

HIGHER EDUCATION POLITICS & ECONOMICS

2024

VOLUME 10 ISSUE 1

Editors-in-Chief

Kim Bullington, Ph.D.

William Nuckols, Ph.D.

<https://ojed.org/index.php/hepe>



TABLE OF CONTENTS



02

**DO INCREASING LEVELS OF EDUCATION
CONTRIBUTE TO COLLECTIVIST
ORIENTATIONS? EVIDENCE FROM THE
U.S. GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY**

Elizabeth A. Jach

11

**NO NEW FRIENDS: THE DESOLATE REALM
OF HIGHER EDUCATION/STUDENT
AFFAIRS PRE-TENURE FACULTY**

Pietro A. Sasso, L. J. Shelton, & G. Blue
Brazelton

35

**SOCIETAL LEADERS OR POLITICAL
FOLLOWERS? INSTITUTIONAL
ACCREDITATION AND THE RISE OF
STATE REGULATIONS**

Chris M. Riley

Do Increasing Levels of Education Contribute to Individualist or Collectivist Orientations? Evidence from the U.S. General Social Survey

Elizabeth A. Jach

University at Albany, State University of New York

ABSTRACT

While prior research has examined the connection between civic engagement and collectivist views, the present study considers to what extent years of education have been associated with more collectivistic views. This study analyzed data from the 2021 United States General Social Survey. Results suggested that more years of education was associated with believing that the government should do more for Black people and that the government should do more overall (in a scaled average of individualism/collectivism). Specific demographic factors were associated with more collectivist or individualistic views. Implications for program and policy development within higher education are considered.

Keywords: individualism/collectivism, higher education, General Social Survey

Prior research has demonstrated a connection between civic engagement and collectivist views. First, the benefits of civic engagement in higher education range from undergraduate students' increased levels of academic and life skills development (Astin & Sax, 1998), to higher grade point averages (GPAs; Newell & Sexena, 2018), to increased levels of civic engagement post-baccalaureate and into adulthood (Myers et al., 2019). Further, research suggests young people are more politically engaged now than in the past (Harvard Institute of Politics, 2023). Previous literature has also illuminated a connection between civic engagement and efficacy beyond college: Collins et al. (2014) identified an association between civic engagement, bonding social capital, and collective efficacy among residents who engaged in issues relevant to their housing. Finkelstein (2010) also found that those who reported more collectivist views had greater interest in volunteer opportunities related to altruism and increasing social connections, whereas those with more individualist perspectives were more interested in volunteering for career-oriented benefits. A study in Italy on psychological adjustment during COVID-19 suggested that a collectivistic orientation was associated with higher rates of perceived risks of infection but predicted a lower level of psychological maladjustment (Germani et al, 2020). Together, prior research demonstrates a connection between civic engagement and collectivist views and how this connection can benefit communities overall.

Research has also examined individualism and collectivism as they relate to experiences for individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Law et al. (2019) found that individuals who endorsed the belief that institutions should be active in social justice were also more likely to report less acceptance of microaggressions. Chang et al. (2020) revealed that people of minoritized ethnicity scored significantly higher than their White peers on vertical collectivism, in which the self is strongly endorsed as part of a collective. These authors also found that minoritized students reported more family obligations than white students, and that students' anxiety about burdening others and/or being judged for seeking help prevented undergraduate students from seeking assistance (Chang et al., 2020). Research has further suggested that African American undergraduate students enrolled at a Predominantly White Institution identified collectivism as a key component of African American culture (Carson, 2009). For international students, individualistic tendencies have been associated with individuals' abilities to enter and leave social groups (Rivas et al., 2019). Conversely, international students with higher collectivistic tendencies may await instructions rather than ask a question (Rivas et al., 2019). Thus, prior research suggests that individualist and

collectivist orientations not only can be based on differing identities and experiences but can also result in different behavioral choices and outcomes.

Theoretical Framework

The present analysis rests on the theoretical basis of individualism versus collectivism. Parsons and Shills (1951) suggested two primary orientations for one's pursuit of life goals: self-orientation and collectivity-orientation. Self-orientation is the "pursuit of private interests", and collectivity-orientation is the "pursuit of the common interests of the collectivity" (p. 60), or individualism and collectivism. Triandis (1995) discussed individualism as an emphasis on individual or shared goals, where individualism reflects a focus on the self and emphasis on one's own judgements and goals, while collectivism reflects a focus on cooperation and the needs or goals of a group or larger society. Ho and Chiu (1994) considered individualism as valuing individual achievement and autonomy and collectivism as valuing interdependence and collective responsibility.

While all individuals and societies reflect both of these orientations, the degree to which each is reflected varies by society and individual (Kâğitçibaşı, 1997). For example, Western societies, such as the United States, lean more toward individualist orientations that emphasize individual goals and needs. Chiou (2001) examined individualism and collectivism among college students, finding that students in the U.S. were more individualistic than students in Taiwan or Argentina. Additionally, these orientations are often shaped by race/ethnicity, culture, and socioeconomic status. According to Singelis et al. (1995), ethnic minorities and those of lower socioeconomic status tend to have a more collectivist orientation.

Individualist and collectivist orientations are shaped by many important factors, including culture, family, and societal norms (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995). Research has considered how individualism and collectivism inform both individual and group behaviors, with measurements considering constructs and their relationship to social desirability (Triandis et al., 1998). Educational experiences and learning experiences have the potential to shape individualist and collectivist orientations. The present study seeks to examine to what extent more years of education are associated with the development of more individualist or collectivist orientations among individuals in U.S. society.

METHODS

Instrument and Sample

The publicly available General Social Survey (GSS; Davern et al., 2021) has been examining social change in the United States since 1972. I employed the 2021 cross-sectional survey, which contacted 27,591 households via mailing, and a total of 4,032 individuals responded via the web survey or via phone. Responses were collected from December 1, 2020 to May 3, 2021 in both English and Spanish and employed differing survey panels, such that not all recipients received every survey question. The present analysis dropped missing data such that only respondents who had answers to all independent and dependent variables of interest were included ($N=2,334$). I obtained necessary institutional review board approval for the analysis.

Variables

Table 1 provides an overview of descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables employed in this analysis. The dependent variables included four measures of whether the government should be doing more to help people in the U.S., and a mean-based scale of the four items ($\alpha=0.84$). These GSS items (or a former version of them) have been previously used by researchers to measure individualism and collectivism (Celinska et al., 2007; Cohen & Liebma, 1997; Marchant Shapiro & Patterson, 1995). Specifically, the questions asked participants: "Some people think that Blacks have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to Blacks. Where would you place yourself on this scale...?" (reverse-coded: government should help = 5, no special treatment = 1); "Some people think that the government in Washington should do everything possible to improve the standard living of all poor Americans (...), other people think that it is not the government's responsibility, and that each person should take care of himself (...), where would you place yourself on this scale...?" (reverse-coded: government should help = 5, people should help themselves = 1); "Some people think that the government in Washington is trying to do too many things that should be left to individuals and private businesses. Others disagree and think that the government should do even more to solve our country's problems. Still others have opinions somewhere in between. Where would you place yourself on

this scale...?” (reverse-coded: government should do more=5, government does too much=1); and “In general, some people that that it is the responsibility of the government in Washington to see to it that people have help in paying for doctors and hospital bills. Others think that these matters are not the responsibility of the federal government, and that people should take care of these things themselves. Where would you place yourself on this scale...?” (reverse=coded: government should help=5, people should care for themselves =1).

Several demographic characteristics served as independent variables. These items included: age; years of education (0-20, including 1st through 12th grade, and 1-8 years of college); sex (male = 1, female = 2); married (recoded into married = 1 or not married = 0); born in the United States (yes = 1 or no = 2); and dichotomous race variables (1 = yes or 0 = no) for: White, Black, Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander (collapsed categories), Other, and Hispanic.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (N=2,334)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	0.00	1.00	-1.97-2.15
Years of Education	0.00	1.00	-5.33-1.89
Sex (Male = 1, Female = 2)	1.55	0.50	1.00-2.00
Married (yes =1, no = 0)	0.50	0.50	0.00-1.00
Born in the United States (yes =1, no =2)	1.11	0.31	1.00-2.00
Race: White (yes =1, no = 0)	0.82	0.39	0.00-1.00
Race: Black (yes =1, no = 0)	0.12	0.32	0.00-1.00
Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native (yes =1, no = 0)	0.03	0.17	0.00-1.00
Race: Asian or Pacific Islander (yes =1, no = 0)	0.04	0.21	0.00-1.00
Race: Other (yes =1, no = 0)	0.01	0.09	0.00-1.00
Race: Hispanic (yes =1, no = 0)	0.04	0.19	0.00-1.00
Help Blacks	2.98	1.46	1.00-5.00
Help poor	3.34	1.25	1.00-5.00
Government should help	3.17	1.29	1.00-5.00
Help sick	3.66	1.26	1.00-5.00
Individualism/collectivism (alpha = .84)	3.28	1.09	1.00-5.00

ANALYSES

I used OLS regression to analyze whether years of education were associated with more individualist or more collectivist orientations. I included five models, one for each of the dependent measures, as well as for the scaled measure of the four separate dependent measures ($\alpha = .84$). All models used a clustering command (SVY in Stata) as delineated by the Davern et al. (2021) GSS codebook. I also evaluated all five models for possible issues of multicollinearity by considering the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each variable in the five models, and results ranged from 0.873 to 1.460, within recommended limits (Menard, 2001). A stepwise model was not used to safeguard against coincidental significance, as detailed by Smith (2018).

Results

I examined whether years of education and other demographic characteristics were associated with more individualist or more collectivist orientations. Table 2 provides regression estimates for the association between each independent variable and the measures of individualist and collectivist orientations. For helping Blacks, several demographic variables were positively associated with respondents believing that the government should do more, including: more years of education ($B = 0.24, p < .001$), identifying as Black ($B = 1.05, p < .001$), and identifying race as Other ($B = 0.79, p < .01$). However, two demographic factors were negatively associated with helping Black people, or put another way, that Blacks should receive no special treatment. These demographic factors included those of an older age ($B = -0.17, p < .001$) and identifying as being married ($B = -0.24, p < .01$).

Table 2: Regression Estimates for the Association Between Education and Measures of Individualist or Collectivist Orientations (N=2,334)

	I Help Blacks	II Help Poor	III Gov. do more	IV Help sick	V Individ./ Collect.
	Coef. (S.E.)	Coef. (S.E.)	Coef. (S.E.)	Coef. (S.E.)	Coef. (S.E.)
Age	-0.17 (0.04)	*** -0.19 (0.03)	*** -0.14 (0.03)	-0.16 (0.03)	*** -0.16 (0.02)
Years of Education	0.24 (0.04)	*** 0.01 (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)	0.08 (0.03)
Sex (Male = 1, Female = 2)	-0.07 (0.07)	0.04 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	0.01 (0.06)	0.01 (0.05)
Married (yes = 1, no = 0)	-0.24 (0.07)	** -0.22 (0.06)	*** -0.32 (0.06)	-0.28 (0.06)	*** -0.26 (0.05)
Born in the United States (yes = 1, no = 2)	-0.07 (0.12)	0.06 (0.10)	0.13 (0.10)	0.11 (0.10)	0.06 (0.08)
Race: White (yes = 1, no = 0)	-0.25 (0.17)	-0.25 (0.16)	-0.20 (0.15)	-0.04 (0.13)	-0.18 (0.10)
Race: Black (yes = 1, no = 0)	1.05 (0.18)	*** 0.37 (0.17)	* 0.40 (0.16)	* 0.35 (0.14)	** 0.54 (0.11)
Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native (yes = 1, no = 0)	-0.15 (0.20)	-0.13 (0.18)	-0.04 (0.20)	-0.07 (0.16)	-0.10 (0.13)
Race: Asian or Pacific Islander (yes = 1, no = 0)	0.09 (0.20)	0.12 (0.17)	0.01 (0.18)	0.04 (0.17)	0.07 (0.12)
Race: Other (yes = 1, no = 0)	0.79 (0.30)	** -0.22 (0.29)	-0.70 (0.24)	0.47 (0.23)	0.08 (0.14)
Race: Hispanic (yes = 1, no = 0)	0.18 (0.23)	0.31 (0.20)	0.34 (0.20)	0.32 (0.16)	* 0.29 (0.12)
R-squared	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.13

Notes. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$. All continuous variables are standardized. Model I: Help Blacks; Model II: Help poor; Model III: Government should do more; Model IV: Help sick; Model V: Individualism/collectivism scale (alpha = .84).

For helping the poor, identifying as Black was positively associated with believing the government should do more ($B = 0.37, p < .05$). Conversely, being older ($B = -0.19, p < .001$) and being married ($B = -0.22, p < .05$) were negatively associated with helping the poor. Put another way, older adults and married individuals were more likely to believe that poor people should help themselves.

For whether the government should do more or if the government was doing too much, identifying as Black ($B = 0.40, p < .05$) was positively associated with believing the government should do more. Conversely, three demographic factors were negatively associated with the government doing more and were more likely to believe that the government was doing too much. These demographic factors included those of an older age ($B = -0.14, p < .001$), being married ($B = -0.32, p < .001$), and identifying as Other for race/ethnicity ($B = -0.70, p < .01$).

For helping the sick, identifying as Black ($B = 0.34, p < .05$), identifying as Other for race/ethnicity ($B = 0.47, p < .05$), and identifying as Hispanic ($B = 0.32, p < .05$) were each positively associated with believing the government should do more. Older age ($B = -0.16, p < .001$) and married status ($B = -0.28, p < .001$) were once again negatively associated with the dependent variable, in that these respondents were more likely to believe that people should take care of hospital and doctor bills themselves.

For the four-item scaled measure measuring overall individualistic versus collectivistic views ($\alpha = 0.84$), more years of education was positively associated with believing that the government should do more ($B = 0.08, p < .01$). In addition, two demographic factors were positively associated with believing that the government should do more to help people: identifying as Black ($B = 0.54, p < .001$) and identifying as Hispanic ($B = 0.29, p < .05$). Respondents of an older age ($B = -0.16, p < .001$) and those who were married ($B = -0.27, p < .01$) were more likely to report more individualistic views, or beliefs that the government is doing too much and that people should help themselves.

Limitations

The present analysis has several limitations. The research question and variables of interest examined in this study relied upon existing survey data which had preset questions and available responses. While this study assessed individualism and collectivism based on established measures other researchers have used in the past (Celinska et al., 2007; Cohen & Liebma, 1997; Marchant Shapiro & Patterson, 1995), there are other ways to measure individualism and collectivism. For example, the current survey items of interest only asked participants about the status of Blacks and no other racial/ethnic groups. Furthermore, the present analysis is limited by the manner in which demographic factors were measured, such as considering using the binary of sex and limited categories to define race/ethnicity. While the General Social Survey is designed to be representative of the population within the United States (Davern et al., 2021), voluntary participation may have contributed to selection bias within the available data set. Other threats to validity may include regression to the mean. Future research should seek to address these limitations.

DISCUSSION

This study considered to what extent more years of education are associated with the development of more individualist or collectivist orientations among individuals in U.S. society. Results suggested that additional years of education were positively associated with more collectivistic views in the individualism-collectivism 4-item scale. In addition, views that the government should do more to help Black individuals within U.S. society was also positively associated with more years of education, where each additional year of education was, on average, associated with a 0.24-unit increase in more collectivist attitudes toward this policy. These findings suggest that engagement in higher levels of education may make people in society more aware of issues facing Black individuals (both historically and presently) and may encourage collectivist views that the government should enact policies and programs to help. While the connection between civic engagement and more collectivist views has been established (Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Zaff et al., 2008), the present study suggests that more years of formal education is associated with more collectivist views overall. As Hurtado (2019) posited, civic learning within higher education matters, and offers opportunities to counteract policies designed to undermine the public (Krugman, 2023). Furthermore, the present analysis builds on Ho and Chiu's (1994) conceptualization of individualism as valuing individual achievement and autonomy and collectivism as valuing interdependence and collective responsibility, in that more years of formal education has been associated with more collectivist views.

Results also suggested that several other factors were associated with the development of more collectivist orientations, including being of younger age, being Black, and being Hispanic. While these findings replicate previous research which has found that certain demographics are associated with more collectivistic views (Carson, 2009; Chang et al., 2020; Rivas et al., 2019), these findings have implications for institutions of higher education in terms of how to ensure majority-identified individuals learn about differential experiences. Researchers have demonstrated what does and does not work when it comes to diversity training, suggesting that bias training does not work but rather meaningful policy implementation such as planful programs related to hiring, training, mentoring, and work-life balance can have real impacts (Dobbin & Kalev, 2022). It is critical for institutions of higher education to therefore develop and implement meaningful policies to enhance diversity (Dobbin & Kalev, 2022).

The time is now to ensure all individuals have access to experiences in higher education than can develop their ability to engage civically for the betterment of their own lives and society. To be sure, one cannot force individuals to obtain more education and financial costs pose real barriers to pursuit of higher education. Yet there are tangible steps to be taken. Despite current attacks from state legislators on diversity, equity, and inclusion, research demonstrates that diversity and equity work are paramount for our institutions and their members to thrive (Long & Bateman, 2020). Institutions of higher education can develop meaningful ways to recruit more diverse students (Shook, 2022) and safeguard their success through meaningful interventions for retention and persistence toward student success (Kuh et al., 2007).

