

IN THIS ISSUE

- DETC Hires New Accreditation Assistant
- DETC Welcomes New Institution
- The Learning Outcomes Paradox
- DETC Executive Director Announces Retirement

Fall 2012



# DETC NEWS



# DETC NEWS - Fall 2012

## Contents

Executive Director’s Diary.....	1
DETC Hires New Accreditation Assistant.....	4
DETC Welcomes New Institution .....	5
The Learning Outcomes Paradox.....	6
Report from the Accrediting Commission.....	12
DETC Executive Director Announces Retirement After 40 Years of Service.	18
DETC Fall Workshop Set for Santa Fe .....	20
Save the Dates for Future DETC Meetings .....	20

**DETC NEWS**—Published by the Distance Education and Training Council, 1601 18th Street, NW, Suite 2, Washington, D.C. 20009 (202-234-5100).

Story ideas, feedback, letters to the editor and other reader submissions are encouraged and should be sent via e-mail. Please put “DETC NEWS SUBMISSION” as the subject line of your e-mail.

The Distance Education and Training Council (DETC) a nonprofit, voluntary association of accredited distance study institutions, was founded in 1926 to promote sound educational standards and ethical business practices within the distance study field. The independent DETC Accrediting Commission is listed by the United States Department of Education as a “nationally recognized accrediting agency.”

The Accrediting Commission is also a charter member of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

### DETC Staff:

**Executive Director:**  
Michael P. Lambert

**Associate Director:**  
Sally R. Welch

**Director of Accreditation:**  
Nan M. Bayster Ridgeway

**Director of Media and Events:**  
Robert S. Chalifoux

**Accreditation Associate:**  
Lissette Hubbard

**Accreditation Assistant:**  
Brenda Amaya

**Information Specialist and Bookkeeper:**  
Brianna L. Bates

**Legal Counsel:**  
Elise Scanlon

---

# Executive Director's Diary

## ***Voluntary Accreditation: Bowed, Bending, But Not Yet Yielding***

by  
Michael P. Lambert  
Executive Director



Voluntary, non-governmental accreditation, an enterprise that used to enjoy unquestioned acceptance as an important part of what constitutes excellence in education, is enduring a rough patch.

Some critics of accreditation—and they include Senators and op-ed writers—have a stern message for those of us who labor in the accreditation vineyard: Accreditation is not serving the purposes that we now established for it.

The critics seek to reform accreditation by insisting that it become more responsive to calls for more transparency, having more relevant outcomes disclosures and ensuring that institutions are in compliance with federal laws.

The questions facing accrediting associations in this age of accountability and transparency include, “What is our role in assessing quality today? What is

expected of us? What can we do rekindle the public trust in us? How can we stimulate institutions of higher education to be the best they can be, while at the same time serving our role as protectors of the interests of students, government and other important stakeholders?

The Federal government’s chief interest is in ensuring accountability for institutional usage of federal funds. In so doing, with over \$175 billion tax dollars on the table, government has determined that there needs to be much greater accountability for this significant taxpayer expenditure.

One of the most important questions of facing accreditation is, “Can accrediting bodies serve dual but completing roles: government and its call for accountability and gate keeping of funds, and the higher  
*(continued)*

---

**(Executive Director's Diary, continued)**

education community's expectation that accreditors stimulate self-improvement and identify quality for the public?

It is a classic "Hobson's Choice." Agencies are free to be federally recognized, or not. If they do not choose to get recognized, their chances of success and survival, at least for most institutional accrediting groups, are much diminished.

Last April, the National Advisory Council on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI) published its much-anticipated report, *Higher Education Act Reauthorization Accreditation Policy Recommendations*.

One of the most important recommendations from the final Report was to **continue** to have the nation rely on non-governmental accreditation as the gatekeeper for federal funds in higher education. Stated the Report in its key recommendation:

*With a substantial federal investment in education (over \$175 billion available in Title IV funding for student aid in 2011), the federal process for determining aid eligibility has, to date, included institutional or program accreditation as its assurance of the quality of the education endeavors to which federal funds might be directed.*

*A critical issue concerns the extent to which accreditation serves, and should continue to serve, a gatekeeping function for the determination of eligibility of federal funds. Deliberations on this*

*issue covered a range of views, and concluded with the recommendation to retain accreditation in the institutional eligibility process.*

But two members of NACIQI took a different stance in their minority report to the final recommendations to the Secretary, stating: "The accreditors want to be gatekeepers for federal funding on the one hand and self-improvement experts on the other. The two roles simply do not mesh."

### **What's To Be Done?**

I have been penning these "Executive Director Diaries" for the *DETC News* twice a year for the past 20 years, so this essay will be my 40th and my last, as I will be retiring next spring.

As my parting essay to *DETC News'* readers on the most important topic to face non-governmental accreditation in a generation, I would dare to offer a few thoughts to help move the national conversation on the future of accreditation forward.

Accreditors need to get together and decide what they can all agree on, and also agree to do no harm to the positions taken on accreditation by other interest groups. When the time comes for re-authorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act in 2013, the accrediting community should come up with a list of positions that everyone in the community can support.

