



ACCREDITING COUNCIL FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION & TRAINING  
1722 N. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone : 202-955-1113 Fax: 202-955-1118  
<http://www.accet.org>

September 2, 2020

VIA EMAIL  
[aalmarwani@tvtc.gov.sa](mailto:aalmarwani@tvtc.gov.sa)  
[kalothman@tvtc.gov.sa](mailto:kalothman@tvtc.gov.sa)

Mr. Abdulrhman Al Marwani  
Vice Governor  
Technical & Vocational Training Corporation  
Al Murabba Quarter  
Al-Washam Street intersection with King Fahd Road  
P.O. Box 7823  
Riyadh, 11472

***Re: Reaccreditation Denied Under Show Cause  
(Appealable)  
ACCET ID #1322***

Dear Vice Governor Abdulrhman;

This letter is to inform you that, at its August 2020 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education & Training (ACCET) voted to deny reaccreditation to the Technical & Vocational Training Corporation (TVTC), with its main campus in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

It is noted for the record that the Commission originally considered the institution's application for reaccreditation at its December 2018 meeting. The decision was based upon a careful review and evaluation of the record, including but not limited to the institution's Main Campus Analytic Self-Evaluation Report (ASER) and 16 Branch Self-Evaluation Reports (BASERs); the 17 on-site visit team reports and the institution's responses to those reports, dated between November 13, 2018 and February 17, 2020; and a series of four interim reports, dated between March 10, 2019 and February 27, 2020, as detailed in the tables below:

*Visit History:*

Visit	Campus	Visit Dates	Institution Response Received
1	Non-Teaching Main Campus	September 19 – 20, 2018	November 13, 2018
2	Buraidah College of Technology	February 20 – 21, 2019	March 31, 2019
3	Al Majma'ah College of Technology	February 17 – 18, 2019	March 31, 2019
4	Hail College of Technology	February 17 – 18, 2019	March 31, 2019
5	Al Zulfi College of Technology	February 20 – 21, 2019	April 1, 2019

Visit	Campus	Visit Dates	Institution Response Received
6	Buraidah College of Technology for Food & Environment	February 24 – 25, 2019	April 1, 2019
7	Al-Quwaiyah College of Technology	February 13 – 14, 2019	April 1, 2019
8	Onaizah College of Technology	February 27 – 18, 2019	April 1, 2019
9	Al Dawadmi College of Technology	February 11 – 12, 2019	April 1, 2019
10	Riyadh College of Technology (RCT)	October 13 – 14, 2019	December 2, 2019
11	Makkah al Mokarama College of Technology (CTM)	October 16 – 17, 2019	November 29, 2019
12	Al Qunfudhah College of Technology (QCT)	October 20 – 21, 2019	November 29, 2019
13	Al Ta'if College of Technology	October 23 – 24, 2019	December 6, 2019
14	Yanbu College of Applied Technology	October 20 – 21, 2019	December 6, 2019
15	Madinah College of Tourism and Hotels	November 13 – 14, 2019	February 17, 2020
16	Medina College of Technology	November 17 – 18, 2019	February 13, 2020
17	Jeddah College of Technology	November 20 – 21, 2019	February 13, 2020

*Commission Actions and Interim Reporting:*

Commission Meeting	Action	# Outstanding Institutional Weaknesses	Interim Report Received
December 2018	Reaccreditation Deferred; Interim Report Required.	16	March 10, 2019
April 2019	Institutional Show Cause Issued; Reaccreditation Deferred; Interim Report Required.	23	July 15, 2019
August 2019	Institutional Show Cause Continued; Reaccreditation Deferred; Interim Report Required.	16	October 31, 2019
December 2019	Institutional Show Cause Continued; Reaccreditation Deferred; Interim Report Required.	16	February 27, 2020
April 2020	The Commission postponed consideration of some		

Commission Meeting	Action	# Outstanding Institutional Weaknesses	Interim Report Received
	institutions, including TVTC, until its August 2020 meeting due to a shortened agenda caused by the Coronavirus (COVID-19) threat.		

