



# **Directorate of Vocational Reviews**

## **First Monitoring Visit Report**

**Future Institute for  
Training & Development  
Isa Town  
Kingdom of Bahrain**

**Date of last review: 29-31 October 2013**

**Date of the first monitoring visit: 16 June 2016**

**VO013-C2-Ma015**

## Table of Contents

---

Monitoring visit.....	3
Progress on recommendations.....	6
Summary of overall progress grades .....	10

## **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.

### **Criteria for judging progress on an issue / recommendation and the provider's overall progress:**

#### **Information about the provider**

Future Institute for Training & Development (FITD) is part of the Al Meer Group of companies. Established in December 2007, it offers short training courses in management and soft skills. The courses offered are non-accredited and cover topics such as customer service, team building, the art of dealing with work stress and concepts of quality assurance. Since the last review conducted in October 2013, the Institute has enrolled 55 learners; 16 in 2014, none in 2015, and 39 in 2016 up to the date of this monitoring visit. Learners enrolling at the Institute are employed adults, most of whom are employed by the Al Meer Group of companies.

The Institute operates from one location in Isa Town and is managed by a director. The company uses a pool of part-time trainers to conduct its training courses. Currently the Institute employs a training coordinator and a supervisor.

#### **Last review**

The overall effectiveness of FITD was judged as inadequate in the last review and therefore the Institute is subjected to monitoring visits to assess the progress it is making in addressing the recommendations detailed in the review report. The review report concluded that all aspects of the provision were inadequate except the quality of programmes, which was evaluated as satisfactory.

#### **Any significant changes to the provider since the last review:**

- The appointment of a full time director to manage the Institute.

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

**Table 1: Judgement per recommendation**

Judgement	Standard
<p><b>Fully Addressed</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Partially Addressed</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Not Addressed</b></p>	<p>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.</p>

**Table 2: Overall Grading**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Grade Description</b>	<b>Standard</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Sufficient progress</b>	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. <b>No further monitoring is required.</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>In progress</b>	The provider has at least partially addressed all of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous monitoring report.
<b>C</b>	<b>Insufficient progress</b>	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:

Device a system to assess learners' development and progress and ensure that all learners make the expected progress on all courses.

### Judgment: not addressed

#### Comment:

Although trainers frequently check learners understanding through suitable verbal questions and discussions during sessions, the outcome of the formative assessment is not properly recorded for all courses and the summative assessment, which is mainly pre- and post-course assessment, is basic and direct for the majority of courses and does not match the depth of the course objectives. Comparing learners' marks in the pre-course assessment with their marks in the post-course assessment, reveals that learners do not make sufficient progress in line with the course level and the adding value is minimum for the majority of courses.

### Recommendation 2:

Enhance the teaching and learning experience through:

- improving sessions plans and ensuring that plans are informed by prior assessments for better accommodation of learners' varying needs
- ensuring that all learners and employers are updated systematically
- ensuring that learners are provided with suitable support and guidance that help them to reach their potential.

## **Judgement: not addressed**

### **Comment:**

The majority of lesson plans are generic with minimum details limited to mainly the course topics and overall time allocation. Although, the trainers deliver training sessions that are managed appropriately, the lesson plans do not usually highlight specific course objectives and the planned activities are not detailed enough. Furthermore, the outcomes of the pre-course assessment and continuous assessment are not evidently utilised to inform the lesson plans.

Learners and employers are sufficiently updated on learners' performance; learners receive general instant and verbal feedback during the sessions and the pre- and post-course assessment results are shared with employers by completion of the course. However, the written feedback provided on learners' produced work is insufficient. On the other hand, FITD has a useful form where learners evaluate themselves against a set of criteria. The trainers review learners' self-ratings and record an overall score. However, there is no clear rubrics or guidelines on how these scores are allotted to learners to indicate their actual individual performance.

The support and guidance provided to learners are still *ad hoc*. The management has not yet taken effective measures to address this recommendation. The Institute does not have a clear mechanism or a written support and guidance policy. Very limited evidence provided on support cases.

### **Recommendation 3:**

Establish a system to ensure that courses are regularly reviewed and updated

## **Judgment: not addressed**

### **Comment:**

Course material vary in design, structure and depth of details. Design of courses is left to the trainers' own experience and style. Whereas the course material of one course is very detailed and informative, another course conducted recently lacks the necessary details and the course material is mostly a collection of activity sheets. A mechanism to review and update courses is

not yet established. A generic document on course design is in place but has no direct relevance or impact on what is offered.

#### **Recommendation 4:**

Strengthen the management role in monitoring the quality of provision through:

- ensuring that achievement data are aggregated and trends are monitored over time
- improving the current internal lesson observation scheme to be more critical and informative
- ensuring that employers and learners feedback about the provision are regularly collected and utilised for further improvement.

#### **Judgment: not addressed**

##### **Comment:**

While the Institute conducts pre- and post-course assessment as well as some activities to check learners' understanding, the aggregated achievement data for the pre- and post-course assessment is not thoroughly analysed to inform improvement actions. In one case, one trainer prepared an end of course summery report, which is sufficiently informative but it does not highlight key issues or trends to inform decision making.

The Institute director occasionally attends courses to observe trainers using a suitable form with a number of relevant evaluation items focusing on the quality of teaching and training. While the ratings recorded during class observations against these items are sufficiently critical, no comments or feedback is written on the form for subsequent follow-up. Lower ratings are not explained and issues are not highlighted. Anyhow, the feedback is shared with trainers verbally.

Learners' feedback is regularly collected after each course on a useful form, yet the collected forms are not aggregated to facilitate analysis. Critically rated items and comments are not marked for follow up and action. For example, a low rating for the quality of course material of



one of the conducted courses did not trigger any discussion or exploration. Moreover, the Institute does not have a formal mechanism to seek employers' feedback.

## **Overall Judgement and Further Recommendations**

### **Overall Judgement: insufficient progress**

#### **Comment:**

Although the Institute has developed a useful action plan to address the recommendations, the implementation of the plan has not been effective to address the recommendations sufficiently. After a period of long intermittent operation due to management change and issues with Ministry of Labour & Social Development requirements, the Institute resumed its regular operation in the first quarter of 2016 with three courses. Trainers are properly selected as reflected from their appropriate training methods. However, key processes are not yet formalized through explicit policies and procedures. Overall, the impact of the new management is not yet evident on the current practices in order to address the major recommendations identified by the previous review report.

## Summary of progress grades

---

<b>Overall progress grade</b>	<b>Grade: C</b>	<b>Description:</b> Insufficient progress
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Description</b>	
Recommendation 1	Not addressed	
Recommendation 2	Not addressed	
Recommendation 3	Not addressed	
Recommendation 4	Not addressed	

The Institute has taken some initial steps to address the recommendations of the last review and improve performance. However, 'Insufficient Progress' is given to the Institute since the steps taken are ineffective in addressing all recommendations. As per QQA regulations, the Institute will be subjected to a second monitoring visit.