



August 26, 2016

VIA E-MAIL AND UPS DELIVERY

Ms. Jackie Syktich  
President/CEO  
DuBois Business College  
One Beaver Drive  
DuBois, PA 15801

*mainc@dbccollege.com*

Dear Ms. Syktich:

DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE, DUBOIS, PA	ID CODE 00011225(MC)
DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE, OIL CITY, PA	ID CODE 00012819(BC)
DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE, HUNTINGDON, PA	ID CODE 00012824(BC)
DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE, PHILIPSBURG, PA	ID CODE 00250238(LS)

**Subject: Renewal of Accreditation Denial Letter**

The Council considered your institution's application for a renewal of accreditation. As a result of its review of the application materials, the on-site evaluation visit reports, and the institutional responses, the Council found the following based on the *Accreditation Criteria*:

DuBois main campus

1. The campus initiated distance education without seeking prior approval from the Council and included reference to this mode of delivery in promotional brochures, its website, student handbook, and catalog (Section 2-2-106 and Appendix H).
2. The campus does not demonstrate that emphasis is placed upon the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall administration of the campus or its learning site. There was insufficient evidence to support that the administrative staff can manage the campus effectively and in compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria*. The administration of the Phillipsburg location was severely lacking, evidenced most notably by the fact that the courses were taught by an unqualified and unprepared faculty member (Section 3-1-202(a)).
3. The team was unable to verify placements as categorized on the 2015 Campus Accountability Report due to the campus not maintaining sufficient documentation to support the classification of two graduates (Section 3-1-303(a)).

4. The campus does not provide evidence that they adhere to a systematic policy for transfer of credit. In one instance, a graduate of the Executive Assistant program took GR7002, Digital Photography, in the fall 2015 term and MG6220, Marketing, in the winter 2016 term. Following the graduate's successful completion of these two courses, they were removed from the program and replaced with two different courses: Economics and Computer 2-D Animation. The graduate's transcript awards her outside credit for these two classes as well as credit for Digital Photography in the fall 2015 term and Marketing in the winter 2016 term. The graduate was awarded transfer credits for courses she did not take and a degree by the institution (Section 3-1-413).
5. The campus does not utilize enrollment agreements for its currently enrolled students (Section 3-1-414).
6. The satisfactory academic progress (SAP) policy does not include an appropriate statement regarding how repeated courses are included and is not compliant with Section 3-30 of the 2015-2016 Federal Student Aid Handbook. The campus, in at least two instances, issued a qualitative grade and awarded credits for the same course that was taken twice. In addition, the campus does not appropriately monitor SAP related to these instances (Section 3-1-421 and Appendix D).
7. The administration of the Legal Assistant program is not assigned to qualified individuals. The information presented by the institution in its response does not support the qualification of the current curriculum chair of the legal assistant program (Section 3-1-511).
8. The Computer Systems Support Technician and Information Systems Support Technician programs do not evidence a well-organized sequence of appropriate subjects leading to an occupational objective and do not quantitatively and qualitatively approximate the standards at other institutions offering similar degree programs. The programs include the following course, which does not reflect current industry needs and standards: TY2120, Software Applications—DOS (Sections 3-1-513 and 3-3-203).
9. Some courses are not scheduled in a way that is educationally appropriate and that meets the necessary contact hours. The campus had a practice of scheduling two courses in the same classroom at the same time. In this instructional situation the focus and quality of instruction is compromised, and it is not possible for students to receive the contact hours listed on the campus's Academic Credit Analysis (Section 3-1-516(a)(i) and 3-1-517).

10. The campus does not maintain documentation to support that all credit hours awarded are appropriate based on the assessment of knowledge, skills, or competencies acquired. Furthermore, the advanced placement examinations developed by the institution, and available for all courses at the institution, do not evidence collegiate-level standards in every instance (Section 3-1-516(c)(ii)).
11. The catalog does not clearly state certain required elements as listed in the *Accreditation Criteria*, such as information regarding students fees and charges and the mode of delivery for which courses are approved to be offered (Sections 3-1-432(a), 3-1-701, 3-1-702 and Appendix C).
12. There is evidence that one faculty member is teaching in six different courses in the current term, which is an inappropriate number of teaching assignments (Section 3-3-302).
13. There is insufficient documentation that some instructors are qualified to teach their assigned courses or that students, specifically at the Phillipsburg learning site, have any qualified instructor to teach their courses (Section 3-3-302(b)).

