

December 5, 2025

ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

██████████
Campus Director
Arkansas Technical School
200 E. Washington Avenue
North Little Rock, Arkansas 72114

School #M059308
Probation

Dear ██████████:

At the November 2025 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (“ACCSC” or “the Commission”) considered the following regarding Arkansas Technical School (“ATS”) located in North Little Rock, Arkansas:

- The complaint submitted by ██████████, ACCSC’s January 8, 2025 letter, and the school’s October 17, 2025 response;
- The complaint submitted by ██████████, ACCSC’s May 12, 2025 letter, and the school’s October 17, 2025 response;
- The Commission’s previous decision to defer action on the complaint submitted by ██████████, the August 19, 2025 Deferral, and the school’s October 17, 2025 response;¹
- The Commission’s previous decision to defer action on the complaint submitted by ██████████, the Commission’s August 22, 2025 Deferral, and the school’s October 17, 2025 response; and
- The school’s record of delinquent payments to the Commission, set forth in the ACCSC October 9, 2025 letter.

Upon review of the above, the Commission voted to place ATS on **Probation** and direct the school to receive a **Commission Directed Announced On-Site Evaluation**.

The Commission Directed Announced On-site Evaluation may also be combined with the Renewal of Accreditation Visit provided that the school submits all required applications, reports, and the fees shown below on or before the assigned due dates. The school’s Application for Renewal of Accreditation was due on November 14, 2025 and the Self-Evaluation Report is due on December 31, 2025.² The Commission Directed Announced On-site Evaluation fee in the amount of ██████████ will be due upon scheduling the visit to the school.

Ultimately, failure to submit the required materials or fees—less the On-site Evaluation fee—will result in the Commission’s consideration to withdraw the school’s accreditation.

¹ Although the ██████████ complaint was in regard to Arkansas College of Barbering & Hair Design (School #B072134), the branch campus of ATS, in light of the school’s closure, the Commission voted to forward this complaint to the main school via letter dated August 19, 2025.

² See also the Commission’s May 20, 2025 letter notifying the school that although the branch campus Arkansas College of Barbering & Hair Design is closed, the on-site evaluation team visiting Arkansas Technical School for its Renewal of Accreditation, will have access to the December 13, 2024 On-site Evaluation Report from the visit to the branch in order to review whether any of the issues at the branch are also present at the main school.

³ If the school submits the Application for Renewal of Accreditation and the Self-Evaluation Report thus allowing the Commission-Directed Announced On-site Evaluation to be combined with the Renewal of Accreditation On-site Evaluation, then please submit ██████████. Otherwise, each on-site evaluation will be conducted independently, and the school will be obligated to pay for each visit separately.

Area of Non-Compliance with Accrediting Standards

Per the October 9, 2025 ACCSC letter, ACCSC granted Arkansas Technical College's request for an extension for the school's responses to the above-listed complaints as well as the Renewal of Accreditation Application and the Self-Evaluation Report.⁴ Per *Section I (H)(5), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation*, late fees will apply to all applications, reports, and responses that have a specific deadline; however, a late fee may be reduced if the school has requested an extension prior to the due date and that extension has been granted. ACCSC granted extensions with the assessed fees as shown below. As of the date of this letter, ATS has not submitted any of the fees that were due before the date of this letter. In addition, ATS has not submitted the fiscal year 2026 sustaining fees, originally due on June 30, 2025 with a revised due date of October 17, 2025 as shown below.

LATE FEES:

Item	Original Due Date	New Due Date	Assessed Fee Amount
January 8, 2025 letter	February 10, 2025	October 17, 2025	██████
May 12, 2025 letter	June 12, 2025	October 17, 2025	██████
August 19, 2025 Deferral	October 2, 2025	October 17, 2025	N/A
August 22, 2025 letter	September 23, 2025	October 17, 2025	N/A
Application for Renewal of Accreditation	May 27, 2025	November 14, 2025	██████
Self-Evaluation Report	October 8, 2025	December 31, 2025	██████
Sustaining Fees	June 30, 2025	October 17, 2025	██████
Total:			██████

OTHER FEES:

- The school's FY 26 Sustaining Fee (incl Annual Report Processing Fees) of ██████:⁵
- Application for Renewal of Accreditation fee of ██████

This puts the school's obligation currently due to ACCSC: ██████ – due by December 31, 2025.