The Commission determined that the institution has not adequately demonstrated compliance with respect to ACCET standards, policies, and procedures, as summarized in the following tables:

1. *Institutional Weaknesses Identified in 17 Team Reports.*

Of the 198 total weaknesses identified in the team reports, 127 of the findings received a rating of 1 (27 weaknesses) or 2 (98 weaknesses) Note that a rating of 1 means “does not meet standard” and a rating of 2 means “does not fully meet standard”. Further, areas of non-compliance spanned ACCET’s nine broad Standards for Accreditation, as follows:

Standard		Weaknesses
I	Mission, Goals, and Planning	16
II	Governance and Management	35
III	Financial Capacity and Responsibility	1
IV	Curriculum Design and Development	28
V	Instructional Delivery and Resources	17
VI	Qualifications and Supervision of Instructional Personnel	9
VII	Admissions and Student Services	23
VIII	Student Assessment and Achievement	23
IX	Institutional Effectiveness	46
	Total Weaknesses	<u>198</u>

2. *Number of Weaknesses Identified in 17 Team Reports, by Campus Location:*

Campus Location	# Weaknesses
Riyadh NTM (Main )	17
Al Dawadmi (Branch)	8
Al Madinah CT (Branch)	11
Al Majma'ah (Branch)	10
Al Qunfudah (Branch)	11
Al-Quwaiyah (Branch)	8
Al Ta'if (Branch)	10

Campus Location	# Weaknesses
Al Zulfi (Branch)	4
Buraidah CT (Branch)	16
Buraidah CTFE (Branch)	15
Hail (Branch)	14
Jeddah (Branch)	5
Madinah T&H (Branch)	9
Makkah Al Mokarama (Branch)	14
Onaizah (Branch)	16
Riyadh (Branch)	17
Yanbu Al Bahar (Branch)	13
Total Weaknesses	198

Of notable concern were the number of recurring weaknesses reported over four visit cycles, including weaknesses that were, per the institution's interim reporting, resolved, yet re-occurred in later visits.

3. *Eight standards had weaknesses during all four visit cycles:*

Standard:	Cycles Cited:	% Visit Cycles
I-A	4	(all)
I-C	4	(all)
II-A	4	(all)
II-B	4	(all)
II-C	4	(all)
VIII-C	4	(all)
IX-C	4	(all)
IX-D	4	(all)
II-E	3	(3 of 4)
IV-A	3	(3 of 4)
IV-B	3	(3 of 4)
IV-C	3	(3 of 4)
V-A	3	(3 of 4)
V-B	3	(3 of 4)
V-C	3	(3 of 4)
VII-A	3	(3 of 4)

Standard:	Cycles Cited:	% Visit Cycles
VIII-B	3	(3 of 4)
IX-B	3	(3 of 4)
IV-D	2	(2 of 4)
VI-C	2	(2 of 4)
VII-B	2	(2 of 4)
VII-C	2	(2 of 4)
IX-A	2	(2 of 4)
II-D	1	(1 of 4)
III-B	1	(1 of 4)
VI-A	1	(1 of 4)
VI-B	1	(1 of 4)

4. Finally, in reviewing the entire record of team report responses and interim reports, the Commission found that numerous findings remained unresolved, encompassing 22 of the 33 ACCET standards:

Standard	# Campus Locations	Listing of campuses
I-A	2	Madina T&H, Riyadh
I-C	4	Al Ta'if, Makkah, Riyadh, Yanbu
II-A	8	Jeddah, Madinah T&H, Madinah CT Ta'if, Qunfudah, Makkah, Riyadh, Yanbu
II-B	1	Madinah T&H
II-C	1	Madinah T&H
II-E	1	Madinah CT
II-B	1	Riyadh
IV-A	5	Qunfudah, Makkah, Riyadh, Ta'if, Yanbu
IV-B	7	Qunfudah, Makkah, Riyadh, Yanbu, Ta'if, Madinah CT, Jeddah
IV-C	2	Qunfudah, Yanbu
IV-D	5	Qunfudah, Ta'if, Makkah, Riyadh, Madinah CT,
V-A	2	Madinah CT, Riyadh,
V-B	2	Madinah CT, Ta'if,
V-C	1	Madinah C&T
VI-A	4	Qunfudah, Makkah, Riyadh, Yanbu
VII-A	17	All locations
VII-C	3	Jeddah, Madinah, Madinah T&H
VIII-B	17	All locations
VIII-C	17	All locations

