



National Commission for  
**Further and  
Higher Education**  
Malta

# External Quality Assurance Audit Report

**Barts & The London  
School of Medicine &  
Dentistry (University)**

Carried out from 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup>  
November 2020

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Abbreviations List</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Institutional Background.....	4
Overview of the Audit Process .....	4
Summary of the Conclusions Reached by the Peer Review Panel.....	4
<b>About the External Quality Audit</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Aims and Objectives of the EQA.....	5
The Peer Review Panel.....	7
Specific Terms of Reference .....	7
<b>Institutional Context</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Analysis and Findings of Panel</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Standard 1: Policy for Quality Assurance .....	10
Standard 2: Institutional Probity .....	15
Standard 3: Design and Approval of Programmes.....	18
Standard 4: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment .....	21
Standard 5: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification .....	23
Standard 6: Teaching Staff.....	25
Standard 7: Learning Resources and Student Support.....	27
Standard 8: Information Management .....	31
Standard 9: Public Information .....	33
Standard 10: Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes .....	35
Standard 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance.....	37
<b>Response by the Provider</b> .....	<b>39</b>
Preamble .....	39
Response to Key Recommendations and Recommendations Made by the Peer Review Panel .....	39
Response to Mandatory Recommendations made by the Peer Review Panel .....	47
<b>Annexes</b> .....	<b>51</b>
Annex 1: Review Panel Bio Notes .....	51
Annex 2: Agenda of the On-site Visit .....	53

## Abbreviations List

---

ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
EQA/QA audit	External Quality Assurance Audit
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
MQF	Malta Qualifications Framework
NCFHE	National Commission for Further and Higher Education
NQAF	National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SAR	Self-assessment Report

# Executive Summary

---

## Institutional Background

Barts and The London School of Medicine & Dentistry (University), herein referred to as *QMUL Malta, the institution or the university*, which functions as an integral part of the Queen Mary University of London, has been operational in Malta since September 2017.

The institution is currently delivering only one course, namely the five-year MBBS (Medicine) programme, whose core curriculum is identical to QMUL's existing MBBS London. On successful completion of the five-year programme, graduates will be awarded a Medicine MBBS from Queen Mary University of London (Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry).

## Overview of the Audit Process

This report is a result of the External Quality Assurance process undertaken by an independent peer review panel. The panel evaluated the documentation submitted by the educational institution and conducted an online audit visit. The panel was responsible for reaching conclusions on Standards 1 and 3 – 11. As outlined in the External Quality Assurance Provider Audit Manual of Procedures, the NCFHE sought external expertise to evaluate and reach a conclusion on Standard 2. Through this report, the panel also highlighted areas of good practice which, in its view, make a positive contribution to academic standards and quality of education that are worthy of being emulated and disseminated more widely.

Further assessments in regard to the audit process are detailed under Standard 11.

## Summary of the Conclusions Reached by the Peer Review Panel

On the basis of the findings documented in the report, the panel has concluded that QMUL Malta meets Standards 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11, requires improvement for Standards 1, 4, 6 and 8, and does not meet Standard 2. The recommendations in the report are meant to improve the Standards already in place and to enhance good practice.

The panel made nine mandatory recommendations, three of which are to be implemented within a month of publication of the report, one which is to be implemented within 12 months of publication of the report, one by the end of the current academic year, and four which are to be implemented before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year. They also made 16 key recommendations to be implemented within 12 months of publication of the report. The panel also made 16 recommendations.

# About the External Quality Audit

---

## Aims and Objectives of the EQA

Quality assurance in Malta is underpinned by six principles that determine the remit and function of the National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education, and the relationship between internal and external quality assurance to enhance learning outcomes.

- i. The Framework is based on the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and enriched by the European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET) perspective.
- ii. The Framework contributes to a national culture of quality, through:
  - ❖ increased agency satisfaction and numbers of service users,
  - ❖ an enhanced international profile and credibility of providers in Malta,
  - ❖ the promotion of Malta as a regional provider of excellence in further and higher education.
- iii. The Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) is fit for purpose.
- iv. The External Quality Assurance (QA audit) is a tool for both development and accountability. The QA audit shall ensure that the internal quality management system of the provider is:
  - ❖ fit for purpose according to the provider's courses and service users,
  - ❖ compliant with Standards and regulations, and contributing to the development of a national quality culture,
  - ❖ contributing to the fulfilment of the broad goals of Malta's Education Strategy 2014-24,
  - ❖ implemented with effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability.
- v. The 'Quality Improvement Cycle' is at the heart of the Framework.
- vi. The integrity and independence of the QA audit process is guaranteed.

The QA audit provides public assurance about the Standards of further and higher education programmes and the quality of the learning experience of students. It presents an opportunity for providers to demonstrate that they adhere to the expectations of stakeholders with regard to the programmes of study that they offer and the achievements and capabilities of their students. It also provides a focus for identifying good practices and for the implementation of institutional approaches to the continuous improvement in the quality of educational provision.

NCFHE has a responsibility to ensure that a comprehensive assessment is conducted for all higher education providers in Malta. The QA audit provides an opportunity to assess the Standards and quality of higher education in Malta against the expectations and practices of provision across the European Higher Education Area and internationally.

The QA audit examines how providers manage their own responsibilities for the quality and Standards of the programmes they offer. In particular, the following issues are addressed:

- ❖ The fitness for purpose and effectiveness of internal quality assurance processes, including an examination of the systems and procedures that have been implemented and the documentation that supports them.
- ❖ The compliance with the obligations of licence holders with established regulations and any conditions or restrictions imposed by NCFHE.
- ❖ The governance and financial sustainability of providers, including assurances about the legal status of the provider, the appropriateness of corporate structures and the competence of staff with senior management responsibilities.

The QA audit benchmarks the QA system and procedures within an institution against 11 Standards:

1. Policy for quality assurance: entities shall have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management.
2. Institutional and financial probity: entities shall ensure that they have appropriate measures and procedures in place to ensure institutional and financial probity.
3. Design and approval of programmes: self-accrediting providers shall have appropriate processes for the design and approval of their programmes of study.
4. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment: entities shall ensure that programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in the learning process.
5. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification: entities shall consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student 'life-cycle'.
6. Teaching staff: entities shall assure the competence and effectiveness of their teaching staff.
7. Learning resources and student support: entities shall have appropriate funding for their learning and teaching activities and sufficient learning resources to fully support the students' learning experiences.
8. Information management: entities shall ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.
9. Public information: entities shall publish information about their activities which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and readily accessible.
10. Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes: entities shall implement the 'Quality Cycle' by monitoring and periodically reviewing their programmes to ensure their continuing fitness for purpose.
11. Cyclical external quality assurance: entities should undergo external quality assurance, approved by NCFHE, at least once every five years.

Peer-review panels essentially ask providers the following question about their arrangements for quality management:

'What systems and procedures are in place and what evidence is there that they are working effectively?'

The approach to quality assurance can be encapsulated in a number of key questions which providers should ask themselves about their management of quality.

- What are we trying to do?
- Why are we trying to do it?
- How are we trying to do it?
- Why are we doing it that way?
- Is this the best way of doing it?
- How do we know it works?
- Could it be done better?

Answers to these questions should form the basis of the provider's critical assessment of and response to the self-evaluation questionnaire.

The approach of the QA audit is not simply about checking whether providers adhere to the regulations; it examines how providers are developing their own systems in addressing the expectations of sound management of educational Standards and the quality of their learning and teaching provision. It does not involve the routine identification and confirmation of criteria -- a 'tick- box' approach -- but a mature and reflective dialogue with providers about the ways in which they discharge their obligations for quality and the identification of existing good practices.

## The Peer Review Panel

The peer review panel was composed of:

**Chair of Review Panel:** Dr Anca Prisacariu

**Peer Reviewers:** Ms Anita Līce  
Ms Veronica Montebello

**Student Peer Reviewer:** Mr Christian Sammut

**QA Managers (NCFHE):** Mr Giacomo Annese  
Mr Jurgen D'Amato  
Ms Fiona McCowan  
Ms Viktoriia Maltseva

## Specific Terms of Reference

In preparation for the audit exercise, the panel observed the very comprehensive framework of policies, procedures and systems of QMUL London presented in the self-assessment report and its annexes; however, the panel was unsure to what extent this is being implemented in the Malta campus and how internal stakeholders perceive its effectiveness. Likewise, the panel observed the governance system at the parent institution and was interested in exploring the integration of the Malta campus representatives and the measures in place to ensure that the leadership and management of QMUL London reflect the Malta campus' specific needs, challenges and culture.

Furthermore, the panel wanted to understand the arrangements for quality assurance applicable to QMUL Malta and to assess their efficiency, in particular seeing that there is no staff member specifically assigned for quality management and enhancement responsibilities; also, the panel was determined to assess to what extent the arrangements for quality assurance are compliant with the NQAF and NCFHE standards, considering that the QMUL London quality assurance system has been designed with different regulatory expectations in mind (those of the QAA Quality Code). Lastly, the panel wanted to explore the matter of the graduates' recognition, considering the current status of QMUL Malta with the British General Medical Council, as well as what the institution communicates to ensure students' understanding of their status after the completion of their studies.

These areas have, therefore, been identified as main lines of inquiry.

The review team decided that, as part of an enhancement-led approach, it would issue recommendations linked to all parts of the operations of the institute. The report, therefore, distinguishes between:

- Mandatory recommendations (MR) which are crucial to meet a Standard and shall be implemented by the date indicated by the panel.
- Key recommendations (KR) which are important to improve a Standard and should be implemented expediently by the institute to address weaknesses no later than 12 months after the publication of the report.
- Recommendations (R) for improvement which are merely suggestions based on the panel's analyses and observations.

## Institutional Context

---

Queen Mary has been delivering medical education since 1123. In 1740, the London Hospital Medical College was established as England's first official medical school. In 1785, the St Bartholomew's Medical School was formally recognised, followed by St Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College in 1834. A century and a half later, in 1989, the Medical College of St Bartholomew's and The London Hospital Medical College merged to become Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry. In 1992, Queen Mary and Westfield College merged with Bart's and the Royal London School of Medicine and Dentistry, and three years later, in 1995, the final name change took place when Mary and Westfield College changed its public name to Queen Mary University of London (QMUL). QMUL has multiple campuses across London, and it delivers programmes on the ground in several countries, including China, France and Malta.

Since 1992, Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) has operated Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry as a standalone faculty, with the aim of improving the health and wellbeing of people, through research and teaching excellence. The tradition of over 230 years' training of doctors and surgeons is combined with modern medical facilities, including the largest new hospital in Europe, the first new dental hospital building in the UK for 40 years, and open-plan biomedical research laboratories.

The newest medical teaching campus of QMUL London has been established in Malta, where the institution is currently delivering only one course - the five-year MBBS (Medicine) programme. The core curriculum of MBBS Malta is identical to QMUL's existing MBBS London, and it includes early in-depth clinical experience, problem-based learning (PBL), and practical sessions in laboratories, opportunities to undertake an intercalated undergraduate science degree at QMUL's London campus. On successful completion of the five-year programme, graduates will be awarded a Medicine MBBS from Queen Mary University of London (Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry). The MBBS programme is exactly the same course as that delivered at the parent university in London; the Malta campus delivers the same content, the same modules and similar clinical placements. The fourth intake of MBBS students recently joined QMUL Malta in September 2020.

The first two years of the programme since the establishment of the institution in Malta were largely delivered from shared facilities and customised labs located in the Sir M.A Refalo 6th Form College, in the centre of Victoria. The institution has established its own campus, now located in the grounds of Gozo General Hospital, in Victoria. Staff and students moved into the new campus on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2019; the facility measures over 8,100 sq. metres spread over four floors, and features a 150-seat auditorium, two PC labs with a combined space for 140 students, a lecture hall for 125 students, an impressive 250 sq. metre library, a fully equipped clinical skills area, and several simulation rooms, classrooms, and PBL rooms. It also has staff and academic offices, open-plan areas, a range of meeting rooms, a boardroom, a dividable student common room, two contemplation rooms, a double reception, and a 1,000 sq. metre catering area with a café, offering stunning 360-degree views of Gozo. The campus can host 800 students. Adjacent to the main campus building is the Anatomy Centre, which was opened for teaching in December 2018 and provides a teaching area for anatomical skill and knowledge.