The most logical and experienced group to organize the accrediting community to build consensus around the common positions is the Council For Higher Education Accreditation, which had sponsored *The CHEA Initiative* from 2008-2012.

---

*(Executive Director's Diary, continued)*

It was a national dialogue on accreditation and its future. The initiative developed action plans for the critical issues facing accreditation. The results of this 4 year exercise should be brought into play to see where common ground exists.

Other suggestions I respectfully offer include:

1. The leaders of accrediting associations, working closely with CHEA and their stakeholder institutions and their governing bodies, **should take the lead** and be the driver of a true reform agenda for accreditation in reauthorization. The accrediting association executive directors from the regional, national and specialized sectors should take the lead in making the hard choices decisions about the appropriate role and functions of voluntary accreditation. In past reauthorizations, accreditation has had to react to the proposals of others from outside the enterprise. This time, the accreditors themselves should be advancing, proactively, a reform agenda that has meaningful new provisions that will engender national respect for accreditation once again.
2. The link between accreditation and gate keeping for federal funds needs to be **seriously re-examined and totally overhauled**. How best to do this remains to be worked out by experts in accreditation, the Congress and federal program administrators. The current system is not working well.
3. There is a workable, practical model for us to consider for the next reauthorization of the HEOA. This model is the one that is followed by the **Department of Veterans Affairs** and the **Department of Defense**. The model has worked well because the line between academic freedom and accountability for federal funds is not inter-mixed. With these Federal student funding programs, there is a **dual and separate path** for institutions to gain eligibility for federal funds:
  - (a) first, the institution must be accredited by a recognized accrediting agency, and the process and criteria of becoming accredited is left to the accreditors; and
  - (b) the institutions must comply with the rules of participation in the particular federal program, as established and administered by the respective Federal Department. In each case, the federal agency does not use accreditors as surrogates to check on compliance with their agency's regulations and expectations, and they do not impose academic policies or standards on the accreditors.
4. Finally, the critics of accreditation do have a point about **accountability**. An accredited institution, I have always believed, is an institution of unquestioned integrity and probity that always delivers on its promises to its learners. Accreditors need to double down on

---

*(Executive Director's Diary, continued)*

their efforts to require transparency, to insist on **uniform and responsible formulas** to calculate outcomes, and to disclose those outcomes in a common and prominent fashion.

In closing, I would like to say what a wonderful privilege and honor it has been for me to have served the DETC community for the past 4 decades. During my career, an estimated 60-plus million people enrolled with DETC accredited institutions, and I would submit that nearly all of them had a fine experience and had their life touched in a positive way.

It is gratifying to think that I may have played a small role in making sure that these folks were given the opportunity to learn and grow because of the diligent work of the DETC and its Commissioners.

---

## Get E-mail Updates from the DETC!

Are you interested in receiving e-mail updates from DETC? You can visit the DETC website to sign up to receive messages from DETC regarding upcoming meetings and events, actions taken by the DETC Accrediting Commission, proposed revisions our for public comment, and more!

Visit [www.detc.org](http://www.detc.org) and enter your email address in the box on the home page to sign up!

And don't forget, you can also follow the DETC on Twitter (@DETCAccrediting and @DETCMeetings) or Like our facebook page ([www.facebook.com/DETCAccrediting](http://www.facebook.com/DETCAccrediting))!

---

## DETC Hires New Accreditation Assistant

The DETC is pleased to announce Ms. Brenda Amaya has been hired to serve as the DETC's new Accreditation Assistant. She started with DETC on Monday, August 13, 2012.



**Brenda Amaya**

Before coming to the Council, Brenda worked with The Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, where she assisted the Patient Services Department by informing and guiding patients battling a blood cancer. She is continu-

ing her involvement with the organization by serving on the Patient Services Committee for the local National Capital Area Chapter.

She attended James Madison University, where she graduated in 2010 with a Bachelor of Arts in International Affairs. During her time at JMU, she studied abroad in Spain and completed a semester in Washington, DC as a Congressional Office intern on Capitol Hill.

Please join us in welcoming Brenda to the Council staff. She can be reached at 202-234-5100, ext. 106, or [Brenda@detc.org](mailto:Brenda@detc.org).

---

# DETC Welcomes New Institution

*Editor's Note: At the June meeting of the DETC Accrediting Commission, one new institution was accredited (see **Report from the Accrediting Commission**, page 10). Please join us in welcoming them to the DETC Family.*



**Grace Communion Seminary**, in Glendora, California, is an educational institution affiliated with Grace Communion International (GCI), a member of the National Association of Evangelicals. The institution, which began in 2004, provides quality online graduate-level education in pastoral ministry.

The institution's mission statement is *Equipping the Saints for Pastoral Ministry*. It is committed to equip the saints for pastoral ministry through graduate education in biblical, theological, ministerial and pastoral studies informed by Trinitarian Incarnational faith.

