

Malta Leadership Institute – Follow-up Report - 4th and 5th June 2025

STANDARD 1: STANDARDS FOR INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
<p>MR 1: The institution shall, within one year from the publication of this report, establish, formalise and implement with consistency, a quality assurance system with a clearly defined policy, division of responsibilities, as well as fit for purposes processes and instruments that support the continuous improvement of the student learning experience.</p>	<p>The MLI Quality Assurance Manual was updated in March of 2025 and contains most of what is expected. The institutional quality assurance system is described, including, in appendices, what is expected of most roles relevant to QA. In the conversations the panel had, it became clear that this system is implemented. Several key stakeholders have been shown to work on continuous improvement.</p> <p>One aspect is missing from the institutional QA system, however. Using the generally accepted model of PDCA, it is remarkable that MLI does not describe what the Plan for quality is. Neither what the institution sees as quality (which indicators, what thresholds for those indicators are) nor the process to get there are described in the QA Manual.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>MR 2: MLI shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, ensure that the system of institutional policies covers all elements included in the NQAF Standard 1.</p>	<p>In the Policies & Procedures of MLI, the vast majority of elements are covered. Only on some aspects it could be debated if the prescribed measures are implemented to the extent the panel would like. An example is the involvement of external stakeholders in quality assurance. MLI introduced the role of external verifiers; in the view of the panel, this is only an activity in the Check phase of the PDCA, but that external stakeholders are involved in QA is clear.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>MR 3: MLI shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, revisit the strategic planning documentation - Strategic and Operational Plans - to ensure that they enable the</p>	<p>There was an update of the Strategic Plan which now includes defined goals and subgoals in a structured and measurable way.</p> <p>The panel is under the impression, however, that this document is mostly relevant on paper and less so in the real situation of the institution. In the</p>	<p>Judgement: Significant progress made</p>

<p>organisation to reach its defined goals in a structured and measurable way.</p>	<p>current situation of the institution, with normal operations impeded, strategic leadership had not formulated short- to mid-term plans and goals to overcome these threatening circumstances. Only when pressed by the panel, a one-page document with short-term Plans & Goals was produced during the site visit. This document had not been discussed with any stakeholders inside or outside the institution.</p>	
<p>MR 4: MLI shall, within one year of the publication of this report, develop and implement processes for the monitoring, implementation, and reporting on the Strategic Plan implementation.</p>	<p>The institution does report on the progress of its Strategic Plan. This report is discussed with several stakeholders in the institution.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 1: The institution should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, simplify the system of documents, forms, policies, procedures, agreements, logbooks, checklists, charts, rules and manuals currently in place at the institution by adding more structure, order and fitness for purposes, as well as clarity for those that need to operate with these tools.</p>	<p>Although the complete list of policies and procedures of MLI still covers more than one page, the structure provided for the totality of policies and procedures makes it possible to have a quick overview. The current structure provides insight into which documents are relevant for which group of stakeholders.</p> <p>The panel is convinced more work could be done to simplify, but in its core clarity is present.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 2: The institution should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, ensure engagement of all stakeholders in strategic planning processes.</p>	<p>External stakeholders are used by MLI. These stakeholders are, however, almost exclusively active on the aspects directly relevant to their own interests. Strategic subjects do not seem to be discussed between the institution and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Students are not active in governance and strategic planning. They were not present in the MLI Council when it was still functioning, neither are they invited in the current, temporary MLI Core Group.</p>	<p>Judgement: No significant progress made</p>

