	questions. I want to get to the finding right
20	away. You had mentioned there was going to be
21	enough data, the standards.
22	Obviously the compliance

issue deals with providing opportunity for your 1 2 member institutions to actually weigh in and have comment on those. 3 Could you talk to the deficiency in 4 how you plan to overcome that? 5 Absolutely, Claude, thank 6 G. MORT: you for the opportunity to address that. 7 8 We work very closely with our analysts 9 on this particular finding and I think it's important that we spend just a couple of minutes 10 and I can walk you all through what that process 11 12 was and what we're going to do to improve that 13 process moving forward. But we started our standard review 14 process literally five years ago. 15 It started 16 with Staff, we met as a Staff to take a look at 17 our current standards with really no direction in 18 mind. 19 We just took a white board and said 20 what's working for us, what's not working for us 21 and started at that stage. Then what we did is we reached out to 22

some of our cooperative partners and some of the other agencies that we are friendly with and took a look at what they were doing, shared what we were doing and asked them to take a look at what we were doing.

6 And we received comments back from 7 those folks at that time. From there what we did 8 is we put together many different focus groups 9 that consisted of different characteristics of 10 our membership.

11 That included the current impact role, 12 that included residential programs, it included 13 early education programs. So, we took a lot of 14 time to take a look these special purpose areas 15 that affects us.

From there what we did was we put together a small pilot group of 13 schools, correction, 13 organizations with 12 schools to take a look our new standards.

20 We actually asked them for feedback 21 over a period of about 9 months. We met with 22 them on three different occasions to talk about

1

2

3

4

1

what we were proposing.

2	They gave us feedback at that point.
3	Immediately, we took that feedback and put it
4	right back into the document. So, as we received
5	that feedback, it was immediately updated.
6	From there, we asked that same group
7	of 12 schools to actually go through the entire
8	process.
9	We put them through a self-study
10	process, posted a visiting team, and we received
11	feedback from the school, we received feedback
12	from the visiting team and again, updated that
13	document.
14	Where we realized in working with the
15	Department that we should have done is also
16	opened that up to public comment.
17	So, what we did in response to that
18	conversation that we had with our analyst was on
19	our website today folks can go to the career and
20	technical page, click on it, and provide us with
21	feedback on our standards anytime.
22	The second thing we did was we

realized that the policy that we currently have 1 2 in place did not include the public members being able to comment. 3 4 So, at a recent Executive Committee 5 meeting about a month or so ago, we actually updated that policy to state that we would 6 7 receive public feedback as well. 8 So, we thought it was a very 9 comprehensive process and we were thrilled to get the feedback from Karmon and her team to include 10 11 the update to the policy and to update the 12 ability for folks to provide comments on your website. 13 14 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: One, have you formalized that process? And two, is there ever 15 16 an opportunity for all your member institutions 17 to review and to comment? 18 G. MORT: Thank you, Claude, I can't 19 believe I skipped over that. Yes, absolutely. 20 It was towards the beginning of that 21 process as we started to codify some of the new standards. We did send that out to all of our 22

	2
1	members and allow them to provide us with
2	feedback as well.
3	We also ask our Commissioners and we
4	also ask the Members of our Advisory Committees
5	to take a look at that as well. Thank you for
6	putting that out.
7	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Did the pilot
8	group, do you feel like they were representative
9	of your full membership?
10	G. MORT: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: That helps. If
12	so, have you formalized this process into a
13	policy?
14	G. MORT: We formalized this into a
15	process that will align with the policy that we
16	have in place.
17	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: That sounds
18	good.
19	A few other questions, it sounded
20	like, based on your comments, that institutions
21	that are at the secondary level versus post-
22	secondary level tend to be more fragile if you

	u
1	will or may close more abruptly than those that
2	are in the post-secondary space?
3	Is that accurate? And if it is, can
4	you talk about the fragility of the secondary
5	institution versus the post-secondary?
6	G. MORT: I've never heard it put that
7	way but absolutely, you are correct. I will tell
8	you that the private secondary schools, we do
9	accredit.
10	They tend to be a little more, to use
11	your word, fragile and at the post-secondary
12	level because of the strong vetting process that
13	we go through to bring folks into Middle States
14	at the candidacy level.
15	We make sure that they're extremely
16	financially viable even before they obtain an
17	offer of candidacy. They're not even going to
18	become part of our membership without showing
19	that they have that financial ability to do so.
20	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: You had
21	mentioned or it was mentioned, 70 percent, I
22	think a 70 percent placement range is a

requirement, how did you derive the 70 percent mark?

That goes back several 3 G. MORT: We basically just decided at that time to 4 vears. use the Perkins model. It works quite well so we 5 adopted the Perkins model at 70 percent, we put 6 7 that out to our members. 8 We're going back probably 10 or 12 9 years, maybe even longer, receive that feedback from our member institutions say yes, we're 10 11 comfortable with 70. Full disclosure, many of 12 them said let's drop it to 60 and we said no. But that's been the model that would 13 14 have been using now for probably a dozen or 15

15 years. Claude, that 707070 rule that we call it 16 is 70 percent completion, 70 percent licensing, 17 and 70 percent placement. That's where we draw 18 the line in the sand.

19 G. MORT: There's not a lot of 20 accrediting bodies that have line standards 21 anymore so that's interesting that you still do 22 that.

1

I	
1	Another question I have deals with the
2	Title IV eligible institutions and looking at
3	student debt, and particularly the default rate.
4	What are the institutional characteristics of
5	those who carry larger default rates?
6	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: If I'm looking
7	at the dashboard statistics that you're probably
8	addressing, yes, if I was to look at the
9	accreditation dashboard, those are going to be
10	primarily public schools that opened their doors,
11	for example, for nursing programs or something
12	along those lines.
13	I would have to really dig into those
14	numbers but quite a few of them are quite a
15	small amount of those are going to be those
16	private for-profit institutions.
17	G. MORT: I think that answers most of
18	my questions, Mr. Chairman, if you want to open
19	it up.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Questions from the
21	Committee?
22	K.S. ALIOTO: I have one more.

		20
1	CHAIR KEISER: Go ahead, it's still	
2	your floor.	
3	K.S. ALIOTO: Does it cost \$10,000 to	
4	become a member? Because you had said that you	
5	were losing \$150,000 and there were 15 schools	
6	closing. Does it cost \$10,000 each?	
7	G. MORT: It doesn't, our dues and	
8	fees schedule is quite abundant. It's going to	
9	depend on the number of students that enroll in	
10	the school, it's going to depend on the	
11	characteristics of the school.	
12	But I will tell you it's not going to	
13	be in that \$10,000 range, it's going to be a lot	
14	lower than that.	
15	CHAIR KEISER: If I may follow up on	
16	that, when you were at Commission, one of the	
17	Commissions of the Middle States Association I	
18	assume because you even introduce yourself as the	
19	Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools	
20	if this is the secondary Commission.	
21	You do not do a separate financial	
22	audit from the parent organization?	
	-	

	20
1	G. MORT: Thank you for that question.
2	We probably should have clarified this a little
3	bit better.
4	We used to fall under the umbrella of
5	the Middle States Association and that included
6	the higher ed Commission, the secondary
7	Commission, and the elementary Commission.
8	We are now two totally distinct and
9	separate organizations, we no longer have a
10	parent organization. Our parent organization is
11	the Middle States Association of Colleges and
12	Schools. The higher Ed Commission, we
13	allow them to still utilize our name if they so
14	choose but we are no longer under the auspice of
15	that parent organization. We are separate and
16	distinct.
17	CHAIR KEISER: So, your corporation is
18	Middle States Colleges and Schools but you
19	operate under your recognition of secondary
20	schools.
21	G. MORT: That's correct. We're the
22	Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

and we're in front of you today with just one of
our Commissions, which is the Commission on
secondary schools.
CHAIR KEISER: Are other Commissions
within the organization?
G. MORT: There is one other
Commission and that is the Commission on
elementary schools.
CHAIR KEISER: Have they broken out
financial statements or is that a combined
financial statement for the total corporation?
G. MORT: You're counting that, Mr.
Chair, as of today we are one audit and one
budget. Back in 2019 we might have still been
split between the elementary and the secondary
Commission.
CHAIR KEISER: How would we know the
financial stability of the Commission we are
recognizing if they're combined with another
Commission?
G. MORT: It's all one and the same.
CHAIR KEISER: If you're including the

elementary school recognitions, you're not. 1 You 2 have two Commissions within the group, the secondary and element, your one corporation you 3 have a similar audit. I don't think you break it 4 5 out. At least, in the audit it did say 6 7 there are multiple Commissions within the 8 organization. So, how do we know the Commission 9 that we're recognizing today is financially 10 responsible? 11 D. Rufo: If I may, we operate as one The Commission you are looking to 12 organization. 13 recognize and we're hoping you will recognize is 14 responsible for secondary and post-secondary 15 schools. 16 So, when the schools come through, 17 they're responsible for the accreditations, the 18 decisions and so forth but because there is the 19 elementary Commission as well, their 20 responsibility is just the elementary schools. 21 They combine together to form the 22 Commission on Elementary and Secondary Schools,

which is what the budget is referencing to. 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: Okay, but in here it says the Commission on Secondary Schools, not 3 Elementary and Secondary Schools. I'm just 4 5 confused as to who is what and what are the audits reflecting. 6 7 And if, let's say, the 8 elementary school is doing great but the 9 secondary sized schools are not doing -- that 10 group is not putting the money into it, we would 11 not know, would we? 12 G. MORT: Mr. Chairman, we don't look at the schools as individual Commissions. 13 The accreditation action is taken at that level but 14 the revenue coming in goes to Middle States 15 16 Association of Colleges and Schools' Commissions 17 on Elementary and Secondary Schools. 18 CHAIR KEISER: I'm sorry, I took too 19 much time. Questions from the Committee? 20 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 21 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: I will have one 22 last --

	21.
1	CHAIR KEISER: Raise your hand, Wally,
2	You're welcome, because I can see your hand.
3	There's Claude too.
4	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: You see my
5	hand?
6	CHAIR KEISER: I did not, now I do.
7	So, Wally, Claude, and then Bob, how about that?
8	W. BOSTON: I think this is a question
9	for the General Counsel. I'm confused, I don't
10	know that we've had two agencies that are part of
11	one corporate shell.
12	Art, I actually got where you were
13	going, which is what if the secondary schools
14	don't support this, they think it's losing too
15	much money.
16	Although, at the same time, I'm not
17	sure that we have any precedent to look at it
18	from almost a cost accounting allocation
19	perspective, so I'm wondering if the General
20	Counsel has any advice for us.
21	G. MORT: There's no attorney in the
22	room so I will try to answer your question. Are

you asking your General Counsel or ours? 1 2 CHAIR KEISER: Our General Counsel. (Simultaneous Speaking.) 3 This is Angela Sierra from 4 A. SIERRA: 5 the Office of the General Counsel. I'm not sure whether the accreditation group Staff considered 6 7 that. 8 I'm not prepared to really answer the 9 question from a legal standpoint right now off the top of my head. So, I'm not sure if anybody 10 11 else has comments. 12 J. KRAFT: Hello again, everyone, Jim 13 Kraft. One important point would be that we have a joint Commission and all of the votes from the 14 15 Commissioners are handled first by their individual Commissions and then it comes before 16 the Joint Commission. 17 18 So, if one person makes a motion we 19 hear first elementary and then we hear a second 20 by a Commissioner from the secondary. So, there 21 is an accountability in checks and balances between the two. 22

	∠
1	And the same with Staff, we don't
2	divide the Staff or any of the bills, the
3	operating costs of Middle States by elementary
4	and secondary. It's always been that way, it's
5	been one joint process and one joint Commission
6	and the policies are all the same too.
7	There aren't separate policies for
8	elementary and secondary, they're all handled
9	through the joint operation.
10	G. MORT: Just a couple things to add
11	to what Dr. Kraft was saying, with respect to
12	policies, we do have additional policies in place
13	for our career and technical schools. That would
14	be in addition to the other policies that we have
15	already in place.
16	But I think it's important to know
17	that for the past several years, Middle States
18	has had a surplus and to be quite honest with
19	you, I'm a little surprised that this was in
20	front of us today only because we are very
21	financially sound with quite a robust investment
22	portfolio as well as our accounts in the bank.

	2
1	CHAIR KEISER: You've got to choose
2	loss and operations.
3	G. MORT: That was the last year that
4	we were in the red.
5	CHAIR KEISER: That's all we had.
6	Wally, questions? Bob?
7	B. SHIREMAN: On this financial issue
8	I'm not at all concerned about your finances. I
9	did want to clarify, I think there are a lot of
10	Commissions that have various operations that are
11	not 100 percent about their higher ed
12	accreditation.
13	But if for the purposes of the
14	elementary Commission you took on a large
15	liability that turned out to have been a poor
16	decision to have made, I assume that liability
17	would affect the whole organization and it would
18	be something that we should be concerned about
19	with regards to the secondary operation, even if
20	it happened in the context of your elementary.
21	Is that right? Is that what you mean
22	by your one overall organization?

	2.
1	G. MORT: That's exactly right, Bob.
2	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
3	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Beyond, I
4	appreciate that statement because I think we've
5	noticed in the last Agency we approved, the
6	pharmacy does more than just the Title IV piece,
7	they do a lot of different things as well.
8	I'm going to pivot a little bit and
9	ask whether or not I notice on the review, at
10	the very beginning the first review there were a
11	lot of non-compliance pieces and you were able to
12	get those into compliance except for the two
13	citations that we've got here.
14	Talk to us a little bit, is that
15	largely because of the change in the standards
16	and how does that transition work for all of you?
17	Can you speak a little bit to the a lot of non-
18	compliance and then you were able to become
19	compliant?
20	G. MORT: Thank you for that question.
21	I'm going to be very transparent here and Ms.
22	Sims-Coates can attest to this. We initially

sent in our initial submission, that was done by 1 2 the previous president and by the previous president alone. 3 No other individuals worked on that 4 5 report to the detriment of you guys getting that report. We tried several times to get other 6 7 individuals to work with her on that submission. 8 She felt it was her responsibility and 9 her responsibility alone. After her departure, I took on the 10 11 responsibility along with my colleague, Mr. Rufo, 12 and what we found by going through that process was what she originally submitted was incorrect 13 14 information and we corrected it immediately. So, to answer your question, a lot of 15 16 what was out of compliance we got in compliance 17 with providing the Department the correct 18 information. G. MORT: Congratulations on making 19 20 the adjustments in short order. 21 VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: I'm sweating. 22 That's all I had, Mr. Chairman.

	21
1	CHAIR KEISER: Herman, do you have a
2	comment?
3	H. BOUNDS: I did but I think
4	everybody has pretty much settled on the
5	financial issue.
6	I was going to say that the agency has been
7	recognized under this structure for quite some
8	time and we've had a long look to take a look at
9	the Agency's finances and we thought they were
10	adequate.
11	But I think it sounds like everybody
12	has settled on that issue now so I don't have
13	anything to add.
14	CHAIR KEISER: I don't see anymore
15	hands, that's good. Thank you very much, will
16	the staff person add to your observations?
17	K. SIMMS-COATES: I have no comments.
18	CHAIR KEISER: We'll go to the primary
19	readers. Kathleen and Claude, entertain the
20	motion.
21	K.S. ALIOTO: Do you want to make the
22	motion?

1	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: I'd be happy
2	to. I move that NACIQI recommend
3	that the senior department official grant Middle
4	States continued recognition with the required
5	compliance report to be submitted to the
6	Department within 12 months from the decision of
7	the SDO.
8	Is there a second?
9	J. DERBY: I'll second the motion.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Discussion? We had
11	that on the last one. No more discussion so
12	we'll call for a vote. Kathleen?
13	K.S. ALIOTO: No.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
15	R. ARTIS: Yes.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
17	J. BLUM: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
19	R. BOOTH: Yes.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
21	W. BOSTON: Yes.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?

	2
1	J. DERBY: Yes.
2	CHAIR KEISER: David?
3	D. EUBANKS: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
5	M. LINDSAY: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Molly?
7	M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
9	R. MAYES: Yes.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Mary-Ellen?
11	M.E. PETRISKO: Yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?
13	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Yes.
14	CHAIR KEISER: Bob?
15	B. SHIREMAN: Yes.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya?
17	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Steven? Are you still
19	with us? I guess he's not here. I don't see
20	him. We have a quorum and the motion passes.
21	Thank you very much, Members of the Middle State
22	Commission on Secondary Schools.

I	2
1	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
2	It is 3:00 p.m. We have a choice, we
3	could take the afternoon off, are the people from
4	ABA here, George?
5	G.A. SMITH: They should be. They are
6	standing by, she can send an email if you wanted
7	them too. All agencies, especially those on the
8	following day are notified early on before the
9	meeting begins to be on standby just in case the
10	pace goes pretty quick.
11	CHAIR KEISER: If you do leave here
12	this afternoon, George and I discussed it, we
13	could have a policy discussion in the morning and
14	then have our SACs in the afternoon so we could
15	be sure that we have a quorum, unless there's an
16	objection from the Members.
17	G.A. SMITH: Just to clarify, Art,
18	it's still possible for us to have a quorum even
19	though Ronnie can't join us until the afternoon.
20	But in case
21	CHAIR KEISER: Just in case it will
22	give us comfort.
-	

1	22
1	G.A. SMITH: I got you, I just wanted
2	to make sure people understood we could still do
3	SACs in the morning if you went with the next
4	Agency.
5	J. DERBY: I like that plan.
6	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
7	CHAIR KEISER: How about ADA, are they
8	around or no?
9	G.A. SMITH: They're saying they're
10	here. They're here, it might take a moment. If
11	you guys are interested maybe we could take a
12	quick break.
13	CHAIR KEISER: We'll take a five-
14	minute break, we'll be back here at 3:06 p.m.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
16	went off the record at 3:01 p.m. and
17	resumed at 3:07 p.m.)
18	CHAIR KEISER: Thank you for waiting
19	for us. We are going to have a fourth agency
20	that we're going to review today and the current
21	Agency up for renewal of recognition is the
22	American Demo Associations, condition on Demo

1

accreditation, ADA CODA.

2	The primary readers are Jennifer Blum
3	and Robert Shireman, the departmental staff is
4	Mike Stein. Jennifer, Bob, you're up.
5	J. BLUM: Bob, I'll do the intro. The
6	Commission on Dental Accreditation CODA is a non-
7	Title IV programmatic accreditor.
8	The Agency's accrediting activities
9	include the accreditation of pre-doctoral,
10	dental education programs leading to the DDS or
11	DMD degree, advanced general dentistry education
12	programs, advanced dental specialty education
13	programs, and the allied dental education
14	programs, including dental assisting education
15	programs, dental hygiene education programs,
16	dental laboratory technology education programs
17	and dental therapy education programs, and those
18	developing programs that have attained initial
19	accreditation status and those programs offered
20	via distance education.
21	The Agency accredits more than 1400
22	programs, currently covering 22 dental education

areas.

2	Recognition by the Secretary allows
3	the programs accredited by CODA to participate in
4	federal programs other than Title IV,
5	specifically the Public Health Service Act
6	administered by HHS.
7	The Agency is not required to meet
8	separate and independent requirements because of
9	its federal link. Its federal link is not Title
10	IV federal assistance.
11	The predecessor to CODA was first
12	recognized in 1952 and the last full review of
13	the Agency was conducted at the June 2012 NACIQI
14	meeting. The Agency completed a compliance
15	report in 2013 and a focused review in 2017, at
16	which time it was renewed for five years.
17	CHAIR KEISER: Mike?
18	M. STEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
19	Committee Members, my name is Mike Stein and I'm
20	providing a summary of the petition for renewal
21	of recognition for the American Dental
22	Association Commission on Dental Accreditation,

1

also known as CODA or the Agency.

_	
2	The accreditation to the senior
3	department official is that the agency has
4	substantial compliance in its recognition should
5	be the need for five years.
6	Department Staff identified one
7	outstanding issue regarding the agency laws
8	related to the recognition area of basic
9	eligibility, organizational, and administrative
10	requirements.
11	Department Staff recommends the Agency
12	submit a monitoring report 12 months from the
13	date of the senior department official's letter.
14	The monitoring report should include
15	rosters for each site visit conducted during the
16	12-month period that clearly identifies each
17	person and their role on each site visit team.
18	This recommendation is based on a
19	review of the Agency's petition and supporting
20	documentation as well as three virtual
21	observations that included an AGC Commission
22	meeting conducted in January of 2021, a file

review conducted during August 2021, and a review 1 2 Committee meeting conducted January 2022. The Department received one complaint 3 against the Agency during the review period which 4 5 was closed with no further action. Therefore, as we said earlier, the 6 7 Department Staff is recommending to the senior 8 department official to renew the Agency's 9 recognition of the nationally recognized accrediting agency at this time subject to 10 11 refreshment and review of the monitoring report 12 due in 12 months. 13 The representatives here from the 14 organization will be happy to take any questions 15 you may have. 16 CHAIR KEISER: Are there any questions 17 by the Committee to any of the Staff? 18 J. BLUM: Yes, I have some. I just 19 want to make sure that I understand -- I don't 20 want to lose you on this but this issue that's 21 causing the monitoring report, is it the 22 Department is reading the regulation, the

criteria to require that the Agency, or any 1 2 Agency for that matter, have each an educator and a practitioner as part of the site visiting teams 3 as opposed to one person can't satisfy both 4 roles? 5 M. STEIN: That's correct. 6 7 It's my understanding in the past that 8 our understanding of that regulation is a 9 problematic accrediting agency you have to have 10 at least one educator and one practitioner on every site visit team as well as decision-making 11 12 bodies and other review bodies. 13 J. BLUM: And there can't be a person 14 who can satisfy both being an educator and a practitioner, which by the way happens? 15 There 16 are such people. 17 M. STEIN: Right, particularly in 18 CODA's case, it's easy for someone to meet the 19 definition of both roles, which is fine. There 20 should be one person filling one role at a time. 21 They could be an 22 educator/practitioner, which is how they're often

labeled but you would want each role separately 1 2 identified on the site team. I don't know if the Chairman will jump 3 4 in if he has anything else to add from a 5 historical perspective but that's my understanding of how we've enforced that in the 6 7 past. 8 (Simultaneous Speaking.) 9 J. BLUM: Before Herman jumps in, because I am interested in Herman's point, the 10 11 actual criteria reads educator, practitioners 12 and/or employers on its evaluation. 13 So, that and/or, to me, if I were 14 reading it as an Agency I might think it could be a single -- that you don't have have to have all 15 16 three because you have an and/or. 17 I'm going to ask CODA similar 18 questions but to me this is an example of a 19 monitoring report that's one year out, which I 20 also have a question about. 21 Can we just say they can accomplish the monitoring report in the next three weeks? 22 Ι

looked at that and I believe you don't have to 1 2 wait a year on monitoring reports. And this one to me seems truly 3 administrative if all that we're asking them for 4 5 is to designate on their rosters that they have one of each. Although, in my personal view 6 7 that's not necessarily required by the criteria. So, I am interested in thoughts on 8 9 this from the Staff perspective. 10 M. STEIN: Sure, and Herman can chime 11 in with any historical perspective, I would say 12 that the finding isn't one of significance. It seemed to me our definition is substantial 13 14 compliance. 15 It was clear from a review of their 16 documentation that in general, their policies 17 speak to including education or education 18 representative and practitioners on their site 19 visit teams. 20 The details of the policy that talked 21 about the composition of each site visit team was a little confusing and it wasn't clear that it 22

required educators and practitioners on every 1 2 site visit team for each specialty discipline. In fact, one of them, if not two, if 3 I remember correctly, talked about including 4 administrators, which isn't something that's 5 required for programmatic accrediting agencies. 6 And it was clear from looking at the 7 general roster of site visitors, they included 8 9 minimum educators and practitioners. I do understand from talking with the 10 Director that within their specialty it's very 11 12 easy for someone to be an educator and a 13 practitioner. 14 And the documentation for each specific site visit team, some clearly indicated 15 16 educators and practitioners, some it was just a 17 little unclear. So, that was the reason for the 18 recommendation. 19 I'll let Herman speak to any kind of 20 historical knowledge about how we've interpreted 21 or enforced that rule. 22 H. BOUNDS: In the past, that has been our interpretation of having individuals serve a specific role on the site team. It would seem a little odd if you had a supply team and you had one person, say, serving in three different roles.

I think somebody could challenge that
in some sort of complaint review or something in
that matter. But we've always looked at that as
having an educator, a practitioner now the new
regulation says educator practitioner and/or
employer.

12 That's some of the history on the 13 background and whether NACIQI believes otherwise 14 is something for NACIQI to evaluate.

15 CHAIR KEISER: Do we have questions 16 from Staff?

J. BLUM: I had one other which is I noted and I'll ask the Agency about this as well, it seemed like in terms of negative actions, adverse actions that the Agency can take, looked like they only have two, denial, which presumably is from initial accreditation and withdrawal.

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

1

2

3

4

i	4
1	And those are the only two adverse
2	actions. Mike, am I reading that correctly? I
3	just want to make sure. Is that your read too?
4	M. STEIN: That's correct.
5	J. BLUM: That seems somewhat unique,
6	I haven't seen that before and I'll ask about
7	that further but thank you.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Now we have the Agency
9	to present and I'd recognize Dr. Sherin Tooks,
10	the Director of CODA, and have you introduce your
11	fellow panel members.
12	S. TOOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	My name is Sherin Tooks and I am the
14	Director of the Commission on Dental
15	Accreditation. I have with me Dr. Sanjay Mallya,
16	who is our current Vice Chair, and Ms. Kathryn
17	Albrecht, who is CODA's legal Counsel.
18	I will turn it over to Dr. Malia to
19	make opening remarks and I believe that he will
20	present some information, Ms. Blum, to your
21	question regarding the site visit team
22	composition and then certainly, we're happy to

address any questions that NACIQI has. 1 2 Thank you so much. S. Mallya: Good afternoon, my name is 3 4 Dr. Sanjay Mallya and I'm the Vice Chair of the 5 Commission of Dental Accreditation, also known as Dr. Tooks and Ms. Albrecht are here with 6 CODA. 7 me. 8 CODA's Chair, Dr. Bruce Rotter, was 9 unable to join us today but sends his regards. We'd like to thank the USDA Staff, in particular 10 11 Mike Stein and Dr. Bowens for their current 12 review of the petition for readmission and 13 guidance throughout the process. 14 We also thank the members of NACIOI for the review of our petition. CODA takes pride 15 16 in ensuring fulfilment of its mission just to 17 serve the public and the dental profession by 18 developing and implementing accreditation 19 standards. 20 But more importantly, continuous 21 scholarity and improvement of dental education 22 programs.

Since its initial recognition in 1952, 1 2 CODA has consistently applied a rigorous dental education program to all dental and dental 3 -related education programs that seek 4 accreditation for that standard developed through 5 the broad communities of interest and nationally 6 7 accepted. CODA's program review and due process 8 9 mechanics allows for a fairer and consistent and objective review of dental education programs 10 seeking accreditation, all the accreditation by 11 12 the Commission to clear policies and procedures 13 as well as robust interest protocols. 14 Further the Commission applies a continuous monitoring process for education 15 16 programs through various policies and procedures 17 including its annual selling, program changes, 18 and government increases and others. 19 Further, students and the public have 20 entertained CODA process through very mechanisms 21 including student engagement through interviews 22 with educational site visits, representation of a

public member on each of its 17 review Committees 1 2 which are advisory to CODA, representation of a student and full public members on the Board of 3 Commissioners, and the ability to fight 4 complaints against programs under CODA's purview. 5 The engagement in the readmission 6 process under the new regulations, the government 7 8 took swift action to devise its policies and 9 procedures to align with the changes made to the criteria for recognition. 10 11 In doing so, we believe the process of 12 re-recognition has served its process of allowing the Commission to review and strengthen its 13 14 accreditation program. As we conclude our opening remarks, we 15 16 would like provide further comment on the USDA 17 analysis related to CODA's compliance in 602 15A4 18 which states educators, practitioners, and are 19 employers on its evaluation, policy, and 20 decision-making values if the agency-accredited 21 programs are single purpose institutions and 22 their students are in specific professions.

1	The Commission believes that it has
2	met this critical intent of 602.A4 and asks
3	NACIQI to consider the following perspective in
4	making a recommendation to the USDA.
5	First the most recent USDA recognition
6	criteria indicates educators, practitioner and
7	our employers, which I guess for the and/or and
8	comma placement provide a list of potential
9	individuals who may be enrolled in the process.
10	We note that the prior recognition
11	criteria stated educators and practitioners. The
12	new regulation appears to allow greater
13	flexibility than the prior regulation. CODA also
14	notes that we have educators and practitioners on
15	our site visit team with the teams and the
16	Commission.
17	Second, CODA believes that among
18	program to program accreditation agencies and
19	especially those with healthcare themes,
20	professionals maybe hope educators and
21	practitioners concurrently.
22	Students all complained in clinical

settings under the clinical license of an 1 2 educator who is also a practitioner. In fact, user individuals who can fill 3 both roles concurrently schedule the 4 5 accreditation review process because these individuals can apply the education principles 6 needed for student learning along with the 7 8 practice experience needed upon graduation. 9 The ability of the distance of knowledge and skill are critical in 10 11 accreditation. 12 Third, we are unsure why an individual is 13 prohibited from serving concurrently in two 14 roles, namely, educator and practitioner since 15 the criteria did not stipulate this provision as 16 part of the requirement. But the intent is that the site was 17 18 the only real material based on the road side, we 19 feel the value of having an individual who can serve marked roles is lost. 20 21 Site visitors draw upon all of their knowledge and experience as educators and 22

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

practitioners in conducted review and this study goes to the individual to see a varied perspective.

