March 8, 2023

President
Palm Beach Academy of Health & Beauty
1220A 10th Street
Lake Park, Florida 33403

Dear [Name]:

At the February 2023 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (“ACCSC” or “the Commission”) considered the December 2, 2021 complaint submitted by [Complainant] against Palm Beach Academy of Health & Beauty (“PBAHB”) and PBAHB’s Admissions Report. Upon review of the Commission’s November 16, 2022 Continued Warning letter and the school’s response, the Commission voted to place PBAHB on Probation with a subsequent review scheduled for ACCSC’s August 2023 meeting. Additionally, the Commission reviewed the school’s response to the November 16, 2022 Admission Report and voted to continue PBAHB on Admissions Reporting. The reasons for the Commission’s decisions are set forth below.

PROBATION ORDER

Complaint Review History

ACCSC received a complaint submitted by [Complainant] dated December 2, 2021 against PBAHB located in Lake Park, Florida. The complaint alleges that PBAHB may not be in compliance with the Commission’s standards in the areas of instructional materials and equipment, and advertising/promotion. The school was directed to submit documentation to the Commission to demonstrate compliance in the aforementioned areas. The school was required to submit a narrative response to [Complainant] allegations, a copy of any complaints filed with the school, a complete list of all training/instructional aids for the complainant’s cohort, a copy of the policy and procedures to ensure recruitment personnel do not make misleading statements regarding the school’s personnel and faculty, a record of the most recent recruitment training, a description of any remedy offered to [Complainant] and the status of any such offer, and any other supporting documentation.

In response to the Commission’s initial December 29, 2021 letter, the school provided two responses dated February 3, 2022 and February 6, 2022. ACCSC determined the responses appeared to be missing the requested list of textbooks and publication dates for the Hemodialysis Technician program, as well as documentation regarding the sufficiency of the equipment. Furthermore, additional information was required regarding faculty qualifications, the roles and responsibilities of staff in the area of recruitment, and the school’s complaint policy and procedure. As a result of the school’s February 3, 2022 and February 6, 2022 responses, ACCSC determined that additional information was necessary pertaining to the following areas: instructional materials, equipment, recruitment, faculty qualifications, and student complaints.

In response to the Commission’s February 14, 2022 additional information request, the school’s March 1, 2022 response notes that [Name] was currently on a leave of absence and awaiting an externship placement without providing further explanation of the school’s process and procedure for ensuring that [Name] would be able to secure an externship. Additionally, the school provided the applicable roles and responsibilities of the admissions personnel, the requested student satisfaction surveys, faculty personnel report, the complaint policy, and an explanation of the school’s adherence to its complaint procedure, an
explanation of the sufficiency of the textbooks, materials, and equipment, and an attestation of the student’s receipt of the program materials. The school’s February 3, 2022, February 6, 2022, and March 1, 2022 responses were forwarded to the Commission for review at the May 2022 Commission meeting.

At the May 2022 Commission meeting, the Commission considered the aforementioned responses. The Commission found that school’s responses did provide an explanation pertaining to the complainant’s allegations and documentation in response to the Commission’s requests for information. However, in reviewing the submitted documentation regarding the school’s assistance to secure an externship site for the complainant, the Commission was concerned with the school’s ability to ensure students secure externships in a timely manner as well as the school’s use of its leave of absence policy when a required externship could not be arranged by the school. The Commission noted that the student’s transcript recorded her enrollment status as leave of absence, however, the explanation provided, only states that: “[t]he school understands the progress [student] has completed her theory courses and is awaiting to attend her externship component” (February 27, 2022 PBAHB response, p. 5), without further explanation as to why the school executed a leave of absence. The Commission expressed concern with the extensive time between the student’s last date of attendance of September 9, 2021 and the student’s current status awaiting an externship site. This left the Commission questioning the school’s effectiveness in securing externship sites for its students, the procedure for updating students of this progress, and whether or not the school is continuing to enroll students in programs that require an externship component when such externships are difficult to obtain.

Additionally, although the school noted it “took substantial measures to address the concerns of [complainant]” (February 27, 2022 PBAHB response, p. 6), the Commission noted that the school did not provide sufficient documentation showing a resolution with respect to the student’s complaint. The response contains email correspondence dated November 2, 2021 between the school administrators noting all the complainant’s concerns, but only addressed the externship component in subsequent emails. In addition, the school provided an email dated January 18, 2022 informing the complainant that her concerns would be investigated further, with the complainant’s response to the school indicating communication should be addressed to her attorney. The school’s response does not provide an explanation of the process and procedure that occurred during the time between these email correspondences to rectify the concerns, an update regarding the status of the investigation, nor an explanation of the complainant’s response referring to potential legal action.

