STANDARD 1: STANDARDS FOR INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE	
JUDGEMENT: MUC does not meet Standard 1	
Recommendation **(as per EQA Report)**	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
CR 1.1- The Panel insists that a robust Quality Assurance Policy (QAP) is created within a period of eight (8) months. The QAP shall document all the policies, procedures and processes necessary for a sound quality assurance system such as a programme design and review policy, an assessment policy, an equality and anti-discrimination policy, etc. These will include a clearly defined delineation of any policies taken or adapted from other institutions.	The Policy was created. Please see attached documents. *Kindly note that the documents all reference Malta University Training Services – as it was planned to shift all services under this Business Line name – within Malta University Consulting Ltd remaining as the company name.* *In view of the MFHEA not accepting the word University in the Business Line name, even as the specific law requirement has been waived in our case (and described so in our license), we may need to revert and reissue all documents with Malta University Consulting Ltd.* ***All public documents issued thus far have only referred to Malta University Consulting Ltd.***
CR 1.2 - MUC shall clearly assign and document the responsibility for the QA function as part of the development of their QAP (CR 1.1 above) within eight (8) months in order to resolve the current ambiguity over roles and to provide focus.	The responsibilities were assigned in Procedure CP-01
KR 1.3 - Should MUC choose to continue using all or parts of UM policies and processes, MUC should have a written agreement with UM whereby both parties agree on which components are shared.	Separate written agreements with the individual UM faculties and departments were established. Please see attached document showing agreement with Department of Social Policy & Social Work, Faculty for Social Wellbeing, University of Malta .
KR 1.4- MUC should actively engage all stakeholders (including employers) in strengthening the quality assurance structures.	Questionnaires have been developed for employers and are in the process of being distributed. A copy of one such questionnaire is attached.
KR 1.5- MUC should ensure that a process of internal review is implemented within the institution in order to ensure that QA processes are reviewed, followed and implemented.	Please see attached Procedure CP-17 and a sample of one of the already performed audits.

RI 1.6- Activities which fall under the responsibility of the Training Administrative Coordinator should be documented as standard operating procedures to ensure continuity in case of succession, quality output and uniformity of performance.	The Procedures that fall under the Quality Policy have taken this into account.

STANDARD 2: INSTITUTIONAL PROBITY

JUDGEMENT:
MUC meets Standard 2.

Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation
RI 2.1 MUC should develop clear selection criteria, roles and responsibilities for headship positions, which are both documented and made public.	MUC already has a Board of Directors approved document for recruitment which has recently been updated. Nonetheless, Job Descriptions will be additionally considered for headship positions.
RI 2.2 MUC should monitor progress against its business plan and sets financial and volume targets for the growth of its training unit.	Agreed. It is being carried out.

STANDARD 3: DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMMES

JUDGEMENT:
MUC meets Standard 3.

Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation
KR 3.1 – MUC shall include a sound and structured programme design and review policy in the QAP in order to ensure consistency in operations (Standard 1. CR 1.1).	Please see documents CP-05 and CP-06 (attached)
KR 3.2 - The institution should further enhance its process for programme design through a more structured dialogue and consultation process with all stakeholders and social partners, students and lecturing staff.	Questionnaires have been developed for employers and are in the process of being distributed. A copy of one such questionnaire is attached. The feedback form for students is described in procedure CP-13 (attached)

RI 3.3 - In order to ensure more seamless student placements across stakeholders MUC should establish an agreement with the stakeholders ensuring acceptance of student placements and supervision.	This is being taken into consideration

STANDARD 4: STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT	
JUDGEMENT: MUC requires improvement to meet standard 4.	
Recommendation **(as per EQA Report)**	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
CR 4.1- Within eight (8) months MUC shall ensure that measures are put in place to ensure that students are aware of, and have recourse to, a clear set of QA policies and procedures relating to: grading criteria and classification, marking, assessment and re-assessment, misconduct, mitigating circumstances, the granting of extensions, appeals, the granting of temporary leave, student support mechanisms and systems that impact on their learning. Additionally, they shall ensure that criteria for marking are published in advance of student assessments and provide for on-course QA such as second marking or moderation.	A student handbook has been developed – see procedure CP-12 (attached). It is sent out by email to the students.
KR 4.2- MUC should systematically document, within a QA system, the review of pedagogical approaches, modes of delivery, adjustments made to courses and other measures relating to learning, teaching and assessment that it implements. This will assist MUC in ensuring it maintains a student-centred focus.	Please see documents CP-06, CP-07, CP-08 and CP-10 attached. *Due to Covid restrictions, courses were all delivered online using Zoom platform.* *In the case of the Award in Residential and Day Care, a contingency plan has been put into place (following approval from MFHEA) in the case of student placements being restricted due to Covid measures. Plan and MFHEA approval email attached.*

