

- For those campuses or institutions that have resolved all outstanding areas of non-compliance, the IRC member should be prepared to briefly explain what materials were provided in order to evidence compliance.

Once all areas of non-compliance and relevant materials for the respective campus or institution have been reviewed, the IRC member must ensure he/she has done the following on the orange sheet:

Select Appropriate action from the orange sheet IRC Recommendation drop box (i.e., approval, deferral, compliance warning, show-cause, withdrawal by suspension, denial)

- Note your decision: OK, BUT**

If BUT, does finding need to be revised? If this is the case, consult with the staff person who conducted the visit and deliberate with the IRC members.

- OK, PENDING**

If PENDING, the response has not addressed the findings sufficiently and additional information is required. If the corrective action is minor, staff can request the additional evidence in the form of documentation on behalf of the IRC reviewer during the IRC meeting. If the information being sought is received and remediates the finding, the IRC reviewer may change the recommended action to OK.

- OK**

If OK, the finding has been successfully remediated by the campus response.

- NO**

IF NO (unconditionally), the campus response is insufficient to remediate the finding and the campus will be required to submit further documentation as evidence of compliance.

Draft the appropriate language in the NEEDED section and draft the appropriate motion letter

During IRC Considerations, the entire group and staff then agree on a proposed action to present to the full Council. Each participant should be prepared to discuss reasons for the recommended action and to answer specific questions concerning the response items, team report, etc.

Proposed recommendations to grant initial accreditation or to remove an institution's accreditation by denial or suspension are to be presented in a matter which will articulate the Council's reasons for such an action in a succinct manner.

TYPES OF ORANGE SHEETS

1. **Original Orange sheet-** indicates those institutions or campuses being reviewed for the first time but are not an initial

Campus Name	
Campus Address	
City, State Zip Code	
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i>	<i>ID Code:</i>
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.	<i>No. of Findings:</i>
<i>Staff:</i>	<i>IRC:</i>
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/Choose an item.	<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> Choose an item.
<i>Background Information:</i> (Please summarize retention and placement, any adverse or complaints, and licensure pass rates, if applicable, in addition to other information that will be helpful in considering this application/visit.)	
	<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.
<i>Commissioner:</i>	<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.

2. **Deferral sheet-** indicates those institutions or campuses that have outstanding areas of noncompliance from a previous Council Meeting

Name of Campus	
Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i>	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.	<i>No. of Original/Remaining Findings:</i> /
<i>Staff:</i>	<i>IRC:</i>
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/ Choose an item.	<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> Choose an item.
	<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> Choose an item.
<i>Current Status:</i>	
<i>Background Information:</i> (Please summarize retention and placement, any adverse or complaints, and licensure pass rates, if applicable, in addition to other information that will be helpful in considering this application/visit.)	
	<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.
<i>Commissioner:</i>	<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.

3. **Initial accreditation sheet-** indicates those initial campuses or institutions that are being reviewed for the first time

Name of Campus	
Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> IG	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX
<i>DE:</i> Choose an item.	<i>No. of Findings:</i>
<i>Staff:</i>	<i>IRC:</i>
<i>Initial Retention:</i> NN%	<i>Initial Placement:</i> NN%
<i>Institutional Background:</i> (Please summarize any information that will be helpful in considering this application, such as adverse; complaints; licensure pass rates, if applicable; current accreditation; etc.)	
	<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.
<i>Commissioner:</i>	<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.

4. **Initial accreditation deferral sheet-** indicates those initial campuses or institutions that have outstanding areas of non-compliance from a previous Council Meeting

Name of Campus		
Address		
City, State, Zip Code		
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> IG	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.	<i>No. of Original/ Remaining Findings:</i> /	
<i>Staff:</i>	<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Initial Retention:</i> NN%	<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Initial Placement:</i> NN%		
<i>Institutional Background:</i> (Please summarize information that will be helpful in considering this application, such as adverse; complaints; licensure pass rates, if applicable; current accreditation; etc.)		
<i>Current Status:</i>		
<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.		
<i>Commissioner:</i>	<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

<h2>MOTION LETTER CANNED LANGUAGE GUIDE</h2>
--

ALL IRC reviewers are required to utilize the Council’s canned language as applicable, when recommending a deferral action for any campus or institution.

This information can be found by doing the following:

- Look under the Documents Templates
- Click on the Motion Letter Template folder
- Click on the Word Document titled Canned Language for Motion Letters Then find your respective area of non-compliance and cater the canned language specific to the items you would like to request in order for the campus or institution to come into compliance

**Note- The canned language is primarily used by the Council as a tool to keep the language in motion letters precise and consistent for each campus or institution. It is a representation of the most common areas of non-compliance. Therefore, there may not be an appropriate canned language for every case so it will be necessary to develop new language as needed.*

RECOMMENDING AN ACTION

All areas of non-compliance must be sufficiently rectified and demonstrate compliance before the Council will grant accreditation. If additional information is needed to determine if a campus or institution has addressed all findings, a deferral may be necessary. Once the campus or institution has been determined to be **out of compliance**, the corresponding action would be a compliance warning, show-cause directive, or withdrawal by suspension (Sections 2-3-220, 2-2-230, and 2-3-402). Generally speaking, an action on a renewal of accreditation can only be deferred once, after which, it can be determined if they are out of compliance with the applicable Criteria sections.

Reasons for a short grant or unusual background information should be explained briefly on the Orange File Review Worksheet (e.g., "This school was suspended at the December 2013 meeting, and the suspension was subsequently reversed after a Review Board hearing").

The orange sheet must be completed for all actions being recommended. All negative recommendations made by an IRC reviewer should be discussed with ACICS management. In some cases, a member of the Intermediate Review Committee will review deferrals with numerous or severe citations.

NOTE: Should the campus not respond to one or more findings at all (overlooked, portion of response lost in mail, etc.), staff should contact the school immediately. **No motions should be written pending receipt of further information, with the exception of financials.**

The recommended action should explicitly describe any areas of noncompliance and clearly outline the actions and materials necessary to demonstrate compliance.

DETERMINING GRANT LENGTHS

Each IRC reviewer has the responsibility of recommending to the Council, the appropriate number of grant years for each respective campus or institution being considered for an initial grant or a renewal of accreditation. Final action by the Council to accredit or renew accreditation or not to do so, or to limit or otherwise condition the grant of accreditation is determined only following review of pertinent information and data on the campus or institution.

