

**PEGASO INTERNATIONAL**

**MFHEA Follow-up Audit  
Site Visit, 6 and 7 November 2023  
Panel Report, 27 November 2023  
Concept version**

# Contents

- Standard 1: Policy for Quality Assurance.....3
- Standard 2: Institutional Probity .....7
- Standard 3: Design and Approval of Programmes.....7
- Standard 4: Student-Centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment .....12
- Standard 5: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification .....15
- Standard 6: Teaching Staff.....18
- Standard 7: Learning Resources and Student Support .....21
- Standard 8: Information Management.....23
- Standard 9: Public Information.....25
- Standard 10: Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes .....26
- Standard 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance.....27

## Standard 1: Policy for Quality Assurance

<b>Original judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p><b>MR 1:</b> PI shall ensure key strategic documents have a clear link to QA indicators, timeline and budgeting, within 9 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>A Strategic Plan has been created in parallel with the launching of a new phase of development of the Institution and conceived through a process based on sharing through an open and inclusive dialogue with the various components of Pegaso International (PI) that will also be involved in monitoring the redefined objectives, through discussions both internal to the Institution and external to the stakeholders.</p> <p>In drafting the Strategic Plan, on the one hand, PI set the objective of continuity of the best practices launched in recent years in terms of scientific research, publications and international conferences. On the other hand, PI identified the objectives for improvement and the resources necessary to further strengthen the ranking and reputation of Pegaso International, through the planning and launching of new projects, programmes and synergies as well as adequate investments in human capital and in tangible and intangible infrastructures.</p> <p>(see attachment MR1 evidence)</p>	<p>Although the panel did not see the links to QA, budgets and timeline in the publicly available strategic documents, the internal documents provided to the panel did show these aspects.</p> <p>The panel suggests making the non-sensitive documents public, in order to be as transparent as possible to internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>MR 2:</b> PI shall ensure quality assurance processes are effectively focused on all main areas of the institution's operation, within 9 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI adopts, in principle, a continuous improvement which has at its core the fundamental element of Quality Assurance and therefore this enables it to intervene critically and constructively on eventual innovative paths in its didactic approach and research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- monitoring and periodic review of the study courses;</li> <li>- monitoring of the study pathways undertaken by the students whilst checking on their active participation at workshops or other representative bodies;</li> <li>- testing competences of academic staff and the respective consistency of teaching and research activities through constant monitoring;</li> <li>- monitoring resources, infrastructure, technological attributes and other tools made available to students and academic staff to facilitate the creation of an efficient learning environment that adequately supports the learning process;</li> <li>- control and updating of the information system in order to ensure in real time reliable collation, analysis and use of data as well as all necessary information for effective and efficient management of educational and research activities.</li> </ul> <p>The implementation mechanisms of such principles are based on:</p>	<p>The panel witnessed ample QA processes in different areas such as learning and teaching, support and digital. However, the institution could apply such written QA documentation more. For example, the institution mentions multiple times “monitoring”, but it uses this term vaguely and/or without mentioning the specific process being implemented.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
--	--	--

1. The empirical evidence and monitoring which support the decision-making processes at all levels
2. Comparison of learning and research experiences, also on an international level, which represent improvement opportunities and the occasion to establish areas of cooperation directed towards the integration of the Institution's educational offer
3. Pursuing the development and support of the improvement of quality assurance processes through a governance that is able to guarantee the implementation of guiding principles, time-testing of the ongoing processes of quality assurance in the various organs involved, and proposing actions of review and reflection aimed at redefining the objectives and processes, also in view of the Institution's strategic plan.

**Evidence:** PI's continuous improvement approach is reflected in the dynamic nature of its Quality Management System (QMS). The manifestation of PI's QMS is realised through the quality assurance processes it practices, which are supported by the relevant policies and procedures. The latter are drafted and updated in line with requirements necessitated by PI's evolution over time. These developments are evidenced by attached sample copies of new forms and updated policies that have been effected in the interim months thereby satisfying the recommendation of the EQA panel with respect to quality assurance processes.

(See attachments MR1 and MR2 evidence)

