		•				
1	XAVIER BECERRA					
2	Attorney General of California LINDA L. SUN					
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General KATHERINE MESSANA					
	Deputy Attorney General	•				
4	State Bar No. 272953 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702					
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013					
6	Telephone: (213) 269-6311 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	*				
7	Attorneys for Complainant	·				
	BEFORE THE					
8	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS FOR THE BUREAU FOR PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION					
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
10						
11	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. 1002620				
12 13	CALIFORNIA INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	STATEMENT OF ISSUES				
14	Application for Approval to Operate an Institution Non-Accredited					
15 16	Respondent.					
17						
18	Complainant alleges:					
19	PARTIES					
20	1. Dr. Michael Marion, Jr. (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in his					
21	official capacity as the Chief of the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (Bureau),					
22	Department of Consumer Affairs.					
23	2. On or about August 14, 2002, the former Bureau for Private Postsecondary and					
24	Vocational Education (BPPVE) received an Application for Approval to Operate an Institution					
25	Non-Accredited from California International Theological Seminary (Respondent). On or about					
26	August 14, 2002, Respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all					
27	statements, answers, and representations in the application. On February 6, 2004, the BPPVE					
28	issued a Temporary Approval to Operate. On June 30, 2007, the BPPVE was sunset (Responden					
	·	•				

had not obtained full approval to operate). On January 1, 2010, the California Private

Postsecondary Education Act of 2009 (Act) became effective and the Bureau began operations.

On July 11, 2011, the Bureau received non-compliant catalog and enrollment documents from

Respondent. On February 26, 2013, the Bureau notified Respondent that additional information

was required. On July 17, 2014, Respondent provided additional documents to the Bureau. On

July 21, 2014, the Bureau received additional documents from Respondent. On March 7, 2016,

the Bureau sent Respondent a deficiency letter. On April 6, 2016, the Bureau received

Respondent's response to the deficiency letter. On May 6, 2016, the Bureau sent Respondent

another deficiency letter. On September 30, 2016, the Bureau received Respondent's submission

of its accreditation plan (but no further response to the May 6, 2016, deficiency letter). The

Bureau denied the application on April 4, 2017.

JURISDICTION

3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs (Director) for the Bureau, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Education Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Business and Professions Code section 22 defines the term "board" to include "bureau."
 - 5. Section 94887 of the Education Code states:
 - "An approval to operate shall be granted only after an applicant has presented sufficient evidence to the bureau, and the bureau has independently verified the information provided by the applicant through site visits or other methods deemed appropriate by the bureau, that the applicant has the capacity to satisfy the minimum operating standards. The bureau shall deny an application for an approval to operate if the application does not satisfy those standards."
 - 6. California Education Code section 94885 states, in pertinent part:
 - "(a) The bureau shall adopt by regulation minimum operating standards for an institution that shall reasonably ensure that all of the following occur:
 - (1) The content of each educational program can achieve its stated objective.

2. You were enrolled at an institution or a location of the institution within the 120 day period before the closure of the institution or location of the institution, or were enrolled in an educational program within the 120 day period

- 3. You were enrolled at an institution or a location of the institution more than 120 days before the closure of the institution or location of the institution, in an educational program offered by the institution as to which the Bureau determined there was a significant decline in the quality or value of the program more than 120
- 4. The institution has been ordered to pay a refund by the Bureau but has
- 5. The institution has failed to pay or reimburse loan proceeds under a federal student loan program as required by law, or has failed to pay or reimburse proceeds received by the institution in excess of tuition and other costs.
- 6. You have been awarded restitution, a refund, or other monetary award by an arbitrator or court, based on a violation of this chapter by an institution or representative of an institution, but have been unable to collect the award from the
- 7. You sought legal counsel that resulted in the cancellation of one or more of your student loans and have an invoice for services rendered and evidence of

To qualify for STRF reimbursement, the application must be received within four (4) years from the date of the action or event that made the student

A student whose loan is revived by a loan holder or debt collector after a period of noncollection may, at any time, file a written application for recovery from STRF for the debt that would have otherwise been eligible for recovery. If it has been more than four (4) years since the action or event that made the student eligible, the student must have filed a written application for recovery within the original four (4) year period, unless the period has been extended by another act of law.