At the IRC level of review, the number and seriousness of any deficiencies, and the campus's or institution's capability to overcome them, are taken into account, as well as financial status, retention and placement reporting, complaints or external information, and past Council actions. As such, the IRC reviewer should utilize the grant length guidelines below as a tool, not as a standard, in determining the appropriate number of years on a case by case basis.

<i>Concern</i>	<i>Suggested Max.</i>	<i>Additional Comments</i>
FINANCIAL & CAMPUS-LEVEL STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOME ACTION	4 years	The Financial Review and Institutional Effectiveness committees may want to discuss particular situations that may justify a longer grant.
SUBJECT TO LS&T (potential loss of <u>all</u> Title IV) Cohort Default Rate greater than 45%. - or - greater than 40% and has not reduced its rate by at least five percent from the previous year.	Case-by-case decision Review potential for institution to continue operation	For consideration by the Financial Review Committee which may recommend a show-cause directive. Evidence of successful appeal, <u>substantial</u> decrease in default rate based on appeal, limited use of Title IV, minimal criteria violations/no reporting requirements may warrant special consideration by the Council for full grant.
25% or above cohort default rate for three consecutive years (potential loss of FFELP [formerly GSL] only; or potential provisional status or loss of all Title IV aid due to "lack of administrative capability") Over 40% for one year -- may lead to provisional status or loss of FFELP	Case-by-case decision	Reporting requirements (e.g., financial, retention, placement) or concern with retention/placement may warrant a shorter grant or additional review. Evidence of successful appeal, <u>substantial</u> decrease in default rate, and/or limited use of Title IV may warrant full grant.
AFTER A NEGATIVE ACTION OR SUBSTANTIVE AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE	2-4 years Case-by case decision	<i>Accreditation Criteria</i> states that the Council will not grant accreditation for a full six-year term if the grant is awarded following any hearing resulting from a previous action to deny accreditation. Financial and Institutional Effectiveness reporting influences grant length.

INITIALS (unaccredited institutions)	3 years	Excluding branch-to-freestanding. Grant length may vary depending upon the institution's compliance with Council standards.
INITIALS (institutions currently accredited by another organization)	4 years Case-by case decision	The institution may receive a grant length of more than four years based on the institution's compliance with Council standards.
LIMITED NUMBERS OF FINDINGS (able to be resolved within no more than two Council meeting sessions)	4 years	Reporting requirements (e.g., financial, retention, placement) may warrant shorter/longer grant and/or additional review.
NO FINDINGS (or minimal findings such as catalog issues and resolved in one Council meeting session)	5-6 years	Reporting requirements (e.g., financial, retention, placement) may warrant shorter grant/additional review.

APPLICANTS FOR INITIAL GRANT OF ACCREDITATION

When an institution has completed the procedures of an application for an initial grant of accreditation, undergone a resource visit, prepared a self-study, undergone a team evaluation visit, financial review, Intermediate Review Committee review, and commission review, a proposed action is recommended concerning its request.

If an institution is found to be in compliance with all criteria, the appropriate action is to grant the institution accreditation for a specific period of time. Generally, a three-year grant is awarded. The institution may be awarded a four year grant if it was previously accredited by another agency.

If the institution did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate its compliance, the IRC member may recommend deferring action on the application and require additional information from the campus/institution concerning the correction of the deficiencies. A deferral will extend until the next meeting of the Council, depending upon the deficiencies. Generally, the deferral should not be for more than one year.

If an institution is found to be seriously and substantially out of compliance with the criteria, the IRC may recommend that the Council deny the request for an initial grant of accreditation. In the case of denial, as in a deferral, a list of the specific criteria with which the institution was found in noncompliance must be noted and the reasons identified why the institution was found in noncompliance. Should a denial be recommended, the institution will have the right to appeal that decision to the appropriate party.

Campuses/institutions that apply for freestanding, main campus accreditation for a currently-operating branch campus are considered to be applying for an initial grant.

APPLICANTS FOR RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION

Institutions previously accredited have been given grants of accreditation for a specific period of time. Within that period of time, they must make application for new grants in order for accreditation to continue uninterrupted. The Council office keeps track of the grants and advises institutions when they should initiate applications for new grants of accreditation (Self Study).

Failure of an institution to initiate an application for a new grant of accreditation or of the Council to grant the institution an extension of the previous grant of accreditation will result in the expiration of the institution's accreditation with the passage of time.

Generally, institutions applying for new grants of accreditation will be considered and given new grants of accreditation or will have the previous grants of accreditation extended in order for the Council to receive additional information.

OTHER APPLICATIONS CONCERNING INSTITUTIONS

In addition to considerations of institutions seeking initial or new grants of accreditation, the Council makes decisions about a number of other requests. Depending on the file assigned, an IRC member may be expected to propose an action based on the institution's application. These additional applications are:

- QAM – OS: Quality Assurance Monitoring- Out of Scope Application**
- QAM – RV: Quality Assurance Monitoring-Readiness Visit Application**
- QAM – HC: Quality Assurance Monitoring-Higher Credential Application**
- QAM - DE < OR > 50%: Distance Education Application**
- QAM - LSV: Quality Assurance Monitoring – Learning Site Verification**
- QAM- NB: Quality Assurance Monitoring – New Branch**
- QAM – CO: Quality Assurance Monitoring - Change of Ownership**

Many institutions appear on the Council's agenda for consideration of a decision which was deferred. A deferral generally occurs when the Council does not have sufficient information to make a decision or there is evidence of some deficiency in the campus/institution that may be corrected. Periodically, an IRC member may be asked to review an institution whose action has been deferred or which is on a compliance warning or show-cause directive. However, IRC members are routinely asked to review the files for campuses/institutions which are new to the Council agenda. If a deferral is reviewed by the IRC, the review must reconsider the action which resulted in the deferral to determine the appropriate decision.

Whether seeking an initial or a new grant of accreditation, the institution is afforded due process in its review by the Council and, should the Council take a negative action, there is a standard procedure concerning the rights of the institution to an appeal.

IRC members may also be asked to review special visit reports. A special visit is initiated by staff or the Council when an institution/campus is deemed “at-risk,” of non-compliance or has triggered a review for a number of other reasons, including an ongoing assessment of all risk factors. Possible actions for a special visit include approval, compliance warning, show-cause, and withdrawal by suspension.

MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS

If the campus/institution is on the agenda for more than one reason, ask staff whether there should be more than one letter. If a new grant also has QAM:RV or QAM: OS reviews, and all receive approval, there will be a letter generated for each separate action, i.e., new grant approval letter, QAM:OS letter or QAM: RV letter, etc.).

NOTE: Branch campuses and QAM:OS programs can be given inclusion while the other action is deferred; make sure the appropriate grant date is the same in both letters.