The Commission also noted the school did not provide sufficient evidence and explanation that the program materials and equipment are sufficient for the student population or a narrative response demonstrating the program textbook is sufficiently comprehensive and reflects the current occupational knowledge and practice. Specifically, the Commission required justification that the instructional material reflects the current occupational knowledge, but the school did not provide any justification of the textbook. The school also provided minutes from the Program Advisory Committee to demonstrate the equipment and materials are sufficient for the number of students in the Hemodialysis Technician program. However, the Commission found that the documentation did not show either a) a meaningful review by the PAC of the school’s programs and supporting resources and materials or b) a comprehensive and clear description of the review and commentary made by the school representatives and the PAC members (Appendix III – Program Requirements, Standards of Accreditation).

Upon review of the Commission’s prior directives and the school’s responses, the Commission voted to direct PBAHB to submit additional information in the areas of instructional materials, externships, advertising, faculty qualifications, student complaints, and leaves of absence to demonstrate the school’s compliance with accrediting standards to be reviewed at the August 2022 Commission meeting.
August 2022 Meeting Review and Action

At the August 2022 Commission meeting, the Commission reviewed the May 17, 2022 ACCSC letter and PBAHB’s response, which led to further questions and concerns regarding PBAHB’s operations in the areas of externships, leaves of absence, and facilities. Firstly, the Commission had questioned the school’s execution of the externship components of its programs. In response to the Commission’s request for specific policies and/or procedures regarding a student’s inability to secure an externship placement, PBAHB stated:

In the past, [PBAHB’s] practice was to place students on a Leave of Absence when an externship site was unavailable. This was not a formal policy, but an ad hoc attempt to deal with the unusual situation precipitated partly by the Covid-19 pandemic, and short-term inability to send students to clinical externship sites. The institution recognizes that this was an error, and has revised the practice… (July 15, 2022 PBAHB response, p. 6).

Although the school provided the new policy, the Commission questioned whether the school in fact implemented the policy because the documentation provided had not been fully executed with a date and signature.

Additionally, in the May 17, 2022 letter the Commission requested the status of enrolling students in programs that require an externship component. Of the three programs requiring externships, there is no active externship site for the Patient Care Technician program, while the Hemodialysis Technician program continues to have only one active site. The Commission expressed concern that the school is enrolling students in the Patient Care Technician program without having sufficient active externship sites and without an established timeline as to when such externship sites could be acquired. The Commission also questioned the viability of the externship site for the Hemodialysis Technician program as well as the school’s plan to remain attentive to the three enrolled students who are on a leave of absence given the following response:

Based on the revised curriculum for the Hemodialysis Technician program which requires 40 hours of clinical experience, the one site should be adequate. However, the Clinical Coordinator is in the process of identifying additional hemodialysis sites and the goal is to have a minimum of two sites under contract by the end of July 2022 (Id., p. 8).

The school’s response states that the externship site for the Hemodialysis Technician program declined to accept students from PBAHB during the “summer and fall of 2021 due to: a) a change of ownership of the site and b) the Covid-19 pandemic” (Id., p. 8). Based on the school’s response, however, it appears that PBAHB failed to follow up with the site or to secure other agreements. The Commission noted the extreme amount of time between the identification of the externship site’s declination of students and the continued failure to secure new sites as of the time of the school’s response, despite the school’s own knowledge of the externship site’s reluctance to take on new students. Additionally, the Commission noted that the school’s response failed to provide sufficient justification or explanation regarding the unsuccessful efforts to attain an additional externship site for this program. Furthermore, the school did not provide an update of the status of the current externship site’s willingness to take on new students, and why the three students in this program remain on a leave of absence despite the school’s declaration that one site should be adequate.

Furthermore, PBAHB provided an update of the number of currently enrolled students in the Hemodialysis Technician program and the status of each student’s externship component. The school stated there are currently three students enrolled in this program, including
All three students are currently on Leave of Absence. Unfortunately, the institution has been remiss in seeking clinical sites for these students...These students (which include [redacted]) all completed the didactic portion of the Hemodialysis program in the summer of 2021. Admittedly, the institution did not follow up with obtaining clinical sites, once the students were on LOA (Id., p. 7).

The Commission expressed serious concerns regarding the excessive amount of time these students remain on a leave of absence. As noted in the Standards of Accreditation, a leave of absence period may not exceed 180 days within any 12-month period and each leave of absence is to be properly requested by the student (Section VII (A)(3)(c)(ii) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation). Moreover, placing a student on a leave of absence while awaiting an externship placement is not an acceptable practice. The school provided its leave of absence policy to reflect the above standard but noted, “…since the practice of placing students who did not have access to an externship site on [leave of absence] status was done on an ad-hoc basis, it is not part of the institution’s [leave of absence] policy” (Id., p. 8). The Commission’s reaction, however, is that the school has violated its own LOA policy and accreditation standards on a continuous basis. The school stated in its response that [redacted] has declined communication requests with the institution and that the school “did not execute a [leave of absence] request, and the institution did not send [redacted] a [leave of absence] form to execute” (Id., pgs. 8-9).

