January 29, 2015

Patricia Schust
LIC/LISMA Language Center Long Island
1125 Willis Avenue
Albertson, NY 11507

Dear Ms. Schust:

The CEA Policies and Procedures and U.S. Department of Education requirements for recognized accreditation agencies require public disclosure of Commission decisions and in the case of denial, an opportunity for the site to respond. (CEA Policies and Procedures, Public Disclosure, C. Commission Decisions). Thus, CEA prepares a brief statement summarizing the reasons for the agency’s denial of accreditation of a program or institution; the statement is forwarded to the site for a responsive comment. The statement and the site’s responsive comment, if any, are then forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education, the appropriate office at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and recognized accreditation agencies and licensing bodies as relevant, and are made available to the public on CEA’s website (www.cea-accredit.org). If no responsive comment is made, CEA provides evidence to the U.S. Department of Education that the site has been offered the opportunity to comment.

This letter constitutes the required brief statement; it is being provided to you for your responsive comment.

LIC/LISMA Language Center Long Island was denied continued initial accreditation by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation at its December 2014 meeting.

The following are the standards for which the site was found to be out of compliance and upon which the final denial was based.

- Curriculum Standard 2
- Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 2
- Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 4
- Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 9
- Student Services Standard 3
- Length and Structure of Program of Study Standard 2
- Student Achievement Standard 1
- Student Achievement Standard 2
- Student Achievement Standard 3
- Student Achievement Standard 4
- Program Development, Planning, and Review 1
- Program Development, Planning, and Review 2
Your responsive comment may make general comments about the process and findings but should not respond to findings for each individual standard. The responsive comment will not be considered an appeal of the decision and will not result in a reconsideration of the accreditation decision. CEA reserves the right to redact comments which are inflammatory or which do not pertain to the reasons for denial as stated in CEA’s statement below.

Please provide your responsive comment within 30 days, by March 1, 2015. If you choose not to respond, this letter will be forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education as evidence that you were given the opportunity to respond.

The Commission recognizes that a program or institution which has been denied accreditation may nonetheless be actively engaged in making standards-related improvements. Thus, CEA’s policies permit immediate re-application for eligibility. Please contact me should you have questions about this process or any other aspect of this letter.

Sincerely,

Mary Reeves, PhD
Executive Director