GENERAL PROCEDURES AND COUNCIL ACTIONS

During the course of the file review, IRC members will review a number of campuses/institutions and arrive at a proposed action regarding each. These recommended actions may range from a grant of accreditation, to the denial of a new grant of accreditation, to a show-cause directive. Staff has drafted the appropriate letters for common decisions. The outlines have been prepared to comply with the procedural guarantees outlined in the *Accreditation Criteria* so that they will provide the necessary information for the institution to understand the Council's position and will afford the institution the opportunity to adequately respond to the Council.

ACCREDITATION GRANTED (APPROVAL)

If an institution is found to be in compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria*, ACICS may grant accreditation for a specific period of time from a minimum of one year to a maximum of six years. The length of the grant shall be at the discretion of ACICS. A grant of accreditation for less than six years is not a negative action and, therefore, is not appealable.

The Council will not grant accreditation for a full six-year term if the grant is awarded following any hearing resulting from a previous action to deny accreditation.

ACTION DEFERRED

When an institution is measured against the criteria and there is insufficient evidence available for the Council to make a decision, ACICS may defer action until the next Council meeting, pending receipt of additional information. In such cases, ACICS will provide in writing the reasons for the deferral, state what the institution needs to provide, and invite a response to the findings by a specific date.

Deferral is, in effect, “no action at this time” and is not a negative action. Therefore, deferral is not an appealable action. Neither is a deferral a final action. In all cases of deferral on reevaluation of accredited institutions, the Council will extend the present grant of accreditation for a period sufficient for the institution to provide the information needed, including time for procedural due process following the Council’s review of the information not to exceed twelve months, if the longest program is less than one year in length; eighteen months, if the longest program is at least one year, but less than two years in length; and two years, if the longest program is at least two years in length.

COMPLIANCE WARNING & SHOW-CAUSE ACTIONS

An institution/campus is determined to be out of compliance when it has been given the opportunity to provide information and the information provided fails to evidence compliance with the applicable standards. This will start the maximum time frame “clock” and the institution/campus must come into compliance within that period dictated by Chapter 3, Introduction. An adverse action can be taken **PRIOR TO THE** end of that period but it cannot be extended beyond it, except for good cause (Section 2-3-220).

Further, a show-cause directive may be issued after the review of the institution’s/campus’s response to a compliance warning action or may be directed once the institution/campus has been determined to be *materially* out of compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria*.

DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR INITIAL OR RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION

As outlined in Section 2-3-300 of the *Accreditation Criteria*, a denial of an accreditation status is characterized by the Council’s withholding accreditation and is a negative action which is challengeable (appealable) by the institution.

If the reviewer’s assessment is that the institution has failed to demonstrate its compliance, in ability and willingness, with the standards after its submission of additional information, a denial recommendation may be considered. It is critical that in the reasons for this denial is thoroughly detailed in both the orange sheet and motion letter drafted.

MAXIMUM TIME FRAME

The Introduction to Title II, Chapter 3 of the *Accreditation Criteria* identifies the maximum amount of time an institution is provided to address the concerns of the Council. This is a recognition requirement of the U.S. Department of Education. These timeframes are:

- Twelve months, if the longest program is less than one year in length;
- Eighteen months, if the longest program is at least one year, but less than two years in length; and
- Two years, if the longest program is at least two years in length.

The File Review (Orange) Worksheet identifies the last meeting of the campus/institution’s maximum time frame.

NEGATIVE ACTION – WITHDRAWAL BY SUSPENSION

A withdrawal by suspension action is only appropriate on other applications for consideration by the Council. It is not appropriate for a renewal of accreditation or initial accreditation application as these

can be denied, and not withdrawn. Instead, a withdrawal action takes away a current grant of accreditation prior to its expiration (Section 2-3-400).

When the review is of a branch campus, the recommended action would be to **withdraw the approval of the campus within the accredited status of the institution**. This letter would be drafted TO the main campus as a branch campus does not, in and by itself, hold accreditation.

Negative recommendations must be reviewed by the appropriate staff member prior to final consideration by the Intermediate Review Committee.

** In cases of a show-cause directive or withdrawal action, the institution must be directed to provide a teach-out plan, consistent with Section 2-2-303 of the Accreditation Criteria. Prepare with teach-out language, if applicable; if teach-out language is in motion, check that it has not previously been requested (past motions). If it has been requested previously, check if a complete plan has been received and always ask for an update*

DEADLINES FOR SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION

****Note- This information is also located in the pocket of your binder**

April meeting: June 30 for response submission deadline
Continue 30 days post Council action for review in August

August meeting: October 31 for response submission deadline
Continue 30 days post Council action for review in December

December meeting: February 28 (or 29) for response submission deadline
Extend to April 30 for review in April

In instances where the grant of accreditation has previously expired or will expire (see April meeting), the grant must be extended, not continued.

GLOSSARY

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

A financial statement is required of all institutions 180 days following the end of their fiscal year. This statement is not required to be audited and certified. Separate audited financial statements must be submitted with certain types of applications. The annual sustaining fees are based on the total educational revenue reported on the income statement.

BRANCH CAMPUS (previous Additional Location)

A branch campus is a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of that institution, but under the same corporate structure as the main campus. The branch campus is permanent in nature, offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential, and has its own budget, faculty, administrative staff and supervisory organization.

CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT (CAR)

Each accredited campus/institution is required to file no later than November 1, a report covering the previous year beginning July 1 and ending June 30.

CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP/CONTROL

An institution is judged to have undergone a change of ownership or control when controlling interest of the institution has changed hands through the sale of stock, either totally or partially, or when an institution, through contract or other means, has altered control of the institution.

As a result of a change of ownership or control, the institution's grant of accreditation is automatically discontinued and the institution must make application for reinstatement via the Change of Ownership application process. If the institution fails to do so in the manner stipulated by Section 2-2-403 of the *Accreditation Criteria*, the institution's accreditation will be discontinued as of the date of the actual change of ownership and will remain in abeyance.

DEFERRAL

Actions on an institution's application may be deferred when further information is needed by the Council or further guidance to the branch/institution concerning deficiencies is in order. A deferral is not a negative action or a final decision and is not appealable.

DENIAL OF AN APPLICATION – INITIAL OR RENEWAL

Denial of accreditation is a final Council decision, but the campus/institution is entitled to an opportunity to present its appeal of the denial in a fair and impartial hearing before the Review Board.