Following CODA's review of the initial staff analysis, CODA marked by its policies and procedures to more clearly identify the roles of educator and practitioner.

8 Further, following the review of the 9 final report, that review of the team data will 10 rely on the education program of the prior year 11 using the criteria that an individual can only 12 serve in one role.

CODA found that approximately 94 of the 95 advanced site visits and 85 of the 88 advanced site visits in the last year included themes with one educator and one practitioner if CODA were to have assigned this role to individuals in a single program.

As noted, CODA revised its policies to require site visitors to inform CODA of the educator of practitioner status and will make site with team assignments available. However,

1

2

through a retrospective review, we believe that 1 2 we have complied with this criteria. The Commission will move forward with 3 4 assigning site visitors to a single role and 5 request that NACIQI consider this matter and the interpretation of 631 15A4. 6 7 Based on our recent data analysis, we 8 respectfully request that CODA be found compliant 9 with no further reporting required. Ms. 10 Albrecht and I are happy to answer any questions 11 that you may have. Thank you for the opportunity to make 12 13 this introductory statement. 14 CHAIR KEISER: Thank you. Our primary readers, Bob and Jennifer? 15 B. SHIREMAN: Jennifer, you go ahead 16 17 and start. 18 J. BLUM: Thanks for the presentation 19 and I'm inclined to agree with you. For the 20 discussion purposes for particularly later when we're contemplating motions, I think it's good to 21 22 have a conversation with you now about it.

Ī	4
1	I tend to agree with you because I
2	don't think somebody who serves as both, there
3	was somebody who was an educator and a
4	practitioner, when they're going to do a site
5	review all of the sudden can only put one hat on.
6	They're probably going to be looking
7	at whatever it is they're reviewing with both
8	hats, and actually, I think that's a good thing.
9	I think it would only become
10	problematic if for some reason there was only one
11	site visitor and that one site visitor was
12	covering all three bases and that would get a
13	little messy and squirrelly. But that's not the
14	situation here.
15	What I'm seeing and what I think I'm
16	seeing is simply a really, really administrative-
17	type error where people weren't labeled. It
18	wasn't that the site visitors didn't comply with
19	the requirements of the criteria.
20	And so I guess I assume that based on
21	your presentation, that's pretty much exactly
22	what your feelings are on this.

I	2
1	S. Mallya: That's correct, and
2	perhaps I would let Dr. Tooks state the question
3	on these.
4	S. TOOKS: If I may, we do believe
5	that in the instances that we went back to
6	retrospectively, as Dr. Mallya indicated, there
7	were less than a handful that we didn't feel
8	confident making the determination
9	retrospectively.
10	But moving forward, we certainly have
11	put in place a form that our site visitors are
12	actually going to be designating that they
13	qualify in those two criteria, which either/or,
14	or perhaps both, so that it aligns with the
15	policy that we put in place to direct report the
16	requirement.
17	J. BLUM: I have a follow-up on this
18	and then I have two different subject matter
19	questions. On this, do you feel that you need a
20	year to file a monitoring report that would
21	satisfy the Department's request?
22	S. TOOKS: No, not necessarily, it

would be a matter of whether -- if I may, I think 1 2 there are a couple of issues here. First of all, the comma placement and 3 4 then the and/or lead us to the question as to 5 whether you actually need all three or any of the combination of the three or perhaps you could 6 have two educators or two practitioners on a 7 8 team. 9 So, we believe that the language and comma placement and the use of and/or allow the 10 accrediting agency the flexibility to dictate its 11 team composition as it deems appropriate with any 12 combination of those individuals, not necessarily 13 two different distinct individuals. 14 That's Issue 1. 15 16 If we are to be held to the 17 interpretation that has occurred we are in the 18 process now, as we have implemented a new policy 19 on this, we are in the process of collecting that information from our site visitors and moving 20 21 forward will dictate you are the educator, you 22 are the practitioner for the purpose of complying

1

with this requirement.

2	However, we still contend that the
3	most robust process of an accreditation review
4	comes from individuals who can actually serve in
5	any role which they have background and
6	experience and expertise to do.
7	J. BLUM: I'm going to move on to
8	different topics.
9	As I mentioned with the Department
10	Staff, I was kind of curious, I noted that it
11	seems like you only have two adverse actions and
12	in a way, only one because I assume you only use
13	denial on the initial review.
14	I guess you could use it on a renewal.
15	And then withdrawal.
16	So, you have no show-cause, you have
17	no probation, do you provide, because the way I
18	look at accreditation, not that it's great to
19	have multi layers of negative action so I'm not
20	suggesting that either but do you provide
21	commentary on improvement?
22	I will say it made me a little bit

concerned because oh, my gosh, if you jump from 1 2 approval to withdrawal and there's no gray space in between, it seems like you would be wanting to 3 4 approve everybody. 5 And so that's just my interpretation, you can read the slip too. So, I really want to 6 7 give an opportunity to you on what there is in 8 between approval and withdrawal if there is 9 anything in between. Absolutely, that's a great 10 S. TOOKS: I'll start by saying this is my 20th 11 question. 12 year with CODA and I have been serving as the Director of CODA for the last nine years. 13 14 I've been before this group, this is my third time with you and I say all of that to 15 16 state that in my 20 years with CODA, these have 17 been our accreditation standards. 18 I don't know the history or the 19 statuses I should say, the accreditation statuses 20 of programs. I don't know the initial history as 21 to how these statuses came to be but I believe 22 that they are in place to essentially simplify

the process.

2	And you're correct that denial of
3	accreditation is an adverse action that is
4	appealable related to an applicant program.
5	Withdrawal of accreditation is an
6	adverse action that's appealable related to re-
7	recognition or re-accreditation of a program,
8	however, we also have an approval with reporting
9	requirement status and we have an intent to
10	withdraw that could be added to the approval with
11	reporting requirement status.
12	And those statuses are used in between
13	the full, if you will call it full,
14	reaccreditation approval without reporting
15	requirements leading to a potential withdrawal of
16	accreditation.
17	So, those statuses certainly alert the
18	program that there are deficiencies. All of our
19	transmittal letters to programs provide them with
20	details as to the deficiencies as well as the
21	requested information.
22	So, they have very clear instruction

as to the deficiency citation and the information 1 2 the CODA needs to see for them to become compliant. And the programs have generally 3 4 speaking an 18 to 24-month timeframe to come in 5 to compliance. CODA will use the intent to withdraw add-on, 6 7 if you will, to the approval with reporting 8 requirement status typically in the last six 9 months. And CODA may extend for good cause if 10 11 there is a good cause reason deemed appropriate 12 by the Commission, but that's kind of the 13 chronology if you will of our accreditation 14 statuses. 15 That's extremely helpful and J. BLUM: 16 actually makes me feel a lot better. My last 17 question is on student achievement standards and I think Bob may have questions about this but I 18 19 just have one. 20 On licensure pass rates, I saw a 21 figure, I think it was Figure 9 of Exhibit 170, 22 but anyway it was really a high impressive

licensure rate, which is great, but I just wanted
 to ask about that.

3 It's noted that it's the percentage of 4 graduates who take the -- it's a pass rate for 5 those who take the exam. Just out of curiosity, 6 are there graduates who don't take the licensure 7 exam that you know of?

8 Is there a certain percentage of folks 9 who go through programs that are licensure 10 programs and for whatever personal reasons don't 11 take the exam?

S. TOOKS: With the Commission being large in the number of program disciplines that we accredit, I'm going to give you a different answer depending on the discipline.

In dental education, leading to the DDS or DMD, which is a practicing general dentist, those individuals generally have to attend a code-accredited program as well as sit for a national written and clinical exam to be licensed.

22

In those cases, generally anyone who

is a graduate of a program is going to have to 1 2 take those licensing exams to be licensed to The same applies for dental hygiene, 3 practice. those are licensed state regulated state 4 licensure licensed professionals. 5 In advanced dental education, those 6 7 individuals are already licensed dentists but they may be getting board-certified in a 8 9 specific, quote, specialty of dentistry, which 10 would be beyond the DDS or DMD degree. And I used, quote, specialty, because 11 12 CODA doesn't define the specialties of dentistry 13 and we make a really big point of clarifying that 14 to everyone but we accredit these advanced education disciplines. 15 16 In allied dental education, I 17 mentioned dental hygiene as being a licensed 18 profession. Two of the other allied disciplines 19 that we accredit, dental assisting and dental 20 laboratory technology, it depends on the state. 21 But generally speaking, if I were to generalization, I would say they're not generally 22

licensed so in other words you may not even have
 to attend a CODA-accredited program to practice
 in those two disciplines.

In those cases, the completion rate and the sitting for a certification exam may not correlation with one another as nicely because you don't have to have that certification of practice.

9 That was helpful, and then J. BLUM: one last question about the licensure rate that I 10 11 saw and now I don't have it in front of me so I 12 don't know which one it was but I was just 13 curious, I know some age when we look at 14 licensure rates, sometimes it's licensure pass rates of the first time they took the exam versus 15 16 the second.

17Do you know off the top of your head18if the licensure pass rates that you're19referencing are just based on a one attempt pass20rate?21S. TOOKS: I don't know that off the22top of my head but I do know that when we are

accrediting programs when we're doing the actual 1 2 on-site visitation, those discussions are had by the site visit team and the programs as part of 3 4 their outcomes assessment process. 5 J. BLUM: I was wondering because the rates that I saw were so high and not that it's 6 possible that they are on the first attempt but I 7 8 was wondering whether some of them are on --9 which is also fine, to have a second or third 10 attempt. 11 But I was just curious. I think those 12 will satisfy my questions. Bob? 13 B. SHIREMAN: Thank you for your 14 presentation. I'm glad that Jennifer brought up the 15 16 issue of approval versus denial and I'm totally 17 fine with the way that you are doing it and even 18 to caution you about going in a direction of 19 having a bunch of in between stops. 20 And the example I'll provide is that 21 the IRS review of tax exempt entities used to be 22 just approval or deny and a bunch of observers

said the IRS is too reluctant to do anything when
 there are problems.

We need to give them some intermediate 3 4 sanctions but now some commentators are seeing 5 that the intermediate sanctions have created a situation where people are more willing to 6 7 violate the rules because they figure there will 8 just be a penalty, I'll pay the penalty and deal 9 with it afterwards. 10 So, as long as you actually are 11 monitoring and notifying folks, there is a 12 benefit to them knowing there are severe 13 consequences if they do not come into compliance. 14 So, I support what you're doing there. You'll probably notice that I ask a 15 16 lot about public members, the regulatory 17 requirements for public members are pretty 18 minimal. I'm just saying they cannot be 19 associated with any of your accreditation 20 colleges. 21 You go further, you say there cannot even be a dentist or a member of the allied 22

dental field. So, I think that's great, you've
got the dean of a law school, professor of
optometry and a nurse who actually as a Ph.D. in
higher education leadership.
Can you tell me how this approach to
public members evolved and what role you asked
your public members to play?
S. TOOKS: Absolutely, I believe that
the Commission values greatly the participation
of public members.
As we've indicated in our petition, we
have public members on each of our 17 review
Committees which are advisory to the Commission
and then we have four public members out of the
33 Board of Commission Members.
The evolution of public member
criteria has really been this has been a long-
standing criteria of the Commission, that they
not have any ties to dentistry and I believe that
this is in place really to ensure that we have
that public perspective, more so than input from
individuals who already are aware of dentistry or

the dental education practicing professional 1 2 characteristics. We get a lot of that already from our other 3 4 members who bring their expertise and so we're 5 pretty firm about the expectation for our public members. 6 7 It is very difficult, I will say, to 8 find public members but we somehow manage to do 9 so and I think they bring a great perspective and they're valued very greatly. 10 11 B. SHIREMAN: Your annual surveys that 12 you provided, thank you for providing that and that is quite a data book. I notice that Table 13 14 21 has student loan volumes by institution, meaning the total amount of student loans that 15 16 they have. 17 But I didn't see anything in terms of 18 average student loan debt in different 19 disciplines. Is that something that you track? 20 S. TOOKS: I suspected you would ask 21 this question. 22 Having sat in on all of the other

www.nealrgross.com

sessions the last day and a half, it's actually 1 2 not something that CODA tracks directly, however, I did look and find a sister agency, if you will, 3 which is the American Dental education 4 5 Association does collect information from graduating students and their latest data, and I 6 7 apologize that I'm looking at the side, I'm 8 looking at another screen, that I was able to 9 find reflects that the average dental school debt in 2021 reported by senior dental students is 10 11 about the same as it was in 2016. 12 So, that's the data that's available 13 right now, CODA doesn't specifically collect that 14 information. I do suspect that some 15 B. SHIREMAN: 16 of the more importantly student loan debt and 17 earnings data to track would be for some of the 18 allied dental fields where the earnings I'm 19 guessing are probably more variable. 20 So, I would encourage you to make use of that data which is more available than it's 21 ever been before. 22

A couple of other items you have in 1 2 the annual survey, you have a rank order of schools by the percentage of financial aid 3 4 revenue and then there's also percentage of 5 financial aid expenses. I have two questions, when you say 6 financial aid revenue, does that include loans or 7 8 are we talking about grants? And then I wasn't 9 sure what you meant by financial aid revenue of an institution. 10 11 They're very low numbers so I'm 12 assuming it's not Title IVA because I would think 13 that would be a high number. 14 S. TOOKS: I'm not 100 percent clear on what you're looking at but I would say a lot 15 of the data that we collect is twofold. 16 17 Table 12 is the one that B. SHIREMAN: 18 I'm asking is financial aid revenue if you happen 19 to have it. 20 S. TOOKS: I do not, I apologize, but 21 I would say this, the data that we collect 22 related to our annual survey serves a couple of

1	purposes. One is that of course it's			
2	very important to the accreditation process and			
3	we actually use the annual survey data, we			
4	compile it for a program for the last five years			
5	and provide it to a site visit team.			
6	They have essentially a five-year			
7	compilation of the program's changes and things			
8	like that, so it's very valuable in that regard.			
9	Additionally, the dental education			
10	programs themselves like to benchmark against one			
11	another and so we publish a lot of what we			
12	consider publicly available information so the			
13	programs can utilize that to compare themselves			
14	with other educational programs.			
15	B. SHIREMAN: One other figure, Figure			
16	11, just to be aware of, it talks about dental			
17	assisting programs and it has the number of			
18	students requesting financial aid.			
19	My guess is that's grants and loans,			
20	it is very useful to differentiate at least from			
21	a student perspective.			
22	The school gets the money either way			

but from a student perspective it has a very
 different feel and I think important to the
 monitoring those sorts of things.

On recruiting practices, a lot of agencies take a minimalist approach to the requirement that they have a policy on recruiting.

8 Your policy statement on advertising and 9 recruiting is a quite strong statement that institutions should not only avoid outright lies 10 11 but they must it says, quote, exhibit integrity 12 and responsibility in advertising and recruitment 13 and that responsible self-regulation requires 14 rigorous attention to principles of et cetera practice, which seems like a good just general 15 16 don't do sleazy things, don't try to come as 17 close as possible to the line.

Be very et cetera. What kind of monitoring do you use to enforce this policy? S. TOOKS: This policy along with I would say coupled with the standards that we have on admissions and student recruitment, the

standards along with admission talk about having 1 2 written admissions policies and procedures. And so those things are reviewed very 3 4 closely during an accreditation site visit. something. That's when I would say the most 5 rigorous review occurs. 6 7 Having said that, it is not too 8 frequent but it does happen in which we learn of 9 perhaps some advertising that's going on in which 10 we will write to a program and say, look, you 11 need to clean up your website, you're not stating 12 this in accordance with what we allow for your 13 accreditation status or it's incomplete or you're 14 not clarifying your accreditation sponsoring organization. 15 16 We have written those letters and will

16 we have written those letters and will
17 take action when things are brought to our
18 attention and do so as needed.

B. SHIREMAN: That leads well into my
last question, which is you say in your narrative
that you recently changed your policies so that
you could respond to anonymous complaints and I

(202) 234-4433

	∠
1	imagine that a complaint about an ad might
2	sometimes be anonymous.
3	Can you explain what led to your
4	change in policy?
5	S. TOOKS: We were advised many years
6	ago to consider both formal written complaints,
7	which we consider signed by an individual whom we
8	can correspond and have a name to as well as
9	anonymous complaints.
10	So, the Commission will accept
11	anonymous complaints and by that what we mean are
12	individuals who we can't communicate with.
13	They've either created perhaps a fake email
14	account or sent something in the mail to us.
15	We take all of those seriously and so
16	in doing so an anonymous complaint, just because
17	it's anonymous, shouldn't be this regarded.
18	If it has merit and potential need for
19	review, then the Commission will take action to
20	proceed with that review and inform a program of
21	the receipt of that information and desire to
22	inquire as to their compliance with a potential

1 outstanding area. 2 B. SHIREMAN: Thank you so much. CHAIR KEISER: Further questions while 3 4 I have everybody on? Jill? M.E. PETRISKO: Thank you very much 5 for your presentation. 6 7 CHAIR KEISER: You need to get closer 8 to your microphone. 9 J. DERBY: I'm doing my best, thank Thank you for your 10 you for reminding me. 11 presentation and your very clear answers to the 12 questions that have been asked so far. 13 I want to actually encourage Members 14 of the Department to take seriously what you have 15 been saying about the educator and practitioner 16 being together in one person. 17 I think that is tremendous strength to 18 have both of those together and to allow that to 19 happen, unless of course, as Jennifer said, 20 there's only one person on a team, which I assume never happens for you. 21 22 I just wanted to say I think it's a

great idea for you to interpret it that way. 1 2 I apologize for this next question because it did not come up to me until the 3 primary readers were talking so I did not look at 4 5 your website about this but with regards to the statuses you have of approval or withdrawal, my 6 understanding ordinarily has been that withdrawal 7 8 is voluntary on the part of the institution. 9 Is withdrawal, as CODA uses that term, 10 both voluntary and involuntary and however any 11 member of the public know what the difference 12 would be? I believe I lost Dr. 13 S. TOOKS: 14 Petrisko. Is that me or is that everyone? I think her question 15 CHAIR KEISER: 16 was how do you define withdrawal of recognition? 17 S. TOOKS: Sure. 18 I believe the intent here is to 19 distinguish between an action that would be an adverse action, which is what we refer to as 20 21 withdrawal versus the program voluntarily 22 discontinuing its own accreditation with CODA,

1	1
1	which is the program choosing to close or no
2	longer be accredited by CODA.
3	And the language or term we use for
4	that, term of art if you will, is discontinue
5	accreditation. We actually have two separate
6	terms.
7	Discontinuing is the term that is the
8	program's choice to discontinue, the withdrawal
9	is CODA's adverse action against a program.
10	M.E. PETRISKO: Thank you, as long as
11	it's defined that way and it's clear, thank you
12	very much.
13	With regards to the approval with reporting,
14	is there any gradation there because a report can
15	be you haven't updated your student handbook or
16	it could be we found that your faculty aren't
17	qualified.
18	And those are very different things.
19	So, again, as far as informing the public about
20	how well an institution is doing, how is that
21	communicated if there really are gradations in
22	what's needed?

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 262

S. TOOKS: We don't rank, if you will, 1 2 the severity of educational standards and their compliance thereof. So, in our view as CODA, the 3 approval with reporting requirements status is 4 used for any outstanding area in which the 5 program is out of compliance. 6 The severity of it becomes impactful 7 8 when the intent withdraw is added to it, which is 9 typically within that last six months before the withdrawal adverse action may take effect. 10 11 But again, trying to be succinct and 12 clear and as simple as possible, there's no 13 variability, it's approval with reporting 14 requirements if a program is out of compliance with any standards. 15 16 M.E. PETRISKO: Thank you, that's very 17 helpful. 18 CHAIR KEISER: Jill? 19 J. DERBY: Yes, a quick question, on 20 your Commission, particularly your site visits, I 21 know that you accredit dental hygiene programs. 22 Do you include dental hygienists in those groups?

	2
1	S. TOOKS: Absolutely, and thank you
2	for the question, Dr. Derby. Yes, CODA is a peer
3	review process and so the site visit teams are
4	peers in that particular discipline.
5	So, using the discipline that you just
6	identified, the site visit team to a dental
7	hygiene program would be dental hygienists. The
8	site visit team to a pediatric dentistry program
9	would be pediatric dentists, et cetera.
10	J. DERBY: That's helpful, thank you.
11	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
12	J. BLUM: Apologies for another
13	question but Mary-Ellen prompted me to think of
14	something else related to her line. So, if you
15	only have the actions that you have and you don't
16	have probation, there are a number of federal
17	regulations.
18	And again, I'm not necessarily
19	suggesting you should have probation but because
20	you don't, there are a number of regulations that
21	may even be at the state level too, I'm just not
22	thinking off the top of my head, but at the

1 federal level certainly.

2	There are a number of regulations
3	where if a program or an institution is put on
4	probation it triggers other things by the
5	Department and by other regulators and perhaps
6	even by the accreditor.
7	And the one that comes very top of
8	mind is Teach Out Plans. If you have a program
9	on probation, the program needs to submit a Teach
10	Out Plan to your agency. Do you treat intent to
11	withdraw as the equivalent thereof to probation?
12	What status do you decide the Teach
13	Out Plan is necessary? And I'm just using that
14	as an example of those types of triggers.
15	S. TOOKS: We don't have a
16	probationary status. We have the two adverse
17	actions being denied and withdrawn.
18	Regarding Teach Out plans in
19	particular, the Commission modified its policy
20	and procedure within the last two or three years
21	I would say to strengthen the Teach Out/program
22	closure requirements, which are that if a program

1 is closing, it must provide a Teach Out plan to 2 the Commission. And the Commission will monitor that 3 program and all of its enrolled students and will 4 5 not discontinue accreditation until that Teach Out plan has been fulfilled and all those 6 7 students have matriculated through the program. 8 That's a specific monitoring mechanical for Teach Out. 9 That's required I think by 10 J. BLUM: any agency, that if a school is closing 11 12 technically they should have provided the Agency a Teach Out Plan. 13 14 So, while I'm glad you're doing it now, that's something that actually you probably 15 16 should have been doing for a while. I'm more interested in the issue of 17 18 Teach Out Plans. What we often know in this 19 world of school closures is that everything 20 happens too late, for the student I mean. 21 And so there is a regulatory requirement now that requires at the time of 22

probation that an institution or program provide a Teach Out Plan.

And if you don't have probation, I'm not suggesting -- I want to be really sensitive here because I'm actually not taking issue with the way you have your structure on actions.

7 But if it means that you're not going 8 to be on top of a potential closure, forget the 9 actual closure, but when you're seeing weakness 10 that might be intent to withdraw, intent to 11 withdraw sounds pretty harsh to me.

I would think that might trigger a Teach Out Plan requirement. That's I think a question for you, I actually now think I might want to go back to Mike Stein who already has his hands up to ask how they meet the requirement.

17 If they don't have probation, how are 18 they meeting the requirement that requires them 19 to have a Teach Out Plan if you hit probation? 20 So, maybe this is a question for Department 21 Staff.

22

1

2

M. STEIN: Sure, I just wanted to

point out that probation, which is applicable to 1 2 a few different areas, mostly is in areas that apply to institutional accrediting agencies so 3 around Title IV requirements, so substantive 4 change and the Teach Out Plan agreement. 5 They would apply to institutional 6 accrediting agencies rather than programmatic. 7 So, in this case they were not applied to CODA. 8 9 That's helpful. J. BLUM: 10 CHAIR KEISER: Are there any other Sensing none, I would ask Mike to 11 questions? 12 come back and make any comments. 13 M. STEIN: I don't have any further 14 comment. CHAIR KEISER: I do not believe there 15 16 are any third-party commenters so we'll move to a 17 motion by the two readers, Bob and Jennifer. 18 J. BLUM: I am hesitating, I'm either 19 going to take the Department's or suggest that 20 they have already been in compliance based on a 21 very reasonable interpretation of the regulation 22 as it stands currently with regards to educator

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

1

and practitioner.

2	B. SHIREMAN: Do you want my thoughts?			
3	J. BLUM: Yes.			
4	B. SHIREMAN: Because it's a close			
5	call, doing it without the additional signals the			
6	SDO that a reasonable case can be made either			
7	way. So, I kind of lean in that direction but			
8	I'm open to whichever direction you choose.			
9	J. BLUM: I would like to strike the			
10	monitoring report and make a recommendation to			
11	the SDO for recognition for five years.			
12	CHAIR KEISER: Is there a second to			
13	the motion?			
14	M.E. PETRISKO: I second.			
15	CHAIR KEISER: Seconded by Mary-Ellen			
16	Petrisko. Now we have discussion.			
17	B. SHIREMAN: One thing is I think we			
18	should create a Subcommittee on the Oxford comma.			
19	M.E. PETRISKO: I agree.			
20	M. HALL-MARTIN: Team Oxford Comma.			
21	CHAIR KEISER: We can do that after			
22	this motion. Any comments or questions on the			

1	motion? Sensing none, I'll call for a vote.
2	We'll start with Kathleen.
3	K.S. ALIOTO: Yes.
4	CHAIR KEISER: Roslyn?
5	R. ARTIS: Yes.
6	CHAIR KEISER: Jennifer?
7	J. BLUM: Yes.
8	CHAIR KEISER: Ronnie?
9	R. BOOTH: Yes.
10	CHAIR KEISER: Wally?
11	W. BOSTON: Yes.
12	CHAIR KEISER: Jill?
13	J. DERBY: Yes.
14	CHAIR KEISER: David?
15	D. EUBANKS: Yes.
16	CHAIR KEISER: Michael?
17	M. LINDSAY: Yes.
18	CHAIR KEISER: Molly?
19	M. HALL-MARTIN: Yes.
20	CHAIR KEISER: Robert?
21	R. MAYES: Yes.
22	CHAIR KEISER: Mary-Ellen?

	∠				
1	M.E. PETRISKO: Yes.				
2	CHAIR KEISER: Claude?				
3	VICE CHAIR PRESSNELL: Yes.				
4	CHAIR KEISER: Bob?				
5	B. SHIREMAN: Yes, and I encourage the				
6	Agency to monitor student loan debt and earnings				
7	for the allied and dentistry fields.				
8	CHAIR KEISER: Zakiya?				
9	Z. SMITH ELLIS: Yes, with the same				
10	support for the comment Bob just made.				
11	CHAIR KEISER: Steven? I think he				
12	left us. The motion passes. Thank you and thank				
13	you, Members, we appreciate your time and efforts				
14	on behalf of your students. We have finished our				
15	day.				
16	It's been a long day. tomorrow will				
17	be I hope our last day, meaning I don't think				
18	we're going to need to be meeting on Friday.				
19	We are scheduled to start at 10:00				
20	a.m. tomorrow and I suggest that we do that and I				
21	also offer that we take the final morning agenda				
22	that's scheduled for that Friday morning, which				

1 includes the policy discussion and we'll bring 2 that into the morning and then at 1:00 p.m. begin the SACs recognition process. 3 4 G.A. SMITH: Do you mind if I 5 interject just quickly? We should have a disclaimer about 6 7 dates and times listed for agenda items that are 8 subject to change but there is a concern from the 9 Agency that potentially the third-party commenters might not be available. 10 11 We're in the process of contacting the 12 third-party commenters at this point just to see. 13 But let's hope that the quorum can be achieved 14 tomorrow morning and we won't even have to make 15 the switch. 16 But I wanted to make you aware of 17 that. 18 CHAIR KEISER: As long as you're 19 watching everything. Bernie watches it all the 20 time no matter what. 21 I think he's made a presentation at 22 every meeting we've had that I can remember going

back to the Bush Administration and way before 1 2 We'll do the best we can, me. hopefully we can do that tomorrow, otherwise, if 3 you have a bigger problem with SACs because 4 5 you've got a lot more presenters with the SACs. Right, and that's the 6 G.A. SMITH: 7 concern, exactly. 8 M.E. PETRISKO: How do we know that? 9 CHAIR KEISER: We're meeting tomorrow 10 at 10:00 a.m. 11 G.A. SMITH: We'll know whether or not 12 the quorum is achieved and we're in the process 13 of seeing whether or not the third-party 14 commenters are available. So, more to come, maybe we can send you an email later today or 15 16 surely we'll be discussing it. 17 B. SHIREMAN: You're checking to see 18 whether the third-party commenters on SACs are 19 available to do SACs imagine, is that what you're 20 saying? 21 G.A. SMITH: It's the other way, it's 22 those people who were supposed to be off need to

1 be available tomorrow morning. I see, it's the 2 flexibility. CHAIR KEISER: Then it will be harder 3 If we convene at 10:00 a.m. and we 4 to move SACs. 5 can't move it, we may just take the morning off and start at 1:00 p.m. 6 G.A. SMITH: We'll be in touch either 7 8 later today or first thing in the morning, we'll 9 know the best route to take. CHAIR KEISER: Wally, do you have a 10 11 question? 12 J. DERBY: No, I just wondered if we could still get them both in tomorrow. 13 14 I know I only have couple of hours 15 Friday morning if I needed to be on it and 16 couldn't participate maybe in the whole 17 discussion but is the issue about the 18 availability of people? We couldn't just reverse 19 the order and do policy first and the Agency 20 second. 21 CHAIR KEISER: That's what we're 22 trying to do, Jill, the policy in the morning,

and again, we don't need a quorum for policy, 1 2 that's just a discussion. J. DERBY: But if we can't, can we do 3 policy in the afternoon? 4 5 CHAIR KEISER: We'll appraiser do SACs 6 in the afternoon because we have a bigger group of presenters than we do for the policy 7 8 discussion. 9 G.A. SMITH: You wouldn't need a quorum for policy too but there's no threat to it 10 11 not being a quorum because no one is recusing for the policy conversation. 12 13 But just to let you know, there are 14 also commenters for the policy part of the conversation to their third-party commenters that 15 16 we want to reach out to. 17 CHAIR KEISER: Wally? 18 W. BOSTON: I just wanted to clarify, 19 right now the plan is to do the policy in the 20 morning unless you can move SACs up. I'm on both 21 so I'll be here either way, I just wanted to get 22 a bearing for which one would go first.