Standard	# Campus Locations	Listing of campuses
IX-B	3	Qunfudah, Makkah, Yanbu,
IX-C	3	Yanbu, Ta'if, Madinah CT,
IX-D	17	All locations

The institution failed to demonstrate full compliance with 22 of the 33 ACCET Standards for Accreditation, as summarized in the tables above. Multi-campus ACCET institutions must demonstrate that each training location is under the effective guidance and control of the main campus and that each location understands and effectively and systematically implements all 33 of the ACCET Standards for Accreditation. Further, all ACCET vocational institutions must demonstrate positive student outcomes in accordance with ACCET completion and placement benchmarks. Detailed below are six standards which represent the most egregious examples of the institution's non-compliance with ACCET standards:

1. Standard II-A: Governance

The institution failed to demonstrate that its management structure ensures the integrity and capability of the institution and its compliance with statutory, regulatory, and accreditation requirements. The following examples make evident that the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard:

a. Persistent and Recurring Weaknesses Across Campuses and Visit Cycles

As indicated in the tables above, in addition to the pure volume of outstanding weaknesses, the persistent and recurring weaknesses provide conclusive evidence that the institution does not exercise adequate systematic and effective governance over its locations and programs. ACCET Document 25 – Policy on Additional Locations categorically states:

*“The failure of a branch, auxiliary (satellite) classroom, or temporary avocational classroom to be in full compliance with ACCET standards and policies is a direct reflection on the main campus and will call into question its accredited status.”*

b. Unapproved Programs and Locations

On-site visit teams reported unapproved programs, programs with incorrect clock and credit hours, and unapproved locations at 10 campuses, including Riyadh College of Technology, Qunfudah, Buraidah, Jeddah, Hail, Buraidah Food and Environment, Makkah, Yanbu, Madinah, and Madinah College of Tourism & Hotels. Throughout succeeding Commission Action Letters (CALs), the institution was reminded to make application for new programs, program changes, new locations, and changes of location via AMS. While the institution submitted nine new programs to ACCET in AMS in July 2019, all were reverted back to the institution for being substantially

incomplete. These applications were never completed and resubmitted to ACCET.

In some cases, the institution embedded applications for new locations within responses to team reports (for example, Makkah which was substantially incomplete, and Riyadh, where the team found that RCT had supervisory authority for three active branch campuses which were never approved by ACCET). The institution provided, in its response to the team report, substantially incomplete applications for auxiliary classrooms. The December 2019 CAL stated:

*“The RCT response included three minimally completed applications for auxiliary classrooms, an incomplete application for the Renewable Energy Program, and an application for a Change of Program Name. However, the team found that RCT has supervisory authority for three unapproved branch campuses, not auxiliary classrooms, which were formerly secondary school facilities, located more than 100 kilometers from the RCT campus, with each having a Vice-Dean, and opened with the intention of become stand-alone colleges. Further, applications for branch campuses and program additions/changes can only be submitted within AMS, with payment required upon submission.”*

c. Failure to Provide Documentation in English as Required

The institution repeatedly failed to provide documentation in English as required by ACCET Document 1 – The Accreditation Process which states: *“To ensure a comprehensive and informative evaluation by the Commission, all correspondence and documentation must be provided in English to ACCET.”* The failure to provide translated documentation in English impeded the review process, as illustrated under numerous Standards for Accreditation, including, but not limited to, Standards IV-A Educational Goals and Objectives, IV-B Program Instructional Materials, IV-D Curriculum Review and Revision, and VIII-B Attendance Requirements.

d. Failure to Pay Sustaining Fees/Late Payment of Visit Fees

The ACCET Associate Executive Director met with the Vice-Governor and Quality Assurance (QA) leadership in Riyadh during the April 2018 review cycle to review, among other issues, the non-payment of outstanding invoices dating to the May 2017 Quality Assurance Visits. These outstanding invoices eventually totaled \$248,000. ACCET was subsequently informed that the accredited entity, TVTC, was not authorized to pay its own fees, with this task relegated to the Colleges of Excellence (COE) a TVTC related entity. Forthcoming invoices were only paid after repeated reminders and ACCET threats to cancel upcoming visit cycles.