#### Oil City branch campus

1. The campus initiated distance education without seeking prior approval from the Council and included reference to this mode of delivery in promotional brochures, its website, student handbook, and catalog (Section 2-2-106 and Appendix H).
2. The campus does not demonstrate that emphasis is placed upon the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall administration of the campus. There was insufficient evidence to support that the administrative staff can manage the campus effectively and in compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria* (Section 3-1-202(a)).
3. The team was unable to verify placements as categorized on the 2015 CAR due to the campus not maintaining sufficient documentation to support the classification of one graduate (Section 3-1-303(a)).
4. The campus does not provide evidence that they adhere to a systematic policy for transfer of credit (Section 3-1-413).
5. The campus does not utilize enrollment agreements for its currently enrolled students (Section 3-1-414).

6. The satisfactory academic progress (SAP) policy does not include an appropriate statement regarding how repeated courses are included within the policy (Section 3-1-421 and Appendix D).
7. The campus does not have a designated on-site administrator for student financial aid (Section 3-1-434(a)).
8. The campus has not completed appropriate graduate or employer follow-up studies (Section 3-1-441(c)).
9. The individual assigned to administer the occupational associate's degree program in Legal Assistant does not have sufficient time to devote to oversight, given her other duties and responsibilities (Section 3-1-511).
10. The Computer Systems Support Technician and Information Systems Support Technician programs do not evidence a well-organized sequence of appropriate subjects leading to an occupational objective and do not quantitatively and qualitatively approximate the standards at other institutions offering similar degree programs. The programs include the following course, which does not reflect current industry needs and standards: TY2120, Software Applications—DOS (Section 3-1-513 and 3-3-203).
11. The prerequisite system does not assure proper qualifications of students. In one instance, a Clinical Medical Assistant graduate was able to take MD2307, Medical Terminology III/Anatomy and Physiology, and MD2308, Pharmacology, before taking MD2301, Medical Terminology I/Anatomy and Physiology, which does not follow its stated prerequisite system (Section 3-1-513(b)).
12. Some courses are not scheduled in a way that is educationally appropriate and that meets the necessary contact hours. The campus had a practice of scheduling two courses in the same classroom at the same time. In this instructional situation the focus and quality of instruction is compromised and it is not possible for students to receive the contact hours listed on the campus's Academic Credit Analysis (Sections 3-1-516(a)(i) and 3-1-517).
13. The campus does not maintain documentation to support that all credit hours awarded are appropriate based on the assessment of knowledge, skills, or competencies acquired. Furthermore, the advanced placement examinations developed by the institution, and available for all courses at the institution, do not evidence collegiate-level standards in every instance (Section 3-1-516(c)(ii)).

14. The campus does not always select and use appropriate learning materials. In one instance, faculty members teaching students in EL4200, Basic Electricity and Electronics, self-published a book which stated in its copyright page that “some information in this book may be misleading or simply wrong.” The administration required the students to purchase the book for the course (Section 3-1-532(c)).
15. The campus does not provide evidence of faculty development plans for all faculty members (Section 3-1-543).
16. The catalog does not clearly state certain required elements as listed in the *Accreditation Criteria*, such as information regarding students fees and charges and the mode of delivery for which courses are approved to be offered (Sections 3-1-432(a), 3-1-701, 3-1-702 and Appendix C).
17. Not all advertising and promotional material accurately portrays the current status of the campus. The campus created, displayed, and distributed to students brochures that offered and promoted an unapproved mode of instructional delivery (Section 3-1-703 and Appendix C).
18. Library resources are outdated, and reference and resource material do not enhance, augment, and support the curricular and educational offerings (Section 3-1-800(a) and 3-3-403).
19. There is evidence that one faculty member is teaching in six different courses in the current term, which is an inappropriate number of teaching assignments (Section 3-3-302).
20. There is insufficient documentation that some instructors are qualified to teach their assigned courses. There is no evidence that the Legal Assistant program has a qualified faculty member to teach its courses (Section 3-3-302(b)).