The school stated, “[redacted] and two other Hemodialysis Program students are on [leave of absence] awaiting an opportunity to participate in clinical rotations to complete their program,” that “[e]ach of these students completed the didactic portion of their programs in the summer of 2021” and that [redacted] also expressed her reluctance to participate in an externship without additional remedial training” (Id., p. 9). The school provided conflicting and incomplete information regarding ongoing communication with the complainant. The school previously stated the complainant has declined communication with the school, yet she appears to have requested remedial training and the school has failed to provide further explanation of the complainant’s reference to involve an attorney in this situation. Overall, the school’s response raised serious questions regarding the school’s execution of the leave of absence, withdrawal, and termination policies and procedures.

Additionally, the Commission expressed concerns regarding the school’s physical facilities and required detailed clarification of the school’s ongoing modality of delivery of education to the current student population. In response, the school stated:

As you may be aware, [PBAHB] is waiting to take occupancy of a new location. Owing to health concerns, the current campus is not suitable for student use. The institution anticipates that occupancy will commence August 15, 2022. Therefore, assuming that a certificate of occupancy is provided by Palm Beach County, we propose to invite [redacted] and the other two students to begin their capstone course on or about August 22, 2022 (Id., p. 10).

Accrediting standards state that a school must apply to the Commission at least 60 days prior to its intended move date (Section IV (E)(4)(c)(i) Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation). The Commission had not received the school’s Change of Location-Part I Application, despite the school’s statement that it will begin occupancy on August 15, 2022.

The Commission is in receipt of the school’s notification dated December 30, 2021 indicating that the safety of the building where classroom instruction is located was compromised and required repairs and maintenance. While the school awaited repairs it requested “distance learning until the building condition is completely remedied by the property owner, or a suitable substitute location is found…” (December 30, 2021 PBAHB notification, p. 1). At the time of the notification the school had approval for the hybrid distance education modality. The school had not requested an expansion of distance education to change
the modality of the program delivery to fully online. Thus, the Commission questioned the suitability of the learning environment, in addition to the safety standards required by appropriate regulatory authorities (Section (I)(G)(1)&(2) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation), due to the school’s own admission that the facility is not suitable for student use. Additionally, the Commission required clarification regarding the school’s delivery of education in the classroom, and whether the school delivered education fully online without approval.

Overall, the Commission found that PBAHB’s response and actions demonstrated an inability to appropriately secure externship sites for the Hemodialysis Technician and Patient Care Technician programs and raised significant concerns that the school continued to enroll students in a program with no or an insufficient number of active externship sites. Additionally, the school’s practice of placing students on a leave of absence due to the lack of available externship sites, coupled with the continued leave of absence status for the three students in the Hemodialysis Technician program, called into question the school’s ability to maintain the appropriate policies and procedures for programs with an externship component. Finally, the Commission required a detailed explanation of the suitability of the school’s physical facilities and the modality for which the school has been delivering education since December 2021, at the time of the notification of unsafe facility conditions. Given these concerns and questions, the Commission voted to place PBAHB on Warning with a subsequent review at the Commission’s November 2022 meeting.

**November 2022 Meeting Review and Action**

At the November 2022 Commission meeting, the Commission reviewed the August 29, 2022 ACCSC Warning and PBAHB’s September 30, 2022 response. The school’s response further compounded concerns regarding PBAHB’s operations in the areas of externships, leaves of absence, and facilities resulting in escalated concerns regarding the school’s adequate management and administrative capacity, to include appropriate administrative and operational policies and procedures to which the school adheres, reviews, and updates as needed (Section 1(A)(1)(d) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

The Commission previously expressed concerns regarding the school’s inability to secure externships for students enrolled in programs that require the completion of an externship component. In response to the Commission’s request for documentation demonstrating the school’s active externship sites for the applicable programs and policy revisions, the school provided a list of externship sites for two of the school’s three programs with externship components. The response indicates that the same externship site, Sunshine Dialysis, continues to be the only active externship site for the Hemodialysis Technician program, with a pending agreement still yet to be secured. The Commission again questioned the school’s policies and procedures for securing externship sites and the school’s continued failure to secure an additional site as of the date of the school’s response. Additionally, the Commission expressed concern regarding the school’s management and administrative capacity, and the continued inability to place the two remaining students in the active externship site or the site’s willingness to accept students for an externship. These issues led the Commission to also question the school’s policies for ensuring acceptable agreements and sites are actively maintained and monitored.

