



Vocational Review Unit Monitoring Visit Report

**National Institute of Technology
Manama
Kingdom of Bahrain**

Date of last review: 19 - 21 March 2012

Date of monitoring visit: 9 December 2012

Table of Contents

Monitoring visit	3
Progress on recommendations	4
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

The National Institute of Technology (NIT) was established in 1997 and is licensed by the Ministry of Labour to offer courses in computing and information technology (IT) to corporate and individual learners. NIT offers a wide range of externally-accredited and non-accredited IT programmes and a number of short training courses in management and soft skills. The institute is a Microsoft Silver Certified Partner, an Oracle Approved Education Provider, a Certified Internet Web Professionals (CIW) Authorized Training Partner and an International Computer Driving Licence (ICDL) Approved Training and Test Centre. It is also designated as a Pearson VUE online testing centre for Oracle and Microsoft and a Thomson Prometric online testing centre for Cisco and CIW certifications. In 2012, NIT enrolled 404 learners, 55 per cent of whom are enrolled on externally accredited courses.

Last review

The overall effectiveness of NIT was judged as inadequate at the last review and was therefore subject to monitoring visits to assess the progress they were making in tackling the recommendations detailed in the review report. The review report concluded that despite the focused vision of the centre's new leadership and management and its drive for change, and the good range of programmes on offer, actual practices that impact on learners' achievement were ineffective. Lack of effective monitoring of trainers' performance and the limited teaching and assessment methods employed by the trainers had resulted in inconsistent levels of achievement among groups and inadequate progress of significant groups of learners. While sufficient support was provided to those intending to sit for the external examinations, progress and attainment was insufficiently monitored and recorded and learners and other stakeholders were not provided with useful feedback. However, the review team judged NIT's capacity to improve as satisfactory based on recent improvements and recent initiatives which included a newly appointed full time management team and expansion of the range of courses on offer.

Significant changes to the provider since the last review

From July 2012, NIT had implemented the following:

- a procedure for assessing learners' prior attainment and progress during courses through the use of an electronic system which also generates reports of individual learners' marks
- assessment of pre- and post-course achievement using a bank of questions
- record keeping of learner marks.

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 1.1:

- ensure that all learners achieve the intended qualifications or course objective they aim for by:
 - implementing effective procedures for assessing, analysing and utilising learners' prior attainment

Judgment: partially addressed

Comment:

From July 2012, pre-assessment was implemented by the institute on most courses conducted; however, implementation is not systematic to ensure that initial assessment is relevant and does not have clear assessment criteria. Moreover, the outcomes are not analysed and it is not clear how these are used in lesson planning. However, the outcomes are used to place learners at the appropriate course level.

Recommendation 1.2:

- ensure that all learners achieve the intended qualifications or course objective they aim for by:
 - introducing an effective system to assess, record and analyse learners' progress and assessment and regularly inform learners and stakeholders about the outcomes

Judgement: not addressed

Comment:

Although the provider now assesses learners' progress during the course through mid- and post-course examinations, and records these, the implementation of this is insufficiently systematic and the assessment criteria are not clear. According to the records provided, the added value in terms of the difference between the pre- and post-course assessments are minimal on the majority of the courses conducted. The pre- and post-course assessments for MS

Office short modules are still the same as those used during the last review which were judged as ineffective. It is still not evident how learners and stakeholders are informed about learners' achievement.

Recommendation 1.3:

- ensure that all learners achieve the intended qualifications or course objectives they aim for by:
 - devising effective measures to improve attendance and punctuality.

Judgment: partially addressed

Comment:

NIT now has a procedure to record attendance and punctuality. According to the records and sessions observed, attendance has improved, however, punctuality is still an issue and is not systematically recorded. Those coming late to their sessions are not challenged.

Recommendation 2 :

- ensure that teaching and training is learner-centred and effective in motivating all learners and accommodating their individual needs

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

According to the observed sessions, training is still inadequate. Although trainers are qualified and have suitable technical experience, the delivery approach they use is still overly teacher-centred and fails to engage and motivate learners and to help them to make the progress expected of them. Assessment is minimal and learners' understanding is insufficiently checked.

Recommendation 3 :

- enrich courses with additional supporting activities

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

The review team were provided with a limited range of evidence to address this recommendation, comprising merely of video clips to facilitate training rather than additional activities to enhance the courses and enrich learners' experience. With the type of courses offered by the provider, it is expected that learners could be provided with better opportunities for exposure to more practical examples.

Recommendation 4 :

- introduce more effective trainers' performance monitoring systems

Judgment: not addressed**Comment:**

NIT is still using the same form used during the previous review to monitor trainers' performance. According to the updated action plan, trainers' performance is monitored through peer observations and the video recording of sessions. The completed peer observation forms however are insufficiently critical and most do not identify areas for development. Moreover, the impact of peer observations on the observed sessions was not clear enough. There was no evidence provided on and how the outcomes of the video recording of sessions are used to improve the quality of training.

Overall Judgement and Further Recommendations**Overall Judgement: insufficient progress****Comment:**

Although NIT has started to make some improvements, these are still insufficient to have a significant impact on learners' achievement and the quality of training. Learners' prior attainment and progress during the course, although being currently assessed, the implementation of this is insufficiently systematic. Moreover, the added value is minimal according to the results of the pre- and post-course assessments. Despite trainers being qualified with sufficient technical experience, delivery is still too teacher-centred with minimal learners' engagement. Measures to monitor trainers' performance are still not effective enough to have an

impact on the quality of training and peer observations are insufficiently critical and rarely identify areas for development.

Monitoring visit recommendations:

In addition to the previous review recommendations, NIT needs to address the following for the next monitoring visit:

- ensure that pre- and post-course assessment for all courses are systematic, structured and based on the course set objectives
- ensure that learners' performance data sheet (LPD) is regularly updated to reflect achievement data, and all supporting evidence is kept
- ensure that peer observations are critical and focused on identifying areas for development and improving the quality of training.

Summary of progress grades

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

*The major aspect of the recommendation has not been addressed.