In addition, as of the date of this letter, the school has not submitted the Application for Renewal of Accreditation which, after an extension, was due November 14, 2025. Without the submission of an Application for Renewal of Accreditation, the school has failed to fulfill its process and reporting obligations.

A fundamental eligibility criteria for ACCSC accreditation is that the school must fulfill all process requirements and pay all required fees (*Section I (G)(2)(c&e), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation*). Failure to provide reports and fees to the Commission may result in an action taken by the Commission consistent with *Section VII of the Rules of Process and Procedure (Section I (H)(5) and Section I (J), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation)*. As of the date of this letter, ATS has not submitted any of the required fees listed above or the Application for Renewal of

⁴ As stated in the October 9, 2025 letter, ATS was directed to but did not attend the October 2024 Accreditation Workshop. Per the January 16, 2025 delinquency letter, the school was directed to have a representative attend the April 10-11, 2025 Accreditation Workshop and follow the April 2025 workshop deadlines. Campus Director ██████ attended the April 2025 Accreditation Workshop.

⁵ This amount is based on the school's Financial Statements submitted on June 30, 2025.

Accreditation. Therefore, the school must submit the Application for Renewal of Accreditation and the required fees in the amount of [REDACTED] by December 31, 2025 as set forth in this letter. Failure to submit the required materials or fees will result in the Commission's consideration to withdraw the school's accreditation.

Additional Areas of On-Going Concern

1. Arkansas Technical School must demonstrate that the school ensures the continuity of management and administrative capacity through the reasonable retention of management and administrative staff and that the school has adequate management and administrative capacity in place that includes 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 postsecondary educational institution in compliance with accrediting standards (*Section I (A)(1)(a) & Section I (A)(4), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation*). With regard to the complaint against the branch campus Arkansas College of Barbering & Hair Design ("ACBHD") submitted by [REDACTED] ACCSC's August 19, 2025 Deferral pointed out to ATS that the December 13, 2024 On-Site Evaluation Report from the renewal visit at ACBHD includes a finding that nearly all of ACBHD's managers and administrative employees had been in their current positions less than 6 months and that ACBHD's management utilized a team-based approach to administering three affiliated schools. The report further stated that at the time of ACBHD's on-site visit, the school was recovering from a wave of duty re-assignments. In response to the December 13, 2024 On-Site Evaluation Report, ACBHD provided notice of the campus' closure. Given the issues found at the branch campus, the Commission forwarded this issue to ATS as the responsible main school. The Commission directed ATS to provide a narrative response regarding the adequacy of management and administrative capacity of ATS; the staffing duty re-assignment and termination decisions; a copy of ATS's most recent performance evaluations; a Management Personnel Retention Chart for all management/administrative level staff at ATS for the period of June 1, 2024 to July 1, 2025; and a detailed description of the management structure and administrative capacity at ATS.

In response to the August 19, 2025 Deferral, ATS stated that some events transpired prior to the arrival of the current administration and therefore, the school cannot confirm nor deny some of [REDACTED] recollection of events. ATS's response indicates that since the start of the newly appointed Campus Director in January 2025, no staff have been demoted and there is no one from the previous leadership team still employed as of January 2025. ATS has had one termination of leadership regarding a Program Director who was employed from April through August 1, 2025, and ATS is still in the process of identifying a qualified candidate for this position. With regard to performance evaluations, ATS stated that the school does not have access to most recent performance evaluations. The school's plan is to perform evaluations in January 2026.

ATS also provided a Management Personnel Retention Chart for 8 management team members, as directed. This information indicates that other than the Barber Instructor (6 years tenure) and the Financial Senior Aid Officer (1 year and one month tenure), the team members have been in place for less than one year with some in place for only 1 month or 4 months. ATS's response also indicates that the school utilizes FAME for additional financial aid and enrollment support and that the school is restructuring its administrative organizational chart to include more support positions for the Program Department once enrollment improves. ATS indicated that the school is currently interviewing qualified applicants for the Program Director position.

Overall, ATS's response to the complaint suggests that administrative and managerial transitions have hindered the school's ability to fully address the Commission's concerns regarding the adequacy of administrative and management capacity. ATS indicated that due to new leadership, the school currently lacks access to certain records and is therefore unable to provide comprehensive responses to the Commission. In addition, given ATS's current finding of noncompliance for delinquent fees/application, the current status of restructuring and implementing a new management team, and the Commission's concerns regarding the areas listed in this letter (i.e., refunds, student needs and satisfaction, and sufficiency of learning materials), the Commission is not convinced that the school has adequate management and administrative capacity in place that includes 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 postsecondary educational institution in compliance with accrediting standards.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission directs ATS to prepare the following for the on-site evaluation team.