The Commission noted that the school’s *Policy and Procedures for Clinical Externship Agreements* describes the procedure for renewal of externship site agreements through a mechanism of tracking and a procedure that mirrors that of initially establishing the site agreement. As noted in the school’s response and the externship agreement documentation, the agreements automatically renew on an annual basis and “[t]he Campus President shall keep records such that it is possible to track the expiration of the Clinical Agreements” (PBAHB September 30, 2022, p. 87). The active externship site chart noted on page 17 of
PBAHB’s September 30, 2022 response indicates that there is no contract expiration date for the sites unless cancelled, which contradicts the policy’s statement that there are records of the agreement’s expiration dates. As such, the Commission required clarification of the school’s procedures and documentation demonstrating the renewed agreements have been completed to ensure the updated annual renewal of the five externship sites noted in the chart on page 17 of the September 30, 2022 response.

The Commission further questioned the status of the school’s Patient Care Technician program regarding required updates. The school’s July 14, 2022 response, page 7, Table I: Summary of Programs with Externship Components states that there are “Externship Sites Available” for the Patient Care Technician program, yet none had been secured at the time of the school’s response to the Commission’s August 29, 2022 Warning. Additionally, in the July 14, 2022 response regarding an update on the enrollment of students into this program, the school stated, “[t]he institution is currently enrolling students for the Medical Assisting and Patient Care Technician [programs]” (PBAHB July 14, 2022 response, p. 16). In response to the August 29, 2022 Warning, the school did not provide secured externship site agreements nor any update regarding the efforts to attain additional externship sites. Additionally, the school stated “[t]he institution has made no changes in its enrollment procedures for programs with clinical externships (PBAHB September 30, 2022 response, p. 18). Without any clarifying information, the Commission questioned whether the school should continue to enroll students in a program that has no active externship sites.

The Commission’s concerns continued to escalate regarding the two students who remained in the Hemodialysis Technician program without externship placements, pending or otherwise, as of the date of the school’s September 30, 2022 response to the Warning. The school stated that it has created a 40-hour remedial training course for these students and have discussed scheduling the course with the students. The school’s response, however, lacks a detailed explanation of the students’ enrollment status at the time of the response (as those students wait to begin this training at an undetermined time) and a detailed plan for securing an externship site following the completion of the remedial training. The Commission noted that these two students have remained in the program while the school concurrently retains an active externship agreement, yet the school has not been able to place the students at the site. This failure exists despite the school’s Policy on Clinical Externship Sites which states, “[t]he institute shall maintain a sufficient number of externship sites to accommodate student needs and ensure that a site is available for each student without delaying student academic progress” (PBAHB September 30, 2022 response, p. 86). The school has not only previously violated its Leave of Absence policy by placing these students on leaves of absences that extended in excess of 180 days but continues to violate its Policy on Clinical Externship Sites in delaying the students’ academic progress by failing to finalize the conclusion of the students’ educational requirements.

Finally, the Commission found that the school’s response to the August 29, 2022 Warning continued to raise serious concerns regarding the school’s operation and delivery method of education since December 1, 2021. The Commission approved the school’s Change of Location-Part I application on September 29, 2022, in which the school noted the Scheduled Last Date in Current Location of June 2, 2022 with a Scheduled Date Classes Resume in New Location of October 1, 2022. The Commission noted this is a period of almost four months that the school did not have a physical facility that was approved for instruction. PBAHB has approved programs with lengths of less than four months, leading the Commission to question the school’s operation during this transition period (PBAHB is only approved for a hybrid distance education delivery method). As such, the Commission required a detailed explanation of the school’s delivery of education during this period of transition and how the education was delivered to all programs. The school’s response states:
From December 1, 2021, to present, online instruction was supplemented with hands-on, in-person training. This instruction occurred in a variety of ways. Initially and for a short time the campus was open several hours per day to provide students an opportunity to practice skills related to cosmetology, barber, skin care, and massage therapy. Students were able to come to campus to pick up supplies and kit for their programs. For the most part, the hands-on portion of the training was conducted via field trips. Student field trips were organized to a local massage and beauty facility which is owned and operated by a PBAHB faculty member adjacent to the campus. Students were afforded an opportunity to practice massage, skin care, cosmetology, and barber services at this facility, under faculty supervision (PBAHB September 30, 2022 response, p. 19-20).

Based on this response, the Commission questioned the school’s actions in allowing hands-on training for these programs to be conducted at facilities that are not ACCSC approved facilities and requires a detailed explanation of PBAHB’s policies and procedures for providing education outside the approved location, and a detailed explanation of the regulatory agencies requirements for completing hands-on training at unapproved facilities. Additionally, the Commission required an explanation of regulatory agencies requirements regarding hands-on training with equipment kits that students have removed from the facility.