GRANT OF ACCREDITATION

A grant of accreditation is extended to a campus/institution for a specific period of time. In order for a branch/institution to continue in accredited status, the previous grant must be extended again by special action of the Council or the Council must confer a new grant. A grant of accreditation may not exceed six years in length.

HEARING

A hearing is a formal process in which an institution which has been show-cause has been directed to do so in person, before the Council.

LEARNING SITE (previously Campus Addition)

A location of a main campus or branch campus which is under the direct control of the onsite administration of that campus but at a site that is apart from the primary location of that campus.

NEGATIVE ACTION

A negative action is the withdrawal of accreditation (either by revocation of accreditation or suspension of accreditation) or the withholding of accreditation.

REEVALUATION

The process of a campus/institution being considered for a new grant of accreditation is referred to as a reevaluation.

REMAND

Remand is an action by the Review Board to send a case back to the Council for further consideration.

REVIEW BOARD

The Review Board is comprised of fifteen members appointed by the Council who are responsible to hear appeals of withdrawal or denial actions (except for revocation arising out of summary suspension order).

REVOCATION

Revocation of accreditation is a final action by the Council to withdraw accreditation. **Revocation actions are not appealable. (See Section 2-3-401)**

SUSPENSION

All suspensions except summary suspensions must be preceded by show-cause directives and are appealable to the Review Board.

Summary suspensions are issued when campuses/institutions cease or are believed to have ceased operations and can be challenged before the Council. After passage of the specified time, a suspension will become a revocation (Sections 2-2-301 & 2-3-401). Suspension is the result of a branch/institution's being found in noncompliance of the *Accreditation Criteria*. Suspension is a negative action and appealable to the Review Board **(See Section 2-3-402)**

SUSTAINING FEES

Sustaining fees are collected from member institutions to support the activities of Council. These are due on October 31 of each year and are based on the total educational revenue as reported on the campus's/institution's Annual Financial Report.

USER FEES

User fees are paid by branches or institutions requesting approvals from the Council including new programs, change of ownership, new branch campuses, and change of name or location.

WITHDRAWAL

Withdrawal of accreditation is the result of the Council's suspension or revocation of an institution's accreditation. This should not be confused with the withholding of accreditation.

The withdrawal of accreditation by suspension is appealable to the Review Board. The withdrawal of accreditation by revocation is not appealable. **(See Section 2-3-400)**

WITHHOLDING OF ACCREDITATION (DENIAL)

The withholding of accreditation is the refusal of the Council to grant an initial or new grant of accreditation or reinstatement of accreditation in a change of ownership control or re-designation of an institution's current level of accreditation. This is a negative action and is appealable to the Review Board.

APPENDICES A-D

APPENDIX B: FILE REVIEW WORKSHEET PREPARATION

The following are procedures for completing “orange” file review worksheets:

1. Following the travel cycle, campuses new to the agenda (typically visited this cycle) will have file review worksheets (orange sheets) prepared by staff. The template is located under <https://membercenter.acics.org>, under Commissioner Portal Documents/Document Templates/Orange Sheet Templates.
2. Staff complete the top portion, or block information, of the File Review Worksheet and add the findings from the report:

Orange Sheet

Campus Name			
Campus Address			
City, State Zip Code			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i>	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i>	<i>Main ID:</i>
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.		<i>No. of Findings:</i>	
<i>Staff:</i>		<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/Choose an item.		<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Background Information:</i> (Please summarize retention and placement, any adverse or complaints, and licensure pass rates, if applicable, in addition to other information that will be helpful in considering this application/visit.)			
		<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Commissioner:</i>		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

IRC:

COMM:

STATEMENT OF FINDING (AREA NEEDING EXPLANATORY RESPONSE FROM TEAM REPORT)

IRC:

NEEDED:

COMMISSIONER:

Initial Grant Visit Orange Sheet

Name of Campus			
Address			
City, State, Zip Code			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> IG	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX	<i>Main ID:</i>
<i>DE:</i> Choose an item.		<i>No. of Findings:</i>	
<i>Staff:</i>		<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Initial Retention:</i> NN%		<i>Initial Placement:</i> NN%	
<i>Institutional Background:</i> (Please summarize any information that will be helpful in considering this application, such as adverse; complaints; licensure pass rates, if applicable; current accreditation; etc.)			
		<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Commissioner:</i>		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

Under the current guidelines that allow for individual grant lengths, there should only be one orange block on a letter and one letter for each visit. Check the motion letter folders for each of your visits and ensure that a draft letter with a complete block is saved.

On the template, all fields that say “choose an item” have a drop-down menu. Click the section to activate the drop down and select the appropriate entry.

Reason on Agenda: IG– Initial Grant; RA – Renewal of Accreditation; SP – Special; UA – Unannounced; ESC – Extensive Substantive Change
 QAM-CO – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Change of Ownership
 QAM-OS – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Out of Scope
 QAM-RV – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Readiness Visit
 QAM-HC – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Higher Credential
 QAM-DE – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Nontraditional Education Visit Report, Distance Education
 QAM-LSV – Quality Assurance Monitoring: Learning Site Verification
 QAM-NB – Quality Assurance Monitoring: New Branch

Level: Enter the credential level of the campus (001-Certificate, 1-Diploma, 2-Occupational Associates, 3-Academic Associate’s, 4-Bachelor’s, 5-Master’s)

ID Code: Enter the full ID code for the campus. Double check this number in Personify.

Main: Enter the ID Code for the main campus if a Branch campus

Distance Education: Indicate if the campus is utilizing distance education. This will apply to all QAM: DE visits or full team visits that included a distance education review.

- <50%= up to 50%
- ≥50%= 50% or more
- Consortium
- N/A= the campus does not offer distance education or did not undergo a DE review during the visit.

No. of Findings: Enter the number of findings on the team report.

Staff: Provide first and last name of the staff member on visit.

IRC: Provide first and last name of the IRC reviewer.

