Public Notice of Revocation and Denial of Accreditation Actions
Updated September 19, 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.

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>Ladera Career Paths Training Center</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>Under Appeal</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Cities Barber College</td>
<td>Grand Prairie, TX</td>
<td>Denial of Accreditation</td>
<td>Under Appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The ACCSC Appeal Panel has remanded the Denial of Accreditation for the following school back to the Commission for further consideration. Due to the decision by the Appeals Panel, the Commission’s adverse action is not final.

REMAND FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

<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>The Academy</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Denial of Accreditation</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Commission maintains this list for all actions from the preceding twelve months.
NOTICE OF FINAL ACTION – REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF ACCREDITATION:

The following schools have chosen not to appeal the Commission’s adverse accreditation decision and the Commission 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>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes a Satellite Location in Gurabo, PR.
** Includes Satellite Locations in Yabucoa, PR and Juncos, PR.

The ACCSC Appeals Panel has upheld the Revocation or Denial of Accreditation Action for the following schools making the Commission’s adverse action final.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Barber &amp; Hair Design College</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>September 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeySkills Learning Center</td>
<td>Clifton, New Jersey</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>September 8, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>Revocation of Accreditation</td>
<td>July 28, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION ACTION – FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 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 Revocation of Accreditation

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 – UNDER APPEAL

ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 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. Summarized below are the grounds for this revocation action.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION

1. Ladera failed to demonstrate that the school engages in ongoing efforts to promote student loan repayment (Section I (E), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. Ladera failed to demonstrate that the school (1) has admissions criteria designed to admit only those students who are reasonably capable of successfully completing and benefiting from the training offered and (2) publishes in its catalog and informs, prior to admission, each applicant for enrollment of the program’s admission requirements, process, and procedures; the nature of the training and education provided; and the program’s responsibilities and demands (Section V (A)(1) and (2), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. Ladera failed to demonstrate that the school maintains and protects permanent educational record for all currently enrolled students against damage or loss (Section VI (B), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4. Ladera 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, its location, its name, its personnel, its training, its services, or its accredited status (Section IV (B)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

5. Ladera failed to provide documentation to demonstrate that the school disclosed to students whether accreditation and/or approval by a third-party regulatory agency has been achieved and is in good standing (Section IV (C)(4)(c), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

6. Ladera failed to provide documentation to demonstrate that current and prospective students were informed of the school’s Probation status with the Commission (Section VII (L)(8), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

7. Ladera failed to provide documentation that the Commission deemed pertinent and relevant to an accreditation action (Section I (H), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

8. Ladera failed to demonstrate that there is full-time, on-site supervision by an individual or team with the appropriate combination of education, experience, and demonstrated ability to lead and manage a post-secondary educational institution (Section I (A)(1)(a), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
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 REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION


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 REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION

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 – UNDER APPEAL
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: JUNE 6, 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.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION

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

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 Denial of Initial Accreditation

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 – APPEAL REMAND

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

At the February 2011 meeting, ACCSC voted to deny the Application for Initial Accreditation submitted by The Academy located in Miami, Florida. Summarized below is the accrediting standard that serves as the basis for this denial action.

Summary of Grounds for the Denial of Accreditation

1. The Academy did not demonstrate that the school has accurately represented itself to ACCSC or to prospective students through advertising and promotional materials (Section IV (D)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. The Academy did not demonstrate that the school has the proper supervision and oversight of its educational activities and programs (Section III (A)(1) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. The Academy did not demonstrate that the school’s program offerings are only comprised of appropriate educational activities such as lecture and laboratory hours (Section II (A)(2)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4. The Academy did not demonstrate that successful program completion is based upon satisfactory achievement of the knowledge, skills, and competencies required by program objectives (Section VII (A)(3)(h), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

5. The Academy did not demonstrate that the school enforces a policy of acceptable student attendance (Section VII (A)(3)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

6. The Academy did not demonstrate that, at each interval specified, the school determines the likelihood that the student will be able to attain the minimum cumulative grade point average required for graduation (Section VII (A)(3)(a)(i), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

7. The Academy did not demonstrate that the school determines that each enrolled student meets the school’s admissions requirements admissions criteria (Section V (A)(2)(b), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION - FINAL ACTION
ACTION ORIGINATION DATE: SEPTEMBER 7, 2011

STATE BARBER & HAIR COLLEGE (MS #056052)
2514 S. AGNEW AVENUE
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA, 73108

At the August 2011 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the Accreditation of State Barber & Hair College (“SBHD”) located in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Summarized below is the accrediting standard that serves as the basis for this revocation action.