The QMUL Malta is integrated in the main governing committees and boards, and attends all of the main meetings that are held in London. The institution also has several QMUL Malta governing groups and committees, where key members of staff in London also sit and advise on. Although located outside the UK, the MBBS medicine programme delivered in Malta is subject to audit by the UK General Medical Council (GMC), initially on an annual basis (2018-22, and then five-yearly), ensuring that the programme meets internationally recognised standards.

# Analysis and Findings of Panel

---

## Standard 1: Policy for Quality Assurance

*Policy for quality assurance: entities shall have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management.*

### Main Findings

The quality assurance system at the QMUL Malta is regulated and implemented in line with the General QMUL QA Handbook. According to the SAR, the Handbook is informed by the Strategy 2030; however, the Handbook submitted to the panel does not seem to have been updated since the 2013-2014 academic year, in spite of major developments taking place in the international QA landscape (such as the adoption in 2015 of the revised European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education - ESG and the development of the NCFHE External Quality Assurance Provider Audit Manual of Procedures) or in light of the new institutional developments and challenges. During the audit meetings, the panel has learnt that an updated version of the QA Handbook is available, but this was not submitted to the panel in spite of numerous requests.

According to the SAR, the management of academic quality and standards in teaching and learning is covered through the following:

- programme development, approval and withdrawal processes,
- programme specifications for all taught programmes,
- guidance on collaborative provision,
- the Academic Regulations which specify programme and assessment regulations,
- the Queen Mary Academic Credit Framework,
- use of external examiners in all examinations and Examination Boards,
- student representation and feedback mechanisms, and student induction,
- Annual Programme Review and Taught Programme Action Plans, including the analysis of student data on admission, progression and completion,
- periodic review of the teaching and learning provision made by all academic schools and institutes,
- external reviews by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education and by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.

The panel was further provided with a document describing the specific arrangements for the MBBS programme Quality Assurance at QMUL, as well as another document referred to in the SAR as Quality in Teaching Framework, but later titled as Quality in Teaching and Learning for Malta.

The panel was unsure as to the necessity of multiple documentation that overlapped and partly contradicted one another, and again found the lack of consistency in their titles rather confusing; furthermore, the panel is not sure about the source of the *Quality in Teaching and Learning for Malta*, taking into consideration that the parent institution had declared that the Malta campus is restricted from developing its own QA arrangements.

All in all, these three documents collectively reflect the organisation of the quality assurance system, including the responsibilities of different organisational units, as well as those of institutional leadership, individual staff members and students with respect to quality assurance. However, the panel was not able to identify the role of QMUL Malta staff, as the local representatives, in the implementation of the quality assurance system governed by QMUL London; whilst there are some tools applicable remotely, such as the external moderation system or the national student survey, there are other components relating to the programme delivery, such as the quality visits to local education partners or the peer observation of teaching, that require coordination on the ground. Given that there is no administrative staff dedicated to the implementation of the QA system in Malta specifically, there is some uncertainty about the comprehensiveness of the QA arrangements in the education delivery on the ground. Furthermore, not having a Malta-specific QA contextualised approach also implies that the NCFHE expectations in regard to the component of the institutional system of policies are not always catered for, as explained in different sections below.

The panel was impressed with the level of student engagement in different stages of the quality assurance system:

- student survey at the end of every module with the aim of continuous improvement of the quality of teaching;
- two student-staff liaison committees (SSLC) have been set up in Malta; both of these committees meet every month in order to ensure that there is an effective channel for formal communication between students and staff;
- engagement with the National Student Survey (NSS), which again gathers opinions on the quality of the course;
- student membership of school committees (further detailed in Standard 2).

The panel was unable to identify a formal policy that defines the relationship between research and learning and teaching.

The institution has developed and adopted a policy on research Integrity which defines the QMUL commitment to producing and promoting quality research according to the highest standards of integrity. Specifically, QMUL has adopted the following commitments:

- maintaining the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research;
- ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal, and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards;
- supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice, and support for the development of researchers;
- using transparent, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise;
- working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to review progress regularly and openly.

Furthermore, the institution is implementing an Intellectual Property Policy that protects the traditional rights of scholars concerning their work and encourages the free and open creation and dissemination of works produced by researchers and scholars.

The procedures for ensuring against academic fraud, in particular in regard to cheating, plagiarism and academic honesty, have been formally defined and reflected in the MBBS Assessment and Progression Handbook. Furthermore, the MEDPRO Faculty and Student Handbooks underline the principles of ethical and professional responsibilities within the academic community. As confirmed during the meetings conducted by the panel, these expectations are further enforced through different presentations delivered by QMUL Malta staff.

The institution has developed comprehensive policies and procedures for ensuring the integrity, reliability, suitability and continuous availability of the technological infrastructure (including hardware and software). QMUL Information technology policies are in place and are being monitored and revised periodically to ensure the IT integrity of the University, staff and students. QMUL has several information systems in place to manage staff and student activity, resources, and progression. When it comes to access management, emails, printing, data protection, information security, patch management, record retention and internet policy, QMUL ensures integrity, reliability, suitability and availability.

According to the SAR, as part of the procedures for verifying the identity of all enrolled students, QMUL Malta requires students to upload their photo ID in the form of a passport or nationality card during the online enrolment process. This is then checked by staff to ensure that the ID is valid, in date, and not fraudulent. Students are also required to supply their police clearance letter, and QMUL Malta staff then crosscheck both documents. As a last step in the verification process, the institution ensures that the person enrolling under the name is the same person as in the documents by checking their photo ID and police clearance letter in person when the student arrives at QMUL Malta.

QMUL is formally committed to creating an environment for work and study where staff and students are treated with dignity and respect, and where all forms of bullying, harassment and hate crime are not tolerated. To ensure that QMUL community is free from all forms of prejudice, discrimination, harassment and bullying, in 2019 the institution launched *Report + Support*, a secure online platform aimed at tackling all forms of abuse, bullying, harassment, violence and hate crime. The website provides access to information about local and national support services, and also serves as a platform where incidents can be reported. Support can be provided either through Student Services for students or through the Richmond Foundation, if counselling is required. The panel was not able to locate any information about this platform, or any principle statement for equity, equality, intolerance and anti-discrimination, in the QMUL Handbooks for Faculty and Students.

The QMUL policies are not easily located on the institutional website, but on a different website within a completely different domain, not intuitive and easy to find, which makes it very difficult for the intended audiences to have access to them; this matter is further detailed under Standard 9. Furthermore, the panel could not identify any general Student Handbook that serves as a

collection of policies made available to students during induction to support their onboarding process and getting them introduced to their rights, obligations and general expectations while at the institution in regard to Code of Conduct, Disciplinary Policy, quality assurance and student engagement, as well as the general provisions in regard to assessment, appeals, etc. This is further developed under Standard 5.

In regard to the policy making process, the panel was not able to identify evidence that QMUL Malta has a direct impact and opportunity to influence QMUL London policy documents; in fact, according to the senior management representatives the panel has met, there are no particular challenges and needs specific to the QMUL Malta campus that need to be reflected in the policy making process.

There is no formalised system for the involvement of external stakeholders in quality assurance: the institution has not yet graduated a cohort of alumni and there is no systematic communication with representatives of the labour market to evidence their engagement in quality enhancement processes.

As part of its self-assessment documentation, the institution has submitted the School of Medicine and Dentistry Strategy for the 2014-2019 timeframe. However, the panel did not proceed to assessing it because it is obviously outdated and its contents are no longer current. According to the SAR, QMUL London has recently developed and adopted a new strategy for the 2019-2030 time frame, which has not been cascaded into a specific document for the School of Medicine and Dentistry. Furthermore, QMUL London has developed and adopted an Education Enabling Plan which sets out the guiding strategic framework for education at Queen Mary through 2030. It is aligned with the performance indicators in Strategy 2030, and has been updated to reflect the changing educational landscape in terms of both internal and external factors. There is no Malta-specific strategic plan and the panel found no reference to the QMUL Malta campus in the Strategy 2030 or the Education Enabling Plan. Therefore, it is unclear what direction QMUL Malta is following, what its priorities are (whether these are formalised in a Malta-specific document or KPIs are determined for Malta in a more general document), and who, and how often, reports on the progress towards the achievement of these priorities. Defining a clear direction for QMUL Malta would also provide better support to guide decision making.

### **Good Practice Identified**

The panel found commendable the student engagement in quality assurance and the use of student voice in improving the quality of the student learning experience.

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**MR1.** The institution shall ensure that, before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year, an updated QA Handbook is in place to guide the policy, processes and procedures for quality assurance at QMUL Malta, specifically determining the roles and responsibilities of local staff in their implementation of and response to the requirements determined by the NQAF and NCFHE standards.

**KR1.** The institution should revisit the regulatory framework for QA in order to avoid duplication, contradiction and general confusion of internal stakeholders.

**R1.** The institution could clarify the relationship between QMUL London and QMUL Malta in regard to the applicable QA framework.

**KR2.** The institution should ensure clarity in the responsibilities of different organisational units, as well as those of institutional leadership, individual staff members and students, with respect to quality assurance at QMUL Malta, in particular in relation to tools such as quality visits to local education partners or the peer observation of teaching, which now lack accountability and continuity.

**KR3.** The institution should reconsider the arrangements for quality assurance at QMUL Malta so that the campus benefits from appropriate human and financial resources to ensure their successful implementation.

**R2.** The institution could ensure that the QMUL policy framework defines the relationship between research and learning and teaching.

**MR2.** The institution shall develop, before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year, a Student Handbook as a collection of policies made available to students during induction to support their onboarding process and have them introduced to their rights, obligations and general expectations while at the institution.

**R3.** The institution could ensure that QMUL Malta has a direct impact and opportunity to influence QMUL London policy documents to reflect the challenges and needs specific to the QMUL Malta campus,

**KR4.** The University should improve the institutional efforts to engage the external stakeholders in quality assurance and design fit for purpose communication channels accompanied by an effective closing of the quality feedback loop,

**MR3.** The institution shall clearly identify, no later than one year after publication of this report, the strategic priorities concerning QMUL in Malta or, as applicable, define specific KPIs to measure the contribution QMUL Malta is expected to make to a more general strategy; and clarify the associated monitoring and reporting methodologies to identify who reports on the progress towards the achievement of the Malta campus priorities and how often this reporting is conducted.

## Conclusion

Requires improvement to meet Standard

## Standard 2: Institutional Probity

*Institutional and financial probity: entities shall ensure that they have appropriate measures and procedures in place to ensure institutional and financial probity.*

### **Main Findings**

QMUL Malta is governed by a Board, which meets primarily to take decisions that have a fundamental impact on governance, management or finances of the company. The Board of QMUL Malta Ltd has five members: four representatives of QMUL UK and one representative of QMUL Malta.

In addition to the Board, QMUL Malta leads, and is overseen by, a number of operational committees, including the following key groups:

- QMUL Malta Steering Group
- QMUL Malta Operations Group
- Malta Marketing and Student Recruitment Committee
- Malta Estates and IT Board.

QMUL Malta is also represented on, and reports into a large number of other London-based committees, such as:

- ARC (student recruitment and admissions)
- Student Services
- Student Academic and Pastoral Support
- QEC Quality Enhancement Committee
- all academic committees (Phase 1, Year 3, Year 4, Year 5).

According to the SAR, within QMUL Malta, the Deputy Dean for Education and the Director of Operations are responsible for managing academic delivery and the ongoing operation of the organisation and the facilities, ensuring both are fit for purpose.

- The Deputy Dean for Education is responsible for all academic and curriculum delivery matters, and line-manages the current academic team of medical lecturers and the visiting clinical lecturers.
- The Director of Operations directs QMUL Malta's internal operations, such as facilities, student recruitment, marketing, the curriculum office team, student engagement, library staff, business development, community engagement, overall business support for staff and students, local finance, legal and HR support, IT, and stakeholder relationships.

The panel was provided with two charts: a professional services one reporting to the Director of Operations, and an academic services one reporting to the Deputy Dean for Education. The panel found them clear, logical and structured, with a clear distinction between academic and

administrative structures. The individuals occupying the positions reflected in the organisation charts are generally qualified to meet the obligations of their roles.