In a memo to TVTC leadership dated December 14, 2018, ACCET stated:

*“However, as of this date, payment for the past due invoices has still not been received, despite assurances from your office and the Vice Governor (most recently*

*during our conference call on November 1), that these would be paid timely. The total outstanding remains US \$248,207.41. A copy of the outstanding invoice summary is attached for your reference.”*

As of the date the Commission made its decision to deny accreditation, the institution’s 2020 annual sustaining fees, in the amount of \$14,700 due by January 31, 2020, remained unpaid.

e. Completion and Job Placement

The reaccreditation cycle for TVTC commenced in September 2018 with full on-site team visits to the Corporate office and to the Riyadh College of Technology (RCT). The September 2018 Corporate office visit team found C&P tracking inadequate at the corporate level. As stated in the Team Report from the September 19 – 20, 2018 visit, Standard IX-D Completion and Placement:

*“While the institution has a policy to record and assess completion and placement, the corporate office does not have a system in place to monitor these processes. Staff at the corporate office could not articulate which corporate department currently was overseeing these processes. The QA staff indicated to the team that their department will be taking the leadership on this standard but had no data available relative to completion and placement performance for any of the campuses available for the team to review to demonstrate current implementation of the policy.*

*The team found that this lack of monitoring of completion and placement rates meant that the institution was unable to validate the quality of its education and training.”*

Further, the RCT team found that the campus was unprepared for the visit, lacking even the elemental Document 8.1 – Visit Preparation Checklist. The visit was abandoned after the first day, due to the extension of the national holiday into the following school week and rescheduled for the year following (December 2019) visit cycle).

At the time of the rescheduled visit to the Riyadh College of Technology, which took place a full year later (October 13 – 13, 2019), the on-site team assigned a rating of 1 (*Does not meet standard*) for Standard IX-D, with the preponderance of programs, based on the college’s own statistics, in the programmatic probation range (53% or less for completion and 56% or less for placement), stating:

*“The team found that the campus did not follow policies and procedures which provide effective means to regularly assess, document, and validate the quality of the education and training services provided relative to placement, as required by this standard.*

*The team identified the following weaknesses:*

- *Completion rates for many programs were significantly below the ACCET benchmark of 67% for calendar year 2018*
- *Document 28.1s were incorrectly prepared*
- *Placement verification documentation did not provide information relative to the job title or job responsibilities of the graduate*
- *The campus lacked the essential understanding of how Document 28.1 is populated as well as the minimum requirements for verifying placements and procuring attestations from graduates*
- *The campus did not follow policies and procedures which provided effective means to regularly assess, document, and validate the quality of the education and training services provided relative to placement, as required by this standard.”*

Continuing through the remaining visits (totaling 17 on-site team visits), this weakness persisted at all of the TVTC college campuses visited, with ratings of 1 and 2 reported throughout. See Standard IX-D below for a more detailed summary of the persistent findings relative to completion and placement.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard, as the institution did not demonstrate the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

2. Standards IV-A Educational Goals and Objectives and IV-B Program Instructional Materials

The institution failed to demonstrate that there are appropriate language knowledge and skill elements included to meet the performance outcomes expected from the courses and programs. Additionally, the institution failed to demonstrate that its program materials are appropriate in scope, sequence, and depth for each program in relation to the stated program goals and objectives; that instructional materials support the goals and objectives; and that materials are up-to-date, readily available, and facilitate positive learning outcomes.

The team reports for The Riyadh College of Technology (RCT), Makkah al Mokarama College of Technology (MCT), Al Qunfudhah College of Technology (QCT), and the Yanbu College of Applied Technology (YCAT) (December 2019 cycle) found concerns from faculty and employers relative to the English speaking abilities of trainees, which the Commission found applicable to both Standards IV-A and IV-B (and also identified as a weakness under Standard IV-D Curriculum Review and Revision). The teams found that this problem was most acute in computer/technology courses, where important course materials were published in English and can be highly technical.