<p><b>KR 1:</b> PI should ensure strategic documents are developed in a truly participative manner, involving both internal and external stakeholders, within 9 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI had already, some months prior to the EQA review, begun to implement an opinion survey system amongst students and graduates by means of the administration of questionnaires inherent to the teaching and organisation of study courses. Such findings aim at the improvement of quality in teaching, the efficiency of the organisation and the adequacy of support structures.</p> <p>This system has been mostly implemented in recent months in view to the eventual involvement of companies involved in various sectors which are akin to those which PI has approached in order to compile questionnaires aimed at evaluating the correspondence of its degree courses with the ever-increasing educational requirements of the job market. PI is committed to a constant monitoring of such system of feedback collation through which it seeks to obtain immediate and accurate data whilst imposing mandatory response from which the student cannot be exempted.</p> <p>(See attachments KR1 evidence)</p>	<p>To the panel, it is clear that students and external stakeholders were invited to be part of the strategic process. From what the panel has seen, there is some room for improvement, for instance, in involving teaching staff in general and involving all stakeholders in a more profound way.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
<p><b>KR 2:</b> PI should formulate and implement strong links between learning and research in PI's operation, within 12 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR1 + KR14</p>	<p>The clear link that was observed by the panel is the yearly PI Conference, as are several seminars further strengthening the link between learning and research. The panel would suggest the institution further strengthen this link by requiring teachers to engage in research activities.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>KR 3:</b> PI should monitor the QA Officer's role and responsibilities and conduct a thorough assessment of their effectiveness after, within 12 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR2  The new General Management, in agreement with the Board of Directors and the Academic Committee, devised and designed the remodulation of the technical management structure, based on a strategic and functional relevance for the achievement of specific objectives.  With particular reference to the Quality Assurance area, an internal QA manager with considerable experience in the sector has been identified and appointed, to coordinate internal activities supported by an external consultant resident in Malta and expert in QA procedures as per the MFHEA guidelines and procedures.</p> <p>(See attachments MR2 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed a mental model of the requirements of the QA Officer in the institution's top management. At the same time, these requirements have not been clarified on paper. An assessment of the effectiveness of the QA Officer has not been carried out.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>
--	--	---

## Standard 2: Institutional Probity

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Standard met</p>		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p>No recommendations</p>		

## Standard 3: Design and Approval of Programmes

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard</p>		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>

<p><b>MR 3:</b> PI shall strengthen the interaction between student-teacher and student-student by including live sessions, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>The strategy adopted by PI in response to the need to activate constant interaction between student and teacher is the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers have been selected and nominated for the coordination of study courses on the basis of their expertise, academic commitment and scientific research. This element of coordination has been considered necessary to monitor the overall course of studies and related observations shall be shared during periodic meetings with teaching staff presided by the Rector</li> <li>2. Guidelines have been drafted on interactive teaching and related support tools have been implemented on the E- learning platform of the Institution</li> <li>3. Teachers have been briefed on the realisation of interactive teaching through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The transmission of guidelines</li> <li>- The transmission of a video tutorial exemplifying how to activate the tools on the platform</li> <li>- Briefings with the Rector, the Registrar and the IT support staff</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Evidence of interactive teaching is being registered and additionally, it was deemed opportune, at least initially, to involve also the administration management in order to register such feedback and students' suggestions for the overall operational benefit of the Institution</li> </ol>	<p>The interaction between students and teachers is somewhat at the low end of the spectrum. On the one hand, this seems to be fitting given the delivery method of distance learning. The guidelines coming from PI shaping this interaction are clear and mostly implemented. On the other hand, the panel thinks there is room for further enhancement in this area. According to some students, very little interaction between learners and teachers/tutors took place. In the PhD programmes the student-student interaction could be strengthened. For other levels, no students were interviewed.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
--	---	--



Measures to move towards a more blended learning experience and the increase of interaction have been implemented. Guidelines have been developed and have been disseminated to all lecturers/supervisors. Academics are inducted into the process via CPD Sessions covering pedagogy, emerging technologies and QA. Co-ordinators - tutor/lecturer/peer-reviewer - responsible for organising and monitoring interactive sessions, including initial orientation sessions for students, have been identified for each degree programme.

Evidence

1. Appointment of coordinating tutor
2. Schedule of meeting for interactive didactic sessions between students and lecturers
3. Guidelines for the use of the e-learning Platform for the delivery of interactive teaching.

(See attachments MR3 evidence) (To include reference to live synchronous session with PhD students with the intervention of the Rector, Academic Staff and Administrative Director's Office)

