

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and H.R. 609

on Several Key Accreditation-Related Issues



Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Distance education	<p>Current law allows accreditors to review distance education programs without separate accreditation standards. Accreditors must apply and enforce consistently standards that ensure that an institution's courses or programs—including distance education courses or programs—are of sufficient quality to achieve the stated objective for which the courses or programs are offered. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(a)(4)]</p>	<p>The bill would still allow accreditors to review distance education programs without separate accreditation standards. [499]</p> <p>The bill would require accreditors to ensure that institutions offering distance education programs have processes to confirm that a registered student is the same student who completes the required work. [499]</p> <p>The bill would require accreditors to ensure that site visitors are well-trained and knowledgeable about their responsibilities regarding distance education. [499]</p> <p>The bill would require accreditors to monitor growth, but unlike H.R. 609, S. 1614 apparently would not limit such requirement to distance education. Specifically, the bill would require accreditors to monitor “the growth of programs at institutions that are experiencing significant enrollment growth.” [499]</p> <p>Unlike H.R. 609, the bill would not require a National Academy of Sciences evaluation of distance education programs.</p>	<p>Like S. 1614, the bill would still allow accreditors to review distance education programs without separate accreditation standards. [495]</p> <p>Like S. 1614, the bill would require accreditors to ensure that institutions offering distance education programs have processes to confirm that a registered student is the same student who completes the required work. [495]</p> <p>Like S. 1614, the bill would require accreditors to ensure that site visitors are well-trained and knowledgeable about their responsibilities regarding distance education. [495]</p> <p>The bill would require accreditors to monitor “the enrollment growth of distance education to ensure that an institution experiencing significant growth has the capacity to serve its students effectively.” [495]</p> <p>The bill would require a National Academy of Sciences “evaluation of the quality of distance education programs, as compared to campus-based education programs, at institutions of higher education.” [Manager’s Amendment; 931]</p>

¹Accreditation-related provisions in S. 1614, the Higher Education Amendments of 2005, as reported by the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on November 17, 2005.

²Accreditation-related provisions in H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2006, as passed by the U.S. House of Representatives on March 30, 2006. Relevant floor amendments and sections are identified in brackets.

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Transfer of credit	<p>Current law generally is silent on transfer of credit. The 1998 Higher Education Act reauthorization called for a U.S. Department of Education study to evaluate policies or practices instituted by federally recognized accreditors regarding treatment of transfer of credit from one higher education institution to another. [Pub. L. No. 105-244, § 804 (Oct. 7, 1998)]</p>	<p>The bill would require institutions to administer transfer-of-credit policies that do not deny transfer-credit requests solely on the basis of an institution’s accreditor as long as the accreditor is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education (“Secretary”). The bill also would require institutions to make transfer policies publicly available. [487]</p> <p>Unlike H.R. 609, S. 1614 would require an institution to disclose (1) a list of institutions with which it has established articulation agreements and (2) the percentage of students at the institution who successfully transfer academic credits, updated on an annual basis. [487]</p> <p>Under S. 1614, accreditors would be required to confirm that an institution discloses publicly its transfer-of-credit policy and that such policy does not deny transfer-credit requests solely on the basis of an institution’s accreditor as long as the accreditor is recognized by the Secretary. The bill also would add a new provision under which accreditors would be required to confirm that an institution has transfer of credit policies “in which acceptance or denial of transfer of credit is decided according to criteria established in guidelines developed by the institution’s admissions committee.” [499]</p> <p>Unlike H.R. 609, the bill would not call for a report on transfer of credit study.</p>	<p>Unlike S. 1614, the bill’s accreditation-related provisions would not require accreditors to confirm that an institution’s transfer-of-credit policies do not deny transfer-credit requests solely on the basis of an institution’s accreditor as long as the accreditor is recognized by the Secretary. However, the bill’s institutional disclosure requirements would require an institution to administer transfer-of-credit policies that do not deny transfer-credit requests solely on the basis of an institution’s accreditor as long as the accreditor is recognized by the Secretary. [Souder/Bishop Amendment; 484]</p> <p>The bill would require accreditors to confirm as part of an accreditation review that the institution has “transfer policies that are publicly disclosed and specifically state whether the institution denies a transfer of credit based solely on the accreditation of the institution at which the credit was earned.” [Souder/Bishop Amendment; 495]</p> <p>The bill would call for a report by September 30, 2007, on transfer of credit study originally authorized in 1998 Higher Education Act reauthorization. [922]</p>