The online delivery of the institution's curriculum serves busy pastors who cannot leave pastorates for the residential seminary. Lay persons and ministers can

take courses of interest in order to enhance their ministry through better understanding the nature of God, participation in the ministry of Jesus, and revelation through the Bible. Grace Communion Seminary's perspective focuses on Trinitarian Incarnational theology and pastoral ministry, and the institution's programs are entirely online and use the Moodle learning platform.



**Russell Duke**

Grace Communion Seminary offers one degree program, a Master of Pastoral Studies. The program requires completion of fourteen courses, including a Theology of Ministry thesis. Courses also are offered in biblical studies, theology, church history, and ministerial and pastoral leadership.

Grace Communion Seminary offers one degree program, a Master of Pastoral Studies. The program requires completion of fourteen courses, including a Theology of Ministry thesis. Courses also are offered in biblical studies, theology, church history, and ministerial and pastoral leadership.

Non-degree students can enroll in Grace Communion Seminary's Continuing Education courses in the area of their interest, all of which are offered at the Master's level. Upon completing four courses students receive the Certificate of Theological Studies, and upon completing three more courses they receive the Advanced Diploma of Christian Ministry.

All programs are open to academically qualified men and women who desire to expand their education in biblical studies and theology and their service in pastoral ministry in the evangelical tradition.

For more information about Grace Communion Seminary, please visit the institution's website at [www.gcs.edu](http://www.gcs.edu).

---

# The Learning Outcomes Paradox

## ***Trend in Standardization of Learning Outcomes in the Post-Industrial Era of Higher Education***

by  
Farhad Saba, Ph. D.  
Professor Emeritus, Educational  
Technology  
San Diego State University



While institutions of higher education are encouraged to move towards definition of standardized learning outcomes to demonstrate the effectiveness of their program offerings, learners in the world of work are increasingly required to develop unique context-driven solutions to the problems at hand; solutions that are not standardized! The process of accountability and accreditation is moving towards standardization—the sought-after goal of industrialization—while in the emerging post-industrial era of the 21st century, at least in the advanced economies of the world, what is required of the workers is finding novel solutions that are unique in the context of particular problems.

To be sure, for anyone to be able to develop creative solutions certain learning standards must be met. In Bloom's taxono-

my of learning outcomes critical thinking, creativity, and application of one's knowledge to novel situations are considered to be a higher-level goals after standardized behavioral and cognitive objectives have been mastered by the learner.

However, what has become clear through distance education research in the last 30 years is that individual learners reach standard learning objectives, as well as emergent outcomes for creative problem solving in unique ways and not through the standardized one-size-fits all curriculum and assessment models that are going to be in place if current trends in regulation and accountability continue.

Standard models of instructional design and assessment are static. Static instructional systems by their nature are not

*(continued)*

---

## **(The Learning Outcomes Paradox, continued)**

dynamically responsive to the individual needs of each learner. As such, they are ill equipped to meet the educational needs of the workforce in the post-industrial era of the 21st century. System dynamic solutions are needed that are based on the post-industrial view of distance education.

### **The Post-Industrial View of Distance Education**

This view of distance education is grounded on dynamic systems science methodology and technology (Moore and Kearsley, 2012). The origin of the application of systems approach to distance education is traced back to Charles Wedemeyer, professor emeritus of the University of Wisconsin-Madison who in the 1970s established the concept of learning anywhere, anytime. (Wedemeyer, 1981). Following Wedemeyer's tradition, Moore (1983) Professor of Education, Pennsylvania State University, postulated that:

- Distance in education is a social and psychological phenomenon in contrast to the idea of distance in terms of the physical space between the learner and the instructor.
- The distance between the learner and the instructor—or *transactional distance*—is determined by the *dialog* between the learner and the instructor.
- Transactional distance is measured by
  - the *independence* that *each* learner requires in the learning process, and

- the requisite *structure* that the instructor or the instructional institution must bring to bear to ensure that students meet the standard learning objectives and attain emergent learning outcomes that is unique to each individual learner.

Thus, *distance* in education or transactional distance varies dynamically for each individual learner throughout the learning process in a course or in a program of study as dialog and structure vary in the dynamic process of interaction between the learner and the instructor and among the learners.

Saba and Shearer (1994) conducted a study in which they empirically verified Moore's postulate. They used a system dynamics modeling software to simulate the variability of transactional distance with two other variables of structure and dialog. Data collected from 30 learners, who were taught in 30 separate instructional sessions individually, indicated that in each case **when structure (instructor control) increased, transactional distance also increased, and when dialog (learner control) increased, transactional distance decreased.**

Therefore the researchers observed an inverse dynamic relationship between the rate of dialog and the level of transactional distance. In this study, while the general pattern of variability was the same for all 30 learners, researchers realized that **each individual learner exhibited different rates of dialog as their personalized instructional sessions progressed.**

*(continued)*

---

## ***(The Learning Outcomes Paradox, continued)***

### **Significance of the Study for Learners and Design of Learning Systems**

Based on the above and subsequent studies (Saba 1997, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2012) several observations can be made:

- Optimal learning may occur under different conditions for different learners.
- Novice learners require a high level of structure, and as their expertise increase they become more self-reliant and autonomous.
- Educational systems of the future can optimize the condition of learning if they respond to learners individually in a dynamic environment adaptable to the instructor's requirement for structure and the learner's ability to learn autonomously.
- While designing instruction with pre-determined outcomes is necessary, such instruction is not sufficient to lead to spontaneous creativity, which is present in peak learning experiences when learners exhibit emergent behaviors.
- Dynamic learning systems, which provide non-standardized differential responses to individual learners, offer the condition in which unique emergent learning behaviors, such as application of new knowledge to a novel situation, or solving a new problem by critical thinking, can manifest themselves while accommodating pre-determined learning objectives. (Saba, 2007)

In recent years, new adaptive technologies have emerged that offer differential responses to learners in various courses and programs. These include software applications that take advantage of intelligent agents, recommendation engines, artificial intelligence and similar other technologies. Learning management systems that include such technologies provide dynamically generated individual responses to unique requirements of each learner for autonomy and structure. They are in sharp contrast to some of the learning management systems that are widely used today, which offer a static and linear path to learning with pre-determined standardized learning objectives that may have been enough in the industrial era but leave the learner short changed in the current economy.

### **Implications for How Higher Education Administrators Manage Their Institutions**

Sociologist Alvin Toffler (1980) posited that embedded in the management structure of educational institutions is a "hidden curriculum" that belongs to an industrial era. This stealth design encourages learners to acquire industrial meta-skills, such as punctuality and other competencies that may be of less importance in a 21st century society and economy as compared to the economy and society of the past 100 years. For example, in the 1960s, while enrolled in the undergraduate program in broadcasting at San Francisco State University, the author was trained to be very punctual. My TV production professor, Dr. Herbert Zettl, always reminded us that, "ten o'

*(continued)*

---

## ***(The Learning Outcomes Paradox, continued)***

clock happens at ten o' clock!" Today, in an era when TV audiences watch what they want when they want it, I wonder if such punctuality is as important to broadcasters as it was in the 1960s. Yes, they still must meet deadlines and be on time for live broadcasts. However, as audiences increasingly stream programs to their computers to watch at their leisure, the broadcasters' punctuality becomes less important.

This is just a simple example that illustrates how post-industrial technologies are altering the meaning and application of fundamental concepts, such as, time in the current era. The meaning of concepts such as time and distance, that we have taken for granted in the industrial era for the past two or three hundred years are now changing and finding new connotations in the post-industrial time, especially for the younger generation who constitute the majority of students in higher education.

In practical terms, most institutions of higher education follow an academic calendar that has little or no flexibility for learners who may complete a course of study in a time period less than the customary 16-week if they operate on a semester system. Learners who may differ in their prior knowledge of the subject matter at hand, or may have a higher need for structure, or can accept more autonomy in learning are all required to spend the same seat-time in a classroom or online and receive the same educational treatment as everyone else in a lock-step curriculum that is designed linearly and statically.

In total disregard of individual differences most courses move at a pre-deter-

mined pace, and must meet the requirement for a certain number of study time hours. This uniform pacing may have been desired in the industrial era as the production line in factories also moved at a steady speed. However, this monotonous pacing is not serving any purpose for learners in the second decade of the 21st century.

The industrial management system of colleges and universities dramatically inhibits the flexibility that dynamic distance education systems can offer students and instructors. Time, thus money, is wasted when institutions do not offer programs with differential learning options to learners. The one size-fits-all course structure today is becoming increasingly more expensive because it prevents the system of higher education from becoming more responsive to the needs of the learners in form and function.

In systems terminology, organizations that cannot respond appropriately to their environment will wither away. Ironically, at this very time trends in assessment and accreditation point towards supporting standardized and static systems of instruction and assessment that result in attaining pre-determined outcomes when in addition to such outcomes dynamically generated emergent (or creative) outcomes are what learners need to attain in order to thrive and survive in the post-industrial economy.

### **Impact on Instructors**

Faculty are solo workers (Saba, 2012). Like the crafts men and women of the pre-industrial era they do not enjoy the affordances of industry, such as, division

*(continued)*

---

## ***(The Learning Outcomes Paradox, continued)***

of labor and direct capitalization of their work. In Most institutions of higher education instructors create and their courses, respond to learners' inquiries, assess their students and provide feedback to them without the benefit of assistance from an instructional designer, an evaluator, a graphic artist, an instructional assistant or any other professional who might enable them to design, produce, deliver, and assess more effective courses.

Some institutions, primarily for-profit private universities and colleges, that do offer staff assistance to their instructors are heavily criticized as if though differential staffing somehow diminish the quality of instruction rather than improve it! Also lacking is the provision of sufficient funds for instructors in the creation of their courses. In a typical academic department of a college or university there is usually an absence of a line item budget for creating a course! If such industrial means (i.e. division of labor and infusion of capital) are afforded to faculty through a grant or a special project it is only for a limited period of time.

Clearly, there is a chasm between the pre-industrial professional culture of faculty and that of the university administrators who live in a industrial culture, with features such as division of labor and a standardized budget and an accounting system to manage it.

