

Report of the Meeting
of the
National Advisory Committee
on Institutional Quality and Integrity

February 3-4, 2011
Cameron C. Staples, Chairperson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
BACKGROUND	3
PANELS APPEARING BEFORE THE NACIQI	5
I. Challenges and Perspectives on Quality in Higher Education	5
II. Perspectives on Federal and State Interests.	5
III. Academic Scholarship Perspectives	5
IV. Perspectives of Institutions--the "Accredited" Constituencies.	5
V. Perspectives of the Beneficiaries of Quality in Higher Education.. . . .	6
VI. Perspectives for Fundamental Change.	6
VII. Perspectives of Accreditors.	6
VIII. Perspectives from "Outside the Box".. . . .	7
IX. Initial Synthesis of Panel Discussions from Day One.	7
PRESENTATIONS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	7
I. Public Commenters that Made Oral Presentations.. . . .	7
II. Public Commenters that Submitted Written Comments and Written Requests. . . .	7
to Make Oral Comments	
COMMITTEE AGENDA-SETTING EXERCISE.. . . .	8
I. Overview.. . . .	8
II. Members' Individual Views of Key Issues.	8
III. Members' Collective Picture of Key Issues and Ideas They Wanted to Pursue.. . .	8
IV. Prioritization of the Issues.	8

APPENDICES

- A. Transcript of the Challenges and Perspectives on Quality in Higher Education Panel
- B. Transcript of the Perspectives on Federal and State Interests Panel
- C. Transcript of the Academic Scholarship Perspectives Panel
- D. Transcript of the Perspectives of Institutions – The “Accredited” Constituencies Panel
- E. Transcript of the Perspectives of the Beneficiaries of Quality in Higher Education Panel
- F. Transcript of the Perspectives for Fundamental Change Panel
- G. Transcript of the Perspectives of Accreditors Panel
- H. Transcript of the “Outside the Box” Panel
- I. Transcript of the Synthesizers Panel
- J. Transcript of the Public Commenters’ Oral Presentations
- K. Public Commenters’ Written Submissions and Written Requests to Make Oral Comments
- L. Transcript of the Members’ Individual Views of the Key Reauthorization Issues
- M. List of Specific Ideas or Recommendations Received from the Members
- N. Committee Results of the Agenda-Setting Prioritization Exercise

BACKGROUND

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI or the Committee), was established by Section 114 of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 and most recently, Section 106 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). Chief among its statutory functions is the committee's responsibility to advise the Secretary of Education, or his designee, the Senior Department Official (the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education), regarding the recognition of specific accrediting agencies or associations, or a specific State approval agency as reliable authorities concerning the quality of education and training offered by postsecondary educational institutions and programs. It also provides advice to the Secretary on the establishment and enforcement of the Criteria for Recognition of accrediting agencies or associations under Subpart 2, Part H, Title IV, of the HEA. Another function of the NACIQI is to advise the Secretary regarding policy affecting both recognition of accrediting and State approval agencies and institutional eligibility for participation in programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The NACIQI is required by law to meet at least twice a year.

The February 2011 NACIQI meeting was held in response to the Secretary's request for a report on recommendations concerning the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. It was not a traditional NACIQI meeting during which the review of agencies occurs. The purpose of the meeting was to invite speakers to inform, educate and challenge the NACIQI members concerning the question:

What is working (and not working) in the current system of recognition, accreditation, and institutional student aid eligibility?

The two-fold goal of the meeting was: 1) to broaden the members' knowledge concerning accreditation, program quality, institutional quality, and Title IV institutional eligibility from a number of different perspectives and 2) to arrive at a draft set of topics on which the Committee will focus during the reauthorization of HEA portion of the June 2011 NACIQI meeting.

The meeting provided the Committee with a grounding background, an opportunity to learn and ask questions, and an opportunity to consider all of the issues at hand in defining the areas for recommendations. It also provided the Committee an opportunity to identify and prioritize what issues the members considered most important for the report to address. Towards those goals, the members heard from eight different panels composed of a variety of higher education experts on the first day of the meeting. In addition to the information presented in the transcript for each panel (See Appendices A-J) for the transcript for each panel.), Appendix K contains the written submissions received from those individuals who were invited as panelists.

On the second day of the meeting, the panel of synthesizers, who served as a sounding board for the NACIQI to help it narrow the scope of the suggestions, reported on what they had heard during the previous day's multiple panel presentations. Oral presentations by members of the public followed. Next, the NACIQI members presented their own synthesis

of the panels, which was followed by an agenda-setting exercise. The members present used Post-its to first identify and then, prioritize what areas they wanted to pursue further within the report.

Members in attendance for all or part of the meeting included Cameron C. Staples (Chairperson), Arthur J. Rothkopf (Vice Chairperson), Susan Phillips (Reauthorization Subcommittee Chairperson), Bruce Cole, Arthur Keiser, Wilfred "Bill" McClay, Anne D. Neal, William Pepicello, Jamiene S. Studley, and Lawrence N. Vanderhoef .

U.S. Department of Education personnel who participated in the meeting included: Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education Eduardo Ochoa, Committee Executive Director Melissa Lewis, Accreditation Director Kay Gilcher, and Program Attorney Sarah Wanner. The following Accrediting Agency Evaluation Unit (AAEU) staff were in attendance: AAEU Chief Carol Griffiths, Jennifer Hong-Silwany, and, Charles Mula. Other Department staff that supported the meeting included: Cathy Sheffield and Jannetta Washington.