Through collaborative action, institutions of higher education can work toward meaningful collectivism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special thanks to Dr. Teniell Trolan, Associate Professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York, for valuable feedback on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251–263.
- Carson, L. R. (2009). “I am because we are:” Collectivism as a foundational characteristic of African American college student identity and academic achievement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 12, 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-009-9090-6>
- Celinska, K. (2007). Individualism and collectivism in America: The case of gun ownership and attitudes toward gun control. *Sociological Perspectives*, 50(2), 229-247. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sop.2007.50.2.229#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Chang, J., Wang, S. W., Mancini, C., McGrath-Mahrer, B., & de Jesus, S. O. (2020). The complexity of cultural mismatch in higher education: Norms affecting first-generation college students’ coping and help-seeking behaviors. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 26(3), 280–294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000311>
- Chiou, J. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(5), 667-678.
- Cohen, S. M., & Liebman, C. (1997). American Jewish liberalism: Unraveling the strands. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 405–430.
- Collins, C. R., Neal, J. W., & Neal, Z. P. (2014). Transforming individual civic engagement into community collective efficacy: The role of bonding social capital. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 54, 328–336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-014-9675-x>
- Davern, M., Bautista, R., Freese, J., Morgan, S. L., & Smith, T. W. (2021). General Social Survey 2021 Cross-section. [Machine-readable data file]. Principal Investigator, Michael Davern; Co-Principal Investigators, Rene Bautista, Jeremy Freese, Stephen L. Morgan, and Tom W. Smith. NORC ed. Chicago, 2021. 1 datafile (68,846 cases) and 1 codebook (506 pages).
- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2022). *Getting to diversity: What works and what doesn't*. Harvard University Press.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2010). Individualism/collectivism: Implications for the volunteer process. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(4), 445–452. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2010.38.4.445>
- Germani, A., Buratta, L., Delvecchio, E., & Mazzeschi, C. (2020). Emerging adults and Covid-19: The role of individualism-collectivism on perceived risks and

- psychological maladjustment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(3497), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103497>
- Harvard Institute of Politics. (2023). Harvard Youth Poll, 44th edition, fall 2022. *Harvard Kennedy School Institute of Politics*. <https://iop.harvard.edu/fall-2022-harvard-youth-poll>
- Ho, D. Y.-F., & Chiu, C.-Y. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism, and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research and methodology series, Vol. 18. Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 137-156). Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Sage.
- Hurtado, S. (2019). “Now is the time”: Civic learning for a strong democracy. *Daedalus*, 148(4), 94-107. https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_01762
- Kâğıtçıbaşı, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kâğıtçıbaşı (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and applications* (pp. 1–49). Allyn & Bacon.
- Krugman, P. (2023, February 16). The Right don't need no education. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/16/opinion/education-desantis.html>
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2007). Piecing together the student success puzzle. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 32(5).
- Law, J. P., Kim, P. Y., Lee, J. H., & Bau, K. E. (2019). Acceptability of racial microaggressions among Asian American college students: Internalized model minority myth, individualism, and social conscience as correlates. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 22(9), 943–955. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2019.1699040>
- Long, M. C., & Bateman, N. A. (2020). Long-run changes in underrepresentation after affirmative action bans in public universities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(2), 188-207. <https://doi.org/10.3102/016237372090443>
- Menard, S. (2001). *Applied logistic regression analysis* (2nd ed). Sage Publications.
- Marchant-Shapiro, T., & Patterson, K.D. (1995). Partisan change in the Mountain West. *Political Behavior*, 17(4), 359–378.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3004081>
- Myers, C. B., Myers, S. M., & Peters, M. (2019). The longitudinal connections between undergraduate high impact curriculum practices and civic engagement in adulthood. *Research in Higher Education*, 60, 83–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-9504-4>
- Newell, M., & Saxena, S. (2018). The missing link: An exploration of the relationship between civic engagement and grade point average. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 25(1), 27–44.
- Parsons, T., & Shills, E. (1951). *Toward a general theory of social action*. Harvard University Press.
- Rivas, J., Hale, K., & Burke, M. G. (2019). Seeking a sense of belonging: Social and cultural integration of international students with American college students.

- Journal of International Students*, 9(2), 687–703. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i2.943>
- Shook, K. (2022, April 17). Dos and Don'ts for recruiting diverse students. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2022/04/18/dos-and-donts-recruiting-diverse-students-opinion>
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 240–275.
- Smith, G. (2018). Step away from stepwise. *Journal of Big Data*, 5(32), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-018-0143-6>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K.-S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(2), 275–289.
- Zaff, J. F., Malanchuk, O., & Eccles, J. S. (2008). Predicting positive citizenship from adolescence to young adulthood: The effects of a civic context. *Applied Developmental Science*, 12(8), 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690801910567>
-

Elizabeth A. Jach, PhD, (she/her) is an assistant professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York. Dr. Jach studies higher education experiences and outcomes using quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches. Dr. Jach has ten years of professional experience in higher education administration, in areas including institutional effectiveness, human research protections, assessment of student learning, and student affairs. Email: ejach@albany.edu ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8134-8054>

No New Friends: The Desolate Realm of Higher Education/Student Affairs Pre-Tenure Faculty

Pietro A. Sasso

Delaware State University

L. J. Shelton

University of Arkansas

G. Blue Brazleton

Northern Arizona University

ABSTRACT

Institutional politics and emerging changes to the professoriate have potentially positioned tenure-track faculty within an academic labor system that assumes academic training and expertise guides their progression. This qualitative narrative study of 12 higher education and student affairs (HESA) pre-tenure faculty explored their navigation of tenure experiences at their institutions. Participants shared personal and professional challenges related to tenure in which they were challenged to negotiate academic and student affairs professional identities. Personal challenges included strained personal lives and relationships with feelings of isolation or loneliness. These findings offer insight into HESA pre-tenure faculty experiences as an avenue to better support this unique population. Study implications center equitable practices and community building.

Keywords: higher education, student affairs, faculty, pre-tenure

The professional culture of higher education and student affairs (HESA) can be described to “provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus” (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. 13). This professional culture consists of interconnected stakeholder associations which hold shared, collective investment such as College Student Educators International (ACPA) and

Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA). Each of these professional organizations, along with the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE, 2023), have representative faculty commissions which support HESA graduate preparation programs or the departments housing these programs. Regional associations, along with functional area-specific associations, also have a vested interest in HESA faculty experiences as these educators shape graduate education to prepare HESA professionals.

These collective academic and professional associations coupled with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) set curriculum and professional standards such as the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies (2015) and the ACPA Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization (2019) that HESA faculty teach to emerging higher education professionals. Faculty teach formal curricula as well as informal or hidden curricula through professional socialization (Harris, 2020). We assert that this process of professional socialization is also a reciprocal relationship among members of the professoriate and within HESA faculty programs.

Although tenure-track faculty are a decreasing representative of the professoriate in higher education because of processes such as adjunctification, their scholarly and professional experiences are distinctive (Hutcheson, 2018). Faculty culture, particularly for HESA professors, requires faculty to assimilate and reproduce values, norms, and beliefs of their organization (Harris, 2020; Tierney, 1988). Yet, these expectations of social reproduction may facilitate affective tensions from being “constrained by traditional cultural paradigms and operating procedures” (Antonio et al., 2000, p. 376). Pre-tenure HESA faculty may be particularly vulnerable to these cultural tensions of negotiating the norms of the professoriate and the profession of higher education administration. Yet, there is no research which specifically elucidates their professional lived experiences in the context of HESA graduate programs.

Understanding HESA faculty experiences is an avenue to support these pre-tenure faculty who teach in graduate preparation programs which are “the primary site for professional training and socialization for student affairs educators” where HESA faculty “have the opportunity and responsibility to cultivate the next generation of student affairs leaders...” (Shelton & Yao, 2019, p. 157). ACPA Commission for Faculty and Graduate Programs [formerly Commission for Professional Preparation] (2023), NASPA Faculty Council (2021), and ASHE Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs (CAHEP) (2023) highlight the importance of scholarship to inform HESA faculty work. Moreover, in 2022 the NASPA Faculty Council (NASPA, 2021) acknowledged the important role pre-tenure HESA faculty serve in delivering higher education and influencing students’ lives, all while “faculty are simply trying to manage their everyday existence, family roles, and careers...” (Moore, 2022, para. 1). Understanding these realities can help institutions support HESA pre-tenure faculty who are in key roles for sustaining the field as faculty shape graduate education to prepare HESA professionals.

Thus, in the current study we posit that understanding pre-tenure HESA faculty experiences may allow stakeholders such as department chairs, deans, senior faculty,

and provosts to better understand how to support current and future generations of faculty to enhance the academic labor system. This goal is particularly pressing for HESA faculty, where the traditional values of the profession conflict with those within the academy or professoriate (Shelton & Ardoin, 2020).

The purpose of this study was to extend the current research to better understand experiences of pre-tenure HESA faculty. Findings provide greater insight into the expectations and responsibilities of those who engage in the professional preparation of HESA professionals. The following primary research question guided the study: How do pre-tenure HESA faculty navigate the various teaching, research, and service activities during their pre-tenure years?

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is situated within a HESA lens through elucidating scholarship about specific HESA graduate programs and faculty. The changing nature of the tenure system and problematizing specific challenges of tenure-track faculty are also included.

HESA Graduate Programs

There are 428 HESA graduate programs (NASPA, 2021) that train campus educators “who are dedicated to the growth and development of students outside of the formal curriculum” (Schuh et al., 2017, xxvii). Multiple studies have focused on HESA graduate preparation program learning outcomes related to skillsets and competencies of graduates (Ardoin, 2019; Ardoin & Martinez, 2019; Gansemer-Topf & Ryder, 2017; O’Brien, 2018). Studies on HESA graduate student experiences have also focused on the importance of supervised fieldwork such as internship, practicum, and graduate assistantships (Liddell et al., 2014; Perez, 2017; Young, 2019), and on avenues for professional development (Haley et al., 2015). Studies have also highlighted that HESA graduate programs serve as sites of socialization for future professionals (Arminio & Ortiz, 2016; Bureau, 2018; Lombardi & Mather, 2016; Perez, 2016; Yao et al., 2017).

HESA graduate programs are based on professional standards as well as values drawn from the seminal *Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV; Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2022; ACPA & NASPA, 2016; NASPA, 1989). These offer a foundational means for evaluating if programs are achieving benchmark guidelines for the profession (Arminio, 2009; Dean, 2013; Henning et al., 2008). Scholars have noted the necessity of assessment of these standards as a larger effort of overall program evaluation (Finney & Horst, 2019). Faculty have been challenged to question the competencies in advancing their progression by suggesting, “you cannot be competent in this system, you can only do competence over and over” (Smithers, 2022, p. 4). Yet, the role of faculty in teaching professional competence in student affairs through graduate professional preparation is a common expectation (Eaton & Smithers, 2020; Smithers, 2020). Also, within the context of professional competencies and curriculum assessment, there is little contextualization of the

experiences of HESA faculty given the centering of student affairs certification and professional competency (Smithers, 2022).

HESA Faculty

HESA graduate preparation faculty play important roles in the socialization of graduate students (Weidman & DeAngelo, 2020). Faculty work generally falls into three main categories, (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service, which guide faculty work and set the standards for faculty evaluation which is often tied to pay and ongoing employment opportunities (Shelton & Ardoin, 2020). HESA faculty are key educators as, “For many entering student affairs, graduate preparation faculty members are looked to as not only professors but also students’ first confidants, mentors, advisors, and coaches” (Schuh et al., 2017, p. 545).

Faculty also socialize students to the profession, professional practice, norms, values, beliefs, and attitudes (Weidman & DeAngelo, 2020). HESA faculty delivery of curricula serves a central role in socializing graduate students to the norms, values, and behaviors of the higher education administration profession (Kuk & Cuyjet, 2009; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). These curricula are typically rooted through teaching the canon of college student development theory (Harris, 2020).

Graduate students as well as faculty learn and adopt these knowledge and administration skills through this socialization within curriculum which make them agents within their organizations (Boss & Dunn, 2023). However, Harris (2020) describes this socialization and teaching process as “contestable” (p. 1) in which some HESA faculty may opt out from teaching the traditional cannon; instead, they will challenge the dominant lens which other colleagues may perceive as unnecessary or disruptive. HESA is often considered to be a low-consensus educational context open to many different perspectives about teaching and curriculum (Torres et al., 2019).

Additionally, some programs purposefully have faculty who focus on diversity, belonging, or multicultural competencies (Kelly & Gayles, 2010). These faculty are frequently women-identifying or from other diverse backgrounds (Hubain et al., 2016; Patton & Catching, 2009). Students of Color in HESA graduate programs experience racial microaggressions by well-intentioned peers, faculty, and assistantship supervisors and often faculty have to support students through these experiences while negotiating their identities as well (Linder et al., 2015; Linder & Winston Simmons, 2015). Yet again, there is a lack of deeper understanding about the experiences of faculty teaching in professional preparation of higher education leaders and administrators (Harris, 2020).

Experiences Within the Professoriate

Tenure exists in a politically sensitive climate which facilitated the socialization of a new generation of academics into marginalized positions with neoliberal policies (Hutcheson, 2018; Shelton & Ardoin, 2020). The professoriate is generally misunderstood and lacking in support from the public arena, leading to questions about who else may not understand the role of higher education faculty (Hutcheson, 2018). Scholarly critiques of tenure typically have included interrogating the power

systems that co-constructed the tenure system which has benefited cisgender white men marginalized women and other Faculty of Color (Blockett et al., 2016).

In particular, female faculty are less likely to be recognized for their work by their male colleagues and more frequently report job dissatisfaction (French et al., 2020; Ponjuan et al., 2011). Although women faculty publish at equal rates to men, they also tend to be burdened with higher teaching loads than men and increasing service loads (Monroe et al., 2008; Rosser, 2004; Sax et al., 2002). Family obligations and childcare are often challenging for women faculty as academia can be unaccommodating to faculty with children (Mason et al., 2006; O'Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006).

Moreover, there is a “graying and staying” nature in which older, senior tenured faculty retain their tenured positions (Camblin & Steger, 2000, p. 4). The number of faculty over 65 has doubled since 2000 (Kaskie, 2017; Witcher & Sasso, 2022). Furthermore, the faculty job market has become increasingly competitive for PhD graduates given that the market is saturated and “candidates are often expected to have several publications in leading journals, putting lots of pressure on them” (Larson et al., 2013, p. 745). Also, department chairs and senior faculty develop and define what constitutes quality and productivity, how publications and research are valued and weighed, and which areas of scholarship should be emphasized (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). However, the systems of academic freedom and tenure have been leveraged into a culture of scoring to measure scholarly impact (Youn & Price, 2009).

Pre-tenure faculty frequently report experiences of political tensions, academic bullying, racism, sexism, and social isolation (Yudkevich et al., 2015). These experiences in the tenure system often led to delayed maturation toward lifespan benchmarks including foregoing long-term kinships, home ownership, enlargement of the family unit, as well as engagement in leisure activities (Yudkevich et al., 2015). Other researchers have suggested there are gaps related to intersectional research examining different subgroups of faculty (Blackwell et al., 2009; Eagan & Garvey, 2015). Filling this gap is important, as faculty demographics have shifted to become more diverse across gender and racial identities (Kaskie, 2017).

The power dynamics and structures of the tenure process particularly marginalizes faculty of color and women (Blockett et al., 2016). Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) faculty and women on the tenure track often examines both sex and race, and some authors have included a range of sub-populations such as Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Asian, American Indian, Arab-American, and Native American faculty (Porter, 2007; Settles et al., 2018; Victorino et al., 2013). Given that BIPOC faculty are not a monolith and sub-population experiences likely differ, other authors focus on the experiences of specific populations such as Black faculty (Arnold et al., 2016; Patton & Catching, 2009). For example, Black faculty exploitation is a concern as the professoriate can be tenuous and complex to navigate (Patton & Catching, 2009). Race and sex relate to student ratings and service expectations which impact career advancement and retention (Blockett et al., 2016; Settles et al., 2018).

Women and BIPOC faculty may become trapped in a negative feedback loop of committee assignments. Some of these obligations may not be counted for tenure and promotion (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Porter, 2007; Settles et al., 2018; Youn &

Price, 2009). In particular, Black faculty experience racial microaggressions from students and peers and larger service burdens (Patton & Catching, 2009). A negative campus climate often leads to attrition for women and BIPOC faculty (Victorino et al., 2013). Black faculty particularly experience racial battle fatigue and cultural taxation in the promotion and tenure process (Arnold et al., 2016). It is unclear how the realities of the tenure-track experience are nuanced for HESA pre-tenure faculty, although one auto-ethnography specifically addresses the need for identity-conscious mentoring and support for student affairs professionals who transition into tenure-track faculty roles (Perry et al., 2019). Layering these identity-based realities for pre-tenure HESA faculty provides a more holistic view of faculty experiences as an avenue to support that career advancement.

Conceptual Framework

To guide the study, we used theories of doctoral and faculty socialization as a lens from which to understand what faculty are trained to expect in their work and to help make meaning of participant stories. Weidman et al. (2001) conceptualized socialization as a set of overlapping factors influencing the emerging scholar within the broader context of academia. Some of the factors included in their model of socialization were institutional culture, peer climate, interaction and integration with the institution, and the overall climate within which the scholar is developing. Austin (2002) raised some areas of potential significant effect on the socialization and preparation of graduate students toward faculty careers, such as an insufficient sense of community, unclear expectations and limited perspectives on academic life, and how the program prepares and develops individuals for faculty work. The dynamics of socialization described above provided a structure for the study to conceptualize what kinds of experiences faculty may go through during their pre-tenure years which informed the design of the semi-structured interview guide and make meaning of the data with participants across different institutions.

METHODOLOGY

In this qualitative study, we drew from narrative inquiry (Tyson, 2006) to analyze qualitative interviews collected from 12 HESA pre-tenure faculty members. For data collection, we engaged in semi-structured interviews, followed by drawing from narrative data analysis (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021; Saldaña, 2021). Lastly, the entire study was rooted in a foundation of attention to reflexivity and positionality (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021).

Research Design

This qualitative narrative inquiry studied how HESA faculty negotiated their tenure-track experiences. We drew from narrative methods to explore the experiences of individuals through participants telling stories about their lives (Riessman, 2005). The selected elements of narrative inquiry such as thematic analysis (Riessman, 2005) allowed us to center multiple narratives. This approach validated participants' agency

in their lived experiences as sources of important knowledge (Clandinin, 2013). The researchers also drew from narrative inquiry due to the complexities of professional and personal identity expression of faculty which allows for the researchers to center, “discussions of race, gender, class, and sexuality as part of a larger political and epistemological struggle for a better and just future” (Tyson, 2006, p. 25). Although we drew on the aforementioned narrative inquiry elements, this study deviates from traditional narrative inquiry in that the intent was not to focus on one individual, or retell a story in chronological order (Clandinin, 2013; Riessman, 2005). Rather, general narrative research does not require representing findings chronologically, as there are various ways to understand and inquire into human experience as situated in relationships and community (Clandinin, 2013). The intentional use of selective elements of narrative inquiry allowed for an overall richer approach and understanding of the data shared across our participants. This study also followed the research design of similar studies about tenure-track faculty experiences (Harris, 2020). The following primary research question guided the study: How do pre-tenure HESA faculty navigate the various teaching, research, and service activities during their pre-tenure years?