However, no claim can be paid to any student without a social security

- California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71750 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) Every institution shall make refunds that are no less than the refunds
- (b) An institution may not enforce any refund policy that is not specified in the catalog as required pursuant to section 94909(a)(8)(B) of the Code, and must refund all institutional charges upon a student's withdrawal. Withdrawal policy procedures pursuant to section 94909(a)((8)(B) of the Code shall include, at a minimum: the acceptable methods of delivery of a notice to withdraw; whether withdrawal can be accomplished by conduct, and if so, how; the position or positions to whom the notice to withdraw must be delivered; and the date that the notice to withdraw is considered effective, which shall be no later than the date received by the

(3) Name of institutional accreditors for each branch and satellite campus. and for each such campus at which any programs have programmatic accreditation, the names of the programmatic accreditor for each such program, and effective dates (4) Information regarding participation in state and federal student loan and grant programs, including the total amount of funding received from each source for those students enrolled in an approved California school regardless of their state (5) Information regarding participation in other public funding programs, including the amount of funding received from each public funding source; for

FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Administration)

- 43. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94885, subdivision (a)(5) of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71730, subdivision (e) in that Respondent did not provide evidence that its Chief Academic Officer (CAO) possesses a degree or equivalent acceptable experience because Respondent did not submit academic transcripts and a signed employment contract for the Chief Academic Officer.
- 44. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94885, subdivision (a)(5) of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71730, subdivision (f) in that Respondent did not provide evidence that it employs administrative personnel who have the expertise to ensure the achievement of Respondent's mission and objectives and the operation of the educational programs because it did not submit the curriculum vitae of the Chief Operating Officer and the Chief Executive Officer.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Enrollment Agreement)

- 45. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94902 of the Code in that Respondent did not submit an Enrollment Agreement (EA) that included all of the required information and disclosures as mandated by section 94911 of the Code and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71800.
- 46. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71800, subdivision (d) in that Respondent did not include the date by which the student must exercise his or her right to cancel or withdraw and the refund policy on the EA.
- 47. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71800, subdivision (e) in that Respondent did not include mandatory information regarding an itemization of all institutional charges and fees including, the non-refundable registration and Student Tuition Recovery Fund fees and applicable fees outlined in Respondent's catalog in the EA.

III

	48.	Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94911, subdivision (b) of
the C	Code in	that the EA did not include mandatory information regarding a schedule of total
charg	ges (in	cluding a list of any charges that are nonrefundable and the student's obligations to the
Stud	ent Tu	ition Recovery Fund) clearly identified as nonrefundable charges.

- 49. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94911, subdivision (c) of the Code in that the EA did not include mandatory information regarding the total charges for the current period of attendance, the estimated total charges for the entire educational program, and the total charges the student is obligated to pay upon enrollment.
- 50. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94911, subdivision (e)(2) of the Code in that the EA did not include mandatory information regarding Respondent's refund policy and a statement of fact regarding federal student financial aid funds.
- 51. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94911, subdivision (f) of the Code in that the EA did not include mandatory information regarding the students' responsibility for repayment of loans plus interest, less the amount of any refund.
- 52. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94911, subdivision (g) of the Code in that the EA did not include mandatory information regarding the implications of defaulting on federal or state loans.
- 53. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94897, subdivision (i)(1) and section 94911, subdivisions (d) and (h) of the Code in that the EA did not include a compliant transferability disclosure or a clear and conspicuous statement that the EA is legally binding when signed by the student and accepted by Respondent. Instead, the EA included information regarding transferability of units to the University of Santa Monica (a private educational corporation that is not affiliated with Respondent).

THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Instruction and Degrees Offered)

54. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94893 of the Code in that Respondent failed to obtain prior authorization to make a substantive change to its approval to operate. Specifically, Respondent listed two unapproved degree programs, the Bachelor of

.

28 II

Theology and Master of Arts, in the catalog and School Performance Fact Sheet (SPFS), without obtaining prior authorization from the Bureau to offer such educational programs to the public.

55. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71715, subdivision (b) and section 71850, subdivision (a) in that Respondent did not provide evidence to document that the instruction offered leads to the achievement of the learning objectives of each course. Specifically, Respondent failed to provide documentation regarding the admission requirements, information regarding the ability-to-benefit examination, the types and amount of general education required, the title of the educational programs and other components of instruction offered, graduation requirements, and identifying each occupation and job title to which each educational program is represented to lead. Further, Respondent has not demonstrated that its undergraduate degree program meets the minimum requirements appropriate to the level and type of degree given.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Educational Programs)

- 56. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94885, subdivision (a)(1) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71710 in that Respondent is in violation of the minimum operating standard because it did not provide evidence that the contents of the educational program can achieve its stated objective(s) nor has it demonstrated that it created syllabi that complies with all of the mandatory provisions pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71710, subdivision (c).
- 57. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71865 in that Respondent has not provided evidence that any of its graduate-level degree program curricula meets the minimum educational requirements that are necessary to confer a graduate degree. Specifically, Respondent failed to fully comply with the mandatory provisions pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71865 with respect to its graduate degree programs in Master of Arts in Ministry, Master of Arts in Divinity, and Doctor of Ministry.

58. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71710, subdivision (d) in that Respondent has not demonstrated that it provides sufficient library and other learning resources to meet and support the instructional needs of students that conduct academic research at the Bachelor's level.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Faculty)

- 59. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94885, subdivision (a)(5) of the Code and California Code of Regulations title 5, section 71720, subdivision (a) in that Respondent failed to provide evidence that it contracted with duly qualified faculty and failed to demonstrate that it maintains records documenting that each faculty member is duly qualified and was qualified to perform the duties to which the faculty member was assigned, including providing instruction and evaluating learning outcomes.
- 60. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71720, subdivision (a)(2) in that Respondent failed to demonstrate that it developed and implemented written policies and procedures providing for the participation by duly qualified faculty in conducting of research, development of curricula, academic planning, enforcement of standards of academic quality, pursuit of academic matters related to Respondent's mission and objectives, establishment of criteria for contracting with new faculty, and evaluation of faculty credentials.
- 61. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71720, subdivision (a)(3) in that Respondent failed to demonstrate that it employs a sufficient number of faculty members to provide instruction in its educational programs.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Catalog)

62. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(1) in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include the specific beginning and end dates defining the time period covered by the catalog.

28 ///

- 63. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(2) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include a statement in its catalog that Respondent is a private institution, Respondent did not include a statement in its catalog that it is approved to operate by the Bureau, and Respondent did not include a clear and conspicuous statement that approval to operate means compliance with state standards as set forth in this chapter.
- 64. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(12) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include a statement in its catalog specifying all components of the required bankruptcy disclosure.
- 65: Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(9) in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include a description of the facilities and of the types of equipment and materials that will be used for instruction.
- 66. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(10) in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include a description of library and other learning resources and the procedures for students to access those resources.
- 67. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(3)(A) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include the specific required language directing students to the Bureau for unanswered questions.
- 68. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(3)(B) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include specific required language encouraging students to review the catalog and the School Performance Fact Sheet prior to signing an enrollment agreement.

- 69. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision
 (a)(3)(C) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include specific required language referring individuals wishing to file a complaint about Respondent to the Bureau.
- 70. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(15) of the Code in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include specific required language in its catalog that addresses transferability of credits and credentials.
- 71. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71775.5, subdivisions (a) and (c)(1), in that Respondent failed to provide students with the Notice to Prospective Degree Program Students disclosure where each degree program is described and failed to include the dates by which Respondent is required to achieve preaccreditation and full accreditation.
- 72. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(8)(A) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71770, subdivisions (a) and (b) in that Respondent failed to include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent did not include a detailed description of institutional policies in admission policies, admissions requirements for ability-to-benefit students, and a list describing any transfer or articulation agreements. Moreover, Respondent did not disclose whether or not it had entered into an articulation or transfer agreement with any other college or university.
- 73. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(7) and section 71770, subdivision (c) in that Respondent did not include its policy on the award of credit for prior experiential learning experience, including assessment policies and procedures, provisions for appeal, and all charges that a student may be required to pay.
- 74. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(4) in that Respondent did not include language proficiency information, including the level of English language proficiency required of students, the kind of

8

12 13

11

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23

24

22

25

27

28

26

documentation of proficiency that will be accepted, whether English language services are provide, and (if so) the nature of the service and its cost.

- 75. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(5) in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that included information regarding whether or not any instruction will occur in a language other than English and, if so, the level of proficiency required and the kind of documentation of proficiency that will be accepted.
- 76. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(5) of the Code in that Respondent did not include a description of the programs offered and a description of the instruction provided in each of the courses offered by Respondent, the requirements for completion of each program, including required courses, any final tests or examinations, any required internships or externships, and the total number of credit hours, clock hours, or other increments required for completion.
- Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(16) and section 94897, subdivision (p) of the Code in that Respondent did not include in the catalog, a statement specifying whether Respondent or any of its degree programs are accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education, and further did not disclose the known limitations of the degree.
- Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(9) of the Code in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that contained a schedule of total charges for a period of attendance and an estimated schedule of total charges for the entire educational program.
- 79. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(14) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 76215, subdivisions (a) and (b) in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that contained the specific required language related to the Student Tuition Recovery Fund (STRF). Specifically, the catalog did not include information regarding a description of the student's rights and responsibilities with respect to the STRF, a statement that specifies that it is a state requirement that a student who pays tuition is required to

pay a state-imposed assessment for the STRF, and a statement that describes the purpose and operation of the STRF and the requirements for filing a claim against the STRF.

