Public Notice of Revocation and Denial of Accreditation Actions
Updated November 1, 2012

The Commission provides public notice of any adverse action, including revocation and denial of accreditation actions, along with a summary of the reasons for the Commission’s action and information pertaining to the ACCSC appeal process (Section X (D)(3), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation). The information below shows the revocation and denial of accreditation actions taken by the Commission followed by a summary of the reasons for these actions and the Commission’s appeal process.

REVOCATION/DENIAL OF ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION:

An independent Appeals Panel has heard an appeal from the following schools and has affirmed the ACCSC adverse accreditation decision to deny the school’s Application for Renewal of Accreditation. The Commission’s adverse accreditation decision is final and effective as of October 19, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Final Action Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladera Career Paths Training Center</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Denial of Renewal of Accreditation</td>
<td>October 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Cities Barber College</td>
<td>Grand Prairie, TX</td>
<td>Denial of Renewal of Accreditation</td>
<td>October 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following schools have chosen not to appeal the Commission’s adverse accreditation decision and therefore the Commission’s Revocation or Denial of Accreditation action is effective as of the date listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah Technology Center</td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>Denial of Initial Accreditation</td>
<td>June 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Technology Institute</td>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>June 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Career Community College</td>
<td>San Juan, PR*</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>June 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Career Community College</td>
<td>Manati, PR</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>June 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Career Community College</td>
<td>Humacao, PR**</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>June 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosim Flight Academy</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>October 1, 2012†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Academy</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Denial of Initial Accreditation</td>
<td>October 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes a Satellite Location in Gurabo, PR.
** Includes Satellite Locations in Yabucoa, PR and Juncos, PR.
† The school’s comment regarding this action can be found below.

1 The Commission maintains this list for all actions from the preceding twelve months.
APPEAL STATUS UPDATES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Action Subject to Appeal</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATI Career Training Center</td>
<td>Oakland Park, FL*</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>Under Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI Career Training Center</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>Under Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI Career Training Center</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>Under Appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These schools remain accredited through the appeal process, although operating under Probation status.

DENIAL OF A SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE APPLICATION

The Commission has denied a substantive change application for the following institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETI Technical College</td>
<td>Niles, Oh</td>
<td>Denial of a Substantive Change Application</td>
<td>December 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCAION OF ACCREDITATION ACTION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: SEPTEMBER 20, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: OCTOBER 1, 2012

AEROSIM FLIGHT ACADEMY (BR 072127)
12711 BLUME AVENUE
HOUSTON, TEXAS

At the August 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of Aerosim Flight Academy located in Houston, Texas. Summarized below are the grounds for the Commission’s actions.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

Aerosim Flight Academy failed to maintain its eligibility for accreditation because the school has not provided education and training to students in accordance with its primary objectives on a continuous basis as required by Section I (D)(2)(b), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation. Accordingly, pursuant to Section VII (P)(1)(a) Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation.
PUBLIC COMMENT DISCLOSURE FORM

To Be Submitted No Later Than October 22, 2012

Michale S. McComis, Ed.D.
Executive Director
ACCSC
2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite #302
Arlington, Virginia 22201

RE: Aerosim Flight Academy – School #B072127
12711 Blume Avenue
Houston, Texas 77034

Dear Dr. McComis:

I understand and agree that the Commission, pursuant to Section X (C)(4)&(D)(4), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation, will make public a summary of the reasons for the decision together with any comments submitted by the school. I further understand that the summary will be accompanied by the attached comments.

I understand and agree that the attached comments constitute Aerosim Flight Academy’s public comments on the adverse accreditation action that are to be disseminated with the public notice of the Commission’s decision dated March 8, 2012 and final decision dated July 11, 2012 including, but not limited to, dissemination to appropriate federal, state and other accrediting agencies and posting to the ACCSC website (Section X (C)(4)&(D)(4), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

I understand and agree that the school is not obligated to submit public comments and acknowledge that the attached comments are provided voluntarily.

I understand and agree that the public comments must be in summary format, professional in tone, and free of profanity and calumnious statements. I acknowledge that any comments which do not meet these requirements will not be disseminated or posted along with the summary of the reasons for the adverse accreditation decision.

I understand and agree that the Commission will release its summary of the adverse accreditation decision to the public pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation and that the school’s written comments will not be added to this disclosure if this form and comments are not submitted in the required format on or before October 22, 2012.