- Initial Retention /Placement: This information only applies to initial grant orange sheets. This number would come from the initial CAR, which is not the standard CAR report that member institutions submit.
- Max. Time Frame: Maximum Time Frame (MTF) is the maximum amount of time an **institution** has to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance with the *Criteria*. To determine MTF, you will use the longest program of study at the institution (meaning the main and all branches) offers. This includes making maximum time frame determinations for QAM visits.
- less than one year, then their MTF is 1 year from the month of the Council meeting;
 - over 1 year but less than 2 years, then their MTF is 18 months from the month of the Council meeting. If that falls during a month that there is no Council meeting, you go with the closest Council meeting to the 18th month, but not over 18 months. For instance, if the visit file is first on the agenda in December 2012, the MTF is April 2014.
 - o **December 2012** □ 18 months later □ June 2014 □ **MTF = April 14**
 - there is no June Council meeting, so the MTF would end at the April 2014 meeting (not the August 2014 meeting)
 - 2 years or more, then their MTF is 2 years from the month of the Council meeting.
 - If unknown, the length of the longest program may be found in the team report, catalog, or CAR. Please refer to Title II, Chapter 3, Introduction a, b, and c of the *Accreditation Criteria* if needed.
- Org. Grant Exp. Date: The date in which the grant awarded by the Council was originally supposed to expire. This is always December 31, 20XX. Please complete/verify for accuracy by going the “Accreditation” tab of the institution’s record in Personify.
- Institutional Background: Initial Grant visit only. A brief summary of the background of an institution visited. The assigned staff would get the information from the catalog, initial resource report, introduction of the team’s report, or the appropriate manager who is responsible for coordinating initials.
- Background Information: All other visits. If there is pertinent information that would be helpful to commissioners as background, please include a brief summary. Such information may include, but is not limited to, accreditation by another agency, explanation of adverse or pending complaints, or special circumstances.
3. The section listing the areas of non-compliance noted in the team report is to be added to the orange sheet by staff (ACICS Intranet/AID Department/Documents/TEAM.RPT/visit cycle). The IRC committee will add their notes via the computer following the IRC heading. The Council will add their notes during their meeting in the space next to COMM.
 4. Save the orange sheet and name it by the ID Code listed on the file (i.e. 00011314) to the application in in the application in Application Documents and tag it “Orange Sheet.”

5. To begin the draft motion letter, open a new document, copy and paste the school block information from the top of the page and start the letter. This draft will include the Date, ID Code (*Use Personify code beginning with “000” or “00”*), address, salutation, and copy. Be sure to “c:” the appropriate contacts, as indicated by the template. This information is found in Personify. Save the document in the application in Application Documents and tag it “draft letter.” See below for an example.

Example:

Campus Name			
Campus Address			
City, State Zip Code			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i>	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i>	<i>Main ID:</i>
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.		<i>No. of Findings:</i>	
<i>Staff:</i>		<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/Choose an item.		<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Background Information:</i> (Please summarize retention and placement, any adverse or complaints, and licensure pass rates, if applicable, in addition to other information that will be helpful in considering this application/visit.)			
		<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Commissioner:</i>		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

September 1, 2014

ID Code 00012345(MC)

VIA EMAIL ONLY

complianceacme@smith.edu

Mr. Frank Smith
 President
 Smith College
 1234 Edgewood Drive
 Acme, TX 80236

Subject: Renewal of Accreditation - Approval

SMITH COLLEGE, SUNNYSIDE HILLS, FLORIDA

ID CODE 00054321(LS)

Dear Mr. Smith:

Sincerely

Michelle Edwards
 President and CEO

- c. Ms. Cathy Sheffield, Accreditation and State Liaison, U.S. Department of Education
 Mr. Samuel Ferguson, Commission for Independent Education, Florida Department of Education (joey.smith@fldoe.org)

6. After recommended motions have been discussed by the Intermediate Review Committee, the staff should check the orange sheet, make any content or formatting changes as needed (space for commissioners should be provided).
7. Review the motion letter in the application under the tag “Draft Letter.”

APPENDIX C: Deferral, Compliance Warning, Show-Cause

1. Following the travel cycle, schools that did not receive an approval from the last Council meeting should have “orange” file review worksheets prepared. The template is located in the Member Center under Commissioner Portal Documents/Document Templates/Orange Sheet Templates/Deferral Orange Sheet Template.
2. Staff completes the top portion of the File Review Worksheet and drafts motion letters, following the outline above. The findings and reason on agenda will differ slightly. (see below) Staff should be sure to update the orange block information to the current data.

Original / Remaining

Findings: Enter the original number of findings and the findings remaining for the current session of Council.

Reason on Agenda: After the reason code add the number of times the applications has already been on the Council agenda. For example, if a renewal of accreditation application first appeared before Council in December 2016 and was deferred to April 2017, the reason on the agenda would read, RA1. If that same application was placed on Compliance Warning or Show Cause for the next council meeting in August 2017, the reason on the agenda would read RA2, and so on.

Status: Provide a brief explanation of what has taken place to date. For example: “The campus was visited during the spring 2016 cycle for a new grant. There were 12 findings. The campus was deferred until the December 2016 Council Meeting with 1 remaining findings.”

Background Information

If there is additional pertinent information, such as open adverse/external information, a pending complaint, or special circumstances, please provide a brief summary.

3. A section listing the findings and action to be taken noted in the motion letter must be posted by staff. You will review the response and add your notes to the orange sheet. The Council will add their notes during their meeting.
4. You must indicate how the campus responded to each finding and whether you have found the item corrected/resolved by indicating “OK” or “NO.” Indicate why you believe the response answers all, part, or none of the area of non-compliance. Focus on providing written notes that will help the commissioners reviewing the file. Save the orange sheet in the application in the Commissioner Portal/Application Documents and tag it as “Orange Sheet.”

Deferral Orange Sheet

Name of Campus			
Address			
City, State, Zip Code			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i>	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX	<i>Main ID:</i>
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.		<i>No. of Original/Remaining Findings:</i> /	
<i>Staff:</i>		<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/ Choose an item.		<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> Choose an item.	
		<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Current Status:</i>			
<i>Background Information:</i> (Please summarize retention and placement, any adverse or complaints, and licensure pass rates, if applicable, in addition to other information that will be helpful in considering this application/visit.)			
<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.			
<i>Commissioner:</i>		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

IRC:
COMM:

STATEMENT OF FINDING (AREA NEEDING EXPLANATORY RESPONSE FROM MOTION LETTER)

REQUESTED ACTION TAKEN FROM MOTION LETTER

IRC:

NEEDED:

COMMISSIONER:

Initial Grant Visit Deferral Sheet

Name of Campus			
Address			
City, State, Zip Code			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> IG	<i>Level:</i> Choose an item.	<i>ID Code:</i> 000XXXXX	<i>Main ID:</i>
<i>Distance Education:</i> Choose an item.		<i>No. of Original/ Remaining Findings:</i> /	
<i>Staff:</i>		<i>IRC:</i>	
<i>Initial Retention:</i> NN%		<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> Choose an item.	
<i>Initial Placement:</i> NN%			
<i>Institutional Background:</i> (Please summarize information that will be helpful in considering this application, such as adverse; complaints; licensure pass rates, if applicable; current accreditation; etc.)			
<i>Current Status:</i>			
<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.			
<i>Commissioner:</i>		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Choose an item.	

