



January 9, 2026

VIA EMAIL  
vivian.zhang@supstat.com

Ms. Vivian Zhang  
School Director  
NYC Data Science Academy  
500 Eighth Avenue, Suite 908  
New York, NY 10018

***Re: Reaccreditation Denied while on Show Cause  
Appealable (Not a Final Action)  
ACCET ID #1593***

Dear Ms. Zhang:

At its December 2025 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education & Training (ACCET) voted to deny reaccreditation to NYC Data Science Academy, located in New York, NY.

The decision was based upon a careful review and evaluation of the record, including the institution's Analytic Self-Evaluation Report (ASER), the visit team report (on-site visit conducted September 24-25, 2024), and the institution's response to that report, dated November 13, 2024. The Commission's December 2024 action deferred consideration and directed the institution to submit an interim report for review at its April 2025 meeting.

Because the institution submitted the interim report, dated April 1, 2025, after the deadline, it was not available to the Commission in time for its April 2025 meeting and, therefore, was not reviewed. The Commission voted to defer consideration and continue the institution's accredited status, pending further review at its August 2025 meeting, and directed the institution to submit an interim report for review to include Standards II.A. Governance, II.B. Institutional Management, II.C. Human Resource Management, II.D. Records, and IX.D. Completion and Job Placement.

The interim report, dated June 30, 2025, was found to be substantially incomplete with respect to Standards II.A. Governance, II.C. Human Resource Management, II.D. Records, and IX.D. Completion and Job Placement. As a result, the Commission voted to defer consideration of reaccreditation again at its August 2025 meeting and directed the institution to submit an additional interim report for review at its December 2025 meeting. As a result of the incomplete interim report, the Commission voted to issue an Institutional Show Cause directive, requiring the institution to provide a compelling rationale showing cause why its accreditation should not be withdrawn.

The institution's most recent interim report, received on November 18, 2025, was reviewed by the Commission at its December 2025 meeting, along with the institution's Annual Financial Report (due March 31, 2025, and received November 19, 2025). While the issues relative to Standards II.A. and II.D. were addressed in the institution's interim report, the Commission determined that the institution did not demonstrate why its accreditation should not be withdrawn due to its failure to demonstrate compliance with ACCET standards, policies, and procedures, as follows:

1. Standard II.C. Human Resource Management

The institution failed to demonstrate that written human resource policies and procedures are followed that ensure that qualified and capable personnel, at appropriate staffing levels, are effectively utilized and address the recruitment, selection, hiring, orientation, supervision, evaluation, retention, training, and professional development of all personnel.

The institution was directed to provide documentation to show systematic and effective implementation of its professional development policy, including evidence that all faculty and staff engaged in professional development since the team report response.

*The institution's interim report indicated that all faculty and staff have completed professional development activities appropriate to their positions, and it has documented each employee's participation in these activities. It also noted that, moving forward, the Academy will implement a revised Professional Development Policy and Procedures, requiring every employee to complete at least one professional development activity per year. It noted that the Director of Operations will maintain a Professional Development Tracking Log to ensure compliance with the policy. Further, the interim report stated that the School Director will conduct an annual review of professional development records to verify participation, identify training needs, and ensure alignment with institutional goals and accreditation requirements. However, the documentation provided, including a copy of the Professional Development Tracking Log, shows very little activity and does not demonstrate the systematic and effective implementation of the policy in practice over time. In addition, the log shows training activity for four employees, the team report noted five employees and the institution's website indicates at least 15 faculty and staff.*

**Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate full compliance with Standard II.C. Human Resource Management.**

2. Standard III.A. Financial Stability

The institution failed to demonstrate responsible financial management with resources sufficient to provide quality education, training, and student services, and to complete the instruction of all enrolled students. Its financial reports did not provide clear evidence of financial stability and sound fiscal practices.

In addition to the interim report, the Commission reviewed the institution's annual financial report, which was submitted late and therefore was not available for review by the Commission at its August 2025 meeting. The Commission noted at the December 2025 meeting that accounts payable and accrued expenses are more than double the amount of cash on hand.

*This significant decline in revenue called into question the institution's ability to deliver its educational programs and student services, reflected in the ongoing pattern of issues noted in the previous interim reports reviewed by the Commission.*

**Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate full compliance with Standard III.A. Financial Stability.**

### 3. Standard IX.D. Completion and Job Placement

The institution failed to demonstrate that written policies and procedures are followed that provide effective means to regularly assess, document, and validate the quality of the education and training services provided relative to completion and placement rates, as applicable.

