BRITISH ACCREDITATION COUNCIL INSPECTION REPORT

MID-WAY PROBATION REVIEW
(Short Course Provider)

PROVIDER: Centre for Capacity Training and Development

ADDRESS: 10 Victoria Street
Bristol
BS1 6BN

HEAD OF PROVIDER: Mr James Baffoe

ACCREDITATION STATUS: Probation accreditation

DATE OF INSPECTION: 13 December 2018

ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE DECISION AND DATE: Continued probation accreditation 31 January 2019

PART A – INTRODUCTION

1.   Background to the provider

The Centre for Capacity Training and Development (CCTD/the Provider) was established as a limited company in October 2015. CCTD is owned by two directors, both originally from Ghana. One is also the director of a training company in Accra, which is called the African Institute of Management Science (AIMS). The other is based in Bristol. The director based in Bristol, who is called the Programme Director, is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Provider. He is in regular contact with his colleague in Accra regarding the operation of CCTD. CCTD also has strategic partnerships with training companies in the United States of America and Canada. Only the CCTD provision in the United Kingdom (UK) is accredited by BAC.

The Provider aims to provide high quality training and development activities to community organisations, businesses and public enterprises.

CCTD offers short courses, typically two weeks long, in a range of business and management-related subjects to participants from outside the UK in both public and private sectors. Courses are offered in a wide range of areas such as Management and Protocols, Private Public Partnership and State-Owned Organisations, Project Management and Monitoring, Procurement and Logistics and Agriculture and Food Security.

For the delivery of its courses, CCTD uses meeting rooms in a modern serviced business centre in central Bristol. The centre also acts as a virtual office, providing a mailing address and office services. CCTD does not currently have any full-time employees. Trainers and a part-time administrator are engaged when required on a self-employed basis.

2.   Brief description of the current provision

CCTD offers courses of one or two-weeks' duration in subjects such as Management of Agricultural Research, Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Programme, Public Sector Budgeting and Budgetary Control, Strategic Planning for Health Executives and Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) Legal Framework. The courses are targeted at participants who are aged in their mid-twenties or older. The participants are sponsored by their employers or by international development donor agencies and come from western, eastern and southern Africa, West Indies, Asia and the Middle East. CCTD also offers a portfolio of courses where there is a specific request and demand.

Courses are delivered by freelance facilitators who are employed by the Provider to deliver a course subject to demand. All courses offered are delivered face-to-face.

All participants are aged 18 or over and are enrolled through the short-term study visa route. There is generally an equal split of male and female participants undertaking the courses.

At the time of the inspection, one male participant was undertaking the first week of a two-week course entitled Environmental Impact Assessment. The participant was from Sierra Leone.

In 2017, there were two enrolled participants who undertook studies with the Provider. In addition, there was one participant enrolled at the time of undertaking this inspection and a further six participants during 2018, totalling nine participants. The demand for courses is increasing and there is a projected uptake of a minimum of 30 participants for 2019. The courses are delivered through a morning and an afternoon session with a scheduled lunch break.

3.   Inspection process

The mid-way probation review was undertaken over half a day by one inspector. Meetings were held with the Programme Director, a facilitator and a course participant. The inspection also included a review of documents and an inspection of the premises. The Director of Programmes cooperated fully with the inspector and made available the documents requested.

4. Inspection History

Inspection Type	Date
Stage 2	23 March 2017
Supplementary	16 May 2017
Stage 3	19 July 2018

PART B – JUDGMENTS AND EVIDENCE

The following judgments and comments are based upon evidence seen by the inspector during the inspection and from documentation provided by the provider.

1.   Significant changes since the last inspection

The Provider has expanded the number of self-employed facilitators with whom it engages to extend the skills and expertise to deliver the portfolio of courses. The facilitators have defined job descriptions with clear roles and responsibilities. All have undertaken an induction process and have been issued with a Staff Handbook. The handbook provides clear information and support for staff new to the organisation and also acts as an effective point of reference for established staff.

The Provider has introduced a Quality Assurance process, which is documented and has been disseminated to the management and administration staff as well as to the facilitators. The process identifies the stages involved and clarifies the personnel responsible for ensuring that it is adhered to.

CCTD has developed its communication channels and introduced a messenger application to share key information with participants to support them both pre-course and whilst they are attending a course. This application is managed by the Programme Director who personally ensures that participants are able to contact him easily with a query or an issue. The feedback from participants is positive and makes particular comment on the support infrastructure and open communication with the Programme Director by means of this application.