Participants

We used snowball sampling to construct an authentic sample, and no gatekeepers were used to avoid a potentially skewed sample or sampling bias (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021). Four initial participants were recruited through social media (Facebook, Instagram) and then participants made recommendations for others based on inclusion criteria. Criteria included: (1) teaching in a HESA graduate program at the masters or doctoral level; (2) holding a tenure-track position with pre-tenure status; and (3) employment at an accredited private or public institution. Current study participants self-identified race and/or ethnicity and gender. Notably, all participants provided their sex when asked to share their gender, had no known *a priori* experiences with the researchers, and were all from different institutions and academic programs (see Table 1).

Positionality

Given our proximity to the narratives as tenure-track faculty, we engaged in processes of reflexivity to interrogate their assumptions and engage their positionalities to avoid complicity, invalidating beliefs, and reinforcing systems of power (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021). We all brought our personal and professional perspectives to the study throughout the research process, ranging from study conceptualization to data collection, data analysis, and dissemination. Professional perspectives influenced our investment in the study, as we were all pre-tenure HESA faculty during early study stages and were eager to make meaning to inform our own careers while also using knowledge to help others in their HESA faculty journeys. Thus, as researchers we acknowledge our privilege and power due to our professional identities and the responsibility that comes with them to advocate for equitable workplace environments for pre-tenure faculty. We also brought personal perspectives to the

study, especially regarding social identities and framing the topic in a way that reflected our lived experiences and awareness of others' realities as HESA pre-tenure

Table 1. Participant Self-Identified Demographic Information

Participant	Gender Identity	Age	Race and/or Ethnicity	Faculty Years	Institutional Type	Administrative Experience
Chandler	Man	34	White	4 Years	Liberal Arts	6 years
Ira	Man	29	White	2 Years	Masters Comprehensive	3 years
Joey	Man	35	White	2 Years	Research Intensive	10 years
Khadijah	Woman	37	African American	New	Research Intensive	10 years
Monica	Woman	33	Latina	1 Year	Liberal Arts	4 years
Overton	Man	31	African American	2 years	HBCU	3 years
Phoebe	Woman	32	Jewish	New	Masters Comprehensive	3 years
Rachel	Woman	36	White	5 years	Catholic Heritage	8 years
Regine	Woman	35	Asian	5 years	Research Intensive	8 years
Ross	Man	31	Latino	3 Years	Research Intensive	None
Russell	Man	37	White	6 years	Christian	10 years
Synclaire	Woman	31	Biracial	2 years	Hispanic Serving	2 years

faculty. As a research team, we all experience different intersecting identities of race and gender respectively as either mixed-heritage Latino, LGBTQ+, or White. These parallel experiences created a shared connection with participants in which disclosure levels may have varied based on dynamics rooted in varying social identities. However, we believe our collective identities and approaches to this study helped provide a nuanced understanding of the HESA faculty pre-tenure experiences.

Data Collection

We used a semi-structured interview guide which was developed by the primary researcher and reviewed by two subject-matter experts who were full professors of higher education administration specializing in qualitative methods. The guide included questions such as “In what possible ways, if at all, did your pre-tenure status influence your faculty experiences?” and “Tell me what it is like to navigate tenure for you.” The first author conducted all participant interviews in which data were masked to the other study researchers. Interviews took place on site at HESA professional conferences where the first author provided participants with a standard informed consent form. Interviews lasted between one and two hours and data collection continued until saturation was reached at 12 participants (Guest et al., 2006). A professional third party performed interview transcriptions to prepare for data analysis.

Data Analysis

Findings were conceptualized through the interpretive relativist ontology paradigm in which epistemology assumes that the researcher cannot separate themselves from what they know (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021). Data analysis was conducted through narrative analysis in which researchers “make sense of stories outside of the context in which they are situated” which were located within political, social, and historical contexts (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021, p. 149). Data analysis also followed the general question of, “how does this context bear witness and shape the story?” (p. 149). This question was used to begin data analysis in which we constructed preliminary memos about salient concepts (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021; Saldaña, 2021).

An initial listing of patterns was developed for each participant using these narrative analysis documents. Significant focus was given to participants’ meaning-making of pre-tenure experiences, professional identities, and relationships with other professional peers (Esposito & Evans-Winters, 2021). This initial coding process assisted the researchers in understanding how individual participant lived experiences amplified the convergence of themes (Josselson & Hammack, 2021). Each interview was individually coded because of the nuances between different institutional contexts in congruence with this approach to narrative inquiry.

Interconnected patterns across participants related to the research questions were applied and sections of transcripts were structured into thematic clusters (Saldaña, 2021). Additional narrative pieces that did not fall into these themes were also identified. Two rounds of narrative analysis were conducted using this process to reconcile any potential incongruencies. Final narrative analysis documents were generated to further refine the themes using code mapping as an organizing heuristic (Saldaña, 2021).

Trustworthiness

We continuously reflected on our subjectivities to remain aware of how they influence data analysis. The primary researcher conducted all data collection and analysis, the second author assisted with subsequent data analysis, and the third author served as a final reviewer for study dissemination. We then employed Esposito and Evans-Winters's (2021) trustworthiness strategies: (1) the use of an external auditor, who was a retired university professor from a student affairs graduate program with *a priori* experience and knowledge in that area; (2) the use of a subject matter expert, who assisted in reviewing and questioning the main themes and questions to clarify researcher bias; and (3) member checking using the interview transcript data and preliminary analysis. None of our participants suggested any changes, nor disagreed with the data analysis.

FINDINGS

Findings highlighted that pre-tenure HESA faculty struggled with professional and personal challenges. Professional challenges included difficulty navigating tenure and feeling like an academic outsider by straddling student affairs and academic professional identities. Personal challenges included delays in achieving adult milestones as well as affective sentiments of isolation and loneliness. Throughout the study, we mirrored both participant's self-identified language and language from existing literature, which at times results in the inclusion of both sex- and gender-related terminology for different constructs.

Professional Challenges

The tenure system disillusioned the HESA pre-tenure faculty. They all described how the tenure process reduced their professional ambitions for scholarship because they had to pivot to service obligations to support diversity activities. HESA faculty engaged in what they termed as the "politics of respectability" because the "old heads," or senior faculty, policed their professional activities through the tenure evaluation process. This was coupled with straddling professorial and student affairs professional identities which made them feel like academic outsiders.

Difficulty Navigating Tenure

All participants shared they felt subordinate to their senior colleagues and described significant power dynamics. HESA faculty struggled with these faculty within their academic programs and across their department who were in other professional programs or K-12 education. They suggested that they felt powerless because they remained untenured and were perceived as immature by their senior tenured colleagues. Chandler described this age gap as problematic, because "[t]he gap between myself and my adjacent colleagues by age is almost 20 years." Older faculty often frustrated the younger women faculty in nuanced, gendered ways. Regine shared she "felt compressed by the male hegemony" within their respective academic departments who were mostly retired principals, teachers, or superintendents.

Similarly, Phoebe described the male culture in their department as “just like the show *Madmen*” in which hypermasculinity benefited men and subordinated everyone else. Synclaire expressed that she was excluded and poorly treated by other women faculty who assigned her undesirable committees that she felt pressured to accept because “they often say that they have childcare and that I wouldn’t understand these demands until I have my own children. I get told I have to teach the later courses until 10:30 PM because of this too.”

Participants ubiquitously noted that older faculty often pressured them to ghostwrite manuscripts even if it was not related to higher education or student affairs and assume personal administrative tasks through acts of servitude such as pet sitting. Multiple participants were pressured to co-author research with their senior department or institutional colleagues in which they performed most of the authorship and were only added as the last author. Overall, participants felt like they had little support or guidance. Monica shared her perspective about tenure:

I feel like the tenure system is really a structural barrier, rather than about academic freedom. I also struggle as a pre-tenure faculty member with receiving clear guidelines. I have had 2 department chairs and each of them provide me with very different guidelines. Candidly, I think tenure is a socially constructed system that is a bunch of bullshit.

Expectations were different for HESA faculty and often based on K-12 or professional education scholarly productivity, rather than native to the HE/SA academic discipline. Further, these were challenges expressed by all participants as they cited a lack of collegial and institutional support in navigating tenure. Khadijah expressed frustration about her research in the tenure process which required her to produce one presentation and peer-reviewed scholarly article per year, but “...there is one pool of conference funding that I have to compete with others to get. How the fuck do I get tenure when they don’t support anything for me?”

Pre-tenure faculty also shared stories about increasing assignment of responsibilities by their senior colleagues. Some participants were given extra service burdens by senior faculty such as student recruitment, committees, advising, and dissertation or thesis responsibilities. Synclaire noted, “As a [Biracial] Black woman who teaches in a masters level student affairs program, all the minority students and even professional staff come to me to vent.” These power dynamics and additional tasks led to sentiments of frustration and difficulty navigating the tenure-track in which pre-tenure faculty did not feel supported. For example, Ross, like many of the participants, described how he struggled with the faculty professional culture and negotiating the tenure process as a HESA faculty in relation to other faculty who receive more support. Ross shared:

There is this meme that my students often use with Donald Glover who is the hip hop artist Childish Gambino. When he was on the show ‘*Community*’ there is a scene where he walks into a room holding a pizza box and then walks right out as everything is on fire. I feel that this is my life right now. Everything is on fire, but I can only pretend to eat pizza. I cannot demonstrate any vulnerability or struggle to my colleagues because it will be perceived as unacademic. Our professorial culture does not allow for feelings or affective expression.

These difficulties navigating tenure were often rooted in differences between academic generations, as well as gender and a lack of support or guidance.

Academic Outsiders

All but one participant previously served as a student affairs professional. Professional identity was often conceptualized by participants as a struggle between the polemics of faculty or student affairs professional identities. Chandler noted this duality: “I received such mixed messages as I feel there is a lack of respect for our profession as an academic discipline and then other SAPros [student affairs professionals] do not trust me as a faculty member.” Chandler describes feeling unsure about how to demonstrate his commitment to the two functional areas of his career: faculty member and industry professional. These mixed messages contributed to tensions in navigating scholarly and practitioner identities which participants felt led to a diffused professional orientation. These two tensions of first not being respected as a legitimate scholar and faculty member by many other faculty and the second of no longer being trusted as a professional of student affairs resulted in feeling unwelcome in both professional homes for HESA faculty.

For participants, these professional identities held salience and they felt compelled to code switch because other student affairs professionals often saw faculty as a professor, and not as an administrative colleague. Their attempts to balance their professional identities led to tensions and Joey shared their professional identity diffusion:

As I progressed through my first-year as a full-time faculty member, I felt like I lost my identity. I did not fit into the boxes of faculty culture, and I did not have the hours of a student affairs professional anymore. I am so torn between my SAPro identity and my faculty identity. I feel confused about who I am supposed to be.

All HESA pre-tenure faculty were often questioned by other student affairs professionals why they felt compelled to transition into a faculty role whether or not they had previous experience in student affairs or higher education administration. Other faculty shared they encountered microaggressions from other professionals to not become a faculty member because they were not ready or incapable of making this shift. Overton shared:

I worked in residence life and in student involvement as a mid-level professional before I joined the professoriate. I often get asked at NASPA or ACPA conferences why I joined the dark side.

In addition to other campus professionals, faculty from different academic disciplines also questioned their legitimacy, which made them feel invisible or disrespected. Other faculty questioned the validity of their HESA research and their doctoral degrees, and this disrespect typically occurred in department meetings and cross-campus committees. Other faculty were often confused about the purpose of HESA programs and felt that the research was just about the “fun of college” as summarized by Synclaire who added, “I feel I have to constantly prove my worth. No one respects higher education as an academic discipline.” Pre-tenure faculty had limited connections with senior faculty or non-HESA faculty, and instead engaged in

collegiality with student affairs professionals or with HESA faculty from other institutions.

Personal Challenges

The tenure system particularly positioned the pre-tenure HESA faculty with higher service and teaching burdens which they felt impacted their personal lives. They suggested their quality of life was better when they worked in student affairs or in administration. The participants cited the tenure system as frustrating and dehumanizing. They also felt the imposed system of shifting productivity and metrics associated with tenure shaped their professional lives and bled into their personal relationships. Participants felt this limited their capacity to achieve adult milestones and led to isolation or loneliness.

Delays to Adult Milestones

Pre-tenure faculty contextualized their individual experiences tethered to their pre-tenure status as a general lack of support during the tenure process as HESA faculty. They firmly believed their pre-tenure status negatively impacted their personal lives in what they termed as a process of *adulting*. They compared how other faculty across disciplines at their institutions were able to progress in their personal goals and milestones. Russell stated, “I feel like I am eschewing life commitments to pursue this life of the mind.” Participants felt like they were engaging in forms of delayed adulting by missing traditional life benchmarks such as home ownership, marriage, and having children to pursue their faculty career. They disclosed and described various ways in which they struggled to afford and matriculate towards these life benchmarks as highlighted by Russell and considered their low salaries as HESA faculty as preventing adulting. In particular, women-identifying HESA faculty highlighted their lower salaries in comparison to men and other education faculty. Pre-tenure faculty shared their low salaries which they believed were compounded by high student loan balances accumulated in their doctoral programs.

Student loan debt was typically in excess of \$100,000. Ira and Regine specifically suggested this was because they had to take low paying graduate assistantships in their HESA masters and doctoral programs in student affairs divisions which forced them to take out more student loans for financial support. HESA faculty felt their student loan burden prevented them from purchasing a home, which limited them to renting instead. Rachel shared that, “My loan debt is preventing me from buying a house, and I rent because of this.” They felt they were not engaged in the same material culture because they did not make enough money and lagged behind their peers in achieving other benchmarks, such as having children or getting married, which they believed they were sacrificing to be in a tenure-track position.

In particular, many of the women-identifying faculty discussed their guilt about having a family or children and wanted to wait until tenure was granted. Regine shared, “As a woman, I definitely feel pressure with my biological clock rapidly ticking.” Women-identifying HESA pre-tenure faculty noted that their career as an administrator and then starting over as a professor kept pushing back their timeline

for family planning. HESA faculty compared these benchmarks to other peers in their personal or professional lives through examples they saw on social media, such as posts about baby announcements and weddings. These sorts of benchmarks were described with a sentiment of nostalgia and loneliness as pre-tenure faculty described maintaining these personal and professional relationships as a significant challenge.

Isolation and Loneliness

HESA faculty longed for the sense of professional community and camaraderie they developed as student affairs professional or cultivated as a graduate student. Yet, as pre-tenure faculty they felt marooned in social isolation and experienced difficulties with loneliness, as Monica suggested she felt “like Rapunzel in the ivory tower of academe.” Overton referred to his loneliness as a “desolate realm” because he suggested that pre-tenure faculty are left alone for their own resilience in navigating the professoriate. Ira further described this challenge as, “I think one of the biggest struggles for millennial [younger] faculty members is the sense of isolation...I go to coffee shops just to be around people.”

Any new personal friendships HESA faculty formed were limited to student affairs staff or other younger faculty and maintaining regular contact with old friends was challenging. Kim described how she connects with others:

The only warm glow I get is not from a potential partner, but from my screen when I am reading dissertations or student papers. When I moved to [insert town] to begin this position, I had no friends. Now in this interview...I still have no friends. I take trips home and to meet friends during the academic breaks.

However, there were some additional nuances among pre-tenure faculty. Women described making friends with other student affairs professionals but struggled to maintain these friendships due to high staff turnover. Men discussed feeling lonely and unable to form new authentic friendships, particularly when there were no other men in their department or when they relocated to college towns. Joey described the process of making friendships and struggles dating:

I am like the Drake song ‘No New Friends.’ All my friends are limited to the student affairs professionals on my campus. I really feel isolated sometimes because of the college town. I fear that I will never find a significant other.

The HESA faculty indicated that the tenure process was taxing on their intimate and amorous relationships. Only two participants (Ross, Monica) were currently living with their partner and others were ashamed of their current situations and unsure how to move forward in their thirties. Khadijah stated:

I signed up for online dating services...I have to literally lie and say that I am a teacher and then tell them I am a professor after a few dates. Why should I have to dumb myself down to accommodate male fragility?

Phoebe candidly disclosed that the strain of the tenure process may have influenced their partner’s decision to separate from them:

I am divorced. That is such a blunt statement and I hate to say it aloud. My husband was tired of supporting my ups and downs with the tenure process. I had to keep assuming more responsibility which took time away from my marriage. I feel like a failure. My career success has cost me in my personal life, and I find

it difficult to move on, so I continue to be a workaholic to avoid my feelings. I feel like I will be a cat lady wearing Thanksgiving sweaters in June very soon.

For HESA pre-tenure faculty, these experiences of isolation, failed intimate relationships, and loneliness connected to their tenure process were all related to other issues with mental health. Overton highlighted this concern, stating that his work was “done in such isolation, that I forgot how to be successful at socializing. I struggle with depression and intimate relationships. I no longer know how to be vulnerable or my truest self.”

These personal challenges of professional adulthood shared by the participants were about forming relationships and progressing towards their expected life benchmarks. Personal or strained relationships often led to sentiments of isolation and lack of connection to others. Relationship challenges conveyed by pre-tenure HESA faculty also related to some identity diffusion about their professional role.

DISCUSSION

The current study contributes to an ongoing scholarly conversation about faculty experiences by adding nuanced perspectives on how pre-tenure HESA faculty negotiated their tenure process. This tenure experience negotiation included personal and professional challenges within their tenure experiences that were professionally marginalizing and taxing on their personal lives. These findings from this research further nuance the experiences of HESA faculty and extend support for extant research about the socialization experiences of tenure-track faculty.

Our discussion is couched within the study framework of doctoral and faculty socialization (Austin, 2002; Weidman et al., 2001) to understand faculty pre-tenure experiences. Participant stories reflected how socialization involved overlapping factors of negotiating the institution, peers, and broader climate (Weidman et al., 2001). These realities connected to participants’ faculty career socialization related to a potential lack of preparation and clear expectations, lack of community, and unrealistic expectations around academic life (Austin, 2001). Notably, HESA faculty were our population of interest based on our experiences and expertise, but we discovered that many findings could potentially apply to other populations beyond our field.

Personally, pre-tenure HESA faculty struggled to work towards traditional life benchmarks of “adulting” they associated with others their age such as home ownership or marriage. Participants felt saddled by student loan debt and inhibited by lower salaries. They felt reminded by their lack of progression towards adult benchmarks such as having children by comparing themselves to others on social media. These faculty felt isolated and lonely as they struggled to maintain personal relationships and sustained professional connections. These findings about the personal struggles of tenure-track faculty support existing research which highlight the personal tax accrued for professional achievements (Yudkevich et al., 2015).