The institution was directed to provide updated ACCET Document 28.1s – Completion and Placement Statistics for calendar years 2023, 2024, and partial year 2025 (January 1–May 31), along with ACCET Document 28.2s – On-Site Sampling Verification Forms and supporting documentation for all placements and waivers for the following programs:

- Data Analytics Bootcamp – Online
- Data Science Bootcamp – Online (FT)
- Data Science Bootcamp – Online (PT)

The institution was also directed to provide documentation to evidence that the appropriate staff have been trained on the Graduate Employment Policy and Procedures.

In its interim report, the institution indicated that it provided updated Document 28.1s – Completion and Placement Statistics for the three above-referenced programs for calendar years 2023 and 2024 and partial year 2025 (January 1–May 31); however, only two programs were submitted for 2025, and an additional program, AI Bootcamp, was submitted for 2024. It is noted that “AI Bootcamp” is not an approved program name listed in ACCET’s Accreditation Management System (AMS). The interim report further stated that it is reconciling its placement verification procedures and documentation, which it will have completed by January 12, 2026, and provided an updated Graduate Employment Policy and Procedure. However, the institution’s reported placement rates for the past three years are 0% for all reported programs.

#### 2023

Program	Completion (completers/eligible)	Placement (placed/eligible)
<b>ACCET Benchmark</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<i>Data Science Bootcamp-Online (24 weeks)</i>	77.78% (14/18)	0% (0/11)
<i>Data Science Bootcamp-Online (12 weeks)</i>	100% (1/1)	0% (0/1)
<i>Data Science Bootcamp-Online (16 weeks)</i>	100% (14/14)	0% (0/12)

#### 2024

Program	Completion (completers/eligible)	Placement (placed/eligible)
<b>ACCET Benchmark</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<i>Data Science Bootcamp-Online (24 weeks)</i>	72.22% (13/18)	0% (0/13)

AI Bootcamp	100% (1/1)	0% (0/1)
Data Analytics Bootcamp-Online (12 weeks)	100% (2/2)	0% (0/2)
Data Science Bootcamp-Online (16 weeks)	73.33% (11/15)	0% (0/11)

**2025 (January 1–May 31)**

Program	Completion (completers/eligible)	Placement (placed/eligible)
<b>ACCET Benchmark</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>70%</b>
Data Science Bootcamp-Online (16 weeks)	0% (0/1)	0% (0/0)
Data Science Bootcamp-Online (24 weeks)	0% (0/1)	0% (0/0)

*This lack of documented job placements, sustained over a significant period of time, precludes the institution from effectively demonstrating institutional effectiveness as required by ACCET standards. Without documented job placement outcomes, the institution failed to substantiate that its programs yield positive outcomes for students or that graduates are achieving successful employment. As a result, the institution did not provide sufficient evidence to establish that it fulfills its stated mission or that students are benefiting from its educational offerings in a manner consistent with ACCET standards.*

**Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate full compliance with Standard IX.D. Completion and Job Placement.**

**Denial of Reaccreditation:** Since denial of accreditation is an adverse action by the Accrediting Commission, the institution may appeal the decision. The complete procedures and guidelines for appealing the decision are detailed in ACCET Document 11 – Policies and Practices of the Accrediting Commission, available on our website at [www.accet.org](http://www.accet.org). Per Document 11, “An institution that is denied reaccreditation is not automatically eligible to reapply for accreditation. The institution must first seek and obtain the permission of the Commission to apply. Further, the institution may not reapply for accreditation until at least one year from the date of the Commission’s final action. If the implementation of such final action by the Commission is delayed but ultimately upheld through legal remedies pursued in an appropriate court of law, the one-year minimum waiting period required prior to reapplication by the institution will begin on the date of the court’s decision.”

**Appeals Request:** To initiate an appeal, the institution must file a written request for an appeal to the Accrediting Commission, **within fifteen (15) calendar days** after receipt of this letter. The request for an appeal must include the electronic submission of the following documents: (1) a signed affidavit by an authorized representative of the institution, indicating that a notice of the denial of accreditation, has been disclosed to all current and prospective students **within seven business days** of receipt of the decision, prominently published on the institution’s website, and posted in a conspicuous place at the institution, to include, at minimum, the admission office and the student lounge or comparable location, notifying interested parties of the Commission’s

adverse action; (2) a teach-out plan in accordance with ACCET Document 32 – Teach-Out/Closure Policy, to ensure that students are afforded an opportunity to successfully complete their training in the event of the institution's closure; and (3) verification that the institution has no outstanding financial obligations owed to ACCET.