The institution’s response and subsequent interim report indicated that *“The English Language Center Council have met to improve the English program, discuss the outcomes of the meeting between TVTC curriculum and some colleges and the call for feedback regarding*

*the issue.*” The institution indicated that it has updated its textbooks for English 101 and 102, but failed to provide details regarding the new text, evidence of faculty training regarding the new materials, or evidence of implementation of the new textbooks in the curriculum. A copy of the meeting minutes to “*Develop English Language Curricula in Technical Colleges*” was provided which noted the change in textbooks, suggested soliciting feedback from College Deans, and “*to consider a final decision in light of the feedback received.*” The institution also provided three pdf documents in Arabic. The institution failed to demonstrate: 1) the overall English proficiency of TVTC graduates, 2) the alignment of course materials to this proficiency, and 3) the expectation of IT employers within the country relative to the English proficiency of TVTC graduates, as required by the Commission.

Additionally, the Ta'if College of Technology (December 2019 cycle) team report indicated that some of the textbooks, particularly in accounting and office management, were outdated, and the team found through interviews with staff that responses to repeated requests for curriculum revision are sometimes not addressed, as detailed in Standard IV.D – Curriculum Review and Revision. The institution’s interim report included three pdf exhibits in Arabic as well as a narrative indicating that “*trainers were directed to use the digital library and use the latest curricula that have the same course description according the TVTC plan.*” However, the institution failed to demonstrate that the curriculum has been updated, that faculty have been trained to use the revised program materials, or that the new materials meet the curriculum objectives.

Further, the team report for the Madinah College of Technology (MCT) (April 2020 cycle) indicated that instructors in the IT programs (Networking Technology, Software, and Technical Support) were not observed to be using lesson plans, which several instructors confirmed during interviews with the team. The institution’s response indicated the attachment of lesson plans; however, all appendices were in Arabic. Additionally, the institution submitted a “*Teaching and Learning Observation & Feedback Form*” which indicated that the instructor being observed used a lesson plan. However, this observation was dated “22/9/19” [September 22, 2019] prior to the on-site visit.

Finally, the team report for the Jeddah College of Technology (JCT) (April 2020 cycle) indicated that the core texts used for the Hotels program and the Travel and Tourism program were out of date. The institution’s response indicated that the books and references at the Tourism and Hotel Department “*are based on the curricula prepared by the Foundation's Curriculum Department, in addition to relying on newest, and reliable external sources in proportion to the nature of the training material, both in the theoretical or practical side, so that it addresses how to get the necessary skills for this department.*” However, the institution failed to address the concern regarding the outdated program materials. The institution provided a copy of the Ticketing and Reservations Manual (dated March 2008), an Opera PMS Reference Manual (dated 2006) and a 2019 “*Agreement Relating to Travel Agent Reservation Systems Training For Students of The National System Of Joint Training In The Kingdom Of Saudi Arabia.*” However, no evidence of review of program materials or implementation of updated texts was provided.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with these standards, as the institution did not demonstrate the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

2. Standard IV-C Externships/Internships

The institution failed to demonstrate that it provided externship sites to ensure appropriate and timely learning experiences in its externship program.

The Qunfudah College of Technology (QCT) team report indicated that 22 of the 83 students on co-op at the time of the visit were completing the cooperative on campus and were not experiencing an actual work environment. Additionally, approximately eight of the current 17 cooperative students in the electronics department were working as lab assistants on campus, helping the instructors, maintaining the equipment, and performing other tasks associated with the department. The team did not find that these on-campus placements realistically simulated an actual work environment. Similarly, the Yanbu College of Applied Technology (YCAT) team report indicated that the campus lacked sufficient off-site externship sites which may indicate a lack of market support for the number of graduates in their various majors.

In its response, QCT indicated that the Cooperative Department had met and made several recommendations, including the intention to provide cooperative opportunities within the major as much as the college is able. Correspondence was provided in Arabic between the campus and a Toyota dealership regarding possible cooperative training opportunities. YCAT indicated that several meetings and workshops have been held with business sectors in Yanbu to assure the provision of opportunities. The Yanbu campus provided an Excel spreadsheet indicating externship sites assigned for the following semester in 2020. However, no documentation was provided to demonstrate that trainees at both campuses participating in their cooperative experience are given real work at real employers, as a cooperative experience is intended.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard, as the institution did not evidence the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

3. Standard IV-D Curriculum Review and Revision

The institution failed to demonstrate that it implements effective written policies to continuously monitor and improve the curriculum; that its policies include both soliciting and utilizing feedback from relevant constituencies (e.g. faculty, students, graduates, employers, and advisory/certification boards) and analyzing student outcomes, including student completion, and, if applicable, job placement results.