	2
1	CHAIR KEISER: We're going to say
2	tomorrow morning, 10:00 a.m. either way George
3	gets organized. If not, we're going to need a
4	half-day tomorrow and a half-day on Friday but I
5	hope we can get everything done tomorrow.
6	K.S. ALIOTO: George, send an email to
7	us if you found out.
8	G.A. SMITH: If we find out anything
9	this evening, we'll be sure to reach out via
10	email but the latest you'll hear from us is
11	around 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.
12	K.S. ALIOTO: Thank you so much.
13	CHAIR KEISER: Everybody have a good
14	evening and we will reconvene at 10:00 a.m.
15	tomorrow morning.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17	went off the record at 4:07 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Α **a.m** 1:9 5:2 96:9,10 271:20 273:10 274:4 276:2.11.14 42:4 **ABA** 221:4 abbreviated 173:3 **ABHE** 2:8 4:6 10:13 12:7 14:13,20,22 15:1 15:3,4,9 16:21 17:1,6 18:2 19:18 20:7,15,19 21:1,3,4,12 22:16 23:5,12 24:6 26:3,16 27:18 28:2,13 29:12 30:12 31:1,5 32:16 33:21 34:18 35:19 36:4 37:16,19 38:1,16 39:11 44:20 46:2,13 46:21 47:2 48:9 50:6 50:13 ABHE's 21:7 26:9 31:1 **ABHE-** 16:3 ability 81:20 121:3 131:2 161:14 202:12 204:19 235:4 237:9 able 41:22 47:21 48:21 49:22 50:4,22 51:2 101:19 102:2 120:7 132:17 136:20,21 142:17 146:15 152:8 156:7 158:4 168:9 169:21 202:3 216:11 216:18 254:8 above-entitled 96:8 173:8 222:15 276:16 above-mentioned 13:3 abruptly 204:1 absent 167:10 absolutely 71:21 81:1 126:12 143:8 199:6 202:19 204:7 244:10 252:8 264:1 abundance 24:13 abundant 207:8 academia 105:13 119:5 academic 6:16 15:2 18:18 20:1 31:3,10 34:5 46:10 61:18 63:16 105:17 106:1 121:16 134:5 academicians 119:15 academics 118:12 academy 124:3 accept 71:19 133:21 165:6 259:10 acceptable 32:9 57:22 77:7 182:19 accepted 90:14 234:7 accepting 91:14

access 147:9 151:21 153:6 194:7 accident 122:15 accommodate 31:6 accommodation 79:20 accompanied 53:2 accompanying 33:17 accomplish 228:21 account 122:17 123:12 259:14 accountability 109:5 182:6 213:21 accounting 212:18 accounts 163:16 197:7 214:22 accredit 6:3 75:12 107:17,21 108:12 204:9 247:14 248:14 248:19 263:21 accreditations 210:17 accredited 11:3,4 15:3 16:4 17:8 20:7,20,22 22:17 23:5,8,20 25:11 26:16 30:13 32:15,21 35:2 36:5 45:1 46:1 59:5 99:7 108:8 110:3 111:22 112:6 165:15 182:9,12 184:13 185:9 187:13,18 224:3 262:2 accrediting 5:20,21 11:5 44:7 79:19 96:13 98:13 99:8,21 100:7 107:3 108:7,10 110:18 113:1 117:15 127:6 167:19 171:4 178:8 205:20 223:8 226:10 227:9 230:6 242:11 250:1 268:3,7 accreditor 11:3 12:8 19:19 20:14 22:20 24:9 37:10 99:9 108:14 175:15 185:4 191:4,5 223:7 265:6 accreditors 192:11 accredits 10:20 20:2 98:21,22 99:2 108:2 175:16 176:17 183:8 183:19 188:12 223:21 accumulated 17:10 196:1 accurate 204:3 ACE 119:7,11 achieve 26:9 32:15 achieved 31:12 272:13 273:12 achievement 27:17

28:13.15 29:2.13 30:2 52:22 54:1 55:13,20 60:2 67:7 72:6,18 73:6,19 74:13,14 75:7 75:11 82:19 83:13,18 84:2,12 85:13 86:11 87:13,19 89:16 149:3 161:10 168:22 184:17 185:8 187:8 188:22 246:17 achievements 19:13 achieving 33:15 34:7,8 54:16 60:14 acknowledge 16:17 ACP 148:11 **ACPE** 2:12,15 4:10 98:14 99:9 100:1 104:4,9,14,21,22 105:10,22 106:2,5,5 106:12,21 107:8,14 108:2,12,14,17 109:18,20 110:10,11 110:12,22 111:4,14 112:1,11,18 113:16 114:15,18 115:5,12 115:15 130:16 ACPE's 107:13 109:7 111:2 114:2 115:2,17 115:21 116:1 acquisition 29:3 Act 5:11,13,18 41:7 176:13 224:5 acted 54:21 184:11 acting 81:5 action 24:6 25:7,7,8 32:9 38:15 40:3,4,6 56:12,20 57:9 68:1 111:5,15 113:16 114:9,11,18,20 115:22 125:17 126:14 126:17 128:21 144:9 144:10,19 145:8,20 163:12 211:14 226:5 235:8 243:19 245:3.6 258:17 259:19 261:19 261:20 262:9 263:10 actions 24:2,21 26:22 37:9 40:12 65:5 66:11 67:6 72:19 101:4 102:22 103:2 112:3 115:6 147:12 158:19 172:14 184:6 231:19 231:20 232:2 243:11 264:15 265:17 267:6 activation 106:2 active 136:12 activities 11:6 19:13 107:15 111:2 183:17

186:18 187:5 223:8 activity 23:10 110:18 136:13 actual 84:2,12 180:6 228:11 250:1 267:9 ad 259:1 ADA 222:7 223:1 ADA-CODA 3:10 4:18 add 42:19 70:19 78:18 82:14 91:22 92:19 130:12 142:2 150:17 154:7 214:10 218:13 218:16 228:4 add-on 246:6 added 68:5 245:10 263:8 addition 6:15 35:14 36:8 75:3 82:17 100:19 111:14 115:12 184:13,15 214:14 additional 17:18 36:15 68:15 81:20 102:13 107:14 110:17 111:12 111:18 112:1,18 131:10 154:5 168:7 214:12 269:5 Additionally 184:22 256:9 address 10:3 27:3 32:22 110:18 113:12 114:12 115:5 124:22 125:3 126:21 135:8 137:4 138:20 139:8 140:10 144:4 145:18 148:6 152:14 161:22 179:1 184:17 192:19 199:7 233:1 addressed 30:21 57:7 58:11 116:11 117:7 124:9 126:17 159:19 193:3 addresses 116:4 addressing 25:17 50:8 76:13 81:11 86:15 88:8 206:8 adequate 112:15 134:9 159:16 218:10 adequately 125:4 adjustments 111:19 157:6 217:20 administered 224:6 administration 43:14 76:15 109:3 273:1 administrative 53:15 110:1 225:9 229:4 administrative-240:16 administrators 230:5 admire 42:22

admission 153:19.20 154:2 155:10 156:11 258:1 admissions 156:4,16 156:22 257:22 258:2 admit 155:20 admitted 88:2 122:2 149:9 adopted 113:3 174:17 205:6 adult 21:14,22 advanced 223:11,12 238:14,15 248:6,14 advancement 25:21 26:5 107:2 advances 133:8 advancing 17:7 advantage 152:7 167:18 adverse 101:4 102:22 112:3 113:16 114:11 114:17 115:6 158:19 172:14 231:20 232:1 243:11 245:3,6 261:20 262:9 263:10 265:16 advertising 257:8,12 258:9 advice 6:11 212:20 advised 259:5 advises 6:9 Advising 9:10 advisory 1:3,8,11 5:5 5:12,14 7:6 9:6 27:14 82:7 131:1 203:4 235:2 252:13 advocate 9:7 affect 215:17 affirmation 183:2 afternoon 104:17 172:22 177:5,21 221:3,12,14,19 233:3 275:4,6 AGC 225:21 age 249:13 agencies 5:19,20,21 6:17 9:14 69:6,7 75:19 84:8 99:8 117:15 125:21 127:6 131:8 161:2 164:20 164:22 165:4 168:3 168:12 169:14 172:22 176:3,12 182:7 200:2 212:10 221:7 230:6 236:18 257:5 268:3,7 agency's 9:18 11:12 12:12,15,17 13:4,14 13:19 19:6 23:11

35:22 39:6 71:16 84:20 91:21 100:2,6 100:18,21 113:20 157:15 158:8,10 165:14 168:20 171:3 176:2 178:7,18,22 218:9 223:8 225:19 226:8 agency-accredited 235:20 Agency-based 163:17 agenda 9:15 30:16 39:22 271:21 272:7 aggregate 21:7 187:22 ago 57:21 137:14 199:15 202:5 259:6 agree 71:3 91:1 92:21 93:3 127:5 164:18 165:19,20 170:21,22 239:19 240:1 269:19 agreeing 94:9 agreement 68:3 69:1 268:5 Ah 133:19 ahead 36:21 207:1 239:16 aid 6:13 44:4 176:13.22 255:3,5,7,9,18 256:18 Alan 2:1 5:8 Albrecht 3:11 232:17 233:6 239:10 alert 66:18,19 245:17 align 203:15 235:9 aligns 241:14 Alioto 1:12 92:21 93:11 165:19 166:2 171:6 175:8,11 179:20 180:6,17 189:16 190:20 191:12 192:1 192:10,17 193:4,10 193:15 194:4 195:4 195:20 196:15,19,22 197:8,14,22 198:11 198:13 206:22 207:3 218:21 219:13 270:3 276:6,12 allied 223:13 248:16,18 251:22 254:18 271:7 allocation 212:18 allow 203:1 208:13 236:12 242:10 258:12 260:18 allowed 66:21 allowing 235:12 allows 224:2 234:9 amazing 50:7 amend 174:4 amended 5:11,13 78:11

83:7 amendment 71:20 77:10,11 78:12 79:14 84:13 90:4,5,9,10,11 90:12,13,14,17,20 91:10,11,15,18 174:17,20 amendments 91:6 American 3:9 4:17 7:12 48:20 105:19 107:20 119:1 132:1 182:3 222:22 224:21 254:4 American-serving 20:10 amount 98:10 135:12 190:11 206:15 253:15 amounts 120:9 121:2 analysis 13:5,17 110:19 113:13 114:13,14 115:12 116:1 122:9 124:6 125:9 130:4 151:10 153:9 156:8 156:10 157:7 235:17 238:5 239:7 analyst 97:7,11,14,18 97:20 98:1 100:3 189:7 201:18 analysts 199:8 analyzing 64:5 and/or 33:8 228:12,13 228:16 231:10 236:7 242:4,10 Angela 78:12,17,19 81:17 85:8,10 86:1 87:9 88:13 96:18 213:4 anniversary 16:22 announced 113:6 annual 12:19 17:17 22:20 26:6.8 27:18 28:6 32:1 33:7,13 34:2,3,22 44:11 45:19 76:17 121:12 122:5 124:13 140:5 182:22 186:9,20 187:2,10,19 188:8 190:12 192:7 192:14,21,22 193:13 234:17 253:11 255:2 255:22 256:3 Annualized 20:5 annually 17:22 19:6 anonymous 39:14 258:22 259:2,9,11,16 259:17 answer 36:16 42:20 47:2 83:17 88:22 121:6 150:14 153:5 159:6 190:18 212:22

213:8 217:15 239:10 247:15 answered 37:1 answering 116:16 answers 206:17 260:11 anticipate 64:17 66:8 66:10 anticipated 30:8 53:12 anybody 60:16 81:11 213:10 anymore 205:21 218:14 anytime 124:13 201:21 anyway 246:22 apologies 51:15 66:1 67:12 264:12 apologize 177:20 254:7 255:20 261:2 app 191:10 appealable 245:4,6 appeals 135:9 appear 25:5 133:19 appearance 23:11 appeared 53:10 appears 177:14 236:12 applaud 81:4 87:21 88:7 applicable 268:1 applicant 23:22 33:5,11 154:11 245:4 applicants 17:18 28:7 60:16 application 9:18 82:1 85:14 86:7 120:11 179:9 applied 33:4 77:22 149:8 197:20 234:2 268:8 applies 234:14 248:3 apply 74:16 197:18 237:6 268:3,6 **applying** 75:10 78:6 88:12,20 169:3 appoint 119:9 appointed 18:15 105:11 118:22 119:12 appointing 119:7 appraiser 275:5 appreciate 9:12 40:22 42:22 47:14 58:3,4 73:1 80:18 87:8 96:3 135:6 137:5 148:22 173:18 181:20 188:15 189:1 216:4 271:13 appreciating 130:2 appreciation 16:6 106:14 approach 17:15 27:10 118:2 131:7 252:5

257:5 approaches 42:6 **appropriate** 29:9 34:15 40:12 47:16 72:19 78:5 82:18 112:13 157:6 164:15 185:11 187:4 188:6 242:12 246:11 appropriately 78:1,6 170:1 appropriateness 55:19 approval 5:19,21 39:10 50:1 195:8 244:2,8 245:8,10,14 246:7 250:16,22 261:6 262:13 263:4,13 approve 71:5,15 244:4 approved 24:1 33:11 68:18 91:10,17 216:5 approving 189:4 approximate 190:11 approximately 20:6 23:7 24:2 99:3 108:3 172:18 238:13 April 12:22 13:1 39:7 114:12 area 24:19 25:18 28:21 37:18 52:2,21 61:7 67:8 75:13 82:4 94:19 100:22 129:16 131:14 140:9 150:5 151:9 192:19 225:8 260:1 263:5 areas 30:18 33:19 62:1 102:11 125:10 128:10 128:12 191:8 200:14 224:1 268:2,2 arose 16:15 art 7:2 43:2 76:7 90:22 98:8 139:3,19 212:12 221:17 262:4 **Arthur** 1:9,11 articulates 31:8 **Artis** 1:14 8:9,9 93:14 166:5 170:5,19 171:8 219:15 270:5 asked 54:18 55:7 56:1 56:10 65:19 124:5 200:4,20 201:6 252:6 260:12 asking 32:11 55:8 59:6 73:4,10 86:18 91:12 163:10 213:1 229:4 255:18 asks 32:22 236:2 aspects 47:7 51:9 assembly 18:14 assess 61:22 67:15

156:4 assessment 12:14 13:13 14:5 17:19 24:4 24:8 26:20 27:4,7,9 27:17,20 28:1,3,9,15 35:16 36:8 53:14,19 54:4,17,19 60:9 61:12 61:20 62:18,19 67:14 71:17 156:19 157:7 250:4 assessment-related 30:21 assign 169:18 assigned 9:17 238:17 assigning 239:4 assignments 238:22 assist 25:16 27:15 33:8 35:12 135:1 154:5 assistance 16:8 27:14 116:15 224:10 Assistant 2:16 181:3 assisting 187:3 223:14 248:19 256:17 assists 34:9 associate 2:9,10,12,19 2:21 3:11 14:1 15:17 15:19 105:16.22 110:21 181:16 associated 193:1 251:19 Association 2:7 3:9 4:5 4:17 8:19 10:11,19 12:6 14:19 36:11 71:6 105:19 132:1 175:14 181:6,11 207:17,19 208:5,11,22 211:16 224:22 254:5 associations 164:13 222:22 assume 156:12 207:18 215:16 240:20 243:12 260:20 assumed 153:13 assuming 32:14 57:6 57:20 190:22 255:12 assure 35:18 36:3 106:22 116:10 assuring 118:7 asterisk 22:4 at-risk 193:9 attained 223:18 attempt 61:4,9,9 249:19 250:7,10 attend 51:2 247:19 249:2 attendance 25:22 26:7 97:3

attending 20:19 attention 33:18 85:17 137:6 151:18 257:14 258:18 attest 216:22 attorney 212:21 attract 50:22 attrition 122:6,12 audible 159:2 audio 78:21 audit 187:19 192:14,22 193:11,14,15,16,17 193:22 194:2,3 207:22 209:13 210:4 210.6audits 211:6 **AUDRA** 2:19 August 226:1 Ausdle 1:19 9:1,2 95:22 **auspice** 208:14 authorities 6:1 authority 130:6 135:7 authorization 6:18 authorized 6:10,14 authorizes 6:16 automatically 153:1 automotive 175:22 availability 16:14 194:7 274:18 available 6:20 30:9 59:4 108:21 113:17 115:1 133:10 159:17 238:22 254:12,21 256:12 272:10 273:14,19 274:1 avenues 195:1 average 21:8,9 22:15 23:4,7 41:13 124:2 132:3,8 140:13,14 253:18 254:9 averaged 17:21 averages 24:2 44:9 avocation 28:19 avoid 257:10 awarded 109:9 aware 61:1 70:17 119:11 157:13 252:22 256:16 272:16 awkward 173:19 В **B** 8:15 53:9 55:4 81:18 89:5 95:18 98:19 101:18 102:18 103:8 103:21 117:1 118:16

119:18 125:19 126:22

131:6 133:4,17 137:5

138:2,5,9 158:2

159:13 160:12 165:8 167:22 168:12 170:6 170:11 172:8 173:15 174:11,21 175:3 215:7 220:15 239:16 250:13 253:11 254:15 255:17 256:15 258:19 260:2 269:2,4,17 271:5 273:17 bachelor 14:1 back 39:6 51:12,15 58:20 59:5 67:21 72:8 72:16 73:22 76:3,12 76:14 85:3 86:14 90:11 91:5,18 92:2 96:11 98:4 118:10 139:12 149:2 154:1 155:1 161:3 162:13 162:15,20 163:13 164:1 173:1,6,7,11 190:15 195:10 200:6 201:4 205:3,8 209:14 222:14 241:5 267:15 268:12 273:1 background 119:17 127:22 231:13 243:5 backlog 50:2 bad 44:16 195:21 balance 52:13 140:14 balances 213:21 ball 84:21 bank 194:22 214:22 bar 153:20 based 12:17 13:3 30:1 38:22 39:13 42:6.8 43:19 48:12 58:7 59:20 80:8 81:5,9 100:17 132:8 157:6 158:9 159:1 178:17 185:5 186:19 203:20 225:18 237:18 239:7 240:20 249:19 268:20 bases 240:12 basic 225:8 basically 205:4 **basis** 114:10 133:1,7,10 140:5 183:15 190:12 192:14 BCPS 2:16 bearing 275:22 Beatty 2:8 14:12,16,21 37:12 40:21 43:8 44:17 45:16 47:19 48:6 49:12 58:4 63:12 64:21 66:16 68:4 69:2 69:17 70:11 Beatty's 60:5 beginning 61:6 118:4

279

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

attendees 28:4

	I	l	l
202:20 216:10	241:17 243:7 246:15	110:21 116:19,20	capacity 128:17
begins 126:10 221:9	249:9 250:5 264:12	117:2 123:5 126:12	care 19:7 127:22 137:6
behalf 14:19 36:11	266:10 268:9,18	127:14 134:19 140:17	169:9,11,12
98:11 100:2 104:19	269:3,9 270:7	142:13 145:5 147:15	career 21:21 28:20 29:6
189:9 271:14	blurb 137:16,20	147:20 148:2,10	176:4 181:19 184:1
behold 128:4 154:1	board 26:12,15,18	150:6 152:2 154:8	184:20 185:5 187:14
believe 53:3 66:1 75:9	100:19 104:22 109:11	156:14	195:17 196:13 201:19
110:13 116:2 202:19	109:14 111:11,17	branch 68:15 111:10	214:13
229:1 232:19 235:11	115:14,14 117:14,14	break 50:9 96:5 97:5	careers 28:18 149:7
239:1 241:4 242:9	117:19 118:5,17,20	210:4 222:12,14	175:20
244:21 252:8,19	119:15 121:10 122:19	brief 101:2,6 103:1	careful 16:12 19:3
261:13,18 268:15	122:22 123:4 124:5	106:9	79:18 164:19
believes 144:1 231:13	124:15,17 125:16	briefing 9:20	carefully 73:12 94:14
236:1,17	126:18 127:10 128:21	bring 86:14 204:13	123:9 152:13
benchmark 123:10	129:10 130:9 131:1,3	253:4,9 272:1	CARES 41:7,15
142:10 153:17 256:10	136:3,4 142:12	bringing 52:9 131:9	Carolina 8:7,10
benchmarks 122:6	143:16 178:20 199:19	155:5	carry 206:5
154:2 Dama Bat 0:0	235:3 252:15	broad 234:6	carrying 54:14
Benedict 8:9	board-certified 248:8	broader 143:16	case 53:16,21 55:4
benefit 251:12	Boards 8:19 128:10	broken 209:9	59:14 158:12 163:6
Bernie 272:19	Bob 8:14,15 75:1 79:12	brought 155:15 250:15	221:9,20,21 227:18
best 27:19 36:3 47:21 118:14 122:2 130:20	81:16 83:6 87:7 89:3	258:17 Bruce 233:8	268:8 269:6 cases 27:6 58:13 84:8
153:3 260:9 273:2	92:2 94:10,17 95:17 116:21 138:17 159:11	budget 6:19 195:5	136:18 137:4 141:7
274:9	165:6 168:8 172:7	209:14 211:1	152:19 188:4 247:22
better 37:7 52:16 76:1	173:13 212:7 215:6	bunch 250:19,22	249:4
84:17 141:3 142:20	216:1 220:14 223:4,5	burden 89:8 164:9	cash 22:8 194:8
151:22 165:2 171:6	239:15 246:18 250:12	burdensome 83:20	catch 121:19 133:13
208:3 246:16	268:17 271:4,10	Bureau 109:3 132:9	category 193:9
beyond 63:5 84:18	bodies 113:1 205:20	Bush 273:1	CATHRYN 3:11
103:21 114:19 216:3	227:12,12	business 46:16 141:13	caught 60:17
248:10	body 79:19 90:17	155:3	cause 25:11 70:7,14
Bible 10:20 29:3 46:19	167:20	10010	122:8 124:6 125:9
51:3	book 253:13	C	151:10 153:9 195:9
biblical 2:7 4:5 10:12	bootcamps 141:10	C 97:10 99:17 102:16	246:10,11
10:20 12:6 13:22	Booth 1:13 8:5,5 84:16	102:19 103:13 157:20	caused 196:16
14:20 17:3 19:21 29:1	93:20 94:4 166:10	157:22 158:4,7 159:5	causes 82:20
36:11 71:6	171:12 219:19 270:9	180:16	causing 226:21
big 119:19 248:13	borrowing 141:8	C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 4:1	caution 250:18
bigger 273:4 275:6	boss 127:16	calendar 47:13	celebrated 16:21
bills 214:2	Boston 1:14 7:11,11	call 93:8 124:11 161:14	centered 113:14
bit 52:15 60:1 61:19	43:7 45:15,22 47:3,4	205:15 219:12 245:13	century 8:16 24:15
88:18 120:22 123:2	48:4 76:7 77:7 78:8	269:5 270:1	CEO 8:13
135:5 140:22 141:8	91:13 93:22 94:5	called 89:11 142:11	certain 44:11 47:7
145:16 150:8 155:6	139:18 166:13 171:14	calling 161:11	104:9 123:19 126:10
169:19 190:15 194:11	212:8 219:21 270:11	camera 177:7,8,14,18	140:18 150:15 151:9
208:3 216:8,14,17	275:18	campus 21:8 61:16	151:9 196:3 247:8
243:22	bounce 51:12 140:22	68:15 184:15	certainly 46:3,6 47:13
black 144:13	150:8	campus-based 10:22	156:17 180:10 198:18
blueprint 123:13	Bounds 2:2 71:14	CampusEdu 18:6	232:22 241:10 245:17
Blum 1:13 9:9,9,9 67:20	74:19 78:14 96:21,22	Canada 11:7	265:1
68:19 69:3 70:8,15	97:9,12,16,19,22 98:3	Canadian 20:4	certainty 88:11
77:11,19 87:8 93:16	98:8 106:14 189:8	candidacy 69:19,20	certificate 46:9 184:14
161:1 166:8 167:2	191:9 218:3 230:22 Bowens 233:11	184:2 204:14,17	certificated 175:21 certificates 14:1,2
168:19 171:10 219:17 223:2,5 226:18	Bowens 233:11 box 157:14 194:22	candidate 13:21 17:18 23:13 25:8 45:7 59:13	47:10
223.2,5 226.16 227:13 228:9 231:17	Boyer 2:12 105:21	69:17,22 112:2,6,8	certification 6:12 26:9
232:5,20 239:18		03.17,22 112.2,0,0	Set throation 0.12 20.3
	106.2 110.10 17 20	176.19	26.10 249.5 7
	106:2 110:10,17,20	176:19	26:10 249:5,7

certify 107:18 certifying 183:9 cetera 118:19 257:14 257:18 264:9 CFOs 18:18 26:5 **Chairman** 3:13 90:7 99:17 104:17 167:17 206:18 211:12 217:22 228:3 232:12 Chairperson 7:2 challenge 152:18 185:18 231:6 challenges 16:11 101:22 challenging 185:10 chance 75:3 84:14 change 2:10 15:20 27:5 32:20 33:11 42:8 50:8 50:11 63:18 86:22 92:1 135:4,16 146:11 151:5 173:19 184:12 216:15 259:4 268:5 272:8 changed 48:18 86:8 146:7.12 159:21 258:21 changes 24:1 36:1 42:3 50:12 51:15 64:9 123:12 151:14 153:19 184:14 234:17 235:9 256:7 changing 35:7 characteristic 41:20 characteristically 150:7 characteristics 200:9 206:4 207:11 253:2 characterizes 129:11 charge 135:22 181:17 charges 6:15 Charitable 26:14 **Charity** 2:4 97:9,10 98:17 99:16,19 101:16,19 106:17 139:12 157:19 159:10 **chat** 157:14 **check** 138:2 194:19 checking 273:17 checklist 115:6,10 146:8 159:22 checks 213:21 Chief 9:6 child 128:5 chime 121:7 229:10 **CHIN** 2:19 choice 221:2 262:8 choices 154:12 choose 76:4 168:21

208:14 215:1 269:8 choosing 262:1 **chosen** 189:20 Christan 181:14 Christian 2:21 180:11 chronology 246:13 churches 24:11 42:16 circumstances 32:14 citation 147:13 246:1 citations 216:13 cited 44:14 114:10 claim 182:10,11 clarification 44:18 81:8 81:14 clarified 208:2 clarify 64:2 74:16 87:10 88:1 174:14 215:9 221:17 275:18 clarifying 77:20 88:17 92:3 248:13 258:14 clarity 86:19 **CLARK** 1:14 Claude 1:12 7:18,19 79:12 95:15 163:21 172:5 175:8.10 189:13 198:15 199:6 202:18 205:15 212:3 212:7 216:2 218:19 220:12 271:2 clean 258:11 clear 45:14 53:21 129:4 129:16 229:15,22 230:7 234:12 245:22 255:14 260:11 262:11 263:12 clearer 47:1 **clearly** 52:19 57:10 145:16 225:16 230:15 238:6 click 134:2 145:7,19 148:2,10 201:20 clicked 163:1 clinical 236:22 237:1 247:20 close 195:14 196:17 204:1 257:17 262:1 269:4 closed 226:5 closely 199:8 258:4 closer 52:17 260:7 closing 207:6 266:1,11 closings 195:6 closure 265:22 267:8,9 closures 266:19 coaching 25:16 Coates 177:2 CODA 223:1,6 224:3,11 225:1 228:17 232:10