In the Commission’s estimation, PBAHB’s response demonstrated an inability to secure viable externship sites for programs that have externship components, evidenced by the ongoing delay in the academic progress of the two remaining students in the Hemodialysis Technician program. The extended period of time these two students were on a leave of absence status, then removed, and are now continuing to wait contributes to the Commission’s concerns regarding the school’s ability to adhere to its own operational policies and procedures. Additionally, the school’s response raised serious concerns of the school’s delivery of education since December 1, 2021 in unapproved facilities as noted by the school’s own admission that it continues to practice hands-on training in facilities outside the ACCSC-approved location.

The culmination of unresolved questions and concerns and the continued revelation of additional concerns and questionable practices in PBAHB’s response combined with the school’s previously demonstrated inability to apply for a Change of Location-Part I application, raises questions of the school’s management and administrative capacity.

**February 2023 Meeting Review and Action**

At the February 2023 Commission meeting, the Commission reviewed the November 16, 2022 Continued Warning and the January 13, 2023 PBAHB response. The school’s response failed to demonstrate that PBAHB has adequate management and administrative capacity in place to ensure the appropriate administrative and operational policies and procedures are adhered to, reviewed, and updated as needed (Section I (A)(1)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation). The school’s most recent response did not resolve the Commission’s previously cited concerns and in fact revealed new areas of concern and includes persistent discrepancies in the documentation. As evidenced in PBAHB’s January 13, 2023 response, the management and administrative operations and policies in the areas of externships, leaves of absence, and facilities have escalated the Commission’s concerns and have failed to meet expectations in the areas described below.

The Commission has previously expressed serious concern regarding the school’s inability to secure externships for students enrolled in programs that require the completion of an externship component. The Commission’s concerns have grown more urgent as a result of documentation identifying three students with pending graduation enrollment status due to a delay in attaining externship placements, despite evidence of the retainment of active externship site agreements. The Commission has continually expressed concern that the school has not maintained active externship sites for all applicable programs and that
students have been unable to graduate due to the school’s inability to secure these necessary sites. Despite the Commission’s consistent inquiries, the school’s actions have exacerbated the ongoing issue of placing students in externships.

In response to the Commission’s request for documentation identifying all students awaiting externship placement and their corresponding transcripts, the school provided two students in the Hemodialysis Technician program and one student in the Medical Assisting program. The two Hemodialysis Technician students remain without a secured externship placement; the school provided documentation of communication with a site to place the students, yet the Commission noted these placements remain unsecured.1 The Medical Assistant student’s transcript includes a start date of September 20, 2021 and Last Date of Attendance of September 29, 2022 with a “Pending Graduation” enrollment status. Although the school’s response includes six active enrollment sites for the Medical Assisting program, given the school’s history of failing to place students at appropriate externship sites in a timely manner, the Commission does not have confidence that the school will meet its obligations in this regard.

In the same response to the Commission’s request for documentation identifying all students awaiting externship placement and their corresponding transcripts, the school provided the remaining two Hemodialysis Technician students transcripts, [REDACTED]. Specifically, in regard to [REDACTED] transcript, the Commission requires clarification for the inclusion of the HDT010E Externship notation and the corresponding reference to the course’s completion. This notation is part of an overall inconsistent presentation and concerning attendance records on all three transcripts leading the Commission to question the school’s policies and procedures regarding student academic progress.

The inadequacy of the school’s management and administrative capacity is highlighted again due to the content of the student transcripts more broadly. While not previously noted as a concern in the past, it came to the Commission’s attention from the school’s most recent response that the percentage of attendance on three of the four transcripts in the school’s response is troubling. One transcript shows less than 56% of attendance complete, while two of the transcripts identify less than 25% of attendance completed, yet all three students are pending graduation status. The Commission requires detailed explanations to show that students are attending classes at an acceptable rate (Section VII (A)(3)(b), Substantive Standards of Accreditation). The culmination of unresolved externship placements, discrepancies in the school’s responses, and the revelation of multiple concerns regarding student transcripts in the school’s most recent response substantiates the concerns of the school’s operational policies and procedures.

Adding to the Commission’s concerns are discrepancies in the school’s responses. Most recently, the Progress Report for [REDACTED] dated September 21, 2021 has a withdrawn enrollment status, yet the school has repeatedly stated to the Commission that [REDACTED] was on a leave of absence. In response to the Commission’s May 17, 2022 letter requesting an update as to the status of [REDACTED] education, the school responded: “[a]s of this date, [REDACTED] remains on a Leave of Absence status. The Institution plans to resolve this issue as described in Item (m). We anticipate that she will be offered the opportunity to return to active status as described in our response to Item (m)” (PBAHB July 15, 2022 response, p. 6). In the response to the Commission’s August 29, 2022 Warning, PBAHB stated that “[i]nitially, [REDACTED] expressed an interest only in the externship training. Later, she declined to participate in either activity, and informed the school to cease contact. As of the date of this letter, [REDACTED] has been withdrawn from the institution [emphasis added]. She appears to have no interest in finishing her program or receiving any additional training” (PBAHB September 30, 2022 response, p. 1). The school’s repeated references to the

1 The school’s response states that one of the Hemodialysis Technician students was unable to be contacted. The school provided documentation demonstrating efforts made to reach the student to continue the process of placing the students at an externship site.
student’s status indicates that prior to school’s September 30, 2022 letter, the student should not have had an enrollment status of withdrawn. Yet, the transcript provided in the school’s January 13, 2023 response shows a withdrawn status with no explanation provided. The timeline of changes in this student’s enrollment status demonstrates prolonged inadequacies in maintaining viable procedures to ensure compliance with the school’s internal policies as well as ACCSC Standards of Accreditation.