<p><b>MR 4:</b> PI shall ensure there is sufficient attention paid to the internship of students in individual programmes, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>In order to offer students the possibility to undertake internships, work-based learning experiences and to support them in identifying opportunities that are relevant to their course of studies, PI has stipulated specific agreements with entities that may partner it both in providing such possibilities as well as in related ancillary services, such as hospitality and accommodation. A case in point is the agreement signed with NSTS for internships for practical training in the specialisation of the students' academic subject, at present envisaged to be informatics, administration and civil engineering, under the tutelage of a Mentor of the industry partner placement entity in line with a pre-organised programme schedule and pre-agreed target outcomes. Ongoing bilateral relations and satisfaction shall be monitored by officials of the company and certified accordingly at the end of the internship.</p> <p>(see attachments KR1 and MR4 evidence)</p>	<p>For the Masters and PhD programmes, the panel understood that the students are working in the field of their studies, and that these activities are part of their (research) process. For the Bachelor students, the panel could not establish this.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
<p><b>KR 4:</b> When designing and developing courses, a proper procedure for formal external stakeholder involvement must be put in place, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI has set up a mechanism for the collation of feedback received from stakeholders through the administration of questionnaires as described above in KR1.</p> <p>Moreover, as reported also in response to KR2, dedicated Steering Committees have been instituted for each field of study and these are composed of representatives of the Institution and representatives from the job market. These committees shall convene periodically and in any case before the commencement of the academic year in order to observe the overall results of the courses with particular reference to learning quality indicators and relativity to the exigencies and objectives of the job market, in such way as to enable learning paths to be adapted and developed in accordance with current educational requirements.</p>	<p>The panel observed informal as well as formal engagement of external stakeholders in the development of courses. For the designing of courses and programmes, the external stakeholders interviewed indicated that they were not involved in this aspect.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

	<p><b>Evidence:</b> PI's Doc 004 Course Design Process stipulates that this process requires consultation with the various stakeholders that may have an interest in the course, including industry, and education institutions with whom PI collaborates, other lecturing staff and professionals, prospective students, etc. This will be updated further to include reference to a new procedure currently being drafted outlining the formal composition and terms of reference of all PI's Boards and Committees.</p> <p>In the interim, stakeholder feedback is solicited via the attached feedback sheets and, as stated, by online questionnaires.</p> <p>(See attachments KR4 evidence)</p>	
<p><b>KR 5:</b> PI should ensure supervisors are trained to lead the process of supervision, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI has drafted and approved guidelines and policies in regard to various operational areas of the Institution. This exercise forms the basis for the sharing of information and procedures between dedicated sectors as well as all the actors involved in the educational process. As regards the lecturers` and supervisors` CPD, the Institution has adopted determining procedures through the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ guidelines for the use of platform</li> <li>✓ guidelines for the development of didactic material</li> <li>✓ guidelines for interactive teaching and relative tools</li> <li>✓ guidelines for the supervision of research activities related to PhD</li> <li>✓ guidelines for supervision of doctoral theses.</li> </ul> <p>all with the aim of monitoring and simultaneously guaranteeing compliance with procedures. Moreover, periodic meetings chaired by the Rector will be organised to ensure opportunities for discussion and sharing of ideas which are useful for the Academic Committee to evaluate improvement measures to be taken.</p> <p>(see attachment KR5 evidence)</p>	<p>For the PhD programmes, the panel observed sufficient attention for supervisors. For the Bachelor and Masters programmes, the panel holds the position that further improvement is needed.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>

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

<b>Judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p><b>MR 5:</b> PI shall ensure learning-supportive interaction between students and faculty members is encouraged and formalised on a regular basis during the course period, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>Guidelines for lecturers and students have been developed, describing in detail the features and functions of the tools that are customised according to whether the user is a lecturer or a student. The document has been disseminated to all the lecturing staff, including job descriptions, and to the students, following Academic Committee approval, and this is available on the platform.</p> <p>Guidelines for interactive teaching adopted by PI provides that each lecturer responsible for the teaching of courses offered by PI undertake the following opportunities of interaction with the students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fora and chats</li> <li>2. Induction and Tutorials online</li> <li>3. Video conferencing</li> <li>4. Workshops and conferences in person</li> </ol> <p>Lecturers and Coordinating Tutors shall, periodically and upon request by the Rector, submit a report concerning the interactions with the students and any observations arising therefrom.</p> <p>(see attachment MR5 evidence)</p>	<p>The didactical guidelines provided by PI make clear that interaction is required, and the panel observed that this is implemented accordingly. The panel understood that students are not always participating, probably indicating that the institution could strengthen the process and increase student motivation.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>KR 6:</b> The learning and teaching process should be decentralised and autonomy given to respective faculty members for their courses in their complexity (including examination and other phases), within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>The teaching and learning process is centrally monitored in order to guarantee quality of such. However, the responsibility for the development of didactic material pertaining to the subject is entrusted to the particular lecturers of the respective subjects. The lecturer is to assume the responsibility for the knowledge and content material, and the resources via which these are imparted, as well as a periodic update of same.</p> <p>Similarly, in the assessment phase, it is the lecturer who prepares the paper for the final examination which the student shall have to take to demonstrate that the necessary knowledge and competences in the subject have been acquired so as to pass the final stage. It is also left at the discretion of the lecturer to establish if the final exam will consist of a written exercise, a multiple-choice test, or an oral examination and to communicate this to the students by means of a notice published on the platform. No matter the form of examination, this will be held online through the e-learning platform of the Institution, which simultaneously monitors, from an IT perspective, that the correct procedures are being observed. Lecturers are obliged to provide preparatory tests for the final examination so that the student may practise and evaluate the level of preparation expected. Lecturers are also required to provide an evaluation of the course itinerary of the student besides the final examination. The organisation procedures of this evaluation of the course itinerary are left at the discretion of the lecturers on the basis of the specific discipline as specified in the employment letter.</p> <p>Evidence of the lecturers' autonomy both in the evaluation and didactic approach are to be found in the appointment letter uploaded in the folder.</p> <p>(see attachment KR6 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed strong ownership for their courses in the teaching staff.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
---	---	---

