Maj. Gen. Gregg F. Martin  
President  
National Defense University  
Bldg 62 - Marshall Hall  
Fort McNair, DC 20319-5066

Dear General Martin:

At its session on June 28, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 3 (Institutional Resources) and Standard 5 (Administration). To note that the institution remains accredited while on warning. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2013, documenting (1) a comprehensive technology acquisition, replacement, and operations plan, including provision for current and future technology needs and with qualified staffing for the office of technology, as appropriate to the institution's complexity, educational programs, and support services (Standards 3 and 5). To further request that the monitoring report provide evidence of the implementation of (2) goals and objectives that are clearly linked to the institution's new mission (Standard 2); (3) a multi-year budgeting process aligned with the institution's new goals and objectives (Standard 3); and (4) the use of assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation (Standard 7). To direct a prompt liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission's expectations. The due date for the next Periodic Review Report will be established when accreditation is reaffirmed.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Statement of Accreditation Status for your institution. The Statement of Accreditation Status (SAS) provides important basic information about the institution and its affiliation with the Commission, and it is made available to the public in the Directory of Members and Candidates on the Commission's website at www.msche.org. Accreditation applies to the institution as detailed in the SAS; institutional information is derived from data provided by the institution through annual reporting and from Commission actions. If any of the institutional information is incorrect, please contact the Commission as soon as possible.

A Public Disclosure Statement will also be developed, consistent with the Commission's policy on Public Communication in the Accrediting Process. The statement provides an explanation of the nature of the institutional accreditation action that has been taken by the Commission. The Public Disclosure Statement will accompany the institution's Statement of Accreditation Status and will be made available on the Middle States Commission on Higher Education web site. It will also be provided on request to inquiring individuals. It is expected that the Public Disclosure Statement will be complete and posted within 30 days. A draft of the statement will be provided for institutional factual review prior to finalization.

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education accredits institutions of higher education in Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other locations abroad.
Please check to ensure that published references to your institution's accredited status (catalog, other publications, web page) include the full name, address, and telephone number of the accrediting agency. Further guidance is provided in the Commission's policy statement Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status. If the action for your institution includes preparation of a progress report, monitoring report or supplemental report, please see our policy statement on Follow-up Reports and Visits. Both policies can be obtained from our website.

Please be assured of the continuing interest of the Commission on Higher Education in the well-being of National Defense University. If any further clarification is needed regarding the SAS or other items in this letter, please feel free to contact Dr. Debra G. Klinman, Vice President.

Sincerely,

R. Barbara Gitenstein, Ph.D.
Chair
STATEMENT OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
Bldg. 62 - Marshall Hall
Fort McNair, DC 20319-5066
Phone: (202) 685-4700; Fax: (202) 685-3935
www.ndu.edu

Chief Executive Officer: Maj. Gen. Gregg F. Martin, President

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Enrollment (Headcount): 1898 Graduate
Control: Public
Affiliation: Federal
Carnegie Classification: Special Focus - Other Special-Focus Institutions
Degrees Offered: Postbaccalaureate Certificate, Master's;
Distance Education: Yes (approved for the following program(s): Master of Science in Government Information Leader)

Accreditors Approved by U.S. Secretary of Education: n/a

Other Accreditors: PAJE--Process for Accreditation of Joint Education a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the Department of Defense through the Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff Senior Acquisition Course is accredited by the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Information Assurance is accredited by the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security as a Center of Academic Excellence.

Instructional Locations

Branch Campuses: Joint Forces Staff College, Norfolk, VA.

Additional Locations: John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School Bank Hall, Fort Bragg, NC.

Other Instructional Sites: None

ACCREDITATION INFORMATION

Status: Member since 1997
Last Reaffirmed: November 15, 2007

Most Recent Commission Action:

June 28, 2012: To warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with
Standard 3 (Institutional Resources) and Standard 5 (Administration). To note that the institution remains accredited while on warning. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2013, documenting (1) a comprehensive technology acquisition, replacement, and operations plan, including provision for current and future technology needs and with qualified staffing for the office of technology, as appropriate to the institution’s complexity, educational programs, and support services (Standards 3 and 5). To further request that the monitoring report provide evidence of the implementation of (2) goals and objectives that are clearly linked to the institution’s new mission (Standard 2); (3) a multi-year budgeting process aligned with the institution’s new goals and objectives (Standard 3); and (4) the use of assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation (Standard 7). To direct a prompt liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission’s expectations. The due date for the next Periodic Review Report will be established when accreditation is reaffirmed.

**Brief History Since Last Comprehensive Evaluation:**

**November 15, 2007:** To accept the Periodic Review Report and reaffirm accreditation. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2011-12.