According to the QMUL academic governance framework, the institution seeks to ensure that the student voice is represented at all levels; students are members of the Senate and its sub-boards. The panel found that student representation is ensured and all parties are satisfied with the settings students have available to influence decision making at QMUL both Malta and London.

The panel has found a great integration and interoperability between QMUL Malta and its parent institution in regard to governance and management; however, as the institution is maturing, QMUL should pay closer attention to assessing the efficiency, effectiveness and fitness for purpose of the task division and governance remit between the two campuses, determining what works and what does not, and taking remedial actions. The panel has identified some confusion across the academic community in regard to the *higher-up* governance, as there seems to be a blending between academic and corporate structures.

Queen Mary University of London - Malta Limited (hereinafter referred to as QMUL Malta) is a company incorporated in Malta under registration number C 69087 and is a fully owned subsidiary of Queen Mary University of London Holdings Limited, which is also registered in Malta under C-71247. The holding company is in turn fully owned by the Queen Mary University of London (UK Registration number RC000710).

The accountant appointed to report to the Authority stated that, whereas QMUL Malta is adhering to its employment obligations, he is unable to confirm whether they are adhering to their FSS/NIC, VAT and other fiscal obligations. No compliance certificates were presented and, given the non-compliance with Malta Business Registry obligations outlined further below, he also infers that, since the company has not submitted its tax returns for basis years 2018 and 2019, both are now overdue.

The accountant found that the company is also not in line with respect to the submission of the annual financial statements to the Malta Business Registry, with the last audited financial statements presented to the Registry related to the year ending July 2017. Thus, the company is not compliant with respect to the presentation of the audited financial statements for July 2018 and July 2019. On the other hand, it is compliant in respect of the annual return for 2020 submitted to the Malta Business Registry. The same non-compliance profile with Malta Business Registry applies to the parent company.

The accountant was given a draft of the audited financial statements for the period ending July 2018, the final copy of which has not yet been submitted to the Malta Business Registry, however, was utilized for the purpose of assessing financial position and performance. In the year ending July 2018 the company started trading, however, it registered a substantial loss for the year which resulted in a significant negative equity position, exceeding €1.4m as at the end of July 2018. The company reported a positive net current assets position which was, however, dwarfed by a €2.5m amount due to the parent company, which is deemed to be of a long-term nature. This financial position and performance are consistent with that of a company that is still making significant investments which are still at early stages of yielding results.

A projected cash flow statement and forecasted capital expenditure budget for two years – 2019 and 2020 – was submitted. This document is evidence of an assiduous monitoring of cash spend by the company in line with its capital commitments. However, no longer term and up-to-date budgets were presented to us, especially comprehensive budgets that take a 360-degree span of financial matters, namely financial performance, cash flows and financial position. This significantly restricted the accountant’s analysis of such projections.

The accountant’s findings and financial assessment led him to conclude that the company is not able to meet unexpected challenges by putting in the necessary financial support required at times of uncertainty, unless it retains the full and continued support of its ultimate beneficial owner. The ultimate beneficial owner, namely the Queen Mary University of London, provided the accountant with a copy of a comfort letter in which they confirmed their support to the company to meet its liabilities and to carry on its activities as a going concern.

### **Good Practice Identified**

The active partnership with the students and the consideration given to their voice. Students are not only given a voice but are also supported in and encouraged to use it effectively in a way that is impactful and enhancement oriented.

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR5.** The institution should assess the efficiency, effectiveness and fitness for purpose of the task division and governance remit between QMUL Malta and its parent institution and take remedial actions as the Malta campus is maturing.

**MR4:** Queen Mary University of London - Malta Limited and its parent company shall undertake all the necessary managerial and financial steps to ensure full compliance with laws and regulations, especially those relating to financial reporting and taxes, before the end of the current academic year.

**KR6:** The institution should ensure a more comprehensive budgeting approach considering financial performance and financial position, in addition to cash flows and capex spend, especially during periods of vulnerability, such as the start-up phase of the projects undertaken by the company.

**R4:** The institution could reflect the significant dues by the company to the Queen Mary University of London as a capital contribution in the financial statements of the company, thus consolidating and sanitizing the net equity position of the company in the medium term.

## **Conclusion**

Does not meet Standard

## Standard 3: Design and Approval of Programmes

*Design and approval of programmes: self-accrediting providers shall have appropriate processes for the design and approval of their programmes of study.*

### **Main Findings**

QMUL has well defined policies and academic regulations governing the approval of new programmes and the continuous monitoring and review of the existing programme. QMUL London leads these arrangements and processes; the panel learnt that the MBBS course has its design and content defined by QMUL London and by the requirements of the General Medical Council as specified in *Tomorrow's Doctors (GMC 2009)* later updated and replaced by *Promoting excellence: standards for medical education and training (GMC 2016)*. There is evidence of involvement of both the academic staff and the students of the Malta campus in the institutional structures involved in monitoring and review of the programme, including the Senate, as the sovereign body of the institution's Academic Governing Framework.

The QMUL system for the quality assurance of academic processes and delivery includes periodic six-yearly curriculum reviews with the next one planned for 2025. Also, regular monthly meetings are held between the institution and a number of Maltese stakeholders in the spirit of collaboration between the two parties and to ensure that the delivery of the programme is fit for purpose, is in line with local health system standards and regulations, and imparts benefits to the wider community. Moreover, the panel learnt that market research in Malta commissioned by the institution informs the development of new programmes and looks for industry-led opportunity and identifies gaps in local expertise. However, the panel was not presented with evidence of any formal process involving stakeholders in Malta where the local workforce situation is analysed. Such investigation could determine future healthcare requirements in terms of demand and expertise based on variables, such as expected population growth, technological and social change, and health policy. Formally minuted meetings would explicitly present the required information to enable conversations between stakeholders and plan actions based on this data. Moreover, the involvement of external stakeholders in programme reviews and changes is not formally documented.

According to the self-assessment documentation available to the panel, the MBBS programme is closely monitored and reviewed yearly by the GMC as part of QMUL application for the recognition of the programme delivery in Malta, in order to ensure that the institution follows the standards and requirements of the GMC. Thus, the outcomes of the theoretical programme and practical skills component are aligned to those requirements of the General Medical Council. The panel became aware that the first MBBS programme cohort needs to run to completion before GMC will take a decision regarding its recognition. Students are conscious of the overarching proceedings regarding the GMC recognition and QMUL Malta has offered redress to everyone if the MBBS programme is not recognized by the GMC. An annual review is carried out to determine the alignment of the MBBS programme to GMC standards, recommendations are given, and actions to be taken are followed up by the Medical School Annual Return. On the local front, discussions are ongoing with the Malta Medical Council and the development of a Maltese language course was one of the actions taken in response to this and to feedback from the clinical floor where

placements are carried out. The Maltese language prerequisite is also an entry criterion for the Malta Medical Foundation Programme for those students who opt to stay in Malta for their foundation programme. Registration with the MMC remains a prerequisite even to carry out the Malta Medical Foundation Programme, hence, the panel insists on more effort being put into discussions with MMC.

The institution works systematically and effectively to plan, provide, oversee, evaluate, improve, and assure the academic quality and integrity of its academic programme and the credits and degree awarded. All teaching and assessments are correlated to an online compendium of modular specific learning outcomes. The institution has systems in place which help them to understand how and what students are learning, and to use the evidence obtained to improve the academic programme and the way teaching is done.

The Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) provides a formal means of communication and discussion between the institution and its students. The committee consists of student representatives from each year of the MBBS programme, together with appropriate representation from staff. It is designed to respond to the needs of students, as well as act as a forum for discussing programme and module developments. The SSLC has a pivotal role in supporting and reporting feedback given by students, although the Gozo Society (the local student association) and student representatives are also effective communication channels which students use. Follow up is then instigated with the relevant responsible body according to the nature of the issue. Several changes have been implemented to programme content and mode of delivery in response to student feedback.

The panel learnt that tutors have weekly meetings to discuss lectures and feedback from students. This forum is extremely productive and beneficial. It is where exchange of good practice is carried out, feedback is considered, and changes to accommodate needs or suggestions for improvement are planned. More formal feedback is gathered through anonymous surveys and outcomes of these are forwarded and discussed in the various boards, committees, fora, meetings, and channels which are active within the institution.

The panel learnt how the institution has had some difficulties with clinical placements. The Medical Curriculum Committee (MCC) has discussed mitigation factors to address clinical placement during COVID times. The section of the institution which is usually used to teach clinical skills is being used by GGH due to the current situation. Agreements have been reached with various local hospitals and clinics to accommodate a portion of student placements. Notwithstanding the fact that it is extremely important that students get the appropriate clinical exposure; the panel noted that there are concerns about students not being able to reach the intended programme outcomes due to cancellation of some of the clinical placements. Ensuring that all students are kept abreast of the availability of their required clinical placements and what mitigation measures are being undertaken by the institution will alleviate concerns of uncertainty among students of how this might affect their progression.

## **Good Practice Identified**

Thorough research of the market and the possibilities for cooperation with industry before implementing new programs in Malta.

## **Recommendations For Improvement**

**MR5:** The institution shall ensure that, within a month of publication of this report, its institutional website and any documentation concerning student enrolment reflect in a transparent manner the current status of the students in relation to the MMC registration and their ability to practice the medical profession.

**KR7:** The University should increase the institutional effort towards negotiations with the Malta Medical Council (MMC), especially considering that some students might choose to carry out their Medical Foundation Training in Malta, and hence would need to be registered with the MMC,

**R5:** The institution could formally establish and document the involvement of external stakeholders, including local potential contributors, in the identification of future healthcare requirements in terms of demand and expertise, training needs, programme design and reviews.

**R6:** The institution could ensure that students are privy to all the necessary information with regard to clinical placement challenges, mitigation measures which are being taken, and any possible effects on their progression. Communication must be transparent and use various channels to ensure that all students are reached.

## **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Standard 4: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

*Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment: entities shall ensure that programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in the learning process.*

### **Main Findings**

The *MBBS Assessment and Progression Handbook (QMUL 2018-2019)* clearly defines the QA processes for assessment procedures, which seems to be successful in ensuring consistency and transparency. This handbook includes among other items terms of reference of exam boards and external examiners, an assessment framework, assessment procedures for the different modalities of assessment, marks and marking protocols, and student failure and reassessment procedures. The handbook also makes explicit the procedures which are used in extenuating circumstances and also in cases of academic offences. This handbook can be viewed and downloaded from the institution website and is widely used by students and tutors.

The diversity of the students and their needs are attended to within the array of pedagogical approaches and assessment methodologies which are also appropriate to course level, content and intended learning outcomes. The MBBS programme uses teaching and assessment methods which encourage active participation of students. Some of these have been introduced in response to programme enhancement suggestions from students and academic staff, an example of which is Problem Based Learning.

The institution continuously explores avenues to improve its systems and uses tutor and student feedback to do this. The panel noted the variety of modes of delivery of teaching and assessment used and how students have visibility of this from induction and throughout the course of their studies. Formative and summative assessments are used as a method to assess student knowledge and skills, and to design a student plan for further learning. The panel learnt how the academic progress of students is reviewed throughout the year. Weekly student support meetings, monthly Academic Group meetings, senior tutors and also MEDPRO supervisors offer opportunities for student academic support. The timeliness of publication of results and the level of feedback given following every assessment are generally effective. However, there are exceptions where feedback has been communicated to students sometimes up to four to five months after the assessment itself. This might fall short of the intended benefits of feedback that allow students to monitor and adjust their own learning needs.

According to the documentation made available to the panel and as confirmed during the meetings, regulations and processes allow for complaints and appeals of the assessment process, including modality and content of assessment; however, academic judgements concerning allocation of marks are not considered grounds for appeal and are rejected automatically. The panel was informed that there is no possibility for assessments to be re-marked by an independent examiner.

A number of examiners are engaged in any one assessment and examination. Principal internal examiners for each year communicate with Module Leads to set examination papers. Tutors either

assign marks for different components of the written examinations or are involved in assessing different stations in Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) exams. External examiners are also involved in summative assessments and feedback is reported back to the Medical Education Enhancement Committee. The students are well guided to develop a structured clinical placement logbook, which is also assessed, and room for further development is identified and communicated to students. Final assessment scores are stored by the London Assessment Unit which is the body that keeps all Malta and London student rankings together.