Participant feedback has identified the benefit of enrichment activities for participants to enable them to apply what they are studying to their real life. The Provider is currently identifying and establishing links with local business and industry to develop opportunities to undertake visits that have relevance to the courses.

2.   Response to actions points in last report

4.1 Publicity must be thoroughly reviewed and adjusted to ensure that it describes the Provider accurately and raises realistic expectations about all aspects of the provision.

The website content has been updated and provides accurate images of the facilities available at the centre. The portfolio of courses that are being offered have been separated into two distinct sections on the website. There is a link for the scheduled courses that are offered along with dates of availability. There is a separate link on the website for details of additional courses that are available on demand.

With regard to the hard copy brochures, the Provider has already mailed out the stock of brochures for 2019 and it has been confirmed that this is the last time a printed brochure will be used.

7.4 A formal mechanism for reporting back to participants on the Provider's response to feedback must be developed as soon as enough participants have attended to make this a meaningful exercise.

Participants complete a feedback form on completion of the course. A sample of feedback forms was viewed during the inspection and comments were positive with specific reference to the knowledge and expertise of the facilitators. All feedback forms are reviewed by the Programme Director who personally responds to individual participants to follow up any matters that need addressing.

8.1 Effective systems for monitoring and reviewing all aspects of the Provider's performance must be developed and implemented.

CCTD has introduced a top-level strategic review of the business which acts as a process for identifying, reviewing and monitoring the Provider's performance. The review document has a strategic focus and does not make specific reference to a review of operational matters. Feedback is captured by means of end of course

questionnaires and also through informal channels such as conversations during the course between the Programme Director, the facilitators and the participants. Feedback is gathered by the Programme Director who is highly responsive in returning to the participants with an outcome. This feedback is captured in forms and held centrally by the Programme Director but there is currently no mechanism to review the performance at course level to identify areas of good practice and areas for further development.

8.2 Reports presenting the results of the Provider's reviews and action plans must be produced.

An action plan, as a result of the Provider's performance review, has been developed with focus areas, targets and with responsibilities and review dates identified. The action plan does not include specific action points, which are related to individual course performance.

8.3 Action plans responding to stakeholder feedback must be produced.

Participant feedback is reviewed and monitored but there is no written document to provide a formal overview of the courses that are performing well and to identify areas for development.

3.   Response to recommended areas for improvement in last report

It is recommended that job descriptions and other management documents are dated as a reminder for when they are due for review.

Appropriate job descriptions are in place and include dates for their review.

It is recommended that the content of the website is reviewed and adapted to ensure that it is sufficiently clear for the Provider's target audience.

The website has been updated with content and images to accurately reflect the portfolio of courses that are available. It also includes an updated section, which provides detail about the Provider and its ethos and vision for building capacity within the workforce. The section also provides detail on how this will be achieved through a focused portfolio of courses and highly experienced and qualified facilitators.

The website would benefit from more careful proof reading as it includes a small number of spelling mistakes.

The Provider has liaised with the company that manages the website content and all spelling errors have now been removed.

It is recommended that the minimum English language level is also expressed as an appropriate Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) level and an appropriate International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score.

The website identifies the English language requirements for a participant with specific reference to qualifications that would be recognised by the countries of origin of current participants. The website does not make reference to the minimum English language level requirements expressed as an appropriate Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) level and does not identify the requirement for an appropriate International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score. The Provider commented that specifying that participants needed to demonstrate an identified IELTS score could have a negative impact on the business.

PART C – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

FURTHER WORK TO MEET OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

8.1 Effective systems for monitoring and reviewing course performance from an operational perspective and at a whole course level must be developed.	☐ High ☒ Medium ☐ Low
8.2 Reports that include a course level review and action plan must be produced so that it can feed up to the strategic review document.	☐ High ☒ Medium ☐ Low
8.3 A formal mechanism to record all participant feedback must be developed to inform the strategic review of the Provider as well as course level reviews.	☐ High ☒ Medium ☐ Low

FURTHER WORK TO MEET OUTSTANDING RECOMMENDED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

It is recommended that the minimum English language level is also expressed as an appropriate Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) level or an appropriate International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score so that participants enrolled can benefit fully from their course attendance.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS REQUIRED

None	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT *(to be reviewed at the next inspection)*

None