



**State Workforce Innovation Council
Career and Technical Schools Accreditation Committee
February 28, 2013
Indiana Department of Workforce Development
Conference Room 301-B
10 N Senate Ave, Indianapolis IN**

Present: Jac Padgett, Leroy Jackson

Remote Attendees: Randy Holmes, Mark Maassel

Absent: Dennis Rohrs, Paula Pinkstaff

Also Present from DWD: Jeff Gill, General Counsel, Robert Robisch, Associate General Counsel, Nate Klinck, Director of Policy, Terri Banks, Associate Director of Policy, Jodi White and Dinell Edge, Accreditation Specialists

Call to Order and Roll

Nate Klinck announced that due to Gina DelSanto's recent departure to accept a new position, committee member, Jac Padgett, had agreed to serve as acting committee chair. Mr. Padgett called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. and began by noting a quorum and requesting that the record show there were no members of the public present.

Action Items

Meeting Minutes – December 20, 2012:

Mr. Padgett introduced the minutes of the committee meeting held on December 20, 2012, and asked for comments. There were no comments. Mr. Jackson motioned to approve the minutes, and Mr. Holmes seconded. Due to attendees participating remotely, a roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Student Complaints:

Terri Banks introduced the student complaints by reminding committee members of the current adjudication process. She summarized the process document that was sent out ahead of the meeting, and indicated that the committee members would be considering staff recommendations regarding the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law for two student

complaints. Prior to reading the staff recommendations concerning the complaint filed by Diana Meyer against TechSkills, LLC, Jeff Gill stated that IC 4-21.5-3-29 grants the State Workforce Innovation Council (SWIC) the authority to modify the ruling of the administrative law judge. It was noted that both complainants, Diana Meyer and Jon Marquess, had been properly notified of the nature and intent, date, time and location of the committee meeting today. It was further noted that both complainants were given the requisite opportunity to submit objections to the administrative law judge's findings, and that while Ms. Meyer did not submit objections, Mr. Marquess did so in a timely manner.

Diana Meyer vs. TechSkills:

The staff report, presented by Ms. Banks, recommended that the committee modify the Conclusions of Law as the final order in the case of Diana Meyer vs. TechSkills. Ms. Banks read the proposed modifications, and after some brief discussion, Mr. Holmes moved to modify the administrative law judge's conclusions as presented by staff. Mr. Jackson seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Jon Marquess vs. TechSkills:

A review and discussion of the student complaint filed by Jon Marquess against TechSkills was also conducted. Ms. Banks presented the staff report that recommended adoption of the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law of the administrative law judge in the matter. Additionally Ms. Banks was asked to summarize Mr. Marquess's objections to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law rendered by the administrative law judge. Staff summarized the objections, answered additional questions, and when there was no further discussion, Mr. Maassel moved to adopt the ruling of the administrative law judge. Mr. Jackson seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Tabled Items from 12/20/12 Meeting

Orientation Process for Prospective Applicants

A discussion was held regarding establishing an orientation process for proprietors wishing to apply for a temporary status with OCTS. This discussion included whether a fee should be charged for the orientation as well as the orientation content and preferred delivery method. Staff were asked about a timeline for preparing an orientation and responded that while the content is available it could take between three and six months to develop a delivery platform. Mr. Jackson made a motion to empower staff to continue the development of an orientation process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes, a roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Application timeframe

Staff introduced further research and recommendations regarding establishing a deadline for submitting a completed application prior to requiring additional application fees. The new recommendation was modified from an original ninety day limit to a total of one hundred eighty days and indicated distinction should be made between active and inactive applications.

Mr. Gill indicated the importance of being sure that application deadlines can be enforced consistently. If there are to be exceptions to deadlines, those need to be dealt with in policy as well. With the additional questions and challenges identified, Mr. Klinck recommended staff draft a proposed policy, submit to legal for review, and present for further discussion at the next committee meeting.

Adjournment

Having covered all of the agenda items and with no further discussion, Mr. Padgett reminded committee members of the next meeting on April 18th and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Jackson so moved and the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.