

**THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

**TO:** Higher Education Committee

**FROM:**  

**SUBJECT:** Institutional Accreditation: Bramson ORT College

**DATE:** December 29, 2016

**AUTHORIZATION(S):** 

**SUMMARY**

recommendation pursuant to Regents Rules 4-1.5(c)(8).

- Assessment of Student Achievement (Regents Rule §4-1.4[b]);
- Programs of Study (Regents Rule §4-1.4[c]);
- Faculty (Regents Rule §4-1.4[d]);
- Resources (Regents Rule §4-1.4[e])
- Administration (Regents Rule §4-1.4[f]);
- Support Services (Regents Rule §4-1.4[g]);
- Student Complaints (Regents Rule §4-1.4[j]); and
- Public Disclosure of Accreditation Status (Regents Rule §4-1.4[m]).

Although the Department recommended denial of accreditation, RAC, after recommending that the Board of Regents grant Bramson probationary accreditation for a period of two years.

On December 17, 2013, after consideration of the recommendation of the RAC, including the full record of compliance review and additional materials provided by Bramson to the RAC, the Board of Regents recommendation and granted probationary accreditation to Bramson for a period of two years in order to afford the college an opportunity to come into compliance with the standards for institutional accreditation. The Regents Rules provide that an institution may be granted probationary accreditation of time, not to exceed two years, *during which the institution shall come into compliance with standards for accreditation through corrective action* §4-1.2[s](emphasis added).

During the two year period of probationary accreditation, Bramson submitted quarterly reports and additional information to the Department. Additionally, peer review teams visited the college on March 10, 2015 and October 21, 2015. Department staff and members of both teams of peer reviewers prepared a draft probationary review report with the teams observations and findings.<sup>1</sup> The March 2015 peer review team found that Bramson had come into compliance with the following two standards for institutional accreditation:

-

The March 2015 peer review team found that Bramson was also out of compliance with the following additional standard for institutional accreditation:

- Consumer Information (Regents Rule §4-1.4[i]);

The October 2015 peer review team found that the College remained out of compliance with all standards identified by the March 2015 team and also found the College to be out of compliance with the standard regarding Student Complaints (Regents Rule §4-1.4[j]).

On April 21, 2016, leadership, the RAC voted to recommend to the Board denial of accreditation. The Council stated, institution has been found to be out of compliance over several years, by three peer review visit teams, with standards defined under Sections 4-1.4(b),

assessment of student achievement, programs of study, faculty, resources, administration and support services. An appeal to the Commissioner pursuant to Regents Rule §4-1.5(c)(8) was filed by Bramson on May 19, 2016. Pursuant to Regents Rule §4-1.5(c)(8), on June 15, 2016, the Deputy submitted a response to the appeal.

Bramson appealed the recommendation of the RAC on the basis that the decision was arbitrary and capricious. The Deputy Commissioner in his response countered

As a result, the Commissioner found that Bramson was not in compliance with the standards for institutional accreditation, nor had the College shown good cause for the corrective action period to be extended. As such, she affirmed the recommendation  
The  
itted to the  
College.

The attachment to this item provides some statistical data on the College and sets forth the range of accreditation actions authorized under Subpart 4-1 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and Section 4-1.5 concerning appeal of a Regents determination, and Section 3.12 regarding the institutional accreditation appeals board

**Related Regents Items**

**Information on Bramson ORT College**

Enrollment

Fall cohort	
2010	851



## **Possible Accreditation Actions**

Accreditation without conditions. The institution is in full compliance with the standards for institutional accreditation. Any follow-up matters are not, in the judgment of t maintain adherence to the institutional accreditation standards for the period of accreditation. Recommendations or any follow-up reports relate either to minor compliance matters or to the strengthening of practices that meet the standards of compliance. Accreditation without conditions may be for a period of up to ten years; customarily it is not for a period of less than five years. Accreditation without conditions may apply to institutions seeking initial accreditation or renewal of accreditation.

Accreditation with conditions. The institution is in substantial compliance with the standards for institutional accreditation. Any areas of non-compliance are not of such nature to the institutional accreditation standards during the term of accreditation. The institution has demonstrated the intent and capacity to rectify identified deficiencies and to strengthen practice in marginally acceptable matters within no more than two years. The institution will be required to take steps to remedy issues raised in the review for accreditation and to provide reports and/or submit to site visits concerning such issues. Accreditation with conditions may be for a period of up to ten years, contingent on a finding of compliance within no more than two years on any areas for deficiency cited in the Regents accreditation action. Accreditation with conditions may apply to institutions seeking initial accreditation or renewal of accreditation.

Probationary accreditation. The institution is in partial compliance with institutional accreditation standards and may reasonably be expected to meet accreditation standards within no more than two years. During this period, the institution provides documentation of compliance with standards, particularly all standards that were not met at the time of the Regents action. A follow-up visit by Department staff and/or peer reviewers may be required following provision of a required report. Probationary accreditation may apply only to institutions seeking renewal of accreditation.

Denial of accreditation. The institution does not meet standards for institutional accreditation and cannot reasonably be expected to meet those standards within two years. Denial of accreditation may apply to institutions seeking initial accreditation or renewal of accreditation.





(11) Appeal of a determination of adverse accreditation action or probationary accreditation to the institutional accreditation appeals board.

(i) An institution may appeal a Regents determination of adverse accreditation action or granting probationary accreditation to the institutional accreditation appeals board in accordance with the requirements and procedures of this paragraph. The institution shall have the right to a hearing and to be represented by counsel during the appeal.