233:6.15 234:2.20 235:2 236:13,17 238:5,13,17,19,20 239:8 244:12,13,16 246:2,6,10 248:12 254:2,13 261:9,22 262:2 263:3 264:2 268:8 CODA's 227:18 232:17 233:8 234:8 235:5,17 238:4 262:9 CODA-accredited 249:2 code-accredited 247:19 codify 202:21 cohort 21:16,19 cohorts 21:15 22:11 26:15 colleague 191:17 217:11 colleagues 105:9 collect 45:17 254:5,13 255:16,21 collected 31:22 35:13 **collecting** 64:4 242:19 collection 35:12 college 8:6,10 9:3 15:3 15:12 47:5 133:9 144:13,16,18 152:17 175:14 colleges 7:21 8:20 10:21 19:20 51:3 112:21 132:1 181:11 196:17 207:19 208:11 208:18,22 211:16 251:20 **Columbia** 8:10,13 176:8 combination 87:10 242:6.13 combine 210:21 combined 45:20 46:22 209:10,19 come 46:7,9,10 48:20 49:21 50:1 63:2 72:8 72:16 73:15,17,21 76:3 80:2 88:6 117:8 124:15 128:12 135:3 139:12 141:11 154:14 190:4 191:16 196:22 210:16 246:4 251:13 257:16 261:3 268:12 273:14 comes 47:5 60:8 86:14 177:3 213:16 243:4 265:7 comfort 221:22

comfortable 72:5 205:11 coming 43:4 127:9 157:3 190:9 191:13 191:14,20 211:15 comma 236:8 242:3,10 269:18,20 commend 43:8 comment 11:14 74:11 84:7 86:1 94:8,9 101:13 112:19 114:2 138:17 155:1 156:10 157:14 160:22 161:4 161:18 162:10,12 164:15 165:18,19,21 166:3,6,8,11 167:20 168:18 169:8 170:3 179:12 190:2 199:3 201:16 202:3,17 218:2 235:16 268:14 271:10 commentary 243:21 commentators 251:4 commenters 10:3,6,8 268:16 272:10,12 273:14,18 275:14,15 comments 9:22 10:2 33:21 68:5 70:17,18 85:4 87:9 93:5.6 95:1 104:6 113:21 115:18 157:12 159:3.5 169:16,17 177:2 180:14 200:6 202:12 203:20 213:11 218:17 268:12 269:22 commission's 31:2 Commissioner 213:20 commissioners 19:1,5 58:17 203:3 213:15 235:4 commissions 18:13 175:13 207:17 209:2 209:4 210:2,7 211:13 211:16 213:16 215:10 committed 106:21 committee 1:3,8,11 5:5 5:13 7:6,22 10:9 12:3 14:18 18:16 35:19 36:14 74:20 79:1,8 82:8 85:16 86:19 96:13,14 99:18 104:18 116:7,10,17 177:22 180:18 202:4 206:21 211:19 224:19 226:2,17 committee's 14:8 committees 5:15 203:4 235:1 252:13

common 197:8.9 Commonwealth 176:7 **communicate** 61:5,10 62:1 259:12 communicated 31:3 262:21 communicating 60:11 communication 13:7 29:17 60:10 62:20 communities 234:6 community 9:2 137:18 183:3 compare 256:13 compared 44:8 compilation 256:7 compile 256:4 compiled 136:8 **complainant** 134:11,16 134:22 136:18 complained 236:22 **complaint** 39:15 101:9 134:12,20 135:15,19 226:3 231:7 259:1.16 complaints 11:13 39:22 133:19,21 135:3 136:4,7,12,17 137:7 179:13 235:5 258:22 259:6,9,11 complete 18:2 19:1 22:1 33:12 46:8 completed 26:17 64:22 72:9 185:12 224:14 completely 89:12 completers 186:6 completion 185:1 205:16 249:4 compliance 26:21 30:5 32:17 33:2,9,16 34:10 54:5,7,8,8,12 57:12 58:8 59:10,12 60:21 64:13,14 65:18 66:20 67:2 73:7,8 74:6 76:11 77:3 78:3,15 79:7 80:5,9 82:7,11 82:18 83:3 85:2,3,18 100:8,10,13 101:1,12 102:4 103:4 109:17 111:20 115:13 116:8 126:1,3,7 138:22 139:6 158:8,10,17,21 159:14 160:7 162:14 178:9,12,22 184:18 185:21 186:9,11 198:22 216:12,18 217:16,16 219:5 224:14 225:4 229:14 235:17 246:5 251:13 259:22 263:3,6,14

(202) 234-4433

268:20 compliant 54:22 55:18 57:13 79:2,9,16 80:2 86:4 88:5,21 89:2 93:17 103:17 158:20 162:20 216:19 239:8 246:3 complicated 74:8 complied 239:2 complies 88:12 179:7 compliment 138:14 149:11 comply 116:12 158:15 240:18 complying 158:13 242:22 **component** 46:10,10 127:5 129:7 156:5,19 composite 22:19 32:3 composition 229:21 232:22 242:12 comprehensive 26:17 28:8 30:4 34:20 35:15 37:3 56:2 62:20 111:5 136:6 137:1 179:4 202:9 comprised 109:11 **computer** 175:22 concept 162:1 concepts 182:16 concern 24:19 77:20 80:17 81:5 123:11 124:10 125:10 130:5 130:11 137:1 160:22 195:9 272:8 273:7 concerned 51:13 82:4 85:15 215:8,18 244:1 concerning 29:15 concerns 27:12 54:1 86:16 89:6 125:1 193:18.20 conclude 117:5 235:15 concludes 14:6 36:10 179:14 conclusion 30:7 35:18 concurrently 236:21 237:4,13 condition 222:22 conditions 25:4 32:17 conducted 13:1 111:4 224:13 225:15,22 226:1,2 238:1 conference 27:22 28:3 28:4 34:9,12 60:15 conferences 25:20 26:1 26:7 34:3,4,5 confidence 182:14 183:7

confident 116:11 241:8 confidentiality 37:22 confirm 125:20 192:15 conflict 19:6,10 confuse 45:18 confused 102:13,15 211:5 212:9 confusing 229:22 Congratulations 217:19 conjunction 87:4 107:20 consequences 251:13 consider 74:3 76:10 103:15 116:7 161:8 172:13 236:3 239:5 256:12 259:6,7 consideration 125:17 considered 77:12,15 119:8 176:19 213:6 considering 49:2 consisted 200:9 consistency 110:14 129:3 130:20 consistent 19:4 185:7 193:2 234:9 consistently 140:9,11 188:1 234:2 **consists** 109:22 constituents 51:17 179:3 constitute 20:21 consultants 84:10 consultation 28:6 consume 151:17 consumer 29:18 119:5 contacting 272:11 contemplated 79:11 contemplating 239:21 contend 243:2 content 125:12 135:19 context 29:11 185:3 215:20 continue 42:9 69:21 116:12 159:22 165:7 180:2 continued 23:17 38:10 38:14 100:12 111:19 114:2 178:11 219:4 continuing 33:22 47:20 51:5 107:18 173:12 continuous 76:21 186:14,21 188:21 233:20 234:15 contradict 83:11 contribute 130:8 control 122:11 convene 274:4

conversation 48:1 58:16 127:18 130:9 130:10 159:4,12 201:18 239:22 275:12 275:15 conversations 51:16 67:17 129:12 143:15 convinced 89:5 cooperative 200:1 coordinating 181:17 **copy** 145:13 **Corder** 2:3 97:20,20 core 19:20 corporate 128:16 212:11 corporation 208:17 209:11 210:3 corporations 128:15 correct 56:17 60:5 80:6 92:14 94:3 126:12 146:3,3 160:12 196:18,21 198:12 204:7 208:21 217:17 227:6 232:4 241:1 245:2 corrected 217:14 correcting 187:7 correction 200:18 correctly 102:19 230:4 232:2 correlation 249:6 correlations 156:21 correspond 259:8 corresponding 164:8 corroborating 62:8 cosmetology 176:1 **cost** 198:3 207:3,6 212:18 costs 83:22 214:3 Council 2:11 4:9 98:14 98:20 99:22 104:20 119:1 counsel 3:12 75:16 82:13 85:11 212:9,20 213:1,2,5 232:17 counseling 46:16 150:12 count 20:5 counted 45:12 counting 209:12 countries 49:21 198:4 country 191:14 couple 37:7 40:16 43:13 151:1 199:10 214:10 242:2 255:1 255:22 274:14 coupled 257:21 course 18:6 40:17

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

49:10 53:18 75:6 122:18 124:20 129:22 136:3 169:9,12 183:16 256:1 260:19 covered 111:16 covering 223:22 240:12 **COVID** 19:16 42:10 COVID-19 193:21 197:15 198:5 **CPA** 18:21 create 269:18 created 251:5 259:13 creating 152:7 creation 118:1 creative 42:5 credentials 17:10 32:4 criteria 13:9 79:2 80:6 85:15,16 86:4 101:1 103:7 156:5,11,16,22 227:1 228:11 229:7 235:10 236:6,11 237:15 238:11 239:2 240:19 241:13 252:17 252:18 criterion 77:21 101:8 108:16 116:4 158:21 critical 92:1 123:6 236:2 237:10 **CSS** 184:18 curiosity 247:5 curious 48:11,15 49:5 76:19.22 79:15 102:16 140:6 144:6 144:20 243:10 249:13 250:11 current 21:17 35:5 47:13 52:3 112:17 113:3 143:12 176:2 186:17 188:5 190:2 199:17 200:11 222:20 232:16 233:11 currently 12:9 18:5,21 34:19 35:15 40:5 45:8 59:20 60:18 69:15 70:12,14 80:12 99:2 112:1 176:17 184:2 187:12 202:1 223:22 268:22 curricular 151:4 curriculum 121:9 125:12 150:22 151:5 curtailed 198:6 customarily 150:15 **customary** 162:18 163:5,6 cut-off 192:4 D

D 1:16 8:2 74:10 83:10 95:5 142:2 148:15 149:2 151:15 153:5 153:14 155:17 157:8 166:17 171:18 191:19 210:11 220:3 270:15 Daggett 97:2 Dan 2:21 181:2,15 danger 167:22 dangerous 167:21 dashboard 20:14 21:2 21:17 22:2,7 41:11 43:11,12,17 44:19 45:13,17,19 46:5,19 76:14 206:7,9 dashboard's 22:15 data 19:13 20:14 21:2 22:20 24:16 31:22 32:13 35:12,13,14 41:6 47:5,22 52:10 56:15,17 64:5,5,8 65:2 66:1 67:4,14,16 76:13 84:9 109:4 132:12 133:9 149:6,6 149:16 187:10.22 198:21 238:9 239:7 253:13 254:6.12.17 254:21 255:16,21 256:3 data-driven 188:19 dataset 21:17 date 30:2 52:9 100:14 178:14 225:13 dated 55:6 dates 272:7 Dave 8:3 David 1:15 8:1 74:9 81:16 83:9 84:17 85:5 86:4 87:11 89:6 95:4 149:1 166:16 171:17 220:2 270:14 David's 87:12 Dawn 2:16 106:3 day 5:4 7:5 39:12 85:3 114:8 115:5,9,21 221:8 254:1 271:15 271:16,17 days 101:4 113:18 114:16 DDS 223:10 247:17 248:10 deadline 79:5 deal 17:16 50:18 53:11 150:12 173:4 251:8 dealing 191:1 deals 199:1 206:1 dealt 40:20 dean 2:15 15:11 105:1

105:16 135:21 148:7 252:2 dean's 136:1 deans 136:15 debt 120:9 121:3,21 131:16 132:3,11,17 133:10,14 160:5,8,17 164:8 165:17 168:4 168:11,13,15 169:6,9 169:11,12 172:9,12 196:6 206:3 253:18 254:9,16 271:6 debts 195:21,22 decide 69:6,7 87:21 265:12 decided 205:4 decides 122:12 decision 19:4,8,13 23:10 50:10 62:2 74:5 82:10 83:1 100:9,12 100:15 113:16,19,20 114:4,8 115:18 130:6 131:2 178:10,12,14 191:7 196:5 215:16 219:6 decision-making 188:20 227:11 235:20 decisions 101:5 118:14 125:18 129:1 138:22 210:18 decrease 41:18 decreased 195:5 decreases 41:19 dedicated 110:9 deemed 54:4,11 59:16 246:11 deems 242:12 deep 41:18 42:12 default 63:6 132:11 164:7 187:16 192:1,2 206:3.5 **defeat** 90:4,20 defeating 153:3 defer 163:9 189:22 194:10 deferred 25:7,7,8 deferring 27:5 164:12 deficiencies 245:18,20 deficiency 102:15 199:4 246:1 deficient 33:3 102:12 103:11 define 152:3 182:18 248:12 261:16 defined 31:11 111:8 262:11 definitely 40:11 66:17 definition 31:2,6 227:19

229:13 degree 2:13 46:12 56:21,22 98:22 99:2 107:9,10,19 110:8 111:1 119:20 154:18 162:3 196:13 223:11 248:10 degrees 6:16 14:1,2,3 110:3 164:4 **Delaware** 176:5 delay 12:2 delayed 121:17 delegate 18:14 deletion 184:14 deliberate 19:4 deliberations 6:22 delivery 42:3 51:2 demands 182:5 Demo 222:22,22 demonstrate 32:16 59:10 61:3 101:5 102:20 114:15 116:8 179:2 185:21 186:8 188:9 demonstrated 86:7 92:22 115:13 116:9 demonstrating 30:2,20 60:20 87:20 179:9 denial 115:18 231:21 243:13 245:2 250:16 denied 112:7 115:15 265:17 denominations 42:16 dental 3:9,9 4:17,17 223:6,10,12,13,14,15 223:16,17,22 224:21 224:22 232:14 233:5 233:17,21 234:2,3,3 234:10 247:16 248:3 248:6,16,17,19,19 252:1 253:1 254:4,9 254:10,18 256:9,16 263:21,22 264:6,7 dentist 247:18 251:22 dentistry 223:11 248:9 248:12 252:19,22 264:8 271:7 dentists 248:7 264:9 deny 250:22 department 1:1 2:1 9:19 10:7,15 11:9,13 12:9,10,11,16 13:7 16:6 17:1 36:6,13 42:7 53:5 71:5 73:4 74:8 75:4,6 82:9,9,17 82:21 88:6 94:13 98:17 100:5,16 101:11 105:3,5,15

106:15 107:5.8.14 108:11,22 109:8 110:19 111:3 112:4 115:11 116:7,14 143:21 144:5 146:2 146:19 158:20 159:20 160:3,11,15 161:7 162:7 175:8 178:6,15 179:11,12 189:3 192:9,12,17 201:15 217:17 219:3,6 225:3 225:6,11,13 226:3,7,8 226:22 243:9 260:14 265:5 267:20 department's 38:1 113:13,14 158:9 163:9 192:6 241:21 268:19 departmental 223:3 **departure** 217:10 **depend** 207:9,10 dependent 140:15 depending 132:5 170:7 192:12 247:15 depends 248:20 depositing 194:8 Derby 1:15 8:18,18 94:8 98:15 138:13 139:14 157:17 159:8 160:20 166:15 170:22 171:16 219:9 220:1 222:5 260:9 263:19 264:2 264:10 270:13 274:12 275:3 derive 205:1 described 76:18 describing 49:18 103:2 design 46:17 designate 118:20 229:5 **Designated** 2:2 designating 241:12 designed 18:7 190:4 desire 184:4 259:21 desk 135:20 192:22 detail 102:14 148:11 detailed 25:1 125:7 145:7 details 229:20 245:20 determinant 126:6 determination 241:8 determined 13:8 111:12 115:3 158:20 determines 6:1 detracts 84:1 detriment 154:22 217:5 developed 56:3,8 61:7 112:17 234:5 developing 18:5 27:22

35:15 223:18 233:18 development 25:1,20 28:8 33:20 34:5 55:8 62:15 111:10,18 125:13 150:22 deviation 149:13 153:17 deviations 123:11 140:1 devise 235:8 **DeVos** 191:7 dictate 242:11,21 difference 261:11 different 26:2 40:15 43:15 49:7 86:11 119:9 162:19 200:8,9 200:22 216:7 231:4 241:18 242:14 243:8 247:14 253:18 257:2 262:18 268:2 differentiate 256:20 differently 40:16 155:2 difficult 47:8 84:18 128:2 133:5 253:7 dig 206:13 diligent 25:12 diluted 154:19 direct 12:14 13:13 14:5 36:8 71:17 79:20 81:10 85:16 126:6 135:8 145:13 149:5 241:15 direction 199:17 250:18 269:7.8 directly 28:16 115:8 135:21 254:2 director 2:1,2,8,10,13 2:13,14,16,19 3:14 5:9 14:13,22 15:17,20 16:19 96:22 104:4 105:10,12,22 106:1,4 106:12 110:22,22 230:11 232:10,14 244:13 **Director/Substantive** 2:9 directors 104:22 directs 141:2 disadvantaged 108:21 disagree 87:11 disasters 195:11 196:16 discharge 6:9 discipline 230:2 247:15 264:4,5 disciplines 120:4 247:13 248:15,18 249:3 253:19

disclaimer 272:6 disclosure 205:11 discontinuation 184:15 discontinue 262:4,8 266:5 discontinuing 261:22 262:7 discovered 80:19 81:13 discuss 25:6 discussed 47:12 131:19 153:15 221:12 discussing 48:3 90:9 273:16 discussion 10:9 47:12 66:17 71:12 77:18 94:15 95:2,3 117:8 125:6 143:22 157:15 165:12 169:17 219:10 219:11 221:13 239:20 269:16 272:1 274:17 275:2,8 discussions 103:7 124:20 125:15 135:18 250:2 dismissals 121:16 disposal 190:8 disgualifies 128:6 dissertation 15:5 distance 11:1 14:4 50:11,14,16 107:11 176:10 223:20 237:9 distinct 208:8,16 242:14 distinctions 54:10 distinctly 52:19 distinguish 261:19 **distribution** 149:15,17 **District** 176:7 diverse 109:11 diversity 29:7 31:7 35:9 118:5 divide 41:11 214:2 DMD 223:11 247:17 248:10 doctor 99:1 107:10 113:7 doctoral 110:3 doctorate 56:22 document 102:14 201:4 201:13 documentation 12:18 13:6 16:14 40:11 53:17 55:19 100:18 134:11 146:6,11 149:12 156:8 178:19 179:2,8 185:20 187:2 225:20 229:16 230:14 documented 186:5

documenting 34:9 56:1 documents 128:21 180:7 194:5 doing 42:9 47:10 55:1 72:10 76:20 80:1,14 81:13 84:3,5,14 87:5 92:4,6 124:16,17 131:11 141:15 150:21 151:3 155:2,7 161:16 167:5 169:1,1 190:3 197:11 200:3,4,5 211:8,9 235:11 250:1 250:17 251:14 259:16 260:9 262:20 266:14 266:16 269:5 dollars 109:9 Donna 2:5 96:18 doors 206:10 downturn 40:14 downward 51:9 dozen 205:14 Dr 12:4 14:12 15:8,12 15:16,19,21 16:7,11 16:18 43:8 45:22 47:3 48:6 49:18 58:15 59:21 60:5 70:17 97:7 98:6 104:4,14 105:9 105:11,21 106:2,3,8 110:10,10,12,16,21 116:20 117:2,13,20 137:12 181:1,5,7,9,14 190:1,6 194:14 214:11 232:9,15,18 233:4,6,8,11 241:2,6 261:13 264:2 draft 13:4 114:14 115:11 116:1 draw 205:17 237:21 drink 19:15,17 drop 83:13 155:14 205:12 dropped 72:3 153:21 167:13 dropping 133:15 dual 45:11 182:15 due 21:19 22:4 40:5 100:9 178:9,14 195:5 226:12 234:8 dues 194:18 195:3 196:3,7,10 207:7 Ε **E** 1:9,11,14 52:8,14,18 earlier 33:21 50:6 67:7 69:21 73:1 150:12 155:1 226:6 early 120:8 121:20

284

133:14 184:6 200:13

221:8 earning 143:4 earnings 43:20 131:17 133:11,15 160:5,8,17 161:9 164:8 165:17 168:13 169:6,10,11 169:12 172:9,12 254:17,18 271:6 easier 134:21 easily 83:17 east 138:1 **Eastern** 173:7 easy 134:1,14 137:12 227:18 230:12 echo 84:16 170:5 echoed 86:5 **ECP** 145:8 ed 48:15 208:6,12 215:11 EDU 61:16 education 1:1,1 2:1,7 2:11 4:5,9 5:11,22 6:2 6:12 8:13 9:10 10:12 10:20 11:1,9 12:7 13:22 14:5,20 17:2,4 29:1 33:22 34:6 35:7 36:12 40:14 48:13 49:3,13 51:7,22 71:6 98:14,21 99:22 104:20 106:16 107:1 107:5,11,16,18,22 109:10 110:5 112:14 112:15 118:8 119:1 156:1 159:21 175:16 176:10,13 182:3,17 183:3 189:3 192:18 200:13 223:10,11,12 223:13,14,15,16,17 223:20,22 229:17,17 233:21 234:3,4,10,15 237:6 238:10 247:16 248:6,15,16 252:4 253:1 254:4 256:9 educational 6:4 14:4 20:12 31:12,20 176:10 183:1,4,9 234:22 256:14 263:2 educator 15:2 227:2,10 227:14 228:11 230:12 231:9,10 237:2,14 238:7,16,21 240:3 242:21 260:15 268:22 educator/practitioner 227:22 educators 109:12 230:1 230:9,16 235:18 236:6,11,14,20 237:22 242:7

effect 146:7 151:14 263:10 effective 113:4 186:4 effectiveness 15:11 18:19 30:1 34:18 35:17 67:16 effort 120:4 138:20 139:7 efforts 81:5 116:8 141:4 271:13 eight 22:14 55:11 56:11 111:7 136:9 141:22 142:3,6 156:18 eight-month 55:7 either 30:10 49:22 53:11 56:16 62:9 73:22 74:5 75:5 80:18 81:21 129:18 156:9 159:11 174:8 243:20 256:22 259:13 268:18 269:6 274:7 275:21 276:2 either/or 241:13 elaborate 153:12 elected 18:14 105:18 electronic 133:21 134:20 electronically 194:22 element 34:16 60:20 152:20 156:15 210:3 elementary 208:7 209:8 209:15 210:1,19,20 210:22 211:4,8,17 213:19 214:3,8 215:14.20 elements 32:18 33:17 34:14 37:17 51:21 156:20 eligibility 6:4,11 32:17 108:18 176:21 225:9 eligible 206:2 eliminate 196:5 elimination 186:18 Elizabeth 97:2 Ellen 1:17 43:6 52:6,11 72:2,21 76:8 77:17 79:15 80:4 85:12 86:3 88:10 95:12 Ellen's 91:2 Ellis 1:18 9:5,5 92:3,9 92:15 95:20 143:19 146:13 147:19 148:1 148:9,14,21 161:22 170:9,15 172:11 177:16 220:17 271:9 else's 45:13 email 221:6 259:13 273:15 276:6,10

emerged 38:6 Emeritus 7:12 8:6 9:2 emphasis 29:13 employ 188:5 employability 140:12 employer 231:11 **employers** 228:12 235:19 236:7 employment 49:1 186:5 empowered 17:5 encourage 35:13 133:4 133:12,12 160:4,7,16 161:5,14 165:16 172:8,11 254:20 260:13 271:5 encouraged 160:10 encouragement 27:11 162:4 165:3,10 encouraging 161:1 162:2 endangering 168:5 endorses 183:5 enforce 257:19 enforced 228:6 230:21 engage 31:16 engaged 30:4 34:19 50:16 141:6 engagement 17:16 18:7 35:14 234:21 235:6 engages 107:14 188:20 engaging 62:16 136:13 Engle 2:14 104:3,4,7,13 105:9,11 106:9,11,11 117:13,20 118:3 119:11 121:5 130:14 131:20 133:16 145:21 150:17 enjoy 182:7 enjoyable 127:17 enlarge 180:2 enlightenment 58:2 enroll 207:9 enrolled 108:4 149:9 152:4 154:4 236:9 266:4 enrollment 25:21 26:5 32:1 40:15 41:18,19 44:1 49:10 51:10 125:11 153:9.12 154:10 187:19 188:2 **enrollments** 154:21,22 ensure 35:12 37:10 107:15 111:19 112:13 115:6 121:1 152:14 155:7 252:20 ensuring 17:3,7 233:16 enter 194:2 entering 123:7

entertain 218:19 entertained 234:20 entire 86:20 173:20 174:13 189:8 201:7 entirely 108:6 170:5 entities 250:21 entity 119:9 entry 141:12 environment 35:7 134:5 equivalent 265:11 era 198:5 error 240:17 errors 32:13 escalates 126:16 especially 83:21 164:3 221:7 236:19 **ESQ** 1:13 essential 32:18 33:16 34:14,15 37:17 51:21 60:19 127:4 143:8 essentially 127:8 244:22 256:6 **EST** 1:9 establish 176:21 179:6 established 5:10 111:13 174:12 188:1 establishing 111:10 et 118:19 257:14,18 264:9 Eubanks 1:15 8:2.3 74:10 83:10 95:5 149:2 151:15 153:5 155:17 157:8 166:17 171:18 220:3 270:15 evaluate 30:1 35:16 47:8 57:11 112:15 231:14 evaluated 54:21 80:11 111:14 156:17 evaluating 78:3 evaluation 12:21 17:20 24:18 27:4 28:10 29:8 29:22 30:11,14 32:19 58:14 62:4,7 65:10,11 65:13 128:20 156:6 164:1 185:22 186:19 187:9 228:12 235:19 evaluations 66:22 111:5,8,8 evaluator 18:6 61:15,19 evaluators 18:1 19:5 58:17 60:1,22 61:20 62:11,17 evening 276:9,14 event 100:11 events 39:5 everybody 96:6 139:11

218:4,11 244:4 260:4 276:13 evidence 30:20 34:15 56:4 61:3 62:8 72:14 102:7 113:22 163:4 186:5 evidenced 84:5 evolution 252:16 evolved 134:18 252:6 exactly 64:2 78:21 79:17 86:13 102:7 216:1 240:21 273:7 exam 120:7,14,15,16,18 122:22 123:4,13 140:2 141:7 142:18 149:22 151:3 247:5,7 247:11,20 249:5,15 example 84:9 88:5 122:11 125:22 133:20 134:7 153:18 154:9 206:11 228:18 250:20 265:14 examples 34:14 exams 120:2,12,14 121:10 122:19 248:2 exceed 100:14 178:13 excellence 26:12 excellent 16:18 76:13 84:20 exceptional 109:14 **excuse** 12:2 19:14 71:16 77:5 90:2 executive 2:1,8,12,14 5:8 14:12,22 18:15 26:10 104:3 105:10 105:11,16,22 106:12 110:21 181:1,15 190:1 202:4 exempt 250:21 exercise 29:9 **exhibit** 69:12 102:20 114:13 116:2,3,9 146:2 158:13 193:10 194:5 197:1 246:21 257:11 exhibits 53:1 69:11 84:6 102:17 143:21 149:5 193:18 198:15 existence 88:6 exists 80:22 expand 140:6 143:14 expanding 184:6 expansion 12:13 13:12 71:16 **expect** 183:4 expectation 18:3 253:5 expectations 131:2 185:7,10

expected 61:2 156:4 expenses 255:5 expensive 89:10 162:3 experience 16:3 17:11 31:17 48:17 49:16,17 50:14 51:5 105:12 106:6 110:4 134:17 174:2 186:2 237:8,22 243:6 experienced 18:12 24:13 184:8 experiences 31:13 109:16 experiencing 49:14 52:5 expert 174:1 expertise 17:13 109:16 163:9 243:6 253:4 experts 182:18 explain 43:10 259:3 explained 130:15 explaining 43:18 explanation 32:6,8,11 47:18 103:20 140:2 145:1 explanatory 145:4 explicit 28:22 explore 130:10 exposed 60:22 express 16:5 expressing 106:13 extend 246:10 extension 68:12 extensive 16:2 18:2 33:22 105:12 106:6 extent 120:11 extenuating 32:13 external 43:4 192:14 extraneous 166:11 167:20 170:2 extraordinarily 109:19 extraordinary 144:8 163:12,20 extremely 18:11 110:9 204:15 246:15 F **F** 184:12 fabulous 190:3 face 17:16,16 face-to-face 152:16

faced 89:14

facing 66:11

facilities 134:5

230:3 237:3

fact 44:14 45:16 54:12

68:17 80:18 94:10

117:5 142:21 186:12

factoring 152:19 factors 179:21 faculty 31:17 32:3 56:12,19,21 57:2 125:13 137:3 150:22 262:16 fail 125:3 failure 120:19 188:9 fair 135:12 fairer 234:9 **FAIRESS** 2:19 fairing 49:6 fairly 44:19 62:14 120:19 123:20 132:14 141:19 193:2 faith- 48:11 faith-based 24:9 48:8 fake 259:13 fall 25:20,22 26:7 27:21 28:2,5 34:3 38:19 208:4 fallen 193:8 falls 153:16 188:1 familiar 48:9 family 128:7 **FAPhA** 2:14 far 9:15 35:4 51:13.15 84:8 119:11 162:4 195:6 260:12 262:19 fashion 29:19 favor 85:4 94:16 favorable 184:8 favorably 189:4 FCCP 2:14 February 12:20 18:9 22:9 26:6 33:10 34:21 38:9,13,14,18 100:20 federal 2:2 5:9,12 6:6 6:13,16 21:6 41:14 44:4 69:8 77:21 108:15,16 133:8 176:13,21 224:4,9,9 224:10 264:16 265:1 federally 176:12 feedback 102:2 200:20 201:2,3,5,11,11,21 202:7,10 203:2 205:9 feeder 157:1 feel 38:12 43:17 163:16 169:13 203:8 237:19 241:7,19 246:16 257:2 feeling 78:7,8 feelings 240:22 feels 79:16 161:2 fees 207:8 feet 180:22 fell 24:17

fellow 8:18 232:11 felt 73:14 217:8 fewer 22:11 57:4 field 182:3,17 252:1 field-based 19:22 fields 254:18 271:7 fight 235:4 figure 86:12 102:6 147:11 246:21,21 251:7 256:15,15 figuring 143:9 file 13:1 22:20 178:21 225:22 241:20 filed 101:9 filing 134:20 fill 237:3 filled 62:8 filling 227:20 filter 177:15 final 13:16 40:6 84:7 110:19 113:13,16 114:4 141:6 144:10 238:9 271:21 finally 66:13 189:6 finances 49:11 194:12 215:8 218:9 financial 22:18 24:7.13 24:19 25:1,2,4,6,14 25:17,22 26:3,11 32:2 32:4 40:18 67:9 179:21 187:17 188:2 193:18 198:8.9 204:19 207:21 209:10 209:11,18 215:7 218:5 255:3,5,7,9,18 256:18 financially 180:1 204:16 210:9 214:21 find 69:12 73:5 74:20 74:22 75:13 79:1,6,8 122:9 144:22 145:2 146:15,20 147:5 148:15,20 149:8 156:7,9 185:9 188:16 253:8 254:3,9 276:8 finding 81:21 113:13,14 144:17 198:19 199:9 229:12 findings 39:17 192:9 fine 99:16 119:2 139:14 227:19 250:9,17 finished 64:18 138:8 271:14 firm 253:5 firmly 106:21 first 21:21 22:22 28:1 31:10 32:12 36:22 37:15 48:13 58:5