I understand and agree that the Commission has no responsibility for how the school’s comments may be used once they are put in the public domain.

[Signature]

[Date]

[Name/Title]
September 28, 2012

Michale S. McComis, Ed.D.
Executive Director
Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges
2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 302
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Re: Public Comment for dissemination and posting – Aerosim Flight Academy School #B072127

Dear Dr. McComis,

Please disseminate to the appropriate federal, state, and other accrediting agencies, and post to the ACCSC website, the following Aerosim Flight Academy public comment to accompany the commission’s summary of its decision to revoke the accreditation of Aerosim’s branch campus in Houston Texas:

“Aerosim Flight Academy attempted in earnest to keep the Houston branch campus open and to offer students the opportunity to enroll in the ACCSC approved Professional Pilot Program while also conducting contract training for San Jacinto College. Unfortunately, due to lack of student loan financing for our ACCSC program, slowly over time our students gravitated to become students of SJC, leaving our ACCSC program to languish with low enrollments and then finally last year we had no enrollments for the fall semester.

Aerosim elected to wait to see if the Spring semester would fill however it did not. Further, our contract with SJC was up for renewal in August of this year. In June / July (their summer break) we entered into good faith negotiations with SJC to try to find a way to help solve our enrollment problem for the ACCSC program.

Unfortunately, negotiations were unsuccessful, and Aerosim Flight Academy elected not to renew its contract with the college and to cease operations at the Houston campus. The closing of that campus sadden us greatly as we take our business and our accreditation very seriously.”

Thank you,

Paul Woessner
VP Training Solutions
Training Center General Manager
Aerosim Flight Academy
2700 Flightline Ave.
Sanford, FL 32773
(w) 407-430-4179
(C) 407- 625-4606
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION ACTION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: JUNE 18, 2012

HAWAII TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE (MS #070350)
629 POHUKAINA STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of Hawaii Technology Institute located in Honolulu, Hawaii. Summarized below is the basis for this revocation action.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

Hawaii Technology Institute did not demonstrate that the school’s primary educational objective is to prepare students for entrance or advancement in one or more occupations requiring technical or career oriented competencies and skills. In addition, Hawaii Technology Institute did not sufficiently show that the school’s primary educational objectives are career oriented and provide graduates with the necessary competencies, skills, and level of education for employment in their fields of study (Section I (B)(1)(d)(i), Rules of Process and Procedures, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS
SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: JUNE 18, 2012

UNIVERSAL CAREER COMMUNITY COLLEGE – SCHOOL #M069439
1902 FERNANDEZ JUNCOS AVENUE STOP 26 1/2
SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO 00909

UNIVERSAL CAREER COMMUNITY COLLEGE – SCHOOL #B070309
MCKINLEY STREET #113
MANATI, PUERTO RICO 00674-4572

UNIVERSAL CAREER COMMUNITY COLLEGE – SCHOOL #B070574
ANTONIO LOPEZ STREET #6
HUMACAO, PUERTO RICO 00791

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of the above-referenced locations of Universal Career Community College (“UCCC”). Summarized below is the basis for this revocation action.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION


2 Includes a Satellite Location in Gurabo, PR
3 Includes Satellite Locations in Yabicoa, PR and Juncos, PR
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION – UNDER APPEAL
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012

ATI CAREER TRAINING CENTER – SCHOOL #M001339
3509 NORTHWEST 9TH AVENUE
OAKLAND PARK, FLORIDA

ATI CAREER TRAINING CENTER – SCHOOL #M001340
7265 NORTHWEST 25TH STREET
MIAMI, FLORIDA

ATI CAREER TRAINING CENTER – SCHOOL #B072154
4575 SAN MATEO BOULEVARD, SUITE 130-G
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of ATI Career Training Center located in Oakland Park and ATI Career Training Center in Miami, Florida. As a result of this action, the accreditation for the following branches and satellite locations is also hereby revoked

- ATI Career Training Center – Albuquerque, New Mexico (a Branch Campus of ATI Career Training Center – Oakland Park, FL)
- ATI Career Training Center-College of Health Careers – Miami, Florida (a Satellite Location of ATI Career Training Center – Oakland Park, FL)
- ATI Career Training Center-College of Health Careers – Miami, Florida (a Satellite Location of ATI Career Training Center – Oakland Park, FL)
- ATI Career Training Center – Lauderhill, Florida (a Satellite Location of ATI Career Training Center – Oakland Park, FL)