An online learning environment QMplus has always been used and is even more so because of the COVID pandemic situation. This affords a platform for student-centred learning and flexibility for students. The panel noted that there is high satisfaction with the learning resources provided and the modality of teaching. The meetings conducted during the audit confirmed that it is planned that this be made more interactive and participative for students and tutors as the QMplus system is further developed. Tutors have already received training to ensure that this platform is used to its full potential. Student-centred learning is further consolidated through MEDPRO which safeguards the students' professional and personal development on an individual level. Moreover, once students start clinical placements, they are assigned a clinical supervisor. The panel heard how the students value this initiative and feel that through this system clinical experiences can be better contextualised. Tutors and clinical supervisors have been given training on both MEDPRO and effective clinical supervision.

#### **Good Practice Identified**

N/A

#### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR8:** The institution should ensure the timely communication of feedback and assessment results to students in order to better allow students to monitor and adjust their own learning needs.

**KR9:** The institution should allow for the possibility of appealing academic judgements concerning allocation of marks in order to guarantee that students are given the opportunity to have assessments re-marked by an independent examiner in the spirit of upholding fairness and impartiality.

**R7:** The institution could consider having set timelines integrated into the MBBS Assessment and Progression Handbook for giving feedback on assessments to students in order to ensure that the intended benefits of feedback that allow students to monitor and adjust their own learning needs are being met.

#### **Conclusion**

Requires improvement to meet Standard

## Standard 5: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

*Student admission, progression, recognition and certification: entities shall consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student 'life-cycle'.*

### **Main Findings**

The processes of student admission, progression, recognition and certification are regulated by the policies and regulations of QMUL. Regulations are very detailed, transparent, and cover all phases of the student 'life cycle'.

An *Admissions Policy* for the QMUL is the point of reference for the admission process, including entry requirements. Information is explained in detail, clear and published on the website. Staff involved with recruitment of students is trained on fair selection and conducting interviews. The panel heard that there were cases of inaccurate information having been provided to potential students, however, these problems were resolved by increasing the capacity for supporting students in the recruitment and induction processes. A Malta-based Marketing and Student Recruitment Manager who guides students through the application process, as well as a Student Experience Manager who assists students with moving to Gozo and helps them to settle in, were recruited in 2019. It is also planned to recruit an Admissions Officer in Malta. The panel also learnt about student peer support offered to first-year students by the Gozo Society Student Association. However, there is no evidence of a systematic evaluation process of the overall satisfaction of students with the recruitment process.

The *Institution's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy* includes effective induction of students. Students get familiar with regulations through an orientation period in week zero before the beginning of semester. The first-year students also receive a Student Support Handbook via e-mail informing students of all services available. The handbook, however, does not provide sufficient information on rules for behaviour, academic misconduct, academic requirements, and relevant University policies. There are also special sessions organised throughout the study period, for example, presentations by the Head of Assessment to explain assessment details, as well as induction before each placement. The panel learnt that induction of students is a group effort and that lecturers and administrative staff are approachable for all students who need advice.

The progression of students is closely and regularly monitored through both official and informal methods. The University monitors student participation and engagement with the online learning environment, as well as analysing the results of assessments. In-course assessments are frequently formative to inform further learning needs. For each MBBS year, an Academic Review Group exists to oversee the academic progress of individual students undertaking the MBBS programme by reviewing students who are not attaining acceptable academic performance and providing assistance to them. Students encountering learning difficulties are referred to Senior Tutors or the Head of Student Progression. The small size of the campus allows tutors to personally follow the progress of individual students.

Detailed information on the course requirements, assessments, and procedures to prevent plagiarism is provided in the *MBBS Assessment and Progression Handbook*. A system of external examiners is in place to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly, and that decisions in relation to individual students are taken after due deliberation. The reports of external examiners are a key source of information in the monitoring of modules and programmes of study. External examiners are in a position to offer advice to examination boards and programme organisers. The panel commends the way the results of exams are analysed, comparing student cohorts in Malta and UK, as well as providing detailed feedback to students.

The policy for accreditation of prior learning for QMUL explains the process and conditions for recognising prior certified learning (APCL) (for prior learning at higher education level), prior experiential learning (APEL), and for credit transfer from another higher education provider. Non-formal learning is not covered by the process. There have not been any cases of recognition of prior learning (RPL) in QMUL Malta yet, and the panel could not identify reasons for this apart from the lack of demand. Nevertheless, the panel suggests that the opportunities for RPL should be sufficiently highlighted in the process of student recruitment.

The sample transcript of certificate of achievement provided by QMUL does not include a reference to achieved learning outcomes as stipulated in the NQAF.

### **Good Practice Identified**

1. The level of quality and details of the QMUL written policies and procedures, in particular, the procedures for student assessment;
2. The procedures and practices of data collection and analysis on student progression are well developed to inform necessary action to support student learning;
3. The work dedicated to student support, as well as the availability and arrangements of pastoral care.

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**R8.** The institution could implement a systematic, regular evaluation process of the overall satisfaction of students with the recruitment and admission processes.

**R9.** The institution could increase the visibility of RPL opportunities in the recruitment and admission process to ensure that these are used by individuals fulfilling necessary requirements.

**MR6.** The institution shall ensure that, within a month of publication of this report, the transcript of certificate of achievement provided by QMUL includes a reference to achieved learning outcomes as stipulated in the NQAF.

## **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Standard 6: Teaching Staff

*Teaching staff: entities shall assure the competence and effectiveness of their teaching staff.*

### Main Findings

The institution has developed a *Recruitment and Selection Policy*, which governs the recruitment of all QMUL teaching staff. It describes extensively the QMUL approach to hiring, from determining a need, to creating the job profile, proceeding through authorisations, advertising, shortlisting and selection methods, decision making, candidate feedback and making an offer. QMUL underlines its commitment to selecting and recruiting people with the right skills, knowledge and experience, through a fair recruitment process, in accordance with its core values, as outlined in the Queen Mary 2019-2030 Strategy; furthermore, the institution commits to applying its recruitment practices equitably, ensuring that staff and candidates are not subject to any detriment in respect of protected characteristics that are, or may be construed as, discriminatory.

The panel found that the *Recruitment and Selection Policy* is being implemented successfully at QMUL Malta and the teaching staff is generally qualified and well equipped to conduct their academic and academic support activities. The potential for improvement is in increasing the research profile of the teaching staff in Malta in a way that better informs the teaching activity, which we found is a rather isolated practice at the moment.

The institution does not have a formalised policy and system for professional development. The panel learnt that there is an ongoing concern and prioritisation for the growth of teaching staff, reflected in their one-on-one's with managers, led by a genuine preoccupation for the enhancement of the student learning experience. However, there does not seem to exist any standardised system around it that determines the specific tools and metrics used to identify training needs and the budgets and strategies allocated to continuous professional development, and regulates how other QA tools communicate to professional development (assessment of training impact, intentionally observing if module evaluations are improving in areas where growth was provided, etc).

QMUL Malta has not formalised a system for the performance review of its staff - the panel noted the line manager appraisal system, but this is a rather isolated tool as opposed to a more holistic approach where student feedback, self-assessment and peer observations of teaching feed into a holistic understanding of individual performances of staff.

The panel took note of the systems and procedures in place to monitor the delivery of teaching and learning in order to ensure that the Standards are being met, such as the SSLC, module evaluations, NSS, Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP) - further detailed in Standards 3 and 10, which reflect a genuine commitment to quality enhancement and taking action on student feedback, as detailed in the previous sections of this report.

There is no systematic survey that assesses the satisfaction of staff with their conditions of employment (hiring, onboarding, promotion, professional development, performance review, leave policy, etc); the panel was provided with a one-off survey that had been conducted amongst

staff in regard to their joining QMUL Malta and the arrangements associated to relocation, but no other tool is measuring staff satisfaction with their employment conditions.

### **Good Practice Identified**

N/A

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR10.** The institution should increase the research profile of the teaching staff in Malta in a way that better informs the teaching practice.

**MR7.** The institution shall develop, formally adopt and implement a system for the continuous professional development of all staff before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year,

**MR8.** The institution shall develop, formally adopt and implement a system for the all-staff performance review before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year.

**R10.** The institution could set up a systematic form of collecting all-staff satisfaction with their employment conditions and implement this to inform improvement.

### **Conclusion**

Requires improvement to meet Standard

## Standard 7: Learning Resources and Student Support

*Learning resources and student support: entities shall have appropriate funding for their learning and teaching activities and sufficient learning resources to fully support the students' learning experiences.*

### **Main Findings**

The institution offers modern, state-of-the-art infrastructure and learning resources onsite in Malta. According to the meetings conducted by the panel, the environment for learning and learning resources available seem appreciated. The new building of the QMUL Malta was completed in October 2019. Its capacity significantly exceeds the current number of students, as it could comfortably support up to 800 students. Students have card access to a fully equipped Anatomy Centre which was completed in December 2018, a Clinical Skills Centre reproducing the hospital environment, a library, study rooms for individuals and for groups, and two PC labs. The institution also has a SimMan, allowing students to practice clinical scenarios. Although students have access to these learning areas for extended hours close to examination periods, the panel learnt that longer opening hours would be appreciated.

An online learning environment QMplus, based on Moodle, is actively used in the study process. QMplus includes slides or presentations, chat rooms and discussion forums, online coursework, wikis and blogs. As lecture presentations are recorded (in Q-review enabled rooms), students can use them for review and revision. Interviewees agreed that QMplus is a user-friendly and useful learning platform. However, the desire for files to be uploaded earlier was expressed. Regular staff training on new technologies, as well as the intention to recruit a clinical fellow to develop training with the SimMan, indicates the efforts to ensure interactive learning experience.

Students also benefit from a wide range of online resources. It was highly appreciated by the interviewees that the students of QMUL Malta have access to all of the online resources that students in London have. The access to databases of online scientific journals is managed centrally by the team in London. The current subscriptions ensure access to relevant, high-profile databases and more than 7,000 journal titles and e-books. The physical library includes around 1,830 book titles; a one-week loan policy is in place unless multiple copies are available. Needs for new resources are collected through annual calls for requests, helpdesk and ad-hoc requests, as well as annual liaising with Programme Leaders to ensure that the core reading list is available. Special attention is paid to ensuring digital accessibility of the library and learning resources. Library Services manage a resource called Reading Lists Online that allows staff responsible for teaching modules to upload the reading lists for their subject, along with a commentary on the most relevant sections of text, which is particularly relevant for visually impaired students. The website and online learning environment are continuously reviewed to ensure compliance to accessibility standards.

The institution's approach to online learning provision and online resources, including the QMplus system, recorded lectures and regular staff training on new technologies, allowed QMUL Malta to successfully adjust to the extraordinary situation of the COVID-19 pandemic as all lectures were moved online; although challenges remain to ensure quality learning experience with the pandemic restrictions.

The clinical training takes place in Primary Care clinics, Gozo General Hospital, Karin Grech Hospital and Mater Dei Hospital. Due to the COVID pandemic, the number of clinical placements was reduced, but the institution is making efforts to ensure their availability to all students, and reviews and adapts schedules accordingly.

Student academic progress and engagement is closely monitored throughout the year with student progress being discussed on a weekly basis, and those struggling are quickly identified. Students with low engagement, including low online activity, are approached individually. Students who encounter academic difficulties with their studies will be allocated to a senior tutor who will assist the student to explore specific areas of difficulty and put together a plan to help address these until the student is back on track. Personal and professional development of students is facilitated through a MEDPRO mentor scheme and Barts Portfolio in which all students participate. These are designed to help students develop appropriate attitudes and behaviours, including self-awareness and self-care skills to enable them to reach their full potential. Each student has a MEDPRO Supervisor providing one-to-one educational supervision and guiding students to develop their own Personal and Professional Development Plan. All academic staff have received MEDPRO training. In year three, students are assigned a clinician who is able to share their experiences of being a practising doctor. The panel observed high satisfaction with the accessibility of tutors and the possibility of personal contact due to low student numbers, as well as with the support and development opportunities offered through the MEDPRO programme.

