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

External Quality Assurance
Audit Report

LEAD Training

Services

Carried out between

9th and 10th December 2020

Table of Contents

Abbreviations List

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ESG	European Higher Education Area
EQA/QA audit	External Quality Assurance Audit
EQAVET	European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
LTS	LEAD Training Services
MQF	Malta Qualifications Framework
NCFHE	National Commission for Further and Higher Education
NQAF	National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education
QA	Quality Assurance
QAM	Quality Assurance Manual
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SAR	Self-Assessment Report

Executive Summary

Institutional Background

LEAD Training Services (LTS) is licensed as a Further Education Institution (License number: 2013-FM1-021) by The National Commission for Further and Higher Education.

LTS was established in 2011, and at the time focused on delivering one-day seminars and conferences. In 2012, LTS changed its operations, embarked on obtaining a licence with NCFHE as a Further and Higher Educational Institution and received accreditation of its home-grown training programmes. The main objectives of LTS is to provide training services and updated continued professional development courses on current and relevant topics which are essential for NGOs, government and private companies or are emerging topics from local and EU directives and legislations. LTS also offers customised courses to support and assist various companies and institutions. Training programmes are developed in response to companies who are looking to invest in their employees by enhancing their staff's knowledge and skills. The Institution's mission statement as highlighted in the SAR presented to the panel is:

"LEAD Training Services is committed to providing professional, effective and practical training services to people within business organisations, government and NGOs, with the aim of adding tangible value to the quality of their work and contributing to the professional development of their members of staff."

LTS offices are located in the Tower Business Centre in Swatar, however, LTS makes use of various approved training centres, generally located in central areas.

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 onsite audit visit. The panel was responsible for reaching conclusions on Standards 1 and 3-11. As outlined in the External Quality 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.

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 LTS meets Standards 2, 3, 6, 7, 9 and 11, requires improvement for Standards 1, 4, 5, 8 and 10. The recommendations in the report are meant to improve the standards already in place and to enhance good practice.

The panel made seven mandatory recommendations to be implemented within six months of publication of this report. They also made 13 key recommendations to be implemented within 12 months of publication of this report together with nine 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 regards 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 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 by, or with the approval of, the MFHEA on a cyclical basis, according to the MFHEA guidelines, 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 Veronica Montebello
Peer Reviewer:	Dr Inġ. Owen Casha
Student Peer Reviewer:	Mr Chris Sammut
QA Managers (NCFHE):	Mr Jurgen D'Amato, Ms Fiona Mccowan and Mr Giacomo Annese

Specific Terms of Reference

The general terms of reference of the Review Panel were to review the fitness for purpose and effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes as implemented by the provider against the Standards outlined in the National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education.

Following the preliminary meeting held with the provider on 29th September 2020 and pursuant to the documentation received from LEAD Training Services, the Panel sought to focus their questions around three main themes and used triangulation in order to gain a better understanding of the QA provisions in place.

The main lines of enquiry were:

- The effective implementation of an internal quality assurance system at LTS aligned to the Standards outlined in the National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education and with an active input from staff, students, lecturers and external stakeholders.
- The capacity of LTS to ensure a student-centred approach to teaching and learning.
- The regular feedback collected from the students and staff and the use of that feedback by the institution in ongoing development of the study programmes.
- The value added of the training provided by the institution.

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 before the date indicated by the panel.
- Key recommendations (KR) are important to improve a standard and should be implemented expediently by the institute to address weaknesses.
- Recommendations (R) for improvement which are merely suggestions based on the panel analysis and observations; these could be implemented by the institution.

Institutional Context

In 2013 LEAD Training Services was licensed by the NCFHE as a Further and Higher Education Institution (holding licence no 2013- FM1-021). LTS is licensed to deliver programmes which are classified up to MQF Level 6, providing that these programmes have been formally recognised and/ or accredited by The National Commission for Further and Higher Education. The licence for LTS to operate as a Further Education Institution was renewed for a further year in March 2020 (until March 2021).

LTS is authorised to deliver six programmes at MQF level 4, 29 programmes at MQF level 5 and eight programmes at MQF level 6. All programmes are home-grown awards. The institution designs and delivers accredited short courses both on a public and bespoke basis focused mainly on subject matter related to: Advanced VAT and Tax Matters, Internal Audit, Capital and Risk Management, Remote Gaming Business, Anti-Money Laundering and Funding of Terrorism, Management and Leadership and Human Resources and People Management. The training programmes offered by LTS are relevant and contemporary to current trends and niches in the market and in business, and have practical value both nationally and internationally. The target students are professionals who are looking to keep abreast of developments in their line of work, and also individuals who would like to explore new areas of study.

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 panel was presented with preliminary information on the vision, mission and objectives of the institution and an outline of a long-term strategy of continuously providing professional and practical training services in response to the demands of industry, business organisations, government and NGOs. Lead Training Services endeavour to accredit all its courses with NCFHE. This is a safeguard for quality of training and validates the value of the courses for the employment market and industry in general.

The panel heard how although LTS has a very good working relationship with external stakeholders, including employers and social partners, this is not formally documented, however, the panel can confirm that this networking is extremely important for LTS. External stakeholders confirmed that they have regular communications and meetings with LTS before the launching of the training course and this ensures that their needs and requirements are met. The stakeholders also confirmed that they were satisfied with the skills and knowledge which their employees developed after following courses delivered by LTS. They stated that the training 'ticked all their boxes'.

