



هيئة جودة التعليم والتدريب
Education & Training Quality Authority
Kingdom of Bahrain - مملكة البحرين

Directorate of Vocational Reviews

Second Monitoring Visit Report

Bahrain Institute
East Riffa
Kingdom of Bahrain

Date of last review: 23-26 January 2017

Date of the 1st monitoring visit: 1st March 2018

Date of 2nd monitoring visit: 2nd December 2018

VO044-C3-R097

Table of Contents

Monitoring visit	3
Progress on recommendations	6
Summary of overall progress grades	11

Monitoring visit

The purpose of monitoring visits is to evaluate the progress made by an institute in addressing the key issues for action identified by the review report.

Information about the provider

Bahrain Institute was established in 1970. It is licensed by the Ministry of Education to offer short courses in Information Technology (IT), such as Microsoft office and basic graphic design, and general English. The Institute also offers private school tutorial courses for different subjects such as mathematics, Arabic, English and French along with preparation courses for Test of English as a Foreign language (TOEFL) and the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Moreover, Bahrain Institute offers courses from Cambridge Training College Britain (CTC). Since the last review which was conducted in January 2017, the Institute conducted IT and general English courses only.

The Institute is managed by a full-time chief executive and a team of finance and administration in charge, with a head of training who is also a full-time English teacher and employs a team of part-time teachers for different subjects and a full-time caretaker. Since the first monitoring visit, Bahrain Institute enrolled 263 learners, 184 learners (70%) are enrolled in the general English and 79 learners (30%) enrolled in the IT courses.

Last review/first monitoring visit outcomes

The overall effectiveness of Bahrain Institute was judged to be inadequate in the last review; hence, the Institute was subjected to a first monitoring visit on 1 March 2018 to assess the progress it made in addressing the recommendations detailed in the review report. In the first monitoring visit, the progress made by Bahrain Institute was insufficient. A significant minority of learners were not developing the language skills and were scoring below satisfactory level. Although assessment tools used has improved adequately, there were few cases of inaccurate correction and marking. In addition, quality assurance measures were insufficient and strategic planning was not based on a critical self-evaluation process nor fully operationalised.

Any significant changes to the provider since the last review/ monitoring visit:

- A progress sheet to record learner’s results during the course has been introduced since July 2017.
- A new placement test has been introduced since July 2017.
- The organisation of the course file content has improved.

Criteria for judging progress on an issue / recommendation and the provider’s overall progress:

Table 1: Judgement per recommendation

Judgement	Standard
Fully Addressed	The provider has demonstrated marked progress in addressing the recommendation. The actions taken by the provider have led to significant improvements in the identified aspect and, as a consequence, in the overall effectiveness of the provider, particularly in the outcomes for learners.
Partially Addressed	The provider has taken positive action to address the recommendation. There is evidence that these actions have produced improvements and that these improvements are sustainable. The actions taken are having a positive, but as yet incomplete, impact on the quality of provision and outcomes for learners.
Not Addressed	The provider has not taken appropriate actions to address the recommendation and/or what actions have been taken have had little or no impact on the quality of provision and outcomes for learners. Weaknesses still persist within this aspect of provision.

Table 2: Overall Grading

Grade	Grade Description	Standard
A	Sufficient progress	The provider has fully addressed the majority of the recommendations contained in the review report, and/or previous monitoring report, and includes those which have most impact on learners' achievement, and the rest have been partially addressed. No further monitoring is required.
B	In progress	The provider has at least partially addressed all of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous monitoring report.
C	Insufficient progress	The provider has made little or no progress in addressing the majority of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous monitoring report.

Progress on recommendations

Recommendation 1:

Ensure that learners, particularly in English courses, develop skills and knowledge appropriate to their level and achieve all course objectives/ILOs

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

Learner Performance Data sheet (LPD) submitted for this monitoring visit and the records kept by the Institute show high retention and success rates in most of the courses, which is reflected in the IT courses where learners develop knowledge and skills appropriate to their course level. However, in the general English courses, which constitute the majority of the total enrolment (70%), learners' work does not reflect the expected standards of understanding and achievement of course objectives. Learners generally develop adequate reading and listening skills; however, most of them are still straggling in writing, grammars and vocabulary. This was also evident in the observed lessons. Moreover, the value added as indicated by learners' work is minimal for the majority of learners. In addition, the outcome of this measurement is insufficiently focused on measuring learners' progress in the main English language skills particularly writing. Furthermore, learners' work is not always marked accurately and the moderation process is not effective in promoting continuous improvement

Recommendation 2:

Ensure that assessments are relevant and marking is fair and rigorous in order to measure and evaluate learners' performance accurately

Judgement: partially addressed

Comment:

Teachers assess learners' understanding and achievement of course objectives through appropriate pre-course test, final test and ongoing formative assessments. During sessions, verbal questioning, written and practical activities are used; however, the effectiveness of the

formative assessments used is inconsistent among teachers in terms of the appropriateness of questions and tasks used to the learners' level, time allowed for learners to think and answer and the feedback provided to learners. Pre-course tests and final tests conducted are relevant and appropriate to the course levels. Nonetheless, there are cases of inaccurate correction and marking. Suitable marking scheme and rubric for assessing writing skills are developed, nevertheless, marks distribution is not accurate in a few cases, and the rubric for writing is not effectively implemented in most of the courses. Also, the correction of the writing task does not specify learners' mistakes in detail and although, teachers provide useful verbal feedback during lessons, learners are not provided with sufficient written feedback on their repeated mistakes and how to improve. Moreover, the Institute does not implement model answers and moderation of assessment is not effective to identify issues in marking.