<p><b>KR 7:</b> A direct or continuous feedback mechanism with students on the course delivery needs to be established. This mechanism is to be implemented within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI has set up a mechanism to gather stakeholder feedback; in this case the gathering of students' opinions, whereby such mechanism is implemented for all the degree courses offered by the Institution and is aimed at obtaining information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The efficiency of the didactic method by gathering evaluations and levels of satisfaction related to the content and methods of the organisation of the didactic content, such as the study load, didactic material, timetables, didactic competence and availability of the lecturer, etc.</li> <li>✓ The suitability of the infrastructure and of support services, such as the platform, the virtual classrooms, the online library, the student secretariat, etc.</li> </ul> <p>The aim is to highlight the strong points and critical elements of the teaching activity and, moreover, of the degree courses. Student feedback will be given due consideration during the annual programme monitoring and the programme cyclical review process in order to improve the design and development of the programme, enhance the organisational governance of the IT basis, and implement improved didactic processes and related services in conformity with the students' point of view, as protagonists of the educational process.</p> <p>(see attachment KR7 evidence)</p>	<p>The way PI collects feedback from students is more than sufficient. The follow-up process, in which the collected feedback is used and communicated, is sufficient as well. A clear feedback loop is established.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
<p><b>KR 8:</b> There must be a peer reviewer or peer assessor included in the process to support learning development, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR3</p>	<p>The panel did not see evidence that the reviewers and assessors active in the assessment process are facilitated in learning from and with each other.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>
<p><b>R 1:</b> There may be follow up and mentoring/guidance for students during the delivery and after it.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR3</p>	<p>The guidance for students could be enhanced, according to the panel. At the same time, it seems that many students deliberately choose distance learning and, in that choice, expect less direct guidance from the</p>

		<p>institution. The panel did not speak to students in Bachelors and Masters programmes however, and since those students might require more guidance in their learning process, the panel suggests the institution check whether these students are satisfied with the current levels of mentoring and guidance.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
--	--	--

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

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard</p>		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p><b>MR 6:</b> Admission criteria shall be transparent and consistent as per the programme as well as aligned with the NQAF, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>With respect to and in line with the educational requirements necessary for admission to university courses, PI has elaborated entry requirements for each programme of studies included in its educational offer in order that these may be clearly described and easily understood by potential students.</p> <p>In the course of the initial orientation phase, the Students' Admissions Office meticulously informs the student of the requirements and documentation necessary for admission, whilst offering support with all information by means of email as well as verbal exchanges.</p> <p>Students are to have, at least, advanced level English to enable them to cope with the demands of the programme of studies. The didactic agreement covers design, development and delivery of the programme of studies in the English language as well as the relevant didactic resources and materials necessary.</p>	<p>The admission criteria are clear and communicated well.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Admission criteria clearly defined on the website.  <a href="https://pegasointernational.eu/educational-offer/english- courseshttps://pegasointernational.eu/students/admission-requirements">https://pegasointernational.eu/educational-offer/english- courseshttps://pegasointernational.eu/students/admission-requirements</a></li> <li>2. An agreement with the NSTS (Malta) English Language Institute has been signed. This covers the design, development and delivery of programmes of studies in the English language and the relevant didactic resources and materials necessary.</li> </ol> <p>(see attachment MR6 evidence)</p>	
<p><b>KR 9:</b> For each course, an induction and orientation session should be provided by the concerned faculty member at the beginning of the course, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>The orientation phase of admission is coordinated by non-academic staff who is however competent in didactic matters and has acquired experience for education, scientific publications and through constant professional updates.</p> <p>For an optimal implementation of the intended learning process, PI offers interaction possibilities between the activities of the teachers and those of the particular tutor for each discipline.</p> <p>The teacher agrees with the tutor on the learning methodology and most adequate tools to adopt:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the initial phase of the teaching activity, the coordinating tutor organises a first synchronous meeting with the students aimed at contributing, identifying and implementing the various requirements in such way as to enable the best possible orientation and pursuit of the didactic activity.</li> <li>2. During this period of teaching delivery, the tutor proceeds to stimulate and moderates the interaction between students on the teaching content by providing, when opportune, further resources in accordance to requirements for the personalisation of the module as highlighted by the students in the fora dedicated to the respective disciplinary study for each teaching module.</li> <li>3. The tutor’s task is also that of reporting these requests and every other significant element to the teacher in order that the personalisation path is suitably structured and elaborated upon. The tutor, therefore, also has the task of monitoring the development and progress of the module’s activity in relation to which he/she provides the teacher with all the elements necessary for the structuring of further eventual activity and elaboration.</li> </ol> <p>(see attachments MR6 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed the induction and orientation sessions at the beginning of the course are carried out.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>