The panel saw that LTS compiled a comprehensive Self-Assessment Report (SAR) which is based on the standards outlined by the National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education. The SAR presented to the panel consisted of a comprehensive exercise carried out by the Institution which included a risk assessment, the identification of areas of improvement and a proposed action plan for implementation. This SAR clearly shows that the institution is truly reflecting on ways to improve the internal quality assurance structure within the institution. This report suggests that the required documentation specific to the internal quality assurance standards within the institution was spearheaded by the NCFHE audit exercise and has just recently been compiled into one Quality Assurance Manual (QAM).

LTS presented the panel with a QAM, which reflects the organisation of the quality assurance system and several policies and procedures which drive this system, including the roles and responsibilities of the institutional leadership and individual staff members. During the interviews with management, teaching staff and students, it was clearly evident that although LTS did not have all the policies and procedures formalised as is required of a sound QA system, these are being implemented consistently in the day-to-day operations of the institution. Notwithstanding, components of the QA system require further development to ensure more formalisation of procedures such as receiving feedback from stakeholders and tutors, and feeding this into an improvement of QA within the institution, thus informing the institution's strategic management.

During the audit visit, the panel heard how top management, including the Director of Business Development, who is responsible for quality assurance, have plans to further develop areas which have already been identified. These include documenting business meetings, offering Continued Professional Development (CPD) in the pedagogy of teaching and learning to teaching staff, formalising procedures for tutor feedback for students, complaints and appeals, recognition of prior learning (RPL) and carrying out QA checks of programme accreditation applications. The panel has been provided with evidence which shows that members of management and administrative staff have contributed to the compilation of the QAM. During the audit interviews, the panel learnt that teaching staff, students and stakeholders are not aware of the QAM document. The panel recommends that this is addressed appropriately by the institution. LTS should ensure that the QA system is understood and implemented across the institution. The collaborative input of suggestions and ideas will strengthen the institution's internal systems. Notwithstanding, the panel could see that there is considerable engagement by LTS's top management to comply with NCFHE Quality Standards and continuously seeks to improve the learning experience of students.

Moreover, the current QA policy document is not publicly available on its website and, since this is a requirement of the QA standards, the panel insists that this is rectified at the earliest.

Good Practice Identified

- The extensive networking which the institution prides itself in accomplishing is a strength which raises the profile of LTS and guarantees business connections.

Recommendations for improvement

MR1.1: LTS shall within 6 months of publication of this report finalise its QAM, taking into consideration the feedback and recommendations from this EQA.

MR1.2: The Institution shall, within 6 months of publication of this report, make the QAM public.

KR1.1: In order to ensure that LTS develops a robust and sustainable internal quality management system, all stakeholders including external stakeholders, teaching staff and students should, within 12 months of publication of this report, be active participants of the monitoring and review of the QA processes and procedures.

R1.1: LTS could consider formally documenting minutes of internal meetings and meetings with stakeholders. This will provide an official record of points discussed, decisions taken and drive a plan of action.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services requires improvement to meet Standard 1.

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

LEAD Training Services or LTS was established in 2011 and is a non-incorporated entity which offers exclusively accredited short courses on a public basis on internal audit, advanced VAT and tax matters, remote gaming, people management and anti-money laundering and funding of terrorism, amongst others. LTS is managed by James Grech and Anneliza Grech, who handle general management and finance & administration, respectively. Both Mr. Grech and Ms. Grech have very solid personal and professional profiles in terms of the quality of their qualifications in accountancy and audit and hands-on experience in internal auditing. Thus, the owner-managers of this business as well as other persons occupying heading positions are fit for purpose. It was noted that the business has clearly outlined the duties and responsibilities of the main roles within its structure, and also put into place a written procedure relating to the engagement and selection for any headship positions as, at present, the company is owner-managed. Through the implementation of its Headship Positions Selection procedure, should any such vacancy arise, the owner-managers will carefully select personnel for crucial regulatory and academic roles.

The business is adhering to fiscal, FSS/NIC, employment and other regulatory obligations, including submission of timely FSS reports and personal income tax returns, in a proper and timely manner. The performance of the business in the last years has shown a steady increase in turnover, optimum control on costs and overheads and is thus showing very healthy profits. This means that, subject to an element of ring-fencing of such profits and reserves, the owners would be in a very good position to meet unexpected challenges by putting in the necessary financial and human resources required at times of uncertainty.

From a financial perspective the business is an unincorporated entity, which although small is exhibiting very good growth rates. Despite this, it remains inherently reliant on the continued support of its ultimate beneficial owners, that is, its owner-managers. Thus, it would be advisable for the owner-managers to regularly prepare, monitor and update financial budgets for the business, which would be, in turn, based on a set number of targets against which to monitor actual performance.

Good Practice Identified

N/A

Recommendations for improvement

R2.1: It is recommended that the owners of LEAD Training Services prepare regular financial budgets and set achievable targets for it, against which to monitor actual performance and especially at times of uncertainty.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services meets Standard 2.