- Decide on the recommended action and choose the appropriate motion letter template, located in the Commissioner Portal under Document Templates/Motion Letter Templates. Select the template by the code that matches the appropriate action.
- Copy the motion letter template to the draft motion letter, immediately “Save” the new document as the campus ID code in the application in the Commissioner Portal under

Application Documents and tag it as "Draft Letter."

Southwestern College 29 University Run Asheville, NC 28803			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> RA1	<i>Level:</i> 04	<i>ID Code:</i> 00011203	<i>Main ID:</i> N/A
<i>Distance Education:</i> up to 50%		<i>No. of Original/Remaining Findings:</i> 11 /2	
<i>Staff:</i> Erin Peabody		<i>IRC:</i> Jackson Reibus	
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/ 2018		<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> APR20	
		<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> APR18	
<i>Current Status:</i> The institution first appeared before Council during the April 2018 Council meeting with eleven findings. The institution was deferred to the August 2018 Council meeting with two remaining findings.			
<i>Background Information:</i> The institution's current retention rate is 78% and placement stands at 81%. There are no other concerns (i.e. complaints, external info, etc.)			
<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Approval			
<i>Commissioner:</i> Pauline Messing		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Approval-3 years	

September 1, 2018

ID Code 00011203(MC)

VIA EMAIL ONLY

acicsinfo@southwestern.edu

Mr. Ronald Thompson
Executive Director
Southwestern College
29 University Run
Asheville, NC 28803

Subject: Renewal of Accreditation - Approval

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Sincerely

Michelle Edwards
President and CEO

- c. Ms. Cathy Sheffield, Accreditation and State Liaison, U.S. Department of Education
Mr. Samuel Ferguson, Commission for Independent Education, Florida Department of Education
(joey.smith@fldoe.org)

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE ORANGE SHEETS

Southwestern College			
29 University Run			
Asheville, NC 28803			
<i>Reason on Agenda:</i> RA1	<i>Level:</i> 04	<i>ID Code:</i> 00011203	<i>Main ID:</i> N/A
<i>Distance Education:</i> up to 50%		<i>No. of Original/Remaining Findings:</i> 11 /2	
<i>Staff:</i> Erin Peabody		<i>IRC:</i> Jackson Reibus	
<i>Original Grant Expiration Date:</i> 12/31/ 2018		<i>Maximum Time Frame (mtg):</i> APR20	
		<i>Date First Appeared on Agenda:</i> APR18	
<i>Current Status:</i> The institution first appeared before Council during the April 2018 Council meeting with eleven findings. The institution was deferred to the August 2018 Council meeting with two remaining findings.			
<i>Background Information:</i> The institution's current retention rate is 78% and placement stands at 81%. There are no other concerns (i.e. complaints, external info, etc.)			
<i>IRC Recommendation:</i> Approval			
<i>Commissioner:</i> Pauline Messing		<i>Commissioner Recommendation:</i> Approval-3 years	

IRC: NO
COMM: NO

STATEMENT OF FINDING (AREA NEEDING EXPLANATORY RESPONSE FROM MOTION LETTER)

- Documentation was not available of an annual evaluation of the campus's CEP (Section 3-1-113). The campus responded to the finding by providing a schedule for 2018 and forward to evaluate the campus's CEP twice annually, also indicating that meetings will be conducted more often, as needed. The campus also provided an updated CEP in their response, as well as, a proposed agenda for a February 22, 2018 CEP meeting and the topics that would be covered were outlined on the agenda.

REQUESTED ACTION TAKEN FROM MOTION LETTER

Provide documentation of the February 22, 2018, CEP meeting that includes actual minutes addressing the agenda items provided in the last response.

IRC: The campus only submitted a copy of the February meeting agenda but did not include meeting minutes nor attendee sign in sheet.

NEEDED: Provide a copy of the actual meeting minutes for the February 2018 CEP meeting.

COMMISSIONER: The campus must submit the minutes for the February 2018 CEP meeting.

IRC: YES
COMM: NO

STATEMENT OF FINDING (AREA NEEDING EXPLANATORY RESPONSE FROM MOTION LETTER)

- The team was unable to verify the campus retention rate and a graduate unavailable for placement on the 2017 CAR (Section 3-1-203 and Appendix L). The campus did provide documentation for Ms. Celine White and Ms. Ursula Cross regarding their transfer to the Apex campus; however, this

information has not been updated in the CAR. Mr. Monty Jack, Ms. Carmen Silver, and Ms. Patty Knot have not been updated at the time of this report. The CAR has not been updated as of March 12, 2018.

REQUESTED ACTION TAKEN FROM MOTION LETTER

The campus must provide an explanation in an updated CAR that reflects Ms. Celine White's and Ms. Ursula Cross' transfers to the Apex campus. The campus must also provide documentation that evidences the validity of Mr. Monty Jack, Ms. Carmen Silver's retention waivers for the 2017 CAR. Additionally, the campus must also properly identify with supporting documentation the need for Ms. Ms. Patty Knot's placement waiver.

IRC: The campus acknowledged that Ms. White and Ms. Cross both transferred to the Apex campus, thus not impacting the retention rates for their programs. Mr. Jack and Ms. Silver were incorrectly identified as reenters from withdrawal. These two errors caused the medical assisting program's retention rate to decrease from 60 percent to 58 percent and the information system's program from 74 percent to 71 percent. No backup documentation was provided for the placement waiver for Ms. Knot, who had been waived as an SSI disability waiver. Depending on the dates of initial disability, such as prior to enrollment with no extension from a doctor subsequent to her graduating, this may or may not be a valid waiver. The campus response for all of these potential changes to the CAR was that since the campus is in a teach-out mode, they decided to not update the 2017 CAR.

NEEDED: N/A

COMMISSIONER: The campus must submit an update to their 2017 CAR that reflects Ms. Celine White's and Ms. Ursula Cross's transfers to the Apex campus. The campus must also provide documentation that evidences the validity of Mr. Monty Jack, Ms. Carmen Silver's retention waivers for the 2017 CAR. Additionally, the campus must also properly identify with supporting documentation the need for Ms. Patty Knot's placement waiver.