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Public information	<p>Under current law, accreditors must disclose to the public “upon request” a summary of any review that results in a final accrediting decision involving denial, termination or suspension of accreditation, together with comments of the affected institution. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(a)(8)]</p> <p>Current law also requires accreditors, as part of their operating procedures, to disclose accreditation standards and procedures and accreditation status of each institution under its jurisdiction, including whether the institution is being considered for accreditation or reaccreditation. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(c)(5), (6)]</p>	<p>The bill would continue to require accreditors to make public a summary of certain final accrediting decisions, together with the comments of the affected institution, but would make such disclosure mandatory (i.e., not upon request) and would specify additional final accrediting decisions that would trigger the disclosure requirement. Those additional decisions would be final withdrawal—which H.R. 609 also would add—and probation—which H.R. 609 would not expressly add. In addition, like H.R. 609, the bill would require accreditors to make public “any other adverse action taken with respect to an institution,” but, in contrast to H.R. 609, the bill does not specify whether the comments of the affected institution must be disclosed in connection with such “other adverse action”. [499]</p> <p>Unlike H.R. 609, the bill would require accreditors to make public “a summary of . . . the award of accreditation or reaccreditation of an institution.” The bill does not specify whether the comments of the affected institution must be disclosed with the summary. [499]</p> <p>In contrast to H.R. 609, the bill would not add a new requirement that accreditors disclose publicly information about evaluation teams.</p> <p>S. 1614 would give the Secretary responsibility for publishing the college consumer profile. The college consumer profile would provide data on higher education institutions, particularly with respect to cost. [108]</p>	<p>The bill would continue to require accreditors to make public a summary of certain final accrediting decisions, together with the comments of the affected institution, but would make such disclosure mandatory (i.e., not upon request) and would specify additional final accrediting decisions that would trigger the disclosure requirement. Those additional decisions would be final withdrawal and “any other final adverse action taken with respect to an institution.” [495]</p> <p>The bill would retain current operating procedure requirements related to disclosure and would add a requirement that accreditors disclose publicly information about their evaluation teams from the prior calendar year; the process for team member selection, preparation and evaluation; and team members’ accreditation responsibilities. [495]</p> <p>Like S. 1614, the bill would give the Secretary (not institutions with accreditor oversight, as proposed in an earlier version of the bill) responsibility for publishing the college consumer profile. Although there is some overlap between S. 1614 and H.R. 609, the college consumer profile under H.R. 609 generally would include more categories of data compared to the college consumer profile under S. 1614. [108]</p>

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Due process	<p>Current law requires accreditors to apply procedures that comply with “due process” (procedural fairness), including (1) adequate specification of requirements and deficiencies at the institution under examination; (2) notice of an opportunity for a hearing; (3) right to appeal any adverse decision against such institution; and (4) right to representation by counsel for any such institution. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(a)(6)]</p>	<p>The bill’s due process provisions are comparable to H.R. 609’s due process provisions, except that S. 1614 (1) would clarify that the right to counsel is limited to appeals of adverse actions, (2) would specify that probation is an adverse action for purposes of the right to appeal and (3) would specify that an opportunity for written response must occur prior to final action. [499]</p>	<p>The bill would expand provisions on due process to include (1) opportunity for written response to be included in evaluation and withdrawal proceedings and (2) the opportunity to appeal an adverse action at a hearing prior to final action. In addition, the bill would require that the appeals panel not include individuals involved in an initial adverse accreditation decision. The bill would retain the requirement that an accretor’s procedures provide (1) adequate notice and (2) right to representation by counsel. [495]</p>

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Missions of religious institutions	<p>Current law requires accreditors to consider student achievement in relation to institutional mission, but otherwise does not address accreditation standards related to institutional mission. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(a)(5)(A)]</p> <p>Current law provides that if an institution has had its accreditation withdrawn, revoked or otherwise terminated, the Secretary may allow an institution to remain certified as an institution of higher education for purposes of federal student financial aid programs for a period sufficient to allow the institution to obtain alternative accreditation if the Secretary determines that the reason for withdrawal, revocation or termination is related to the institution's religious mission or affiliation and is not related to the accreditation criteria required by law. [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(k)]</p>	<p>The bill would require that accreditors consistently apply and enforce standards "that respect the stated mission of the institution of higher education, including religious missions". [499]</p> <p>The bill would retain current law provisions regarding adverse action related to religious mission or affiliation.</p>	<p>H.R. 609 and S. 1614 are identical except that H.R. 609 uses the word "consider" instead of "respect". [Manager's Amendment; 495]</p> <p>Like S. 1614, the bill would retain current law provisions regarding adverse action related to religious mission or affiliation.</p>