The primary objective of the administrators is to meet the needs of students as uniformly as possible. As such, there is considerable lack of synchronicity between the pre-industrial culture of the faculty and

the industrial culture of the administrator, not to mention the post-industrial culture of the learner!

When faculty see that the industrial structure of the university administration precludes meeting the individual needs of students by providing them with variable structure and autonomy, they are compelled to ask: Why should they use information technologies to offer a one-size-fits-all course to a group of students, specially when the same results can be obtained with much less expensive means –that is without the cost of a course team and a multimillion-dollar information technology infrastructure?

## **Summary and Conclusion**

The world of work requires creative individuals who can offer novel solutions to situation-based problems. How distance education is organized and practiced in the next few years will define the extent to which institutions of higher education can provide differential educational experiences to their learners that are based on learners' prior knowledge of each subject, as well as their tolerance for autonomy and need for structure.

The current trend in assessment of higher education towards standardization of learning outcomes by regulation, however, challenges the dynamic nature of distance education, and the need to personalize instruction in the post-industrial 21st century economy. Ironically, the computer and telecommunication nexus that can provide economies of scale through new adaptive technologies is used to standardize learning process and outcomes!

*(continued)*

---

## ***(The Learning Outcomes Paradox, continued)***

Also, In the immediate years to come, if faculty are offered differential staffing and operating funds to meet the individual needs of the learners by creating and offering adaptive courses, distance education will remain academically relevant and economically cost effective. The major hypothesis put forward here is that a dynamic model of course development that responds to learners differentially will

- Decrease the overall cost of education
- Increase the relevancy of education to learners
- Increase the synchronization of the three cultures of faculty (pre-industrial), administrators (industrial) and learners (post-industrial), and
- Provide a workforce that is capable of responding to a fast changing economic environment through creative thinking and situation-based problem solving.

Unless the current experience with the Internet in offering distance education succeeds in increasing the relevancy of the learning experience to the learner as described here distance education will once again leave center stage only to re-emerge later with the inevitable arrival of a new technology.

Similar to individuals, each institution is unique in its vision, mission and organizational structure. A systems approach, allows institutions to look into the future and enable themselves to use distance education in the era of the Internet to individualize instruction and personalize the academic experience of learners.

## **References**

- Moore, M. G. (1983). The individual adult learner. In Tight, M. (Ed.) *Adult Learning and Education* 153-168. London: Croom Helm
- Moore, M., Kearsley, G. (2012). *Distance education: A systems view of online learning*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Saba, F. (1997). Distance education and economic development in the postindustrial United States. *Open Praxis*, 1(1), 15-17.
- Saba F. (2006). The new academy: A dynamic vision for a postmodern era of distance education. In Beaudion, M. F. (Ed.). *Perspectives on higher education in the digital age*. (259-256). NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Saba, F. (2007). A systems approach in theory building. In M. G. Moore, (Ed.). *Handbook of Distance Education*. (43-55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Saba, F. (2008). Learning management systems of the future: A theoretical framework and design. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*. Retrieved from [jolt.merlot.org/vol4no2/saba0608.htm](http://jolt.merlot.org/vol4no2/saba0608.htm)
- Saba, F., (2012). Experts talk: Interview with Dr. Farhad Saba. In M., Kostina, & W., LaGanza. *The golden climate in distance learning*. Hampton, NH: Mindstrip Media.
- Saba, F., & Shearer, R. L. (1994). Verifying key theoretical concepts in a dynamic model of distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 8 (1), 36-59.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. NY: Morrow.
- Wedemeyer, C. A. (1981). *Learning at the back door: Reflections on non-traditional learning in the lifespan*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

---

# Report From the Accrediting Commission

The DETC Accrediting Commission met on June 14-15, 2012 and took the following actions:

## Public Commissioner Appointed

The Commission voted to appoint Ms. Nanette Swarthout to her first three-year term as a public member on the Commission. Ms. Swarthout replaces Ms. Carol Osborn who resigned from the Commission. Ms. Swarthout's first term will end in 2015.



**Nanette Swarthout**

Ms. Swarthout is a senior instructor at Fontbonne University's Options Program, teaching Human Resources and Business courses to Bachelors and MBA degree students. She is also the Human Resources Manager for McCallum Place in St. Louis, MO. Ms. Swarthout was the Instructional Design Consultant for DRA/SIRSI, a leading library software automation company. Prior to the purchase of DRA by SIRSI, she was the training and conversions manager for DRA. Ms. Swarthout started her career working for Trans World Airlines as a reservation sales agent and worked her way up to Director of Employment Services. While working for the airline, Ms. Swarthout also held the positions of Director of

Employee Relations, Director and Manager of Training, and Training Instructor for the Trans World Travel Academy, an operating division of the airline. Further, Ms. Swarthout is a member of the Society for Human Resource Management, the Employment Management Association, and the American Society of Training and Development. She has served on numerous DETC Examining committees as an Evaluator for both Educational and Business Standards. Ms. Swarthout earned an MBA degree from Fontbonne University and a B.S. in Communications from Illinois State University.