- a. An Organizational Chart listing all positions and names of personnel for each position;
 - b. Documentation of qualifications for all key management-level staff to demonstrate experience and ability to manage a school in compliance with accrediting standards; and
 - c. An update regarding the management staff restructuring and the hiring for the vacant Program Director position.
2. ATS must demonstrate that the school has and applies a fair and equitable refund policy also in compliance with state or third-party requirements, or in the absence of such requirements in accordance with generally accepted practices. (*Section I (D)(3), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation*). With regard to the complaint submitted by [REDACTED], in the February 19, 2025 Deferral, the Commission found that ATS's response did not address the allegation that the Complainant was overcharged and was supposed to receive a check, or documentation to support the narrative explanation of actions taken following the Complainant's withdrawal, to include a demonstration of the return of funds to the Department of Education. Therefore, the Commission directed the school to submit a narrative response regarding the Complainant's allegations, along with the refund policy, attendance records, and documentation of the Complainant's refund.

In the August 22, 2025 Deferral, the Commission noted that the response to the February 19, 2025 Deferral did not include a narrative, the Refund Report Worksheet submitted by the school was blank, and the Refund Report Summary Sheet showed a late refund payment. With regard to the late refund payment, the Date of Determination was listed as August 20, 2024, the Refund Due Date was listed as September 6, 2024, and the Date Refund Paid was listed as October 4, 2024, 28 days late.

In response to the August 22, 2025 Deferral, ATS provided documentation including a student ledger (October 17, 2025 ATS Response, pg. 15), a Refund Report Worksheet and Refund Report Summary Sheet, and a copy of the Complainant's Return to Title IV ("R2T4") calculation sheet. The narrative response begins by stating that some of the events occurred prior to the current school administration and therefore the school cannot confirm or deny the Complainant's memory of the matter. On page 2 of ATS's response, the school stated the following:

[REDACTED] enrolled on March 5, 2024. As of March 19th only the first disbursement had been received from this student making this one of four disbursements for student that complete a 1500 hour program [sic]. Therefore, [REDACTED] was not entitled to a refund check at that time

per our review of his ledger. The student withdrew from the program on 8/20/24. His first refund check was due to him on 8/21/24 but he was no longer a student at that time. [REDACTED] earned 534 training hours at the time he withdrew but should have had at least 768 hours as his contract had him training 32 hours each week...

A review of the student's ledger does identify that additional tuition charges were posted to his account two days after his drop date. The staff responsible are no longer employed to inquire. However, R2T4 refunds were made on 10/04/24. This investigation has allowed us to identify the additional funds are due for return to R2T4, we are in the process of returning the remaining balance (Id., pg. 2).

In response to the Commission's request for an explanation of the late refund, the school stated:

Our investigation did not identify a late student refund for [REDACTED]. He withdrew on August 20, 2024 and had not attended class since August 8, 2024. A refund was due on August 21st per our investigation and [REDACTED] was no longer a student (Id., pg. 3).

The school's response creates ambiguity regarding its obligation to issue a refund directly to the student. While the school's statement acknowledges that a refund was due, it simultaneously asserts that [REDACTED] was no longer a student, leaving the Commission to question whether the institution believes the Complainant is not entitled to the refund because of his withdrawal status, which would not meet accreditation standards. The Commission also found the Refund Report Worksheet⁶ on page 4 of the October 17, 2025 response to be unclear. The worksheet indicates that the school issued a refund in 38 days; however, the Date of Determination is August 22, 2024 and the date the refund was paid is October 4, 2024 which shows the refund being made in 43 days. The worksheet also shows a question mark written next to the field for the maximum number of days to disburse funds per the school's refund policy. The refund policy submitted in the response states the following:

All refunds will be calculated based on the students [sic] last date of attendance. Any monies due a student who withdraws shall be refunded within 14 days of a determination that a student has withdrawn, whether official or unofficially.

Any monies due to be returned to Title IV will be returned to the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) within the allocated 45 days outlined by DOE (Id., pg. 3).