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE MOTION LETTERS

RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION APPROVAL

January 5, 2019

ID Code 00022603(MC)

VIA EMAIL

acics42@national-college.edu

Ms. Mary Houston
Campus Director
National College
2576 Thousand Oaks Cove
Memphis, TN 38115

Subject: Renewal of Accreditation – Approval

NATIONAL COLLEGE, NASHVILLE, TN
NATIONAL COLLEGE, BRENTWOOD, TN

ID CODE 00022605(BC)
ID CODE 00145823(LS)

Dear Ms. Houston:

At its December 2018 meeting, the Council acted to award your institution renewal of accreditation to offer programs through the academic associate's degree level through December 31, 2022. This grant of accreditation includes the campus's continued approval to offer up to 50 percent of one or more programs through distance education.

This grant of accreditation includes the following branch and learning site located at:

NATIONAL COLLEGE, 415 OAK LANE, NASHVILLE, TN 37116	ID CODE 00022605(BC)
NATIONAL COLLEGE, CEDAR TREE ST, BRENTWOOD, TN 37027	ID CODE 00145823(LS)

The Council's renewal of this grant is an expression of its confidence that the institution will continue to review, monitor, and revise its operations to ensure the high quality of education toward which we must all strive.

Please contact Mr. Andre McDuffie at amcduffie@acics.org or (202) 336-6767 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Michelle Edwards
President and CEO

c: Ms. Cathy Sheffield, Accreditation and State Liaison, U.S. Department of Education
Mr. Ralph Woods, Nashville branch campus (acics43@national-college.edu)
Ms. Julie Woodruff, Tennessee Higher Education Commission (Julie.woodruff@tn.gov)
Ms. Theresa Sisneros, Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs
(Theresa@caahep.org)
Dr. Claire Dixon-Lee, Commission on Accreditation of Health Informatics and Information
Management (Claire.dixon-lee@cahiim.org)

RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION-COMPLIANCE WARNING

January 5, 2019

ID Code 00020521(MC)

VIA EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

acics@caun.edu

Ms. Annette Simms
Campus President
California University
3022 Camino Del Rio, Suite 100
San Diego, CA
92106

Subject: Renewal of Accreditation – Continued Compliance Warning

CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES, CA
CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

ID CODE 00205623(BC)
ID CODE 00029241(BC)

Dear Ms. Simms:

At its December 2018 meeting, the Council considered your institution's application for renewal of accreditation, the evaluation team's visit report, and the institution's responses to that report. The institution first appeared before Council in August 2018 with a cumulative total of 42 findings and was then issued a compliance warning action.

The renewal of accreditation visit to the San Diego main campus yielded no findings. The visit to the Los Angeles branch campus had twenty-five (25) findings, of which the institution resolved thirteen (13) in its first response and has subsequently resolved seven (7) to the Council's satisfaction. The visit to the San Francisco branch campus initially yielded seventeen (17) findings, of which the institution resolved seven (7) in its first response and has subsequently resolved six (6) to the Council's satisfaction. Therefore, as a result of its review, the Council found the following based on the *Accreditation Criteria*:

Los Angeles branch campus:

1. The data collected regarding graduate and employer satisfaction are not being used to improve the educational processes at the campus (Section 3-1-111 and Appendix K). The campus provided an updated CEP and supporting evidence of completed graduate and employer satisfaction surveys. However, the campus did not provide appropriate summary and analysis of the results of the graduate or employer surveys, although provided in the CEP for other elements.
2. Not all staff have a signed job description or annual performance reviews (Sections 3-1-202(b) and 3-1-303(a)). In response to the finding, the institution submitted a newly established uniform method of organizing human resources documents within each employee's file. However, this documentation did not meet Council standards due to the following: signed job descriptions and annual performance reviews for faculty and staff were not included in the response.
3. Follow-up studies on employer satisfaction surveys are not being conducted at specific measuring points post placement (Sections 3-1-441(c) & 3-1-701 and Appendix C). In response to the finding, the institution addressed practices that might increase their response rate. However, this documentation did not meet Council standards due to the

following: The procedure of surveying graduate satisfaction post placement was not executed. The institution has also included statements in their catalog that state that the United States Department of Education and ACICS require the institution to contact its graduates' employers. The United States Department of Education and ACICS do not require any institution to contact graduates' employers.

4. There is insufficient documentation on the utilization of community resources in all programs (Section 3-1-512(c) and Glossary). In response to the finding, the institution submitted a narrative of all the community service projects with which they are involved. However, this documentation did not meet Council standards due to the following: the response did not detail community resources that are utilized to enhance student enrichment and potential career opportunities instead of community services.
5. The campus has not developed a written and mutually signed agreement for students on externship in the Dental Assisting program that includes the specific learning objectives, course requirements, and evaluation criteria (Section 3-1-513(a)). The campus provided a mutually signed affiliation agreement for each site that has an active student extern along with the syllabus and assessment guidelines. However, the syllabus and assessment guidelines have no indication that they have been reviewed or acknowledged by the externship site, instructor, or student. There is an acknowledgement section on the syllabus and assessment guideline document for the instructor and student to sign, but these fields have been left blank.

San Francisco branch campus

1. The Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP) does not include an explanation of how the data is being used to improve its education processes (Section 3-1-111 and Appendix K). In its response to the original finding concerning the quality of the evaluation of the elements in the CEP, the campus provided a summary and analysis, benchmark, and an action plan that indicates improvement to the educational processes for graduate satisfaction. Additionally, they included a summary and analysis for graduation rates as directed, assessment of how student learning outcomes now contain direct measurements, and information regarding licensure (NCLEX) outcomes, which are sufficient. However, the plan did not include how the data are used to improve the educational processes, or any changes made for student satisfaction as a result of the data analysis.
2. There is no evidence of a plan for distance education instruction and its integration in the Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP) (Section 3-1-111 and Appendices H and K). The campus submitted a revised CEP which included a distance education component. However, there were no faculty satisfaction survey results, meeting minutes, or other documents to evidence the implementation and integration of distance education activities.
3. The catalog does not identify application deadlines and amounts that may be awarded for scholarships (Sections 3-1-431(b), 3-1-701, and Appendix C). In their response, the campus stated that short-term scholarships have been removed as they are no longer used. The catalog and webpage regarding scholarships lists Stratford First Scholarships and four different international scholarships. There is a link to one application form, but it is unclear if that form is to be used to apply for any or all of the offered scholarships, and the application itself states a deadline of May 1 at the bottom of the form and June 1 at the top of the form, which is conflicting information. Consequently, the published scholarship information is not consistent and does not address the finding.

4. The revised Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) policy does not address the effect of a withdrawal (W) grade on the rate of progression calculation (Section 3-1-421 and Appendix D). Although the campus provided a copy of the revised SAP policy with a rollout date of September 2018, the SAP policy does not address the effect of the W grade on the rate of progress calculation.