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

The process for the design and approval of programmes is limited to a few key people within the institution, including the Managing Director, the Director of Business Development and Quality Management and the programme developer, who is usually the tutor himself or herself. Although the Managing Director frequently consults with the tutors, particularly in highly specialised and technical courses, it can be noted that the Managing Director has a central role in identifying new niches and the related programme content or training needs. His search for new niches is aided by getting feedback from attendees of networking events organised by the institution (particularly HR personnel from companies), contacts held as a result of the Managing Director's profession as an accountant and auditor, feedback acquired via surveys or random calls and other outreach activities. In addition, the networking activities enable the informal involvement of employers and other market stakeholders in the design and review of the programmes and courses offered by the institution. Students are not really involved in the design of programmes but are directly involved in assessing the quality of the delivery of the programmes (teaching and learning processes) through the feedback they supply. Nonetheless, it is not clear how student feedback is vetted and taken on board. It is not evident whether the institute takes evidence-based decisions during the design and approval of its programmes. In addition, a formal institutional approval process is still to be implemented together with a regular course review, since this is currently being carried out on an ad hoc basis.

The expected student workload is clearly defined in terms of ECTS learning credits and is in line with the MQF and the Malta referencing report (2016). This is shown on the web page dedicated to each course. In addition, the target audience and the minimum eligibility and selection criteria are also clearly indicated. The majority of the programmes offered by LTS are learning outcome-based, although a clear and explicit identification and distinction between knowledge, skills and competences is not stated. The design and approval of programmes is in line with the institutional strategy since the institution's mission is to provide top-up CPD awards for established professionals together with providing CPD in newly emerging areas arising from a new regulation or legislation. The lecturers employed by the institution are high ranking professionals and market leaders. It is clear, from both the interviewed lecturers and the curriculum vitae (CV) samples provided, that the institution manages to hire people which hold more than the minimum requirements in terms of qualifications and competences. Courses and programmes are also well supported with appropriate resources, including presentations, notes and videos, together with different forms of assessment which are tailored according to the needs of the course. The support and attention received by the students from both lecturers and administrative staff during their course of studies is an indication of appropriate learning dynamics, tutor-learner interaction and attention to supporting student progression.

Good practice identified

- Tutors are highly involved in the design of new courses and programmes, while adequate importance to their role as experts in the field is acknowledged, supported and encouraged.

Recommendations for improvement

KR3.1: LTS should, within 12 months of publication of this report, ensure that a formal institutional design and approval process is documented and implemented together with a regular course review.

KR3.2: LTS should, within 12 months of publication of this report, involve students in the design of courses and programmes offered by the institution.

KR3.3: Clear documented mechanisms should be introduced, within 12 months of publication of this report, in order to show how the student feedback is to be vetted and taken on board, together with evidence-based decisions on the design and approval of its programmes.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services meets Standard 3.

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

LTS projects itself as a highly student-centred institution. It provides students with a welcoming learning environment and ample course material via their website such as notes and videos. According to the information collected, it transpires that students following courses at this institution indeed receive adequate support from the lecturers and from the administrative and support staff. In addition, students confirmed that they go through a positive experience at the institute. Student-centred learning is encouraged by valuing feedback from students (related to the teaching and learning processes) at the end of the course and along the course via random calls. Lectures are often centred around the background and work experience of students and make flexible use of a variety of pedagogical methods. During the interviews, conducted by the panel members with the current students and alumni, it seems that many lecturers ask students for their background during the first session. An informal recognition of prior learning (RPL) is used to recognise learning obtained through formal, non-formal and informal learning other than the mainstream certification. This is assessed through the candidate's CV and also via an interview. Students are presented with a learning environment in which two-way communication exists between the lecturer and the student, and which nurtures the culture of knowledge delivery via the use of practical scenarios and test cases, often brought to the table by the students themselves. Nonetheless, the fact that attendance at lectures is monitored and mandatory, limits the spirit of acknowledging and attending to the diversity of students which would require more flexible learning paths, and does not encourage a sense of autonomy in the learners, although the latter are required to do self-study during their own time.

Students are well aware of what is required from them during their assessment. No procedures exist to protect against cheating and plagiarism. Nonetheless, given the tutors' experience and highly competent background, they have the role to assess and prevent this from taking place. Assessment is consistent throughout all courses. Assessors are familiar with the assessment methodologies adopted within their programmes. The moderation of assessment involves only the lecturer and the Managing Director in case of a revision of assessment. This is very limited in terms of arrangements for the moderation of assessments, given that it is highly questionable that the Managing Director would be well-read in a wide spectrum necessary to cover all subject areas. This limits the consistency, oversight and fairness of assessment arrangements. In addition, there are no formal processes which check the extent to which intended learning outcomes are being achieved. There are no formal processes by which feedback is given to students in order to support their learning development, even though this happens informally if a request is made by the student. The institution is currently working on a procedure by which students receive formal qualitative feedback on their performance during assessment. A so-called tutor assessment criteria feedback form has been compiled but was never implemented up to the date of the onsite audit visit. The panel understands that an appeals board has never been set, but it would be set up

on an adhoc basis, should the need arise. The institute is successful in promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.

Good practice identified

- Lectures are often centred around the background and work experience of students.

Recommendations for improvement

MR4.1: The institution shall, within 6 months of publication of this report, formalise the regular evaluation of the delivery and pedagogical methods which will lead to adequate and appropriate adjustments.

KR4.1: The institution should, within 12 months of publication of this report, introduce procedures and mechanisms while making use of existing tools in order to guarantee that no cheating or acts of plagiarism are committed.

KR4.2: The institution should, within 12 months of publication of this report, introduce formal procedures and mechanisms for student complaints and appeals.

KR4.3: Arrangements for the moderation of assessment should involve more than one assessor, particularly for courses which are not highly specialised. The institution should ensure this within 12 months of publication of this report.