PANELS APPEARING BEFORE THE NACIQI

I. Challenges and Perspectives on Quality in Higher Education Panel

A. Panelists:

Judith Eaton, Council on Higher Education Accreditation
Peter Ewell, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Dr. Eduardo M. Ochoa, U.S. Department of Education

- B.** See Appendix A for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

II. Perspectives on Federal and State Interests Panel

A. Panelists:

Sandy Baum, Independent Education Policy Analyst
David Longanecker, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Hans L'Orange, State Higher Education Executive Officers

- B.** See Appendix B for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

III. Academic Scholarship Perspectives Panel

A. Panelists:

Richard Arum, New York University
John Pryor, University of California, Los Angeles
Amy Wells-Dolan, University of Mississippi

- B.** See Appendix C for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

IV. Perspectives of Institutions--the "Accredited" Constituencies Panel

A. Panelists:

Susan Hattan, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Muriel A. Howard, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Harris Miller, Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities
Gary Rhoades, American Association of University Professors
Michael Tanner, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

- B.** See Appendix D for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

V. Perspectives of the Beneficiaries of Quality in Higher Education Panel

A. Panelists:

Christine Keller, Voluntary System of Accountability, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

Lindsay McCluskey, U.S. Student Association

Susan Traiman, Business Roundtable

- B.** See Appendix E for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

VI. Perspectives for Fundamental Change Panel

A. Panelists:

Clifford Adelman, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Kevin Carey, Education Sector

Milton Greenberg, American University

- B.** See Appendix F for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

VII. Perspectives of Accreditors Panel

A. Panelists:

Barbara Brittingham, New England Association of Schools and Colleges

Neil Harvison, American Occupational Therapy Association

Michale McComis, Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges

Belle Wheelan, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

Roger Williams, Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training

- B.** See Appendix G for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

VIII. Perspectives from "Outside the Box" Panel

A. Panelists:

Tom Dawson, Gates Foundation

Rachel Gunner, U.S. Green Building Council

Barmak Nassirian, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions

- B.** See Appendix H for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above panelists' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

IX. Synthesizer Panel

The Synthesizer Panel provided an initial cut at the disparate ideas and themes presented by the many presenters on February 3rd. The goal of the obtaining the Synthesizers' perspective was to provide, in effect, a sounding board against which Committee members might react to and build on to accelerate their own "synthesis" process.

A. Synthesizers:

Sandy Baum, Independent Education Policy Analyst

Peter Ewell, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Holly McKiernan, Lumina Foundation

- B.** See Appendix I for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above synthesizers' presentations and the question and answer period that followed.

PRESENTATIONS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

I. Public Commenters that Made Oral Presentations

A. List of Public Commenters that Made Oral Presentations

Joyce Rechtschaffen, Princeton University

Ralph Wolf, Senior College Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Karen Moynahan, The National Association of Schools of Music, The National Association of Schools of Art and Design, The national Association of Schools of Theatre, and The National Association of Schools of Dance

Bernard Fryshman, Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools, Accreditation Commission

Sally Tom, Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education

Anthony Bieoa, Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools

Ronald Blumenthal, Kaplan Higher Education

Dr. Massood Jallali, No organization listed

Diane Jones, External and Regulatory Affairs for Career Education Corporation

- B.** See Appendix J for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the above public commenters' presentations and the question and answer period that followed, if any.

II. Public Commenters that Submitted Written Comments and Written Requests to Make Oral Comments

A. List of Public Commenters that Submitted Written Comments and Written Requests to Make Oral Comments

Mollie Benz Flounlacker, Association of American Universities

Shirley M. Tilghman, Princeton University

Ronald Blumenthal, Kaplan University

Albert C. Gray, Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools

Dr. Massood Jallali, No organization listed

Glen S. McGhee, Florida Higher Education Accountability Project; Related Attachments A-E

Terry G. Pence and Robert C. Trundle, Northern Kentucky University and related correspondence

Karen Moynahan, National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), and the National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD)

B. See Appendix K for the written comments and the written requests made in advance of the meeting to make an oral presentation received from the public.

COMMITTEE AGENDA-SETTING EXERCISE

I. Overview

Susan Phillips, Reauthorization Subcommittee Chairperson, explained that the purpose of the agenda-setting was to start to identify a draft set of focused areas for further consideration and recommendation development at the June NACIQI meeting. The exercise consisted of three parts: an opportunity for each member present to offer their own initial synthesis of the presentations presented; a collective picture of where those members present were in terms of issues, and what those members present would like to pursue; a prioritization of which issues are the most important to those members present.

II. Members' Individual Views of Key Issues

See Appendix L for the portion of the meeting transcript that contains the comments made by the NACIQI members concerning their individual views of the key issues related to the reauthorization of the HEA.

III. Members' Collective Picture of Key Issues and Ideas They Wanted to Pursue

The members used pink Post-it notes to obtain an aggregate picture of those issues they wanted to pursue further. Each member was asked to write what they thought were the most critical issues for the NACIQI to form judgments about in the reauthorization recommendation development process. They used one blue Post-it note to specify the one specific idea or recommendation that they would like to explore further. See Appendix M for the complete list of the specific ideas or recommendations received from the members.

IV. Prioritization of the Issues

The three top priorities as determined by the members present were: 1. Reducing the regulatory burden and scope; 2. Clarifying the roles of the triad members; and 3. A combination of "Alternatives to regional scope for accreditors," "Delinking eligibility and aid," "Inter-accreditor alignment," "Better data," and "Consumer Information." See Appendix N for the ranking of the issue categories from those members present, and from those that subsequently submitted their top choices.