**September 1, 2010:** To acknowledge receipt of the substantive change request. To include the following additional location provisionally within the scope of the institution’s accreditation, pending a site visit to the location within six months of commencing operations: John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School Bank Hall, 2175 Reilly Road Stop A, Fort Bragg, NC 28310-5000. The Commission requires written notification within 30 days of the commencement of operations at each additional location. The Commission notes that approval extends for one calendar year from the date of this action. In the event that operations at the additional location do not commence within this time frame, approval will lapse. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2011-12.

**September 1, 2010:** To acknowledge receipt of the substantive change request. To include the online Government Information Leaser Master of Science degree program within the scope of the institution’s accreditation. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2011-12.

**March 3, 2011:** To note the visit by the Commission’s representative and to affirm inclusion of the additional location at John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School Bank Hall, 2175 Reilly Road Stop A, Fort Bragg, NC 28310-5000 within the scope of the institution’s accreditation. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2011-2012.

**Next Self-Study Evaluation:** n/a

**Next Periodic Review Report:** n/a

**Date Printed:** June 29, 2012
DEFINITIONS

Branch Campus - A location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. The location is independent if the location: offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential; has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and has its own budgetary and hiring authority.

Additional Location - A location, other than a branch campus, that is geographically apart from the main campus and at which the institution offers at least 50 percent of an educational program. ANYA ("Approved but Not Yet Active") indicates that the location is included within the scope of accreditation but has not yet begun to offer courses. This designation is removed after the Commission receives notification that courses have begun at this location.

Other Instructional Sites - A location, other than a branch campus or additional location, at which the institution offers one or more courses for credit.

Distance Education Programs - Yes or No indicates whether or not the institution has been approved to offer one or more degree or certificate/diploma programs for which students could meet 50% or more of their requirements by taking distance education courses.

EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

An institution's accreditation continues unless it is explicitly suspended or removed. In addition to reviewing the institution's accreditation status at least every 5 years, actions are taken for substantive changes (such as a new degree or geographic site, or a change of ownership) or when other events occur that require review for continued compliance. Any type of report or visit required by the Commission is reviewed and voted on by the Commission after it is completed.

In increasing order of seriousness, a report by an institution to the Commission may be accepted, acknowledged, or rejected.

Levels of Actions:

Grant or Re-Affirm Accreditation without follow-up

Defer a decision on initial accreditation: The institution shows promise but the evaluation team has identified issues of concern and recommends that the institution be given a specified time period to address those concerns.

Postpone a decision on (reaffirmation of) accreditation: The Commission has determined that there is insufficient information to substantiate institutional compliance with one or more standards.

Continue accreditation: A delay of up to one year may be granted to ensure a current and accurate representation of the institution or in the event of circumstances beyond the institution’s control (natural disaster, U.S. State Department travel warnings, etc.)

Recommendations to be addressed in the next Periodic Review Report: Suggestions for improvement are given, but no follow-up is needed for compliance.

Supplemental Information Report: This is required when a decision is postponed and are intended only to allow the institution to provide further information, not to give the institution time to formulate plans or initiate remedial action.

Progress report: The Commission needs assurance that the institution is carrying out activities that were planned or were being implemented at the time of a report or on-site visit.

Monitoring report: There is a potential for the institution to become non-compliant with MSCHB standards; issues are more complex or more numerous; or issues require a substantive, detailed report. A visit may or may not be required.
**Warning:** The Commission acts to Warn an institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy when the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and a follow-up report, called a monitoring report, is required to demonstrate that the institution has made appropriate improvements to bring itself into compliance. Warning indicates that the Commission believes that, although the institution is out of compliance, the institution has the capacity to make appropriate improvements within a reasonable period of time and the institution has the capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

**Probation:** The Commission places an institution on Probation when, in the Commission’s judgment, the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and that the non-compliance is sufficiently serious, extensive, or acute that it raises concern about one or more of the following:

1. the adequacy of the education provided by the institution;
2. the institution’s capacity to make appropriate improvements in a timely fashion; or
3. the institution’s capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

Probation is often, but need not always be, preceded by an action of Warning or Postponement. If the Commission had previously postponed a decision or placed the institution on Warning, the Commission may place the institution on Probation if it determines that the institution has failed to address satisfactorily the Commission’s concerns in the prior action of postponement or warning regarding compliance with Commission standards. This action is accompanied by a request for a monitoring report, and a special visit follows. Probation may, but need not always, precede an action of Show Cause.

**Suspend accreditation:** Accreditation has been Continued for one year and an appropriate evaluation is not possible. This is a procedural action that would result in Removal of Accreditation if accreditation cannot be reaffirmed within the period of suspension.