Professionally, women-identifying faculty were assigned more service and higher expectations for the labors of mentoring which supports extant research findings (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Porter, 2007; Settles et al., 2018). Moreover, all faculty faced conflict with senior faculty, high service burdens, marginalization from

other academic disciplines, and struggled to manage expectations of other academics and student affairs professionals. These findings mirror research which suggested that younger faculty are more likely to struggle across their intersecting personal and professional lives (Hoeller, 2014). Personally, these experiences led to challenges with social isolation and delayed maturation toward lifespan benchmarks such as home ownership or having a family (Yudkevich et al., 2015). Pre-tenure HESA faculty community, connectedness, and clearer guidelines for tenure. Lacking these elements led to professional identity diffusion in their need for recognition. These issues are consistent with research suggesting that younger faculty struggle with role ambiguity and have a higher need for community and collaboration (Manning, 2017).

Pre-tenure HESA professors are a newer class of faculty which mirrors the evolution of the professoriate across HESA graduate programs. These individuals are *post-praxis* in that their primary identity is assumed to be as professor, rather than student affairs professional (Manning, 2017). They assume a more cosmopolitan scholarly identity rather than a more local identity of the student affairs professional (Manning, 2017). Many had limited professional experience beyond the entry-level or new professional classification (typically classified as 0-3 years). However, participants in the current study cited their experiences based on their research and teaching roles and shared little about their HESA practitioner professional experiences even when prompted in interviews.

Based on the study, integration and treatment of pre-tenure HESA faculty may be a contradiction of the values of student affairs and higher education. While the core values of the profession of student affairs are outlined within *The Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV) or other historical documents, it is stressed that higher education's purpose is to not only transmit knowledge, but to develop learners who see the world beyond themselves (NASPA, 1989). Yet, student affairs was described as a low-consensus educational context (Torres et al., 2019).

This tension is expressed by pre-tenure HESA faculty in this study who identified feeling insufficiently supported as junior faculty. They perceived that tenure track realities of a competitive, less-collaborative faculty culture were at odds with the collective, humanizing, constructive values, and foundations of HESA culture. Participant experiences reflected research on problematic faculty labor expectations, as the nature of faculty work was an additional difficulty to navigate with little individual agency and with invisible or uncompensated labor (Yudkevich et al., 2015). Overall, participant stories highlighted key themes from existing literature while providing a nuanced understanding of pre-tenure HESA faculty experiences.

Limitations

This study has some acknowledged limitations such as a small heterogeneous sample of tenure-track faculty from HESA programs. The researchers of this study are faculty members and may have perceived *a priori* participant knowledge which may have influenced the responses of the participants. Participants may have selectively disclosed details of their experiences given their potential knowledge of or relationship with the researchers. Given these considerations, the results are not

necessarily transferable across all faculty demographics despite a heterogeneous sample of participants and institutional types.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH

These study findings illustrate that tenure as a social institution of expectation and evaluative performance holds to standards that may not accurately represent the effort and commitment provided by pre-tenure HESA faculty. Tenure processes were designed for academic freedom pursuits in a previous era of higher education with scant updating of teaching, scholarly, and service expectations in ways that provide support for faculty (Hutcheson, 2018).

Pre-tenure HESA faculty experiences illustrate the need to review how faculty are incorporated, developed, and supported in HESA graduate programs. Individual faculty members are ultimately responsible for navigating academia, and untenured or non-tenure-track faculty may not be able to express agency or even identify areas in which they need support (Hutcheson, 2018). Given that participants reported similar experiences, institutional leaders can use this knowledge to review and recommit to the values of the HESA field within the purview of faculty work.

Study findings indicate a lack of ambiguity about navigating tenure, including a lack of clarity on how to be successful in the process. To alleviate this ambiguity and lack of clarity, we suggest multiple formal feedback milestones via departmental and college-level evaluations of pre-tenure faculty during years three through five of a faculty member's progress toward tenure. These evaluations could be included in the faculty member's application for promotion and tenure. If a faculty member receives support and praise for their work in teaching, scholarship, and service in these evaluations, then this support of positive performance should be taken into consideration during the promotion and tenure review process (leaving less ambiguity of the faculty member's quality of work for promotion). Also, during such evaluative processes, faculty members can be given direct feedback regarding their progress regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. If a faculty member has been engaging in well-supported and meaningful service to a point of detriment in their areas of scholarship or teaching, then those evaluating the faculty member can be much more specific in the reprioritization of these tasks as the faculty member progresses.

In support of tenure navigation, pre-tenure HESA faculty negotiated unclear expectations or responsibilities. There should be a career ladder approach for pre-tenure HESA faculty that allows them to assume progressive responsibility for program administration (Victorino et al., 2013). These career ladder approaches should also consider the impact of cultural taxation in which Black HESA faculty or other Faculty of Color are placed with higher service burdens (Patton & Catching, 2009), which was reflected in the current study when pre-tenure HESA faculty struggled to balance teaching, research, and service expectations. They were forced to assume greater obligations across all three domains and there needs to be greater equilibrium by letting faculty decide their own service and research obligations (O'Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011).

Study findings also highlighted personal and professional challenges regarding being academic outsiders and feelings of isolation and loneliness. As such, we suggest

centering ways to help pre-tenure faculty develop community. Institutions can implement intentional mentoring programs and find ways to connect pre-tenure HESA faculty to others in similar life and career stages. Particularly, participants wanted to connect with others and felt isolated. Additional efforts could be made to organize writing retreats or other professional development events such as “teach ins” or identity-based, faculty interest groups as opportunities for social connection. These opportunities would be highly salient for Black HESA faculty or other Faculty of Color by facilitating an increased sense of belonging (Patton & Catching, 2009). Building in this intentional community can provide support for those in similar life stages who may also feel challenges to adult milestones that our participants noted, resulting in less feelings of isolation.

Future research should consider the limitations of these findings and further explore the experiences of other HESA faculty such as those in contingent (adjunct) and clinical (teaching) roles. Future research should also consider how previous professional experience may facilitate different scholarly identities such as focusing on student affairs, higher education, and/or critical scholarship. Additional research is needed to better understand the experience of HESA faculty which may illuminate the ways in which their experiences can be improved.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this study suggest that the HESA academic discipline is still evolving in which cultures from the profession buttress against those of traditional academia. In this sample of pre-tenure HESA faculty, participants lacked social connectedness concurrent with quality of life and tenure navigation issues, as well as issues of professional self-worth and agency. Additional roles were often given to pre-tenure HESA faculty as a response to their gender identities, as expected or required as part of their HESA faculty roles. For these issues to exist within student affairs graduate preparation programs, it suggests a disconnect between the espoused and de facto values of the field when operationalized via the treatment of pre-tenure HESA faculty. Knowledge from participant stories can guide practice for improving the experiences of pre-tenure HESA faculty.

REFERENCES

- ACPA - College Student Educators International. (2023). *Commission for faculty and graduate programs*. <https://myacpa.org/groups/cpp/>
- ACPA - College Student Educators International & NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2015). *ACPA/NASPA professional competency areas for student affairs educators*. <https://tinyurl.com/3yr5hawh>
- Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation’s faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23, 373-397. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2000.0015>
- Ardoin, S. (2019). The journey from #sagrad to #sapro. *New Directions for Student Services*, 166, 19-28.

- Ardoin, S., & Martinez, B. (2019). *Straddling class in the academy: 26 stories of students, administrators, and faculty from poor and working-class backgrounds and their compelling lessons for higher education policy and practice*. Stylus Publishing.
- Arminio, J. (2009). Chapter ten: Applying professional standards. In G. S. McClellan & J. Stringer (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed., pp. 187–205). Jossey-Bass.
- Arminio, J., & Ortiz, A. M. (2016). Professionalism. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & V. Torres (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (6th ed., pp. 377–391). Jossey-Bass.
- Arnold, N. W., Crawford, E. R., & Khalifa, M. (2016). Psychological heuristics and faculty of color: Racial battle fatigue and tenure/promotion. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(6), 890-919. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11780891>
- ASHE- Association for the Study of Higher Education (2023). *Council for the advancement of higher education programs* (CAHEP). <https://www.ashe.ws/cahep>
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94–122. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1558449>
- Blackwell, L. V., Snyder, L. A., & Mavriplis, C. (2009). Diverse faculty in STEM fields: Attitudes, performance, and fair treatment. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2, 195-205. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016974>
- Blockett, R. A., Felder, P. P., Parrish III, W & Collier, J. (2016). Pathways to the professoriate: Exploring Black doctoral student socialization and the pipeline to the academic profession. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 40(2), 95–110. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/pathways-professoriate-exploring-black-doctoral/docview/2049976526/se-2>
- Boss, G. J., & Dunn, M. (2023) Exploring the role of doctoral education in scholarly practice. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 60(2), 223-235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2021.1994411>
- Bureau, D. A. (2018). Grounded in their work: Interpreting perceptions of professional values by participants in student affairs preparation programs. *Journal of College and Character*, 19(3), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02194587X.2018.1481098>
- Camblin, L. D., & Steger, J. A. (2000). Rethinking faculty development. *Higher Education*, 39, 1-18. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/a:1003827925543>
- Clandinin, J. D., (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry: Developing qualitative inquiry*. Routledge.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2023). CAS professional standards for higher education (11th ed). https://www.cas.edu/store_category.asp?id=14
- Dean, L. A. (2013). Using the CAS Standards in assessment projects. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2013(142), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.v2013.142>

- Eagan, M. K., Jr., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(6), 923-954. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0034>
- Eaton, P. W., & Smithers, L. E. (2020). This is not a checklist: Higher education and student affairs *competencies*, neoliberal protocol, and poetics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 52(5), 560–574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1679624>
- Esposito, J., & Evans-Winters, V. (2021). *Introduction to intersectional qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.
- Finney, S. J., & Horst, S. J. (2019) Standards, standards, standards: Mapping professional standards for outcomes assessment to assessment practice. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(3), 310-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1559171>
- French, K. A., Allen, T. D., Miller, M. H., Kim, E. S., Centeno, G. (2020). Faculty time allocation in relation to work-family balance, job satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103443>
- Gansemer-Topf, A. M., & Ryder, A. (2017). Competencies needed for entry-level student affairs work: Views from mid-level professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 35(1), 40-54. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2017.0004>
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18, 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Haley, K., Jaeger, A., Hawes, C. & Johnson, J. (2015) Going beyond conference registration: Creating intentional professional development for student affairs educators. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 52(3), 313-326, DOI: 10.1080/19496591.2015.1050034
- Harris, J. C. (2020). "Socialized into the field": Exploring how higher education and student affairs faculty members are socialized to teach student development theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2020.0000>
- Henning, G. W., Mitchell, A. A., & Maki, P. (2008, September–October). The Assessment Skills and Knowledge standards: Professionalizing the work of assessing student learning and development. *About Campus*, 13(4), 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.259>
- Hoeller, K. (2014). *Equality for contingent faculty: Overcoming the two-tier system*. Vanderbilt University Press.
- Hubain, B. S., Allen, E. L., Harris, J. C., & Linder, C. (2016). Counter-stories as representations of the racialized experiences of students of color in higher education and student affairs graduate preparation programs. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29(7), 946-963, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1174894>
- Hutcheson, P. A. (2018). Why tenure needs protection in these troubled times. In J. L. DeVitis & P. A. Sasso, P. A. (Eds.) *Colleges at the crossroads: Taking sides on contested issues* (pp. 113-126). Peter Lang Publishing.

- Joseph, T. D., & Hirshfield, L. E. (2011). 'Why don't you get somebody new to do it?' Race and cultural taxation in the academy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(1), 121-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2010.496489>
- Josselson, R., & Hammack, P. L. (2021). *Essentials of narrative analysis*. American Psychological Association Press.
- Kaskie, B. (2017). The academy is aging in place: Assessing alternatives for modifying institutions of higher education. *Gerontologist*, 57(5), 816-823. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnw001>
- Kelly, B. T., & Gayles, J. G. (2010). Resistance to racial/ethnic dialog in graduate preparation programs: Implications for developing multicultural competence. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 29, 75-85.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. George Washington University.
- Kuk, L., & Cuyjet, M. J. (2009). Graduate preparation programs: The first step in socialization. In A. Tull, J. B. Hirt, & S. A. Saunders (Eds.), *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration: A guide for new professionals and their supervisors* (pp. 89-108). Stylus.
- Larson, R. C., Ghaffarzadegan, N., & Xue, Y. (2013). Too many PhD graduates or too few academic job openings: The basic reproductive number R0 in academia. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 31(6), 745-750. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2210>
- Liddell, D. L., Wilson, M. E., Pasquesi, K., Hirschy, A. S., & Boyle, K. M. (2014). Development of professional identity through socialization in graduate school. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51, 69-84. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2014-0006>
- Linder, C., Harris, J. C., Allen, E. L., & Hubain, B. S. (2015). Building inclusive pedagogy: Recommendations from a national study of students of color in higher education and student affairs graduate programs. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 48, 178-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.959270>
- Linder, C., & Winston Simmons, C. (2015). Career and program choice of students of color in student affairs programs. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 52(4), 414-426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2015.1081601>
- Lombardi, K. M., & Mather, P. C. (2016). Understanding anticipatory socialization for new student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 34(1), 85-97. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2016.0006>
- Manning, K. (2017). *Organizational theory in higher education* (2nd ed). Routledge.
- Mason, M. A., Goulden, M., & Wolfinger, N. H. (2006). Babies matter: Pushing the gender equity revolution forward. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 9-30). Stylus Publishing.
- Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., & Alexander, A. (2008). Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6, 215-233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592708080572>
- Moore, C. M. (2022). *Welcome from the director*. NASPA Faculty Council. <https://www.naspa.org/division/faculty-council/issues>

- NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.(2021). *Faculty Council*. <https://www.naspa.org/division/faculty-council/issues>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (1989). *Points of view: A perspective on student affairs*. Author. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED336654>
- O'Brien, J. J. (2018). Exploring intersections among the ACPA/NASPA professional competencies. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(3). 274-290. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0027>
- O'Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A. (2011). The pursuit of prestige: The experience of institutional striving from a faculty perspective. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, 4(1), 39-3. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5666-6_3
- Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). 'Teaching while Black': Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(6), 713-728. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390903333897>
- Perez, R. J. (2016). A conceptual model of professional socialization within student affairs graduate preparation programs. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education*, 1, 35-52. <https://doi.org/10.28945/2344>
- Perez, R. J. (2017). Enhancing, inhibiting, and maintaining voice: An examination of student affairs graduate students' self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 58(6), 833-852. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0067>
- Perry, A. L., Dean, S. R., & Hilton, A. A. (2019). New faculty transitions and obstacles: An auto-ethnographic exploration. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, (10)2, 43-72.
- Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure-track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(3), 319-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2011.11777204>
- Porter, S. R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 523-541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2007.11772328>
- Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the National Study of New Professionals in Student Affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49, 319-335. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0022>
- Riessman, C. K. (2005). Narrative analysis. In N. Kelly, K. M. Horrocks, B. Roberts, & D. Robinson (Eds.), *Narrative, memory & everyday life*. (pp. 1-7). University of Huddersfield. <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/4920/>
- Rosser, V. (2004). Faculty member's intention to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197294>
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Publications.
- Sax, L., Hagedorn, L., Arredondo, M., & DiCrisi, F. (2002). Faculty research productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 423-446. <https://jstor.org/stable/40196891>
- Schuh, J. H., Jones, S. R., & Torres, V. (2006). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (6th ed). Jossey-Bass.

- Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003>
- Shelton, L. J., Ardoin, S. (2020). Contingent faculty and adjuncts in higher education. In M. J. Amey, & M. E. David (Eds.). *The SAGE encyclopedia of higher education* (pp. 298-301). SAGE Publishing. <https://sk.sagepub.com/reference/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-higher-education>
- Shelton, L. J., & Yao, C. (2019). Early career professionals' perceptions of international preparation in higher education/student affairs graduate programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 60(2), 156-172. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0016>
- Smithers, L. E. (2020). Student success as preemption: Predictive constructions of futures-to-never-come. *Futures*, 124, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102639>
- Smithers, L. E. (2022): The production of alter-competence: Wonder in graduate preparation program coursework. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 60(4), 521-536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2022.2111520>
- Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA). (2021). *Graduate program directory*. <https://apps.naspa.org/gradprograms/srchres.cfm>
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 2-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981868>
- Torres, V., Jones, S. R., Renn, K. (2019). Student affairs as a low-consensus field and the evolution of student development theory as foundational knowledge. *Journal of College Student Development*, 60(1), 645-658. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0060>
- Tyson, C. A. (2006). Research, race, and social education. In K. C. Barton (Ed.), *Research methods in social studies education: Contemporary issues and perspectives* (pp. 39-56). Information Age Publishing.
- Victorino, C.A., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Conley, S. (2013). Campus racial climate: A litmus test for faculty satisfaction at four-year colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(6), 769-805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777310>
- Weidman, J. C., & DeAngelo, L. (Eds) (2020). *Socialization in higher education and the early career: Theory, research and application*. Springer.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education—A perilous passage? *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 28(3). The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Witcher, S. D., & Sasso, P. A. (2022). A comparison of generational differences in faculty perceptions of online versus face-to-face professional development – A community college case study, *College Teaching*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2022.2124394>

- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 407-428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558400151002>
- Yao, C., Wilson, B., Garcia, C., DeFrain, E., & Cano, A. (May 22, 2017). Helping graduate students join an online learning community. *EducauseReview*. <https://tinyurl.com/42nky66y>
- Youn, T., & Price, T. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(2), 204-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11772139>
- Young, D. G. (2019). Supervised practice experiences and professional preparation of graduates from student affairs master's programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 60(3), 290-306. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0027>
- Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P.G., & Rumbley, L.E. (2015). (Eds.). *Young faculty in the 21st century: Academic career opportunities and challenges around the world*. State University of New York Press.
-

PIETRO A. SASSO, Ph.D., is an associate professor and coordinator of the doctoral program in higher education at Delaware State University. His research focuses on the college experience, student success, and educational equity. Email: PSasso@desu.edu; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9308-3292>

LESLIE JO (LJ) SHELTON, PhD is an assistant professor of higher education and program coordinator of the higher education M.Ed. program at the University of Arkansas. Her main research areas focus on how HESA educators can better serve students with minoritized social identities, as well as exploring the experiences of HESA graduate students. Email: lshelto@uark.edu ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0757-339X>

G. BLUE BRAZLETON, PhD is an associate professor of community college and higher education leadership at Northern Arizona University. His research primarily looks into the intersection of technology and education, but he also researches how individuals interact with and are impacted by institutional systems. Email: Grady.Brazelton@nau.edu

Societal Leaders or Political Followers? Institutional Accreditation and the Rise of State Regulations

Chris M. Riley
Abilene Christian University

ABSTRACT

This article traces the evolution of higher education accreditation and the impact of modern partisan critiques that challenge its traditional values. For example, the Trump-led Department of Education (ED) introduced new rules resulting in the end of regional boundaries related to accreditation. Moreover, questions have emerged related to oversight of accreditation agencies. Some states have attempted to break up the *higher-education cartels*, by requiring institutions to change institutional accreditors, threatening university policies related to shared governance and academic freedom and exerting political control over hiring processes. In light of this, the ED and accreditors have pushed back by issuing guidance reasserting its oversight of such changes, outlining required procedures, and reinforcing the values of accreditation. Recently, Florida has filed suit against ED challenging the constitutionality of the accreditation regime. Against that backdrop, this paper considers how higher education leaders should respond in light of Douglass' (2021) political determinist hypothesis.