The Commission noted further discrepancies in the list of active externship sites; page 5-6 of PBAHB’s January 13, 2023 response contains two externship locations that do not appear in the school’s September 30, 2022 response to the Commission’s August 29, 2022 Warning. These sites include, Any Lab Test Now, contract start date of August 26, 2021 and Cute Look Medi-Spa Medical Facility, contract start date August 31, 2021. Despite the Commission’s repeated requests for all active externship sites and applicable documentation, the school has failed to provide complete and accurate information in all instances.

The school’s failure in this regard also led the Commission to question the viability of the Sunshine Dialysis externship site despite the continued inability to place Hemodialysis Technician students there. This failure led the Commission to review the school’s mechanism used to track renewal of externship sites. In this regard the response states, “[t]he Campus President monitors contract dates in MS Outlook” (PBAHB January 13, 2023 response, p. 7). This Commission found this response to be wholly insufficient to show that the school has an adequate tracking mechanism of externship sites, given the fact that the Commission has been expressing concerns in this area for a significant period of time.

Moreover, the Commission has previously questioned the school’s actions regarding in-person training during the period of June 2, 2022 to October 1, 2022. As previously mentioned, the Commission noted a period of almost four months where the school did not have a physical facility that was approved for instruction, prior to the approval of the Change of Location-Part I that was submitted at the Commission’s directive. Following December 1, 2021, the school has previously said that hands-on training was conducted via field trips to a facility owned by a faculty member: “[s]tudent field trips were organized to a local massage and beauty facility which is owned and operated by a PBAHB faculty member adjacent to the campus [and that s]tudents were afforded an opportunity to practice massage, skin care, cosmetology, and barber services at this facility, under faculty supervision” (PBAHB September 30, 2022 response, p. 5). The Commission raised serious concerns regarding the school’s practice of completing hands-on training outside of an ACCSC approved facility. Compounding concerns further is the school’s most recent response to the Commission request for policies and procedures for operating programs outside the school’s main facility:

*The Institution did not operate any program outside the scope of it’s hybrid delivery model. However, students performed services at home with their family members and friends under the supervision of the instructors through ZOOM. Furthermore, students were encouraged to go on supervised instructor led fieldtrips to perform services at nursing home and convalescent centers* (PBAHB January 13, 2022 response, p. 8).

The narrative description of where the hands-on training took place during the identified timeframe has been inconsistently presented to the Commission in two of the school’s responses; initially, the school stated this training took place in a facility owned by an instructor of PBAHB, adjacent to the school. Most recently, the school stated students were encouraged to complete hands-on training at nursing homes and convalescent centers. The school’s responses demonstrate a changing narrative for the occurrence of the hands-on training. As demonstrated by two different responses provided to the Commission’s repeated requests for a description of the program’s operational status and clarification of the delivery format during this period; items requested from the Commission’s August 29, 2022 Warning and the November 16, 2022
Continued Warning. The responses additionally, fail to provide documentation or justification that conducting this training outside of the approved facility is an acceptable practice.

This information simultaneously brings into question the school’s policies on the completion of labs and hands-on training via a distance education modality. Specifically, the Commission requires further clarification as to how the school is classifying the hours completed off-campus. The school has previously said students completed education in a hybrid setting, yet the school has not accounted for the four-month timespan that the school did not have an approved facility. The school has stated students have practiced hands-on training outside of the facility with faculty supervision conducted via field trips, or supervision conducted virtually. Based on this account, the Commission questioned whether the school was operating hybrid programs or was in fact offering fully online programs during the four-month timespan in question, for which the school does not have approval.

At the Commission’s request for an explanation of regulatory agency policies regarding operating programs outside of an approved location, and the use of equipment outside of the facility, the school stated, “Students were encouraged to go on faculty supervised and instructor led field trips to service the nursing home and convalescent centers. That is the extent of activities outside the facility” (Id., p. 8). PBAHB has failed to show that the school understands that any activity performed outside an approved facility requires notification and/or approval. PBAHB has continually failed to provide the Commission with the confidence that the school understands the expectations for meeting the Standards of Accreditation in this regard due to the:

- Delayed submission of the Application for a Change of Location-Part I;
- Continued delay in submitting an approvable Application for a Change of Location-Part II;
- Four-month period that the school operated without an approved facility; and
- Hands-on training being practiced outside of an approved facility and for which the school appears to have awarded credit.