A Student Support Handbook lists the available student support at QMUL Malta. A Student Office operates as a one-stop office and provides essential services for students. An Academic and Pastoral Support Unit with a Mental Health Coordinator offers expert, personal and academic support at every stage of studies. The institution makes a considerable effort to ensure support for students with learning difficulties, as well as accessibility for students and staff with disabilities. Students with specific learning difficulties, such as dyslexia, can receive advice, guidance and practical support, including formal educational psychologists' assessments, arranging individual tutorials from specialist dyslexia tutors, and additional time in exams. The panel observed high satisfaction with the work of the Student Office, as well as the availability of pastoral care. The panel commends that the availability of services has been improved in recent years following student feedback and supports the intention to implement regular evaluation of student support services. The panel also identified the need to ensure more gender adjusted/balanced student support to cater for diverse student needs.

The panel learnt about the recruitment process of administrative and support staff, and opportunities for growth, and concluded that the institution makes sufficient efforts to ensure their appropriate qualification and growth. All staff are provided with mandatory training which is essential to their role and are encouraged to undertake job-related and work-relevant interest-related training. QMUL essential training is available at no cost. In addition, QMUL Malta has allocated a budget which allows each member of staff to access paid training each year. The institution should consider increasing the visibility of this lump sum to ensure general awareness of it amongst all staff. Applications for training are made following discussion with the respective line manager, upon completing a staff development questionnaire. The panel learnt about a very supportive attitude and regularly offered opportunities for growth. Needs for growth can be discussed at the annual appraisal meetings. The panel also noted the practice of regular staff engagement in learning activities. When a new staff member joins, regular meetings are held about objectives, progress and support needed. In case of concerns, one-to-one meetings are organised

with the line manager. However, the institution should establish and implement a formal policy and provisions to inform and guide professional development in a more systematic way.

The panel learnt about financial support for students, in the form of fee waivers, based on academic achievements. The panel also noted how the institution has supported students with short-term financial difficulties, however, there is no systemic support for students that may be socioeconomically disadvantaged. The panel underlines that the two categories of scholarships have different purposes: the first type – academic scholarships – has the objective of supporting and encouraging excellence and performance, and therefore should be offered taking into account academic results. The second type – social scholarships – has the role of facilitating the access to, and progress and completion of, higher education studies, and should therefore be offered to students that need them from the socioeconomic background point of view, without taking into account academic performance. The panel would recommend that the institution consider offering more financial support in the form of fee waivers to students coming from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as increasing the visibility of other financial support tools.

The panel also heard about certain difficulties students face during the study period in Malta. Not all students can easily find a place of residence after the first study year when the halls of residence have been guaranteed by the institution. Third country nationals have to go through a cumbersome process to obtain residency permits and health insurance. Although these are out of the institution's control, QMUL Malta could consider putting more effort into at least providing timely information and reminders on procedures. The panel also learnt of the lack of extracurricular and sports activities offered by the QMUL Malta, apart from those organised by the Gozo Society. More volunteering and sports opportunities, including gym, would be appreciated.

Student satisfaction with the resources, administration and student support services has only been evaluated in one isolated instance and, based on the meetings conducted by the panel, the institution plans to implement such a system with regularity.

### **Good Practice Identified**

1. Modern learning infrastructure and resources available onsite in Malta, as well as online;
2. The MEDPRO programme as a successful initiative for student personal and professional development. There is a high appreciation for the way the programme is organised, especially the opportunity to set and discuss personal goals with an experienced mentor.

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR11.** The institution should implement a systematic, regular evaluation process of the overall satisfaction of students with the resources, administration and student support services.

**R11.** The institution could extend the opening hours of buildings used by students.

**R12.** The institution could increase the visibility of the budget available for CPD to ensure general awareness of it amongst all staff.

**R13.** The institution could offer more financial support in the form of fee waivers to students coming from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as increase the visibility of the other financial support tools.

**R14.** The institution could provide more practical and informative support to students when it comes to finding a place of residence, obtaining residence permits and health insurance.

**R15.** The institution could increase the institutional offerings in terms of extracurricular activities and sports.

## **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Standard 8: Information Management

*Information management: entities shall ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.*

### **Main Findings**

QMUL Malta is making use of several information systems in order to manage and record student and staff information. It has been observed that all the information systems which the University provides are hosted, managed and backed up entirely by QMUL.

Another platform which is also used by the admissions team is the SITS, a back-end application (legacy application) which is also used to store student information in conjunction with MySIS.

QReview is another platform being used by QMUL Malta. This information system is used by lecturers to record themselves (if consent is given) while presenting an online session. This recorded session is then manually added to the programme content on QMplus so that students can see it in their own time. This information system was being used prior to the COVID pandemic, but its usage has increased significantly since then.

QMplus is the main information system which students log into to access all resources and support given by the University. QMplus, which is also hosted and managed by QMUL, is developed upon a Moodle instance. Through this online platform, students can access a wide variety of resources, such as online libraries, lecturers' uploaded content, module handbooks, assignments, quizzes, etc. Students also upload their assignments on the QMplus platform which includes a plagiarism detection tool, Turnitin.

During the audit, the panel has observed that not all information is being recorded efficiently through the system. QMUL manual intervention is needed to record attendance. Attendance is first recorded onto an attendance sheet, afterwards the lecturer hands the attendance to the admissions team so that they could manually input it in the system. Furthermore, it was also noticed that there is in place a system which flags students who are not engaging in PBLs and online practicals, but there is no flagging alerting system for students having any difficulties or at risk. Moreover, student support is manually triggered by tutors if this has been identified. Another process which needs manual intervention is timetabling. There have been attempts by the University to find a resolution, but these failed. Attendance is currently being compiled onto an excel sheet by the Student Office and stored on the QMUL server for academics to access during the lecture.

All network traffic in Malta is managed and monitored through the firewalls and intrusion prevention system. All University devices are managed and are logically separated from students' devices.

QMUL Malta provides IT support through various methods: IT support representatives can offer remote support to University students through specific remote support software. Moreover, students can contact IT support directly on a generic email address: servicedesk@qmul.ac.uk.

As part of the learning resources, QMUL offers a wide variety of online libraries for students to access, view or download papers, books etc. Apart from libraries, QMUL offers a system called Talis Aspire which academics can use as an online library.

To ensure a collaborative environment during the pandemic period, the University tried to implement various collaboration platforms, such as Teams, Zoom, Blackboard Collaborate, etc., so that staff, together with students, could resume teaching and learning through online means.

QMUL also makes use of various methods to record information, such as student population, course participation, completion rates and student satisfaction. The panel also observed that such tools are being used to capture different metrics during the academic year which are then used by other teams within the institute to enhance students' experiences within the University.

The panel observed that QMUL is using different systems to carry out different business functions. Moreover, it was also noticed that the University is making use of legacy applications to store and manage student information. These different systems do not necessarily communicate with each other and thus limit administration and management efficiency.

Finally, it was clearly visible that QMUL has a detailed documented retention policy stating for how long teaching, course administration and assessment data should be stored and kept internally. Furthermore, QMUL also makes sure that personal data of staff and students are kept private as per the latest privacy policy which is also available to students and website visitors.

### **Good Practice Identified**

N/A

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR12.** The institution should implement an appropriate solution to record and monitor student attendance online so as to ensure confidentiality, integrity and availability of data are being met. This would also ensure a seamless use of information by management to make informed decisions.

**R16.** The institution could set up an automated alerting/notification system that alerts tutors or student support personnel on the students at risk. Current manual intervention might not be viable if student numbers increase.

**KR13.** The institution should invest in a modern information system solution that integrates the majority of the information systems, so that staff and students could log and work together through a single solution and not separate solutions. Legacy applications such as SITS should be replaced with a modern on cloud solution and thus they could be decommissioned.

## **Conclusion**

Requires improvement to meet Standard

## Standard 9: Public Information

*Public information: entities shall publish information about their activities which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and readily accessible.*

### **Main Findings**

The website of QMUL Malta is a sub-site of QMUL London. The Malta website is updated locally through a specific content management system (CMS). The information which is uploaded is provided by the various teams within the University and all content is formally approved before being published.

The website is responsive, functional and easy to use and navigate (intuitive), the content is clearly displayed, and it has a fresh look which also reflects the branding of QMUL. The website runs through a secure protocol meaning that any communication or data made between the visitor/prospective applicant and the university is kept safe.

It was observed that the QMUL Malta website is not showing all the information which has to be made public as stated by NQAF requirements. The selection criteria information within the website, which is named 'entry requirements', is not clearly and readily accessible to a prospective student. Intended learning outcomes of the courses are also not visible under the MBBS course. Information related to the qualification awarded, including information on EQF /MQF and ECTS / ECVET, is also not displayed to the visitor.

The QMUL Malta website states that its programme is very similar to the London one in terms of content, but information related to the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used is also not visible on the website. Furthermore, it has also been noticed that the website does not show information related to pass marks and even further learning opportunities after students complete their bachelor degree programmes.

QMUL has the chat functionality incorporated into their website. The interesting part is that visitors can chat directly with a student. Thus, prospective applicants can easily speak to students doing a course and gather information, feedback or experiences at the University.

Furthermore, the NCFHE logo is not being shown under the courses which are being regulated by NCFHE.

The panel has also observed that University policies and procedures could be found in a different website with a completely different domain. All the information a prospective applicant needs to know should be made available and easily accessible on the main website.

### **Good Practice Identified**

The online chat functionality available for website visitors, which allows them to chat directly with students and thus the visitor could have a more realistic view of the response given.

## **Recommendations for Improvement**

**MR9.** The institution shall ensure that, within a month of receipt of this report, the following information is made clear, accurate, up to date and readily accessible on the website: the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications available - including level and learning credits, indicative teaching and learning procedures, pass marks, details of student progression and achievement, further learning opportunities available for students.

**KR14.** The University should ensure that the institutional policies are stored in an easy-to-find and intuitive location on the QMUL website, in order to contribute to better visibility to all their intended audiences.

## **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Standard 10: Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes

*Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes: entities shall implement the 'Quality Cycle' by monitoring and periodically reviewing their programmes to ensure their continuing fitness for purpose.*

### **Main Findings**

The MBBS course has a defined and GMC approved content, learning outcomes, course material and e-learning resources, which the QMUL Malta must adhere to. However, the panel learnt that the staff based in Malta and the UK cooperate, and QMUL Malta can contribute to reviewing the programme. Issues on curriculum, based on feedback gathered from students and clinical tutors, are reported to module leads in London. Some teaching sessions can be adapted to the cultural situation of the institution locally, e.g. clinical and communication skills.

The formal programme review procedures include the Annual Programme Review (APR), student evaluation and feedback collection system through anonymized student feedback surveys conducted after each module (JISC surveys), site visits, a system of external examiners, periodic review of QMUL and the external review by GMC, to ensure that the programme delivery in Malta complies to the GMC standards and are of the same quality as in the UK.

APR is the main instrument to ensure continuous process of reflection and action planning with the aim of enhancing the student learning experience. It was conducted on an annual basis until 2020 when it was put on hold due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The panel learnt that this procedure is currently under review and the institution is considering changing it to a bi-annual process with a self-reflection component that practically feeds into action planning.

A system of external examination aims to ensure that procedures and standards of QMUL Malta are identical to London. Every year group has five internal and three external examiners, which review all assessments sat by students in Malta and in London. External examiners can feed into the review of the programme and examinations, if necessary. The Periodic Review of teaching and learning in academic schools and institutes of QMUL occurs on a six-year cycle, and forms part of QMUL's Framework for the Assurance of Academic Standard and Quality. The medical school review was last held in 2017-18, and the next review is planned in 2023-24.

Student feedback provided through the JISC surveys is an important element in the programme monitoring system used to both improve the quality of the course and to compare programme delivery in Malta and UK campuses. However, the panel learnt that the response rate to JISC surveys can get as low as 12%, which was explained by possible survey fatigue and late sending time. The panel also noted that live feedback sessions are organised for first-year students which were especially helpful for the institution with regard to adjusting to the COVID-19 situation and improving online learning. Students have an opportunity to discuss issues at the Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) that meets monthly. Objectives raised from the SSLC meetings, in mentor meetings, and in the JISC surveys are discussed at the Quality Committee and the Medical Education Committee, and appropriate action points are added to the SEAP. These actions are then discussed at future SSLC meetings to ensure that there is a continual feedback loop. The panel

observed appreciation of the SSLC work as the interviewees described it as an effective, transparent and inclusive environment to address issues of concern, and the evidence of changes made was also provided. The panel was satisfied to learn that QMUL Malta plans to elaborate on a Malta-specific SEAP while continuing to contribute to London SEAP. The panel also noted the general openness of the institution to listening to student experience, both through formal and informal channels, and the readiness to quickly address the issues. The panel commends the effectiveness of the student feedback system as it heard of examples of how it had been used to identify and address shortcomings and to improve the student learning experience.