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

ATI Career Training Center in Oakland Park and its branch campus ATI Career Training Center in Miami, Florida failed to prove, after multiple opportunities to do so beginning in November 2010, that the Commission can rely upon information, data, and statements provided pertaining to verifiable records of employment. The accuracy, truthfulness, and completeness of information provided by schools to the Commission are fundamental to the accreditation process (Preamble, Introduction, Rules of Process and Procedure; Section VI (C)(3), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation). In addition, as a main school, ATI Career Training Center in Oakland Park is responsible and accountable for compliance with accrediting standards of its separate facilities and the accreditation of a main school requires adherence to accrediting standards by its separate facilities (Section VIII (B), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: OCTOBER 19, 2012

LADERA CAREER PATHS TRAINING CENTER - SCHOOL #M070566
6820 LA TIJERA BOULEVARD, SUITE 217
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90045

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of Ladera Career Paths Training Center (“Ladera”) located in Los Angeles, California. An independent Appeals Panel has heard an appeal from Ladera and has affirmed the ACCSC adverse accreditation decision to deny the school’s Application for Renewal of Accreditation. The Commission’s adverse accreditation decision is final and effective October 19, 2012 and the Commission has removed the school from the ACCSC list of accredited institutions.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

1. Ladera failed to submit complete documentation of the school’s compliance with all accrediting standards as required by Section I (D)(I), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation;

2. Ladera failed to demonstrate compliance with accreditation standards on a continuous basis in the areas set out in the decision letter as mandated by Section I (D)(2)(a), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation;

3. Ladera failed to fulfill all reporting requirements through the submission of incomplete responses to the Commission’s directives. Section I (D)(2)(c), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation; and

4. Ladera failed to demonstrate that the school has a management team with a demonstrated ability to manage a postsecondary institution in compliance with Section I (A)(1)(a), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation.
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: OCTOBER 19, 2012

MID-CITIES BARBER COLLEGE - SCHOOL #M067291
2345 SW 3RD STREET, #101
GRAND PRAIRIE, TEXAS

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of Mid-Cities Barber College (“MCBC”) located in Grand Prairie, Texas. Summarized below are the grounds for the Commission’s actions. An independent Appeals Panel has heard an appeal from MCBC and has affirmed the ACCSC adverse accreditation decision to deny the school’s Application for Renewal of Accreditation. The Commission’s adverse accreditation decision is final and effective October 19, 2012 and the Commission has removed the school from the ACCSC list of accredited institutions.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

1. MCBC did not show that the school has adequate management capable of operating the school in continuous compliance with standards (Section I (A)(1)(a), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. MCBC failed to demonstrate successful student achievement by reporting acceptable rates of student graduation over the last term of accreditation (Section VII (B)(1)(b), Appendices VII & VIII, Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. MCBC failed to demonstrate that the school has engaged in institutional improvement planning and activities (Section I (B), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4. MCBC failed to demonstrate that:
   a. The use of the LRS materials is integrated into the school’s curriculum and program requirements as a mechanism to enhance the educational process and to facilitate positive learning outcomes for students (Section II (A)(6)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation);
   b. The LRS is managed by qualified school personnel with sufficient experience to provide oversight and supervision (Section II (A)(6)(c), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation); and
   c. Qualified school personnel orient, train, and assist students and faculty in the use of the LRS in a manner that supports learning objectives (Section II (A)(6)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

5. MCBC failed to demonstrate that there the school maintains detailed written minutes of each Program Advisory Committee (“PAC”) meeting that include a comprehensive and clear description of the review of and commentary made by PAC members (Section II (A)(5)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

6. MCBC failed to demonstrate that the school adheres to the policies and procedures relative to the assessment of student academic progress or follows its policy of notifying students of academic progress and attendance every 30 days (Section VII (A)(3)(a), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
DENIAL OF INITIAL ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 2012
FINAL ACTION EFFECTIVE DATE: JUNE 18, 2012

HIALEAH TECHNOLOGY CENTER (MS #072268)
601 WEST 20TH STREET
HIALEAH, FLORIDA 33010

At the May 2012 meeting, ACCSC voted to deny the initial application of accreditation of Hialeah Technology Center located in Hialeah, Florida. Summarized below are the grounds for the Commission’s actions.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