## Public Commissioner Re-Appointed

The Commission voted to reappoint Mr. Patrick O'Malley to his second three-year term as a public member on the Accrediting Commission.



**Patrick O'Malley**

Mr. Patrick O'Malley is a Certified Public Accountant who worked for PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP from 1970 until 2006. His experience with PricewaterhouseCoopers included 36 years of service to large national and multinational companies, primarily engaged in the entertainment and leisure sector, real estate, and manufacturing.

*(continued)*

---

## ***(Report from the Accrediting Commission, continued)***

In 2007, he joined the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) as an Associate Director in the organization's Inspections division. Mr. O'Malley earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting from the University of Evansville in 1970. He has served on the Board of Directors for the University of Central Florida Foundation from 1998 until 2006, where he is currently an ex-officio member of the Finance Committee and a member of the Audit Committee.

He also served on the Board of Directors of the Junior Achievement of Central Florida from 1984 until 2006. Mr. O'Malley joined the Commission in 2009. His current term will expire in 2015.

### **One Institution Gains Accreditation**

The following institution was accredited:

#### **Grace Communion Seminary**

2011 East Financial Way  
Glendora, CA 91740-0730  
(626) 650-2306 or 800-851-2611  
www.gcs.edu

Dr. Russell Duke, President/CEO  
Founded 1947. Offers Master of Pastoral Studies (MPS) and Master's Level Continuing Education Courses (MLCE).

### **One Institution Reaccredited**

The following institution was reaccredited:

#### **Army Institute for Professional Development**

TRADOC Capacity Manager - TADLP  
ATTN: ATIC-IMC (McCool)  
Building 2791, East Wing (Madison Ave/  
Harrison Loop)  
Army Training Support Center  
Fort Eustis, VA 23604-5166

### **Show Cause Issued**

The following institution was issued a Show Cause:

#### **Teacher Education University**

1079 West Morse Boulevard, Suite B  
Winter Park, FL 23789

### **Title IV Certification**

The following institution was certified by DETC to seek eligibility from the Department of Education to participate in the federal student aid programs:

- Sessions College for Professional Studies, Tempe, AZ

### **Name Changes**

- American Graduate School of Education has changed to Acacia University
- Ellis University has changed to John Hancock University
- Martinsburg Institute has changed to Martinsburg College
- Sheffield School of Interior Design has changed to Sheffield School

*(continued)*

---

## ***(Report from the Accrediting Commission, continued)***

### **Change of Location**

The changes of location for the following institutions were approved:

- Diamond Council of America moved into Suite 400 at its same location (3212 West End Avenue, Nashville, TN 37203).
- Dunlap-Stone University moved to 19820 North 7th Street, Suite 100, Phoenix, AZ 85024.

### **New Division**

The Commission approved the change of management for two institutions. The following new division was approved:

Distance Education Company, the parent company of New York Institute of Photography and Sheffield School, has added a new division named New York Institute of Career Development (NYICD). It will be operated out of its office at 211 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.

### **Final Approval of Standards, Procedures, and/or Policies**

To view the revised documents, please visit the Final Approval page of the DETC website at [www.detc.org/actions/approval](http://www.detc.org/actions/approval). Institutions must be in full compliance by January 1, 2013:

### **Standards**

1. Standards V. B. (adding “as described in C.14”) and V.C. (adding “The factors considered by the Commission in making this determination ... etc.”)

### **Policies**

2. C.1. Policy on Substantive Change and Notification (added #10 on acquisition of a hybrid and what constitutes ordering a comprehensive review)
3. C.2. Policy on Change of Mission, Goals, and Objectives (added “The Accrediting Commission will review the Change of Mission/Goals/Objectives Report to decide if an on-site visit is required or if further reporting is necessary.” and deleted redundant paragraphs and adding the action of the Commission”)
4. C.6. Policy on Combination Distance Study-Resident Programs or Training Sites (added #6 on page 3 on implementing a teach-out plan to accommodate students needing to find another resident facilities)
5. C.7. Policy on Approval of New Combination Distance Study-Resident Programs or Training Sites (added #19 about adding a teach-out plan to accommodate students needing to find another resident facilities)
6. C.9. Policy on Degree Programs:

- Page 1: Standard I: Institutional  
*(continued)*

---

***(Report from the Accrediting Commission, continued)***

Mission, Goals, and Objectives (added to second paragraph, # 1) establishes an Advisory Council “that includes members not otherwise employed or contracted by your institution”