The documentation should be compiled as a single .pdf file. Each exhibit should be distinctly labeled, numbered, and sequenced. Please insert bookmarks for each exhibit and ensure that the compiled response is uploaded using the following link:

**Appeals Request Upload link:** <https://www.dropbox.com/request/owwNFFSirPC8ai6OKh25>

**Appeals Fee:** Upon receipt of the complete request for an appeal, as described above, an electronic invoice in the amount of \$9,500 will be issued. Payment is due upon receipt to initiate the appeal.

**Appeals Brief:** If an appeals request is received, an upload link will be provided for submitting the appeals brief documentation electronically.

In the event of an appeal, a written statement outlining the grounds for the appeal and supporting documentation must be submitted to the ACCET office within sixty (60) calendar days of receipt of this letter. The documentation should be compiled as a single .pdf file, beginning with the written rationale, followed by the main narrative update, and then the supporting documentation. Each exhibit should be clearly labeled, numbered, and sequenced. Please include bookmarks for each exhibit. If an appeals request is received, an upload link will be provided for submitting the appeals brief documentation electronically.

The appeal process allows for the institution to provide clarification regarding the conditions at the institution at the time the Accrediting Commission made its decision to deny accreditation, which is the last date of the Commission meeting. The appeals panel may only consider whether the Commission's denial of accreditation was supported by the evidence that was before the Commission when it acted. The Panel may not consider evidence that occurred after the date of the Commission action, except as indicated below. The appeal process does not allow for consideration of changes that have been made by or at the institution or new information created or obtained after the Commission's action to deny or withdraw accreditation, except under such circumstances when the Commission's adverse action included a finding of non-compliance with Standard III.A. Financial Stability, whereupon the Appeals Panel may consider, on a one-time basis only, such financial information provided all of the following conditions are met:

- The only remaining deficiency cited by the Commission in support of a final adverse action decision is the institution's failure to meet ACCET Standard III.A. Financial Stability, with the institution's non-compliance with Standard III.A. the sole deficiency warranting a final adverse action.
- The financial information was unavailable to the institution until after the Commission's decision was made and is included in the written statement of the grounds for appeal submitted in accordance with the ACCET appeals process.

- The financial information provided is significant and bears materially on the specified financial deficiencies identified by the Commission.

The Appeals Panel shall apply such criteria of significance and materiality as established by the Commission. Further, any determination made by the Appeals Panel relative to this new financial information shall not constitute a basis for further appeal.

The grounds for appeal shall be that the Commission's adverse decision should be reversed as erroneous on the basis of the record before the Commission at the time of the decision. The appeals process does not allow for consideration of changes to the effective date of the decision to deny or withdraw accreditation. Additional evidence, if any, may be submitted in the appeals brief if the original evidence on the record at the time of the Commission's decision was erroneous. After the submission deadline for the written statements of the grounds for appeal and exhibits, no additional written information and/or exhibits may be provided, unless they are received by ACCET at least two weeks prior to scheduled hearing, and the institution can show, to the satisfaction of the Appeals Panel Chair, that such information was not available before the initial submission date and failure to make a timely submission was beyond the institution's control. An exception may be made for information and/or exhibits pertaining to findings of violation of Standard III.A. Financial Stability.

Initial applicants are advised that, in the instance of an appeal following a denial of accreditation, in accordance with ACCET policy, the institution may not make substantive changes to its operations, such as additional programs or sites, until a notice of final action is forwarded by the Commission.

It remains our hope that the accreditation evaluation process has served to strengthen your institution's commitment to and development of administrative and academic policies, procedures, and practices that inspire a high quality of education and training for your students.

Should you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact the ACCET office at [info@accet.org](mailto:info@accet.org) or 202-955-1113.

Sincerely,



Res Helfer  
Executive Director

RH/sf

cc: Accreditation Group, US ED ([aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov](mailto:aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov))  
Mr. James Hicks, Deputy Director of External Services, SEVP ([james.d.hicks@ice.dhs.gov](mailto:james.d.hicks@ice.dhs.gov))  
Ms. Katherine Westerlund, Certification Chief, SEVP ([Katherine.H.Westerlund@ice.dhs.gov](mailto:Katherine.H.Westerlund@ice.dhs.gov))  
Ms. Marisa Boomhower, NYSED BPSS ([Marisa.Boomhower@nysed.gov](mailto:Marisa.Boomhower@nysed.gov))