As mentioned under Standard 3, the institution is currently undergoing a process to be recognised by the GMC, and is being reviewed against the Standards and requirements as set out in 'Promoting Excellence: Standards for medical education and training' by GMC. The process takes the form of an annual review, and concerns are addressed through the medical school annual return (MSAR).

The cooperation with the Ministry for Health, Maltese hospitals and primary health care institutions providing GPs supervising clinical placement seems well established, and the contacts are maintained on a regular basis. The panel notes the establishment of Associate Deans positions in every hospital that improved the links between QMUL Malta and the clinical administration, as well as the classes of medical Maltese language, as of academic year 2020/21. Both improvements are in accordance with the GMC recommendation and the expectations of local stakeholders. Although the panel heard about close and regular cooperation with the local stakeholders, it also noted that there is no formal, regular feedback mechanism.

### **Good Practice Identified**

N/A

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

**KR15.** The institution should explore ways to improve student survey response rate.

**KR16.** The institution should establish a formal, regular mechanism for collecting feedback from external stakeholders.

### **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Standard 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance

*Cyclical external quality assurance: Entities should undergo an external quality assurance audit by, or with the approval of, the NCFHE on a cyclical basis, according to the NCFHE guidelines, once every five years.*

### **Main Findings**

The audit of QMUL Malta was conducted by the panel nominated by NCFHE and agreed to by the institution. The audit visit took place from 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020 in an online setting (via Microsoft Teams), based on an agenda drafted and agreed to jointly by the institution, audit panel and NCFHE. During the audit, the panel confirmed the information provided by the institution in the self-assessment documentation and explored in meetings the perceptions of the internal and external stakeholders; based on these main aspects, the panel assessed the compliance of the institution with NQAF and NCFHE Standards.

The panel notes the following aspects from the audit process:

Firstly, it took NCFHE and the panel multiple attempts and escalations for the institution to produce a self-assessment report that meets the features defined in the NCFHE Manual and include:

1. an account of what the provider is currently doing to meet the expectations, in terms of the existing systems and procedures for internal quality assurance;
2. an assessment of how effective these practices and procedures are in ensuring that the provider is fully compliant with the Standards;
3. an outline of proposals for further developments to address any perceived gaps in procedures and to enhance the quality and standards of academic provision and the student experience.

After two separate requests from NCFHE and the panel, the institution was still only submitting isolated documents and accompanying letters, with no self-analytical presentation of the University's activities against the NQAF and NCFHE Standards. The panel was concerned that such a situation could NOT set the audit up for success and was disappointed to note that the institution could not understand the gravity of the matter, which had almost led to the cancelling (or postponing) of the audit itself. On the panel's third request, the situation was remedied, at the cost of extended deadlines that approached dangerously close to the audit days, leading to substantial efforts from all those involved, including late reading of documentation and delays in requesting and receiving supplementary documents, as well as unfortunate last-minute changes in the audit agenda.

The same lengthy process and the apparent lack of understanding by the institution of the panel requests was present in how QMUL Malta approached the audit agenda; for example, in spite of repeated requests that each meeting not exceed more than 6-8 attendees, updated versions of the agenda continued to show even 20+ staff members of QMUL in one session, which were only reduced at the very last moment. Similarly, in spite of specific panel requests that certain

individuals be removed from some meetings (for reasons the panel made very clear in regard to dialogue dynamics, repetition and domination), this was not attended to, which has impacted on the success of some lines of questioning.

Lastly, the panel wonders if the institution was seriously lacking in attention to detail when preparing its submissions for the audit exercise, or QMUL has intentionally not taken the audit process seriously; not only that all the documents produced in preparation for the audit (SAR, letters, organisation structures, etc.) were rather careless and still included internal comments and side notes, and the other annexes that were presumably in effect at the institution were severely outdated (Quality Assurance Handbook from the 2013-2014 academic year, QMUL Strategic Plan from 2014-2019), but also that not all documents requested by the panel were provided despite multiple requests (updated version of the Quality Assurance Handbook).

These were, therefore, challenges of the audit process which the panel has done its best to overcome, at the cost of extended working hours and efforts, all while trying to reduce the understandable tension this type of exercise usually brings, in order to make it a generally positive and constructive experience for the institution.

In spite of these challenges, we would like to thank all the interviewees that took part in the meetings during the audit for the openness and honesty in the dialogue with the panel; this has supported us tremendously in producing a well-grounded and realistic report that will eventually support the institution in its operations.

## **Conclusion**

Meets Standard

## Response by the Provider

---

### Preamble

Queen Mary Malta (QM Malta) would like to thank the NCFHE and the members of the peer review panel for their detailed analysis and feedback of our documentation. The audit provided a fundamental opportunity for QM Malta to identify, reflect and improve on all areas of quality assurance and business processes. With the student experience being core to Queen Mary Malta values, we continually strive to enhance processes and procedures.

Following the NCFHE feedback, please find below responses to all recommendations set and actions carried out by Queen Mary Malta.

### Response to Key Recommendations and Recommendations Made by the Peer Review Panel

Action plan		
Recommendations	Actions to be taken to address the recommendations	Date for completion
Standard 1:		
KR1 - The institution should revisit the regulatory framework for QA in order to avoid duplication, contradiction and general confusion of internal stakeholders.	Queen Mary has an Education Manual which details the QA regulatory framework. This can be found via: <a href="http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/docs/quality-assurance/Education-Manual-2020-21.pdf">http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/docs/quality-assurance/Education-Manual-2020-21.pdf</a>	Complete
KR2 - The institution should ensure clarity in the responsibilities of different organisational units as well as those of institutional leadership, individual staff members and students with respect to quality assurance at QMUL Malta, in particular in relation to tools such as quality visits to local education partners or the peer observation	The School is currently in the process of recruiting a Senior Lecturer in Medical Education (Lead for Quality Assurance and Faculty Development). The incumbent will contribute to the administration of key university activities, specifically the overall leadership and monitoring of the QA of teaching managed and delivered by QMUL Malta and relevant local education partners.	September 2021

of teaching, which now lack accountability and continuity.		
<p>KR3 - The institution should reconsider the arrangements for quality assurance at QMUL Malta so that the campus benefits from appropriate human and financial resources to ensure their successful implementation.</p>	<p>The School has identified the requirement for additional quality assurance support within QMUL Malta. As a result, we are recruiting for an Academic QA Lead (as noted in KR2) and have appointed a Quality Assurance Manager within the Professional Services team. These two roles will work closely together to enhance processes and implementation of QA structures.</p>	Complete
<p>KR4 - The University should improve the institutional efforts to engage the external stakeholders in quality assurance and design fit for purpose communication channels accompanied by an effective closing of the quality feedback loop.</p>	<p>The School has an Associate Deans Committee which sits monthly to discuss quality assurance and is a forum for feedback from all Learning Education Providers (LEPs). This committee has representation from all LEPs and is the primary mechanism for feedback to the School.</p> <p>Additionally, the School holds annual quality site visits and reports with each LEP and includes discussions and feedback sessions with students, Clinical Tutors, Module Leads, Associate Deans and Healthcare Senior Management.</p> <p>Associate Deans are active participants in the Student and Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) and receive JISC module feedback to allow them to have input to quality assurance developments and closing the feedback loop.</p>	Complete
<p>R1 - The institution could clarify the relationship between QMUL London and QMUL Malta in regard to the applicable QA framework.</p>	<p>The School's Quality Assurance structure will be developed in line with the response provided in KR2.</p>	December 2021
<p>R2 - The institution could ensure that the QMUL policy framework defines the relationship between research and learning and teaching.</p>	<p>The School's policy framework will be developed in line with the response provided in KR2. This will be mapped to the School of Medicine and Dentistry education and research strategy.</p>	December 2021
<p>R3 - The institution could ensure that QMUL Malta has a direct impact and opportunity to influence QMUL London policy</p>	<p>The Dean for Education is the Institute Director of IHSE. As part of this remit, the Director has a seat on senior level committees and boards where QM policies and governance structures are approved.</p> <p>The School has the same staffing structure as all QM Institutes within London and has the same representation and influence within the School of Medicine and Dentistry.</p>	Complete

documents to reflect the challenges and needs specific to the QMUL Malta campus.	Queen Mary University has multiple campuses, therefore, policy documents are developed centrally for all entities to adhere to.	
Standard 2:		
<p>KR5 -</p> <p>The institution should assess the efficiency, effectiveness and fitness for purpose of the task division and governance remit between QMUL Malta and its parent institution and take remedial actions as the Malta campus is maturing.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure ongoing compliance in regard to the annual accounts, clear timescales for the delivery of the 2020/21 audit to be agreed.</li> <li>2. For audits from 2021/22, a review of the audit provider to ensure that the provider can deliver the audit for the expanding entity.</li> <li>3. Appoint new role based in Malta to cover Finance</li> <li>4. Review of current financial processes and financial system for the QMUL Malta Subsidiary</li> <li>5. Implement changes agreed from the financial processes and financial systems review</li> </ol>	<p>1. Oct-21</p> <p>2. Dec-21</p> <p>3. Oct-21</p> <p>4. Dec-21</p> <p>5. Jun-22</p>
<p>KR6 -</p> <p>The institution should ensure a more comprehensive budgeting approach considering financial performance and financial position, in addition to cash flows and capex spend, especially during periods of vulnerability, such as the start-up phase of the projects undertaken by the company.</p>	<p>Approach to financial management as follows: (in line with QMUL London processes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management accounts produced monthly for QMUL Malta Ltd and distributed to the Deputy Dean for Education and Operations Director in Malta</li> <li>• Meetings held monthly with the above to review the financial position, performance, etc. (Formally implemented May-21)</li> <li>• Subsidiary performance monitored and reviewed monthly by QMUL London</li> <li>• Annual budgets and interim forecast produced for QMUL Malta, which are reviewed and approved by both QMUL Malta and QMUL London</li> <li>• Subsidiary's performance reviewed annually by Finance and Investment Committee to understand and review performance against the original business case.</li> <li>• Financial controls and processes are in place to enable payment of invoices, collection of debts, submission of VAT returns and completion of annual company returns timely and within statutory timescales (with the exception of the annual statutory accounts which is being addressed)</li> </ul>	Complete
<p>R4 -</p> <p>The institution could reflect the significant dues by the company to the Queen Mary University of London as a capital contribution in the financial statements of the company, thus consolidating and sanitizing the net equity position of the company in the medium term.</p>	<p>The option of converting the current amounts due by QMUL Malta Ltd to QMUL London Ltd into share capital has been discussed and will be reviewed further, but may not be implemented as this is not in line with how other subsidiaries are managed by QMUL London.</p> <p>The recoverability of this balance is reviewed each year by the QMUL London auditors (Deloitte) to ensure that the subsidiary is on track to pay this back in line with the revised business case.</p>	Dec 2021
Standard 3:		
<p>KR7 -</p>	<p>This is considered a priority and further meetings, both with the Deputy Prime Minister (Minister for Health) and</p>	<p>November 2021</p>