Keywords: higher education, accreditation, politics, states

To begin, it is important to understand what is meant by what the term *accreditation* means in the context of higher education. For the purpose of this article, accreditation refers to the process that “accreditors,” recognized non-government entities, use to “ensure that institutions of higher education meet acceptable levels of quality,” which is required to for students attending accredited institutions to receive federal student aid (i.e., quality assurance) (Department of Education [ED], 2023b, n.p.). In this way, the federal government, through the ED has a key role in recognizing accreditors. While states have the primary authority to charter, authorize, and/or regulate

institutions of higher education within their borders and provide important sources of funding and financial aid, without being accredited by a federally-recognized accreditor, institutions would not be eligible to accept the “\$112 billion available in annual student aid” (ED, 2023a).

These accreditors accredit the institution as a whole. Historically, these federally-recognized entities have been known as either *national accreditors*, which accredit vocations, some religious, and online institutions, and *regional accreditors*, which accredit the vast majority of colleges and universities based on geographic region and include organizations like the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges and the Higher Learning Commission (ED, 2023c). Based on recent changes discussed below, both national and regional accreditations are now collectively identified and recognized as *institutional accreditors*. While there are also accreditors referred to as programmatic, specialized, or *secondary* accreditors, which evaluate specific academic programs or disciplines, these do not serve a federal gatekeeper function and are not the focus of this article.

In his 2014 book, *Higher Education Accreditation: How It’s Changing and Why It Must*, Paul L. Gaston provides a sweeping review of the opportunities and challenges facing the accreditation of higher education. There, he notes, “From the beginning, there was an implicit partnership between accreditation and government. Simply put, accreditation offers oversight and quality assurance that in the rest of the world remains largely the responsibility of government bureaucracies” (Gaston, 2014, p. 58). Since that time, questions have emerged related to whether the current relationship between accreditation and government constitutes an “unconstitutional delegation of governmental authority to private bodies” (National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity [NACIQI], 2021, p. 3). More specifically, there is a growing concern “that governance for the public institution is established by state law and that accreditor intrusion into these matters is inappropriate and outside the proper purview of accreditors in their role as Title IV gatekeepers” (NACIQI, 2021, p. 3).

Economic and political pressures facing higher education have only added to those concerns related to accreditation. In a 2018 study, Gallup found that confidence in higher education has significantly decreased stemming from perceptions related to accessibility and rising cost (Markin, 2021). In fact, data show that from 2009 to 2020, total undergraduate enrollment decreased by 9%, from \$17.5 million to \$15.9 million (Irwin et al., 2022). Despite this decrease, between 2010 and 2020, outstanding federally-backed student loans more than doubled, from \$749.8 billion to \$1.56 trillion (Federal Student Aid, 2022). In addition to increased pressure brought on by declining enrollment, skyrocketing student debt, and inflationary costs, what has long been a common concern related to affordability and how best to ensure quality improvement has, like many other topics, turned increasingly political and partisan.

For example, the Gallup study cited above shows that between 2015 and 2018 a larger drop in confidence relating to higher education occurred among Republicans (from 57% to 39%) than among Democrats (from 68% to 62%; Jones, 2015). Likewise, a 2019 study by the Pew Charitable Trust revealed that partisanship significantly impacts Americans' perceptions of whether colleges and universities have a positive effect on “the ways things are going in the country” (Mitchel, 2022,

n.p.). Specifically, the study found the 12% increase between 2012 and 2019 in Americans with a negative view of higher education came almost exclusively from Republicans and independent-leaning Republicans, who went from 37% to 59% as opposed to the Democrats 68% to 62% (Mitchell, 2022).

Additional studies from the Pew Charitable Trust reveal that while 61% of Americans have doubts about the direction of higher education, their underlying reasons for concern underscore a large partisan divide. For example, 92% of Democrats are concerned with high tuition costs (compared to 77% of Republicans), and 56% are concerned about the students developing skills needed to succeed in the workplace (compared to 73% of Republicans). However, the largest disparities stem from ideological factors with 75% of Republicans pointing to “[university] attempts to protect students from views they might find offensive” (compared to 31% of Democrats) and “professors . . . bringing social and political views into the classroom” (compared to 17% of Democrats; Mitchell, 2022, n.p.). Taylor attributes this expanding partisan divide to “white rage about steps toward equity and concerns about public expenditures from economic elites” while also pointing to both a rise in unified Republican control of states, during the Obama Presidency, along with a decline in “white [student] overrepresentation” in higher education (Taylor, 2023, p. 4). In this regard, Taylor summarizes:

In the 2010s, many partisans on the right entered the fray not with ideas for improving higher education’s performance but with aims to rally their political base by colliding with higher education. This pattern is consistent with research by political scientist showing a Republican Party that is increasingly hostile to democratic processes, civic participation, and social institutions. (Taylor, 2023, p. 152)

Others have been more direct, pointing specifically to the impact of former President Donald Trump’s “anti-intellectualism and distrust of experts” (Douglass, 2021, p. 62) as he advanced his “right-wing populist movement” in the face of high-profile campus protests that were leveraged to portray all universities as “symbols of intolerant liberal activism” (Douglass, 2021, p. 89).

Despite these growing economic and political concerns regarding higher education, Congress has not undertaken any significant higher education or accreditation reform. The *Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA)*, which was scheduled for reauthorization in 2013, provides an opportunity for Congress to address modern bipartisan solutions for the underlying challenge facing higher education. However, instead of advancing legislative reform, legislatures are currently leveraging the partisan divide described above to further entrench voters’ partisan ideologies.

For example, in 2021, House Republicans created a Campus Free Speech Caucus and hosted an annual Free Speech Roundtable focusing on combating “woke” faculty and cancel culture (Geis, 2021). In March 2023, the Higher Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee, led by Congressional Republicans, held hearings on free speech on college campuses focusing on DEI initiatives and suggesting “the committee . . . explore possible legislative avenues to create the right incentives to remind universities of the trust we give them when we fund them through tax dollars” (Committee on Education and the Workforce., 2023). To that end, Senators Marco Rubio and Mike Lee have introduced legislation that would prevent private

accrediting agencies from developing or applying DEI standards to their member universities (Rubio, 2023). On the other hand, Democrats remain focused on addressing college debt and continue to push unfunded free-college initiative through bills like the *College for All Act* (Padilla, 2023).

Efforts by the Executive Branch, under Presidents Obama, Trump, and Biden have all attempted to fill the gap left by Congress. In 2019, the Trump-led ED advanced new administrative approaches to reform accreditation, which will be discussed further below. In March 2023, President Biden's ED followed suit announcing an upcoming round of negotiated rulemaking related specifically to accreditation (Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 2022). At the same time, state governments, led primarily by 2024 presidential hopefuls, have taken positions and promoted policies aimed at addressing the partisan concerns most important to their base (both inside and outside their states). As a result, a 2022 survey of college presidents shows that 79% of university presidents worry about "Republicans' increasing skepticism about higher education," and 78% agreed "the perception of colleges as places that are intolerant of conservatives views is having a major negative impact on attitudes about higher education," while only 22% agree that "Republican doubts about higher education are justified" (Jaschik & Lederman, 2022, n.p.).

Relying heavily on the foundation laid by Paul L. Gaston in 2014, this article begins with a brief historical context related to the accreditation of higher education in the United States before turning to current political challenges that have emerged since Gaston's writing. It then concludes by considering how higher education leaders should respond in light of Douglass' (2021) political determinist hypothesis.

Background and Context of Higher Education Accreditation

From State Oversight to Federal Gatekeeper

While states have historically provided oversight of state supported institutions of higher education and other private institutions operating in their territories and/or receiving government support, accreditation by an external association or agencies did not originally exist (Gaston, 2014). The U.S. Department of Education emerged in 1867 and began overseeing the provision of the Second *Morrill Act* in 1890, which provided federal support for land-grant institutions of higher education (Gaston, 2014). Around the same time, regional accrediting associations emerged with an eye toward "separating wheat from chaff" and facilitating the transfer of academic credits between those institutions (Gaston, 2014, p. 18). In other words, at the outset, accreditation of higher education emerged as a wholly voluntary process separate from federal requirements. Under this process, regional associations developed guidelines for accreditations related to institutional quality and established peer review processes for membership (Hegji, 2020).

The independent nature of accreditation changed in the early 1950s with the emergence of what has become known as the *gatekeeping* role for federal financial assistance programs. The *Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952* (also known as the Korea GI Bill) lacked adequate means to identify reputable accreditors so the U.S. Commissioner of Education turned to the existing federally recognized

accreditation associations (Hegji, 2020). The *National Defense of Education Act of 1958* formally adopted this approach by making funding contingent on the recipient attending an institution of higher education that was accredited by an agency or association recognized by the Commissioner (Hegji, 2020). Therefore, as Kelchen (2018) notes, “[a]lthough institutional accreditation remain[ed] optional in theory, it [became] essential for colleges’ survival” (p. 93).

Genuine Oversight

The *HEA* expanded access to education through new federal student aid programs available through Title IV of that act (Hegji, 2020). Again, this expansion further entrenched recognized accreditors as financial aid gatekeepers. Still, the *HEA* included few, if any, requirements regarding what it took to be an accrediting agency recognized by the ED (Hegji, 2020). In 1968, there was a notable rise in federal involvement in the accreditation process when the Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Advisory Committee was established, but “the federal government still had a great degree of latitude in determining the recognition process” (Kelchen, 2018, p. 105).

By 1988, the ED developed federal regulations related to criteria for recognition relating to “recruitment and admission practices; program length; and ‘success with respect to student achievement in relation to the [the school’s] mission,’ which could include consideration of course compilation, state licensing exams, and job placement rates” (Hegji, 2020). Therefore, from the beginning, regulations required accreditors to review how colleges and universities marketed to and enrolled their students, determined the length of academic programs, and ensured success outcomes relevant to their mission.

Still, it was not until the 1992 *Higher Education Act Amendment* (HEAA) that Congress established a process by which accrediting organizations were officially recognized by the ED, which to a large extent, codified the existing federal regulations (Hegji, 2020). Specifically, concerns regarding fraud and abuse stemming from the *proprietary sector* of higher education, which remain to this day, resulted in the federal laws applicable to all recognized accreditors (Hegji, 2020). Once again, the 1998 *HEA* reauthorization further expanded the criteria used to recognize accrediting agencies based on the rise and concerns relating to distance education (Hegji, 2020). The last *HEA* reauthorization (the *Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008*; [*HEOA*]) brought about additional requirements reflective of the global economic downturn and higher education’s concerns related to financial stability including (1) transparency of decision-making and due process requirements associations would use to bring adverse actions against schools, (2) teach-out plan requirements, and (3) public transfer-of-credit policies (Hegji, 2020).

Roles Within Modern Accreditation

Modern accreditation involves four primary players: the ED, the NACIQI, recognized institutional accreditors, and colleges and universities. In this regime, the ED is authorized to recognize or approve accreditors and maintains the list of those

accreditors (ED, 2023d). In other words, the ED does not directly accredit institutions of higher education. Instead, existing accreditors are recognized every five years following a review and recommendation for recognition by the ED's Accreditation Group staff and NACIQI, which is an advisory board established in 1992 but reconvened in 2010 following the 2008 *HEOA* reauthorization (ED, 2023c).

In addition to reviewing accreditors for recognition, NACIQI advises the ED Secretary regarding accreditation matters like the establishment and enforcement of criteria for recognition, certification under Title IV, the relationship between recognition and Title IV certification, and has released three policy reports in 2012, 2015, and 2018 (ED, 2023c; Hegji, 2020). NACIQI has 18 members who serve staggered six-year terms and meet no less than twice a year (Hegji, 2020). The ED Secretary, Speaker of the House, and President *Pro Tempore* of the Senate each appoint six advisory members with knowledge or expertise in higher education and/or who represent the higher education sector and various types of schools including public universities, private non-profit (including faith-based) university, for-profit universities, and community colleges (ED, 2023c). The appointments are made on a bipartisan basis with each party in the House and the Senate each submitting three appointees. A list of the current members of NACIQI is attached (see Appendix A).

Accrediting bodies are independent nonprofit entities that are sustained and controlled by member institutions and staffed by a relatively small number of accreditation professionals, who have prior experience as faculty, deans, provosts, and/or presidents in institutions of higher education. These staff members support a wide variety of volunteer boards and committees populated by current higher education administrators from member institutions. In short, the majority of the work and review of recognized accrediting bodies is done by representatives of current member institutions. This includes establishing and approving accrediting standards or principles (based on federal requirements and best practices); offsite and onsite peer-review processes; decision-making related to substantive changes, accreditation, and reaccreditation; and ongoing monitoring (ED, 2023c). In terms of peer reviews themselves, review committees are staffed by faculty and administrators from outside the state and typically come from the same sector in higher education as the institution under review. For example, a medium-sized, private, faith-based institution would usually be reviewed by an accreditation committee consisting of volunteer faculty and administrators from similar institutions in other states. At least one staff member from the accrediting body also participates in the review process.

In addition to faculty and administrators of member institutions, accrediting entity boards include public members from outside the academy. For example, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) 77-member board includes 11 public members from outside the academy representing each of the states that have historically included SACSCOC (2023). These public representatives are often a trustee or regents of an institution of higher education or elected representative in the state. While states themselves do not have formal roles related to accreditation, they often rely on institutional accreditations related to continued recognition or operation within the state.

Finally, accreditors require college and university presidents to identify one staff member at each institution as an *accreditation liaison*. These roles are typically filed

by a senior faculty member or administrator and may report directly to the president or provost. This role serves as the primary conduit between the accreditor and the institution by (1) staying up to date on accreditation requirements; (2) notifying the institution related to ensuring compliance with such requirements; (3) notifying accreditors of substantive changes and coordinating annual profiles and reports to the accreditors; (4) serving as a resource person during reaccreditation; and (5) maintaining university records related to accreditation.

Void of Updated Federal Regulations

No new federal laws have addressed accreditation since the 2008 *HEOA* reauthorization. In short, it has been a decade since the 2013 reauthorization deadline. Moreover, a review of proposed legislation over the last ten years reveals divergent solutions regarding what needs to be done to address accreditation. Not surprisingly, this divergence runs along party lines with Republicans focused on alternatives to current accreditation regimes, and Democrats focused on further outcome-based accountability of existing accreditors. This comparison also shows Republicans pushing for new innovative opportunities for career-related training and Democrats concerned about for-profit institutions and business partners not fulfilling their promises.

For example, in 2015 and 2017, then-Congressman Ron DeSantis (R-Florida) and Senator Tom Lee (R-Utah) proposed the *Higher Education Reform and Opportunity (HERO) Act*. In an article touting the bill entitled “Breaking Up the Higher-Ed Cartel”, DeSantis and Lee identified the ED, regional accreditors, and colleges and universities as a “bureaucratic iron triangle” and “a kind of education cartel that stifles new, innovative education models that could bring down the cost of acquiring the skills that are critical to securing the good jobs and achieving higher earning potential” (DeSantis & Lee, 2015, n.p.). On his website, Senator Lee further explains, “[t]he HERO Act would [change] the way schools are accredited. The *HERO Act* would enable each state to accredit any institution that provides post-secondary education. With this new accreditation power, states would be able to authorize innovative new education options (for example, massive online open courses, competency-based offerings, and certification exams) for students in any learning situation” (Lee, n.d., n.p.). Specifically, the bill proposes that the respective states would enter into alternate accreditation agreements with the Secretary of Education to create their own process for accreditation (Lee n.d.).

According to the *HERO Act* itself, however, a state’s department of education need not be the alternative accreditor. The agreement could instead identify, “another State agency, an industry-specific accrediting agency, or another entity, and an explanation of the process through which the State will select” (*HERO Act*, 2017a, n.p.). While the bill did not provide specific standards that these entities must meet to serve as accreditors, it did provide that the agreement between the state-selected entity and the ED Secretary should set out “[t]he standards or criteria that an institution that provides postsecondary education and a postsecondary education course or program must meet to become accredited” (*HERO Act*, 2017a, n.p.). In 2017, the bill garnered 77 co-sponsors in the House and one co-sponsor in the Senate:

Tim Scott (R - South Carolina), who recently dropped out of the 2024 Presidential race (*HERO Act*, 2017b, n.p.; *HERO Act*, 2017c, n.p.).

Similarly, the *Higher Education Innovation Act of 2022 (HEIA)*, which was a rare bi-partisan effort from Senators Rubio (R - Florida) and Bennet (D - Colorado), attempted to create *innovation authorizers*, an alternative system to recognized institutional accreditors (Bennet, 2022, n.p.). These *authorizers*, which could be any entity, would submit a proposal for a five-year pilot program with the ED that included performance metrics relating to student learning, completion, the benefit to the student, and affordability (*HEIA*, 2022a). So long as certain statutory thresholds were met related to the metrics, participants of “eligible entities” would be authorized to receive federal financial aid (*HEIA*, 2022a, n.p.). However, if they did not, innovation authorizers would pay the ED Secretary “an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount of federal student loans that are held by current and former students of any eligible entity authorized by the innovation authorizer . . . and that [were] in default each fiscal year” (*HEIA*, 2022a, n.p.). This bill received no additional co-sponsors (*HEIA*, 2022b, n.p.).