It appears that the school is referring to refunds in two ways, those due directly to a student (due in 14 days) and those due to the Department of Education. In addition, it appears that the school is still in the process of returning the remaining balance for the additional funds due for R2T4 (Return to Title IV). As such, the response is unclear as to whether the school owes or owed a refund to the student and if so whether it was paid in accordance with the school's policy.

In addition, the complaint filed by [REDACTED] alleged issues with financial aid such as not receiving a refund check due to a discrepancy with attendance records. After returning from maternity leave, the new financial aid officer acknowledged [REDACTED] concerns but stated that the Complainant will not be receiving a refund for the first semester due to some undisclosed issues with the amounts charged. The school then informed the Complainant there should be \$700 issued from the first semester and a

⁶ The school also submitted two more Refund Report Summary Sheets; however, both differ from the summary sheet mentioned above. Both list the Date of Determination as August 22, 2024. For the sheet on page 7 of the response, the Refund Due Date and the Date Refund Paid fields are blank, and the sheet on page 14 of the response lists the Refund Due Date as October 4, 2024 and the Date Refund Paid as [REDACTED]. The Voluntary Withdrawal form signed by the complainant is dated August 20, 2024.

refund for the current semester. The Complainant stated that she has not received a copy of the financial aid award letter or the contract she was told to reference.

In response to the May 12, 2025 ACCSC letter, ATS stated that a review of [REDACTED] Financial Aid charges and “overtime charges” identified that she received credit for some charges in November of 2024 but was assessed additional charges in 2025 due to being enrolled almost two years in the barber program. The school stated that it conducted an investigation due to this complaint and identified a discrepancy in student charges. The school stated that these charges are automatically added via the school’s Title IV partner, FAME, after a student has exceeded 150% of time in the program. The student’s account has been credited with the overtime charge, and the student has a [REDACTED] credit that will be issued to [REDACTED] along with a textbook to support her in studying for the exam. The Commission noted the school’s response and is interested in more information regarding the school’s policy and procedure pertaining to “overtime charges” and documentation to demonstrate that the credit has been issued and the Complainant received the textbook.

Based on the foregoing the Commission found the school’s refund documentation to be unclear and questions the adequacy and accuracy of the school’s administration of financial aid and refunds, and therefore determined that the on-site evaluation team should review whether the school has systems in place to process refunds in accordance with required policies.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission directs the school to prepare the following for review by the on-site evaluation team:

- a. A copy of [REDACTED] enrollment agreement;
 - b. Documentation that all funds have been returned for [REDACTED];
 - c. Documentation that all applicable charges have been credited and provided to [REDACTED] and that the textbook was issued;
 - d. The school’s policies and procedures pertaining to “overtime charges”;
 - e. The school’s refund policy; and
 - f. A list of five students during 2024 and five students from 2025 that withdrew or were terminated and were due a refund accompanied by the school’s file for each student including the following documentation:
 - i. A completed Refund Report Worksheet and Refund Report Summary Sheet;
 - ii. A copy of the R2T4 calculation sheet and proof of returned funds; and
 - iv. A copy of all electronic refund transactions and/or checks – front and back – issued for the purpose of student refunds.
3. ATS must demonstrate that the school is only operating programs in the modality as approved by the Commission. The addition of distance education as a means of delivering program content is considered a substantive change and requires prior approval through the filing of an Application for Initial Distance Education Approval (*Section IV (E)(6)(a)(v)(1) Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation*). With regard to the complaint submitted by [REDACTED], in the February 19, 2025 Deferral letter the Commission noted that the Complainant’s Attendance History Report for August 2024-October 2024 includes notations referencing distance education and that the report indicates a cumulative total of 85.5 “Distance Ed Hours.” According to the ACCSC records, ATS did not apply

for, or receive approval, to offer any portion of a program via Distance Education. As such, the Commission directed the school to submit an explanation and documentation in this regard. However, the school's response to the February 19, 2025 Deferral did not address this item. Therefore, in the August 22, 2025 Deferral, the Commission again directed the school to submit an explanation regarding the "Distance Ed Hours" listed on the Complainant's transcript and an attestation as to whether or not the school is offering any portion of any program via distance education.