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

60:13 91:7 92:17 93:10 102:1 105:3 106:12 111:1 143:2 143:11 146:4,18 149:19 155:8 184:6 189:16 190:21 213:15 213:19 216:10 224:11 236:5 242:3 249:15 250:7 274:8,19 275:22 first-generation 152:17 first-time 21:15 46:3 47:6 142:15 143:17 fit 142:1 five 12:12 16:22 22:10 33:17 36:8 49:8 59:17 71:7 73:10 74:7 85:5 90:1 91:16,21 96:4 100:14 124:10,11,14 129:22 160:4,15 161:18 165:16 171:4 178:13 199:15 224:16 225:5 256:4 269:11 five- 222:13 five-year 142:11 185:12 256:6 five-year-old 142:9 fix 147:10 150:21 fixable 150:1 fixed 80:22 flexibility 29:10 42:7 51:1 94:10.18 236:13 242:11 274:2 floor 10:16 98:18 207:2 Florek 2:3 98:1,1 Florida 134:8 191:21 flows 194:8 **FNAP** 2:14 focus 28:7,17,19 35:6 76:17 200:8 focused 15:5 17:7 27:4 27:19 33:1 38:20 46:19 67:13 111:7 224:15 focuses 33:18 fold 190:4 folks 200:7 201:19 202:12 204:13 247:8 251:11 follow 47:19 66:3 126:15 137:9 189:15 192:6 195:6 207:15 follow-up 13:6 241:17 followed 10:1 34:22 138:16 following 24:20 37:22 38:18 68:6 100:12 113:5 178:11 221:8

236:3 238:4.8 follows 138:17 for-profit 184:1 206:16 forced 170:2 forget 71:14 267:8 forgiveness 197:16,17 197:20,21 form 117:18,18 210:21 241:11 formal 71:20 259:6 formalized 202:15 203:12,14 formation 5:14 19:22 61:18 former 9:6 forth 5:13 149:9 162:21 210:18 fortunately 37:1 forums 26:4 forward 73:18 80:15 115:7 116:5,13,16 125:6 145:13 199:13 239:3 241:10 242:21 forwarded 115:4 fosters 27:10 found 27:12 33:3 69:13 100:22 101:11 103:11 103:16 132:13 148:21 149:4 153:13 158:19 217:12 238:13 239:8 262:16 276:7 Foundation 8:16 foundational 29:2 founding 17:1 four 15:22 22:11 26:1 31:8 142:21 155:13 252:14 four-year 44:9 fourth 9:15 31:17 222:19 fragile 203:22 204:11 fragility 204:4 frame 86:13 frames 73:13 FRCS 23:1,2,4,7 41:3 Freeman 96:17 frequent 258:8 frequently 140:19 185:18 Friday 47:12 271:18,22 274:15 276:4 friendly 29:18 77:13,16 78:11 90:14 91:14 174:16 200:2 front 65:3 66:1 103:10 103:12 209:1 214:20 249:11 fruitful 124:19

frustrating 170:3 **FTE** 41:12 fulfill 31:9,19 fulfilled 266:6 fulfillment 28:16 29:6 fulfilment 233:16 full 49:1 62:10 109:21 114:22 115:7 194:3 203:9 205:11 224:12 235:3 245:13,13 full-time 16:1 21:15 46:3 47:7 fully 61:7 116:3,11 130:10 function 186:3 functions 6:10 fund 197:15 funded 26:13 funds 41:7,7,14 99:11 108:14 Furman 8:3 further 84:11 94:9 117:8 124:18 134:11 165:12 226:5 232:7 234:14,19 235:16 238:8 239:9 251:21 260:3 268:13 future 142:14 146:9 158:15 160:1 G **G** 190:6 191:6,17 192:6 192:13,21 193:6,13 194:1.10 195:10 196:1,18,21 197:4,11 197:18 198:1 199:6 202:18 203:10,14 204:6 205:3,19 206:17 207:7 208:1 208:21 209:6,12,21 211:12 212:21 214:10 215:3 216:1,20 217:19 **G.A** 5:3 96:16 177:12 221:5,17 222:1,9 272:4 273:6,11,21 274:7 275:9 276:8 gaining 59:13 Gallatin 15:12 gaps 186:16,18 gate 99:10 gatekeeper 20:16 21:3 45:3 108:13 181:22 gatekeeping 195:18 gather 56:7 gathered 54:20 general 3:11 82:13 85:11 212:9,19 213:1

213:2.5 223:11 229:16 230:8 247:17 257:15 generalization 248:22 generally 246:3 247:18 247:22 248:21,22 generation 48:14 gentlemen 16:2 geographic 191:8 George 2:1 5:8 7:3 96:14,20 221:4,12 276:2,6 getting 53:20 86:9 92:18 180:22 217:5 248:8 give 58:2 101:21 131:21 136:16,22 151:13 153:18 167:14 170:6 221:22 244:7 247:14 251:3 given 44:14 55:11 56:10 66:11 67:1 69:20 72:6 78:1 94:15 140:11 156:21 163:20 182:17 **aives** 47:1 94:17 glad 48:2 130:14 250:15 266:14 Glen 2:20 181:15 Glenn 181:2 **goal** 84:12 goals 28:14 29:21 63:15 87:13 Google 147:3,9 Googled 144:22 gosh 73:16 244:1 governance 26:13 115:2 governed 5:12 Governing 8:19 government 41:14 109:6 234:18 235:7 Governor 9:6 GPA 155:6.9 GPAs 141:11 grace 197:15 gradation 262:14 gradations 262:21 grade 135:4,16 grades 84:3,10,10 graduate 6:16 10:22 14:2 20:17 22:6 56:22 108:5 132:16 162:3 168:14 248:1 graduates 131:17 140:12 143:1,6 247:4 247:6 graduating 254:6

graduation 21:15,16 22:2,10,13,16 32:2 44:6,13 45:17 47:8,16 63:6 84:4 121:14 237:8 graduation/transfer 45:20,21 46:22 Grand 137:15,20 grant 26:14 108:21 109:4 219:3 granted 23:12,13 111:21 183:14 197:12 197:19,20 grantee 175:17 granting 176:18 181:19 187:14 188:14 196:13 grants 107:8 109:6,8 255:8 256:19 graphic 46:16 gratified 36:6 gray 150:5 244:2 greater 148:11 182:5 236:12 greatly 42:22 252:9 253:10 Greg 105:21 110:17,21 121:7 123:2 130:18 130:22 142:2,9 153:15 154:6 **GREGORY** 2:12 grey 94:19 ground 38:20 group 2:2 8:13 97:1,8 97:11,15,18,21 98:2 106:15 109:14 119:14 127:19 155:5 200:17 201:6 203:8 210:2 211:10 213:6 244:14 275:6 groups 200:8 263:22 Guam 176:9 guess 43:21,22 63:3 64:16 73:4 75:16 76:7 91:13 97:5 101:20 170:7,11 220:19 236:7 240:20 243:14 256:19 guessing 254:19 guidance 27:8 29:15 61:21 106:19 116:15 233:13 guide 126:1 Н **H** 71:14 74:19 78:14 96:21 97:9,12,16,19 97:22 98:3.8 218:3 230:22

half 66:2 254:1 half-day 276:4,4 **HALL** 1:16 Hall- 10:14 Hall-Martin 7:16,17 10:18 36:22 40:8 71:10 72:1 95:9 166:21 171:22 220:7 269:20 270:19 hampered 194:7 hand 52:7 71:13 72:3 78:18 83:2 121:22 162:12 212:1,2,5 handbook 262:15 handful 241:7 handle 101:19 123:3 132:17 handled 194:12 213:15 214:8 hands 78:12 218:15 267:16 happen 70:10 159:22 255:18 258:8 260:19 happened 39:19 49:7 65:8 80:16 122:15 146:10.15 163:2.20 191:6 193:5,19 215:20 happening 55:9 167:8 happens 91:7 227:15 260:21 266:20 happy 14:8 36:16 127:14 138:3 190:19 219:1 226:14 232:22 239:10 hard 96:3 109:20 harder 274:3 harm 84:14 Harris 2:4 10:16 11:21 12:1,4 14:11,11 16:7 70:18,19 85:22 98:5,6 Harris' 16:12 harsh 80:17 267:11 harsher 66:11 hat 240:5 hats 240:8 hazard 119:22 120:20 HBCUs 20:10 HEA 5:17 6:8,14 head 20:5 193:7 213:10 249:17,22 264:22 headlines 37:8 health 5:17 107:20 108:19,22 109:2,3 127:22 224:5 healthcare 236:19 hear 11:21 43:1 48:3 76:8 85:22 124:16

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

138:4 140:13 157:18 157:20 158:4 213:19 213:19 276:10 heard 85:12 139:22 147:2 204:6 hearing 79:15 142:22 hearings 112:19 heavily 24:10 28:8 heavy 119:14 HEERF 41:6,15 heightened 22:8 141:4 held 182:2 242:16 Hello 97:13 181:9 213:12 help 42:17 66:18 105:7 121:1 126:20 146:20 155:16 177:11 180:2 helpful 67:5 119:17 124:22 130:18 141:8 246:15 249:9 263:17 264:10 268:9 helping 25:13 124:22 helps 88:18 130:19 152:3 203:11 **Helton** 2:4 97:10,10 99:17,19 102:16,19 103:13 106:17 157:20 157:22 158:4,7 159:5 Herman 2:2 71:12 74:16,18 76:9 78:12 78:22 81:19 83:11 96:19,22 98:9 106:14 189:8 218:1 228:9 229:10 230:19 Herman's 228:10 hesitating 268:18 **Hester** 2:9 15:8,13 hey 61:5,21 HHS 109:5 224:6 hi 48:6 78:19 85:10 high 21:12 24:12 29:13 44:8 110:14 120:19 168:15 193:2 246:22 250:6 255:13 high-earning 164:6 higher 2:7 4:5 5:10 6:12 9:10 10:12,20 12:6 13:22 14:20 17:3 29:1 35:7 36:12 40:14 48:15 49:3,13 71:6 122:7 155:22 176:12 208:6,12 215:11 252:4 highlight 129:14 highlights 192:18 Hillsborough 137:22 Hilton 98:18 historical 228:5 229:11

230:20 historically 144:13 190:10 history 17:2 66:11 137:17 145:5,7,17 147:5,15 148:8 162:16,18 163:13 231:12 244:18,20 hit 40:17 48:22 124:12 126:2,10,13 267:19 hits 123:18 124:4 hitting 150:9,9 hold 42:1 56:21 holding 112:2,6 Hon 2:14 honest 214:18 honor 29:8 hope 80:3 88:18 159:2 189:3 198:13 236:20 271:17 272:13 276:5 hopefully 62:14 273:3 hoping 57:6 210:13 host 27:8 60:14 hosted 18:6 38:19 hosting 28:10 hours 129:9 274:14 **HR** 128:14 huge 120:9 121:2 164:9 198:7 Human 108:22 hygiene 223:15 248:3 248:17 263:21 264:7 hygienists 263:22 264:7 Hypothetically 151:16 idea 59:14 118:11 261:1 ideas 124:16 identification 187:4 identified 24:5,18 26:21 30:18 60:3,4 61:16 62:9 117:6 159:15 184:19 187:9 225:6 228:2 264:6 identifies 225:16 identify 125:10 134:2,4 151:2 186:16 187:12 187:21 188:6 238:6 identifying 32:13 62:5 102:11 imagine 128:18 259:1 273:19 immediately 55:22 201:3,5 217:14 impact 41:15 73:20

140:12 143:10 182:2

200:11

impactful 263:7 implement 68:9 88:1 implementation 25:3 55:9 implemented 56:3,9 64:4 113:11 242:18 implementing 28:1 233:18 **implicit** 28:22 important 37:19 82:3 105:5 122:20 130:22 143:7 152:20 199:10 213:13 214:16 256:2 257:2 importantly 233:20 254:16 impressive 246:22 improve 41:4 51:20 62:19 150:13 187:5 199:12 **improved** 22:22 23:2,6 31:10 182:5 improvement 17:14 24:6 25:18 27:16 34:2 56:4,6 76:22 80:19 81:4 129:7 150:2 182:17 186:10.15.22 187:6 188:7,9,21 233:21 243:21 improvements 22:13 36:2 64:9 improving 34:10 141:17 inclination 117:4 159:13 inclined 76:10 239:19 include 18:17,21 20:8 22:7 25:19 34:4 71:16 83:7 87:15,16 160:7 202:2,10 223:9 225:14 255:7 263:22 included 64:11 107:13 112:20 115:22 194:4 200:11,12,12 208:5 225:21 230:8 238:15 includes 27:22 71:15 108:5 272:1 including 14:3 20:9 24:22 32:1 34:2 45:5 55:19 105:13 107:11 109:12 176:8 209:22 223:14 229:17 230:4 234:17,21 inclusion 12:13 13:13 income 143:4 incomplete 258:13 incorrect 217:13 increase 18:7

increases 234:18 increasingly 62:18 incurring 121:21 independent 7:21 99:12 176:15 187:19 224:8 Indiana 48:8 indicate 35:4 44:16 158:14 188:3 193:18 indicated 39:9 68:11,16 195:4 230:15 241:6 252:11 indicates 21:4 22:21 46:2 168:2 197:1 236:6 indicating 68:8 89:1 indication 80:20 120:6 131:16 indications 132:15 indicative 164:7 indicator 32:5 indicators 31:22 32:4 44:11 45:19 47:17 76:17 184:19 individual 152:3 211:13 213:16 237:12.19 238:2.11 259:7 individuals 24:11 26:2 61:17 109:12 217:4,7 231:1 236:9 237:3,6 238:18 242:13.14 243:4 247:18 248:7 252:22 259:12 industry 197:10 ineffective 81:22 inform 238:20 259:20 **information** 12:5 19:12 30:9 36:15 38:21 39:13 59:4 60:11 61:1 63:19 64:7 66:5 73:14 73:17 81:21 110:17 111:12,18 115:20,21 116:3 120:10 133:6 136:19 146:20 148:6 148:20 159:1,17 163:11 168:7 191:9 191:18 217:14,18 232:20 242:20 245:21 246:1 254:5.14 256:12 259:21 Informed 28:13 informing 262:19 inherent 16:11 initial 23:14 59:17 114:2,20 130:4 217:1 223:18 231:22 234:1 238:4 243:13 244:20 initially 216:22

initiated 40:3 initiatives 111:16,19 innovation 35:9 **input** 105:7 112:18 131:4 179:4 252:21 inquire 259:22 insist 83:16 inspiring 155:19 instability 188:3 instance 158:16 163:7 instances 241:5 institutes 51:3 institution 18:17 19:9 21:9 22:7,8 23:17,20 23:21,22 27:11 29:16 31:9,18 32:6,21 37:6 38:4,8,10,13,19 39:1 39:6,10,15 40:2,4 46:13 48:9 53:8,9,22 54:4,11,15 55:3,4,17 56:11 57:3 58:9,10,19 59:13,15,16 61:11 62:12,21 63:16 64:9 65:10,16,18 66:4,19 67:22 68:1,3,6,8 69:13 70:11 72:17 75:9 105:15 134:8.12 144:8 162:20 163:14 183:2,9 186:4 187:3 187:18,21 188:10 192:16 204:5 253:14 255:10 261:8 262:20 265:3 267:1 **institution's** 24:16 63:4 66:7 147:4 183:7 institution-wide 183:15 institutional 1:4 5:6 7:6 11:2 12:8 15:6,10 17:14 18:13,19 19:14 19:19 25:5,18 26:8 28:3 29:21 30:1,5,22 31:4,5 33:19 34:1,13 36:4 37:10,18 53:4 56:2.5 59:4 63:14.19 99:9 108:10 184:21 187:17 206:4 268:3,6 instruction 11:1 125:12 245:22 instructional 35:8 50:19 integrated 53:18 integrity 1:4 5:6 7:7 17:3 37:11,18 257:11 intend 46:11 176:20 intended 55:13 63:8 188:22 intending 46:7 intent 236:2 237:17

245:9 246:6 261:18 263:8 265:10 267:10 267:10 intention 63:11 67:10 113:6 158:14 interest 19:6 51:5 69:5 127:3,16,19 129:9,12 130:11,17 131:7 153:3 168:2 234:6,13 interested 89:20 222:11 228:10 229:8 266:17 interesting 65:1 117:12 127:5 131:9 205:21 interim 111:15 interject 272:5 intermediate 251:3,5 internally 146:8 international 48:13,19 49:15 107:19 interpret 261:1 interpretation 231:1 239:6 242:17 244:5 268:21 interpreted 230:20 interrupt 196:11 interview 50:1 interviews 234:21 intricate 126:19 intrigued 69:5 intro 223:5 introduce 7:8,9 9:18 11:16 14:12,14 96:15 97:1,4 104:3,5 105:8 180:11,13 207:18 232:10 introducing 96:12 introduction 19:11 41:1 58:21 Introductions 4:2 introductory 239:13 invaluable 16:15 32:12 109:16 188:18 invest 197:2.6 investment 35:11 197:6 214:21 investments 194:6 197:1 invitation 124:20 invited 9:22 involuntary 261:10 involved 48:12 60:20 61:14,17 154:17 159:16 irate 135:13 IRS 250:21 251:1 Islands 176:8 191:15 195:13 issue 49:15 72:6 82:20

88:8 116:11 117:6,10 123:1 141:1,17 144:16 146:4 147:1 151:4 166:2 168:11 199:1 215:7 218:5,12 225:7 226:20 242:15 250:16 266:17 267:5 274:17 issued 23:19 100:15 178:15 issues 13:10 25:13,17 27:3,7 30:21 32:22 37:20 38:5,11 49:13 51:18 65:20 80:10 103:17 111:16 119:19 121:20 126:21 129:3 129:14 130:10 179:1 186:7 187:8 242:2 item 82:1 102:3 117:5 145:20 items 39:11 43:16 127:9 133:18 255:1 272:7 IV 6:14 12:8 20:15 21:3 21:7 45:2,5,8,12 99:10 108:13 176:21 181:22 183:21 184:4 188:14 190:4,5 195:18 206:2 216:6 223:7 224:4,10 268:4 IVA 255:12 IX 34:6 .1 **J** 2:12 8:18 9:9 67:20 68:19 69:3 70:8,15 77:11,19 87:8 93:16 94:8 104:7,13 106:11 118:3 119:11 121:5 130:14 131:20 133:16 138:13 139:14 145:21 150:17 157:17 159:8 160:20 161:1 166:8 166:15 167:2 168:19 170:22 171:10,16 181:9 189:22 198:2 198:12 213:12 219:9 219:17 220:1 222:5 223:5 226:18 227:13 228:9 231:17 232:5 239:18 241:17 243:7 246:15 249:9 250:5 260:9 263:19 264:10 264:12 266:10 268:9 268:18 269:3,9 270:7 270:13 274:12 275:3 **J.G** 110:20 123:5 126:12 127:14 134:19

140:17 142:13 145:5 147:15,20 148:2,10 150:6 152:2 154:8 156:14 Jackson 2:9 15:19,21 James 2:20 181:10 Jan 106:11 130:12 Janet 2:14 104:3 105:9 106:9 January 113:4,6 115:14 225:22 226:2 Jennifer 1:13 9:8,9 43:6 67:19 70:16 72:20 76:8 85:9 87:7 93:3 93:15 94:1,9 160:22 165:4 166:7 168:17 170:5 171:9 219:16 223:2,4 239:15,16 250:15 260:19 264:11 268:17 270:6 Jennifer's 164:1 jeopardizing 167:19 Jersey 9:7 176:6 **Jill** 1:15 8:17,18 94:7 98:15,18 116:21 138:10.12 139:13 157:16 159:6.11 160:21 166:14 170:21 171:15 219:22 260:4 263:18 270:12 274:22 **Jim** 181:5 213:12 Joan 155:13 **job** 43:18 50:7 76:13 120:1 168:22 185:2 185:22 186:2 join 22:3 221:19 233:9 joined 16:1 105:9,21 106:3 180:21 joining 15:15 167:13 joint 213:14,17 214:5,5 214:9 journey 27:21 joy 138:14 judgment 55:16 July 1:6 68:6 113:4,11 114:5 180:21 jump 228:3 244:1 jumps 228:9 June 39:21 40:2 67:13 197:2 224:13 jurisprudence 120:15 120:18 Κ **K** 97:13 177:4,8,19 218:17 K.S 92:21 93:11 165:19 166:2 171:6 175:11

179:20 180:6 189:16 190:20 191:12 192:1 192:10,17 193:4,10 193:15 194:4 195:4 195:20 196:15,19,22 197:8,14,22 198:11 198:13 206:22 207:3 218:21 219:13 270:3 276:6.12 Karimi 2:15 104:9,12,15 104:16,21 110:10 137:12,21 138:3 Karmon 2:6 97:12,13 175:9 177:13 178:1 189:7 202:10 Kathleen 1:12 92:2,19 92:20 93:8 165:18 171:5 175:7,10 179:18 180:5 189:13 189:15 190:7 196:11 198:18 218:19 219:12 270:2 Kathryn 232:16 **keep** 95:1,14 133:2 136:11,13 148:7 165:8.10 keeper 99:10 kerfuffle 173:15 Kevin 2:9 15:8 42:18 **key** 136:19 156:15 kick 75:2 kinds 83:19 128:11 141:12 145:18 156:8 157:5 knew 137:13 knot 179:22 knowing 57:17 251:12 knowledge 16:12 17:13 29:3 230:20 237:10 237:22 known 5:6 84:22 113:9 225:1 233:5 Kraft 2:20 181:5,7,9,10 189:22 190:6 198:2 198:12 213:12,13 214:11 Kroll 16:18 1 L 1:13 14:16 37:12 40:21 44:17 45:16 47:19 49:12 58:4 63:12 64:21 66:16 68:4 69:2,17 70:11 97:20 labeled 228:1 240:17 Labor 132:9 laboratory 223:16

248:20 lack 185:19 186:3 Lagaard 96:19 167:11 language 7:15 58:6 59:11,19,19 72:7 82:12 94:11,17 242:9 262:3 languish 150:20 laptop 177:16,17,18 large 47:9,9 157:2 215:14 247:13 largely 216:15 larger 206:5 lastly 101:13 137:11 late 37:8 64:1 172:19 266:20 latest 193:22 254:6 276:10 launched 34:21 112:10 law 69:9 120:15 161:13 252:2 laws 225:7 lawyers 128:16 lax 149:14 lay 28:19 lavers 243:19 layperson 131:13 lead 107:10 128:3 242:4 leader 18:21 leaders 18:18 25:21,21 26:9 34:6 70:22 175:7 leadership 16:3 25:19 34:2 252:4 leading 21:14 56:4 99:1 223:10 245:15 247:16 leads 125:4 136:3 153:7 258:19 lean 269:7 learn 50:18 258:8 learned 64:19 72:9 74:12 learners 21:14,22 learning 18:19 31:11,13 31:17 50:12,14,17 53:15 54:16 55:20 56:5 57:16 63:7 74:1 74:13 80:11 83:12 84:11 87:17 89:12 237:7 leave 221:11 led 38:7 259:3 left 136:19 271:12 legal 75:16 213:9 232:17 legitimate 135:15 length 22:1 110:13 let's 139:11 140:7 180:8 205:12 211:7 272:13

			291
letter 6:19,20 39:8,17	literally 55:12 199:15	102:8,9 103:9 120:17	263:16 269:14,19
54:15 55:6,14 56:12	little 19:15 52:15 60:1	229:1 231:8,20	271:1 273:8
56:20 68:7,7,16	61:19,21 88:18 102:3	looking 16:10 41:5	Macoli 194:14
225:13	102:6 120:22 123:2	43:15 53:1,7 65:2	mail 194:7 259:14
letters 24:6 38:15	130:5 140:22 143:9	67:5 81:8 86:13 88:19	main 101:20
245:19 258:16	145:15 150:8 154:12	102:17 103:1,6,20	maintain 154:21
level 48:2 110:14	154:19 155:6 169:19	127:20 129:2 132:12	maintaining 188:17
149:12 185:1 203:21	172:20 190:15 194:11	142:1,16 143:16,19	major 128:15 139:7
203:22 204:12,14	204:10 208:2 214:19	144:2 146:14 154:3	168:11 182:2 198:2
211:14 264:21 265:1	216:8,14,17 229:22	156:20 164:11,20,21	majority 117:15,19
levels 131:17 133:11,14	230:17 231:3 240:13	165:4 175:5 192:11	135:3
leverage 50:18	243:22	206:2,6 210:12 230:7	maker 90:14 91:11
LG 2:3 97:19,20	lives 128:10	240:6 254:7,8 255:15	makers 19:4 82:15
liability 215:15,16	lo 128:4	looks 80:7 129:17	89:17
license 237:1	lo' 154:1	157:19	making 19:8 66:5 79:19
licensed 110:2 132:17	load 132:17	LORNA 2:19	118:14 125:17 129:1
140:16 175:21 247:21	loan 140:13 160:5,17	lose 226:20	130:7 131:2 161:19
248:2,4,5,7,17 249:1	165:17 168:4 187:16	losing 207:5 212:14	162:8 173:20 217:19
licensee 149:22	192:2 197:16,17,19	loss 215:2	236:4 241:8
	197:19,22 253:14,18	lost 45:10 237:20	Malia 232:18
licensing 123:7 185:1 205:16 248:2			
	254:16 271:6	261:13	Mallory 97:2 100:3
licensure 140:2 143:7	loans 21:6 108:20,20	lot 52:10 83:22 84:1	106:17
246:20 247:1,6,9	119:21,22 253:15	89:9 119:21,21 127:9	Mallya 3:13 232:15
248:5 249:10,14,14	255:7 256:19	149:18 151:18 168:12	233:3,4 241:1,6
249:18	local 137:18	191:19 194:21 198:5	manage 24:14 134:21
lied 66:9	located 11:4 108:8	200:13 205:19 207:13	135:19 253:8
lies 257:10	location 17:19 68:15	215:9 216:7,11,17	Management 6:19
life 28:20 51:6	locations 184:15	217:15 246:16 251:16	manages 31:18
light 35:22 52:4 81:13	191:10	253:3 255:15 256:11	Mangold 2:5 96:18
141:1	lock 194:22	257:4 273:5	manipulative 169:19
liked 154:8	Lodge 137:15,20	lots 132:20 149:5	March 13:1 55:6
limited 151:21 161:7,13	log 136:11	152:18	marginal 61:4
194:6	long 17:2 67:11 110:13	loud 74:2 158:2	mark 205:2
Lindsay 1:16 48:6,7	129:21 190:17 197:11	louder 52:19	marked 237:20 238:5
49:18 95:7 166:19	218:8 251:10 262:10	love 127:15 169:6	Martin 1:16 10:15
171:20 220:5 270:17	271:16 272:18	low 43:20 132:14 140:3	Mary 1:17 43:5 52:6,11
line 56:18 73:1 113:8	long- 252:17	157:21 186:2 255:11	72:2,21 76:8 77:17
129:17 192:2 205:18	longer 48:21 68:18	lower 140:9,11 141:11	79:15 80:4 85:12 86:3
205:20 257:17 264:14	73:19 172:20 194:14	149:18,21 150:7	88:10 91:2 95:12
lined 139:17	194:18 205:9 208:9	151:17 155:6 191:11	Mary-Ellen 164:17
lines 206:12	208:14 262:2	207:14	172:3 220:10 264:13
link 102:13 108:15	look 44:7 47:16 51:19	lowered 153:20	269:15 270:22
128:6,7 159:17	54:3 61:5 70:8 82:21	lowering 154:22	Maryland 176:5
		lunch 172:21 173:2	-
176:12 224:9,9	82:22 86:11 94:13	lunch 172.21 173.2	master's 14:2 56:21 material 237:18
linked 28:16	103:9 116:16 119:3	M	
Lisa 2:8 14:12,21	121:8,10,12,14,16,17		materials 53:5 78:1
list 103:3,14,18 140:19	121:17 122:4,18	M 7:16 10:18 36:22 40:8	106:18 144:1 146:1
140:21 148:19 152:9	131:8,20 133:1,13	48:6 52:8,14,18 71:10	185:14
236:8	137:10 142:14,14	72:1 95:7,9 97:17	math 41:10
listed 6:7 57:4 70:4	145:15 148:18 157:1	166:19,21 171:20,22	MATHX 140:20 141:5
93:7 103:10 108:18	162:15 164:3 189:3	220:5,7 224:18 227:6	141:17 142:18 143:1
114:20 272:7	192:13,15 199:16	227:17 229:10 232:4	143:11 151:3 153:21
listen 73:12	200:3,4,14,19 203:5	267:22 268:13 269:20	155:14
listening 34:21 35:1	206:8 211:12 212:17	270:17,19	matriculated 266:7
73:12 76:9	218:8,8 243:18	M.E 63:1,11 64:16 66:8	matter 96:8 173:8
listing 145:6,17 147:16	249:13 254:3 258:10	67:18 72:4 80:7 81:15	222:15 227:2 231:8
147:20	261:4	95:13 164:18 172:4	239:5 241:18 242:1
lists 5:19	looked 57:15 72:3	220:11 260:5 262:10	272:20 276:16

maximum 140:8 Mayes 1:17 8:12,12 10:15 36:20 40:10 42:20 71:2,21 77:14 77:17 90:22 92:16 95:11 96:7 172:2 220:9 270:21 McKISSIC 2:5 97:6,7 mean 54:8 55:3 57:13 58:10 75:21 117:20 123:12 131:20 140:1 194:9 215:21 259:11 266:20 meaning 253:15 271:17 meaningful 29:18 35:14 47:22 meaningless 89:13 means 29:7 124:12 183:6 267:7 meant 255:9 measure 84:11 measured 51:11 measurement 81:11 measurements 79:21 measures 42:10 87:16 154:5 161:9 mechanical 266:9 mechanics 151:6 234:9 mechanisms 234:20 media 37:14 39:7,14,16 median 43:20 meet 31:13 99:11 122:5 124:15 140:19 142:12 145:3 163:3 176:14 224:7 227:18 267:16 meeting 5:4 7:5 18:9 26:6,8 27:18 30:17 32:8 34:3,22 38:19 39:21 40:1 67:13 72:11 100:19 114:5 114:19 115:14 118:6 128:21 129:10,18 136:4 146:18 163:2 163:17 165:1 173:12 178:20 202:5 221:9 224:14 225:22 226:2 267:18 271:18 272:22 273:9 meetings 12:20 18:10 66:3 129:9,19 meets 13:8 member 7:17 18:22 65:8,13 77:13 109:13 117:14,18 118:13,22 118:22 119:8,10,12 119:13,16 127:8 137:3 188:15 189:10 199:2 202:16 205:10