<p>The University should increase the institutional effort towards negotiations with the Malta Medical Council (MMC), especially considering that some students might choose to carry out their Medical Foundation Training in Malta, and hence would need to be registered with the MMC.</p>	<p>the Permanent Secretary for Health and Maltese Medical Council, are being organised.</p> <p>However, the Foundation Programme Malta is the same as the UK Foundation Programme and, as such, students holding a GMC accredited degree can apply.</p> <p><a href="http://fpmalta.com/page/view/28">http://fpmalta.com/page/view/28</a></p> <p>“Applications will also be considered from candidates qualified with a degree in Medicine and Surgery from the University of Malta or any other basic medical qualification First Degree at MQF Level 7 of five years or more from an accredited medical school in an EU Member State or in the United Kingdom as per Part 1 (a) of the Second Schedule of the Health Care Professions Act (Cap. 464 of the Laws of Malta) by not earlier than 1st January, 2017, provided that such candidates must obtain the said qualification prior to engagement. “</p> <p><a href="http://fpmalta.com/page/view/1578392943">http://fpmalta.com/page/view/1578392943</a></p>	
<p>R5 - The institution could formally establish and document the involvement of external stakeholders, including local potential contributors, in the identification of future healthcare requirements in terms of demand and expertise, training needs, programme design and reviews.</p>	<p>The School holds regular meetings with Learning Education Providers and the Government of Malta. The Dean for Education sits on the Joint Committee panel and boards to ensure engagement with external stakeholders.</p> <p>Furthermore, the School is in daily communications with local clinicians who provide information regarding future healthcare opportunities. Utilising this, for the upcoming academic year, we are developing new clinical placements in the refugee centre to learn about all aspects of migrant healthcare.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>R6 - The institution could ensure that students are privy to all the necessary information with regard to clinical placement challenges, mitigation measures which are being taken, and any possible effects on their progression. Communication must be transparent and use various channels to ensure that all students are reached.</p>	<p>The School uses a variety of platforms such as email, QMPlus, Student and Staff Liaison Committee, lectures and drop-in sessions to ensure all students are kept abreast of all necessary information.</p> <p>This academic year, the School produced an ‘Action Plan’ document for students, updated throughout the pandemic by Heads of Year and Module Leads, to log any components of the course that were not delivered – due to COVID-19 - and to plan timelines for remediation. All undelivered outcomes were highlighted until remediation is planned and delivered. To provide clarity and continued open communication with students, this action plan has been shared to inform them of missed components of the course and how these have been remediated.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>Standard 4:</p>		

<p>KR8 - The institution should ensure the timely communication of feedback and assessment results to students in order to better allow students to monitor and adjust their own learning needs.</p>	<p>Students are advised that summative assessment results during term time are released following the meeting of the academic review group, and results release dates for end of year exams are published in the Assessment and Progression Handbook. Feedback for those exams are released on the same day as results or within one week. For coursework we aim to have work marked within 15 working days, allowing for an additional 10 days for moderation.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>KR9 - The institution should allow for the possibility of appealing academic judgements concerning allocation of marks in order to guarantee that students are given the opportunity to have assessments re-marked by an independent examiner in the spirit of upholding fairness and impartiality.</p>	<p>Students always have the right to appeal within 14 days of results being published, as stipulated in the academic regulations. Students cannot appeal on the grounds of academic judgement, but a second academic will always review the work and provide additional feedback, if required. The moderation process looks to ensure marking consistency and fairness as per the academic revaluations.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>R7 - The institution could consider having set timelines integrated in the MBBS Assessment and Progression Handbook for giving feedback on assessments to students in order to ensure that the intended benefits of feedback that allow students to monitor and adjust their own learning needs, are being met.</p>	<p>The School will add this to the Assessment and Progression Handbook before the new academic year commences.</p>	<p>August 2021</p>
<p>Standard 5:</p>		
<p>R8 - The institution could implement a systematic, regular evaluation process of the overall satisfaction of students with the recruitment and admission processes.</p>	<p>The School will liaise with the London Admissions team to explore establishing a survey.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

R9 - The institution could increase the visibility of RPL opportunities in the recruitment and admission process to ensure that these are used by individuals fulfilling necessary requirements.	The School has improved the navigation on the website to make this information readily accessible.	Complete
Standard 6:		
KR10 - The institution should increase the research profile of the teaching staff in Malta in a way that better informs the teaching practice.	The School is working to increase the research profile of teaching staff and this will be included in the new School of Medicine and Dentistry education strategy.	July 2022
R10 - The institution could set up a systematic form of collecting all staff satisfaction with their employment conditions and implement this to inform improvement.	The School is in the process of recruiting an HR Advisor who will have responsibility for setting up a staff satisfaction survey.	September 2021
Standard 7:		
KR11 - The institution should implement a systematic, regular evaluation process of the overall satisfaction of students with the resources, administration and student support services.	The School runs student surveys in the areas of student support and administration. These are used as feedback mechanisms to enhance services provided by the School. For the 2021/22 academic year, we are introducing QR codes for departments allowing students the opportunity to provide regular feedback throughout their studies.  Additionally, termly student and staff liaison committees are held, whereby students have the opportunity to provide feedback on all curriculum, quality and operations areas.	Complete
R11 - The institution could extend the opening hours of buildings used by students.	The opening hours of the Medical School were reduced throughout the 2020/21 academic year in order to adhere to Malta Public Health regulations. The usual building opening hours are 24 hours a day.	Complete
R12 - The institution could increase the visibility of the budget available for CPD to ensure general awareness of it amongst all staff.	CPD is discussed within staff appraisals. Line managers are responsible for discussing CPD opportunities and then obtaining authorisation for courses. Please see MR7 for current CPD statistics.	Complete
R13 -	The Board agreed this is a priority and discussions are being taken forward to explore options.	N/A

<p>The institution could offer more financial support in the form of fee waivers to students coming from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as increase the visibility of the other financial support tools.</p>		
<p>R14 - The institution could provide more practical and informative support to students when it comes to finding a place of residence, obtaining residence permits and health insurance.</p>	<p>Students receive support during their Induction week. The School provides each student with a welcome pack and hosts a session to explain obtaining residence permits, health insurance and completing required documentation. We will continue to develop the welcome pack and support services to aid the students' transition.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>R15 - The University could increase the institutional offerings in terms of extracurricular activities and sports.</p>	<p>The School has progressed with establishing extracurricular activities for students and staff, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yoga</li> <li>- Art</li> <li>- Mindfulness</li> </ul> <p>We are looking to add to this portfolio as opportunities arise, such as the installation of a kitchen which will allow for cooking classes to be established.</p> <p>A Student Union is in the process of being implemented which will allow for students to link with other local Student Unions and provide funding opportunities for extracurricular activities.</p> <p>The Student Association (which is run by students) organises sports activities based on students' interest and uptake.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>Standard 8:</p>		
<p>KR12 - The institution should implement an appropriate solution to record and monitor student attendance online so as to ensure confidentiality, integrity and availability of data are being met. This would also ensure a seamless use of information by</p>	<p>The School has an electronic room registration system for monitoring student attendance with face-to-face teaching which feeds into SITS. Due to the curriculum being delivered mostly online during the 2020/21 academic year, student attendance monitoring has been problematic and discussions are being held within QM to improve this in future.</p>	<p>July 2022</p>

management to make informed decisions.		
KR13 - The institution should invest in a modern information system solution that integrates the majority of the information systems so that staff and students could log and work together through a single solution and not separate solutions. Legacy applications such as SITS should be replaced with a modern on cloud solution and thus they could be decommissioned.	The School uses QM systems, with SITS being the core student records management database. As QM has circa 28,000 students, a new system would be a considerable investment which there are no current plans for.	N/A
R16 - The institution could set up an automated alerting/notification system that alerts tutors or student support personnel on the students at risk. Current manual intervention might not be viable if student numbers increase.	The School uses an electronic platform called 'Co-Tutor' which is Queen Mary's online Academic Advising management system. This system is used to log and monitor communications between tutors and students, with an emphasis on students at risk or having concerns. Automatic alerts are sent to tutors and students when new data is input and both can access this data.	Complete
Standard 9:		
KR14 - The University should ensure that the institutional policies are stored in an easy-to-find and intuitive location on the QMUL website, in order to contribute to better visibility to all their intended audiences.	The School has updated the website to include the full list of Queen Mary policies – this can be found via the following link: <a href="https://www.qmul.ac.uk/about/foi/procedures/">https://www.qmul.ac.uk/about/foi/procedures/</a>	Complete
Standard 10:		
KR15 - The institution should explore the ways to improve student survey response rate.	The School currently uses JISC for formal module feedback. We run several campaigns in order to promote the surveys in order to increase response rates. For the next academic year, the School is piloting the introduction of QR codes, to allow for ease of accessibility to complete surveys and increase response rates.	Complete

<p>KR16 - The institution should establish a formal, regular mechanism for collecting feedback from external stakeholders.</p>	<p>The School holds annual quality site visits with each LEP which includes discussions and feedback sessions with students, Clinical Tutors, Module Leads, Associate Deans and Healthcare Senior Management.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
--	---	-----------------

## Response to Mandatory Recommendations made by the Peer Review Panel

Mandatory recommendations	Actions to be taken to address the recommendation	Date for completion
<p>MR1 - The institution shall ensure that, before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year, an updated QA Handbook is in place to guide the policy, processes and procedures for quality assurance at QMUL Malta, specifically determining the roles and responsibilities of local staff in their implementation of and response to the requirements determined by the NQAF and NCFHE standards.</p>	<p>Queen Mary has an Education Manual which details the QA regulatory framework. This can be found via: <a href="http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/docs/quality-assurance/Education-Manual-2020-21.pdf">http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/docs/quality-assurance/Education-Manual-2020-21.pdf</a></p> <p>Once the School has recruited the Senior Lecturer in Medical Education (Lead for Quality Assurance and Faculty Development), they will be implementing an appendix which is specific to Malta.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p>MR2 - The institution shall develop, before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year, a Student Handbook as a collection of policies made available to students during induction to support their onboarding process and have them introduced to their rights, obligations and</p>	<p>All policies are available on each page of the QM learning platform (QMPlus) and students are directed to them within the Induction week. To enhance transparency, the Governance Manager of the School of Medicine and Dentistry is compiling two documents – a MBBS Student Handbook and an Assessment and Progression Handbook. These will be displayed on QMPlus and students will have full access to these.</p>	<p>September 2021</p>

general expectations while at the institution.		
MR3 - The institution shall identify clearly, no later than one year after publication of this report, the strategic priorities concerning QMUL in Malta or, as applicable, define specific KPIs to measure the contribution QMUL Malta is expected to make to a more general strategy; and clarify the associated monitoring and reporting methodologies to identify who reports on the progress towards the achievement of the Malta campus priorities and how often this reporting is conducted.	We are currently developing the next iteration of the School of Medicine and Dentistry education strategy with KPIs. This will represent a cogent research strategy with appropriate education opportunities. The School has representation on the panel, with two members of QM Malta staff involved, who will ensure specific KPIs measure the contribution of QMUL Malta.	June 2022
MR4 - Queen Mary University of London - Malta Limited and its parent company shall undertake all the necessary managerial and financial steps to ensure full compliance with laws and regulations, especially those relating to financial reporting and taxes, before the end of the current academic year.	Steps have been taken to expedite the finalisation of the outstanding annual accounts. The 2018/19 accounts have been finalised and are in the process of being submitted. The completion of the 2019/20 accounts are being prioritised by QMUL and the auditors. All supporting documentation and questions have been provided to the auditors to date, to enable them to complete the audits. These are currently being reviewed, so barring any further requests, the accounts should be finalised as soon as possible. A request has been made to the auditors to commit to a timeline. They have not been willing to do so, but have committed to prioritising the finalisation of the accounts. A detailed update is provided separately detailing steps taken.	Target date for accounts to be finalised by the auditors - mid July 21  Signing and submission to then be completed ASAP to enable the subsidiary to be fully compliant
MR5 - The institution shall ensure that, within a month of publication of this report, its institutional website and any documentation concerning student enrolment reflect, in a	The School is currently in liaison with the MMC. Until these are agreed, for clarity, the website has been updated to note that the MBBS programme is a GMC recognised degree and not accredited by the MMC.	Complete  Discussions with MMC to be held throughout Academic Year 2021/22