<p><b>KR 10:</b> A procedure for monitoring the progress of students, as well as a feedback mechanism, must be established, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR9  PI has set up a monitoring mechanism for the learning process which enables the control and advancement of such process with respect to the objectives of the course and the expected results thereof.  The intervention effected during the undertaking of the course enables the testing of what the students have not understood and allows for corrective measures and checking to take place.  The monitoring of the learning process is therefore a broader activity since it makes use of quantitative components of evaluation of the final result of the course together with other informative elements on the learning level of the student and therefore it has an educational nature because it requires the active involvement of the student throughout.  This is intended to produce a valid base for the following operations: well-founded self-evaluation, the teacher's determination of the student's position with respect to educational objectives, eventual recognition of the need for corrective measures.  PI has adopted various evaluation tools in order to project a monitoring activity which is formally defined:  Questionnaires: a system of feedback collation from the students in relation to contents acquired to date  Dialogue: discussions during which the students may ask questions and the teacher may orient the dialogue through the use of guiding questions  Portfolio: a collection of eventual intermediary tests which, when examined altogether in their progressive chronological order, provide hints of the learning progress of the student.  Tests: traditional open or closed questions which are focused on the learning content and intermediary evaluation; It is possible to insert exercises to evaluate the level of learning both in written form (with open or closed questions) or in oral form through synchronous meetings of didactic interaction during the course of study.</p> <p>(see attachments MR6 evidence + KR10 evidence)</p>	<p>Through analysis of the Virtual Learning Environment, the progress of students is monitored.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
--	--	---

<p><b>KR 11:</b> PI should ensure an English language course is included in the curriculum and a standard is set for the admission criteria, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI has concluded an agreement with NSTS Malta in order to provide English Language courses in both general English as well as English for specialist areas to students applying for PI courses. Such courses have internationally recognised certification. The option to entrust the teaching and linguistic education to specialists in the field was determined with the aim of guaranteeing an immediate solution to the educational needs of the students, as well as to ascertain the quality of the educational pathways that NSTS can guarantee to the Institution.</p> <p>(see attachments KR11 evidence)</p>	<p>Although an English course could not be observed in every single curriculum, the desired level of English was set as an entry criterion.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
---	---	--

## Standard 6: Teaching Staff

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation of Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b></p>
<p><b>KR 12:</b> The QA Office should be properly structured, and a procedure should be formalised to evaluate the appraisal of teaching staff and any feedback received to ensure quality Standards are being met, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR2, KR3 and KR7</p>	<p>The structure of the QA Office is not overwhelmingly elaborated, but deemed sufficient by the panel. The appraisals of teaching staff and feedback mechanisms are in place and working, as was confirmed by the interviewees.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>KR 13:</b> PI should provide lecturers with all the academic resources necessary and ensure they have access to international academic databases for publications and journals and professional plagiarism software, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR14 and in KR2          In order to guarantee the originality of the research output produced by Degree and PhD students, Multiversity group is gradually providing to Lecturers of the institutions, members of the Group, the access to the Turnitin.com plagiarism software. In addition, upon submission of the thesis (both for the Degree and PhD course), the supervisor of the thesis must sign the authorisation of the thesis submission where it is stated that the thesis has undergone the due plagiarism controls.</p> <p>(see attachments KR13 evidence)</p>	<p>Both students and lecturers have the access they need to academic resources.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
<p><b>KR 14:</b> PI should do more to facilitate continuous professional development (CPD) for its lecturing staff in a more structured and coherent manner that includes identification of training needs, budget allocation, monitoring of training impact, and the provision of development opportunities relating to course content, and to upskill their pedagogical competences, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI values the development of competences and of the professional development of its teaching staff. To this end, it intervenes in order to reach a careful projection of its teaching methods in order to introduce an innovative didactic approach, which elicits in-depth reflection on evaluation processes from a student-centred perspective. Through participation in workshops, seminars and international conferences, the Institution presents its lecturers with the possibility to update themselves on educational methodologies and assessment tools, which are instrumental in activating processes for continuous improvement of the teaching-learning methods offered by PI to its students.</p> <p>Thanks to regular calendar of events held by the Institution, such as the organisation and promotion of international conferences, PI encourages the sharing of the most recent developments in the management sector, as well as those in economics, technology and education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ It achieves these objectives by including experienced and young academics and professionals from all continents in its network;</li> <li>✓ It encourages discussion and the exchange of knowledge between the academic world and the professional scenario both in formal sessions and during social events; and,</li> <li>✓ It offers a variety of publishing opportunities on an international scale, besides stipulating a number of agreements and strategic partnerships.</li> </ul>	<p>The panel observed the basics in facilitating continuous professional development, but it is clear that the institution should do more in order to show high quality employership. At the moment, PI is relying heavily on the possibilities of the Erasmus Plus programme; the panel is of the opinion that PI should take a more proactive role itself.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>