Bills proposed by Democrats focused on increased accountability and transparency of existing accreditors. Examples include the *Accreditation Reform and Enhanced Accountability Act of 2016 (AREAA)*, which was sponsored by U.S. Senators Elizabeth Warren (D - Massachusetts), Dick Durbin (D - Illinois) and Brian Schatz (D - Hawaii) and required ED to increase accountability and transparency by setting students success outcomes and thresholds, requiring public disclosure of accreditation documents, addressing conflicts of interest between accreditors and institutions, and allowing different levels of accreditation (e.g., accredited with distinction or accredited with risk; *AREAA*, 2016, n.p.). More recently, the *Accreditation Reform Act of 2020 (ARA)* was sponsored by three Democrats in the House (*ARA*, 2020). Specifically, it sought to: (1) increase the information ED considers in recognizing accreditors; (2) strengthen and expand the oversight of the NACIQI and require it to participate in on-site inspections and reviews of colleges and universities, and (3) make all final documents that are part of universities accreditation or reaccreditation processes publicly available (Trahan, 2020). The bill only attracted three additional sponsors (*ARA*, 2020.). Similarly, the *Quality Higher Education Act of 2021 (QHEA)* attempted to increase the objective criteria and outcomes on which accreditors measure schools and hold them accountable (Wilson, 2021). Specifically, if passed, the bill would have required accreditors to have schools identify one measure of student achievement related to completion, workforce preparation, and progress toward completion and participation standards as well as making those publicly available (*QHEA*, 2021a). Additionally, it also expanded the role of NACIQI to create benchmarks for accreditors by comparing their schools’ outcomes to measure accreditor effectiveness (*QHEA*, 2021a). The bill received thirteen co-sponsors (*QHEA*, 2021b).

In conclusion, while no new laws were enacted related to accreditation, it is important to note that the majority of the bills did not propose undermining the historical values of accreditation and higher education like voluntariness, shared governance, academic freedom, or external influence. Instead, most focused on ways

to balance innovation and accountability and relied on ED and NACIQI to provide oversight in one way or another.

Continued Criticism, Negotiated Rulemaking, and More Changes Ahead

Instead of new laws, recurring critiques of accreditation since the 2008 reauthorization have resulted in multiple rounds of negotiated rulemaking. In 2014, Gaston addressed several of these critical reports highlighting the reoccurring concerns. Since then, more reports have emerged from government and non-government sources calling for various reforms to higher education accreditation (see Appendix B). These more recent reports reflect several recurring recommendations:

- 1) *Regional Boundaries* - Move away from regionally-bound accrediting bodies to promote competition;
- 2) *Differentiated Review* - Risk-based and/or expedited review to allow accreditors to modify the reaccreditation process based on an institution's standing;
- 3) *Levels of Accreditation* - Move away from binary accreditation status by adopting levels or tiers of accreditation (with some suggesting modified access to federal student aid based on tiering);
- 4) *New Pathways* - New pathways to accreditation/Title IV eligibility for non-college providers (e.g., "independent authorizers");
- 5) *Credit Hour* - Striking the definition of the "credit hour;"
- 6) *Substantive Change* - Streamline and/or reduce requirements related to "substantive change;" and
- 7) *NACIQI* - Clarifying boundaries between ED and NACIQI to ensure NACIQI independence.

In response, the ED undertook its last round of negotiated rulemaking in 2019, which addressed several of the recommended changes highlighted above (Council of Higher Education Accreditation [CHEA], 2018). Specifically, the negotiated rulemaking made significant changes to accreditation regulations, which took effect in July 2021. Those changes include the following:

- 1) *End of Regional Boundaries* - Eliminated geography to determine an accreditor's scope of recognition;
- 2) *Student Achievement* - Increased expectations concerning student achievement through the collection and analysis of key data and indicators, including institution's or program's performance and measures of student achievement;
- 3) *Increased Flexibility* - Provided flexibility for accreditors to support innovation in higher education, recognizing that innovation has inherent risk, and monitoring the innovation carefully to intervene when student success is at risk;
- 4) *Innovation* - Open the door to student aid for non-institutional educational offerings from colleges and universities, including partnerships with alternative providers;
- 5) *Employer participation* - Encouraged employer participation in developing educational programs by clarifying that institutions may modify their

- curricula based on industry advisory board recommendations without relying on a traditional faculty-led decision-making process;
- 6) *Expedited Review* - Reduced the time and complexity associated with approving an accreditor's application for initial or renewal of recognition;
 - 7) *Credit Hour* - Provide flexibility to distance education, competency-based education (CBE), and other types of educational programs that emphasize demonstration of learning rather than seat time when measuring student outcomes; and
 - 8) *Substantive change* - Simplify substantive change provisions to require that fewer of these changes be reviewed (CHEA, 2019; ED, 2019).

In short, these changes largely reflect many of the concerns raised by earlier reports and address traditional underlying economic concerns related to innovation and accountability. However, these changes failed to address earlier concerns related to university governance and the role of NACIQI.

In 2019, SACSCOC as well as the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) issued warnings to the Universities of South Carolina and Alaska, respectively, stemming from their concerns regarding the governors of those states improperly asserting undue political interference on the university board (Lederman, 2019). In the first situation, SACSCOC was concerned that the governor, while an ex-officio member of the board, had improperly used that role to influence a divided board to hire Robert L. Calsen as president (Lederman, 2019). In Alaska, NWCCU issued a warning to the governor after he had allegedly offered to minimize the size of a cut to the university's budget if it reduced spending in certain areas (Lederman, 2019). As a result of these allegation and concerns, NACIQI commissioned a subcommittee to investigate and consider the "appropriate of accreditors in dealing with political influence at public universities" with some members concerned about the accreditors improperly interfering in "matters that are dictated by state law" and other members that support accreditors calling out "politicians who overstep their bounds" (Lederman, 2019, n.p.).

At its July 2020 meeting, the NACIQI Subcommittee on Governing Board Independence and Political Interference submitted its finding report (NACIQI, 2021). Oddly, while the subcommittee spoke to the multiple accreditation agencies and national organizations that support and advocate on behalf of university trustees, "scheduling or other reasons" prohibited them from hearing directly from governors or trustees (NACIQI, 2021, n.p.). The committee disagreed regarding "whether the evidence demonstrated that accreditors had overstepped the application of their standards" (NACIQI, 2021, n.p.). However, surprisingly, when discussing the role of accreditors as gatekeepers of Title IV funding, the subcommittee concluded:

the [Higher Education Act, which] allows accreditors to establish additional standards (including governance) beyond the statute and regulations, . . . specifically set out only 10 criteria for determination of Title IV funding. The Department has, in turn, ruled that it (and by extension NACIQI) has no authority to review or act on accreditor application of standards specifically outside the Act. The subcommittee discussed how best to resolve the tension between what is allowed and what is required . . . A majority of the subcommittee believes that the accreditor sanctions on governance come up rarely, that there was no

evidence presented in which accreditation was actually revoked based on the governance standard (or that standard alone), and that accreditors are allowed to include criteria for approval beyond the 10 mandated by the Act. These subcommittee members argue that there is no evidence that the threat of revocation of Title IV eligibility has constrained governing boards or institution ownership entities from acting as they wish. It is the majority sense of the subcommittee that the present legislative arrangement is necessary and important to preserve board independence. However, a minority of subcommittee members find it problematic that an agency could revoke or deny accreditation, and thus terminate access to Title IV, for reasons that the Department (and NACIQI) has no authority to review or oversee. These subcommittee members agree with testimony from a non-agency witness that this may *amount to unconstitutional delegation of governmental authority to private bodies*. These subcommittee members fear that the mere threat of revocation of Title IV eligibility might create a chilling effect on governing boards attempting to address challenging issues of cost and quality. There was general (but not unanimous) agreement that governance is often a gray zone where boards are not as fully independent as they may seem on paper (as in those aforementioned examples) and that accreditation agencies need to recognize that reality and wade into those waters in a measured and careful way. A minority of subcommittee members believe that governance for public institutions is established by state law and that accreditor intrusion in these matters is inappropriate and outside the proper purview of accreditors in their role as Title IV gatekeepers (NACIQI, 2021, emphasis added).

In other words, because the undue external influence standards, which have been established by the recognized institutional accreditors, are not part of the statutorily prescribed gatekeeper function, ED (and NACIQI) do not have legal authority to review the accreditor's application of the standard (see Appendix C). However, those accreditor-established standards could still be used to deny accreditation and terminate Title IV funds. The majority finds consolation that there is no evidence that accreditation has ever been revoked based on this standard alone. However, the question remains with regard to what happens when states consistently violated these non-statutory accreditation requirements related to non-government standards like governance, academic freedom, and shared governance? In light of the rise of state regulations appearing to violate these standards, as discussed further below, this seems to deserve the further consideration of both institutional leaders and federal lawmakers.

On March 23, 2023, the ED announced another round of negotiated rulemaking related to the ED's recognition of accrediting agencies (CHEA, 2023). While the specifics related to the rulemaking agenda are still unknown, it is suspected that it is related to oversight of colleges and universities by both states and accreditors following the end of regional boundaries and rise of state regulations (Knott, 2023).

Discussions are also currently underway regarding the possible reauthorization of the HEOA under the leadership of former faculty member and college community president Representative Virginia Foxx (R - North Carolina). Still, progress seems unlikely based on the partisan divide focused on ever-increasing divide regarding the

purpose and function of higher education. In the past, solutions that addressed both innovations along with accountability and oversight might have been able to find support. In other words, policy solution addressing both of these long-held priorities seemed possible.

However, as the following case study indicates, states like Florida are increasingly contributing to the partisan polemic surrounding higher education and accreditation has a major focus of these efforts. As opposed to raising questions related to how new laws might create room for alternative innovations while ensuring appropriate accountability, Republicans in these states are attacking fundamental principles of higher education accreditation like voluntariness, shared governance, academic freedom, and external influence. The following case studies consider how these approaches are making it more difficult to develop federal solutions. In short, the following case studies seems to indicate that by attempting to undercut the underlying principles of higher education as opposed to bridging the innovation and accountability divide, states, largely for partisan political reasons, appear to be moving accreditation (and higher education) in the wrong direction.

THE RISE OF STATE REGULATIONS AND ITS IMPACT ON ACCREDITATION (AND HIGHER EDUCATION)

In the recent book, *Neo-Nationalism and Universities: Populist, Autocrats, and the Future Higher Education*, edited by Douglass (2021), chapter authors examine “the rise of neo-nationalism and its impact on the missions, activities, behaviors, and productivity of . . . universities” across the globe (n.p.). According to Douglass (2021), neo-nationalism is a “radical form of populism with specific characteristics, including protagonists leveraging the politics of fear to attack and blame perceived enemies . . . wrapped in the mantle of patriotism” (p. 17). With each chapter focusing on a different county, the book explores “the role of national politics and norms in shaping the role of universities in nation-states, . . . and . . . ways in which universities are societal leaders or followers” (Douglass, 2021, p. xvii).

Based on these studies, Douglass advances a hypothesis he calls the *political determinist* view, which suggest that because of deep connection between universities and the modern nation-state, “the national political environment, past and present, is perhaps the most powerful influence on the mission, role, and effectiveness of universities . . . more than internally derived academic cultures, labor market demands, or the desires of students” and “largely . . . determine the internal organization and academic culture of universities” (p. 23). Moreover, “[t]he consequence [for failing to act as societal leaders in the face of increasing neo-nationalism] is increasing government control of university governance and management” (McLeMee, 2021). Therefore, by establishing this political determinist view, Douglass (2021) asks “When are universities societal leaders, and when are they followers - reinforcing the existing political order?” (p. 32).

Whereas Douglass and his fellow contributors consider this political determinist view using international case studies, concluding that most institutions are followers, this paper considers this hypothesis in the context of a state: Florida. Specifically, using the political determinist view in reviewing states’ attempts can inform higher

education leaders not only as they guide their institutions but proactively engage in accreditation reformation at the federal, state, and agency level. Moreover, if Florida's efforts are not recognized for what they are, it is possible that it and other states will continue to not only derail accreditation policy but continue to deinstitutionalize higher education as a whole.

Political Determinism

Douglass (2021) proposes the following escalating tiers from the basic role (Tier I) to highest order (Tier IV) to determine whether universities are political followers or leaders in their societies (see Table 1):

Table 1: Escalating Tiers (Douglass, 2021, p. 40)

Tiers	Variables
I	1) Educating a talented labor force and citizenry 2) Technological innovation and economic development 3) Preserving the study of art, history, and culture
II	4) Socioeconomic mobility 5) Global engagement
III	6) Public service engagement 7) Research related to societal problems
IV	8) Critical analysis of society

As opposed to these positive variables of social leadership, Douglass (2021) also points to factors reflective of institutions as political followers, which include: (1) a lack of academic culture openly critical of political leaders; (2) few protections related to academic freedom; (3) conclusions that discussion of significant social and even many scientific problems reflect poorly on the existing political regime. Douglass concludes by averring that whether universities are followers or leaders is the proverbial canary in a coal mine as it relates to the political trajectory of a nation noting that “[t]heir governance and management structure, including the level of autonomy and legal authority for management of their affairs offer a glimpse . . . into the political priorities and the fears and opportunities perceived by . . . leaders and government” (p. 42).

Taylor (2023) refers to this undermining of the societal role of higher education as “deinstitutionalization” that “compromises institutional independence [giving] colleges and universities . . . less latitude to pursue their missions [and results in] campus leaders . . . prioritiz[ing] compliance with political demands over the educational mission” (Taylor, 2023, n.p.). However, unlike Douglass, Taylor suggests that campus leaders have primarily evoked *partial defenses* to these efforts based on higher education's extrinsic contributions such as economic growth or

workforce development outcomes and should instead replace them with “a more robust defense of higher education’s intrinsic value and core purposes” (Taylor, 2022, p. 151).

Douglass’ tiers do not ask leaders to choose one approach or the other but recognize a progression that seems to build from extrinsic to intrinsic. Specifically, it is interesting to note how these tiered leadership factors balance both long-standing, mainstream goals related to invitations and results (e.g., labor force outcomes, technological innovation, economic development, and socioeconomic mobility), as well as what higher education leaders and insiders might point to as missional aspirations. These variables are not an either-or proposition but can serve as a road map to understanding how institutions of higher education can serve as societal leaders by meeting a variety of important functions. In short, the variables do not reflect partisan goals, but recognize the common good served through institutions of higher education. With that in mind, the following case study considers a current context where partisan effort at the state level are seeking to undermine traditional values of higher education accreditation.

Florida

Recent actions by Florida are raising accreditor concerns related to bedrock academic principles of academic freedom, shared governance, improper influence, voluntariness. In one example, SACSCOC followed up on news reports that three political science faculty members at the University of Florida had originally been barred from serving as expert witnesses in a lawsuit brought against the state of Florida related to the removal absentee ballots being racially discriminatory (Ellis, 2021). In a statement entitled, University Statement on Academic Freedom and Free Speech, the university attempted to clarify that it did not bar the faculty members’ rights, but “denied requests of these full-time employees to undertake outside paid work that is averse to the university’s interests as a state of Florida institution,” despite the fact the faculty had undertaken such work previously when the testimony did not relate to allegations against the state (Ellis, 2021, n.p.). After the situation resulted in negative attention from the media and SACSCOC, the university president allowed the faculty to testify, however, this also allegedly served to fuel Florida’s eventual break with SACSCOC discussed below.

Still, since then, more direct threats to traditional faculty oversight of the curriculum and academic freedom have emerged with regard to the New College of Florida. Specifically, since Governor DeSantis’ recent appointment of several new board members at the school, the Board has reportedly sought to overhaul the school’s curriculum in violation of accreditation standards that require faculty to have responsibility for directing the learning enterprise (Rosenburg, 2023). Finally, Florida’s *Individual Freedom Act*, also known as the Stop *WOKE Act*, which is currently blocked by a federal judge, turned academic freedom, another key tenant of accreditation, on its head by banning “professors from expressing disfavored views in the classroom while permitting unfettered expression of the opposite viewpoints” (Rosenburg, 2023, n.p.) In striking down the law in regard to college faculty, the court concludes, “Defendants argue that, under this Act, professors enjoy ‘academic

freedom’ so long as they express only those viewpoints of which the State approves. This is positively dystopian” (Rosenburg, 2023, n.p.).

As noted above, by 2020, negotiated rulemaking brought an end to historical geographic requirement of *regional accreditation*, which appeared to allow institutions to choose between any accreditor the ED recognized as an *institutional* accreditor. Then, in 2021, a conflict arose related to who would be selected as the next president of Florida State University (FSU). Richard Cochran, a former Republican speaker of the Florida House of Representatives and Governor Ron DeSantis’s appointed head of Florida’s Commission of Education, was being considered for the position (Ceballos, 2022). Concerns arose based on Cochran’s role as on the State University System’s Board of Governors, the body charged with choosing the president, as well as his qualifications to serve as president. Specifically, both his alleged lack of qualifications and the conflict of interest related to his role on the hiring board raised concerns for the university’s accreditor about the potential violation of existing accreditation standards (Wheelan, 2021). In fact, public coverage of this possible hire resulted in a warning letter from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC; Wheelan, 2021). Specifically, the letter warned that if unresolved, FSU’s accreditation could be jeopardized (Wheelan, 2021). As a result, Cochran did not move forward, but the Florida legislature passed a new bill in March 2022 requiring all public colleges and universities in the state to regularly change its institutional accreditor. Specifically, the law provides:

A public postsecondary institution may not be accredited by the same accrediting agency or association for consecutive accreditation cycles. In the year following reaffirmation or fifth-year review by its accrediting agencies or associations, each public postsecondary institution must seek and obtain accreditation from an accrediting agency or association identified by the Board of Governors or State Board of Education, respectively, before its next reaffirmation or fifth-year review date. (*FL Senate Bill 7044*, 2020, n.p.).

In short, the new law all but required all public institutions in Florida to find a new accreditor. Based on the evaluation of the State Board of Education, Florida institutions must now apply for accreditation with one of the following institutional accreditors instead of SACSCOC: Higher Learning Commission, Middle States Commission on Higher Education, or the Northwestern Commission on Colleges and Universities (Florida Department of Education, n.d.) If refused by the above accreditors, schools can remain with SACSCOC only if all other ED recognized institutional accreditors deny them accreditation (Florida Department of Education, n.d.). In regard to this change, the Florida Department of Education concluded,

the reaffirmation or reaccreditation process with SACSCOC has become rote; a process primarily viewed as ‘a box that must be checked.’ The opportunity for improved efficiency, greater flexibility, and educational innovation is great. Our colleges and universities are excited to leverage, finally, the opportunity afforded to them by the 2020 USED regulatory changes. (Florida Department of Education, n.d., n.p.)