1. Hialeah Technology Center failed to submit required reports to the Commission in the manner and within the time frame prescribed (Section I (G)(1), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

2. Hialeah Technology Center did not demonstrate that the school fulfills all process requirements required for accreditation (Section I (D)(2)(c), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
DENIAL OF ACCREDIATION ACTION – SUBJECT TO APPEAL
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: OCTOBER 19, 2012
FINAL ACTION DATE: OCTOBER 31, 2012

THE ACADEMY (MS #070594)
3100 S. DIXIE HIGHWAY, SUITE 100
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33133

The Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges voted to deny the Application for Initial Accreditation submitted by The Academy located in Miami, Florida. Summarized below are the accrediting standards that serve as the basis for this denial action.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

1. The Academy failed to:
   a. Maintain eligibility for accreditation by fulfilling all reporting and substantive change requirements (Section I (D)(1)&(2)(a)&(c), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation);
   b. Demonstrate that all programs offered by a school that fall within the Commission’s scope are approved by the Commission as within the school’s scope of institutional accreditation through the application for accreditation process and substantive change approval process (Section I (B)(3)(a), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation);
   c. Ensure that all programs were properly reported to and approved by the Commission (Section I (B)(3)(b), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation);
   d. Notify the Commission of program changes in advance of such changes taking effect or being implemented (Section IV (A)(4), IV (B)(2)(a), IV (C)(1) & (2)(d); Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation); and
   e. Demonstrate continuous compliance with the Standards of Accreditation since the Commission’s September 25, 2009 acceptance of the school’s Application for Initial Accreditation (Section II (A)(1)(e), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

2. The Academy failed to demonstrate that the school’s reported employment rates for the Network Associates and Information Technology programs are supported by verifiable records (Section VII (B)(1)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. The Academy failed to demonstrate that the school’s advertising and promotional materials are truthful and accurate and avoid leaving any false, misleading, or exaggerated impressions with respect to the school and its name (Section IV (B)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTION

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
DENIAL OF A SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE APPLICATION – FINAL ACTION
ORIGINATION DATE: DECEMBER 7, 2011
FINAL EFFECTIVE DATE: DECEMBER 20, 2011

ETI TECHNICAL COLLEGE (MS #059203)
2076 YOUNGSTOWN WARREN ROAD
NILES, OH 44446

At its November 2011 meeting the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges denied the Application for Initial distance Education Approval submitted by ETI Technical College (“ETI) located in Niles, Ohio. This is an adverse action subject to appeal. A summary of the reason for the Commission’s denial action are set forth below:

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE ADVERSE ACCREDITATION DECISION

1. ETI failed to identify an appropriately qualified distance education administrator or team of administrators to oversee the implementation of the proposed distance education program (Section IX (A)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. ETI failed to demonstrate that the faculty training plan for orientation and training of faculty teaching distance education courses includes specific objectives for distance education instruction, timelines for training all faculty to teach via distance education, and documentation of completed training (Section IX (F)(2), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. ETI failed to demonstrate the school has qualified school personnel to orient, train, and assist students and faculty in the use of the learning resource system in a manner that supports learning objectives (Section II (A)(6)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4. ETI failed to provide documentation that the PAC membership includes at least one individual with experience in the delivery and administration of distance education programs (Section II (A)(5)(h), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

5. ETI failed to provide detailed policies and procedures for ensuring distance education students would have access to appropriate externships locations, including the process for identifying locations and training for the on-site supervisor who will guide and oversee the distant education student’s learning experience (Section II (A)(7)(b) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

6. ETI failed to demonstrate the school has established admission requirements for distance education programs and courses of study that assess whether students have the skills, competencies, and access to technology necessary to succeed in a distance education environment prior to their enrollment in the distance education program or course of study (Section IX (E)(2), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

7. ETI failed to demonstrate that the catalog and other publications would clearly describe distance education programs, including the school’s expectations of distance education students, admissions requirements, the prerequisites for participation, expected learning outcomes, graduation requirements, access to the learning resource system, student services, technology requirements, and any other requirements (Section IX (D)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
VIII. APPEAL OF COMMISSION DECISIONS

A. Coverage of Appeals

The appeal procedure specified in this section of the Rules is the exclusive remedy for a school that believes that an adverse accreditation decision by the Commission is unwarranted pursuant to the terms set forth in this section of the Rules.