The Riyadh College of Technology (RCT), Makkah al Mokarama College of Technology (CTM), Al Qunfudhah College of Technology (QCT), and Al Ta'if College of Technology (TCT) (December 2019 cycle) and the Al Madinah College of Technology (MCT) (April 2020 cycle) team reports indicated that faculty across academic departments were discouraged by the slow or total lack of feedback from TVTC relative to curriculum review and revision, and had lost confidence that their input was either considered or valued, reporting that feedback was either very slow or completely lacking. No evidence was provided to the teams to demonstrate faculty feedback as part of the curriculum review process.

The institution's responses included narrative updates such as "*the curriculum development department at TVTC has been in regular contact with the Curriculum Manager in the development of modular programs and new programs,*" but failed to address the lack of faculty involvement in curricular review. Additionally, documentation provided was largely in Arabic and those documents in English failed to demonstrate review of faculty input or evidence of changes to curriculum as a result of such feedback.

It is additionally noted that the institution's failure to appropriately track completion and job placement rates, as noted in Standard II.A and Standard IX.D, severely limits its ability to reliably review the merits of the curriculum in the context of student outcomes.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard, as the institution did not evidence the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

#### 4. Standard VIII-B Attendance

The institution failed to demonstrate that it establishes and implements written policies and procedures for monitoring and documenting attendance; and that the attendance policy ensures that student attendance and participation are consistent with ACCET Document 35 – Attendance Policy and ACCET Document 36 – Leave of Absence Policy.

As originally noted in the December 2018 team report to the main campus, the institution failed to provide policies regarding consecutive absences, excused absences, late arrivals and early departures, leaves of absence (LOA), and make-up work. These findings were repeated in the April 2019 team reports for the Hail College of Technology (HCT), Buraidah College of Technology (BCT), Buraidah College of Technology for Food & Environment (BCTFE), and the Onaizah College of Technology (OCT) and in the December 2019 team reports for the Makkah Al Mokarama College of Technology (MMCT), Qunfudah College of Technology (QCT), and the Riyadh College of Technology (RCT).

It is noted that issues of non-compliance regarding attendance were detailed in the December 2018, April 2019, August 2019, and December 2019 Commission Action letters. The most recent Commission Action letter required the institution to provide an updated attendance policy to include the maximum number of consecutive days absent at which point a student

will automatically be considered withdrawn, and a Leave of Absence Policy compliant with the requirements of ACCET Document 36 – Leave of Absence Policy or a definitive statement that TVTC does not permit Leaves of Absence.

In its response, the institution submitted an attendance policy in Arabic, with some English translation, which indicates that consecutive absences of two weeks will result in removal from the program. The policy also indicates that “*the trainee will not be allowed to continue training if his absence exceeds 20% with or without excuse.*” However, the policy also indicates that “*the trainee participating in national sports, cultural or social events is allowed,*” with no details regarding its effect on consecutive absences or the 20% absence threshold. It does indicate that “*approval should be obtained and confirmed before the leave,*” that “*make-up work and assessment should be performed if it can accommodate the duration and plan of the training,*” and that “*if the make-up work or progress was affected, due to length of multiple participation, the trainee should repeat the term of the unit, and this should not affect the maximum graduation date.*” While the institution’s narrative indicated that the Leave of Absence (LOA) policy meets the requirements of ACCET Document 36, no separate policy was provided, only the language relative to “*national sports, cultural or social events,*” all of which do not constitute a rationale for a leave of absence in accordance with ACCET Document 36, as an LOA is intended “*for emergency situations such as a serious illness, debilitating injury, or death in the immediate family.*” Further, the institution failed to demonstrate communication of the attendance policy with faculty, staff, and students, and failed to demonstrate implementation of its attendance policy at any campuses.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard, as the institution did not evidence the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

#### 5. Standard IX-D Completion and Placement

The institution failed to demonstrate that the quality of its programs are validated by positive training-related outcomes consistent with the benchmarks established by the Accrediting Commission. In accordance with ACCET Document 28 – Policy on Completion and Job Placement, ACCET’s minimum required benchmarks are 67% for completion and 70% for job placement.