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
State accreditors	Under current law, a state may serve as a federally recognized accreditor only if it was recognized by the Secretary for that purpose on or before October 1, 1991, and has been continuously recognized since that date. [20 U.S.C. §§ 1099b(a)(2)(B), (a)(3)(C)]	The bill would not amend current law regarding state accreditors.	Like S. 1614, the bill would not amend current law regarding state accreditors. [Gohmert Amendment]
Governance	Current law does not require accreditors to have accreditation standards that address governance. [20 U.S.C. § 1099c]	The bill would not amend current law with respect to accreditation standards that address governance.	The bill would require institutional accreditors to evaluate board governance “within the context of the institution’s mission.” [495]
Student achievement	Current law requires accreditors to examine institution or program success with regard to student achievement by taking into account the school’s mission along with certain forms of evidence, “including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, State licensing examinations, and job placement rates.” [20 U.S.C. § 1099b(a)(5)] Current law also requires institutions to publish completion or graduation rates for “certificate- or degree-seeking, full-time undergraduate students.” [20 U.S.C. §	The bill would still require accreditors to examine institution or program success with regard to student achievement by taking into account the school’s mission along with certain forms of evidence. The bill would specify the following new forms of evidence without an “as appropriate” qualifier: “student academic achievement as determined by the institution”, student retention, and program completion. In addition, the bill would remove the “as appropriate” qualifier -- present in current law -- in connection with “course completion”. The bill also would add the following new forms of evidence with an “as appropriate” qualifier: “enrollment in graduate or professional programs” -- which is not in H.R. 609 -- and “other student performance information selected by the institution, particularly that information used by the institution to evaluate or strengthen its programs” - - which is in H.R. 609. [499]	The bill would still require accreditors to examine institution or program success with regard to student achievement by taking into account the school’s mission along with certain forms of evidence. The bill would specify the following new forms of evidence, to be considered “as appropriate”: retention, program completion, and “other student performance information selected by the institution, particularly that information used by the institution to evaluate or strengthen its programs.” [495] The bill would retain current law requirements related to institutional publication of completion rates. With respect to full-time undergraduate students, the bill also would require institutional publication of “other student outcome data, qualitative or quantitative, including data regarding distance education, deemed by the institution to be appropriate to its stated educational mission and goals, and, when applicable,

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Student achievement (continued)	1092(a)(1)(L)]	<p>The bill would not amend current law regarding institutional disclosure of completion or graduation rates, except (1) to modify under certain circumstances the calculation applied to address students who leave school to serve in the armed services, on official church missions or with a federal foreign aid service and (2) to require that such information be disaggregated by gender, by each “major racial and ethnic subgroup,” and by “low-income background status as measured by Federal Pell Grant eligibility,” if the number of students in such subgroup or with such status is sufficient to yield statistically reliable information and reporting would not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student. [487]</p> <p>S. 1614 would add a new requirement that institutions disclose (1) “the placement in employment of, and types of employment obtained by, graduates of the institution’s degree or certificate programs,” gathered from various sources and (2) “the types of graduate and professional education in which graduates of the institution’s 4-year degree programs enrolled,” gathered from various sources. [487]</p> <p>Unlike H.R. 609, the bill would not call for a study of best practices in student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>licensing and placement rates for professional and vocational programs.” [486]</p> <p>The bill would call for a study of best practices in student learning outcomes. [926]</p>

Comparison of Current Law, S. 1614 and HR 609

Topic	Current Law	S. 1614 ¹	H.R. 609 ²
Review of federally required institutional disclosures	Current law does not address specifically accreditor review of federally required institutional disclosures.	S. 1614 would require accreditors to ensure that onsite accreditation and reaccreditation evaluations include “review of the Federally required information the institution or program provides its current and prospective students.” [499]	H.R. 609 would require accreditors to ensure that onsite comprehensive accreditation and reaccreditation reviews include “evaluation of the substance of the information required” in 20 U.S.C. § 1092(a)(1)(L), which would require an institution that participates in federal student financial aid programs to disclose to current and prospective students “a summary of student outcomes for full-time undergraduate students, including—(i) the completion or graduation rates of certificate- or degree-seeking undergraduate students entering such institutions; and (ii) any other student outcome data, qualitative or quantitative, including data regarding distance education, deemed by the institution to be appropriate to its stated educational mission and goals, and, when applicable, licensing and placement rates for professional and vocational programs.” [Manager’s Amendment; 495]
Intellectual pluralism and student speech	Current law includes a “sense of Congress” that student speech and association rights should be protected. [20 U.S.C. § 1011a]	The bill would maintain the current “sense of Congress” regarding student speech and association rights and would add, with language that differs from H.R. 609, a “sense of Congress” that intellectual pluralism should be promoted. [104]	The bill would maintain the current “sense of Congress” regarding student speech and association rights and would add a “sense of Congress” that intellectual pluralism should be promoted. [103]