1. Only adverse accreditation decisions made by the Commission are subject to appeal. Adverse accreditation decisions are:
   a. Denial of a substantive change application under Section IV, Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation;
   b. Denial of an application for accreditation (initial or renewal); and
   c. Revocation of accreditation.

2. An accredited school remains accredited, operating under a Probation Order, until the final disposition of the appeal. The Commission will follow its public notification requirements in accordance with the provisions set forth in these Rules.

3. The Commission will not consider petitions for reinstatement or petitions for reconsideration.

B. Grounds for Appeal and Standard of Review

1. A school affected by an adverse accreditation action taken by the Commission may appeal that decision if it has reason to believe the Commission’s decision was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise in substantial disregard of the criteria or procedures of the Commission, or not supported by substantial evidence in the record on which the Commission took action.

2. In order for a school subject to an adverse accreditation decision to revoke accreditation to be eligible to submit its Grounds for Appeal, a school must submit a teach-out plan as directed by the Commission and as required by Section IV (F), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation.

3. On appeal, the school has the burden of proof.

4. The Appeals Panel will only consider that information that was before the Commission at the time that the adverse action was taken.

5. The record on an appeal will include, as applicable, the Letter of Intent to Appeal, Grounds for Appeal, Team Summary Report(s), Commission action letter(s), school response(s), and other documents relevant to the appeal.

6. The appeal fee and all other fees due to the Commission must be paid in full in order to have standing to appeal a Commission decision.
C. Appeal Procedures

1. Letter of Intent to Appeal: To initiate an appeal process the school must submit a Letter of Intent to Appeal accompanied by the required appeal fee, within 10 days after receiving official notice of the adverse accreditation decision.

2. Grounds for Appeal: Within 30 days of receipt of the Commission’s notice of adverse accreditation decision, the school must submit 10 copies of the Application for Appeal of a Commission Decisions and Grounds for Appeal.
   a. The school must set forth in the Grounds for Appeal its case relative to its belief that the Commission’s decision was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise in substantial disregard of the criteria or procedures of the Commission, or not supported by substantial evidence in the record on which the Commission took action. The written Grounds for Appeal must respond to each basis included in the letter reporting the Commission’s decision and the Grounds for Appeal must be prepared and presented in accordance with the Commission’s established process and requirements.
   b. Only evidence previously submitted to the Commission may be included in a submission to the Appeals Panel. The Grounds for Appeal may not include information or documentation that was not in the record at the time that the Commission took the adverse action. The Grounds for Appeal must include a reference to where information and documentation can be found in the record at the time that the Commission took the adverse action.
   c. Financial Information: In instances where the only remaining deficiency cited by the Commission in an adverse accreditation decision is the institution’s failure to meet the Commission’s standards pertaining to financial soundness, an institution may present new financial information under the following conditions:
      i. The financial information is significant as determined by the Commission;
      ii. The financial information was unavailable prior to the adverse action decision;
      iii. The financial information bears materially on the financial deficiencies identified by the Commission; and
      iv. A school may present new financial information only once and any final determination reached with respect to the new financial information does not provide a new basis for appeal.

3. The school has the option of sending a representative(s) to make a presentation at the hearing. The school must provide to the Commission the names and titles of any representatives from the school who will offer testimony or argument in an appeal hearing before the Appeals Panel, and give the name and title of any outside counsel, if the school intends to be represented by counsel.

4. Record of Appeal Hearing: The school has the right to a transcript of the appeal hearing and may request one by notice to the Executive Director of ACCSC at the time of the filing of the Grounds for Appeal. Videotaping of the appeal hearing is not permitted. The school will be responsible for the cost of its copy of the hearing transcript. Any transcription of the hearing will be arranged by the Executive Director of ACCSC.

5. The appeal will be heard within 60 days of receipt of the school’s Letter of Intent to Appeal unless reasonable circumstances prevent the hearing of the appeal in that time frame.
D. Appeals Panel

1. The Executive Director of ACCSC will deliver the complete record of the accreditation proceeding involving the appealing school to the ACCSC Appeals Panel.