PBAHB has failed to demonstrate adequate management and administrative capacity evidenced by the failure to secure externship placements, improper use of leaves of absence, the failure to ensure the school remains attentive to students needs as demonstrated by the ongoing pending graduation status of current students awaiting an externship, the submission of inaccurate information regarding externship sites, multiple instances of discrepancies in documentation and explanations, and the continued deflection of the Commission’s request to justify the hands-on training outside of an approved facility. Given the length of time the Commission has articulated its concerns and provided the school opportunities to remediate the issues, the Commission found that the school has not demonstrated adequate management and administrative capacity and is out of compliance with Section I (A)(1)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission voted to place PBAHB on Probation, and directs PBAHB to submit the following:

a. An update regarding correspondence with [redacted] and the status of the tuition refund;

b. An update of the educational status of the three remaining students awaiting an externship placement, to include executed documentation of the placements and student participation at the site;

c. An explanation in the delay of [redacted] education and the reason this student is pending graduation due to an unsecured externship placement;
d. An explanation of [transcript displayed HDT010E Externship component, and the corresponding notation that the component was completed while the student has a pending graduation enrollment status;]

e. A detailed explanation regarding the noted percentage of attendance on the three transcripts for the students awaiting externship placement and justification for the student’s achievement of required program objectives and student learning outcomes;

f. A copy of the school’s Satisfactory Academic Progress policy documenting these transcripts demonstrate compliance with the school’s policy;

g. A revised policy and procedure for the mechanism the school uses to track renewal of externship site agreements;

h. An explanation and documentation demonstrating the viability of all active externship sites;

i. A detailed description of the programs and courses that operated from June 2, 2022 to October 1, 2022 and the hours completed via distance education;

j. A copy of the school’s distance education policies and description of the breakdown in course hours, to include a justification demonstrating that the delivery of the courses through distance education methods is appropriate and facilitates the delivery of course content in such a way that students may reasonably be expected to achieve learning outcomes;

k. A detailed description of regulatory agencies’ policies regarding operating programs outside of an approved location, and the use of equipment outside of the facility;

l. An update on the current operational status of the school’s facility regarding the Change of Location – Part II application and any applicable correspondence with the Commission for Independent Education; and

m. Any other documentation deemed appropriate by the school to demonstrate compliance with accrediting standards pertaining to this matter.

**PROBATION REQUIREMENTS:**

In cases where the Commission has reason to believe that a school is not in compliance with accreditation standards and other requirements, the Commission may, at its discretion, place a school on Probation. A school subject to a Probation Order must demonstrate corrective action and compliance with accrediting standards. **Failure of the school to demonstrate compliance with accrediting standards or other accrediting requirements by the due date set forth herein may result in a revocation of accreditation action.**

The Commission will not consider substantive changes, a change of location/relocation, or additions (i.e., separate facilities, new programs) to a school or its separate facilities while the school is on Probation. However, a school that is subject to Probation may seek the Commission’s approval for the transfer of accreditation that would result from a change of ownership as described in Section IV, Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation. In accordance with Section X, Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation, the reason for the Probation Order is made public and provided to the U.S. Department of Education, appropriate State agencies, and appropriate accrediting agencies.
Teach-Out Plan Requirement:
Given the serious nature of the issues outlined herein, the Commission directs the school to provide an Institutional Teach Out Plan Approval Form, which must be submitted as part of the response for the items listed above.

Timeframe To Achieve Compliance:
According to Section VII (M),(5) Rules of Process and Procedures, Standards of Accreditation, the Commission may establish timeframes as deemed appropriate for an institution to demonstrate compliance with accrediting standards. Given the nature of the findings contained in this letter, and the history of the matter, the Commission at its August 2023 meeting can take an immediate adverse action to withdraw the school’s accreditation or to determine that additional time is warranted for the school to come into compliance with accrediting standards as set forth herein.

Notification to Students:
Within seven days of the receipt of this letter, the school must inform current and prospective students in writing that the school has been placed on Probation, provide a summary of the reasons for the Probation, and indicate where that action can be obtained from the Commission’s website. (Section VII (L)(7) Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

***

ADMISSIONS REPORT
At the February 2023 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (“ACCSC” of “the Commission”) also considered the Admissions Report submitted by PBAHB. Upon review of the Commission’s November 16, 2022 letter and the school’s January 17, 2023 Admissions Report, the Commission voted to continue PBAHB on Admissions Reporting in order to provide PBAHB with an additional opportunity to demonstrate compliance with accrediting standards. The reasons for the commission’s decision and the Commission’s requirements for PBAHB to demonstrate compliance are set forth below.