	<p>Ultimately, there are discussion sessions, chaired by the Rector, within the Academic Board that are aimed at mutually updating and aligning the procedures of the Institution with such improvements to evidence the dynamism of its policies.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> CPD is highly prized by PI, as indicated in the narrative, and this is supported in a number of its policies and procedures including but not limited to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Doc 006 Teaching, Learning and Assessment Policy,</li> <li>- Doc 012 Research Activity Policy,</li> <li>- Doc 020 Virtual Mobility Policy, etc.</li> </ul> <p>The Strategic Plan also considers CPD as central to its conceptual framework.</p> <p>(see attachments KR14 and MR1 evidence)</p>	
<p><b>KR 15:</b> PI should do more to support lecturers by facilitating research opportunities to enhance their professional development and quality of programmes, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR14</p>	<p>The panel appreciates the use of the Erasmus Plus programme in facilitating research opportunities. The PI conference is as well a good way of creating possibilities in this field. At the same time, the possibilities are still relatively limited.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
<p><b>KR 16:</b> PI should consider implementing a policy to guarantee a minimum level of lecturer-student contact at Master and Bachelor levels, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR3</p>	<p>Through the didactical guidelines, PI ensures a minimum level of contact between students and lecturers. However, the panel could not establish if, in reality, this takes place since only PhD candidates were interviewed.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>

<p><b>KR 17:</b> PI should consider possibilities to improve facilitation of formally structured meetings between tutors to enable them to discuss any issues of new ideas and share best practice, within 6 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in MR3</p>	<p>The panel observed a strengthened tutorship, but holds the position that more internal communication would further strengthen it, for instance, through the possibility for tutor intervision sessions meant for sharing experiences and fostering a sense of community amongst tutors.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Significant progress made</b></p>
--	----------------------------	---

### Standard 7: Learning Resources and Student Support

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Does not meet Standard</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation of Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b></p>
<p><b>MR 7:</b> Accessibility tools shall be added and made available on the education platform, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>These findings were identified during the internal audits and the procedure formalised in Doc010 Students Support Policy. Application forms to facilitate student support requests have been created and developed with stakeholder input and made available on the platform.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application forms to facilitate student support requests have been created and developed with stakeholder input and made available on the platform. Use case sample: The form has already been filled in by a student with dyslexia, who is receiving the necessary support following discussion with the coordinator and the PhD administrative team.</li> <li>2. The PI E-learning platform is compliant with the WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) 2.0 accessibility standards; in order to offer a platform that allows the complete usability of educational content also for disabled people.</li> </ol>	<p>The panel observed accessibility tools provided, and noted that these are being used.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

	(See attachments MR7 evidence)	
<p><b>MR 8:</b> Online library subscriptions shall be formalised, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>This finding was identified during the internal audits. A list of all the sources has been included in the staff manual, in the chapter related to the online library. PI has been working on improving the link between study and research over the past year, particularly via its annual international conference, as well as the MakeLearn &amp; TIIM Conference, and will continue to forge greater links within its programmes, a prime example of which is the Masters in Sustainable Development and progression route to PhD in Sustainable Development. PI is also embarking on creating a database of all the PhD and Masters' theses, thereby forging a chain of international studies, therefore, a double-blind review (first scheduled editorial release includes: Proceedings of the PI Conference and publication of the theses already discussed).</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan for the PI Online Library for International Students (P.O.L.I.S.) has been approved by the Pegaso International Board and implemented on the platform.</li> </ol> <p>The sources are divided according to the course of study and it is possible to find both open access and non-open access databases, periodicals and journals (negotiations are underway for non-open access subscriptions).</p> <p>(See attachments MR8 evidence)</p>	<p>Library subscriptions are available for use by staff and students.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
<p><b>KR 18:</b> The support system should be formalised as procedure, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Policies and procedures substantiating the support system are manifested in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Doc 010 Students Support Policy,</li> <li>- Doc 015 Student Complaints, Appeals &amp; Grievances Procedure,</li> <li>- Doc 018 Equality, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the Additional Support Form has been raised to further enhance the process for the benefit of students.</p> <p>(See attachments KR18 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed that the support system is in place.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