207:4 235:1 251:22 252:16 261:11 members 1:11 7:9 12:3 14:14,17 15:15 18:13 18:15,17,21 54:2,2,9 57:11 58:14 96:18 99:18 104:17 106:14 110:8 118:20 128:13 129:20 177:21 180:17 202:2 203:1,4 205:7 220:21 221:16 224:19 232:11 233:14 235:3 251:16,17 252:6,7,10 252:12,14,15 253:4,6 253:8 260:13 271:13 membership 196:8 200:10 203:9 204:18 memo 129:11 mention 67:10 mentioned 34:4 41:1 44:10 50:6 58:21 59:1 67:7 69:21 75:1 81:19 92:10 110:10 119:14 144:3,21 147:2,16 153:7 155:13 198:20 204:21,21 243:9 248:17 mentioning 64:3 merit 32:11 259:18 messy 240:13 met 1:8 63:9,9 183:10 199:16 200:21 236:2 methods 123:6 metric 45:21 161:15 Michael 1:16 2:6,9 15:19 43:5 48:5,7 95:6 166:18 171:19 220:4 270:16 microphone 52:12 157:19 260:8 middle 2:18 4:13 170:10 173:4 175:5 175:11,13 178:3 180:19 181:5,11 188:17 189:10 190:22 198:3 204:13 207:17 207:19 208:5,11,18 208:22 211:15 214:3 214:17 219:3 220:21 midst 80:1 Midwest 191:2 Mike 97:16,17 223:4 224:17,19 232:2 233:11 267:15 268:11 miles 137:22 million 21:8,9 109:9 mind 91:4 153:11 199:18 265:8 272:4

mindset 143:5 minimal 61:3 251:18 minimalist 257:5 minimally 54:7 57:12 **minimum** 230:9 Ministers 128:16 ministry 18:22 19:22 21:20 28:18,19 29:3 46:20 ministry-oriented 42:13 minority-serving 20:9 minute 96:5 222:14 minutes 67:11 199:10 missed 51:14 145:4 147:14 missing 62:9 mission 28:14,16 29:1 29:4,7,9,11,14 30:2 31:4,7,19 42:14,21 43:20 106:22 110:9 152:2,19 188:18 233:16 missions 31:5 **mistake** 57:5 mix 152:6 mixed 120:10 modalities 35:8 50:19 176:11 model 131:8 186:22 205:5.6.13 moderate 61:4 140:20 moderately 54:5,7,12 54:22 57:12 modest 24:14 modified 171:2 265:19 **modify** 77:5 **Molly** 1:16 7:14,16 10:14,16 36:18,20 70:22 71:12,22 74:18 77:16 92:16 95:8 166:20 171:21 220:6 270:18 Molly's 67:22 moment 58:15 59:22 69:8 144:7 149:3 222:10 money 84:1 197:6 211:10 212:15 256:22 Monica 96:17 167:1,9 monitor 33:8 69:22 123:8 131:16 132:2 160:4,8,11,13,16 162:2 165:16 168:13 172:9,12 266:3 271:6 monitoring 22:8 24:17 73:9 76:10 77:2 78:4 78:16 79:4,9 82:6,11

82:18 83:7 84:19 85:6 85:17 89:1,7,20 91:16 93:18 121:9,12 122:5 123:18,20 124:4,13 131:15 165:21 168:3 186:7 187:1 188:8 225:12,14 226:11,21 228:19,22 229:2 234:15 241:20 251:11 257:3,19 266:8 269:10 monitors 22:18 31:21 187:15 month 137:14 202:5 months 55:11 56:11 100:9 178:10 200:21 219:6 225:12 226:12 246:9 263:9 morning 5:3 7:4 8:2,12 10:18 12:2 14:17 96:21 97:6,17 99:17 104:7 221:13 222:3 271:21,22 272:2,14 274:1,5,8,15,22 275:20 276:2,11,15 Mort 2:20 181:2.15 190:1,6 191:6,17 192:6,13,21 193:6,13 194:1,10 195:10 196:1,18,21 197:4,11 197:18 198:1 199:6 202:18 203:10,14 204:6 205:3,19 206:17 207:7 208:1 208:21 209:6.12.21 211:12 212:21 214:10 215:3 216:1,20 217:19 motion 71:1,3,9 77:5,6 77:13 78:11 82:15 83:6 89:1,4,18,21 90:3,4,5,12,21 91:1,5 91:20 92:7 93:2,7 96:1 159:12 160:2,6 160:19,20 161:5,20 164:2,16 165:11,14 168:6 171:1,2 172:17 173:16,17 174:4,4,17 174:18,19 213:18 218:20,22 219:9 220:20 268:17 269:13 269:22 270:1 271:12 motions 58:6,7 239:21 motto 155:22 move 71:4 78:20 80:15 96:19 113:12 174:10 219:2 239:3 243:7 268:16 274:4,5

275:20 moved 174:21 movements 79:20 moving 73:18 141:8 199:13 241:10 242:20 MSA 184:22 **MSA-** 184:17 MSA-CSS 2:18 4:14 175:6,12 180:12 183:19 184:17 186:8 186:12 187:12,15,21 188:4,12 muddying 169:13 multi 243:19 multifaceted 121:6 multiple 57:10 142:19 210:7 Murdock 26:14 Murphy 9:6 mute 43:5 67:21 139:18 muted 8:21 11:18,19,20 14:15 92:20 Ν N 11:21 12:1 70:19 85:22 98:5 NACIQI 2:1 5:7,9 6:8,15 6:21 10:1 23:11 48:3 71:4 76:4 180:18 219:2 224:13 231:13 231:14 233:1,14 236:3 239:5 NACIQI's 6:22 NAFLAC's 123:19 name 7:16 12:3 14:21 46:17 53:8 96:22 97:6 99:18 104:21 119:4 145:18 147:4 178:1 208:13 224:19 232:13 233:3 259:8 names 53:9 narrative 33:18 114:18 114:22 115:3,7,16 126:4 149:4 156:3 258:20 nascent 57:16 national 1:3 5:5 7:6 99:7 124:1 185:3 247:20 nationally 5:20 100:6 165:15 171:3 178:7 226:9 234:6 Native 7:15 20:10 natural 195:11 196:15 nature 21:19 163:20 nearby 137:20 nearly 182:1 necessarily 44:15

119:5 137:8 194:19 229:7 241:22 242:13 264:18 necessary 31:19 139:1 139:6 265:13 need 19:15,16 52:11 64:6,12 72:7,13 90:17 92:19 111:12,17 137:8 164:19 167:3 194:19 225:5 241:19 242:5 251:3 258:11 259:18 260:7 271:18 273:22 275:1,9 276:3 needed 18:10 24:6 33:19 54:16 58:11 68:8 80:19 126:15 195:14 237:7,8 258:18 262:22 274:15 needs 31:14 118:6 182:7 246:2 265:9 negative 231:19 243:19 neighborhood 137:15 neither 193:7 net 21:10 never 24:13 140:21 152:9 204:6 260:21 new 9:7 16:10 18:6 36:1 39:9,17 43:14 58:21 59:20 61:13,15 62:14 68:10,14,18,22 75:18 88:20 92:10 111:11 111:18,21 113:8,19 130:16 146:17 162:17 163:8 172:19 176:6,6 180:20 181:14 189:17 194:17 195:7 200:19 202:21 231:9 235:7 236:12 242:18 news 39:7 nicely 249:6 Nicole 2:4 10:16 11:18 11:19,19 12:4 14:11 16:7 85:8,20 87:9 88:18 97:3 98:3,6 nimble 42:2 nine 244:13 **non-** 86:3 103:16 158:19 196:12 216:17 223:6 non-compliance 79:6 83:3 85:2 125:4 126:7 216:11 non-compliant 73:5 74:21,22 75:13 81:22 103:5,19 non-degree 175:17 176:18 187:13 non-degree-181:18

188:13 non-degree-granting 176:4 183:20 185:4 non-HEA 108:16 non-profits 128:11 noncompliance 30:19 normal 122:7 149:15,17 normally 49:2 174:3 note 56:12 107:12 114:11 236:10 noted 13:11 16:9 33:21 56:19 69:3 103:3 134:22 139:8,20 165:4 168:14 231:18 238:19 243:10 247:3 notes 236:14 **notice** 114:9 216:9 251:15 253:13 noticed 69:11 126:22 134:10 216:5 noticing 88:8 notification 102:10 138:21 notifications 102:21 158:18 159:15 notified 114:6 221:8 notifying 251:11 November 30:8 39:2,3 58:22 59:2 64:22 73:15,17 number 20:8 44:22 46:4 125:22 129:21 142:6 142:15 147:13 154:14 157:2 188:13 190:13 193:2 207:9 247:13 255:13 256:17 264:16 264:20 265:2 numbers 43:10 206:14 255:11 nurse 5:22 252:3 nursing 176:1 206:11 0 objection 174:9 221:16 objective 29:5 234:10 objectives 29:21 53:18 63:15 183:13 obligation 169:2 observations 12:19 13:6 39:17 130:18 178:20 218:16 225:21 observed 100:19 153:22 observers 250:22 **obstacle** 195:3 obtain 191:10 204:16 **obtained** 109:5 obtaining 188:16

obvious 73:11 obviously 61:13 62:13 62:14 79:14 84:20 118:9 122:21 168:10 198:22 occasions 200:22 occur 87:1 occurred 136:5 154:4,6 192:3 242:17 occurs 258:6 October 12:22 odd 231:3 offer 176:9 204:17 271:21 offered 14:4 28:2,4 46:12 114:1 223:19 offering 10:21 12:13 13:22 46:15 68:13 183:16 offers 63:16 office 1:1 6:19 85:11 135:18 213:5 officer 2:10 15:20 94:13 officers 25:22 official 2:2 5:9 12:11 71:5 75:4 82:9.10.21 100:5.16 113:21 115:18 160:3,15 162:7 178:6,16 219:3 225:3 226:8 official's 225:13 OGC 96:18 167:11 **Ohio** 191:1 old 171:2 Olivet 37:9.14.20 38:6 on-campus 17:21 on-site 250:2 once 18:4 36:10 69:20 76:11 145:16 148:5 one-year 46:9 ones 46:18 ongoing 48:1 62:13,15 76:19 online 34:6 134:8 147:3 185:17 onsite 185:22 187:9 open 112:19,19 134:14 177:17 206:18 269:8 opened 191:10 201:16 206:10 opening 66:17 67:10 181:7 232:19 235:15 operate 39:10 208:19 210:11 operating 214:3 operation 214:9 215:19 operationally 76:1 operations 2:19 182:19

215:2.10 opportunities 20:12 25:16 34:1 126:20 132:20 154:16 opportunity 10:5 14:19 36:14 56:16 67:1 104:19 105:8 114:1 124:15 139:4 179:3 181:20 189:1 196:7 199:1,7 202:16 239:12 244:7 opposed 173:21 227:4 option 94:20 options 73:5 74:3 75:5 optometry 164:5 252:3 order 46:11 64:13 90:8 91:9 151:4 174:2,3 217:20 255:2 274:19 orders 23:19 ordinarily 261:7 ordinary 190:13 **Oregon** 105:2 organization 105:20 118:13 119:2 183:1 183:10 193:14 194:15 207:22 208:10.10.15 209:5 210:8,12 215:17,22 226:14 258:15 organization's 183:12 organizational 225:9 organizations 57:14 112:22 113:1 118:18 118:18,19 133:2 182:20 200:18 208:9 organized 276:3 orientation 119:6 original 13:4 16:20 77:6 90:21 91:5,20 92:7 originally 217:13 ought 85:6 Out/program 265:21 outcome 27:18 47:2 61:13 62:6 77:1 161:9 161:15 168:21 outcomes 15:6 29:10 29:13,14,17,17,22 30:2,6,9,15 31:11 53:18 55:21 56:2 57:17 58:20 59:3,21 60:7,9 63:7,9,13,17 63:18 64:1,10,15 65:7 65:14,19,21 74:13 75:7 86:5 89:12 157:6 188:22 250:4 outliers 140:7 outright 257:10 outside 11:6 122:10

137:15 139:22 142:10 191:11 outstanding 196:7 225:7 260:1 263:5 overall 23:4 41:3 62:21 131:21 184:8 215:22 overcome 199:5 overnight 85:3 overstepping 130:6 overview 34:12 106:9 **Oxford** 269:18,20 Ρ **P** 2:14 98:1 104:3 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 5:1 p.m 172:18 173:2,7,9 173:10 221:2 222:14 222:16,17 272:2 274:6 276:17 pace 221:10 Pacific 2:15 105:2 137:13,17 page 201:20 pandemic 22:4 42:6 48:22 50:5 panel 127:3,7,13,16,19 129:9,13 130:11,17 131:7 232:11 paper 65:3 parachurch 18:22 parameter 123:16 124:13 143:7,15,16 parameters 121:9,13 123:13 125:3,11 150:9,10 paramount 29:9 paraphrase 155:19 parent 207:22 208:10 208:10,15 part 22:19 30:11 42:9 48:17 50:15 51:6 62:6 62:20 67:17 69:19 80:20 96:16 109:21 126:22 127:17 147:3 156:14 161:4 164:16 174:19 176:9 189:18 192:14 193:16 198:8 198:9 204:18 212:10 227:3 237:16 250:3 261:8 275:14 part-time 15:21 21:13 21:22 47:9 partially 162:19 PARTICIPANT 72:21 participate 45:2,2,5,12 108:19 183:21 184:4 224:3 274:16

participating 6:5 44:4 45:8 participation 6:13 252:9 particular 38:4 52:22 67:3 75:8,10,11 89:7 118:20 126:2 129:16 136:8 140:20 145:10 148:12 155:4 196:9 199:9 233:10 264:4 265:19 particularly 16:6,14 27:17 43:9 44:7 46:18 47:6 106:16 111:9 206:3 227:17 239:20 263:20 parties 102:22 **partner** 105:5 partners 200:1 parts 57:11 party 10:3 70:17 101:13 pass 120:2,7 121:11 122:21 123:19 141:17 142:15 143:17 153:21 185:2 246:20 247:4 249:14.18.19 passage 120:17 122:18 123:3,6 126:5 passes 96:2 172:17 220:20 271:12 passing 120:21 pat 190:14 path 29:5 pathway 111:11 155:21 Patrick 177:12 Paul 2:3 97:22 98:1 pay 196:3,7 251:8 paying 119:20 195:3 payments 194:18 pediatric 264:8,9 peer 17:5 186:19 264:2 peers 105:18 264:4 Pell 21:5 penalty 251:8,8 pending 117:7,7 Pennsylvania 176:6 people 44:3 47:10 96:2 98:11 119:3,20 120:20 121:2 127:7.8 127:20 128:9 134:1 137:7 173:17 174:21 221:3 222:2 227:16 240:17 251:6 273:22 274:18 percent 20:18,21 21:4,5 22:1,6,6,15,17 44:1 44:15 45:22 56:21 57:4,5,8 68:13 132:13

132:14 140:7 149:18 185:3 204:21,22 205:1,6,16,16,17 215:11 255:14 percentage 21:13 44:3 47:10 57:2 247:3,8 255:3,4 perfect 88:4 151:15 perfection 93:12 perfectly 119:2 performance 19:12 149:22 182:19 183:7 185:19 186:17 187:2 187:16,22 period 17:22 22:22 24:17,21 27:1 42:10 50:19 55:8 66:21,22 75:17 100:13 101:7 101:10 113:5 115:5,9 124:14 142:11 158:11 158:22 178:12 179:14 196:3 200:21 225:16 226:4 periods 112:20 123:15 Perkins 205:5.6 Permanent 116:21 persist 150:1 person 101:20 174:18 213:18 218:16 225:17 227:4,13,20 231:4 260:16.20 personal 229:6 247:10 perspective 76:20 81:1 127:21 129:1 131:10 212:19 228:5 229:9 229:11 236:3 238:3 252:21 253:9 256:21 257:1 perspectives 109:17 petition 9:22 12:5,18 13:18 16:13,20 32:20 36:15 53:1,2 75:19 99:20 100:18,21 105:4 106:18 114:2 114:12 116:18 178:2 178:18 180:15 181:22 184:7 189:5 224:20 225:19 233:12,15 252:11 Petrisko 1:17 52:8,14 52:18 63:1,11 64:16 66:8 67:18 72:4 80:7 81:15 95:13 164:18 172:4 220:11 260:5 261:14 262:10 263:16 269:14,16,19 271:1 273:8 Ph.D 252:3

pharamcists 132:20 pharmacist 123:1 pharmacists 106:6 107:21 110:3 132:16 pharmacy 2:11,16 4:9 98:14,21 99:1,1,22 104:20 105:1,15,19 107:1,2,3,10,15,18,19 107:21 108:18 109:10 110:4,5,8 112:21,22 112:22 113:7 118:7 119:20 120:14,15,18 122:13 128:1,5,8 131:14,14 132:2,3 133:2 137:22 144:14 154:11 164:5 216:6 PharmD 2:14,16 107:11 108:2 PhD 2:12,14,15 phenomenon 143:13 philosophy 183:13 phone 167:12 **pick** 161:15 picture 47:1 62:10 98:4 **piece** 65:3 92:10 144:4 162:11 163:18 173:17 174:5 191:11 216:6 pieces 136:19,22 137:8 144:3 216:11 pilot 200:17 203:7 **PIP** 129:20 130:5 pipeline 195:7 **pivot** 216:8 place 40:2 57:21,22 123:14 167:21 187:1 191:14 194:17 202:2 203:16 214:12,15 241:11,15 244:22 252:20 placed 22:8 23:16 25:9 30:15 39:22 112:4 188:10 placement 185:2 186:1 186:2 204:22 205:17 236:8 242:3,10 places 29:13 placing 27:2 38:8 plan 25:2,3 28:9 32:9 35:16 54:17 64:3 68:2 68:22 69:19 156:6,20 157:7 199:5 222:5 265:10,13 266:1,6,13 267:2,13,19 268:5 275:19 **planned** 53:17 planning 24:8 26:20 28:15 53:14 54:3,13 184:5

plans 28:1 55:9,10 56:3 57:22 69:9,16 186:10 187:6 188:7 265:8,18 266:18 platform 35:11 185:17 play 92:11 126:14 130:21 252:7 pleasant 43:22 please 14:14 19:14 52:7 97:4 167:1 177:7 pleased 180:19 plotted 149:17 plus 47:16 157:9 pockets 42:12 point 33:17 38:3 40:6,7 59:11 85:1 88:13,17 90:8 117:4 162:1,8,9 179:18 192:20 201:2 213:13 228:10 248:13 268:1 272:12 pointed 62:9 **pointers** 149:5 pointing 145:2 156:12 points 41:6 77:18 91:2 91:2 **policies** 17:6 18:3 19:2 37:22 38:2 86:8 101:12 146:7 179:9 214:6,7,12,12,14 229:16 234:12,16 235:8 238:5,19 258:2 258:21 policy 2:19 9:6 19:6 29:14 30:6 31:3,8 33:11 36:1 58:20.22 59:21 60:7 62:6 63:12 63:13,18,22 64:10,15 65:19 66:6 112:12 159:21 179:7 202:1,6 202:11 203:13,15 221:13 229:20 235:19 241:15 242:18 257:6 257:8,19,20 259:4 265:19 272:1 274:19 274:22 275:1,4,7,10 275:12,14,19 pool 18:1 154:11,19 poor 215:15 population 31:14 47:9 populations 20:13 portfolio 197:2 214:22 portion 89:18,22 99:13 position 25:6 41:15 87:12 109:22 118:22 173:19 positions 105:17 109:21 164:6 possibilities 94:14

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

possible 91:6 143:8 151:19 174:6 221:18 250:7 257:17 263:12 possibly 86:10 post- 176:17 203:21 post-graduation 160:5 160:17 post-secondary 175:17 175:19 176:4 181:18 183:19 185:4 187:13 188:13 196:12 204:2 204:5,11 210:14 posted 38:16,16 66:6 114:18 115:20 201:10 postgraduate 165:17 POSTSECONDARY 1:1 potential 236:8 245:15 259:18,22 267:8 potentially 33:6 272:9 **PPE** 197:18 **PPP** 197:14 practical 19:21 83:18 176:1 Practically 151:19 practice 105:16 110:5 143:2 186:15 188:5 197:9.9 237:8 248:3 249:2,8 257:15 practices 27:19 130:20 184:16 257:4 practicing 122:22 247:17 253:1 practitioner 227:3,10 227:15 230:13 231:9 231:10 236:6 237:2 237:14 238:7,16,21 240:4 242:22 260:15 269:1 practitioners 109:13 117:18 118:11,19 228:11 229:18 230:1 230:9,16 235:18 236:11,14,21 238:1 242:7 pre- 11:3 13:20 98:21 112:7 pre-accreditation 107:9 pre-accredited 17:8 20:7,20,22 23:5,8,12 23:21 26:16 28:7,10 33:6,12 35:2 45:6 59:12 pre-accredits 20:2 99:3 pre-candidate 115:15 pre-conference 26:4 pre-doctoral 223:9 precedent 212:17 precipitating 39:5

predecessor 224:11 predicament 169:19 preempt 127:16 prefer 89:17 preference 77:2 preparation 16:19 28:18,21 141:5 prepare 141:3 prepared 213:8 preparedness 112:14 prerequisite 28:9 prerogative 168:20 prescribed 183:10 presence 194:13 present 1:11 2:1 14:7 36:14 232:9,20 presentation 14:6 37:2 43:9 52:9 61:16 81:9 83:15 179:14,22 239:18 240:21 250:14 260:6,11 272:21 presented 179:21 180:7 presenters 273:5 275:7 presenting 12:4 100:2 presently 108:1 presents 20:14 27:18 president 2:15,19,20,21 2:21 7:12,20 8:5 9:2 15:2,10 48:7 104:8,14 104:22 105:18 137:12 180:12,20 181:1,14 181:15,16 190:1 193:1 194:12,15 196:4 217:2.3 presidents 18:18 25:20 181:3 presiding 1:9 Pressnell 1:12 7:19,20 79:13 81:7 90:7,16 95:16 163:22 167:3,7 167:17 172:6 175:8 189:14 198:17 202:14 203:7,11,17 204:20 206:6 211:21 212:4 216:3 217:21 219:1 220:13 271:3 pressure 51:9 presumably 231:21 pretty 57:16 62:10 73:12 76:17 134:14 140:3 144:8,14 161:7 218:4 221:10 240:21 251:17 253:5 267:11 previous 16:18 76:15 109:7 194:12 196:4 217:2,2 previously 13:15 63:20 68:19,20,21

price 21:10 pride 186:12 233:15 primarily 175:15 206:10 primary 9:17 10:14 70:22 98:15 175:7 189:13 218:18 223:2 239:14 261:4 principles 237:6 257:14 prior 15:1 16:2 19:2 33:13 51:3 75:20 159:14 174:12 236:10 236:13 238:10 privacy 177:15 private 24:10 132:6 184:1 204:8 206:16 proactive 192:20 probably 61:8 81:10 89:15 139:2 151:22 163:8 197:13 205:8 205:14 206:7 208:2 240:6 251:15 254:19 266:15 probation 23:16,17,18 25:10 38:8,14,22 39:3 57:19 68:21 70:6.14 112:5 243:17 264:16 264:19 265:4.9.11 267:1,3,17,19 268:1 probationary 188:11 265:16 probations 89:9 problem 80:21,21 82:5 91:12 94:12 124:6 164:10 165:9 192:5 192:19 273:4 problematic 75:22 148:13 153:2 158:1 227:9 240:10 problems 125:14 150:21 151:11 153:12 251:2 procedure 173:14 265:20 procedures 9:16 101:12 234:12,16 235:9 238:6 258:2 proceed 259:20 process 6:11 9:13 16:8 16:16 22:20 32:1 35:21 36:2 37:3 40:5 40:5 51:6 61:12 62:12 62:13,16 65:1,11 69:20 70:1 80:12 105:7 106:20 110:15 112:11 116:16 125:8 126:10,19 127:1,2 133:22 134:18 135:9 135:11,14,16 138:15

139:3 153:17 169:20 182:22 185:12 186:19 187:1 188:19 199:11 199:13,15 201:8,10 202:9,15,21 203:12 203:15 204:12 214:5 217:12 233:13 234:8 234:15,20 235:7,11 235:12 236:9 237:5 242:18,19 243:3 245:1 250:4 256:2 264:3 272:3,11 273:12 processes 15:7 17:4,14 24:4 procures 31:18 produced 62:3,4 profession 106:7 107:2 118:7 121:4 123:8 128:8 154:15 182:14 233:17 248:18 professional 2:13 15:16 16:1 17:11 28:18 98:22 106:1 107:9 108:20 110:1,2 110:7,22 112:21 157:4 164:4 253:1 professionals 18:20 26:6 109:15 236:20 248:5 professions 154:16 175:21 235:22 professor 2:15 105:1 105:14 252:2 program 2:13 20:1 22:1 26:13 29:16,21 36:4 46:8,12 63:15,16 68:14 106:1 107:11 111:1,9 112:6,7,12,16 113:22 114:1 115:15 115:19 121:13 122:1 123:18 124:4 126:21 134:8 136:8,15 140:18 141:2.15 142:22 144:12 145:10 145:17,22 146:5,15 148:4,5,16,19 153:16 153:19 155:4,16 156:18 157:4 168:14 176:14 183:15 186:5 186:11 234:3,8,17 235:14 236:18,18 238:10,18 245:4,7,18 247:13,19 248:1 249:2 256:4 258:10 259:20 261:21 262:1 262:9 263:6,14 264:7 264:8 265:3,8,9,22