#### Huntingdon branch campus

1. The campus does not have an accurate written policy for out-of-class work (Section 2-2-501(a)).
2. The team was unable to verify placements as categorized on the 2015 CAR due to the campus not maintaining sufficient documentation to support the classification of three graduates (Section 3-1-303(a)).

3. The campus does not utilize enrollment agreements for its currently enrolled students (Section 3-1-414).
4. The catalog does not clearly state certain required elements as listed in the *Accreditation Criteria*, such as the mode of delivery for which courses are approved to be offered. In addition, the satisfactory academic progress (SAP) policy does not include an appropriate statement regarding how repeated courses are included within the policy (Sections 3-1-421, 3-1-700, 3-1-701, and Appendices C and D).
5. The individuals assigned to administer the medical and legal programs do not have sufficient time to devote to oversight, given other duties and responsibilities (Section 3-1-511).

### **Council Action**

Due to the serious nature of the findings discovered during the institution's on-site evaluation visits and the failure of the institution to provide evidence to resolve a significant number of the findings, the Council acted to deny the institution's application for a renewal of accreditation.

Please notify the Council office in writing within ten days of receipt of this notice if you desire to appeal this decision to the Review Board. The appeal notification must include payment of \$10,000 in the form of a cashier's check, which includes the \$5,000 Review Board fee and a \$5,000 deposit on the expense of the Review Board, which will be reconciled based on actual expenses. The payment is also due within ten days of receipt of this notice. If the appeal notice and appropriate fee are not provided within ten days of receipt of this notice, then the Council's decision is final and will be published and disseminated. If the institution elects to appeal this action to the Review Board and remits the appropriate fee by the established deadline, then more detailed appeal procedures and information will be forwarded to the institution.

If the institution elects not to appeal this action, any comments you may wish to make with regard to this decision must be submitted to the Council office within two weeks of the date of this letter. Should you choose to submit any comments, these comments will be included in the summary detailing the reasons for the Council's decision that will be made available to the U.S. Secretary of Education, the appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency, and the public through [www.acics.org](http://www.acics.org).

### **Institutional Teach-Out Plan**

Finally, in compliance with Section 2-2-303 of the *Accreditation Criteria*, the institution is directed to submit to the Council office by **September 15, 2016**, the ACICS Campus Closing

Ms. Jackie Syktich  
August 26, 2016  
Page 7

and Teach-Out Application along with all applicable documentation requested by that application. The Council expects that the institution will take the appropriate steps to assist its students through any transition to successfully complete their programs in an orderly manner.

You are advised that Section 2-3-900 of the *ACICS Accreditation Criteria* stipulates that the Council may bar any person or entity from being an owner or senior manager of an ACICS-accredited institution if that person or entity was an owner or manager of an institution that loses its accreditation as a result of a denial or suspension action or that closes without providing a teach-out or refunds to students matriculated at that time of closure.

### **Current Grant Expires December 31, 2016**

The institution is advised that the current grant of accreditation expires on December 31, 2016. Though, should the institution elect to appeal the decision and remit the appropriate fee by the established deadline, the grant of accreditation will be extended through the appeal process.

Please contact Mr. Ian Harazduk at [iharazduk@acics.org](mailto:iharazduk@acics.org) or (202) 336-6795 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Roger J. Williams". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned over a faint, light-colored background image of a building.

Roger J. Williams  
Interim President

- c: Ms. Cathy Sheffield, Accreditation and State Liaison, U.S. Department of Education  
([aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov](mailto:aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov))
- Ms. Nancy Gifford, U.S. Department of Education, School  
Participation Team, Region III ([nancy.paula.gifford@ed.gov](mailto:nancy.paula.gifford@ed.gov))
- Ms. Patricia Landis, Pennsylvania Division of Private Licensed Schools,  
([plandis@pa.gov](mailto:plandis@pa.gov))