As noted above under Standard II-A Governance, the team report for the Corporate office visit, conducted September 19 – 20, 2018 indicated that ...*lack of monitoring of completion and placement rates meant that the institution was unable to validate the quality of its education and training.* This finding was prescient, as the 16 on-site branch campus team visits conducted in the following three cycles did not identify any campuses that met the standards delineated in ACCET Document 28. The institution did not demonstrate significant improvements over this period.

The following table lists the team ratings at each campus (excluding the non-teaching Corporate location) for Standard IX-D.

Visit	Campus	Visit Cycle	Standard IX-D Rating
1	Buraidah College of Technology	April 2019	1
2	Al Majma'ah College of Technology	April 2019	2
3	Hail College of Technology	April 2019	1
4	Al Zulfi College of Technology	April 2019	2
5	Buraidah College of Technology for Food & Environment	April 2019	1
6	Al-Quwaiyah College of Technology	April 2019	2
7	Onaizah College of Technology	April 2019	2
8	Al Dawadmi College of Technology	April 2019	1
9	Riyadh College of Technology (RCT)	December 2019	1
10	Makkah al Mokarama College of Technology (CTM)	December 2019	1
11	Al Qunfudhah College of Technology (QCT)	December 2019	1
12	Al Ta'if College of Technology	December 2019	2
13	Yanbu College of Applied Technology	December 2019	2
14	Madinah College of Tourism and Hotels	April 2020	2
15	Medina College of Technology	April 2020	1
16	Jeddah College of Technology	April 2020	1

Following each Commission meeting, Commission Action Letters (CALs) expressed concern with the responses to team reports and to the institution's interim reports. The following table provides a sampling of the findings from each CAL for the period December 2018 – December 2019:

Commission Action Letter	Standard IX-D Summary
12/2018	<p><i>The team report noted that the institution does not systematically and effectively implement written policy and procedures related to completion and job placement as the corporate office was unable to articulate a number of facets related to completion and job placement. Additionally, the institution was unable to provide the team with any data available relative to completion and placement performance for any of the campuses that demonstrated current implementation of the policy. As a result, the institution, due to the lack of monitoring of completion and placement rates, was unable to validate the quality of its education and training.</i></p> <p><i>The institution did not respond to this weakness.</i></p>
04/2019	<p><i>The responses to the team reports varied in completeness, ranging from no response (Hail) to submission of campus specific policies and attempted implementation (Onaizah). However, none of the campuses provided complete policies or updated Document 28.1s and 28.2s to demonstrate verifiable completion and placement data. Further, no campus effectively addressed the teams' concerns regarding integrity of the enrollment data provided.</i></p>
08/2019	<p><i>In its response, the Main Campus IR stated only: "Attached based on colleges," and no exhibits were provided. None of the campuses responded to the request for a narrative update and evidence of training of Job Coordinators, and only Onaizah provided Document 28.1s.</i></p>
12/2019	<p><i>The Commission notes that the institution did not include a narrative response for this standard....</i></p> <p><i>In reviewing the Document 28.1s for Hail, Al Dawadmi, and Al Majmah campuses, the Commission found progress in the submission of these reports but notes that the institution has not yet provided all documentation for all reviewed campuses. Further, the team reports for RCT (rating 1), CTM (rating 1), QCT (rating 1), Yanbu (rating 2), and Ta'if (rating 2) all resulted in findings of significant deficiencies in the completion and placement documentation reviewed by the on-site teams, including weaknesses such as:[the CAL listed eight campus specific examples]...</i></p>

Commission Action Letter	Standard IX-D Summary
	<p><i>...These findings belie the institution’s interim report responses that policies, procedures, and training, implemented since the institution was first cited for significant weaknesses in Standard IX-D during the August 2017 Quality Assurance visit, have led to improvements at the campus level in completion and placement verification, as required by ACCET Document 28 – <u>Completion and Placement Policy</u>.</i></p>