RI 4.3-MUC may wish to establish effective standard procedures or formal academic meetings for the regular appraisal of various aspects of their accredited courses, for example, to scrutinise the arrangements for and decisions regarding: moderation and assessment, mitigating circumstances, complaints and appeals. This would help to ensure that the various, geographically dispersed individuals involved in the delivery of these courses maybe better connected, informed, coordinated, supported and their input encouraged.	The following is included in CP-06 (attached). As a minimum, a formal academic meeting is being held annually unless this takes place and is minuted in writing during the course evaluation. An agenda for the course evaluation meeting is set and circulated and includes QA as an item. *Please see also an attached sample meeting minutes (for the Award in the Art of Public Speaking courses) as held in 2020.*
RI 4.4 – MUC may wish to consider, either as part of RI - 4.3 or independent of this, the setting up of mechanisms for the representation and engagement of both students and other stakeholders to enhance their offerings in terms of validity and student-centred focus.	Please refer to KR1.4.

STANDARD 5: STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION	
JUDGEMENT: MUC requires improvement to meet standard 5.	
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
CR 5.1 MUC shall within eight (8) months either adhere to the current eligibility criteria or alternatively revert to NCFHE for revision of the accreditation conditions of the courses to ensure conformity to the NCFHE licence obligations of the courses.	CP-11 (attached) describes eligibility criteria. Online registration form (https://muhc.com.mt/course-registration/) requires upload of qualifications on *selection* of the Award in Pharmacognosy and Herbal products course. This is the only accredited course that requires a previous specific qualification.
KR 5.2- MUC should have formal admission processes, procedures and criteria documented in the QAP and followed by administrative staff to ensure consistency and transparency. This should form part of the development of a QAP as described in Standard 1. CR 1.1.	Procedures CP-11 and CP-12 (attached) describe the formal admission procedures.

KR 5.3–MUC should establish a well-defined, specific entry requirement with regards to literacy in Maltese and English which is sought from all applicants consistently. This will ensure that no student accepted for the programme is disadvantaged because of lack of language proficiency.	The entry requirement and procedure to be followed is specified in CP-11 (attached).
KR 5.4- Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) should be defined. The Panel recommends clearly defined criteria should be established to ensure consistency and fairness.	Also specified in CP-11. Since our courses are very short, with no more than 2 modules, if a student presents evidence of attending a module/passing assessment with very similar learning outcomes, then the student will be exempt from attending that module/doing the assessment.
KR 5.5 – MUC should provide certificates with all the elements defined by the NCFHE regulations including learning outcomes and content description.	Certificates have been updated. A scan of an actual certificate from the Award in Digital Marketing – Planning and Implementation course is attached. You may also wish to note our new format – as will be used for all courses from this point – as per the template attached for the Award in Intermediate Technical and Practical Alternative Dispute Resolution Skills.

STANDARD 6: TEACHING STAFF
JUDGEMENT: MUC requires improvement to meet Standard 6.

Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation

KR 6.1-MUC should establish policies and procedures to support clear, fair and transparent recruitment of teaching staff. Formal documentation should include: records of where, when and why recruitment and specific recruitment methods have been chosen, detailed job descriptions and person specifications, company-wide selection criteria in addition to personal CVs. This will help focus the entity on the need to be transparent, clear and fair and will help them identify what methods work best in recruitment. Measures such as the archiving of interview records for an appropriate period, would also help MUC evidence that its recruitment practices are fair, transparent and support equal opportunities.	Policies are described in CP-07 and CP-08. CP-08 is a trainer handbook that is now being sent out to all new trainers. Up till now, all trainers for our accredited courses have been established University of Malta lecturers. For our newest accredited course (Award in Intermediate Technical and Practical Alternative Dispute Resolution Skills), where another three trainers, who are established in their fields, but not UM lecturers are included, we have also requested and saved their CV's and copies of their certificates.
KR 6.2- A formal system of observations should be established and included within the QA system created by MUC, to monitor the delivery of teaching and learning in terms of quality and to support professional development This will also help develop teaching methods and enhance the student learning experience.	CP-06 and CP-10 (attached) formalize the system. A copy of filled in procedure of CP-10 is attached.
KR 6.3- Lecturers delivering courses for MUC should have their roles and responsibilities clearly described and documented so that there is no ambiguity over their duties.	CP-08 (attached) describes these responsibilities.
RI 6.5- MUC may wish to consider the creation of a formal induction process and/or pack for new staff. This will aid communication, coordination, team building and perhaps establish opportunities for the capturing of feedback, ideas for enhancing QA across the company.	CP-08, trainer handbook (attached) provides this for new trainers.