Despite this alleged excitement, when asked for comment related to this and other changes that Florida has made or is in the process of making related to revamping

college and universities in their state, none of the 40 presidents representing public institutions were willing to make a public statement, even when guaranteed anonymity (Moody, 2023).

In response to the new Florida law, the ED's Office of Student Financial Aid released a Dear Colleague Letter in July 2022 reminding institutions that it must have reasonable cause to change its accrediting agency and such changes must receive prior approval from the ED (Office of Student Financial Aid, 2022). According to that guidance, reasonable cause asks whether the change (1) would strengthen institutional quality, (2) allow institutions to fall under new standards more closely aligned with the institution's mission, and (3) is voluntary (Office of Student Financial Aid, 2002). In a letter written to institutional accreditors the same day, the ED focused on whether changes based on Florida's law were voluntary: "Florida law . . . requires public institutions in Florida to seek new accrediting agencies, which potentially undermines the voluntary nature of the relationship and the independent roles of the various actors" (Office of Post-Secondary Accreditation, n.d., n.p.).

According to a June 2023 lawsuit filed by the State of Florida against officials at the U.S. ED (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023), some Florida institutions began seeking approval from the DOE to switch from SACSCOC to the Higher Learning Commission, another institutional accreditor, in early 2023. In response, ED requested documentation related to communication between schools and Florida and questions about voluntariness: "Absent the mandatory language requiring a change of accreditors, would [your institution] seek an alternative accrediting agency? Please explain." (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023). While these requests were pending, Florida filed suit claiming institutional accreditation was unconstitutional because it violates "private non-delegation doctrine," which prohibits private entities from exercising government power without sufficient government oversight (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023). Specifically, remanence of concerns previously raised by some NACIQI members, Florida argues that the DOE cannot delegate the power to set and apply Title IV eligibility standards to accreditors, which "have the power to hold billions in federal education dollars hostage based on the formulation and application of substantive education standards that are immune from meaningful government supervision" (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023, p. 16). Florida also advanced claims related to the Constitution's appointment and spending clauses and the federal Administrative Procedure Act (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023).

According to the ED's Motion to Dismiss, which was filed in September 2023, it has approved two of the seven Florida institutions that have applied for permission to change accreditors after receiving the requested sufficient information for those two institutions (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023). In regard to the merits of the case, the ED asks the court to dismiss the case with regard to the "private non-delegation" doctrine claiming that accreditors do not actually exercise the power of the federal government but simply rely on their expertise to determine where students can spend federal dollars (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023, n.p.). In this regard, ED argues that when institutions voluntarily meet eligibility standards to accept student dollars, it does not transform those standards into federal regulations (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023). In other words, they

contend that being motivated to meet standards to gain the benefit of accepted federal funds do not transform those standards to legally binding rules (*State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al.*, 2023).

In response to the lawsuit, the President of the United Faculties of Florida, Florida's union for professors at public institutions, said:

I think it's telling, and it should be telling to anyone observing this lawsuit, that not a single faculty member, student, member of administration, donor supporter, nobody in the higher education community in Florida was asking for this. What this fundamentally comes down to is [the] Governor . . . wants to have unilateral authority to control what does and does not get taught in higher education classrooms across Florida. One of the most significant barriers to the kind of authoritarian control is higher education accreditation. (Greenfield, 2023, n.p.)

Societal Leaders or Political Followers?

In regard to whether the institutions in Florida are acting as societal leaders or following political orders, while a few faculty senates and groups like the United Faculties for Florida have questions or pushed back against the changes, the lack of response from institution leaders reflects that it is the latter (Moody, 2022). More specifically, these responses reflect almost directly what Douglass (2021) identifies as signs of political determinism: the institution's unwillingness to be openly critical of political leaders or stand up for protections related to academic freedom. Additionally, recent attacks on faculty testifying against efforts to reduce ballot access as well as diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts in many states reflect the conclusions that discussion of significant social problems are not welcomed when they reflect poorly on the existing political regime. As a result, institutions, especially those in Florida, are left as an involuntary pawn in state efforts to use higher education “a proxy for a broader culture war issue, aimed to leverage his policies for a White House run” (Moody, 2023).

Still, in order to emerge as societal leaders in this highly partisan context, institutional leaders (and those within higher education) must recognize that the opposite of political determinism is not a free will that is simply liberated to choose what it wants and avoid accountability. Again, Douglass' variables are helpful in this regard. For example, to qualify as the highest order of societal leader, institutions must not only address extrinsic goals or effectiveness outcomes related to economic growth and socioeconomic mobility but reemphasize universities' intrinsic purposes connected to public engagement and addressing societal problems through critical analysis. However, it is important to understand that such engagement and analysis is not only externally focused but should be applied internally to institutions of higher education. In other words, to qualify as a societal leader, institutions must be willing to research and analyze themselves. In the past, institutions have accomplished this in part through accreditation. In that regard, accreditation, though continual refinement, can adapt to new economic challenges and provides opportunities to lead (as opposed to simply respond). This requires institutions to adopt standards that require objectives goals and measures, increased transparency, and similar methods have been suggested in the past (see Appendix B).

At the same time, institutional leaders can work to undercut their partisan critics by upholding important higher education's principles like academic freedom, free speech, and encouraging the discussion of important social issues. In other words, political determinism is weakened when internally derived academic culture do not favor partisan voices or perspectives. For this reason, as state legislatures continue to pass new laws related to devise concepts, institutional leaders must double down on protecting open and honest debates and academic inquiry related to any topic of study on their campuses and avoid anything that would weaken historic academic protections.

In this regard, one such leader encouraged institutions to “reimagine student encounters on campus and infuse debate into campus programming” (Daniels et al., 2021, p. 244). Specifically, in *What Universities Owe Democracy*, John Hopkins University President Ronald Daniels encourages universities to move past simply diversifying student bodies to proactively “consider how students engage with one another after they arrive ... not by policing student's behavior after the fact, but modeling what healthy debate looks like as part of the educational function (p. 244).” More recently, other institutional leaders at elite colleges have responded to on-campus controversy by developing thoughtful and public defenses to academic freedom and free speech (at Stanford), refusing to include trigger warnings in university syllabi (Cornell), and creating faculty councils on academic freedom “devoted to free inquiry, intellectual diversity, and civil discourse” (at Harvard; French, 2023, n.p.). In short, institutional leaders should not allow any one group to claim exclusive right to nor undercut these long-held academic principles.

Implications for Accreditation

Accreditation has long provided institutions with opportunities that attempt to address both the extrinsic and intrinsic goals of higher education. Unfortunately, many no longer view accreditation as an opportunity to advance higher education, but a necessary act of compliance. What started as a voluntary effort to measure quality has largely been overshadowed by a requirement to maintain and justify federal financial support. In this regard, institutional leaders should consider how the tiered approach outlined by Douglass (2021) could serve as a common language and approach in addressing accreditation reform. In other words, could the graduated tiers of societal leadership, which incorporated both an extrinsic and intrinsic approach, provide a new way forward? For example, the following revised and simplified version of the Douglass' (2021) tiers should be considered as a possible reframing that could establish levels of accreditation (see Table 2).

Table 2: Douglass' (2021) Reframing of Accreditation

Accreditation Tier	Standards
I	1) Educating a talented labor force and citizenry 2) Providing opportunities for socioeconomic mobility
II	3) Preserving the study of art, history, and culture 4) Engaging and serving publicly and globally
III	5) Critical analyzing society 6) Improving society through research and innovation

The specific federally required recognition factors (see Appendix C) could be reconsidered in light of these standard as well allowing societal leadership to be a guiding principle for all institutions while also recognizing that universities and college might strive to achieve different tiers based on their own mission and goals. Moreover, to be eligible for base levels of financial aid through Title IV, all institutions would need to be accredited as Tier I institutions ensuring the economic considerations and objective factors were guiding investment of federal funds. This would also allow for other types of institutions to serve as Tier 1 institutions.

Therefore, under this framework, accreditors can ensure all institutions are offering programs that provide students with the skills and knowledge needed to succeed in today's workforce. This can involve partnerships with industry leaders, as well as the integration of cutting-edge technology and methodologies into coursework. Additionally, this assumes that all institutions should be educating students not only as future workers, but citizens, ensuring that the partisan concerns are addressed head on by ensuring free speech and academic freedom is the norm on all campuses.

In terms of more advanced tiers, institutional leaders can continue to prioritize the preservation and promotion of the arts and humanities through their accreditation policies. They can ensure that programs in these areas are well-funded and that they encourage students to engage with their communities and explore diverse cultural perspectives. Furthermore, institutional leaders can move beyond more narrow concepts of civic engagement to consider issue related to global citizenship by encouraging international collaborations and exchanges, as well as by ensuring that their accreditation policies prioritize (as opposed to avoid) diversity, equity, and inclusion. As universities advance to the final tier, leaders can encourage critical thinking and analysis among their students and faculty. They can ensure that accreditation policies prioritize research that addresses pressing societal challenges and encourages innovation that benefits society as a whole. Additionally, leaders can advocate for policies that promote collaboration between academia, industry, and government, and that support the translation of research findings into practical applications that improve people's lives. In this way, institutional leaders can to act

as societal leaders by incorporating intrinsic and extrinsic values in higher education accreditation.

Limitations and Future Research

A single, but important, case study like this one is somewhat limited in scope. Therefore, future research should consider other state-based case studies and institutional responses in light of the political determinist analysis. For example, the members of the Texas legislature recently proposed new legislation that would establish a Texas Higher Education Accreditation Commission (Middleton & Creighton, 2023). This commission would be directly accountable to the governor and task with ranking existing ED-recognized accreditors as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or exemplary based on their average educational and labor marking outcomes for all the schools they accredit as well as “whether accreditor takes or considers taking action that would hinder or interfere with authority of the institution’s governing board and institution’s accountability to the legislature” (Middleton & Creighton, 2023). The governor, lieutenant governor, and speaker of the house would each appoint three commissioners, six of whom must be an employer or representative of an association of employers in a target occupations field, as determined by the Texas Workforce Commission (Middleton & Creighton, 2023). Accreditors ranked as unsatisfactory could not serve as an accreditor for public institutions, while institutions could stay with satisfactory accreditors for up to fifteen years and exemplary accreditors indefinitely (Middleton & Creighton, 2023). While the bill did not pass, it shows that Florida is not the only state worth studying. Moreover, future studies might revisit not only single states but the nation as a whole to continually measure this hypothesis in light of new federal laws, rules, and leaders.

CONCLUSION

With another round of negotiated ruling pending and opportunity to make progress on the reauthorization of the HEA, federal lawmakers and ED officials will have many decisions to make. Do they continue to prioritize the historical efforts related to incremental improvements of quality, innovation, and accountability or do they allow the current partisan divide to overshadow opportunities for progress? At the same time, how can institutional leaders push back against the deinstitutionalization of higher education by considering models that allow universities to emerge as societal leaders? In answering these questions, Douglass’ (2021) tiered variables provide a solid foundation for both institutional leaders and lawmakers to consider. Specifically, how can accreditation change to move higher education up those tiers and blunt populist attacks? Instead of staying silent, leaders must start addressing these populist challenges head on by continuing the work of improving quality, accessibility, accountability, and innovation in higher education and promoting a shared vision for the good higher education can do for all regardless of political affiliation.

REFERENCES

- Accreditation Reform and Enhanced Accountability Act of 2016, S.B.3380-114th Congress (2016-2017). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/3380/text>
- Accreditation Reform Act of 2020, H.R.5768-116th Congress (2019-2020). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/5768/cosponsors>
- American Council of Education. (2015). *Recalibrating regulation of colleges and universities: Report of the task force on Federal regulation of higher education*. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Higher-Education-Regulations-Task-Force-Report.pdf>
- Ceballos, A. (2022, February 4). Florida House takes aim at college accreditation process. *Tampa Bay Times*. <https://www.tampabay.com/news/florida-politics/2022/02/03/florida-house-takes-aim-at-college-accreditation-process/>
- College for All Act of 2021, H.R.2750-117th Congress (2021-2022). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/2730>
- Council of Higher Education Accreditation. (2018, October 16). *USDE announces negotiated rulemaking for accreditation and Innovation and other issues*. CHEA.org. <https://www.chea.org/usde-announces-negotiated-rulemaking-accreditation-and-innovation-and-other-issues>
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2019, May 3). *Position paper: appropriate accountability for accreditation and federal policy*. CHEA. <https://www.chea.org/position-paper-appropriate-accountability-accreditation-and-federal-policy>
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2019, November 8). *A review of U.S. Department of Education Final Accreditation Regulations*. CHEA. <https://www.chea.org/review-us-department-education-final-accreditation-regulations>
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2023, March 28). *USDE announces public hearings on Higher Education rulemaking including accreditation*. CHEA. <https://www.chea.org/usde-announces-public-hearings-higher-education-rulemaking-including-accreditation>
- Daniels, R. J., Shreve, G., & Spector, P. (2021). *What universities owe democracy*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DeSantis, R., & Lee, M. (2015, July 24). Break up the higher-ed cartel. *National Review*. <https://www.nationalreview.com/2015/03/break-higher-ed-cartel/>
- Douglass, J. A. (Ed.). (2021). *Neo-nationalism and universities: Populists, autocrats, and the future of Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ellis, L. (2022, October 20). U. of Florida's accreditor will investigate denial of professors' voting-rights testimony. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/u-of-floridas-accreditor-will-investigate-denial-of-professors-voting-rights-testimony?>
- Federal Student Aid. (2022). *Federal Student Aid portfolio summary*. <https://studentaid.gov/data-center/student/portfolio>
- FL Postsecondary Education. S.B. 7044. 2022. <https://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2022/7044>

- French, D. (2023, April 16). The moral center is fighting back on elite college campuses. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/16/opinion/free-speech-campus-universities-promising-news.html>
- Geis, K. (2021, June 14). *Reps. Jim Jordan and Kat Cammack launch Congressional campus free speech caucus with Young America's foundation*. Young America's Foundation. <https://www.yaf.org/news/rebs-jim-jordan-and-kat-cammack-launch-congressional-campus-free-speech-caucus-with-young-americas-foundation/>
- Gillen, A. (2020, April). *The case for escape hatches from higher education accreditation*. Texas Public Policy Council. <https://www.texaspolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Gillen-Escape-Hatches-from-Higher-Education-Accreditation.pdf>
- Government Accountability Office, Higher Education, Expert Views of U.S. accreditation 1–77 (2017). Author.
- Greenfield, N. (2023, July 18). Accreditation experts fire back on Florida HEA lawsuit. University World News. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20230718205255735>
- Committee on Education & the Workforce. (2023, March 30). *Hearing recap: Free speech on Campus edition*. <https://edworkforce.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=409026>
- Hegji, A., (2020). An overview of accreditation of higher education in the United States. *Congressional Research Service*. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R43826/10>
- Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance Act of 1965 (1965). 20 U.S.C., ch. 28 §101 et seq. <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title20-chapter28&edition=prelim>
- Higher Education Amendments of 1992 S.1150 102nd congress (1992). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/102nd-congress/senate-bill/1150/titles>
- Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1998 P.L.110-315 110th congress (1998). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED524343>
- Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 P.L. 110-315 (2008). <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea08/index.html>
- Higher Education Innovation Act of 2022 S.4106 117th Congress (2021-2022a). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/4106?s=1&r=43>
- Higher Education Innovation Act of 2021, S.R.4106 117th Congress (2021-2022b). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/4106/cosponsors>
- Higher Education Reform and Opportunity Act of 2017 H.R. 4274 115th Congress (2017-2018a). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/4274/all-actions?s=1&r=83&overview=closed>
- Higher Education Reform and Opportunity Act of 2017, H.R.4274-115th Congress (2017-2018b). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/4274/cosponsors>
- Higher Education Reform and Opportunity Act of 2017, S.R.2228-115th Congress (2017-2018c). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/2228/cosponsors>

- Irwin, V., De La Rosa, J., Wang, K., Hein, S., Zhang, J., Burr, R., Roberts, A., Barner, A., Bullock Mann, F., Dilig, R., and Parker, S. (2022). *Report on the condition of education 2022* (NCES 2022-144). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2022144>
- Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (Eds.). (2022). 2022 Survey of college and university presidents. *Inside Higher Ed.* <https://www.insidehighered.com/booklet/2022-survey-college-and-university-presidents>
- Jones, J. M. (2021, September 16). Confidence in higher education down since 2015. *Gallup.com.* <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/242441/confidence-higher-education-down-2015.aspx>
- Kelchen, R. (2017, September). Higher education accreditation and the Federal Government. *Urban Institute.* <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/93306/higher-education-accreditation-and-the-federal-government.pdf>
- Kelchen, R. (2018). *Higher education accountability.* Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Knott, K. (2023, January 6). Education Department outlines 'ambitious' regulatory agenda. *Inside HigherEd.* <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/01/06/education-department-outlines-ambitious-regulatory-agenda>
- Lederman, D. (2023, August 2). Accreditors, states and political influence. *Inside Higher Ed.* <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/08/02/federal-accreditation-panel-will-look-political-interference-state-universities>
- Lee, M. (n.d.) *Higher education reform.* <https://www.lee.senate.gov/higher-education-reform-and-college-opportunity>
- Liptak, A. (2023, February 28). Supreme Court appears skeptical of Biden's student loan forgiveness plan. *The New York Times.* <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/28/us/politics/student-loan-supreme-court-biden.html>
- Marken, S. (2021, November 20). A crisis in confidence in higher ed. *Gallup.* <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/248492/crisis-confidence-higher.aspx>
- McLeMee, S. (2021, October 1). 'Neo-nationalism and universities.' Interview with John Aubrey Douglass on 'Neo-nationalism and universities: Populists, autocrats, and the future of higher education'. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/10/01/interview-john-aubrey-douglass-neo-nationalism-and-universities-populists-autocrats>
- Middleton, M., & Creighton, B. (2023). An act relating to the accreditation of public institutions of higher education. (SB 2335). *Texas Senate.* <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/Text.aspx?LegSess=88R&Bill=SB2335>
- Michael Bennet. (n.d.). *Higher education innovation act of 2022 senators Michael Bennet (D-CO).* Author. <https://www.bennet.senate.gov/public/cache/files/7/5/750bdeb1-7de2-408f-9445-af9a1916d125/5CAD9891271EFBE77CF0B7BF8199F45F.one-pager---higher-education-innovation-act-of-2022---april-2022.pdf>