KR4.4: The institution should, within 12 months of publication of this report, introduce a procedure by which students receive formal qualitative feedback on their performance during assessment.

R4.1: Attendance at lectures should be monitored while not being mandatory. Attendance is to be used as one of the means to follow student progression and engagement.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services required improvement to meet Standard 4.

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 panel observed that LTS has a consistent admissions policy which is being effectively applied. Nonetheless, such policy is not formally documented and publicly available. When a prospective applicant needs to apply for a course, s/he is initially advised to access the website to see all the information which is provided and apply from there. If prospective applicants need further information or advice, they are encouraged to contact the institution by email or phone and address any further questions directly to the person responsible.

During course registration, which needs to be carried out using the website, the panel observed that the institution is providing the applicants with clear terms and conditions stating that if the applicant applies for the course, he is agreeing to be bound to all the terms. Online application form details are sent electronically through an email to a LTS staff member automatically so that they could initiate the review process. After the application is reviewed and approved, the student is contacted by the Student Support Executive to make a deposit.

During the audit, the panel observed that the institution does not carry out an induction for students. Nonetheless, a staff member from the institution is always available during the first 30 minutes of each lesson to answer or assist students' queries or concerns. Moreover, it was also pointed out that a contact number and an email address is distributed to all students so that if they have other queries which need to be discussed further or privately, they could reach out and contact student support directly.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, LTS had to adapt and move to online learning. The institution is using ZOOM as an online platform to deliver lectures. Two professional studios were created for tutors to record their online sessions in a professional manner. Such videos are then uploaded onto the resources page so that students could access these videos through a dedicated link. The institution cannot track or monitor webinar activity, which is being done online by the students, therefore student progression can only be reviewed at the end of the course through an exam. Furthermore, there are no monitoring tools in place which record student progression during the lifecycle of the student. Attendance is being recorded as a hard copy, which is then stored within the physical course file and saved in an excel sheet which is uploaded onto a cloud environment. The panel noticed that the way information is being stored is not structurally reliable. The primary reference to a student was the course and not the student. Thus, if an alumnus asks for information related to the courses they attended for a particular year, the institution would not be able to find such information easily.

The panel heard that at the end of the course, students are given an assignment, which is then reviewed and marked by the tutor against criteria which are compiled by the institution together

with the tutor. Tutors provide feedback on the actual exam paper and send it by email to LTS on request.

Students successfully completing the course receive a copy of the certificate via email. The panel observed that the certificates meet NCFHE requirements. The original certificate is conferred during a graduation ceremony which is done once a year.

The panel was informed that both policies and procedures including the QA manual are being formally documented and that the institute will be making these policies available on the website by the end of January 2021.

Good practice identified

- All applications are channelled through the website registration form which is good practice when it comes to handling and managing the back-office work.
- LTS personnel are always available during the initial part of all lessons to make sure that they address any questions there and then and facilitate the smooth running of lectures.

Recommendations for improvement

MR5.1: The institution shall document the admissions policy and make it publicly available after six months from the publishing date of this report.

MR5.2: The institution shall, within 6 months of publication of this report, ensure that proper tools and a suitable information structure are put in place to store and archive student and course details.

MR5.3: The institution shall, within 6 months of publication of this report, ensure that student progression is monitored and recorded.

KR5.1: The institution should, within 12 months of publication of this report, have in place an induction session for all newly-enrolled students to ensure their smooth integration into the course.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services requires improvement to meet Standard 5.

Standard 6: Teaching Staff

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

Main findings

All the teaching staff at the institution are employed on a part-time contract of service basis. Every employed member of staff is provided with a position description and a contract of service. The lecturers employed by the institution are high-ranking professionals, experts in their field and have extensive experience in teaching. The institution does not provide any continuous professional development (CPD) courses to their teaching staff and does not support them in the development of teaching methods. Besides the student course evaluation, there is no evidence of any other performance review mechanisms for teaching staff, although random calls to the students are generally made in order to get feedback along the way. Nonetheless, there are plans to start formally monitoring the quality of training and the Director of Business Development and Quality Management is currently looking at CPD courses which will aid tutors to make online lessons more interactive. The quality assurance system includes student evaluation of courses, which is meant to monitor the delivery of teaching and learning and to ensure that the standards required for the individual programmes of study are being met. Both teaching staff and students are familiar with the course evaluation survey and endorse the usefulness of such a process. This process was at times used to draw attention to, and on certain occasions, stop lecturers who were not performing as expected. The institution has a teaching staff recruitment policy which is based mainly on networking, trust and good contacts with the right people in the market. Such a policy enhances the chances of identifying and recruiting the best people. The institution provides appropriate conditions of employment and support for all staff. Tutors are at the centre of both the course design and delivery and are allowed to express their academic freedom. The current COVID-19 situation showed that the institution is able to adapt quickly to a new situation and encourage innovation in teaching methods, such as online delivery and the use of new technologies. Tutors feel that it would be beneficial to have more interaction with their peers within the institution.

Good practice identified

- LTS is able to adapt quickly to a new situation and encourage innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies

Recommendations for improvement

KR6.1: LTS should, within 12 months of publication of this report, formalise the systems and procedures required to monitor the delivery of teaching and learning and to ensure that the standards required for individual programmes of study or courses (including reaching the set learning outcomes) are being met.

KR6.2: The institution should, within 12 months of publication of this report, provide professional development of lecturing staff, particularly in the development of teaching methods.