On page 3 of the October 17, 2025 response to the August 22, 2025 Deferral the school stated:

Distance Education: Arkansas Technical School and Arkansas College of Barbering and Hair Design did have some students listed under a Distance Education contract prior to 2025. It is my assumption that the school believed they were able to do so under the COVID protocols and that non-administrative staff were not informed the end date for the COVID distance education approval. However, [REDACTED] was not one of those students. It appears that all students were given the ability to clock in via their cellular devices or on the campus' on center time clock. It appears hours submitted for students who clocked in not in the building were given the title of distance education hours as shown on his transcript for 85.50 hours. No students have been enrolled under a distance education contract in 2025. The current administration has received clarity that an application must be submitted to enroll students under this status.

The response also includes a copy of [REDACTED] transcript. The Commission noted ATS's explanation, but given the Distance Education hours listed on the transcript and the attendance records, the Commission determined that verification of the school's response is warranted.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission directs the school to prepare the following for review by the on-site evaluation team.

- a. A list of all students enrolled since January 1, 2025 and
 - b. A copy of each student's records including admissions documentation, enrollment agreements, attendance records, and transcripts.
4. ATS must demonstrate that sufficient equipment and learning stations are provided to allow each student adequate scheduled time for practice (*Section II (A)(5)(c) Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation*). The complaints submitted by [REDACTED] allege that learning materials such as textbooks have not been provided and other materials such as the e-book have not been readily accessible as the Complainants had to login to Cengage Read using a previous login credential which presented some technical issues. In addition, [REDACTED] stated that the school was supposed to provide a program kit after the completion of 250 hours of attendance, which had not been issued even after she completed those hours. [REDACTED] alleges that the kit she received that cost [REDACTED] is inadequate.

The school's response to the [REDACTED] complaint begins by stating that some events transpired prior to the arrival of the current administration, and therefore, the school cannot confirm nor deny some of the Complainant's recollection of events. ATS did state that the students participating in a 1500-hour program are scheduled to receive a program kit at 250 hours pending satisfactory attendance as defined by the Department of Education for Title IV funding recipients. The school indicated it has loaner kits and books for students to use until they receive their own, and due to the school's investigation into this matter ,ATS is currently not charging students for books and kits until

students receive their own. The school's response goes on to state that students and staff have adequate supplies for training and services and that instructors conduct weekly inventory of supplies.

The school's response to the [REDACTED] complaint indicates that some events transpired prior to the arrival of the current administration, and therefore ATS cannot confirm nor deny some of [REDACTED] recollection of events. ATS confirmed that [REDACTED] received and signed for a student kit on two separate dates and that [REDACTED] returned her tablet stating it did not function properly. ATS stated that all fees regarding the tablet and technology were reversed and provided a student ledger. The response also states that at the time of enrollment in 2023, the student was not issued a textbook because she was enrolled as a Distance Education student. Page 2 of the October 17, 2025 response states,

[n]ot being employed at the time of the student's enrollment, I can only assume that Arkansas Technical School staff may have been under the impression that they could enroll a student under this status as a result of the implementation of COVID protocols and they may not have been aware of the official end date of the ACCSC approval of that status... I can attest that no student has been enrolled as a Distance Education student in 2025 (Id., pg.2).⁷

As noted above, the on-site evaluation team will seek to verify this statement.

In order to ensure the school has adequate learning materials and equipment, the Commission directs the school to prepare the following for review by the on-site evaluation team for the Barber/Hair Design (1500 hours) and Cosmetology (1500 hours) programs:

- a. The school's catalog and any addenda or supplements;
 - b. The school's policy for ensuring all students have access to loaner kits until they get their own;
 - c. Information to demonstrate that the loaner kits are sufficient to provide students with all needed materials; and
 - d. The school's policy related to e-books and tablets to demonstrate all students have access to the learning materials.
5. Arkansas Technical School must demonstrate that the school is attentive to its students' needs and maintains written policies and procedures addressing student services. The school must continually monitor and addresses student satisfaction and student needs for services as a means to assist students achieve successful student achievement outcomes (*Section VI (A)(1) & Section V (A)(5), Substantive Standards, Standards of Accreditation*). With regard to the [REDACTED] complaint, ACCSC's January 29, 2025 letter directed the school to submit the most recent student survey results. In the August 19, 2025 Deferral, the Commission noted that although the school provided a narrative response of ACBHD's steps to resolve the issues brought forth in the complaint, the Commission was interested in reviewing a copy of the school's most recent student survey results. Although ACBHD is now closed, the Commission expressed concerns regarding student satisfaction. As the main school is ultimately accountable for the compliance of its branch location, the Commission directed ATS as the responsible entity to submit recent student survey results and the process for documenting compliance with accrediting standards and the status of the students that had transferred from ACBHD to Arkansas Technical School. In response to the August 19, 2025 Deferral, ATS stated:

I am not familiar with the survey process and will need assistance in that regard please. I could not find previous survey information to support your request. Unfamiliar with the process of

⁷ The response to the [REDACTED] complaint includes a copy of her enrollment agreement which states Distance Education and In-Person Enrollment Agreement.

the previous administration's documentation process, the current administration performs continual review of accreditation "handbook" and will use the self-assessment document as a guide. Current investigations into the complaint responses has helped us tremendously with compliance expectations (October 17, 2025 ATS Response to the [REDACTED] complaint, pg. 5).

The school's response appears to indicate that there is no documentation available regarding student satisfaction. The on-site evaluation team will conduct a survey of the current student population. In addition, the school must prepare materials for the on-site evaluation team to include a copy of the current student services policies and procedures and any complaints filed with the school in the last 5 years.

The Commission directs ATS to provide the on-site evaluation team with documentation to demonstrate compliance in the areas delineated above. The school may also provide the on-site evaluation team with any other information the school believes will be useful to demonstrate the school's compliance with ACCSC's requirements in these areas. The On-site Evaluation Report that summarizes the findings of the team will provide details regarding the Commission's review of the school and the additional information requested for a response. The school must respond to each Team Finding, if applicable, and submit all Additional Information Required as stated in the report.

PROBATION REQUIREMENTS:

In cases where the Commission has made a determination that a school is out of compliance with one or more accreditation standards or other requirements, the Commission will place a school on Probation. A school subject to a Probation 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 (Section VII (L)(6), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation)*.

In accordance with *Section X, Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation*, the reasons for the Probation are 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 by December 31, 2025.**

MAXIMUM TIMEFRAME TO ACHIEVE COMPLIANCE:

According to *Section VII (N), Rules of Process and Procedures, Standards of Accreditation*, when the Commission has found an area in which a school is out of compliance with accreditation standards or requirements, the Commission will provide the institution with a written timeline as set forth in the Commission's notification for coming into compliance that is reasonable based on the nature of the finding,

the current period of review, the school's stated mission, and the educational objectives of the institution. Given the nature of the finding, and that the school has already been provided an extension, the maximum timeframe allowed for ATS to achieve and demonstrate compliance with *Section I (H)(5) and Section I (J), Rules of Process and Procedure, Standards of Accreditation* begins as of the date of this letter and ends on **December 31, 2025**. If the fees in the amount of [REDACTED] and the **Application for Renewal of Accreditation** are not received by **December 31, 2025**, the Commission may take action to withdraw the school's accreditation. Please also be advised that the Commission is not required to allow the maximum time frame to remedy noncompliance in all instances and may establish shorter time frames as deemed appropriate, including taking immediate adverse action.

Notification to Students:

Within **seven days** of receipt of the Probation notification and for the duration of that action, the school must:

- a. Inform current and prospective students in writing that the school has been placed on Probation and provide such notice on the school's website;
- b. Provide a summary that accurately describes the reasons for the Probation; and
- c. Provide the uniform resource locator (URL) where that action can be obtained from the Commission's website.

The school must **within seven days** 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*). **Within 10 days the school must upload a copy of the notice provided to students to ACCSC's College 360 Database.**

In summary, the school must provide the following:

- **A copy of the notice provided to students of this Probation to ACCSC's College 360 School Submission Portal uploaded no later than within 10 days of this letter;**
- **The school's submission of required fees and Application for Renewal of Accreditation uploaded to the College360 School Submission Portal no later than December 31, 2025;**
- **An [Institutional Teach Out Plan Approval Form](#) due December 31, 2025; and**
- **The school's submission of the Self-Evaluation Report uploaded to the College360 School Submission Portal no later than December 31, 2025.**

If the items listed above⁸ and a certification attesting to the accuracy of the information are not received in the Commission's office **on or before December 31, 2025**, 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.

⁸ Per Appendix I, ACCSC assesses a \$1,000 processing fee to a school placed on Probation. In this case, the Commission is not requiring payment of this fee at this time.

For further assistance or additional information, please contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Executive Director