2. Standing Appeals Panel:
   a. The Standing Appeals Panel does not include any current member of the Commission.
   b. Members of the Standing Appeals Panel are subject to the ACCSC Appeals Panel Code of Conduct and other requirements as stated in the Commission’s policies and may be removed from the list of Standing Appeals Panel members for failure to comply with these policies.
   c. At least 10 persons constitute the Commission’s Standing Appeals Panel.
   d. Members of the Standing Appeals Panel are nominated by the Commission Chair, with the advice of the Executive Director of ACCSC, and confirmed by the Commission from a pool of candidates who have knowledge of accrediting policies and procedures, such as private career school and college administrators; public members from industry, government, or education; or individuals with experience in accreditation at other agencies.
   e. Prior to the Appeals Panel hearing, the school is advised of the names and school affiliations, if any, of members of the Standing Appeals Panel.
   f. Alternates: The Standing Appeals Panel may be supplemented with qualified alternates in the event that there is an insufficient number of members of the Standing Appeals Panel to constitute a Sitting Appeals Panel with the requisite number of persons.

3. Sitting Appeals Panel: Three persons are nominated by the Executive Director of ACCSC from the Standing Appeals Panel and are confirmed by the Commission Chair to serve as the Sitting Appeals Panel, which will consider a school’s appeal. One member will be designated to chair the Sitting Appeals Panel and at least one member will be considered a public member.

4. Objections:
   a. If the school has good cause to believe any member of the Standing Appeals Panel should not hear the appeal, it must promptly notify the Executive Director of ACCSC of its belief and the reasons for it in writing.
   b. Objections to any member of the Standing Appeals Panel hearing the appeal or any other procedural issues concerning the conditions under which the school’s appeal is to be heard will be considered and ruled upon by the Executive Committee of the Commission. If it is not feasible to convene the Executive Committee, the Commission Chair may act upon the matter in question.

E. Sitting Appeals Panel: Scope of Authority

1. The Sitting Appeals Panel can affirm, amend, reverse, or remand the adverse accreditation decision made by the Commission. The action taken must be approved by a majority of the Sitting Appeals Panel.

2. If the Sitting Appeals Panel affirms the decision of the Commission, the Commission’s action becomes final. When a decision to deny initial or renewal of accreditation or to remove accreditation is final, the school, if previously accredited, is removed from the Commission’s list of accredited schools.
3. If the Sitting Appeals Panel remands the case to the Commission for further consideration, the Sitting Appeals Panel will identify specific issues that the Commission must address and implement in a manner consistent with the appeals panel’s findings and decision. If the Commission takes a subsequent adverse action based upon grounds that have not been reviewed by an Appeals Panel, a school may appeal that action based only on those grounds not previously reviewed by an Appeals Panel.

4. If the Sitting Appeals Panel amends the adverse accreditation decision, the Commission will carry out that action in a manner that is consistent with the Sitting Appeals Panel’s decision.

5. If the Sitting Appeals Panel reverses the adverse accreditation decision, the Commission will carry out that action in a manner that is consistent with the Sitting Appeals Panel’s decision. The Commission may, however, immediately begin a new investigation into the school’s compliance with accreditation standards, which may result in a subsequent adverse accreditation decision. If such is the case, the school may appeal the subsequent adverse accreditation decision in accordance with this section of the Rules.

F. Appeal Hearing Procedures

1. The appeal hearing will commence with an opening statement by the Appeal Panel Chair, which describes the applicable standard of review and the procedures to be followed during the hearing.

2. The appealing school’s representative or counsel may then offer an opening statement summarizing the grounds for appeal. Presentations of all aspects of the appeal are limited to 30 minutes.

3. The Sitting Appeals Panel members may ask questions related to the record on appeal.

4. The appealing school may offer a closing statement and the hearing will adjourn.

5. The Executive Director of ACCSC communicates in writing to the school the Sitting Appeals Panel’s decision and the reasons for that decision.

G. Appeal Fees and Expenses

1. Each school appealing a Commission decision is required to pay the established appeal fee, in accordance with Commission requirements. This includes:
   a. Any main school that is subject to an adverse action;
   b. Any branch campus that is subject to an adverse action independent of its main school; and
   c. Any branch campus that elects to be included in the appeal of a main school that is subject to an adverse action.

2. The expenses incurred in the development and presentation of an appeal, including the fee for the application to appeal, are borne by the school filing the appeal, as indicated in these Rules.