- Page 9: Standard VI: Qualifications and Duties of Owners, Governing Board Members, Officials, Administrators, Instructors/Faculty (added Standards VI.B. and VI.C.)
  - Page 11: Standard VII. Admission Practices (revised high school requirements and approved documentation)
7. C.14. Policy on Student Achievement and Satisfaction, page 2 (added “In order to make it statistically valid, there must be at least five institutions in the group”); page 3 (added “If the institution receives less than 75% for those who answered “yes” to the three questions,”) and “Graduation rates within 15 percentage points of the mean for the assigned degree level will be considered to meet the benchmark.”); page 5 (added “of at least five); page 6, (added “The institution should have at least a 30% response rate on its surveys.”); page 10 (added “with graduation rates for similar degree levels e.g., Associate, Bachelors, Master’s, First Professional, and Professional Doctorate.”) Also revised Standards V.B. and V.C. as shown in #1 above)
  8. C.15. Policy on Institutions Participating in Title IV (page 4, included “that includes members not otherwise employed or contracted by your institution” in #3, under Standard II. Educational Program Objectives, Curricula, and Materials)
  9. C.18. Policy on Annual Reports, page 2 (added “or a deficit in” and “audited or review” under “Analyzing Financial Information”)
  10. C.25. Policy on Change of Name (major revision; added “or adding a New Division”)
  11. C.27. Policy on Teach-Out Plans, page 1(added information on hybrid programs and option to require a Teach-Out Agreement); page 2 (added requirement for teach-out in #2).

**Procedures**

12. D.3. Notification and Information Sharing, page 1 (adding effective date of a Commission’s decision)
13. D.4. Retention of Commission Files and Records, page 1 (added “in hard copy or electronic form”)
14. D.5. Reviewing, Adopting, and Circulating Standards, Policies, and Procedures, page 3 (added the option of Commission adopting changes and then sending them out for public comment)
15. D.8. Conflict of Interest Policy, page 1 (changed “relative” to “family member”)

*(continued)*

---

## ***(Report from the Accrediting Commission, continued)***

16. D.8.1. Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form, page 1 (changed “relative” to “family member”)
17. D.10. Selection and Training of Commissioners, page 1 (added more information on Executive Director interviewing nominees before they are vetted by the Nominating Committee)
18. E.6. Annual Report, page 4 (revised language under VI. Financial Conditions to clarify that institutions must submit an audited or review statement if they show a loss)
19. E.7. Annual Report with Title IV, page 5 (same changes as shown in E.6.)

To view a complete list of the changes to the Policies, Procedures and Standards approved by the Accrediting Commission, visit the DETC website at <http://www.detc.org/actions>.

### **Proposed Changes**

The Commission gave preliminary approval to the following changes to DETC Standards, Policies and Procedures:

1. Revised C.14. Major revision.
2. Revisions to E.17. Glossary
3. Change to C.9., Standard VI – Qualifications of Faculty, page 10 (requiring relevant terminal degrees for

faculty teaching Master’s programs;) and page 11 (faculty may be deemed “exceptional” and documenting in personnel files courses taught and professional preparation)

4. Change to C.21. Policy on Required Institutions Documents, page 1 (adding resumes and official transcripts of its instructors – and an institutional verification mark or stamp that the original document was an “official transcript.”)

To view the documents, please visit the Call for Public Comment page of the DETC’s website at <http://www.detc.org/actions/comment>.

Any comments on the proposed changes should be sent to Sally Welch at DETC ([sally@detc.org](mailto:sally@detc.org)) by Dec. 1, 2012. Please write “Comments on Proposed Changes” in the subject line of your e-mail. If you do not receive a response indicating your comments have been received, please submit them again. Final adoption of these policies will be considered at the Commission’s January 2013 meeting.

### **Applicants for Accreditation and Re-Accreditation**

The following institutions have applied for DETC initial accreditation or re-accreditation:

#### *First Time Applicants:*

- Iteach U.S., Denton, TX
- Nations University, West Monroe, LA

*(continued)*

---

## ***(Report from the Accrediting Commission, continued)***

- Orlando University, Orlando, FL
- Process Work Institute, Portland, OR
- Southwestern Law School, Los Angeles, CA

### ***Applicants for Reaccreditation:***

- Ashworth College, Norcross, GA
- Brighton College, Scottsdale, AZ
- Cleveland Institute of Electronics, Cleveland OH
- Gemological Institute of America, Carlsbad, CA
- Harrison Middleton University, Tempe, AZ
- INSTE Bible College, Ankeny, IA
- Marine Corps Institute, Washington, DC
- New York Institute of Photography/Sheffield School, New York, NY
- New Charter University, San Francisco, CA
- University of Philosophical Research, Los Angeles, CA
- World College, Virginia Beach, VA

## **New Courses/Programs**

The Commission's Subcommittee on Academic Review approved new courses/programs at the following institutions during its call on May 9, 2012:

### **Allied Business Schools, Inc.**

- Medical Terminology for Opticianry

### **American College of Technology**

- Bachelor of Applied Science in Software Engineering – Business Applications
- Master of Science in Business Administration in the Global Economy

### **American Graduate University**

- Logistics Management in Government
- Supply Chain Management
- Global Logistics Management
- Applications in Supply Chain Management

### **California InterContinental University**

- Associate of Arts in Business Administration

### **Penn Foster College**

- Holistic Planet
- Associate of Science in Interior Design

For a complete list of new courses/programs approved by the Commission, visit the DETC website.

