



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

Directorate of Vocational Reviews

First Monitoring Visit Report

Al Adhwa Institute
Isa Town
Kingdom of Bahrain

Date of last review: 24-26 April 2017
Date of the 1st monitoring visit: 12-13 May 2019
VO074-C4-Ma008

Table of Contents

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

Monitoring visit

The purpose of monitoring visit 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

Al Adhwa Institute was established in 2002 and is licensed by the Ministry of Education. It offers tutorial courses covering the Ministry of Education's school curricula for main subjects (Arabic, English, mathematics and science) for all stages. Most learners come from government schools and are aged seven to seventeen.

Since the last BQA review conducted in April 2017 the provider has enrolled 826 learners. The Institute is managed by an acting managing director and employs a pool of 8 part-time teachers who are available as needed. The Institute operates from one location in Isa Town.

Last review

The overall effectiveness of Al Adhwa Institute was judged as inadequate in the last review, as are all aspects of its provision.

Any significant changes to the provider since the last review:

- There are no significant changes introduced by the Institute since the last review report.

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 develop skills and knowledge and make sufficient progress comparing to their prior attainment

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

The Institute has not taken sufficient measures to address this recommendation since the last review visit. Although the records and samples kept show that learners' achievement grades are relatively high during the semester; however, the learners' work does not reflect appropriate attainment level. Assessment mechanisms are not rigorous and do not measure the learners' performance levels accurately. Additionally, marking process of learners' work lacks accuracy in most cases; which is directly mirrored in their achievement levels. Moreover, the Institute does not keep sufficient evidence of learners' work for each subject; where the monitoring visit team could not follow up the learner's status through his/her semester activities and tests and compare them with the achievement records submitted by the provision.

From the observed lessons, the vast majority of learners are developing skills and knowledge overall. Teachers use direct questions and subject-related class activities; however, some learners are not able to achieve the expected level in lessons; and particularly English. Recently, the Institute started to apply diagnostic tests for various courses to identify their starting points; however, the evidence submitted to the monitoring visit team to determine the effectiveness of the test application is not sufficient, and there is no effective application mechanism to follow up learners' progress throughout courses.

Recommendation 2:

- ensure that learners are rigorously assessed, with a clear rubric and that outcomes of assessment are utilised in lesson planning to cater for learners' varying needs

Judgement: Not addressed

Comment:

The Institute has not taken sufficient measures to address this recommendation since the last review visit. Mechanisms to measure learners' skills, knowledge and prior attainment are not improved, the institute still lacks any clear policy to assess learners, and class activities, tests and marking processes are not moderated or validated. Though trainers employ questions and answers and lesson exercises approaches in most observed lessons, the outcomes of assessment are not utilised to cater for learners' varying needs.

Teachers generally use diagnostic and summative tests to measure learners' understanding and achievement of objectives; however, the questions of the diagnostic tests do not measure learners' prior academic standard accurately. Additionally, summative tests sample provided for the review is limited and does not cover various activities. In addition, questions included in these are simple and direct in most courses, mapped to the course objectives and do not measure the advanced skills of subjects; for example, problem-solving and word problems in mathematics.

From the limited sample provided for this review, assessment is not consistent in terms of accuracy of correction and it lacks a clear marking scheme in most tests. Additionally, there is no clear description for open questions such as question items for Arabic and English. Furthermore, marking process lacks accuracy and rigor; grades are overestimated in most cases, and marking process for written tasks does not identify learners' mistakes in detail, and some tests and class activities are not marked.

Recommendation 3:

- devise and implement a clear mechanism to review, approve, update and sufficiently resource courses to meet learners' and stakeholders' needs

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

Since the last review visit, the management does not take any effective initiatives to address this recommendation of the review report; the Institute does not devise a formal mechanism to

review, approve, update, plan, and sufficiently resource courses. Further, courses lack clear briefing and structure including delivery and learners' assessment tools, the course materials are limited to a range of activities covering the textbook questions and the Ministry of Education's previous examination questions. In addition, the use of handouts and exercises are left entirely to teachers' own initiatives, learning resources provided by the Institute are limited and insufficient to effectively provide courses for different groups.

Recommendation 4:

- devise and implement a formal and effective mechanism to support and guide learners to achieve better outcomes, including learners with special needs

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

The management has not taken any sufficient measures to address this recommendation since the last review visit. The Institute still lacks clear and formal policies and procedures to support learners to achieve better outcomes including learners with special needs. Recently, a form to assess learners' achievement was devised; however, samples provided for the review are limited, and there is no mechanism to communicate the form content with parents or learner; and their remarks; if any, are basic and do not reflect the learner's actual progress level. Lately, the Institute has started to apply "Spelling Practice" initiative in English courses; however, no sufficient evidence is provided to the monitoring visit team to determine the standard and effectiveness of its application. Overall, the monitoring visit team was not able to measure the impact of the applied support tools on the learners' achievement.

Recommendation 5:

- strengthening the leadership and management by:
 - ensuring that learners' achievement records for all courses are accurately maintained, closely monitored and analysed to inform improvement decision making
 - devising a strategic plan that focuses on raising learners' achievement and the quality of the provision

- introducing an internal quality assurance system to monitor the overall performance of learners and the effectiveness of the provision.

Judgment: not addressed

Comment:

Since the last review visit the Institute has not taken any effective measures to address this recommendation within its strategic plan 2017-2020. The Institute provided the monitoring visit team with a brief SWOT analysis outcome that takes the provision's internal and external environment factors into account; however, no proof was submitted relating to the use of its outcomes in improving the Institute's performance. On the other hand, the Institute linked strategic objectives and projects to staff members who are responsible for their implementation and identified the follow-up periods; however, such projects are just activities that are implemented on an *ad hoc* manner by all teachers across entire grades. The monitoring visit team obtained some evidence files; nevertheless, they are inaccurate and are not implemented completely. The Institute has vision and mission statements and action plan for the period 2017-2019 that focus on the learners' personal development and academic achievement; however, it is not clear how their objectives will be implemented sufficiently.

Although the Institute maintains records of learners' achievement, they are often inaccurate, undated or updated. Moreover, they do not identify the learners' names nor reflect their actual performance. In addition, the institute does not devise any mechanism to control learners' performance throughout courses; consequently, there are no proofs that the provision utilising the outcomes of learners' performance analysis to inform decisions.

With regard to introducing and applying an internal quality assurance system, the Institute appoints one of the teachers to follow up the quality of provision; however, the Institute still lacks an integrated quality assurance system covering processes, procedures and policies by which all aspects of learning are maintained to meet learners and stakeholders' varying needs; however, no evidence was provided to the monitoring visit team to clarify how the Institute will evaluate the quality of the provision.

Overall Judgement and Further Recommendations

Overall Judgement: insufficient progress

Comment:

It is clear from the above that, Al Adhwa Institute has not taken sufficient measures to address the major recommendations identified in the BQA previous review report including: ensuring that learners develop skills and make sufficient progress that is consistent with their course level and devising a clear and formal mechanism to review, approve, update and sufficiently resource courses; in addition to the recommendations relating to enhancing teaching and assessment methods, whereas the Institute had not developed clear standards to assess learners' standards. Moreover, aspects relating to strengthening the leadership and management role to ensure the quality of provision should be addressed effectively.

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
Recommendation 5		Not addressed

The Institute has not addressed the review report recommendations. Therefore, 'Insufficient progress' is given to the Institute. As per the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA) regulations, the Institute will be subjected to a second monitoring visit. The Institute should take serious steps to improve its provision.