

ARIZONA STATE BOARD FOR PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
1400 West Washington St., Conference Room B1
Phoenix, AZ 85007

COMPLAINT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 27, 2012

Members Present: Dr. Laura Noone
Glen Tharp
KC Miller

Also Present: Teri Stanfill, Director
Keith Blanchard, Deputy Director
Cassandra Pinon, Board Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER – 1:15 P.M.

Glen Tharp called the complaint committee meeting of the Arizona State Board for Private Postsecondary Education Board Meeting, to order at 1:15 P.M.

II. MINUTES:

Mr. Tharp made a motion to postpone the approval of the minutes for June 26, 2012 Complaint Committee meeting as submitted. Dr. Noone seconded the motion. **Minutes approved**

III. PERFORMANCE TRAINING INSTITUTE – Determination to open a complaint.
Institution: Mieke Gibson, Sharon Milosovic, Chris Henry

Mr. Blanchard summarized the report stating staff received a Memorandum from ACCSC regarding a Notice of Commission Actions for Performance Training Institute (PTI). According to the Memorandum, the commission stated it was continuing a probation order for Performance Training Institute, which was originated in March 2012.

PTI received a Show Cause order issued in September 2011, which included concerns that the Arizona operation is more than a call center. The commission stated that the following in its report: “a significant portion of the school’s operation, education support services and administration are carried out in Scottsdale, Arizona.”

It is further noted that PTI offers the following programs that may or may not need licensure in Arizona

ACTION: Dr. Noone made a motion to open a complaint and monitor the situation. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

IV. STUDENT COMPLAINTS

A. #12-S017 Grand Canyon University:
Complainant: Michael Mondragon & Jennifer Lech (Telephonically)

Mr. Blanchard summarized the report stating on April 19, 2012, the State Board received a complaint from student D.P. D.P. stated that during is enrollment, he requested that he

would not have any out-of-pocket expenses and would have all financial aid validated, verified and approved. He stated the appeal of tuition after withdrawal not handled based on the Student Handbook. He requested all information “transparent.”

At its meeting on June 26, 2012, the committee suggested that GCU and D.P. continue to attempt to agree to a mutual satisfactory outcome. D.P. indicated that he and GCU have agreed to a mutual resolution and has requested his complaint be closed.

ACTION: Dr. Noone made a motion to dismiss with no violations. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**B. #12-S018 Grand Canyon University:
Institution: Keith Baker, Josh Meyer, Micelle Nuchols & Jennifer Lech
(Telephonically)
Complainant: E.N.**

Mr. Blanchard summarized the report stating on May 10, 2012, the State Board received a complaint from E.N. regarding his balance he owes GCU and how his athletic scholarship in 2007 was applied. The complainant stated in January 2007, he joined the men’s basketball team at GCU on a scholarship. In his allegation he stated there were promises made to him and that his education would be paid by GCU. He stated the school failed to “holdup” their side of the scholarship and coaches made verbal agreements that they did failed to follow through.

During the review of numerous emails and documents, E.N. did register for classes on January 19, 2010, but was dropped from the classes because the balance that was owed to GCU. It appears the concerns are from 2007, which would be past the 3-year statute of limitations filing a complaint.

ACTION: Dr. Noone made a motion to defer action and forward the matter to the December complaint committee to review with counsel regarding the statute of limitation issue. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**C. #13-S003 Grand Canyon University
Institution: Dr. Kathy Player, Kelly Sanderson & Carol Pratt**

Mr. Blanchard summarized the complaint stating on June 26, 2012 staff received a complaint from A.P. She stated in her complaint that she had successfully completed all of her course work for her master degree in teaching. A.P.’s last instructor notified her that her paper was submitted in Turnitin.com and came up with a high percentage of non-original work. A.P. stated that other instructors would allow her to make corrects and re-submit her papers to address those concerns. The instructor then reported her to the Code of Compliance Board.

GCU states due to the concern of A.P.’s final class, the investigation determined that a large majority of her previous class work were not original work and changed those classes from A or B’s to F’s.

ACTION: Ms. Miller made a motion to refer to the board for review and requested the institution to attend in person. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**D. #13-S008 Grand Canyon University:
Institution: Chris Linderson, Michelle Nuchols & Britt Chandler (Telephonically)
Complainant: D.M. (Telephonically)**

Mr. Blanchard summarized the complaint stating D.M. states she was enrolled in her Master's Degree in Education. The complaint states that she received invoices in the amount of \$13,785.00. These invoices were ignored and wanted GCU to apply these charges to the Student Loan provider "nelnet." Lease note a portion of this amount was a \$9,450 stipend.

The institution stated that effective with the 2010/11 Award Year, all students who utilized Title IV loans were mandated to apply for Direct Loans (DL). These loans are processed and funded through the Department of Education and therefore Nelnet would no longer be a financial aid option for D.M.

ACTION: Dr. Noone made a motion to refer to the board for review so Ms. Leonard could review the financial aid questions and requested the institution to attend in person. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**E. #13-S005 Computer Skills Institute: Sheri Carparelli
Institution: Steve Carparelli & Christina Limas
Complainant: S.W.**

Mr. Blanchard summarized the complaint stating on August 30, 2012, staff received a complaint from S.W. In her complaint, she stated CSI distributed out dated text books for CompTIA Network+ program. The textbooks were outdated for approximately 6-months. S.W. was displeased when the school offered to reimburse her for a failed certification test, instead of CSI paying the re-testing fee in advance.

Complainant S.W. did submit the complaint to the school and appeared to have exhausted the Student Grievance Procedure as required by Rule R4-39-403. However, in the response, CSI stated the student had begun the process of rectifying the concerns through the grievance procedure when she submitted the complaint to the Board. CSI thought the S.W.'s concerns were met.

ACTION: Dr. Noone. Made a motion to dismiss the complaint and found no violations. Dr. Noone noted the resolution that was presented and approved by S.W. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**F. #13-S007 Western International University:
Institution: Austin Rhodes & Tamirra Hoyer
Complainant: G.A.**

Mr. Blanchard summarized the complaint stating on August 27, 2012, G.A. filed a complaint in the numerous emails. He stated 2 concerns; issue of retaliatory grading and financial aid issues. Staff responded to the emails complaint and noted G.A. had did not submitted any documentation or explanation of how he attempted to complete the intuitional grievance procedure.

As a courtesy, staff submitted the emails to WIU listing his concerns. In its response, WIU stated they had explained its position at length to G.A. During additional communications with G.A., staff requested documentation to support his allegation and a

clearer explanation of his issue involving the retaliatory grading. G.A. did not submit any documents. Staff received the sign complaint September 11, 2012 was able to gain clarification from G.A. and identify his concern.

G.A. stated that WIU would not use financial aid funds to clear an account balance from a previous award year. This was obstructing or bar him from completing the final 3 courses remaining in his MBA program. He stated the policy of only using out of pocket funds as the only means of payment was not reasonable. He stated that he believes there is a tendency at WIU to not act on specific issues brought to the attention of its personnel. WIU deliberately utilizes various means to coerce, injure, abuse and extort.

ACTION: Dr, Noone made a motion to dismiss with and finding no violations. Mr. Tharp seconded the motion. Motion Carried.

V. CALL TO THE PUBLIC: N/A

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 2:15 P.M.

The September 27, 2012 Complaint Committee Minutes were approved at the January 24, 2013 Complaint Committee meeting.



Keith Blanchard, Deputy Director