



September 5, 2025

VIA EMAIL
mjabour@swcc.gov.sa

Eng. Mohammed Fath aldeen Jabour
Senior Maintenance Instructor
Saudi Water Academy
04 Al Jubail, 35417
SA

***Re: Initial Accreditation Denied
Appealable (Not a Final Action)
ACCET ID #1636***

Dear Eng. Mohammed Fath aldeen Jabour:

At its August 2025 meeting, the Accrediting Commission of the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education & Training (ACCET) voted to deny initial accreditation to the Saudi Water Academy located in Al Jubail, Saudi Arabia.

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 May 6-7, 2025), and the institution's response to that report, received June 25, 2025.

It is noted that a few of the weaknesses cited in the team report were partially addressed in the institution's response to that report. However, the Commission determined that the institution has not adequately demonstrated compliance with respect to ACCET standards, policies, and procedures and, therefore, failed to demonstrate that it meets all eligibility criteria for accreditation, as required in ACCET Document 1 – The Accreditation Process.

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 accreditation requirements, specifically ACCET eligibility criteria as noted in ACCET Document 1.

The team report indicated a number of concerns regarding the institution's programs in the context of the institution's application for initial accreditation. The institution's application included two programs that had no enrollment at the time of the visit: Qualification Program for Engineer, and RO (Reverse Osmosis) Plants Engineer Specialist.

In March 2025, the institution requested that the following program be added to its initial application for accreditation: Continue [sic] education.

The institution offers 433 professional development courses, categorized by subject area, including technical, managerial, and soft skills. These courses were offered during the time of the visit. The institution was also offering "Diploma Programs." These programs were not included in the application for accreditation, but are promoted on the institution's

website, and included active students at the time of the visit. There are no graduates from these programs, and therefore, they do not meet ACCET eligibility criteria.

Additionally, the institution discussed plans to open two new branch locations: Al Khobar, which is scheduled to open in September 2025, and Madinah, which is scheduled to open in 12–16 months. ACCET Document 1.1 – Initial Accreditation Process advises that, “upon submission of the ASER, no substantive changes in the institution’s operations will be processed or further considered for ACCET approval until after the Accrediting Commission has met, reviewed, and taken final action upon the application for initial accreditation. Substantive changes include, but are not limited to, new programs, major program/course modifications, additional sites, and relocations out of the general market area. Since the ASER presents a comprehensive picture at a given point in time, the Commission wishes to ensure that the accreditation process is accurately focused on a stable representation of the institution’s operations. Further, after an initial grant of accreditation, an institution is prohibited from making substantive changes for an additional 12 months.”

Additionally, the institution advertises a course, “Solar PV Design-Online,” on its website. However, the institution had not included IDL as a delivery modality in its application for accreditation. For the purposes of the visit, only the Continuing Education programs were considered.

Finally, ACCET Document 12.b – Annual Report and Enrollment Statistics, as required for initial applicant institutions, was not provided at the time of the visit.

The institution’s response noted that, “at present, there are no indicators of concern regarding the effectiveness of its training programs,” and indicated that, “this confidence is based on its long-standing professional track record and extensive experience as one of the oldest and most prominent institutions specializing in training for the water sector.” The Commission applauds the institution’s long history of service but notes that the areas of non-compliance with ACCET-specific Standards were not addressed.

The institution further noted that, “Implementation of the “Engineer Qualification Program” and the “Specialized Engineer Qualification Program in Reverse Osmosis Plants” has been temporarily suspended due to the current availability of a sufficient number of qualified professionals in this field, as indicated by market data analysis and the needs of beneficiary entities.” However, the institution indicated that it is ready “to resume the implementation of these two programs in the near future, as soon as clear indicators emerge of renewed demand or gaps in professional competencies—reflecting its commitment to continuously meeting the sector’s needs with high efficiency and quality.” While the Commission appreciates the institution’s commitment to the industry served, this does not demonstrate an understanding of the accreditation or approval process.

The institution clarified that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia requested the implementation of diploma programs, specifically the “Qualification Program for Building Competencies,” and that this request happened after submitting the application for accreditation. The response confirmed that “the program implementation is still ongoing, and no cohort has graduated as of the time of the visit.” However, in an email sent to ACCET staff July 31,

2025, the institution indicated that there has been one graduating class. Documentation provided included two certificates of completion for the “Diploma majoring in Process Plant Operations” program from January 2025. The Commission notes that this is another program name that was not included in the application for accreditation, further demonstrating the institution’s failure to provide a clear and consistent record of programs offered.

Regarding new branch campuses, the institution indicated that “the establishment of the Madinah and Al Khobar branches is one of the initiatives of the Saudi Water Authority. Both branches are currently in the building construction phase. It is worth noting that these two branches are not subject to the organizational or operational supervision of the Water Academy, as they are overseen by a team affiliated with the Saudi Water Authority.” However, the institution did not provide any supporting documentation to demonstrate that these sites are intended only as Saudi Water Authority locations and not Saudi Water Academy branch campuses. The institution further notes that “in the event of a future decision to incorporate the branches into the operational management of the Water Academy, you will be notified accordingly in due course.” This, again, demonstrates a lack of understanding of the accreditation and approval process.

The institution’s response noted that the “Design of Photovoltaic Energy Systems” was “targeting university students for awareness and trial purposes.” It indicated that “the IDL system was not adopted as a primary tool in the teaching process, as its use was limited and non-essential.” However, at the time of the Commission’s review, the Solar PV Design-Online program was still being advertised.

Further, the institution provided one exhibit as supporting documentation (also attached in Standard IX.D.), noting 5,372 students in 2024. The Spreadsheet does not represent all the required fields directed in ACCET Document 12.b.

Therefore, the institution failed to demonstrate full compliance with Standard II.A. Governance.

2. 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 team report indicated that it did not provide completion rates for all programs from calendar year 2024, as required.

The institution’s narrative did not address the team’s concern regarding the failure to provide completion rates for 2024. Instead, it provided the same document attached to Standard II.A, which includes enrollment data and indicates “pass” for each of the 5,372 students listed. The institution did not provide its policy and procedure to detail the requirements for students to pass, nor did it provide a specific completion rate, as required by ACCET Document 28 – Completion and Job Placement Policy.

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

Denial of Initial Accreditation: 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. Per Document 11, “An institution that is denied initial accreditation is not automatically eligible to reapply for accreditation. The institution must first seek and obtain the permission of the Commission to apply, with the decision of the Commission final. If the Commission grants permission, the institution may not reapply for accreditation until after one year from the date of the Commission’s final denial action.”

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: In the case of an appeal, a written statement regarding the grounds for the appeal and supporting documentation must be submitted to the ACCET office **within sixty (60) calendar days** from receipt of this letter. The documentation should be compiled as a single .pdf file, beginning with the written rationale, then the main narrative update, followed by the supporting documentation. 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 Brief Upload link: <https://www.dropbox.com/request/RoRV4Y7czCtaaJqmgQOO>

Failure to submit a complete request and fees for the appeal or the written statement of the grounds for the appeal within the specified time period voids the appeal.

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.

Towards that end, the Commission granted the institution permission to reapply for initial accreditation when the institution is better positioned to meet the Standards of accreditation, waiving the restrictions outlined in ACCET Document 11 – Policies and Practices of the Accrediting Commission.

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

Sincerely,



Res Helfer
Executive Director

RH/lo

cc: Ms. Elizabeth Daggett, Director, Accreditation Group, US ED (aslrecordsmanager@ed.gov)
Ms. Charity Helton, Specialist, Accreditation Division, US ED (charity.helton@ed.gov)