**Show cause why the institution's accreditation should not be removed:** The institution is required to present its case for accreditation by means of a substantive report and/or an on-site evaluation. A "Public Disclosure Statement" is issued by the Commission.

**Remove accreditation.** If the institution appeals this action, its accreditation remains in effect until the appeal is completed.

Other actions are described in the Commission policy, "Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation."
Public Disclosure Statement

National Defense University

June 29, 2012

By the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

This statement has been developed for use in responding to public inquiries, consistent with the Commission’s policies on Public Communication in the Accrediting Process, Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation, and Standardized Language for Commission Actions on Accreditation. It should be read in conjunction with the Statement of Accreditation Status for National Defense University, a copy of which is attached. The policies listed above explain what information the Commission makes public regarding its member institutions and what information remains confidential, describe the various accreditation actions the Commission can take, and define the terms used in the Commission’s actions.

National Defense University, located at Fort McNair in Washington, DC, is a public, special focus institution. It has been accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1997. National Defense University offers programs leading to Master’s degrees as well as Post-Baccalaureate certificates. A full listing of the institution’s additional locations is noted in the Statement of Accreditation Status. A summary of the most recent Commission actions relative to the institution’s accreditation follows.

Current Accreditation Status

On June 28, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted to Warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 3 (Institutional Resources) and Standard 5 (Administration). The full text of the Commission’s action is provided below. The Commission’s accreditation standards are available online at http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011 WEB.pdf.

National Defense University remains accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education while on Warning.

The Commission places an institution on Warning when, in the Commission’s judgment, the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission accreditation standards. When the Commission warns an institution, it believes that, although the institution is out of compliance, the institution has the capacity both to make appropriate improvements within a reasonable period and to sustain itself in the long term. A follow-up report, called a monitoring report, is required to demonstrate that the institution has made appropriate improvements to bring itself
into compliance. A small team visit also is conducted to verify institutional status and progress.

**Summary of Recent Commission Actions**

At least every ten years, all accredited institutions engage in an 18-24 month period of self-study intended to demonstrate institutional compliance with accreditation standards and to promote institutional improvement. National Defense University completed its self-study process and hosted an evaluation team visit during 2011-12. Following the on-site visit, the evaluation team submitted its report to National Defense University and the institution prepared its institutional response. The institutional response is an opportunity for the institution to provide a thoughtful written response to the team report including disagreements with and/or interpretations of evaluation team findings. These prepared materials were considered by the Committee on Evaluation Reports and by the Commission at their June 2012 meetings.

On June 28, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted as follows:

To Warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 3 (Institutional Resources) and Standard 5 (Administration). To note that the institution remains accredited while on Warning. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2013, documenting (1) a comprehensive technology acquisition, replacement, and operations plan, including provision for current and future technology needs and with qualified staffing for the office of technology, as appropriate to the institution's complexity, educational programs, and support services (Standards 3 and 5). To further request that the monitoring report provide evidence of the implementation of (2) goals and objectives that are clearly linked to the institution's new mission (Standard 2); (3) a multi-year budgeting process aligned with the institution's new goals and objectives (Standard 3); and (4) the use of assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation (Standard 7). To direct a prompt liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission's expectations. The due date for the next Periodic Review Report will be established when accreditation is reaffirmed.

**Current Status and Expected Activities**

*National Defense University remains accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education while on Warning.*

Following submission of a monitoring report on September 1, 2013, the Commission will conduct a small team visit to assess the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s standards. Following the on-site visit, a report by the visiting team will be completed. The monitoring report, the small team report and the institutional response to the small team report will be considered by the Committee on Follow-Up Activities, and then by the Commission at its November 2013 meeting.

At its November 2013 session, the Commission will take further action, in accordance with the Commission’s policy, *Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation* (available at
http://www.msche.org/documents/P7A-2_RangeofActions091611.pdf). If the Commission determines that progress sufficient to demonstrate compliance with its accreditation standards has not been made, the Commission may take further action as allowed under the Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation.

**For More Information**

The following resources provide additional information that may be helpful in understanding the Commission’s actions and National Defense University’s accreditation status:

*Statement of Accreditation Status* for National Defense University (http://www.msche.org/institutions_directory.asp) provides factual information about National Defense University and the full text of the Commission’s recent actions regarding the institution.

*Media Backgrounder* (http://www.msche.org/documents/Media%20Backgrounder%202012.doc) answers questions about accreditation such as “What is accreditation?” and “What is the Middle States Commission on Higher Education?”

*Informing the Public about Accreditation* (www.chea.org/public_info/index.asp), published by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, provides additional information on the nature and value of accreditation.