R6.1: The institution could set up adequate fora or structures which encourage and enable interaction of teaching staff with their peers within the institution.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services meets Standard 6.

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

During the audit, the panel observed that there is no specific funding or budget for teaching and learning activities. A budget is only allocated to the website for promotional and advertising purposes. The panel also noticed that students or staff have no libraries (physical or online) or books which they could use for research purposes. On the other hand, during the first lesson, students are given a suggested list of reading books they could use for their own reference. Since the institution engages highly experienced part-time tutors who are experts in their field, LTS is not investing in any continuous professional development. The panel was told that tutors undertook continued training to maintain their own professional competences (CPD), however no training was provided to develop areas focusing on methods of teaching and learning.

The Director of Business Development and Quality Management or the tutor are the primary contacts if students need some form of support. During the audit, the panel noticed that both the Director of Business Development and Quality Management and the tutors go out of their way to support students during the duration of the course. It was also noticed that tutors, staff and directors are approachable, and they have a friendly relationship. Furthermore, it was observed that students who cannot afford paying course fees are given the opportunity to pay in instalments.

When it comes to student information, this is being stored onto an Excel sheet stored on the cloud, backed up in real time and accessed by the management staff according to the specified access control levels. Website information including notes, presentations and videos are being backed up real-time daily through a different cloud provider.

At the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the institution acted immediately and invested in a professional video and sound recording system. Two professional studios were set up for tutors to record their online sessions before they are then uploaded online for students to access. Such online webinars were also exhibited during the audit.

Using Excel spreadsheets, the Director of Business Development and Quality Management initiates the process to start drafting the timetable. Such timetable is first discussed with tutors and, once agreed, this would be published and promoted on social media and the website.

Good practice identified

- Both tutors and the Director of Business Development and Quality Management are approachable and friendly and go out of their way to assist students throughout their studies at the institute.

Recommendations for improvement

R7.1: The institution could consider investing in a virtual learning platform. This will improve flexibility, communication and collaboration between students, tutors and the school. Ultimately, such investment will allow management to work more efficiently, and access information in a structured way, especially when student numbers increase further.

R7.2: The institution could invest in a physical or online library which students could make use of for research purposes and to further their knowledge in the subject area of their studies.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services meets Standard 7.

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

The panel observed that the institute is collecting various student and staff information. This information is being recorded on different Excel sheets and stored on a cloud-based server. The panel heard how students apply directly through the website, the student records are then manually inserted into an Excel sheet which is created for each course. Attendance is collected either physically or as soft copies and these are recorded in an Excel sheet which is used to monitor attendance so later certification can be issued. Course student records, student attendance records, staff records are all kept on the same cloud but in different folders.

The panel observed that the institution does not have an information management system that allows systematic collection, analysis and easy extraction of key information about students and staff. The panel recommends that the institution should think about investing in a more comprehensive and efficient management system which will provide valuable statistics to inform sound management decision making. The panel heard how the current system is meeting the institution's needs and does have the potential to measure and analyse several parameters such as student's satisfaction rates, retention and completion rates and student traceability, however, the panel did not see evidence of this being done. Access to all student and staff-related data is given on a need-to-know basis to the relevant members of staff. LTS does not have a written procedure for who may access the students' and staff records and to what end. In addition, there are no clear procedures of how such key information is analysed and evaluated.

Learning resources are all made accessible to students although, after following the interviews, the panel recommends that course notes are given to students before the course commences. This will allow students, who are all adult learners, the possibility to read through the material and gain a preliminary understanding of the topic.

Good Practice identified

None

Recommendations for improvement

KR8.1: LTS should, within 12 months of publication of this report, have a written procedure for who may access the students' physical and online records.

KR8.2: The institution should , within 12 months of publication of this report, analyse all the data collected so that it could be fed back into the system and inform teaching and learning enhancements, its business information process as well as the range of courses offered.

R8.1: The institution could think about investing in a more comprehensive and efficient management system which will provide valuable statistics to inform sound decision making. and facilitate operations.

R8.3: The institution could consider providing learning resources and course notes to students before the course commences.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services requires improvement to meet Standard 8.

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

LTS uses its website to publish all the information about the programmes and its activities. The website clearly shows the selection criteria, learning outcomes, level and learning credits, teaching, learning and assessment procedures for every course being offered. However, the panel noticed that pass rates for the courses are not visible on the website.

The panel also noticed that the website is responsive, meaning that the website could be accessed from different types of devices retaining the same user-friendly format.

Navigating through the home page, the visitor can intuitively identify the types of courses LTS is offering. Every course has a collection of information clearly organized and displayed. The information provided in every course page is sufficient for the prospective applicant to make an informed decision in terms of knowledge, skills, competencies they acquire to successfully complete the course.

Information related to the cookie policy is clearly presented so that visitors could easily understand why such cookies are being used for.

The institution has a website and social media pages such as Facebook, and YouTube. The panel observed that not all parts of the website are regularly updated.

Finally, it was also noticed that LTS makes use of a newsletter functionality to inform interested students or visitors with LTS latest news or upcoming courses.

Good practice identified

- The cookie policy for the visitor is clearly presented to the visitor.
- The institute has a Newsletter functionality in which visitors can register to receive LTS latest news.

Recommendations for improvement

R9.1 - The institute could consider linking social media's chat functionality through the website so that if visitors have any queries, they could ask directly through the website.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services meets Standard 9.