Summary of Grounds for the Revocation of Accreditation

Over a year ago, the Commission issued an order directing SBHDC to show cause as to why its accreditation should not be revoked for failure to demonstrate compliance with ACCSC’s Standards of Accreditation. At its February 2011 meeting, the Commission revisited the school’s compliance and subsequently issued a Probation Order to the school. In addition, based on the Commission’s continuing concerns about SBHDC’s compliance, the Commission directed the school to undergo an unannounced on-site evaluation. The Team Summary Report of that on-site visit identified numerous issues relative to the school’s adherence to accreditation requirements including the following:4

1. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the school has owners and managers that have the demonstrated ability to lead and manage a postsecondary institution; that the owners of the school are appropriately qualified for their roles and sufficiently engaged in the oversight of school operations (Section I (A) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. SBHDC and its management did not demonstrate engagement in institutional assessment, improvement, and planning activities appropriate and relevant to the school’s current Title IV status and operational condition and that support the management of school operations (Section I (A)(1)(d) and Section I (B) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the school’s management has the ability to demonstrate acceptable student achievement and provide complete and accurate Graduation and Employment (“G&E”) Charts and supporting documentation for each of the school’s programs in accordance with accrediting standards (Section I Statement of Purpose and Section VII (B)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4. SBHDC did demonstrate that the school describes itself fully and accurately to the Commission and to prospective students; follows practices that allow applicants to make informed enrollment decisions; and ensures that school personnel do not make false or misleading statements about the school to prospective students (Preamble, and Section IV, Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

4 The standards cited here represent those in place at the time of the on-site evaluation and as included in the on-site evaluation report. The codification of the Standards of Accreditation has since changed in some areas; however, the requirements are unchanged.
5. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the catalog and enrollment agreement accurately represent tuition charges, discounts, and all payment options (Section I (D)(1) and Section IV (C)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

6. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the financial structure of the school is sound with resources sufficient for the proper operation of the school and the discharge of obligations to its students (Section I (C)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

7. SBHDC did not demonstrate that a copy of the fully signed enrollment agreement is furnished to the student (Section IV (C)(5), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

8. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the school secures documentation to demonstrate each applicant meets all admissions requirements (Section V (A)(2)(e), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

9. SBHDC did not demonstrate that the school has been operating in continuous compliance with accrediting standards (Section I (D)(2)(a), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).

10. SBHDC was directed to provide evidence to demonstrates that the school has informed current and prospective students that the school has been placed on Probation and that additional information regarding that action can be obtained from the Commission’s website as required by Section VII (L)(8), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation.

11. The Commission directed SBHDC to provide a detailed written response to the Team Summary Report. SBHDC failed to do so. Pursuant to Section I (D)(1-3), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation, schools are obligated to supply the Commission with all information and reports required by accrediting rules and standards in order to maintain eligibility for accreditation. The Commission concluded that the school violated this requirement by failing to respond to the Team Summary Report. The Commission also found that by failing to respond the school left unchallenged the Commission’s serious concerns about SBHDC’s compliance with accreditation requirements. For these reasons, the Commission revoked the accreditation of the school.
At the August 2011 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the Accreditation of KeySkills Learning located in Clifton, New Jersey. Summarized below is the accrediting standard that serves as the grounds for this final revocation action.

Summary of Grounds for the Revocation of Accreditation

KeySkills Learning failed to demonstrate that the school is financially sound with resources sufficient for the proper operation of the school and discharge of obligations to students (Section I (C)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTION
SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
REVOCATION OF ACCREDITATION – FINAL ACTION

HAIRSTYLING INSTITUTE OF CHARLOTTE (MS #001291)
209 B. SOUTH KING DRIVE
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA 25204

At its February 2011 meeting, ACCSC voted to revoke the accreditation of The Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte located in Charlotte, North Carolina. Summarized below are the reasons for the Commission’s revocation action.

Summary of Grounds for the Revocation of Accreditation

1. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school has adequate management and administrative capacity to meet accrediting standards on an ongoing basis (Section I Statement of Purpose and Section (I)(A), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

2. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte did not demonstrate that members of school management and administrative employees participate in on-going development and training activities that support their particular roles in the school as directed in the December 8, 2010 Probation Order (Section I (A)(3), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

3. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school has appropriate administrative and operational policies and procedures as required by Section I (A)(1)(d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation.

4. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that there are a sufficient number of faculty members to serve the number of students enrolled in the Barber/Styling program (Section III (B)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

5. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school engages in ongoing institutional assessment and improvement activities appropriate to the size and scale of school operations and that these activities include goal setting, benchmarking, and implementation activities in all areas as required by Section I (B), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation.

6. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school has sufficient support and appropriate budgetary allocations for the school’s Learning Resource System (“LRS”) as required by Section II (A)(6), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation.

7. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school conducts two meeting annually of its Program Advisory Committee (“PAC”) and that the school maintains meeting minutes which include identification of all members in attendance (i.e., titles and affiliations) and a comprehensive and clear description of the review and commentary made by the school representatives and the Program Advisory Committee members (Section II (A)(5)(a&d), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

8. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school’s current advertising complies with ACCSC’s accrediting standards (Section IV (D)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

9. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the financial structure of the school is sound, with resources sufficient for the proper operation of the school and the discharge of obligations to its students (Section I (C)(1), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation).

10. Hairstyling Institute of Charlotte failed to demonstrate that the school has complied with all applicable federal regulations as required as a condition of accreditation eligibility (Section I (B)(2)(a)(ii), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation).
DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION ACTION

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR ADVERSE ACTION
DENIAL OF A SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE APPLICATION – FINAL ACTION

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:

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).

Based on the foregoing, the Commission determined ETI did not demonstrate the capacity to offer programs via distance education and as such has acted to deny the school’s Application for Initial Distance Education Approval.
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.