transparent manner, the current status of the students in relation to the MMC registration and their ability to practice the medical profession.		
MR6 - The institution shall ensure that, within a month of publication of this report, the transcript of certificate of achievement provided by QMUL includes a reference to achieved learning outcomes as stipulated in the NQAF.	The School is in discussions with Academic Registry to implement this. As transcripts are generated by the student records system, this will need amending to include a reference to achieved learning outcomes. As the first cohort of students graduate in July 2022, this allows time for the integration of this requirement.	July 2022
MR7 - The institution shall develop, formally adopt and implement a system for the continuous professional development of all staff before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year.	<p>The School encourages and advertises continuous professional development to all staff. Currently all academic staff have either completed or are undertaking the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) and are completing applications for the Higher Education Authority.</p> <p>QM has a suite of internal courses that all staff are encouraged to attend in order to enhance their skills and provide development opportunities.</p> <p>With the implementation of an appraisal system (MR8), the personal appraisal and development plan identifies the CPD requirements for each individual and will formalise this process.</p>	Complete
MR8 - The institution shall develop, formally adopt and implement a system for the all-staff performance review before the beginning of the 2021/2022 academic year.	<p>The School has implemented a formal appraisal system for all staff. The appraisals will be specific for Professional Services and Academic teams. Details and guidance can be found via the following links:</p> <p><a href="http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/procedures/appraisal/">http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/procedures/appraisal/</a></p> <p><a href="http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/media/hr/docs/working-at-qm/policiesprocedures/appraisalandpromotion/Guidance-appraisal---Operational-Professional-and-Technical.pdf">http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/media/hr/docs/working-at-qm/policiesprocedures/appraisalandpromotion/Guidance-appraisal---Operational-Professional-and-Technical.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/media/hr/docs/working-at-qm/policiesprocedures/appraisalandpromotion/Guidance-appraisal---academicv4.pdf">http://hr.qmul.ac.uk/media/hr/docs/working-at-qm/policiesprocedures/appraisalandpromotion/Guidance-appraisal---academicv4.pdf</a></p>	Complete
MR9 - The institution shall ensure that, within a month of receipt of this report, the following information is made clear, accurate, up to date and readily accessible on the	<p>The website has been updated with the information required, excluding the details of student progression and achievement. We will contact the panel separately for further information. The website can be accessed by the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://www.qmul.ac.uk/malta/programme-details/teaching-and-learning-/">https://www.qmul.ac.uk/malta/programme-details/teaching-and-learning-/</a></p>	Complete

website: the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications available - including level and learning credits, indicative teaching and learning procedures, pass marks, details of student progression and achievement, and further learning opportunities available for students.		
---	--	--

## Annexes

---

### Annex 1: Review Panel Bio Notes

In the setting up of the review panel for Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry (University), the NCFHE sought to maintain a high degree of diligence in the process of selection of the members of the peer review panel. The panel sought to be composed of specialists in quality assurance to act as external peers, professionals and practitioners of quality assurance frameworks, as well as students who, prior to the audits, attended professional Training Seminars organised by the NCFHE.

The following bio notes present the profiles of the members of the peer review panel. The bio notes are correct as at the time the QA audit was carried out, from 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

#### **Chair of Review Panel:**

Ms Anca Prisacariu holds a PhD in Educational Sciences from the University of Bucharest, Romania and was a Research Fellow within the Institute of Behavioural Sciences at the University of Helsinki, Finland. Her research preoccupations are around the quality assurance of higher education, focusing on enhancement-led systems and processes.

Apart from her studies, she has broad working experience with international organisations for higher education and acts as expert for different national quality assurance agencies across Europe and outside of it. From these positions, she has been part of numerous review panels at study programme, institutional and quality assurance agency level. Her consultancy roles in different countries have given Anca extensive experience and expertise in quality assurance, regulation, and the development and review of Standards frameworks.

Her activity as Advisor to the Minister of Education in Romania has increased her experience in formulating, reviewing and implementing policies on higher education at the national level. Also, her background in the student movement adds to her expertise topics like the Bologna Process, student-centred learning, equity, equality and the social dimension of higher education, student engagement, and representation.

Her positions as Head of Quality Assurance at Wintec Saudi Arabia and, subsequently, the African Leadership University in Mauritius, added to Anca's background expertise in vocational education and training, as well as in the development of internal quality management frameworks, coordination of the policy making and revision, monitoring and performance management of the strategic and operational plans, and ensuring institutional compliance in external accountability processes.

**Peer Reviewers:**

Ms Anita Līce is a Manager of Education and Employment Field at the Employers' Confederation of Latvia (LDDK) where she has been working since 2010. She also has worked as an Adviser to the Minister of Education, a Vice-chairperson of the European Students' Union (ESU), and a Senior Officer at the Ministry of Education and Science of Latvia. She holds a Doctoral degree in Education Management (Dr. sc. admin.) from the University of Latvia, where she also has obtained a Bachelor's degree in Mathematics and a Master's degree in Educational Sciences. In the area of quality assurance of higher education, Anita has experience as a peer reviewer in Latvia, Ireland, Portugal and Turkey. She has contributed with research to the European Quality Assurance Forum and the Journal of the European Higher Education Area. In 2019, she was elected as a chair of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Board of the Higher Education Quality Agency in Latvia. She has been a member of the Register Committee of the European Quality Assurance Register since 2014, where she held a position of vice-chair for two years.

Ms Veronica Montebello is a registered dental hygienist by profession who worked in the public and private sectors. Later, she moved to the Ministry for Health where she held the position of Director designate at the Department of Programme Implementation and where she currently holds a position of Senior Allied Health Practitioner at the Directorate Allied Health Care Services. She has a degree in Health Sciences, a Masters in Blended and Online Education (Edinburgh) and is pursuing a Doctoral degree. She is a Fellow with the Higher Education Academy UK, has published a number of research articles in peer reviewed journals, and developed the Competence Assessment Framework for Allied Health Professionals in Malta. Veronica holds a post of Visiting Senior Lecturer at the University of Malta, lecturing and supervising students at both the Faculty of Health Science and the Faculty of Dental Surgery. She is involved in the development, delivery and evaluation of a number of online modules at the University of Malta. She was also involved with MCAST in the capacity of professional advisor in RPL of Health Care professionals and in the development of a number of health care educational programmes delivered by MCAST and commissioned by MFH.

Veronica has completed the NCFHE Peer Expert Review Training and the CPD Award in QA for Further and Higher Education, and has acted as External Peer Reviewer, Chairperson of QA audits, External Evaluator of National Qualifications, and Member of Evaluation panel of University status.

**Student Peer Reviewer:**

Mr Christian Sammut works as a Head of IT with a Maltese-based online gaming company. Previously, he worked as Senior Systems Administrator within the Ministry of Education and Employment in the Government of Malta. He has broad experience in the IT sector within the public and the private sectors. Christian holds a Diploma in Industrial Electronics and Computer Engineering, BTEC Diploma in Computer and Information Systems, a Higher National Diploma in Computing and Systems Development, a BSc Hons in Information Technology, and a Master's degree in Business Administration. Christian has successfully achieved several other IT related certifications, such as MCSA (Microsoft Certified System Administrator), CompTIA Network+, APMG ITIL Foundation, ISTQB-ISEB Certified Tester Foundation, and many more.

## Annex 2: Agenda of the On-site Visit

### QA Audit Agenda: Barts

**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020

**Venue:** Barts, Gozo

#### Day 1

08.30 – 09.00 NCFHE representatives arrive at Barts

09.00 – 09.30 Welcome by Deputy Dean for Education and Director of Operations

Prof Catherine Molyneux, Deputy Dean (QMUL Malta)  
Fiona Wilson, Director of Operations (QMUL Malta)

09.30 – 11.00 Meeting with Senior Administration – Deputy Dean for Education and Director of Operations

Prof Anthony Warrens, Dean (QMUL London)  
Prof Catherine Molyneux, Deputy Dean  
Fiona Wilson, Director of Operations

11.00 – 11.30 Panel discussion

11.30 – 12.30 Meeting with Medical Education Committee / Curriculum Operations / Managers (Phase 1 & 2)

Prof Anthony Warrens, Dean  
Phase 2 Curriculum Operations Manager (QMUL Malta)  
Phase 1 Curriculum Operations Manager (QMUL Malta)  
Deputy Dean for Education, London (QMUL London)  
Governance Manager (QMUL London)  
Senior Lecturer (Head of Assessment) – QMUL London  
Head of Phase 1, London (QMUL London)  
Professor of Medical Education (QMUL London)  
Head of Year 4 (QMUL Malta)  
Senior Associate Dean (QMUL Malta)  
Head of Year 1, Malta (QMUL Malta)  
Head of Phase 1, Malta (QMUL Malta)  
Anatomy Lead, Malta (QMUL Malta)  
Head of Clinical Skills (QMUL Malta)

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch break

- 13.30 – 15.00 Meeting with the Board of QMUL Malta Ltd
- Prof Anthony Warrens (QMUL Malta)  
 Dr Robert Bennett, Chief Operating Officer (QMUL London)  
 Jonathan Morgan, Registrar & Secretary (QMUL London)  
 Richard Stenning, Senior Finance Partner (QMUL London)  
 Marissa Harris, Faculty Strategic Hr Partner (QMUL London)  
 Fiona Wilson, Director of Operations (QMUL Malta)
- 15.00 – 15.30 Panel discussion
- 15.30 – 16.30 Meeting with Medical Education Quality Enhancement Committee
- Prof Catherine Molyneux (QMUL Malta)  
 Head of Quality (QMUL London)  
 Head of Assessment, Head of SSCs (QMUL London)  
 Deputy Head of SSCs (QMUL Malta)  
 Professor of Medical Education (QMUL London)  
 Head of Academic and Pastoral Support (QMUL Malta)
- 16.30 – 17.00 Panel discussion and conclusion of day 1

## **Day 2**

- 08.30 – 09.00 NCFHE representatives arrive at Barts
- 09.00 – 09.15 Meeting with Facilitator
- 9.15 - 10.45 Meeting with students (Years 1 to 4)
- 10.45 – 11.15 Panel discussion
- 11.15 – 12.00 Meeting with Business Development Manager and Marketing and Student Recruitment Manager
- 12.00 – 13.00 Lunch break
- 13.00 – 14.30 Meeting with Lecturers
- Lecturers in BMS (QMUL Malta)  
 Head of Clinical Skills (QMUL Malta)  
 Senior Lecturer in BMS Head of Anatomy (QMUL Malta)  
 Senior Lecturer, Head of Phase 1 and Year 2 (QMUL Malta)  
 Senior Lecturer, Head of Year 1, Deputy Head of SSCs (QMUL Malta)  
 Senior Lecturer Clinical Anatomy (QMUL Malta)  
 Lecturer and Head of Clinical Communication Skills (QMUL Malta)  
 Clinical Lecturers:  
 Associate Dean  
 Module Lead for CR3  
 Deputy Head of Year 4 and Module Lead for HD4  
 Module Lead for MET3b  
 Associate Dean of Karin Grech Hospital
- 14.30 – 15.00 Panel discussion

- 15.00 – 16.00 Meeting with student representatives (from Junior and Senior Student-Staff Liaison Committees, Years 2 to 4)
- 16.00 – 16.30 Panel discussion
- 16.30 – 17.30 Meeting with external shareholders
- Malta Enterprise  
Ministry of Health  
General Medical Council  
Steward Health Care Malta
- 17.30 – 18.00 Panel discussion and conclusion of day 2

### **Day 3**

- 08.30 – 09.00 NCFHE representatives arrive at Barts
- 09.00 – 09.15 Meeting with Facilitator
- 09.15 – 10.45 Meeting with Student Pastoral Support Committee and Student Academic Support Group
- Head of Academic & Pastoral Support (SAPS) – QMUL Malta  
Mental Health Coordinator (QMUL Malta)  
Deputy Head of SAPS (QMUL Malta)  
Senior tutor Year 1 (QMUL Malta)  
Senior tutor Year 2 (QMUL Malta)  
Senior tutor Year 3 (QMUL Malta)  
Senior tutor Year 4 (QMUL Malta)  
Lead of MedPro Malta (QMUL Malta)  
Student Relationship Manager (QMUL Malta)
- 10.45 – 11.15 Panel discussion
- 11.15 – 12.00 Meeting with Library and Learning Resources Administrator, and Facilities and Resources Manager
- Library and Education Resources Administrator (QMUL Malta)  
Facilities and Resources Manager (QMUL Malta)  
Faculty Liaison Librarian (QMUL London)  
University Librarian (QMUL London)  
Head of Operations (QMUL London)  
Technical Manager (Authorising Engineer) – (QMUL London)  
Head of Networks (QMUL London)
- 12.00 – 13.00 Working lunch
- 13.00 – 16.30 Internal panel working session
- 16.30 – 17.00 Presentation of initial findings
- Prof Anthony Warrens  
Prof Catherine Molyneux