



ACCREDITING COUNCIL FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION & TRAINING
1722 N. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone : 202-955-1113 Fax: 202-955-1118
<http://www.accet.org>

May 1, 2020

VIA EMAIL
(arbradio1@yahoo.com)

Mr. Tom Gillenwater, President
Academy of Radio and Television Broadcasting
16052 Beach Boulevard, Suite 263-N
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

*Re: Reaccreditation Denied Under Show Cause
ACCET ID #173*

Dear Mr. Gillenwater:

This letter is to inform you that, at its April 2020 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education & Training (ACCET) voted to deny reaccreditation to the Academy of Radio and Television Broadcasting (ARTB), located in Huntington Beach, California.

The decision was based upon a careful review and evaluation of the record, including but not limited to the institution's Analytic Self-Evaluation Report (ASER); the on-site visit team report (visit conducted on October 16-17, 2018); the institution's response to that report, dated November 27, 2018; and the interim report, dated February 28, 2020.

It is noted for the record that the Commission originally considered the institution's application for reaccreditation at its December 2018 meeting. Subsequently, the Commission deferred accreditation, and required interim reporting, at its April 2019, August 2019, and December 2019 meetings. Additionally, the Commission issued a show cause directive at its August 2019 meeting, based on the institution's failure to provide a complete and substantive response regarding completion and job placement, and continued the show cause directive at its December 2019 meeting. At its April 2020 meeting, the Commission also reviewed the institution's interim report, received February 28, 2020, which was submitted in response to the December 2019 Commission Action letter, and correspondence from the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) regarding the status of the institution's required state approval.

The Commission determined that the institution has not adequately demonstrated compliance with respect to ACCET standards, policies, and procedures, relative to the following findings:

1. Standard II-A: Governance

The institution failed to demonstrate that its management structure ensures the integrity and capability of the institution and its compliance with statutory, regulatory, and accreditation

requirements. Specifically, the institution failed to maintain state approval as required by ACCET standards and policies.

In a letter, dated January 27, 2020, the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) notified the institution that:

The Bureau records indicate that the application for Renewal of Approval to Operate an Accredited Institution Application was denied by the Bureau on March 10, 2017. . . . The Academy was provided multiple opportunities to provide additional written argument and a Request for Stay and Petition for Reconsideration. Ultimately, the Director upheld the proposed decision with the final effective date of March 4, 2019. Therefore, the Academy was ordered to cease operating within 60 days of March 4, 2019.

At no time has the Bureau issued a new approval to the Academy and our records continue to show the status of the Academy as an expired approval.

However, on August 22, 2019, the Bureau in error, sent a letter to the Academy regarding the Show Cause status with the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education & Training. This template letter's contextual reference to an approval, was not a grant of approval for the Academy.

The Bureau is granting the Academy 30 days from the date of this letter to be in compliance with the attached decision to cease operating and follow the closed school procedures."

In a subsequent March 30, 2020 email to ACCET, BPPE clarified the status of the institution's state approval, as follows:

"ARTB does not have an approval to operate at this time. The application for approval to operate has been denied and they have appealed the denial. The denial appeal in this case does not allow the institution to operate while going through the appeal process."

In accordance with ACCET Document 1 – The Accreditation Process, an institution must "meet applicable state licensing requirements" to be eligible for accreditation. The Academy of Radio and Television Broadcasting was denied renewal by the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education. Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this ACCET standard and policy.

2. Standard IX-D: Completion and Placement

The institution failed to demonstrate that the quality of its programs are validated by positive training-related outcomes consistent with the benchmarks established by the Accrediting Commission. In accordance with ACCET Document 28 – Policy on Completion and Job Placement, ACCET's minimum required benchmarks are 67% for completion and 70% for

job placement.

At its April 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed the interim report, dated February 28, 2020, that demonstrated all programs offered by the institution were below ACCET’s required benchmarks in 2018 and/or 2019, as follows:

Program	2018		2019	
	Completion	Placement	Completion	Placement
Radio Online Broadcasting		66.67 (4/6)	50% (8/16)	0% (0/8)
Radio Campus Broadcasting			53.33% (8/15)	
TV and Video Production	50% (2/4)			

Further, the Commission noted that below benchmark completion and/or placement rates for all programs were reported for calendar year 2017. Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with ACCET policy and standard.

Since denial of reaccreditation is an adverse action by the Accrediting Commission, the institution may appeal the decision. The full procedures and guidelines for appealing the decision are outlined in Document 11, Policies and Practices of the Accrediting Commission, which is available on our website at www.accet.org.

If the institution wishes to appeal the decision, the Commission must receive written notification no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from receipt of this letter, in addition to a certified or cashier’s check in the amount of \$9,500.00, payable to ACCET, for an appeals hearing. This notification must be accompanied by (1) a signed affidavit by an authorized representative of the institution, indicating that a Notice of Status of Accreditation has been disseminated to all enrollees and posted in a conspicuous place at the institution, to include, at minimum, the admission office and the student lounge or comparable location, notifying interested parties of the Commission’s adverse action; (2) a teach-out plan in accordance with ACCET Document 32 – Teach Out Plan, to ensure that students are afforded an opportunity to successfully complete their training in the event of the institution’s closure; (3) a certified or cashier’s check in the amount established for appeals in ACCET Document 10 – Fee Schedule; and (4) verification that the institution has no outstanding financial obligations owed to ACCET.

In the case of an appeal, a written statement, plus six (6) additional copies regarding the grounds for the appeal, saved as **PDF documents and copied to individual flash drives**, must be submitted to the ACCET office within sixty (60) calendar days from receipt of this letter. The appeal process allows for the institution to provide clarification of and/or new information regarding the conditions at the institution at the time the Accrediting Commission made its decision to deny or withdraw accreditation. The appeal process does not allow for consideration of changes that have been made by or at the institution or new information created or obtained after the Commission’s action to deny

or withdraw accreditation, except under such circumstances when the Commission's adverse action included a finding of non-compliance with Standard III-A, Financial Stability, whereupon the Appeals Panel may consider, on a one-time basis only, such financial information provided all of the following conditions are met:

- The only remaining deficiency cited by the Commission in support of a final adverse action decision is the institution's failure to meet ACCET Standard III-A, Financial Stability, with the institution's non-compliance with Standard III-A the sole deficiency warranting a final adverse action.
- The financial information was unavailable to the institution until after the Commission's decision was made and is included in the written statement of the grounds for appeal submitted in accordance with the ACCET appeals process; and
- The financial information provided is significant and bears materially on the specified financial deficiencies identified by the Commission.

The Appeals Panel shall apply such criteria of significance and materiality as established by the Commission. Further, any determination made by the Appeals Panel relative to this new financial information shall not constitute a basis for further appeal.

Should you have any questions or need further assistance regarding this letter, please contact the ACCET office at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,



Judy Hendrickson
Interim Executive Director
JHH/jss

cc: Mr. Herman Bounds, Chief, Accreditation Division, US ED (aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov)
Ms. Charity Helton, Specialist, US ED (charity.helton@ed.gov)
Ms. Yvette Johnson, Enforcement Chief, CA Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education, (yvette.johnson@dca.ca.gov)
Ms. Leeza Rifredi, Deputy Bureau Chief, CA Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education, (leeza.rifredi@dca.ca.gov)
Ms. Martina Fernandez-Rosario, ACD - San Francisco/Seattle, US ED (martina.fernandez-rosario@ed.gov)