- 80. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(8)(B) and section 94920, subdivisions (a), (b), and (d) of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71750 in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that contained a withdrawal and refund policy that fully complies with the mandatory provisions.
- 81. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(6) of the Code in that Respondent did not include information regarding whether or not the programs are designed to lead to positions in a profession that require state licensure and what specific licensed positions any program is designed to lead to.
- 82. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(7) of the Code in that Respondent did not include each faculty member's individual qualifications in its catalog.
- 83. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(10) of the Code in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that contained a clear statement indicating whether Respondent participates in federal and state financial aid programs, and, if so, all consumer information that is required to be disclosed to the student pursuant to federal and state financial aid programs.
- 84. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(11) of the Code in that Respondent did not submit a catalog that contained the mandatory loan disclosure information. Specifically, the catalog did not specify that, if a student obtains a loan to pay for an educational program, the student will have to repay the full amount of the loan plus interest, less the amount of any refund, and that if the student receives federal student financial aid funds, the student is entitled to a refund of the money not paid from federal financial aid funds.
- 85. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(6) in that Respondent did not provide a catalog that includes Respondent's policies and practices regarding any form of financial aid. Specifically,

the catalog did not provide any details on what types of financial aid is provided, how students may qualify, any consumer information which Respondent is required to disclose to the student under any state or federal financial aid program, and any applicable payment options that are available to students.

- 86. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(8)(E) of the Code in that Respondent did not provide a catalog that includes Respondent's leave of absence policy.
- 87. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(14) in that Respondent did not provide a catalog that includes Respondent's policies on student rights, including the procedure for addressing student grievances.
- 88. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94909, subdivision (a)(13) of the Code in that Respondent did not provide a catalog that includes whether or not job placement services are provided and a description of the nature and extent of the placement services.
- 89. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivisions (b)(13)(A), (b)(13)(B), and (b)(13)(C) in that Respondent did not include the minimum requirements for a school catalog because Respondent failed to include required housing information, including, whether the institution has dormitory facilities under its control, the availability of housing located reasonably near the institution's facility and an estimation of the approximate cost or range of cost of the housing, and if the institution has no responsibility to find or assist a student in finding housing a clear and conspicuous statement so indicating.
- 90. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94900 and section 94900.5 of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 71810, subdivision (b)(15), section 71920, and section 71930 in that Respondent did not provide a catalog that contains Respondent's policy on the retention of student and institutional record.

28 | ///

· 24

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Website)

91. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94913, subdivision (a) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 74117 in that Respondent's website does not include a current school catalog, a current School Performance Fact Sheet (SPFS), student brochures, a link to the Bureau's website, and Respondent's most recent annual report.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(School Performance Fact Sheet)

- 92. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94897, subdivision (e) of the Code in that Respondent engaged in prohibited business practices. Specifically, the July 17, 2014 SPFS submitted by Respondent states that Respondent received institutional accreditation by the Bureau (the Bureau does not accredit institutions), the SPFS states that Respondent has received accreditation from Transworld Accrediting Commission (this agency is not recognized by the United States Department of Education).
- 93. Respondent's application is subject to denial under California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 74112, subdivision (a) in that Respondent did not submit a separate SPFS for each educational program. Instead, the July 17, 2014, SPFS electronically submitted by Respondent includes a consolidated list of data tables reported for all of its educational programs.
- 94. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94910, subdivisions (a) and (b) and section 94929.5, subdivision (a)(1) of the Code in that Respondent provided inconsistent Completion and Placement Rates data on the SPFS. Specifically, on page 5 of the July 17, 2014, SPFS, the number of graduates reported for 2013 is inconsistent with the number on page 2 of the SPFS for completion rates.
- 95. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 94910, subdivision (d) and section 94929.5, subdivision (a)(3) of the Code in that Respondent provided inconsistent Salary and Wage Information on the SPFS. Specifically, on page 9 of the SPFS, the graduates available for employment for the Master of Divinity Program is inconsistent with the number reported on page 5 of the SPFS, and Respondent failed to provide the salary for the 2011 graduates.

				a a	
1	of business organization in the State of California, whether or not it is incorporated, and				
2	compliance with institutional operating standards.				
3		<u>PRAYER</u>			
4	WHI	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,			
5	and that fo	and that following the hearing, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs issue a			
6	decision:				
7	1.	1. Denying the application of California International Theological Seminary for an			
8	Approval to Operate an Institution Non-Accredited;				
9	2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.				
10					
11	DATED:	9/28/18			
12		/ /	DR. MICHAEL M Chief		
13			Department of Con State of California	Postsecondary Education sumer Affairs	
14			Complainant		
15	LA20176045	220			
16	62960076.do			*	
17			*	3)	
18				*	
19				2	
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26	}	ia .			
27					
28			40		