## Standard 8: Information Management

<b>Judgement:</b> Requires improvement to meet the Standard		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p><b>MR 9:</b> PI shall ensure that a stringent feedback collection system is in place, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR1</p> <p>Measures to be driven by the QA Monitor have been taken via disseminating questionnaires also to stakeholders (identified for each course of study) after being approved by the Academic Committee. Stakeholders will also be involved as guest lecturers, particularly in Masters' programmes. This action is supported by the appropriate policies/procedures/processes, e.g., Doc004 Course Design Process, Doc 005 Programme Design, Development and Approval Policy.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PI has implemented 5 different types of questionnaires for specific purposes. Such questionnaires are uploaded on the platform and are mandatory to complete for students reading the degree programmes listed below.</li> <li>2. The results are collected through the platform. For dissemination purposes, the results are collected in one single document and this is shared with students and stakeholders in the course of a public online streaming event held by the Academic Committee.</li> </ol> <p>(See attachments MR9 evidence)</p>	<p>The collection of feedback through systematic actions is being carried out.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>KR 19:</b> The necessary provisions for the vulnerable student population (i.e., the necessary data field) should be added to the internal information management system, within 3 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>PI's E-learning platform is fully compliant with WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) 2.0 accessibility standards. This is in order to offer a platform that allows the full use of the learning content even for people with disabilities.</p> <p>In the realisation of this platform, due attention was given to revise the starting platform in order to ensure full compliance with the 12 focal points indicated by the Italian Union of the Blind and Visually Impaired, ONLUS, and the 16 examples provided by the same organisation. Basically, it was a matter of setting up the platform in such a way as to make it compatible with a high-quality screen reader such as NVDA. Regarding those with impaired hearing, considering today's current level of development in technology, PI also adopted as its resource, not just stenotype equipment, but subtitling by means of automatic software possibly assisted by replay.</p> <p>These functions have been explained in a document for students, called the E-learning platform student guide Accessible Version.</p> <p>At present, the institution has no enrolments of disabled students. However, one student, enrolled for this academic year in the bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering, presented a certificate of dyslexia.</p> <p>The student was handled in the following way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During orientation, the student informed the administration of the dyslexic condition;</li> <li>2. The administration asked the student to fill in the necessary documentation and to request additional support, together with the medical certificate;</li> <li>3. After receiving the documentation and assessing the case internally, the Student Admission Office arranged a live orientation session with the student to inform him/her about the platform's learning tools and agreed on additional support.</li> </ol> <p>(See attachments KR19 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed that the necessary data field has been added. The basic provisions for vulnerable students are in place.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>
--	--	--



<p><b>R 2:</b> It is advised that a video conference session be organised between students and the tutors prior to the commencement or following the conclusion of the course.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR9  (See attachments R2 evidence)</p>	<p>This session, prior to the commencement or following the conclusion of the courses, has not been implemented structurally.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>
--	---	---

## Standard 9: Public Information

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Standard met</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation of Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b></p>
<p><b>R 3:</b> Students may be consulted on the website using the feedback forms.</p>	<p>A questionnaire was prepared on the evaluation of the information contained on the Institution`s website, in order to assess its clarity and consistency. This questionnaire administered for the students via the E- learning platform. Based on the respective results, the information on the site was implemented and aligned.</p> <p>In addition, the content of the website was updated in line with the MFHEA COMMUNICATION MFHEA/09/2021 on the website for licensed educational institutions, content of media and advertising and use of the MFHEA logo.</p> <p>(See attachments R3 evidence)</p>	<p>Feedback on the usability of the website is being collected.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

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

<b>Judgement:</b> Standard met		
<b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b>	<b>Implementation of Recommendation</b>	<b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress Made</b>
<p><b>KR 20:</b> PI should ensure external stakeholders are sufficiently involved in monitoring and review of the programmes, within 9 months of publication of this report.</p>	<p>As addressed in KR4 PI has set up a mechanism for the collation of feedback received from stakeholders through the administration of questionnaires as described in KR1.</p> <p>Moreover, as reported also in response to KR2, dedicated Steering Committees have been instituted for each field of study and these are composed of representatives of the Institution and representatives from the job market. These committees will convene periodically and in any case before the commencement of the academic year in order to observe the overall results of the courses with particular reference to indicators of learning quality and correspondence to the exigencies and objectives of the job market, in such way as to enable learning paths to be adapted and developed in accordance to current educational requirements.</p> <p><b>Evidence:</b> PI's Doc 004 Course Design Process stipulates that this process requires consultation with the various stakeholders which may have an interest in the course, including industry, and education institutions with which PI collaborates, other lecturing staff and professionals, prospective students, etc. This will be updated further to include reference to a new procedure currently being drafted outlining the formal composition and terms of reference of all PI's Boards and Committees.</p> <p>In the interim, stakeholder feedback is solicited via the attached feedback sheets and, as stated, by online questionnaire.</p> <p>(See attachments KR4 evidence)</p>	<p>The panel observed the mechanisms for monitoring programmes. The formal use of external stakeholders is not abundantly strong when comparing to practices in many other institutions, but the minimal threshold is certainly met.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Action completed</b></p>