- Mitchell, T. (2022, April 1). *The growing partisan divide in views of higher education*. Pew Research Center's Social & Demographic Trends Project. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2019/08/19/the-growing-partisan-divide-in-views-of-higher-education-2/#fn-26534-1>
- Moody, J. (2022, December 14). Florida seeks new accreditors. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/12/14/florida-seeks-new-accreditors>
- Moody, J. (2023, March 8). The tale of three governors. *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/03/08/three-governors-are-driving-gops-higher-ed-agenda>
- Moody, J. (2023, March 23). Florida's college presidents stay silent on major reforms. *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/03/31/floridas-college-presidents-stay-silent-major-reforms>
- Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890, 7 U.S.C. 13 §301 et seq. (1890).
- National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (2015). *Higher Education Act reauthorization: 2015 accreditation policy recommendation*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. <https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/files/naciqi-dir/2015-spring/naciqi-finalpolrecom-jul222015.pdf>.
- National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity. (2018). *2018 Accreditation policy recommendations on regulatory reform*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. <https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/files/2018/02/Regulatory-Reform-Recommendations-FINAL.pdf>
- National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity. (2020). *Report of the NACIQI subcommittee on governing board independence and political*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. <https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/files/2020/08/NACIQI-Governance-Subcommittee-Report.docx>.
- National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI). (2021). *Report of the NACIQI Subcommittee on Governing Board Independence and Political Interference*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/files/2021/12/21-0373.report_NACIQI_FY2021.pdf
- National Defense of Education Act of 1958, 20 U.S.C. 401 et seq. (1958). <https://www.loc.gov/item/uscode1958-004020017/>
- Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. (2022). *Accreditation and related issues*. Author. <https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eAgendaViewRule?pubId=202210&RIN=1840-AD82>
- Office of Post-Secondary Accreditation. (2022, July 19). *Letter to Institutional Accrediting Agencies*. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/letter-to-institutional-accreditors.pdf>
- Office of Student Federal Aid. (2022, July 19). *(GEN-22-10) Guidance for institutions seeking to change or add accrediting agencies*. Department of Education. <https://fsapartners.ed.gov/knowledge-center/library/dear-colleague-letters/2022-07-19/guidance-institutions-seeking-change-or-add-accrediting-agencies>

- Padilla, A. (2023, June 16). Padilla, Sanders introduce bill to make college tuition- and debt-free for working families. <https://www.padilla.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/padilla-sanders-introduce-bill-to-make-college-tuition-and-debt-free-for-working-families/>
- Patel, V. (2023, January 8). A lecturer showed a painting of the Prophet Muhammad. she lost her job. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/08/us/hamline-university-islam-prophet-muhammad.html>
- Quality Higher Education Act of 2021, H.R.5103-117th Congress (2021-2022a). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5103/summary>
- Quality Higher Education Act of 2021, H.R.5103-117th Congress (2021-2022b). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5103/cosponsors>
- Rosenberg, B. (2023, February 13). Should the 'new' New College lose its accreditation? *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2023/02/13/florida-colleges-have-no-right-accreditation-opinion>
- Rubio, M. (2023, June). Colleagues introduce *Fairness in Higher Education Act*. <https://www.rubio.senate.gov/rubio-colleagues-introduce-fairness-in-higher-education-accreditation-act/>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2023, January 25). *Board of Trustees*. <https://sacscoc.org/about-sacscoc/board-of-trustees/>
- State of Florida v. Miguel Cardona et al. case no. 0:2023cv61188 (S.D. Florida 2023).
- Taylor, B. J. (2023, February 13). Is Florida "wrecked"? *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2023/02/13/whats-happening-florida-unprecedented-opinion>
- Taylor, B. J. (2022). *Wrecked: Deinstitutionalization and partial defenses in state higher education policy*. Rutgers University Press.
- The Individual Freedom Act, HB7 (2022). <https://www.flsenate.gov/Committees/BillSummaries/2022/html/2809>
- The United States Government. (2022, August 24). *Fact sheet: President Biden announces student loan relief for borrowers who need it most*. The White House. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/08/24/fact-sheet-president-biden-announces-student-loan-relief-for-borrowers-who-need-it-most/>
- Trahan, L. (2020, February 6). *Representatives Trahan, Dean, and Hayes introduce the Accreditation Reform Act*. U.S. Representative Lori Trahan. <https://trahan.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=1370>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *Fact sheets*. <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/reg/hearulemaking/2018/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2021) *Annual report to the Secretary of Education and Congress: Fiscal Year 2021*. https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/files/2021/12/21-0373.report_NACIQI_FY2021.pdf
- U.S. Department of Education (2023a). *Greater transparency of accrediting agency recognition*. <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/greater-transparency-in-accreditor-recognition.pdf>

- U.S. Department of Education. (2023b). *College accreditation in the United States: Overview of accreditation in the United States*. <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html#Overview>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2023c). *College accreditation in the United States: History and context of accreditation in the United States*. https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation_pg2.html#U.S.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2023d). *College accreditation in the United States: Institutional accrediting agencies*. https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation_pg3.html#RegionalInstitutional
- U.S. Department of Education (2023e). *Accreditation and eligibility requirements for distance Education*. <https://fsapartners.ed.gov/knowledge-center/library/dear-colleague-letters/2023-05-18/accreditation-and-eligibility-requirements-distance-education>
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Bios*. National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity. <https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/bios/>
- Veterans Employment Emphasis Under Federal Contracts Act 38 U.S.C. §4212 (1952). <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/38/4212>
- Wheelan, B. S. (2021, May 31). *Belle S. Wheelan to Sydney Kitson*. <https://www.scribd.com/document/508024434/SACS-Letter-to-Sydney-Kitson>
- Wilson reintroduces the Quality Higher Education Act*. Congresswoman Frederica Wilson. (2021, August 25). https://wilson.house.gov/news/document_single.aspx?DocumentID=1010

APPENDIX A - CURRENT MEMBERS OF NACIQI

Appointed by ED Secretary

- Wallace E. Boston, Ph.D., President Emeritus, American Public University System, Inc. Charles Town, West Virginia. Appointed by Secretary Betsy DeVos.
- Keith Curry, Ed.D., President/CEO, Compton College, Compton, California. Appointed by Secretary Miguel Cardona.
- David A. Eubanks, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina. Appointed by Secretary Betsy DeVos.
- Molly E. Hall-Martin, Ph.D., Director, W-SARA, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), Boulder, Colorado. Appointed by Secretary Miguel Cardona.
- D. Michael Lindsay, Ph.D., President, Taylor University, Upland, Indiana. Appointed by Secretary Betsy DeVos.
- Mary Ellen Petrisko, Ph.D., Former President, WASC Senior College and University Commission, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Appointed by Secretary Betsy DeVos.

Appointed by House

- Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, Ed.D., Strategic Advisor, Fundraiser, and Consultant, New York, New York, San Francisco, California, and Boston, Massachusetts. Appointed by Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi.
- Roslyn Clark Artis, Ed.D., President, Benedict College, Columbia, South Carolina. Appointed by Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi.
- Jennifer Blum, J.D., Principal, Blum Higher Education Advising, PLLC, Washington, DC. Appointed by Congressman Kevin McCarthy.
- Arthur E. Keiser, Ph.D., Chancellor, Keiser University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Appointed by Congressman Kevin McCarthy.
- Robert Mayes, Jr., CEO, Columbia Southern Education Group, Elberta, Alabama. Appointed by Congressman Kevin McCarthy.
- Robert Shireman, Director of Higher Education Excellence and Senior Fellow, The Century Foundation, Berkeley, California. Appointed by Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi.

Appointed by Senate

- Debbie Cochrane, Bureau Chief, California Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education, Alameda, California. Appointed by Senator Chuck Schumer.
- Zakiya Smith Ellis, Ed.D., Principal, Education Counsel, Atlanta, Georgia. Appointed by Senator Chuck Schumer.
- Michael Poliakoff, Ph.D., President, American Council of Trustees and Alumni, Washington, DC. Appointed by Senator Mitch McConnell.
- Claude O. Pressnell Jr., Ed.D., President, Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association, Nashville, Tennessee. Appointed by Senator Mitch McConnell.
- José Luis Cruz Rivera, Ph.D., President, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona. Appointed by Senator Chuck Schumer.

APPENDIX B – CALLS FOR REFORMS TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

Title (Year) Organization	Summary of Suggestions Changes
Recalibrating Regulation of Colleges and Universities (2015) Bi-Partisan Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education	1) Provide unequivocal authority to accreditors for differentiated review 2) Strike the definition of “credit hour” 3) Limit the kinds of “substantive changes” that would require approval by accreditors 4) Limit “additional procedures” to only those cases where there are substantive changes or when branch campuses are up for accreditation review

- 5) Remove requirement for ED approval of change of accreditor for institutions not under sanction
- 6) Prohibit ED from requiring accreditors to review compliance with Title IV Program Participation Agreement
- 7) Change the resolution to allow accreditors to share information with institutions related to ED investigations except as it relates to criminal investigation
- 8) Clear boundaries should be established between ED and NACIQI to prevent micromanagement of NACIQI's activities by the Department
(American Council of Education, 2015).

Higher Education
Accreditation
Concepts and
Proposals (2015)

- 1) Repeal regulations and statutes unrelated to direct institutional quality and improvements (e.g., student verification for online programs, facilities maintenance plans, redundant Title IV eligibility compliance).

Senator Lamar
Alexander
Committee on Health,
Education, Labor &
Pensions

- 2) Permit flexibility and nuance in accreditation reviews (e.g., risk-adjusted or differentiated review for superior versus struggling institutions)
- 3) Encourage graduation, distinction, and clarity in accreditation status and review (e.g., move from binary pass/fail system to accredited with levels from meets the standard to exceeds standards and accreditors voluntarily release documents related to internal review)
- 4) Delink accreditation from institutional eligibility for federal student aid (e.g., tying reaccreditation to federal financial aid (1) creates disincentives for accreditors and their member schools to hold their peers accountable for anything but financial deficiencies and (2) allows accreditors too much authority and judgment over institutional autonomy and governance).
- 5) Establishing new pathways to accreditation and/or Title IV eligibility for non-college providers (e.g., current accreditors with approve nontraditional education providers and/or recognize alternative accrediting through states and for-profit entities)
- 6) Eliminate the geographic structure of regional accrediting agencies (e.g., inject market forces into accreditation selection to break up "regional monopolies" and create competition arguing that

“agencies will quickly stratify, with the toughest agencies attracting the best colleges and universities”)

- 7) Ensure NACIQI independence (e.g., limit any expansion of Secretary's authority in recognition decisions and hire NACIQI staff separate from ED staff to assist with the recognition process and recommendations).

(Alexander, 2015)

Report to the U.S.
Secretary of Education
(2015)

National Advisory
Committee on
Institutional Quality
and Integrity

- 1) Encourage accreditation agencies to develop common definitions of accreditation actions and terms procedures, timelines, and process (i.e., electronic)

- 2) Re-focus NACIQI reviews to direct greater attention to assessing the role of an accrediting agency in assessing the health and well-being and the quality of institutions of higher education, rather than on technical compliance with the criteria for recognition.

- 3) Grant accrediting agencies greater authority to develop standards tailored to institutional mission; to create different substantive tiers of accreditation; and to use different processes for different types of institutions, including expedited processes

- 4) Establish that the recognition review process differentiates among accrediting agencies based on risk or need with some identified as requiring greater levels of attention, and others lesser

- 5) Make accreditation reports about institutions available to the public.

- 6) Afford institutions the widest possible array of choice of accreditor for access to Title IV funds, including all place-based accreditors. Encourage place-based accreditation agencies to expand their scope. Provide greater flexibility for institutions to re-align themselves along sector, institution-type, or other appropriate lines. Allow for alternative accrediting organizations.

- 7) Establish less burdensome access to Title IV funding for high-quality, low-risk institutions.

- 8) Before eligibility for Title IV, require institutions to provide audited data on key metrics of access, cost and student success. These metrics would be in a consistent format across institutions, and easy for

students and the public to access.

9) Reconstitute the NACIQI as a committee with terminal decision-making authority and a staff. This will establish NACIQI as the final decision-making authority on accrediting agency recognition. In addition, ensure that the staff recommendation is provided to the NACIQI for its consideration and that the NACIQI decision will be the singular final action communicated to the senior Department official.

10) Establish that the NACIQI and the Education Secretary and other Department officials meet periodically for mutual briefings and discussions, including policy issues, and resulting in policy recommendations.

11) Establish that the NACIQI, itself, timely disseminates its reports to the Department and to the appropriate Congressional committees.

(NACIQI, 2015)

Higher Education:
Expert Views on U.S.
Accreditation (2017)

1) Modify oversight roles and responsibilities (e.g., reduce overlap and duplication of oversight between ED and states; repeal the statutory prohibition against ED setting and enforcing achievement standards)

Government
Accounting Office

2) Strengthening communication and transparency (e.g., improved communication between states and ED related to struggling schools, making accreditation information publicly available).

3) Using academic quality measures and expanding options (e.g., using student outcomes to measure schools' academic quality, risks-based or differentiated accreditation status, and corresponding aid eligibility)

4) Changing the structure of the accreditation system by establishing (a) "independent authorizers," (b) third party entities to set standards and thresholds for student outcomes and having ED conduct a review of those in good standing, (c) a Higher Education Quality Assurance Commission to coordinate with accrediting agencies instead of ED, or (d) a congressionally chartered accreditation governance entity that would take place of ED and accreditors. (Government Accounting Office, 2018)

Report to the U.S.
Secretary of Education
(2018)

1) The Committee recommends that the Secretary request enabling legislative language be drafted which allows accreditors to create and implement risk-informed

National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity	<p>reviews.</p> <p>2) Grant accrediting agencies greater authority to develop standards tailored to institutional mission; to create different substantive tiers of accreditation; and to use different processes for different types of institutions, including expedited processes.</p> <p>3) Strike the definition of “credit hour.” Education Department has, through regulation, created a federal definition of “credit hour.” It represents an inappropriate intrusion into the academic process. It also discourages the use of innovative models for measuring learning that are not tied to seat time.</p> <p>4) Allow accreditors to waive certain types of “substantive change procedures” that would require approval by accreditors for high-performing institutions. Established institutions should have the flexibility to make changes necessary to address their needs and those of their students.</p> <p>5) Re-focus NACIQI reviews to direct greater attention to assessing the role of an accrediting agency in assessing the health and well-being and the quality of institutions of higher education, rather than on technical compliance with the criteria for recognition. These reviews should be supported by staff analysis that focuses on the effectiveness of the accrediting agency in performing its work, rather than technical compliance.</p> <p>6) Draft legislative language which will support ongoing adjustments to NACIQI’s work to accommodate this newly developing risk-informed procedures and consider ways in which it might be implemented for institutional, programmatic, and specialized accrediting agencies within the advisory capacity of the Committee.</p> <p>(NACIQI, 2018)</p>
Appropriate Accountability for Accreditation and Federal Policy (2019)	<p>1) Rethink the requirements for the extent of experience in order to become a recognized accreditor</p> <p>2) Streamline what is considered “substantive change” for an institution or program in order that fewer changes are subject to this process</p> <p>3) Remove the definition of credit hour</p>
Council on Higher Education Accreditation	<p>4) Eliminate the requirement for confidentiality such that accreditors cannot inform institutions of investigations</p> <p>5) Eliminate requirement for common definitions and terms</p> <p>6) Remove USDE final oversight in posting accreditor</p>

actions and decision letters

- 7) Eliminate USDE oversight of differentiated review
 - 8) Retain the right for statutory right for an accrediting agency to set, with the involvement of its members, and to apply, accreditation standards for or to institutions or programs that seek review by the agency or association and for an institution to develop and use institutional standards to show its success with respect to student achievement, which achievement may be considered as part of any accreditation review.
 - 9) Oppose federal intrusion into academic leadership, institutional mission peer review or academic freedom.
 - 10) Rethink the role of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, including the creation of an alternative committee structure and operation
 - 11) Further revise Negotiated Rulemaking to assure that it is routinely a balanced, transparent and consultative process
 - 12) Require consultation with academics and accreditors for Dear Colleague Letters and Guidance Letters and clarify their role in federal oversight of accreditation.
- (CHEA, 2019)

The Case for the
Escape Hatches from
Higher Education
Accreditation
(2020)

- 1) Move away from binary accreditation (e.g., tiered accreditation system with corresponding levels of federal funding to wind down institutions that fail to improve)
 - 2) Increase competition among accreditors (e.g., states and other new entities as accreditors)
 - 3) Provide federal student aid for programs that meet certain outcome threshold without the need of accreditation (e.g., using third-party certification exams (i.e., standardized tests) for college and labor market outcomes (i.e., rate of return or increase in median earnings)
- (Gillen, 2020)

Texas Public Policy

APPENDIX C – RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITING AGENCY OR ASSOCIATION

20 U.S. Code § 1099b - Recognition of Accrediting Agency or Association

- (A) No accrediting agency or association may be determined by the Secretary to be a reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered for the

purposes of this chapter or for other Federal purposes, unless the agency or association meets criteria established by the Secretary pursuant to this section. The Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, establish criteria for such determinations. Such criteria shall include an appropriate measure or measures of student achievement. Such criteria shall require that

...

(5) the standards for accreditation of the agency or association assess the institution's:

- (A) success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution's mission, which may include different standards for different institutions or programs, as established by the institution, including, as appropriate, consideration of State licensing examinations, consideration of course completion, and job placement rates;
- (B) curricula;
- (C) faculty;
- (D) facilities, equipment, and supplies;
- (E) fiscal and administrative capacity as appropriate to the specified scale of operations;
- (F) student support services;
- (G) recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading and advertising;
- (H) measures of program length and the objectives of the degrees or credentials offered;
- (I) record of student complaints received by, or available to, the agency or association; and
- (J) record of compliance with its program responsibilities under this subchapter based on the most recent student loan default rate data provided by the Secretary, the results of financial or compliance audits, program reviews, and such other information as the Secretary may provide to the agency or association.

CHRIS M. RILEY, J.D., M.P.A. is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Abilene Christian University (Texas) as well as an instructor in ACU's Higher Education Master's Program. He teaches courses on higher educational law, public administration, and constitutional law. He also serves as the university's Liaison to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Email: chris.riley@acu.edu