## **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the DETC Accrediting Commission will be January 10-11, 2013. All matters to be considered by the Commission should be brought to the attention of the Executive Director by no later than **December 1, 2012**.

---

# DETC Executive Director Announces Retirement After 40 Years of Service



After serving on the DETC staff for more than 40 years—20 of them as its Executive Director—Mr. Michael P. Lambert has announced that he will retire from DETC service next spring.

The DETC Accrediting Commission is in the process of conducting a search for the next Executive Director. The next Executive Director will be just the seventh in DETC's 86 year history. The Commission is hoping to announce its decision when the search is completed and the final selection is made in the beginning of next year.

All are invited to join DETC in honoring Mr. Lambert with a celebration at DETC's 87th Annual Conference next April at the InterContinental Mark Hopkins Hotel on Nob Hill in San Francisco,

CA, April 14-16. The new Executive Director will also be introduced to the DETC membership at this time, so please make plans to attend.

"As I look forward to the next passage in my life, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Accrediting Commission, both past and present, who have been so wonderful to work with over the years," Mr. Lambert said. "Also, I cannot say enough nice things about how much I appreciate the great DETC membership and the many fine people it has been my privilege to meet along the way in my career. And I can never say quite enough about our wonderful, dedicated DETC staff, who have made my career so pleasant and so rewarding, and whose commitment to quality serves so many students so well."

Mr. Lambert joined the National Home Study Council (NHSC) in 1972 as an accrediting program coordinator, and was promoted to Assistant Director in 1976 and Associate Director in 1987.

In 1992, Mr. Lambert was elected the sixth DETC Executive Director. In 1994, under Mr. Lambert's leadership, the National Home Study Council, founded in 1926, changed its name to the Distance Education and Training Council (DETC), which has accredited many distance learning institutions and educated more than 135 million Americans.

Throughout his years of service, he has served on over 600 accreditation re-

*(continued)*

---

## ***(DETC Executive Director Announces Retirement, continued)***

view committees in eight countries. Mr. Lambert is nationally and internationally regarded as a top expert in the area of voluntary accreditation and is considered to be a key national leader and technical expert in distance learning.

He has elevated DETC accreditation within the education field to ensure that its integrity and reputation represents the highest quality a student can expect to receive from a DETC accredited institution. Said DETC Commission Chair Timothy Mott: "Not only has Mr. Lambert opened up various avenues for distance learning, but he has always focused on the needs of the student. He is passionate about consumer protection, which allows students and individuals involved with DETC to expect the highest standards from the organization and its accredited institutions."

Mr. Lambert has authored and co-authored more than five dozen publications and is widely published in academic journals. He has addressed audiences in the United States, Canada, Costa Rica, England, Ireland, Germany, Norway, Scotland, and South Africa. He is frequently called upon to consult with federal, state, and foreign governments, universities, corporations, and trade associations about distance education. His writing, speaking, and consulting have shaped national debate defining quality in distance education.

Additionally, Mr. Lambert has served on various advisory boards, including the



**Mr. Michael P. Lambert, right, receiving the DETC Person of the Year award from Ms. Marie Sirney, Chair of the DETC Awards and Recognition Committee, during the 86th Annual Conference 2012.**

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) Committee on Recognition, the CHEA International Commission, the American Council on Education (ACE) Commission on Lifelong Learning, and Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC), where he is a past chair.

Among Mr. Lambert's awards are the U.S. Army Commendation Medal, the DETC Distinguished Recognition Award, the DETC Distinguished Service Award, the DETC Person of the Year Award, the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Distinguished Alumnus Award, the European Association for Distance Learning's "Roll of Honour" for his lifetime contributions to the field, and the Doctor of Humane Letters, honoris causa, awarded by Harrison-Middleton University.

---

# DETC Fall Workshop Set for Santa Fe



The Distance Education and Training Council's 2012 Fall Workshop will take place October 14-16, 2012 at the Eldorado Hotel & Spa in Santa Fe, NM. Located just steps from the historic Santa Fe plaza, the Eldorado Hotel & Spa is walking distance from a host of local treasures, including the Georgia O'Keeffe Museum, and Canyon Road art galleries.

Once again, the cost of the the Distance Education Workshop has not in-

creased—rates are \$900 per person for member institutions and \$1,100 per person for non-members! (Remember, if you're planning to attend the Closing Reception and Banquet on Tuesday, October 16th, you need to purchase a Closing Reception and Banquet registration.)

The registration deadline for the Distance Education Workshop is **Friday, October 5th**. Visit the DETC website for more information and to register!

---

## Save the Date for Future DETC Meetings!

### 2013

#### Accrediting Commission Meeting

January 10-11

#### 87th Annual Conference

April 14-16

The Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, CA

### 2013 (continued)

#### Accrediting Commission Meeting

June 13-14

#### DETC Fall Workshop

October 13-15

The Windsor Court Hotel, New Orleans, LA



---

Distance Education and Training Council  
1601 18th St. NW, Suite 2  
Washington, DC 20009  
202-234-5100  
[www.detc.org](http://www.detc.org)

---