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 panel heard how most courses provided by LTS, in their very nature, necessitate continuous review and updating. The panel heard how the expert teaching staff of the institution contribute to reviewing the programme contents and carry out adjustments to the mode of delivery of teaching according to student needs. Although the panel saw no evidence of formal documentation of the involvement of external stakeholders in the monitoring and review process of the programmes offered by LTS, the panel heard there is a good rapport and communication between the institution and the external stakeholders to ensure that the needs and expectations of industry are met and the most relevant product is offered to the students.

The panel heard how ongoing review at LTS is primarily undertaken through formal and informal student feedback and informal tutor and stakeholder feedback. Students and alumni confirmed that they are appreciative of the value added by the courses provided by LTS in their career development. The panel however, noticed that there is no formal programme review procedure in place.

The panel noted that the data analytics of the anonymous student feedback is extracted, and the institution only informally interprets the outcomes in terms of identifying changes required to enhance students' experience. This information is being periodically evaluated by senior management for decision-making purposes. One such recent example of student feedback feeding into the institution's strategic management is the switch of the institution to online modality of teaching and learning. However, the panel recommends that data synthesis and pooling is carried out and recorded in official regular reports which can be used as a tool to enhance and improve the institution's existing QA mechanisms and training provision. The panel also recommends that the dissemination of outcomes of the feedback and the action plan of implementation of changes is communicated with administration staff and teaching staff during formally minuted meetings.

Overall, the panel was presented with clear evidence which illustrated the impetus for the optimisation of the quality of teaching and learning carried out by LTS with the main objectives being the success of the students in their studies and the delivery of high standard training courses in areas which are relevant and current to industry.

Good practice identified

None

Recommendations for improvement

MR10.1: The institution shall, within 6 months of publication of this report, have a documented and formalised procedure for the monitoring and periodic review process of all the courses offered by LTS. These should be included in the QAM and must at least specify what components will be considered during a revision, the frequency of revision and the persons responsible for such revision. This should include input from LTS staff, tutors, students and external stakeholders.

R10.1: The institution could disseminate outcomes of the feedback and the action plan of implementation of changes with staff and tutors during formal minuted meetings.

R10.2: LTS could carry out data synthesis and pooling. The institution could officially record the outcomes in reports which can be used as a tool to enhance and improve the institution's existing QA mechanisms and training provision.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services requires improvement to meet Standard 10.

Standard 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance

> _Cyclical external quality assurance_: entities should undergo external quality assurance by, or with the approval of, the NCFHE on a cyclical basis, according to the NCFHE guidelines, at least once every five years.

Main findings

LTS fulfils this standard by hosting the external audit referred to in this report. This is the first EQA cycle of the institution.

The professionalism shown by all the team at LTS is commendable. The panel appreciated the cooperation that all the staff members and management displayed throughout the audit. The panel has found LTS to be particularly responsive and self-reflective during the entire quality assurance process. All members of staff showed particular motivation to use the line of questioning of the review panel, and the discussions which ensued during the onsite visit, to improve the operations and practices at LEAD Training Services.

Conclusion

LEAD Training Services Meets Standard 11.

Response by the Provider

Preamble

The Board was very welcoming, open to suggestions and also very attentive when listening to the limitations and ambitions of the academy. The individuals within the board were interested in our academy, so as to get a better picture of how the institution works and functions.

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:		
K1.1	This process has already started. Students are providing feedback with regards to the course at the end of the course, so that such feedback is absorbed, considered and implemented within the QA. Tutors on the other hand are also being given the opportunity to voice their participation through sessions which include a review of the course content, as well as their insight on how we can improve our processes which are ultimately the backbone of a good QA and its procedures.	January 2022
R1.1	This will provide an official record of points discussed, decisions taken and drive a plan of action. Although meetings have formally been reduced due to COVID-19 restrictions, communication has been recorded through email communication. Therefore, when there is an enquiry by a stakeholder for our courses, we call them, we discuss with them via an online platform, and after the meeting is held, an email is sent out to thank them for their time, with a recap of the agenda discussed. At this point in time, this will act as our minutes with stakeholders who are not part of our staff team members. Tutors who will undergo group meetings, will be aware of minutes being taken and these will be distributed among the same tutors after they have been published so that any amendments can be respected and executed accordingly.	January 2022
Standard 2:		

R2.1	Since the company is a family-based company, the Directors discuss budgets and targets internally and monitor it accordingly. At the end of the year, the actual performance is monitored against the set targets, with a post-mortem exercise to review the strengths and weaknesses of such performance.	January 2022
Standard 3:		
KR 3.1	This exercise has already started and tutors are being grouped into their own courses so that they are then given the opportunity to scrutinize, discuss, amend, update and clarify any issues related to the course content, course delivery, course flow, content validity and any other recommendations to update the course accordingly, course logistics and also anything related to course administration or delivery which can be discussed.	January 2022
KR 3.2	Students are tight with time and their tuition hours are generally set after their long working day: from 5.30pm to 8.30pm. Therefore one needs to respect their availability and willingness to participate. However, as things stand, the best way to deal with this issue is to call students at random and ask them a set of questions over the phone and then minute them accordingly. This provides students the opportunity to discuss, suggest and provide feedback to us without feeling the pressure of being in a group or in front of their tutor; allowing them to expose their praise, criticism or their suggestions in a safe and confidential environment and opportunity. Focus groups will be held as well.	January 2022
Kr 3.3	As per above, feedback is taken on through viva-voce opportunities such as random calling and also through end of course online questionnaires. The platform used is SurveySparrow, which provides LTS the opportunity to review all feedback and then incorporate it within the QA and the programmes themselves. Any confidential issues or anything which is unclear in the responses of the participants is then discussed further through another confidential telephone call.	January 2022
Standard 4:		
KR 4.1	As a matter of disclaimer, LTS believes that internal controls to reduce the risk of cheating should be preventive more than reactive. In this respect our exam/assignment papers are mostly made up of practical case study questions making it difficult for a student to *copy and paste* the answer. Our aim is to continue on this route. Nonetheless, LTS will explore and consider other internal control mechanisms which can be implemented.	March 2022