At its August 2020 meeting, the Commission completed the review of team report responses to the final three on-site visits conducted during the April 2020 review cycle: Madinah College of Tourism and Hotels, Medina College of Technology, and Jeddah College of Technology, and found the following:

Location	Team Report Examples	Commission Summary – Standard IX-D
Madinah College of Tourism and Hotels	<p><i>The team found, via extensive discussions with the placement personnel and review of documentation, that the institution lacked the essential understanding of how Document 28.1 is populated... and... Consequently, the numbers on the Document 28.1’s are unreliable and cannot lead to an accurate determination as to whether the branch campus is in compliance with this standard.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site sampling verification forms lacked employer contact information</li> <li>• Food Production completion waivers, which were numerous, were not included on the Document 28.1s</li> </ul>
Medina College of Technology	<p><i>The team found that the campus did not follow policies and procedures which provide effective means to regularly assess, document, and validate the quality of the education and training services provided relative to placement, as required by this standard.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The campus team report response provided a limited narrative stating that “the data has been reviewed and amended for accuracy,” leaving most of the cited weakness unaddressed.</li> <li>• The Document 28.1s provided as exhibits all indicated 100% placement, while the 231 Employment Verification forms all indicated they were verified by phone, on the same day, by the same staff member</li> </ul>

<p>Jeddah College of Technology</p>	<p><i>The team found that the campus did not follow policies and procedures which provide effective means to regularly assess, document, and validate the quality of the education and training services provided relative to placement, as required by this standard.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document 28.2s do not align with Document 28.1</li> <li>• Documents 28.1 only have one graduation cohort, despite two graduation dates</li> <li>• Majority of employment verification forms were missing essential elements</li> </ul>
---	--	---

It is further noted that the institution was cited for completion and job placement rates well below ACCET’s required benchmarks (67% for completion and 70% for placement) and for significant deficiencies in the tracking and verification of completion and job placement during the May 2017 Quality Assurance Visits to the Corporate (non-teaching) office and the Riyadh College of Technology (RCT) (visit conducted May 16 – 18, 2017). the QAV team reported that TVTC had a new database (Rayat) which lacked provisions for tracking completion and placement, and that all completion and placement (C&P) tracking was being tracked manually at the individual campuses with no oversight from the Corporate office. As indicated in the reaccreditation team reports, the individual campuses failed to manually track the required completion and job placement data and to demonstrate the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices in compliance with ACCET Document 28 – Completion and Job Placement Policy, in practice over time.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate compliance with this standard, as the institution did not demonstrate the systematic and effective implementation of policies and practices consistent with ACCET requirements, in practice over time.

Since denial of reaccreditation is an adverse action by the Accrediting Commission, the institution may appeal the decision. The full procedures and guidelines for appealing the decision are outlined in Document 11, Policies and Practices of the Accrediting Commission, which is available on our website at [www.accet.org](http://www.accet.org).

If the institution wishes to appeal the decision, the Commission must receive written notification no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from receipt of this letter, in addition to a certified or cashier’s check in the amount of \$9,500.00, payable to ACCET, for an appeals hearing. This notification must be accompanied by (1) a signed affidavit by an authorized representative of the institution, indicating that a Notice of Status of Accreditation has been disseminated to all enrollees 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; (3) a certified or cashier’s check in the amount established for appeals in ACCET Document 10 – Fee Schedule; and (4) verification that the institution has no outstanding financial obligations owed to ACCET.

In the case of an appeal, a written statement, plus six (6) additional copies regarding the grounds for the appeal, saved as **PDF documents and copied to individual flash drives**, must be submitted to the ACCET office within sixty (60) calendar days from receipt of this letter. The appeal process allows for the institution to provide clarification of and/or new information regarding the conditions at the institution at the time the Accrediting Commission made its decision to deny or withdraw accreditation. 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; and
- 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.

Should you have any questions or need further assistance regarding this letter, please contact the ACCET office at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,



Judy Hendrickson  
Interim Executive Director  
JHH/jss

cc: Mr. Herman Bounds, Chief, Accreditation Division, US ED (aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov)  
Ms. Charity Helton, Specialist, USED (charity.helton@ed.gov)