Recommendation 3:

Ensure that courses are offered based on sufficient understanding of local community needs and that a formal mechanism is implemented to periodically review, design, approve and update courses.

Judgment: partially addressed

Comment:

After the first monitoring visit conducted on 1 March 2018, the Institute has started gathering learners and stakeholders' needs through an adequate form and recording their telephone requests. Accordingly, some private and customised courses were conducted. A generic marketing plan has been developed recently, though it is not yet implemented. On the other hand, the Institute still lacks a formal mechanism to review, design, approve and update the courses it offers. Currently, course books for starters and adults' General English Programmes are updated on *ad-hoc* basis, when new editions are offered by the publishers. In addition, number of hours allocated to each sub-level and the whole level within the General English programme is not sufficient to allow a progressive acquisition of English language skills and support the systematic progression of learners.

Recommendation 4:

Devise a mechanism to support and guide learners on how to achieve better and ensure that all arrangements to support learners with special needs are suitable

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

Since the last monitoring visit, the Institute management did not take effective measures to address this recommendation. Recently, the Institute introduced a new policy on attendance and absenteeism and another policy on how to handle learners with attitude problems. However, these policies are not detailed enough. Whilst learners have the opportunity to use the computer laboratory and get compensation lesson in some cases, these arrangements are not sufficient to support learners to reach their full potential and achieve better outcomes. It is worth mentioning that most learners are struggling to develop their writing skills with a minority of them scoring minimal marks and not progressing well over levels. The Institute communicates with parents to follow-up on learners' absenteeism and individual improvement reports are produced upon course completion which includes course activities' marks. However, the provided information does not accurately reflect the progress made by learners in English language skills or reflect on their areas for improvement. The Institute still lacks a comprehensive written policy and procedures related to the support and guidance provided to learners to help them achieve better outcomes including those with special needs.

Recommendation 5:

Improve leadership and management by:

- ensuring that strategic planning is based on the outcomes of a rigorous self- evaluation process and it is regularly monitored
- improving the quality assurance systems
- ensuring that learners' achievement is closely monitored and that relevant data is analysed to monitor trends over time, while outcomes are utilised to inform decision making.

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

Bahrain Institute has not taken sufficient measures to address this recommendation. The Institute provided the review team with an updated strategic plan 2017-2018, which stipulates a set of main objectives that are relevant to learners' achievement, communication with the stakeholders, improving the performance of teachers, and improving the learning environment. The plan includes a SWOT analysis; however, the analysis is not critical enough and the outcomes are insufficiently linked to the strategic plan. The Strategic Plan is translated to an operational plan which set sub-objectives under each main objective, and the measurement method however; it does not set time scale and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure the achievement of the set objectives. In addition, there is no mechanism to monitor or record the progress made against the plan.

Quality assurance arrangements are still not sufficient; the recently updated policies and procedures are generic, insufficiently detailed and do not cover all essential aspects of teaching and learning. Placement tests although progressive in the difficulty and complexity of the questions included, it is not effectively implemented to place learners at the right course level. Peer observations are recently carried out; however, the used form does not include the critical evaluating criteria and accordingly, the implementation is not effective in promoting continuous improvement of teaching and learning. Also, the completed forms rarely identify areas for development. Moreover, moderation is not rigorous enough to identify issues in the assessment and marking and as a result, the achievement data kept do not always reflect the actual level of learners. Moreover, although data are analysed on an individual course/level, these analyses are not properly utilised to show trends over time and inform decision making.

Overall Judgement and Further Recommendations

Overall Judgement: insufficient progress

Comment:

Overall, Bahrain Institute has taken limited measures to address the major recommendations identified in the previous review report. Although the quality of assessment tools has improved, there are cases of inaccurate marking, the rubric for evaluating the writing part of the assessment in the general English courses is not implemented in most courses, and insufficient

written feedback is provided to learners on how to improve. Accordingly, most learners enrolled in the general English courses which comprises the majority of the enrolment, are still struggling to improve their writing skills and the value added is minimal for the majority of them. Quality assurance measures are still not effective in securing continuous improvement in teaching and learning and the updated policies and procedures are not detailed enough and do not cover important aspects of provision. Lesson observations are not effective in promoting continuous improvement of teaching and the current moderation of assessment is superficial. Although achievement data are kept and analysed on individual course level, these analysis do not monitor trends over time. Last, the updated strategic plan was not built on a critical self-evaluation process and the action plan developed does not set specific KPIs or time scale for achieving the set objectives. Moreover, the progress done so far is not monitored nor reflected in the plan.

Summary of progress grades

Overall progress grade	Grade: C	Description: Insufficient progress
Recommendations		Description
Recommendation 1		Not addressed
Recommendation 2		Partially addressed
Recommendation 3		Partially addressed
Recommendation 4		Not addressed
Recommendation 5		Not addressed

The Institute has taken some steps to address the review report recommendations and improve performance. However, 'Insufficient progress' is given to the Institute since the steps taken are ineffective in addressing all recommendations. As per the Education and Training Quality Authority (BQA) regulations, the Institute is to be scheduled in the normal review cycle with a crucial need for serious efforts to improve its overall performance.