266:4,7 267:1 program's 114:21 145:6 156:5,11 256:7 262:8 program- 184:22 program-specific 187:6 programmatic 108:6,14 223:7 230:6 268:7 progress 24:22 27:1,13 30:19 32:9,22 33:8,15 38:11,12 53:12 54:18 55:1,7,22 56:10 58:12 59:15 65:20 66:3,12 66:13,15 188:8 progression 121:18 122:7 prohibit 84:8 prohibited 237:13 project 30:7 47:11 59:1 61:13 63:2 64:18,21 65:6,8 66:12,20 72:8 76:19 80:12 84:22 87:5 projected 113:8 **prompt** 73:7 prompted 69:4 118:1 264:13 prompts 69:7 proposal 180:7 proposed 94:11,17 proposers 77:8 proposing 201:1 protocol 184:9 185:14 185:16 186:13 188:16 192:7 protocols 234:13 proud 18:11 20:11 proved 32:12 proven 185:6 provide 6:10 9:22 16:15 18:7 19:12 20:12 25:15 27:8 32:6 39:16 47:22 65:20 81:20 101:2 102:9,10 103:3 106:9 110:17 114:1 124:5,8 136:20 144:7 144:20 158:12 175:20 179:2,4,8 186:4 201:20 202:12 203:1 235:16 236:8 243:17 243:20 245:19 250:20 256:5 266:1 267:1 provided 6:2,8,18 13:12 18:8 26:12 41:7 42:7 53:3 101:6 112:16 115:8,10 116:3 146:16,21 149:16 156:19 163:6 185:20

187:10 253:12 266:12 providers 107:17 provides 9:19 17:12 26:3 29:15 33:22 34:12,14 110:14 183:2 providing 52:1 99:19 106:19 157:2 178:2 188:19 199:1 217:17 224:20 253:12 provinces 20:5 proving 141:19 provision 237:15 provisions 5:12 PTA 128:12 public 5:17 7:12 18:15 18:20 29:18 30:10 36:3 38:3 40:7 60:12 63:3 66:18 109:13 113:2 114:7,9 115:2 117:18 118:12,21,22 119:8,9,12,13,16 127:2,8,15,19,21 128:12,22 129:8,12 130:11,17,19 131:7 131:10 132:6 152:12 153:3 169:10 182:8 182:10 201:16 202:2 202:7 206:10 224:5 233:17 234:19 235:1 235:3 251:16,17 252:6,7,10,12,14,16 252:21 253:5,8 261:11 262:19 public's 182:4 public-minded 130:2 publicly 256:12 publish 5:19 29:20 63:14 256:11 published 43:10 Puerto 99:4 176:7 195:12 pull 170:20 pulled 69:10 punish 79:19 purpose 74:3 144:17 147:7 185:6 200:14 235:21 242:22 purposes 188:15 215:13 239:20 256:1 pursue 46:12 purview 86:18 235:5 put 39:5 52:7 53:9 83:14 123:14 136:21 137:9 144:21 165:20 166:3 169:18 173:18 194:16 200:8,16 201:3,9 204:6 205:6

			29
240:5 241:11,15	203:19 206:18,20	84:4 120:17 123:3	179:11 184:11 200:6
265:3	211:19 215:6 226:14	126:5,10 141:18	201:4,10,11 226:3
puts 126:14	226:16 228:18 231:15	142:15 164:7 185:1,2	receiving 59:17
putting 154:5 164:21		-	
	233:1 239:10 241:19	185:2 186:1,3 187:3,5	recognition 4:4,8,12,1
165:5 203:6 211:10	246:18 250:12 255:6	187:16,16 206:5	10:11 11:6,10 12:12
puzzle 136:22	260:3,12 268:11	246:20 249:14,15,18	12:15 13:9,14,16,20
	269:22	250:6	17:22 24:17,21 27:1
Q	quick 50:8,11 85:21	rationale 147:10	35:20 36:7,9,16 50:1
qualifications 56:13,19	221:10 222:12 263:19	re- 245:6	71:7,18 75:17,19 87:
qualified 31:16 57:2	quickly 27:12 87:6	re-accreditation 245:7	91:21 92:14 99:21
262:17	272:5	re-recognition 235:12	100:6,11,13 107:7,13
qualify 241:13	quite 50:2 88:3 119:17	re-vote 167:15	108:15 112:10 114:3
qualitative 183:11	133:20 154:17 174:6	reaccreditation 245:14	165:15 167:19 176:3
qualities 31:9	195:14 205:5 206:14	reach 275:16 276:9	178:3,7,11,13 179:13
quality 1:4 5:6 6:2 7:7	206:14 207:8 214:18	reached 199:22	208:19 219:4 222:21
17:3,7 19:14 27:15	214:21 218:7 253:13	reaching 190:12	224:2,21 225:4,8
30:22 31:2,4,6,10	257:9	reacted 154:20	226:9 234:1 235:10
34:1 35:13 36:4	quorum 220:20 221:15	read 13:20 55:14 99:14	236:5,10 245:7
106:22 107:15 112:15	221:18 272:13 273:12	232:3 244:6	261:16 269:11 272:3
118:7 129:6 131:11	275:1,10,11	readers 9:17 10:14 19:3	recognitions 210:1
154:3 182:5,16 183:3	quote 248:9,11 257:11	98:15 116:21 189:13	recognize 81:4 174:7
184:19,21	quoting 55:18	218:19 223:2 239:15	210:13,13 232:9
quantitative 87:15	quoting oon o	261:4 268:17	recognized 5:20 11:9
183:11	R	reading 138:15,19	12:9 17:1 80:10 99:8
question 37:1,5,13	R 8:5,9,12 36:20 40:10	149:4 163:13 198:15	100:7 107:5 108:10
40:22 44:5,18 47:3	42:20 71:2,21 77:14	226:22 228:14 232:2	111:3 171:4 178:8
54:6 57:10 58:5 64:17	77:17 84:16 90:22	readmission 233:12	218:7 224:12 226:9
66:9 67:22 73:2 82:22	92:16 93:14,20 94:4	235:6	recognizing 209:19
83:17 88:15 92:4	95:11 96:7 104:12,16	reads 228:11	210:9
101:18 137:12,19	137:21 138:3 166:5	ready 49:21 86:9 104:5	recollection 103:13
138:16 143:20 148:3	166:10 170:5,19	reaffirmation 25:9 55:2	recommend 60:16 71:
148:4,6 150:14 153:6	171:8,12 172:2	55:5,6,15 56:9 58:9	79:4,7,9 82:16 160:2
153:7 155:8 156:2	219:15,19 220:9	59:9 70:1	160:14 219:2
157:16 158:8 159:7	270:5,9,21	reaffirmed 23:15 53:22	recommendation 12:1
		real 85:21 91:3 92:1	
159:14 160:9,22	R71 102:18 103:9		12:16 36:7 71:15
168:9 173:13 179:18	114:13	120:4,19 127:21	100:4,17 102:5 158:
190:7,18 194:11	R81 116:2,9 146:2	173:2 237:18	158:22 162:4,13
198:16 206:1 208:1	158:13 159:19	reality 137:6	165:13 168:1 171:3
212:8,22 213:9	radar 39:6	realized 201:14 202:1	178:5,17 225:18
216:20 217:15 228:20	raise 78:22 82:8 129:15	reason 19:17 73:10	230:18 236:4 269:10
232:21 241:2 242:4	212:1	93:22 162:12 163:10	recommendations
244:11 246:17 249:10	raised 65:21	196:9 230:17 240:10	164:21 165:5
253:21 258:20 261:2	raising 82:20 162:12	246:11	recommended 79:3
261:15 263:19 264:2	range 24:20 26:22 58:7	reasonable 185:6	128:20
			recommending 96:4
	67:5 75:22 142:4,6	268:21 269:6	
264:13 267:14,20	400.47 004 00 007 10		226:7
274:11	183:17 204:22 207:13	reasoning 101:3 147:14	
274:11 questionable 56:15	ranged 132:5	reasons 38:15 102:10	recommends 225:11
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17	reconvene 276:14
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9 43:16 52:21 59:6 73:1	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15 122:19 123:6,19	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1 189:5	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4 recording 167:2 170:1
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9 43:16 52:21 59:6 73:1 73:2 101:15,17 102:1	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15 122:19 123:6,19 126:8 143:17 153:21	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1 189:5 recall 102:19	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4 recording 167:2 170:1 170:18
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9 43:16 52:21 59:6 73:1 73:2 101:15,17 102:1 104:1 116:16,22	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15 122:19 123:6,19 126:8 143:17 153:21 185:5 206:3 247:1,4	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1 189:5 recall 102:19 receipt 68:6 259:21	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4 recording 167:2 170:1 170:18 records 6:21
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9 43:16 52:21 59:6 73:1 73:2 101:15,17 102:1 104:1 116:16,22 139:11,17 149:20	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15 122:19 123:6,19 126:8 143:17 153:21 185:5 206:3 247:1,4 249:4,10,20	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1 189:5 recall 102:19 receipt 68:6 259:21 receive 21:5,6 124:21	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4 recording 167:2 170:1 170:18 records 6:21 recovering 19:16 194:
274:11 questionable 56:15 questioners 19:3 questioning 74:15 117:9 questions 10:1 14:9,10 16:15 36:2,17,19 40:9 43:16 52:21 59:6 73:1 73:2 101:15,17 102:1 104:1 116:16,22	ranged 132:5 rank 255:2 263:1 ranks 105:13 196:8 rate 21:16 22:10,16 44:6,6,15 45:20,21 47:1 120:19 121:15 122:19 123:6,19 126:8 143:17 153:21 185:5 206:3 247:1,4	reasons 38:15 102:10 103:16 113:20 114:17 115:17 150:19 152:12 159:18,20 165:3 172:14 247:10 reauthorization 182:1 189:5 recall 102:19 receipt 68:6 259:21	reconvene 276:14 record 76:12 85:19 96 146:16 173:9 193:16 222:16 276:17 recorded 167:4 recording 167:2 170:1 170:18

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 297

recruiting 257:4,7,9 recruitment 49:10 149:7 257:12,22 recuse 19:7 recusing 275:11 red 192:2 215:4 reduce 75:17 reduction 155:9 refer 261:20 referenced 24:5 114:4 referencing 211:1 249:19 referred 12:7 100:1 refers 182:21 reflected 13:15,17 reflecting 211:6 reflective 36:2 reflects 22:2 72:7 254:9 refreshment 226:11 regard 26:19 27:16 29:2 58:18 60:2 67:6 256:8 regarded 259:17 regarding 6:11 12:5 19:8,12 25:2 37:14 40:4 58:16 82:19 94:14 112:2 115:22 116:17 159:4 181:21 184:13,16 185:19,22 225:7 232:21 265:18 regardless 20:1 regards 61:22 72:17 87:12 180:15 215:19 233:9 261:5 262:13 268:22 region 188:14 191:11 regional 99:7 190:21 191:5 regular 65:11 102:20 133:1 173:6 regularly 101:6 regulated 248:4 regulation 81:19 85:13 86:6 113:15 116:9 158:15 226:22 227:8 231:10 236:12,13 268:21 **regulations** 16:10,12 36:1 48:18 69:6 75:18 79:11 136:10 146:6 168:19 235:7 264:17 264:20 265:2 regulators 117:17 118:12,18 265:5 regulatory 251:16 266:21 Reha 97:2 reinforce 186:21 reinitiate 153:17

reinstatement 25:7 reinstituted 43:14 reiterate 83:11 rejected 131:19 related 6:22 25:14 29:14 31:4 32:18 34:14 35:6 37:20 38:6 38:21 42:3 51:21 156:2 187:8 225:8 234:4 235:17 245:4,6 255:22 264:14 relates 34:17 37:17 38:1,3 44:13 49:9 50:5 51:12,17 relatively 130:16 relaying 154:18 released 113:10 **relevant** 102:22 reliable 6:1 relief 197:15 reluctant 251:1 rely 24:10 130:9 238:10 remained 183:18 remaining 13:10 37:5 179:1 remarks 36:10 232:19 235:15 remedies 188:7 remedy 145:21 remember 41:8 74:7 75:18 130:1 195:10 230:4 272:22 remind 86:19 reminding 260:10 remiss 11:16 96:12 remove 89:18,19,21 152:5 165:14 171:2 174:4,9,22 removed 23:16,20 39:1 39:2 68:10,17 196:8 renew 12:11 100:5 160:3,15 178:6 226:8 renewal 4:4,8,12,16 9:14 10:11 11:10 12:5 12:17 36:7 89:22 99:20 100:15 178:2 178:14 183:16 184:7 222:21 224:20 243:14 renewed 173:22 224:16 renewing 39:10 85:5 repeat 142:7,8 report 22:20 27:13 32:1 32:9,22 33:8 39:1,7,7 39:16 44:2,11 45:19 54:18 55:1,7 56:1,10 58:13 62:3,4,7,21 65:15,17,20,21 66:4 66:15 69:10 72:15

73:7,9 76:10,11 77:2 77:3 78:17 79:4,7,10 82:6,7,11,11,18 83:4 83:7 84:19 85:6,17,18 89:1,7,20 91:16 93:18 100:2,8,10,13 102:4 117:6 127:3 138:15 138:22 139:6 143:21 154:1 162:14 177:2 178:9,10,12,22 192:7 192:8,21,22 193:11 198:8,9 217:5,6 219:5 224:15 225:12,14 226:11,21 228:19,22 238:9 241:15,20 262:14 269:10 reported 64:5 124:2 139:20 254:10 reporting 22:14,22 30:12 35:12 83:20 186:13,20 239:9 245:8,11,14 246:7 262:13 263:4,13 reports 24:22 27:2 30:14,15,20 37:14 39:14 66:13.13 111:15,15 128:20 142:22 184:8 186:10 187:19,20 188:3 229:2 represent 180:19 representation 234:22 235:2 representative 203:8 229:18 representatives 9:21 14:7 25:5 101:14 128:15 179:15 226:13 Representing 180:10 represents 47:6 reputation 190:17 request 13:12,17 116:6 239:5,8 241:21 requested 53:5 245:21 requesting 256:18 requests 42:9 184:12 require 5:18 19:20 75:18 78:16 79:3 82:6 111:6 162:6 227:1 238:20 required 24:22 25:2,3,4 27:7 29:20 30:19 32:6 32:10 33:2 39:15 56:20 58:8,13 63:19 63:20 66:6 68:2,9,20 68:21 69:18 70:2,4,7 70:12 74:14 83:12 86:21 87:14,18 99:11

101:7 103:7 108:15 113:17 114:7 115:4,9 136:9 219:4 224:7 229:7 230:1,6 239:9 266:10 requirement 58:18 108:18 115:13 116:4 116:13 123:7 155:10 205:1 237:16 241:16 243:1 245:9,11 246:8 257:6 266:22 267:13 267:16,18 requirements 13:8 89:11 99:13 145:12 176:16 179:7 185:6 186:14,20 224:8 225:10 240:19 245:15 251:17 263:4,14 265:22 268:4 requires 6:6 17:15 33:7 33:14 63:13 75:8 86:6 101:2 113:15 184:18 186:8 257:13 266:22 267:18 requiring 27:4,13 33:11 69:15 84:18.19 89:6 187:5.18 188:7 research 15:5 84:9 87:5 residential 51:3,5 200:12 resolve 27:12 resource 18:19 **resources** 24:7,14,19 25:14,17 31:18 35:9 51:19,22 67:9 83:22 109:2 respect 84:3 185:8 214:11 respectfully 116:6 239:8 respond 10:6 14:8 75:3 101:15 134:13 136:16 139:5 155:10 179:16 258:22 responds 10:7 **response** 10:1 39:16 114:21 115:11 116:1 117:2 124:8 136:1,2 145:9,9 158:7 182:4 201:17 responses 13:5 39:22 157:15 responsibility 22:19 32:3 122:1 210:20 217:8,9,11 257:12 responsible 155:20,21 210:10,14,17 257:13

responsive 136:15

rests 182:15 result 31:15 153:21 resulted 36:1 65:5 66:3 102:4 resulting 29:22 39:1 63:17 184:9 results 53:20 64:19 151:1 186:7 resumed 96:9 173:10 222:17 retention 32:2 63:6 84:3 retrospective 239:1 retrospectively 241:6,9 return 96:5 173:2,4 revamp 112:11 revealed 109:6 revenue 211:15 255:4,7 255:9,18 revenues 24:12 reverse 274:18 reviewed 30:9 59:3 65:17 158:19 186:21 258:3 reviewing 29:10 47:15 52:3 76:18 86:20 106:18 240:7 reviews 57:17 66:2 revise 113:7 185:13 revised 238:19 **revolve** 43:16 revote 170:13 Reza 2:15 104:9,21 Rhea 100:3 101:20 106:17 rich 125:15 Rico 99:5 176:7 195:12 ridiculous 89:10 rigor 55:20 188:15 rigorous 234:2 257:14 258:6 risk 33:7 187:14,22 road 237:18 Robert 1:17,18 8:11,12 10:15,16 36:18 40:9 71:1,20 77:13 90:22 91:14 95:10 98:15,18 172:1 220:8 223:3 270:20 Robert's 91:9 174:1,2 robust 214:21 234:13 243:3 rocky 19:16 role 15:22 127:12 130:2 130:7,22 182:8 200:11 225:17 227:20 228:1 231:2 238:12 238:17 239:4 243:5

252:6 roles 16:3 105:20 227:5 227:19 231:5 237:4 237:14,20 238:6 roll 93:8 185:16 Ron 16:18 Ronnie 1:13 8:4,5 81:17 84:15 86:5 93:19 94:2 166:9 171:11 219:18 221:19 270:8 Ronnie's 89:6 room 78:21 137:16 167:12 181:1 194:14 212:22 root 122:8 124:6 125:9 151:10 153:9 rose 105:13 **Roslyn** 1:14 8:8,9 93:13 166:4 170:4 171:7 219:14 270:4 roster 230:8 rosters 225:15 229:5 Rotter 233:8 roughly 109:9 round 82:12 102:1 route 76:4 274:9 routinely 156:4,16 RPh 2:12,15 rubric 30:10 62:5 64:10 **Ruffo** 181:2,16 **Rufo** 2:21 191:17,19 193:7 210:11 217:11 rule 124:11,11 205:15 230:21 **rules** 91:9 174:1,2 251:7 ruminating 74:2 **running** 136:11 S **S** 2:4 9:1 12:4 60:3 63:10 95:22 97:6 167:11 172:16 232:12 233:3 241:1,4,22 244:10 247:12 249:21 252:8 253:20 255:14 255:20 257:20 259:5 261:13,17 263:1 264:1 265:15 **SACs** 221:14 222:3 272:3 273:4,5,18,19 274:4 275:5,20 sake 91:1.4 salaries 132:19 salary 132:8 140:14,15 sample 158:12 sanction 70:5 182:13 sanctions 27:3 33:3

38:15 66:18 251:4,5 sand 205:18 Sanjay 3:13 232:15 233:4 sat 253:22 satisfy 227:4,14 241:21 250:12 saving 197:15 savings 198:3,7 saw 22:12 46:4 98:3 120:10 190:21 246:20 249:11 250:6 saying 37:15 56:14 61:21 73:13 76:8 79:18 80:4 129:15 146:14 158:3 163:10 214:11 222:9 244:11 251:18 260:15 273:20 says 69:9 80:20 182:12 211:3 231:10 257:11 scale 33:17 scenarios 73:3 schedule 173:1,6 207:8 237:4scheduled 30:11.17 32:8 271:19.22 scholarity 233:21 school 2:15 15:11 103:11,16 105:1,14 128:5 132:6,7 133:6 136:20 144:9 147:16 152:1 182:12 192:5,8 193:3 195:6 201:11 207:10,11 210:1 211:8 252:2 254:9 256:22 266:11,19 school's 122:11 school-by-school 133:10 schools 2:18 4:13 112:21 117:16 133:11 133:14 139:22 140:8 150:3,20 151:9,16 153:8 157:1 173:5 175:6,12,14 178:4 181:7,12 182:9 184:1 188:15 190:2,9,11,16 191:13,19 194:17 195:3,7,14,17 196:2,6 196:12,13 200:17,18 201:7 204:8 206:10 207:5,19 208:12,18 208:20,22 209:3,8 210:15,16,20,22 211:3,4,9,13,17 212:13 214:13 220:22 255:3 Schools' 211:16

scope 11:6 12:13,15 13:13,14,16,19 36:9 71:17 107:7,13 176:2 score 23:4 32:3 102:12 scorecard 47:5 133:9 scored 22:21 scores 22:19 23:7 41:3 140:11 149:10 scramble 83:16 screen 92:8 93:7 104:11 181:4 254:8 scroll 145:9 166:22 scrolling 148:7 scrutiny 38:21 **SDO** 168:1,1 219:7 269:6,11 SDO's 85:17 search 147:3 148:17 second 5:4 7:5 21:21 23:2,18 24:15 28:20 39:8 53:16 67:20 71:8 71:10,11 77:9.11 83:15 89:21 90:15 98:12 146:5 160:18 160:20 174:18 201:22 213:19 219:8.9 236:17 249:16 250:9 269:12,14 274:20 secondary 2:18 4:13 173:5 175:6,12,15 176:18 178:4 181:6 181:10 195:19 196:14 203:21,22 204:4,8 207:20 208:6,19 209:3,15 210:3,14,22 211:3,4,9,17 212:13 213:20 214:4,8 215:19 220:22 seconded 92:17 160:6 269:15 seconder 170:8 seconds 160:21 167:14 secretary 5:18,22 6:7,9 99:8 101:3,7 102:11 102:21 113:17 114:6 114:16 115:1,4,8,16 191:7 224:2 secretary's 13:9 99:12 101:1 176:15 section 5:10,17,18 6:8 69:10 145:5,17 147:16 148:8 174:5 sections 5:16 179:10 sector 48:12,17 49:14 sectors 40:15 48:14 50:9 seeing 77:1 101:22 104:11 129:18 151:8

157:10 163:14 240:15 240:16 251:4 267:9 273:13 seek 190:16 197:16 234:4 seeking 108:9 195:8 234:11 seen 37:13 40:14 41:2,3 41:17 42:5 51:11 80:8 81:12 125:21 127:6 137:19 195:3 232:6 sees 193:1 self 61:20 62:18,19 111:7 self-appointing 118:17 self-assess 33:15 self-assessment 33:13 self-regulation 182:16 257:13 self-study 156:17 201:9 selling 234:17 semester 136:5 send 194:19 202:22 221:6 273:15 276:6 sending 27:3 159:20 sends 233:9 senior 3:11 8:18 12:11 15:17 71:5 75:4 82:8 82:9,16,21 94:13 100:4,16 160:3,14 162:6 178:5,15 219:3 225:2.13 226:7 254:10 sense 27:10 73:22 80:4 83:18 88:7 89:2 126:9 131:13 140:4 146:12 151:15 198:14 Sensing 159:11 165:13 268:11 270:1 sensitive 267:4 sent 35:2 68:7 134:12 146:1 217:1 259:14 sentence 129:4 separate 47:11 99:12 174:19 176:15 181:4 207:21 208:9,15 214:7 224:8 262:5 separately 228:1 September 12:21 114:3 series 25:19 seriously 35:21 131:5 133:20 143:11 259:15 260:14 serve 7:17 14:21 21:12 21:20 48:7 99:10 104:21 118:13 129:20 186:14 231:1 233:17 237:20 238:12 243:4

served 15:3.13.21 31:14 105:19 119:13 123:16 128:11 235:12 serves 15:17 240:2 255:22 service 5:17 15:1 19:2 28:20 29:4 189:2,4 224:5 services 18:20 31:13 109:1,2 180:3 184:6 serving 16:3 19:8 20:16 105:14 128:17 182:6 231:4 237:13 244:12 session 34:22 139:3 174:12 sessions 35:1 254:1 set 16:10 75:6 79:4 87:14 159:1 184:22 sets 5:13 settings 110:6 237:1 settled 218:4,12 seven 15:13,18 112:4 141.22 severe 251:12 severity 263:2,7 shaking 193:7 Shane 2:10 15:16 42:18 **shape** 93:2 share 38:2 65:4 108:1 141:9 181:7 186:17 shared 37:4 200:3 sharing 136:3 sheet 68:17 shell 212:11 shepherd 69:22 Sherin 3:14 232:9,13 shining 141:1 **ship** 125:8 Shireman 1:18 8:15,15 81:18 89:5 95:18 98:16,19 101:18 102:18 103:8,21 117:1 118:16 119:18 125:19 126:22 131:6 133:4,17 137:5 138:2 138:5,9 158:2 159:13 160:12 165:8 167:22 168:12 170:6,11 172:8 173:13,15 174:11,21 175:3 215:7 220:15 223:3 239:16 250:13 253:11 254:15 255:17 256:15 258:19 260:2 269:2,4 269:17 271:5 273:17 short 66:21 93:6 95:1 217:20 shortcoming 138:21

139:8 shortly 167:13 191:6 **shot** 101:21 **show** 25:10 70:6,14 72:16 150:2 162:18 show-cause 23:19 243:16 showed 78:1 showing 183:6 204:18 shown 59:15 141:7 shows 40:11 159:19 163:1 side 67:7 195:19 196:14 237:18 254:7 Sierra 78:19,20 85:10 85:10 96:18 213:4,4 sign 19:5 signal 94:12 signals 269:5 **signed** 259:7 significance 229:12 significant 20:8 25:15 112:9 144:15 **silly** 89:10 similar 26:22 210:4 228:17 Simms-Coates 2:6 97:13,14 177:4,8,13 177:19 178:1 180:17 189:7 218:17 **simple** 147:10 263:12 simplify 244:22 simply 83:13 103:14,18 240:16 Sims-Coates 175:9 216:22 Simultaneous 168:16 170:17 211:20 213:3 221:1 222:6 228:8 sincere 16:5 single 113:12 228:15 235:21 238:18 239:4 sister 254:3 sit 198:16 247:19 site 12:21 136:6 178:20 225:15,17 227:3,11 228:2 229:18,21 230:2,8,15 231:2 232:21 234:22 236:15 237:17,21 238:14,15 238:20,22 239:4 240:4,11,11,18 241:11 242:20 250:3 256:5 258:4 263:20 264:3,6,8 sites 68:11,12,16,18 **sitting** 249:5 situation 37:9 38:7 73:3

102:8 141:13 150:14 152:15 155:13 159:16 240:14 251:6 six 20:4 49:8 110:2 142:3,6 246:8 263:9 size 21:16 sized 211:9 skill 237:10 skills 29:4 skipped 202:19 sleazy 257:16 slide 177:20 slip 244:6 small 21:14,19 24:9 41:9,16 42:1 44:3 46:5 184:1 188:13 200:17 206:15 Smith 1:18 2:1 5:3,8 9:5 9:5 92:3,9,15 95:20 96:16 143:19 146:13 147:19 148:1,9,14,21 161:22 170:9,15 172:11 177:12,16 220:17 221:5,17 222:1,9 271:9 272:4 273:6,11,21 274:7 275:9 276:8 soaring 133:15 society 107:20 182:6 **software** 35:11 solution 125:13 solutions 153:13 solve 94:12 151:11 somebody 45:13 104:10 122:12 177:11 191:16 231:6 240:2,3 somewhat 232:5 soon 143:7 Soren 96:19 167:11 sorry 9:1 12:1,14 31:1 39:2 63:13 64:14 67:20 78:20 87:8 98:5 98:6 130:13 167:6 177:19 211:18 sort 41:17,22 45:9 69:4 69:5 84:4 88:2,7 94:19 126:9 231:7 sorts 153:12 257:3 sound 52:15 214:21 sounded 143:22 203:19 sounds 43:4 47:15 72:12 86:17 152:1 203:17 218:11 267:11 sources 128:16 **South** 8:6,10 Southern 8:13 **space** 204:2 244:2 **spans** 149:6

speak 14:19 37:9 52:12 52:19 94:16 104:19 181:21 216:17 229:17 230:19 speaking 147:5 151:19 168:16 170:17 211:20 213:3 221:1 222:6 228:8 246:4 248:21 speaks 58:12 139:2 **special** 200:14 specialized 19:19 specialties 248:12 specialty 223:12 230:2 230:11 248:9,11 specific 27:8 31:8 33:19 52:2 64:6,11 111:16 125:22,22 129:14 132:22 133:7 163:15 190:18 191:18 230:15 231:2 235:22 248:9 266:8 specifically 37:17 53:7 67:14 79:10 80:5 108:17 163:8 185:22 224:5 254:13 specified 85:19 114:10 spelling 161:8 **spend** 135:5,12 150:12 199:10 spent 102:6 spike 196:10 **spite** 54:1,12 split 209:15 **spoke** 97:3 **spoken** 7:15 sponsoring 258:14 **spring** 50:9 108:5 spurred 89:15 squirrelly 240:13 stability 26:11 110:15 187:17 209:18 stable 123:21 180:1 staff 2:1 9:19 10:7,15 11:16 12:10,16 13:5,7 13:17 15:16 16:1 17:11,17,19,21 18:8 25:3 27:3,8 28:6 30:12,14 33:1,7,18 36:13 53:6 65:8,13 71:3 74:22 76:1 79:3 96:12 97:1 98:10,17 99:14 100:4 101:11 101:17,19 102:2 104:1 105:4 109:20 109:21,22 110:1,2,7 110:13,19 113:13 114:12,14 115:11 116:1,14 117:6