KR 4.2	Students can make use of the Student Manual which is downloadable and available for all to see on the website and for which a link is provided within an invoice and its T&Cs, so that if there are any complaints or any appeals that are required, students are welcome to approach the right channels accordingly. It is interesting to note however, that any complaints or any queries are sorted out over the phone or via emails as there are generally, no major issues.	March 2022
KR 4.3	The best way forward is being discussed. LTS does not discriminate nor discourage any form or lateral thinking from any student, and we are therefore quite open to students being innovative thinkers and reflectors of their assignments' answers based on their experiences, insights and theory learnt in class. Students are never penalised for thinking outside the box. However, we do understand that part of the QA is to ensure various opinions on the answers of students. We are committed to seeing any required changes accordingly.	March 2022
KR 4.4	The logistics to have various tutors to provide feedback within a short course are being discussed as per above.	March 2022
R 4.1	Attendance is taken and recorded. Although progression and engagement is not necessarily related to one's presence and attendance, the attendance is a good guide for tutors to monitor who the participants are and also what their background is, so that any examples or any trains of thought are moulded according to the audience within that class.	March 2022
Standard 5:		
KR 5.5	Students are briefed before sessions start and tutors also strengthen this by delivering an outline of the course at the very beginning. Students are also aware that a Student Support line is available.	March 2022
Standard 6:		
KR 6.1	Tutors are also encouraged and are to provide a lesson plan for their module. This gives tutors a better opportunity for reflection and guidance on their planning of the lesson before a new intake. Tutors are also observed formally and informally, as online lessons allow the Quality Assurance Manager to oversee the session as it goes along. At least once a year, tutors are formally observed and given the criteria of what one would expect out of the session. This is then discussed afterwards between the QA Manager and the tutor.	January 2022

KR 6.2	Tutors are being given training slots in order to be able to participate further in in-house CPDs which are related to teaching methods and content delivery.	January 2022
R6.1	Unfortunately, COVID-19 was a difficult time which did not allow us any opportunities to meet up with our tutors and as a whole team. However, our intention is to create more opportunities and activities to interact even further.	January 2022
Standard 7:		
R7.1	A virtual learning platform is being considered and options are being evaluated for feasibility.	March 2022
R7.2	This suggestion is being considered.	March 2022
Standard 8:		
KR8.1	LEAD Training Services consists of a very small team. Therefore, access to physical and online records is essential to the team so that the service continues with a flow. Such procedures are aligned within the QA Manual, but as the board is suggesting, we will extract such information to create a manual to give clearer guidelines.	March 2022
KR8.2	Such feedback is being diverted into the system, however, we believe that other procedures which are currently ongoing, will further strengthen the range of courses being offered and created.	March 2022
R8.1	This suggestion is being considered.	March 2022
R8.2	This suggestion is being considered.	March 2022
Standard 9:		
R9.1	This suggestion is being considered. Potential clients have the opportunity to contact us through Facebook chats. These chats are responded to as soon as possible.	March 2022
Standard 10:		
R10.1	This will be part of our CPDs sessions where tutors will brainstorm together with staff members over feedback received, in order to create an action plan.	March 2022
R10.2	This suggestion is being considered.	March 2022

Response to Mandatory Recommendations Made by the Peer Review Panel

Mandatory recommendations	Actions to be taken to address the recommendation	Date for completion
MR 1.1	This was done early in 2021. Kindly see link provided on website: https://leadtraining.com.mt/documents-policies/	January 2021
MR 1.2	The documents are visible on the homepage at the bottom of the webpage.	January 2021
MR4.1	Before the next intake, tutors are asked to provide any updates in their course notes and their PowerPoints. However, tutors are also encouraged and are to provide a lesson plan for their module, so that this gives tutors a better opportunity for reflection and guidance on their planning of the lesson. Tutors are also observed formally and informally, as online lessons allow the Quality Assurance Manager to oversee the session as it goes along. At least once a year, tutors are formally observed and given the criteria of what one expects out of the session. This is then discussed afterwards between the QA Manager and the tutor.	January 2022
MR 5.1	This was done early in 2021. Kindly see link provided on website: https://leadtraining.com.mt/documents-policies/ The documents are visible on the homepage at the bottom of the webpage.	January 2021
MR 5.2	LTS has been looking at alternative systems, tools and an information structure to store and archive student and course details. We are also shifting everything online and are discussing the most feasible and effective means of storing such data.	
MR 5.3	As discussed during the conclusion of the Audit in December 2020, LTS provides short accredited awards and courses. The courses provided are only of a few hours and while all procedures are in place to ensure high quality tutoring and the best content and its delivery; LTS does not currently have an online platform which goes into the statistics of logins of students on the platform, the duration on the platform or whether students are accessing the online resources available to them or not. Students are responsible for their own self-study as they are all adults. Students who do enrol for one of our courses do so as they have their career and education at heart and they do not loaf around but are generally quite	July 2022

	participative students within the sessions. Having said that, LTS is still taking this suggestion into consideration and any online platforms which will allow LTS to monitor such engagement are being considered and studied. It is our appeal that considering that these are extra costs which come at an unprecedented time, this request is extended to 12 months rather than in 6 months' time.	
MR 10.1	This process has already started. Students are providing feedback with regards to the course at the end of the course, so that such feedback is absorbed, considered and implemented within the QA. Tutors on the other hand are also being given the opportunity to voice their participation through sessions which include a review of the course content, as well as their insight on how we can improve our processes which are ultimately the backbone of a good QA and its procedures.	January 2022