Council Action

Therefore, the Council acted to continue your institution on **compliance warning**, extend the current grant of accreditation through May 31, 2019, and require the following information prior to its April 2019 meeting:

Los Angeles branch campus:

1. Evidence that graduate and employer satisfaction data are appropriately analyzed in the CEP. Documentation must include an updated Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP) that includes, in relation to the elements of graduate and employer satisfaction, a summary and analysis of the data collected and an explanation of how the data have been used to improve the educational processes at the campus. The campus must also describe any changes made to the educational processes that were directly related to the collection and analysis of these data.
2. A list of current faculty and staff and corresponding signed job descriptions and annual performance reviews.
3. Evidence that graduate and employer surveys are sent out at a specified time following placement. The institution must disclose what specific measuring points will be used for assessment and submit a summary of findings once surveys have been collected. The institution must also submit graduate and employer surveys. Additionally, language that the institution's accreditor and the United States Department of Education require the institution to contact graduates' employers must be removed from all the institution's publications. Revised copies of all documents and publications that contain this language must be submitted with the response.
4. Evidence that a variety of community resources is being used to enhance student enrichment and potential career opportunities. Documentation must include, but is not limited to, a plan for the future use of community resources during each term by faculty and a schedule of community resource usage for the 2018-2019 academic year. The campus must also submit a synopsis of each community resource activity that is scheduled to occur prior to February 15, 2019, sign-in sheets that evidence student attendance, signed student waiver forms, acceptance and presentation by guest speakers, and evidence of students on field trips or in other community activities.
5. Evidence that externship sites for students in the Dental Assisting program are aware of the specific learning objectives, course requirements, and evaluation criteria. Documentation must include a list of all active externship sites, along with signed agreements which evidence acknowledgement, by all parties, of the specific learning objectives, course requirements, and evaluation criteria.

San Francisco branch campus

1. A revised CEP that includes an explanation of how the student satisfaction survey data have been used to improve the educational processes, and any changes that were made that were directly related to the collection and analysis of these data.

2. A revised 2018-2019 CEP that contains an assessment of faculty satisfaction with distance education instruction. Documentation must include, but is not limited to, data regarding graduate, employer, and faculty satisfaction with distance education activities at the campus and program levels; minutes of faculty meetings during which distance education activities were discussed; and other evidence of implementation of distance education activities to improve campus effectiveness. The analysis of the surveys should include the number of surveys sent out and the number returned.
3. A draft catalog with an accurate listing of all campus scholarships offered, along with the eligibility criteria, the application procedures and deadlines, the review process and the determination and amounts of award. In addition, an updated application form must be submitted indicating which scholarship is being applied for along with the application deadline date(s) and other pertinent information as appropriate. This information must be consistent across all media (web site, brochures, etc.).
4. A draft catalog with a revised SAP policy that includes the effect of the W grade on the rate of progress calculation.

The response must be received in the Council office via each campus's Renewal of Accreditation application by **Friday, February 22, 2019**. The institution's ongoing attention and efforts toward continuous improvement are a very important component of its accredited status, and your responsiveness to this Council action letter is essential to a favorable outcome for both the institution and its students.

The Council is obligated to take adverse action against any institution that fails to come into compliance within established time frames without good cause, pursuant to Title II, Chapter 3, Introduction of the *Accreditation Criteria*.

Please contact Mr. Andre McDuffie at amcduffie@acics.org or (202) 336-6767 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Michelle Edwards
President and CEO

- c: Ms. Cathy Sheffield, Accreditation and State Liaison, U.S. Department of Education
Mr. Ralph Woods, Los Angeles branch campus (acicsla@caun.edu)
Ms. Anita Bell, San Francisco branch campus (acicsf@caun.edu)
Mr. Michael Marion, California Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education
(michael.marion@dca.ca.gov)
Ms. Katherine Westerlund and Mr. James Hicks, U.S. Immigration and Customs
Enforcement, Student Exchange and Visitor Program
(katherine.h.westerlund@ice.dhs.gov) (james.d.hicks@ice.dhs.gov)

Grant Lengths:

2 year= December 31, 2019

3 years=December 31, 2020

4 year= December 31, 2021

5 year= December 31, 2022

6 year= December 31, 2023

Level 1: Diploma/Certificate

Level 2: Occupational Associate's
Degree

Level 3: Academic Associate's
Degree

Level 4: Bachelor's Degree

Level 5: Master's Degree

Level 6: Doctoral Degree

IRC Roster July 2016 - November 2019

Name	Date		Name	Date
Cue	Nov-19		Ferrell	Nov-17
Kerr	Nov-19		Bennett	Nov-17
Krissler	Nov-19		Jones	Nov-17
Mago	Nov-19		Olsen	Nov-17
Mosley	Nov-19			
Peterson	Nov-19		Minore	Jul-18
Sellers	Nov-19		Ferrell	Jul-18
Teneyuca	Nov-19		Sellers	Jul-18
Winger	Nov-19		Mosley	Jul-18
Bennett	Jul-19		Ferrell	Mar-17
Bodimer	Jul-19		Bennett	Mar-17
Fuchs	Jul-19		Palmatier	Mar-17
Jones	Jul-19		Krissler	Mar-17
Luce	Jul-19		BenMessaoud	Mar-17
Minore	Jul-19		Peterson	Mar-17
Olson	Jul-19		Mago	Mar-17
			Eckternacht	Mar-17
Adelman	Mar-19			
Atkinson	Mar-19		Kyles	Nov-16
Bynoe	Mar-19		Reed	Nov-16
Ernst	Mar-19		Guinan	Nov-16
Peterson	Mar-19		Adelman	Nov-16
Sellers	Mar-19		Strout	Nov-16
			Ober	Nov-16
Bennett	Nov-18		Timm	Nov-16
Castilla	Nov-18		Bodimer	Nov-16
Dickey	Nov-18		Krissler	Nov-16
Fuchs	Nov-18			
Harazduk	Nov-18		Campbell	Jul-16
Krissler	Nov-18		Palmatier	Jul-16
Kyles	Nov-18		Krna	Jul-16
Minore	Nov-18		Fuchs	Jul-16
Olson	Nov-18		Bennett	Jul-16
Winger	Nov-18		Minore	Jul-16
			Reed	Jul-16
Saadi	Jul-18		Dickey	Jul-16
Reed	Jul-18		BenMessaoud	Jul-16
Peterson	Jul-18			
BenMessaoud	Jul-18			
Dickey	Mar-18			
Minore	Mar-18			
Dhillon	Mar-18			
Sellers	Mar-18			
DeBoer	Mar-18			