126:20 127:3 129:10 130:4 138:17 139:4,9 143:21 157:16 158:20 159:10 162:13 175:9 177:1 178:5 179:17 179:19 186:21 187:11 189:7 199:16,16 213:6 214:1,2 218:16 223:3 225:6,11 226:7 226:17 229:9 231:16 233:10 238:5 243:10 267:21 stage 55:13 57:19,22 66:14 199:21 stages 61:6 stakeholders 60:12 64:6 112:18,20 113:18 114:7 115:9 188:20 standard 9:16 24:7,8 26:19 27:16 30:5 33:13 37:3,16,19 60:8 60:19 63:21 64:1,14 67:3 72:11 73:6 74:15 77:22 78:3 86:11 87:3 87:13.19 88:12.16.20 103:18,20 123:11 125:5 140:1,4 143:20 144:17 148:12 149:13 149:14 153:16 156:14 163:1,3 169:3,4,22 199:14 234:5 standard-setting 182:22 standardization 59:7 standardized 30:10 58:6 60:6 standards 5:14 17:6 18:2 19:2 24:5 28:14 32:18 33:3,16 34:7,8 34:10,13,20 35:5 37:16 40:18 49:9 51:13,16,17,19,20 52:4 53:12 55:18 57:20 60:15,17 75:11 85:14 86:6,7,10,20,22 88:1 102:11 103:4,11 103:14,18 109:18 111:17,20 112:11,13 112:17 113:3,7,9,10 114:10,20 118:6 126:1 134:3 145:3 168:21 179:5 182:18 183:11 184:16,21 185:13 198:21 199:17 200:19 201:21 202:22 205:20 216:15 233:19 244:17 246:17 257:21

258:1 263:2.15 standby 221:9 standing 221:6 252:18 standpoint 134:15 213:9 stands 62:12 72:17 268:22 start 7:10 9:17 37:15 49:15 106:13 117:10 121:6 153:14 159:12 172:19 173:12 239:17 244:11 270:2 271:19 274.6 started 118:10 199:14 199:15,21 202:21 starting 132:8 state 5:19,21 9:3 39:8,9 39:11,18 68:1,10,14 68:18 103:5 115:1 117:17 118:18 147:17 147:20,21 148:3,17 202:6 220:21 241:2 244:16 248:4,4,20 264:21 stated 13:15 92:8 114:5 114:15 183:13 236:11 statement 113:19 114:17,19,22 115:3,7 115:17 148:11 209:11 216:4 239:13 257:8,9 statements 181:8 209:10 states 2:18 4:13 11:5 20:3 98:12 99:4 107:4 173:4 175:5.11.13 178:3 180:19 181:6 181:11 182:8 188:17 189:10 190:22 191:4 195:13 198:3 204:13 207:17,19 208:5,11 208:18,22 211:15 214:3,17 219:4 235:18 stating 73:11 258:11 statistics 108:1 131:21 132:9 206:7 status 13:21 23:12,13 23:20,21,22 25:8,11 28:11 32:15 38:8,22 39:3 59:13 69:20 111:9,22 112:2,7,8 115:15 148:18 184:3 188:11 223:19 238:21 245:9,11 246:8 258:13 263:4 265:12 265:16 statuses 244:19,19,21 245:12,17 246:14

261:6 statute 78:15 statutes 168:20 stayed 137:14 staying 49:3 189:21 steady 42:1 Stein 2:6 97:17,17 223:4 224:18,19 227:6,17 229:10 232:4 233:11 267:15 267:22 268:13 step 32:12 step-wise 125:7 **Stephanie** 2:5 97:5,7 steps 87:22 141:2 Steve 8:21,22 9:1 95:21 Steven 1:19 172:15 220:18 271:11 stipulate 237:15 stomach 179:22 stops 250:19 straight 89:22 92:11,13 strategies 186:4,17 187:4 strength 260:17 strengthen 235:13 265:21 strike 139:5 269:9 strip 191:7 strong 204:12 257:9 strongly 42:15 structure 117:11,21,22 118:3 218:7 267:6 struggle 67:9 struggling 49:20 150:4 150:4 153:8 154:10 students 19:22 20:6,17 20:18,19 21:13,14,16 21:18 22:11 31:16 41:14 42:4 46:4,6,8 47:7 48:14,19 49:1,15 49:20 50:3,21 108:4 108:21 112:14 121:20 135:3,6,13 141:3,5,11 142:17 143:10 149:8 151:3,21 152:4,8,18 154:4,6,11,13,14 155:5,15 156:13 157:3 163:15 207:9 234:19 235:22 236:22 254:6,10 256:18 266:4,7 271:14 students' 149:7 157:4 studies 19:21 study 48:20 111:7 238:1 subcommittee 32:7 74:12 89:16 269:18

301

subject 100:8 178:8 226:10 241:18 272:8 submission 13:4 100:8 178:9 217:1,7 submit 30:19 75:19 144:1 186:10 187:18 225:12 265:9 submitted 12:6 65:15 114:3,11,16 115:16 146:6 191:8 217:13 219:5 submitting 137:7 subsequent 145:22 subsequently 146:21 substantial 32:16 33:9 35:11 58:8 59:10,12 60:21 73:8 225:4 229:13 substantially 54:8 55:17 57:13 79:2 88:5 89:2 92:10 93:17 substantive 15:20 24:1 27:5 32:20 42:8 147:12 184:12 268:4 success 31:15 87:20 155:7.16.21 156:12 156:21 157:5 181:21 185:7 188:5 successful 122:3 141:20 succinct 263:11 sudden 240:5 sufficient 38:12 59:15 suggest 83:4 89:19 172:20 174:3 268:19 271:20 suggested 82:13 suggesting 163:7 243:20 264:19 267:4 **SULLIVAN** 1:12 **summaries** 101:3,6 103:1 summarize 111:2 summarizing 113:19 114:17,19 115:17 129:11 summary 99:19 103:6 103:15 144:7 145:2,4 146:20 147:12 224:20 summer 7:5 supply 231:3 support 16:7 17:20 26:11 27:11 31:13 34:1 36:15 41:8 51:22 84:13 93:2 110:1 162:1,11 164:1 169:22 185:7 188:21 189:9 212:14 251:14

271:10 supported 42:15,16 96:17 109:19 supporting 12:18 13:5 16:13 24:11 100:18 106:18 107:1 178:18 185:20 188:18 225:19 suppose 89:18 supposed 99:14 273:22 surely 273:16 surfaces 32:20 surfacing 44:2 surplus 197:4 214:18 surprise 43:19,22,22 surprised 149:12 214:19 survey 35:2 255:2,22 256:3 surveys 112:19 253:11 suspect 41:6 254:15 suspected 253:20 suspended 43:13 sustain 31:10,19 sweating 217:21 swift 235:8 switch 272:15 system 7:13 53:19,20 61:15 107:21 109:6 144:2 146:19 147:2,9 systematic 112:12 т table 86:15 253:13 255:17 tail 149:19,21 150:8,16 152:12,21 taken 24:20 26:22 35:20 67:6 76:15 88:7 111:4,15 120:8 126:15,17 141:3 144:19 145:8,21 184:7 211:14 takes 54:22 73:19 84:11 123:12 125:16 186:12 233:15 Talbot 2:21 180:11,16 181:14 Talbot's 194:13 talented 109:20 talk 59:22 120:22 123:2 124:16 127:11,12 158:2 195:20 199:4 200:22 204:4 216:14 258:1 talked 117:13 139:21 142:9 229:20 230:4 talking 63:1 91:9 144:6 230:10 255:8 261:4

talks 256:16 tardiness 98:7 target 152:17 tax 250:21 **Taylor** 48:8 teach 68:2,9 69:9,15,18 70:2,4,7,13 265:8,9 265:12,18,21 266:1,5 266:9,13,18 267:2,13 267:19 268:5 **teach-out** 144:12 teaching 56:5 team 14:15 17:20 18:1 18:12 19:5,8 24:18 28:10 30:11,14 54:2,2 54:9 57:11 58:14 62:7 62:11 96:15,16 104:5 127:12 128:20 136:6 189:8 191:9 201:10 201:12 202:10 225:17 227:11 228:2 229:21 230:2,15 231:2,3 232:21 236:15 238:9 238:22 242:8,12 250:3 256:5 260:20 264:6.8 269:20 teams 29:8,22 78:2 227:3 229:19 236:15 264:3 technical 8:6 175:20 190:2 195:17 196:13 201:20 214:13 technically 266:12 technician 107:22 technological 35:8 51:18.21 technology 175:22 176:5 184:20 223:16 248:20 telephone 135:13 tell 39:20 158:3 190:10 190:16 194:16 195:2 195:16 204:7 207:12 252:5 **Telling** 64:12 tells 82:1 template 62:7 185:14 ten 22:12 53:22 55:2,15 66:22 109:12 ten-year 55:5 56:9 tend 150:21 203:22 204:10 240:1 tended 119:3,4 Tennessee 7:20 15:12 tenure 105:14 110:14 190:17 term 15:4 45:18 103:5 103:19 261:9 262:3,4

262:7 terms 74:1 81:8 88:19 126:14,17 127:21 129:20 130:6 132:11 141:10,17 183:12 231:19 253:17 262:6 terrible 89:8 122:14 territories 11:5 territory 20:4 test 149:10 test-takers 142:19 testing 123:13 tests 84:4 Texas 191:21 thanks 48:4 70:15 76:7 79:13 81:14 119:18 139:19 198:18 239:18 theirs 164:12 themes 236:19 238:16 theological 19:21 Theology 15:11 therapy 223:17 thereof 263:3 265:11 They'd 151:22 things 49:7 60:4 74:11 74:20 121:1.14 122:10 124:18 126:14 126:16 128:12 130:1 134:22 141:10,12 145:18 150:20,22 157:5 161:2 163:18 164:5 214:10 216:7 256:7 257:3,16 258:3 258:17 262:18 265:4 third 15:14 31:16 70:17 101:13 237:12 244:15 250:9 third- 10:2 third-party 10:6,8 11:14 157:12 179:12 268:16 272:9,12 273:13,18 275:15 thoroughness 47:14 thought 69:12 72:22 85:11 90:8 103:10 138:7 147:2 167:5 202:8 218:9 thoughts 229:8 269:2 threat 275:10 three 9:14 18:4,14 20:9 20:10 23:16 26:15 35:1 37:16 49:6 53:2 57:15 68:12 69:14 75:22 124:10,11,14 127:7 129:10 141:21 142:5,8,10,18,21 149:20 175:13 178:19 200:22 225:20 228:16

228:22 231:4 240:12 242:5,6 265:20 threshold 22:15 24:18 123:19 124:5 142:1 186:9 188:2 thresholds 123:20 126:13 140:20 185:1 thrilled 202:9 thrive 24:14 thumbs 92:18 tie 85:9 tied 60:20 ties 252:19 tight 39:21 154:12 tightened 163:19 time's 91:4 timeframe 246:4 timeline 39:20 timely 114:6 115:16 135:17 times 124:1,14 136:12 141:1,21 142:18 152:2 162:19,22 217:6 272:7 tireless 189:9 **Titel** 176:21 181:22 190:5 Title 6:14 12:8 20:15 21:3,7 34:6 45:2,5,8 45:12 99:10 108:13 183:21 184:4 188:14 190:4 195:18 206:2 216:6 223:7 224:4,9 255:12 268:4 today 14:7 15:8 94:15 96:17 97:3 100:3 110:11 172:21 173:3 179:15 180:14,18,22 181:13,21 201:19 209:1,13 210:9 214:20 222:20 233:9 273:15 274:8 toes 136:14 tomorrow 271:16,20 272:14 273:3,9 274:1 274:13 276:2,4,5,11 276:15 ton 73:22 tons 121:21 Tooks 3:14 232:9,12,13 233:6 241:2,4,22 244:10 247:12 249:21 252:8 253:20 255:14 255:20 257:20 259:5 261:13,17 263:1 264:1 265:15 tool 33:14 tools 186:14

top 66:13 213:10 249:17,22 264:22 265:7 267:8 topic 89:7,15 topics 243:8 total 20:16,18,19 44:1 209:11 253:15 totaled 26:1 totaling 109:8 totally 93:3 127:5 173:18 208:8 250:16 touch 274:7 touched 87:4 track 120:11 121:1 133:2 164:13 253:19 254:17 tracking 46:21 89:11 109:5 tracks 26:4,8 254:2 train 62:17 trained 54:9 57:11 58:17,18 training 12:20 18:2,3,6 18:9 19:1 25:15 26:3 26:10.13.18 58:14 60:1,5,7,13 61:15 107:1.22 162:5 175:20 transcript 82:22 transfer 21:13 22:16 29:5 44:6,15 46:11 47:16 transfers 195:1 transformation 51:6 transition 113:5 216:16 transitioning 85:2 transmittal 245:19 transparency 147:8 transparent 172:13 216:21 travel 198:5,6 treat 39:14 265:10 treated 133:20 treats 33:5 tremendous 98:10 260:17 tremendously 105:6 Tri-County 8:6 tried 217:6 trigger 267:12 triggers 44:12 81:20 265:4,14 tripped 32:5 trouble 132:12 143:9 troubled 141:13 true 149:14 153:11 truly 229:3 trust 26:14 182:8

trusted 182:10 truth 84:22 try 47:20 52:18 61:4,9 83:17 121:19 125:8 151:13 196:5 212:22 257:16 trying 62:17 73:12 76:21 84:21 86:2,12 93:1 102:6 145:1 147:9,11 263:11 274:22 tuition 24:12 119:21 Tunnel 176:13 turn 7:1 23:10 52:14 58:15 59:21 104:8,8 104:14 106:8 110:16 175:9 177:6 193:10 232:18 turned 215:15 **Turning** 30:22 turns 128:4 twenty 106:3 two 15:4,15 22:21 23:17 23:19 24:5 26:19 27:16 28:14 30:3,5 39:5.11 41:2 53:7 54:18 63:21 64:14 69:14 70:13 74:20 75:19,20 77:8 112:1,5 120:13 123:11 124:1 129:9 133:18 140:1 141:21 149:13 153:16 172:21 179:1 191:21 195:2 202:15 208:8 210:2 212:10 213:22 216:12 230:3 231:21 232:1 237:13 241:13 241:18 242:7,7,14 243:11 248:18 249:3 255:6 262:5 265:16 265:20 268:17 two-day 28:2 twofold 255:16 type 73:3 240:17 types 84:9 127:8 164:5 265:14 typical 49:17 typically 142:3 164:6 246:8 263:9 U **U.S** 1:1 20:3,3 106:15 107:5 108:22 110:4 132:9 176:8 189:2 ultimately 62:2 **umbrella** 208:4 unable 233:9

undergraduate 10:21 13:22 56:22 undergraduates 20:17 21:4 157:3 underserved 20:13 understand 37:21 73:20 80:9 81:1 86:2 92:4 129:3 143:3 144:12 146:13 153:6 161:19 162:5,9 164:11 198:14 226:19 230:10 understandable 132:7 Understandably 54:19 understanding 81:2 120:13 144:18 227:7 227:8 228:6 261:7 understood 222:2 underway 84:22 uneasiness 198:14 unexpected 42:13 unfortunately 167:12 190:7 unique 44:19 182:7 232:5 unit 27:22 United 11:4 98:12 99:4 107:4 182:8 191:4 195:13 universities 7:21 8:20 19:20 university 2:15 7:12 8:3 37:21 48:8 105:2 129:15 135:9 137:14 137:17 138:4 unreasonable 163:19 unsure 237:12 unusual 58:1 update 37:4 112:9 185:13 202:11,11 updated 18:3 64:1,2 115:6,10 201:5,12 202:6 262:15 updates 18:8 25:2 35:6 upped 154:1 **USC** 5:18 **USDA** 233:10 235:16 236:4.5 use 5:14 59:11 61:21 67:15 78:15 91:20 112:12 168:21 176:20 204:10 205:5 242:10 243:12,14 246:6 254:20 256:3 257:19 262:3 useful 256:20 **user** 134:15 237:3 user-friendly 185:15

unclear 230:17

			304
ueee 182:18 261:0	65.10 11 12 170.20	120,16 17 166,12	00:11 104:4 170:10
uses 182:18 261:9	65:10,11,13 178:20	139:16,17 166:12	96:11 104:4 170:19
usual 141:14,16 155:3	225:15,17 227:11	171:13 212:1,7 215:6	170:19 173:11 212:2
usually 142:6	229:19,21 230:2,15	219:20 270:10 274:10	welcoming 180:18
utilize 195:18 208:13	232:21 236:15 250:3	275:17	went 65:11 96:9 132:6
256:13	256:5 258:4 264:3,6,8	wanted 43:3 45:13	173:9 190:21 222:3
V	visitation 250:2	67:21 74:10 75:13	222:16 241:5 276:17
	visited 138:4	77:19 78:22 117:10	weren't 55:12 170:13
validated 54:17	visiting 201:10,12	118:5 149:19 173:19	240:17
validation 27:18	227:3	174:14 221:6 222:1	wet 180:22
valuable 256:8	visitor 240:11,11	247:1 260:22 267:22	whatnot 147:8
value 131:4 237:19	visitors 230:8 237:21	272:16 275:18,21	whichever 269:8
valued 35:5 105:6	238:20 239:4 240:18	wanting 81:2 244:3	white 199:19
253:10	241:11 242:20	wants 85:16 124:21	willing 251:6
values 235:20 252:9	visits 12:22 17:17,19,19	warning 22:9 25:10	window 136:9,16
Van 1:19 9:1,1 95:22	17:20,21 25:4 27:3,5	57:19 70:12,13	145:14
variability 263:13	28:6 33:13 234:22	warnings 66:12	wire 195:1
variable 254:19	238:14,15 263:20	Washington 9:3	wish 113:22
varied 238:2	vocational 175:17,20	wasn't 53:21 77:21	withdraw 114:4 122:16
variety 121:8	voice 19:15 77:1	85:12 122:13 156:7	245:10 246:6 263:8
various 6:6 41:6 123:14	volume 21:7,8 183:17	194:4 229:22 240:18	265:11 267:10,11
124:2 128:10 156:20	volumes 253:14	255:8	withdrawal 145:22
215:10 234:16	voluntarily 261:21	watch 152:9	172:14 231:22 243:15
vary 31:5	voluntary 261:8,10	watches 272:19	244:2,8 245:5,15
vast 135:2	volunteer 18:13 105:20	watching 272:19	261:6,7,9,16,21 262:8
verify 104:10	109:15	waters 169:13	263:10
version 134:20	vote 10:9 85:1 87:7	way 82:19 85:6 88:12	withdrawals 121:17
versus 77:2 132:6	90:3,5,9,10,11,17,19	88:21 90:6 92:17	withdrawn 112:5 144:9
203:21 204:5 249:15	90:21 91:6 93:5,6	120:5 128:14 131:9	144:11 148:16,19
250:16 261:21	95:3 161:4 164:15	149:9 154:20 161:20	265:17
vetting 204:12	166:5 169:17 170:2	170:14 174:7,8 192:1	withdrew 25:11
viability 187:17	170:10 173:20 174:5	204:7 214:4 227:15	wondered 138:22
viable 204:16	174:10 219:12 270:1	243:12,17 250:17	179:20 193:19 274:12
vice 1:12 2:19,20,21	voted 83:8 93:9 168:6	256:22 261:1 262:11	wondering 37:8 40:13
3:13 7:19,21 15:2,10	votes 91:15 170:13	267:6 269:7 273:1,21	40:18 44:12 193:21
79:13 81:7 90:7,16	213:14	275:21 276:2	212:19 250:5,8
95:16 163:22 167:3,7	voting 91:20 92:17	ways 42:3 43:15 50:18	Wood 2:10 15:16 58:15
167:17 172:6 181:1,3	94:21 161:18 166:3	194:17	59:22 60:3 63:10
181:15,16 189:14	169:7 174:13	weak 61:8,9	WOR 65:5
190:1 193:1 198:17	W	weaker 155:6,15	word 61:8 204:11
202:14 203:7,11,17 204:20 206:6 211:21		weakness 26:21 32:14	words 28:12 47:4 160:6 182:9 249:1
212:4 216:3 217:21	W 7:11 43:7 45:15 47:4 48:4 76:7 77:7 78:8	32:20 58:11 267:9 wealth 17:12	work 8:3 16:18 18:11
219:1 220:13 232:16	91:13 93:22 94:5	webinars 34:3	24:12 25:13 35:6
233:4 271:3	139:18 166:13 171:14	website 6:21 30:15	51:20 53:16 54:19
Videoconference 1:9	212:8 219:21 270:11	38:17 40:10 63:5,20	56:17 57:1 81:2 82:13
view 44:13 46:22 105:5	275:18	,	83:17 84:2,20,21 96:3
		65:7,14,14,21 66:2,7 70:5 109:6 114:18	98:11 105:4 121:3
229:6 263:3 viewed 177:14	wage 164:8 wait 82:17 229:2	115:2,21 144:22	126:20 140:17 141:10
viewpoint 130:19	waiting 151:9 222:18	145:1,6,6,11 147:4,18	150:11 151:12 152:13
violate 251:7	walk 60:19 61:1 135:10	147:22 162:15 201:19	186:15 189:9 190:3
Virgin 176:8 191:15	147:17 199:11	202:13 258:11 261:5	199:8 216:16 217:7
195:13	walkthrough 60:14	websites 59:4 63:4	worked 187:7 217:4
Virginia 191:21	walk 137:16	WEDNESDAY 1:6	workforce 49:4 109:4
virtual 12:18 35:1	Walla 9:2,2	week 37:13	working 61:15 80:3
100:19 178:19 225:20	WALLACE 1:14	weeks 228:22	109:20 110:5 127:15
	WALLACE 1.14 Wally 7:10,11 43:5,6	weigh 199:2	135:6,14 141:16
Visa 48.18 40.22 50.4		worgin 199.2	100.0,14 141.10
Visa 48:18 49:22 50:4		Welch 15.12	143.13 150.13 175.22
Visa 48:18 49:22 50:4 visit 27:8 30:11 32:19 33:1,1,7 38:20,22	52:6 76:6 77:4 78:6 91:12 93:21 94:6	Welch 15:12 welcome 4:2 5:3 7:4	143:13 150:13 175:22 188:6 191:20 199:20

199:20 201:14 works 205:5 workshop 12:21 26:4,8 workshops 27:19 world 183:4 266:19 worse 37:7	Z Z 9:5 92:3,9,15 95:20	13800 108:5 14 140:8	226:1 254:10 2021's 194:2
works 205:5 workshop 12:21 26:4,8 workshops 27:19 world 183:4 266:19	Z 9:5 92:3,9,15 95:20		
workshop 12:21 26:4,8 workshops 27:19 world 183:4 266:19		14 140.0	
workshops 27:19 world 183:4 266:19		140 108:2 140:5	2021 3 194.2 2022 1:6 7:5 12:20,22
world 183:4 266:19	143:19 146:13 147:19	1400 223:21	13:2 22:9 30:8 33:10
	148:1,9,14,21 161:22	15 18:13 195:6 205:14	34:21 35:10 39:7,21
worse 3/ /	170:9,15 172:11		
	177:16 220:17 271:9	207:5	40:2 59:3 64:22
worthwhile 169:15	Zakiya 1:18 9:4,5 92:2	15,000 21:11	100:20 108:6 115:14
wouldn't 58:10 91:4	95:19 139:16 143:18	150 21:22 22:5	226:2
168:9 275:9	161:21 170:19 172:10	150,000 195:5 207:5	2024 113:10
write 129:11 194:19	220:16 271:8	15A4 235:17 239:6	2025 113:10,11
258:10	Zarembski 2:16 106:4	16 99:3	2030 55:16
writing 195:21	110:12 142:2 148:15	17 20:4 23:13 235:1	20th 244:11
written 196:10 247:20	153:14	252:12	21 253:14
258:2,16 259:6	zero 134:22	170 246:21	22 106:5 110:13 114:12
wrong 89:8 146:3	Zimbabwe 110:8	170,000 140:14	223:22
wrote 65:14	Zoom 104:10	173,500.00 132:4	224 4:18
		175 4:14	23 109:9
X	0	18 18:12 23:14 246:4	230 109:8
	0.3 23:6	19 183:22 184:3	24-month 246:4
Y	U.J 20.0	1900 182:1	241 24:1
yank 151:20 153:1	1	1932 118:10	25 32:17 44:21 67:11
year 15:14 16:21 22:4		1952 11:10 16:22 107:6	156:15 197:1
22:14 23:18 24:3	1,158 20:17	117:21 224:12 234:1	26 86:21
39:19 60:15 66:22	1.0 22:21	1954 6:20	26E 158:9,14
73:7,9,21,22 74:5	1.1 23:2	1965 5:11	27 86:21 176:20
88:19 121:13 124:11	1.2 23:1	1st 113:4,11 180:21	28 26:16
124:14 136:9 141:6	1.5 23:2 24:17	100 110: 1,11 100:21	29 15:3
141:22 142:5,18	1.7 23:1	2	20 10.0
145:8,20 185:17	1:00 272:2 274:6	2 24:8	3
193:14 194:2 196:9	1:08 172:18	2.5 23:7 149:18	3 132:13 140:5
215:3 228:19 229:2	1:09 173:9	2:00 173:2,7	3:00 221:2
238:10,15 241:20	10 4:6 140:7 205:8	2:00 173:2,7 2:03 173:10	3:01 222:16
	10- 117:13	20 1:6 20:18 44:1	3:06 222:14
244:12	10,000 207:3,6,13		3:07 222:17
years 12:12 15:3,4,14	10:00 1:9 5:2 271:19	110:11 195:7 244:16	
15:18,22 16:22 18:4	273:10 274:4 276:2	200 18:1 41:13	30 167:14
26:15 30:3 36:8 40:16	276:14	2007 50:15	30-day 136:16
41:2 43:13 48:10 49:8	100 198:4 215:11	2012 195:5 224:13	30-plus 190:8
52:5 53:22 54:18 55:2	255:14	2013 224:15	300 24:2
55:15 57:21 59:18	101(c) 5:16	2015 113:4	313 111:15
71:7 73:10 74:7 75:20	11 32:18 34:13 137:22	2016 113:5 254:11	32 21:5 184:2 189:17
75:20 76:1 85:5 90:1	256:16	2016-2017 48:19	33 22:6,15 252:15
91:16,21 100:14	11:41 96:9	2017 11:11 23:11 109:8	354,000 198:1
106:3,5 110:12,13	11:46 96:5	111:4,4 183:16	36 20:3 45:1
111:7 123:10,21	11:49 96:10	224:15	39 45:4
124:10,10 129:22	111 20:3	2018 193:20	
142:11,22 151:1	113 11:3	2019 38:6 105:12	4
155:14 156:18 160:4	114 5:10 6:8 99:3	193:12,17,20 194:17	4 176:13
160:16 161:19 165:16	11th 68:6	209:14	4:07 276:17
171:4 178:13 195:2	12 100:9 178:9 184:20	2019-20 22:3	40 20:21
196:2 197:5 199:15	193:11 194:5 200:18	2020 23:1,2,6 38:9 55:6	40,000 20:6
205:4,9,15 214:17	201:7 205:8 219:6	58:22 64:1 114:3,5	42 5:18 21:8
224:16 225:5 244:13	201.7 205.8 219.8	193:21 194:2 198:9	47 183:20,22
244:16 256:4 259:5		2020-2021 22:3	48 28:3
265:20 269:11	12-month 225:16	2021 12:20,21,22 22:17	487(c-4) 5:16
yesterday 16:9 75:1	125,000 140:15	23:1,3,6 25:22 28:2	4966 5:18
173:3	128 20:19	38:13,14,18 39:3	
York 39:9,18 68:10,14	128,000.00 132:10	108:3 113:6 132:2,10	5
68:18,22 176:6	13 11:3 109:20 111:21	193:22 198:10 225:22	5 4:2
00.10,22 170.0	200:17,18	100.22 100.10 220.22	

I	
5-year 129:20 50 17:21 68:13 51 23:15 26:2 53 20:16,21 21:2,10 41:10 53000 108:4 54 21:4 56 109:9 58 176:17	95 238:14 98 4:10
6	
6,747 20:17 60 101:4 113:18 114:16 115:4,9 205:12 60-day 145:12,14 60.8 22:17 44:14 45:22 601 21:17 46:5 602 86:21 158:8,13	
235:17 602.10 108:16 602.16 88:16 161:6 602.16(d) 13:18 602.17 88:14 602.21C 179:7 602.21D3 179:8 602.26E 101:2 113:15	
116:5 602.35(c) 75:2 602.A4 236:2 60216 85:13 60217 85:14 60221B4 179:1 60234G 78:22	
631 239:6 69 183:19 6b 24:7	
7	
7 176:19 7,905 20:18 70 185:2 204:21,22 205:1,6,11,16,16,17 707070 205:15 73 111:7 75th 16:21	
8	
80 56:21 57:4,8 8016 5:17 85 238:14 88 111:5 238:14	
9 9 200:21 246:21 9.4 57:4 9:00 276:11 91 26:1 94 238:13	

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

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

Before: US DED

Date: 07-20-22

Place: telconference

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

near Rans &

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE. 200 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-7831

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com