<p><b>R 4:</b> PI may inform students about what happens with the feedback they provide.</p>	<p>The results of the questionnaires relating to the various areas, aspects and evaluation, were elaborated and collected in a report on the analysis of the questionnaires for the discernment of the opinion of students, undergraduates and graduates.</p> <p>This report was prepared by the QA office and shared with the Academic Committee for Consequential Actions and Assessments.</p> <p>The results of the report were discussed in an online meeting with student representatives chaired by the Rector.</p> <p>(See attachments R4 evidence)</p>	<p>The information on changes made because of feedback by students, does reach the students. The panel does, however, question whether this information travels further than just the student(s) present as student representative.</p> <p>Judgement: <b>Still work in progress</b></p>
--	--	---

### Standard 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance

<p><b>Judgement:</b> Standard met</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation/s (as per EQA Report)</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation of Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Follow-up Analysis and Judgement on Progress made</b></p>
<p>No recommendations</p>		

## Review Panel Bio Notes

In the setting up of the review panel for [name of Institution], the MFHEA 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 MFHEA.

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 on the 6 and 7th November 2023.

Chair of Review Panel: Mr Eltjo Bazen



Eltjo Bazen has been working in quality assurance of higher education since 2011. He currently works as Chief Product Owner Quality Assurance at HU UAS Utrecht (NL). Eltjo is part of various networks and committees concerning quality and quality assurance in higher education, both Dutch and European. He is active in several auditing roles, such as a chair of internal auditing panels at HU UAS Utrecht, chair of panels of institutional audit abroad and as assessor in EFQM.

Though he loves innovative ideas and experimenting, his firm belief is that the best way to improve is openness and the willingness to learn from each other. Eltjo's educational background is in Philosophy, Business Management and Quality Management. His activities in quality assurance are a perfect combination of his love for education and the fields of philosophy and business & quality management.

Peer Reviewer: Ms Veronica Montebello

Ms Veronica Montebello is a visiting senior lecturer at the University of Malta where she imparts her expertise in both online and face-to-face teaching. Additionally, she serves as a Clinical Supervisor within the Faculty of Dental Surgery and the Faculty of Health Science. In her academic pursuits, Veronica has earned degrees in Dental Hygiene and Health Sciences, complemented by a Masters in Blended and Online Education from the University of Edinburgh. She has achieved the status of Senior Fellow with the Higher Education Academy in the UK. Her commitment to advancing healthcare education is evident through her active involvement in the development, delivery, and evaluation of various online modules at the University of Malta and MCAST. Veronica collaborates with foreign universities to enhance educational programs, showcasing her dedication to global education standards. With a background as a registered dental hygienist, Veronica has made significant contributions to both the public and private sectors. Her leadership experience includes a tenure as the Director designate at the Department of Programme Implementation, MFH, also a senior executive role at the Directorate of Allied Health Care Services. Presently, she holds the position of Lead Profession Manager at the Department of Dental Surgery, MDH and works closely with the People Management Division, MHA. Veronica was the project leader for an ambitious ESF project and is involved with the Malta team on the EU HEROES Joint Action. She also forms part of the WHO Malta delegation on Health Workforce planning and forecasting. Notably, Veronica has spearheaded key projects such as the Competence Assessment Framework (2013), widely utilized by Allied Health Professionals within the public service. Additionally, her contributions to the National Health Workforce Strategy underscore her dedication to shaping and optimising healthcare systems. Veronica is a respected figure in European and international academic circles, actively participating in numerous professional federations, committees, and associations. She holds a position on the Council for the Professions

Complementary to Medicine. Since 2016, Veronica has been an expert panel reviewer and chairperson of several External Quality Assurance audits and programme evaluations for MFHEA.

Student Peer Reviewer: Ms Tiziana Montebello

Ms Tiziana Gatt is currently pursuing an Award in Pastoral Care and Chaplaincy in Schools. Ms Gatt is a University of Malta graduate, awarded with a Master of Arts in Health, Medicine and Society. She also holds a B.Sc.(Hons) in Sport and Active Lifestyles, a Diploma in Management Studies, an Award Certificate in Teaching Adults, and other certifications pertaining mainly to the management and education sphere. She has experience in the volunteering realm, education sector, and in the hospitality and tourism industry. Ms Gatt has been auditing various educational institutions offering accredited courses in relation to quality assurance for the past years.