RI 6.6- MUC may consider using a Performance Management System – review and appraisal. The purpose of this would be to assess the performance of the employee (part time and full time alike) against set standards, assist communication and coordination, assess the development needs and take timely actions to keep the outputs of the courses delivered at optimum levels.	Recommendation noted.

STANDARD 7: LEARNING RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT	
JUDGEMENT: MUC meets Standard 7	
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
KR 7.1 –MUC should ensure that procedures for the approval and procurement of teaching and learning resources are formalised and included as part of the QAP, as recommended in Standard 1. (CR 1.1.)	CP-05 and CP-07 formalize these procedures. It should also be noted that the information of trainers, including their CV's, are sent to the MFHEA as part of the programme accreditation process.
KR 7.2 - Formal written policies and procedures should be formalised to ensure that students who encounter difficulties are supported with a range of arrangements and measures in order for them to continue their learning. These procedures and any measures offered to students should provide for an audit trail for both internal management and external reviews. These should be included in the development of the QAP identified as a conditional recommendation in Standard 1 (CR 1.1)	CP-13 (attached) describes this procedure.
RI 7.3 -MUC should ensure that every member of staff, including teaching staff, has access and makes use of CPD which is focused on developing competencies for delivering better student support.	Recommendation noted and being tackled.

STANDARD 8: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	

JUDGEMENT:	
MUC meets standard 8	

Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation
RI 8.1 - In order for student feedback to be effectively analysed and used for learning enhancement MUC should consider revising the information requested through student evaluation forms.	The updated student form in CP-13 (attached) uses a graded 1-5 star evaluation method to enable statistical analysis.
RI 8.2 - MUC should consider developing a systematic and formalised approach to the process of identifying, recording, storing and managing (acting on) student feedback. This would contribute to the regular evaluation of delivery and pedagogical methods from a student perspective and act as a measure to empower and encourage students to take an active role in the learning process	This will be tackled in a more formal manner. All student feedback is taken seriously.
RI 8.3–Given the industry orientation of these home-grown courses, MUC may wish to consider carrying out tracer studies on alumni to identify career and destination data which should inform MUC planning and be of use to prospective students.	We are evaluating this. However GDPR severely limits our possibilities

STANDARD 9: PUBLIC INFORMATION	

JUDGEMENT:	
MUC does not meet Standard 9.	

Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation
CR 9.1–Within an eight (8) month period MUC shall seek formal recognition of the collaboration between the UM and MUC so as to enable the institution to freely capitalise on the UM branding.	As previously stated above, individual agreements with the respective faculties have been made.

KR 9.2 - MUC should ensure that printed and online public information with regards to selection criteria for admissions, course fees, pass rates, refund policy and some details of student opportunities and career progression is updated regularly and made readily available so that prospective students can make an informed choice.	Procedures CP-12, CP-13 and CP-15 (attached give the information. Course information sheets are provided freely on the website (see example: https://muhc.com.mt/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/COURSE-INFORMATION-SHEET-.pdf) The student handbook will inform students of all criteria.

STANDARD 10: ON-GOING MONITORING AND PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAMMES	
JUDGEMENT: MUC meets Standard 10.	
Recommendation **(as per EQA Report)**	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
KR 10.1- The monitoring and periodic review process of all home-grown courses offered by MUC should be documented and formalised in the QAP and must specify at minimum the objectives and the inputs to be considered at a revision, the frequency of revision and the persons responsible for such revision. This should consider input from MUC staff, lecturing staff, students, stakeholders and employers.	Formalised in procedure CP-06 (attached).
KR 10.2 –MUC should ensure that the monitoring and periodic review of the Award in Pharmacognosy and Herbal Products is overseen internally by MUC in-line with the procedures outlined in the institution QA (Standard 1 CR 1.1) ensuring that MUC develops its own action plans for improvement of the programme.	The same as above – the procedure in CP-06 applies for all accredited courses.
RI 10.3- MUC might wish to consider reorganising the evaluation system used to gather feedback from students and establish a new system for lecturers and stakeholders from industry in order to capture a broader range of views and perspectives for the purpose of consolidating a more robust tool which MUC can use to ensure continuous improvement and relevance of the courses they offer.	The feedback form for students is described in procedure CP-13 (attached).

STANDARD 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance	
JUDGEMENT: MUC meets Standard 11	
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	**Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation**
NA	NA