Annexes

Annex 1: Review Panel Bio Notes

In the setting up of the review panel for LEAD Training Services, the NCFHE sought to maintain a high degree of diligence in the process of selection of the members of 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 Peer Review Panel. The bio notes are correct as at the time of when the QA audit was carried out.

Chair of Review Panel:

Dr 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 Senior Fellow with the Higher Education Academy UK and has presented in a number of conferences and published a number of research articles in peer reviewed journals. She chaired the committee which initiated, planned, designed and organized the Competence Assessment Framework for Allied Health Professionals in Malta which was later adopted for the nursing profession and the Physiological Measurements profession. 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 and directly involved in the design, review and online facilitation of a blended CPD training which is a compulsory prerequisite for all health professionals who wish to become mentors or clinical supervisors of undergraduate students in their clinical practice placements. She is 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. She has also been appointed as an RPL assessor in the area of Health and Social Care with the Institute of Education, Ministry for Education. Veronica sits on the Council of the Professions Complementary to Medicine.

Peer Reviewer:

Dr Inġ. Owen Casha received the B. Eng. (Hons.) degree (summa cum laude) in Electrical Engineering

from the University of Malta in 2004. From September 2007 till June 2008, he was on a research collaboration with CEA-LETI (Grenoble, France) and ST-Microelectronics, as part of his doctoral studies. He received a Ph.D. in Radio Frequency Integrated Circuit Design from the University of Malta in 2010. He is currently a Senior Lecturer with the Department of Microelectronics and Nanoelectronics. He is also the Head of Department. His research interests are low voltage low phase noise radio frequency oscillators and synthesizers, high speed integrated circuits, embedded systems, RF MEMS and design of assistive devices. He authored more than 86 peer reviewed publications in conference proceedings, journals and book chapters. Dr Casha was the co-investigator in a number of EU and National funded research projects including LAB4MEMS, LAB4MEMS II, Interreg CESBA MED and SPEECHIE and is currently involved in the ESAIRQ EUREKA Cluster PENTA and SMARTCLAP projects. Dr Inġ. Casha has sat on a number of NCFHE QA review panels for various institutions, acted as a COST Action proposal evaluator and as an evaluator for the Post Doc Reach High Scholarships in 2015.

Student Peer Reviewer:

Christian Sammut is a Senior Systems Administrator working within the Ministry of Education and Employment in the Government of Malta. He has broad experience in technical support and project management. His recent activities include analysing, evaluating and managing IT projects within the Ministry. Christian read a Diploma in Industrial Electronics and Computer Engineering, BTEC Diploma in Computer and Information Systems and a Higher National Diploma in Computing and Systems Development. He is currently reading for a BSc Hons in Information Technology. Moreover, Christian has successfully achieved several IT related certifications such as MCSA (Microsoft Certified System Administrator), CompTIA Network+, APMG ITIL Foundation, ISTQB-ISEB Certified Tester Foundation and much more. He has always been very dedicated and hardworking in his work.

Annex 2: Agenda of the onsite visit.

Date: 9th & 10th December 2020

Venue: *MMH Academy, Unit 22B, San Gwann Industrial Estate, San Gwann*

Day 1

08.30 – 09.00	**Panel arrives at LEAD Training Services**
09.00 – 10.30	**Meeting with Director and Facilitator** *Mr James Grech, Mr Steve Compagno*
10.30 – 10.45	Panel discussion
10.45 – 11.45	**Meeting with external stakeholders**

- WSC
- MRVA
- Alliance

11.45– 12.00	Panel discussion
12.00 – 13.00	**Meeting with Director of Business Development & Quality Assurance**
13:00 – 13:30	Working Lunch
13:30 – 13:45	**Tutor**
13.45 – 14.30	**Meeting with Students**

- *(Payroll)*
- *(Real Estate)*
- *(Internal Auditing)*

14.30 – 14.45	Panel discussion
14.45 – 15.30	**Meeting with Alumni**
15.30 – 15.45	Panel discussion
15.45 – 16.45	**Meeting with Teaching staff**

Day 2

08.30 – 09.00	Panel arrives at Lead Training Services
09.00 – 10.00	Meeting with Director of Finance and Admin
10:00 - 10:15	Panel discussion
10.15 – 10.45	Corporate Business Development Executive
10:45 - 11:00	Panel discussion
11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Student Support Administration Executive and Credit Control & Student Support Executive

12:00 - 12:15	Tour of teaching platform/database/management Programme
12:15 - 12:30	Panel discussion
12.30 – 13.00	Meeting with Brand and I.T. Manager
13.00 – 16.00	Working Lunch and Discussion on QA Report
16.00 – 16.20	Presentation of Initial Findings

Mr. James Grech, Mr. Steve Compagno