PBAHB must submit a report on the school’s continued efforts to secure documentation to demonstrate that each applicant meets all admission requirements prior to enrollment (Section V(A)(4)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation). In response to the Commission’s November 16, 2022 letter, PBAHB provided the school’s admissions policies and procedures that do not appear to contain any revisions, despite the Commission’s continued questions of evidence and practices of securing documentation to support the school’s decision to enroll students. Additionally, the school provided a roster of the ten most recent enrollments and supporting documentation to support the decision to enroll those students. Previously the Commission has found discrepancies in documentation regarding dates that do not match the supporting documentation and a lack of supporting evidence to support the decision to enroll the student.

In reviewing the documentation provided, the Commission noted that 60% of the student enrollments (6 of 10) were eligible to enroll as Ability-to-Benefit (ATB) students. The school’s admission policy states that ATB students “will not be accepted for regular admission if they have never previously attended a post-secondary school” (January 17, 2023 PBAHB Admissions Report, p. 5). The Commission did not question the appropriateness of this policy, only that the school did not submit documentation to show that it in fact only enrolls ATB students who have previously attended a post-secondary school, or in the event that the
student did not previously attend a post-secondary school, documentation demonstrating that the student is enrolled in the Eligible Career Pathways Program (ECPP), per the school’s policy.

The Commission also noted the poor photocopy quality of the submitted documentation (e.g., the licenses and social security cards) made interpreting the documentation extremely difficult and reminds the school to ensure quality submissions to the Commission. The preceding three responses to the Commission’s requests have lacked complete documentation to demonstrate that the school is implementing the revised admissions policies and procedures and as such the Commission continued to question the school’s compliance with its admissions policies and procedures.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission voted to continue the school on admissions reporting and requires the school to provide the following:

a. A complete copy of the school’s admissions policies and procedures, as stated in the school’s catalog;

b. An explanation of the revisions noted to the admissions policies and procedures, if applicable;

c. The ten most recent enrollments following the school’s policy revisions, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Student Start Date (Class Attendance)</th>
<th>Date All Admissions Documentation Secured</th>
<th>Date Enrollment Agreement was finalized and provided to student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. For the students captured in chart (c.) above, a copy of all documentation supporting the decision to admit the students in alignment with the school’s admission requirements (e.g., proof of high school graduation or its equivalency; a translation of the documents and the credential evaluation report for foreign credentials; scored entrance exams; background checks, as applicable; and signed Enrollment Agreements, etc.); and

e. For any identified ATB student in chart (c) above, the appropriate back-up documentation demonstrating that the student meets eligibility requirements per the school’s policy (e.g. previous post-secondary experience or enrollment in Eligible Career Pathways Program);

f. Any additional information or documentation that the school believe will be useful to demonstrate the school’s compliance with ACCSC’s admission requirements.

**RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS:**

PBAHB must provide a response to this reporting requirement that provides the information requested along with any additional information that the school believes supports a demonstration of compliance with accrediting standards. If the school’s response contains documentation that includes personal or confidential student or staff information that is not required for the Commission’s review (e.g., social security numbers, dates of birth, etc.), please remove or redact that information.

PBAHB must upload the school’s electronic response directly to ACCSC’s College 360 Database. The ACCSC College 360 database can be accessed by clicking here. Please note that the password utilized by the institution to access the Annual Report Portal is the same to access the School Submission section of

---

2 ACCSC has issued the first two modules of the Blueprints for Success Series: Organizing an Effective Electronic Submission and Preparing a Comprehensive Response for Commission Consideration which provide a framework for submitting a well-documented, organized, electronic response for Commission consideration. ACCSC encourages the school to review these modules prior to formulating its response to this letter. More information is available under the Resources section at www.accsc.org.
the College 360 database. The Instructions for College 360 DMS Submissions can be found here. A detailed overview on how to upload a school submission can be found here.

Keep in mind, the school’s response must be prepared in accordance with ACCSC’s Instructions for Electronic Submission (e.g., prepared as one Portable Document Format (“PDF”) file that has been prepared using Adobe Acrobat software (version 8.0 or higher) and which has a .pdf extension as part of the file name). The school will receive an e-mail confirmation that the file has been received within 24 hours of the submission.

The school’s response must include a signed certification attesting to the accuracy of the information and be received in the Commission’s office on or before June 15, 2023. If a response, the required fee, and the certificate of attesting to the accuracy of the information is not received in the Commission’s office on or before June 15, 2023, the Commission will consider further appropriate action.

For assistance with the password or for any other questions regarding the electronic submission requirements, please contact [redacted]. Please note that any password requests to access College 360 must be made by the school director, or designated member of the school’s management team, via e-mail.

For further assistance or additional information, please contact [redacted]

Sincerely,

Michale S. McComis, Ed.D.
Executive Director

c: Florida Commission for Independent Education
Florida Barber/Cosmetology Board