STANDARD 2: INSTITUTIONAL PROBITY		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
MR 5: MLI shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, develop an organisation chart that reflects the actual structure of the institution and includes the main governance and administration functions.	MLI provided the panel with several versions of the organisational chart, occurring in different documents that were dated within a few days of one another. During the site visit the institution indicated which version would be the correct one. This organisational chart, however, has a structure that was not believed to be correct, for instance, in the hierarchical positioning of MLI Core Group and the Principal. Moreover, the chart shows organisational units that do not exist and are, at this moment, a mere suggestion for further organisational development. The main example of this is the Board of Trustees.	Judgement: Still work in progress
MR 6: The institution shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, regulate a clear division of responsibilities for all governance and leadership roles and structures.	MLI has drafted an overview of roles and responsibilities for governance structures. Due to the current circumstances, however, MLI decided to deviate from the governance structures as described on paper. In particular, the MLI Council has been suspended, and a 'Core Group' has been formed in its place. This Core Group does not have the same tasks and responsibilities as the Council, but exactly what is expected from this group is not formalised. While it can be said the institution acts in an agile manner trying to include stakeholders in a difficult time, it is not fully clear to the panel why the Council could not have stayed active with people in interim positions or why the Core Groups tasks and responsibilities could not have been formalised.	Judgement: Significant progress made

<p>MR 7: MLI shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, define procedures for the appointment/selection/election of governance roles and implement them in practice to ensure that the positions are occupied by the best qualified individuals.</p>	<p>MLI described the selection criteria and appointment procedures for most of its governance roles. In practice, this description has not always been followed. For instance, although it was made possible on paper, no students have been active in the MLI Council.</p> <p>For membership of the temporary MLI Core Group there does not seem to be any (formal) procedure.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR3: The institution should submit to the Malta Business Registry, within one month of the publication of this report, the annual returns for the company for the three-year period 2021-2023.</p>	<p>According to the follow-up report drafted by the auditor engaged by the MFHEA, although past their respective deadlines, MLI has submitted its annual returns to the Malta Business Registry (MBR).</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR4: The institution should submit to the Malta Business Registry, within 3 months of the publication of this report, the audited financial statements for 2021.</p>	<p>According to the follow-up report drafted by the auditor engaged by the MFHEA, MLI has not yet submitted its audited financial statements for the financial years ending 2021 through 2023 to the MBR. Based on the evidence, the auditor noted that MLI's financial records have required extensive reconciliation, which might have significantly contributed to the delay. Additionally, in the follow-up report, the auditor has found that MLI and the audit and accounting firm have had several disagreements during the process. These issues, according to the report, have impaired MLI's ability to comply with its statutory obligations with the MBR, but have also had a negative impact on its compliance status with other national authorities, including the MFHEA, the Commissioner for Revenue (CFR), and the National Statistics Office (NSO).</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>

STANDARD 3: DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMMES		
JUDGEMENT: Requires improvement to meet Standard		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
MR 8: MLI shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, formalise and implement with consistency the process and procedures for programme design, while including student and labour market representatives.	<p>MLI developed the Programme Design and Review Policy (Version 1.2, 20.05.2025). This document presents the composition of the Programme Design and Review Committee (PDRC) and its Terms of Reference; and it describes Programme Design and Review Procedures. Programme Design Procedures include student representatives and lecturers in the MLI Council to ensure continuous input. Procedures require: a) to collaborate with external industry experts and career services to analyse job market trends relevant to programme design; b) inform stakeholders about the accreditation process and its impact on programme qualifications; c) incorporate feedback from students, lecturers and external stakeholders during the accreditation preparation phase; and d) gather input from students, lecturers and industry experts on course content, delivery methods and learning outcomes.</p> <p>The MLI Recruitment Policy and Procedure (27.11.2024, v1.3) define the minimum requirements in term of qualifications and competence for teaching staff.</p> <p>External stakeholders are involved directly (Cooperative counselling course, intercultural and ethical aspects in business and education) and indirectly (by student and teacher exchange), as was presented during the meeting. It should be noted that no one full academic programme for accreditation was designed after the Programme Design and Review Policy was approved (Version 1.2, 2025). Therefore, MLI could not provide the evidence on how these policy documents were implemented in programme design and approval for the follow-up panel. Instead of it, the Needs Analysis for the Wellbeing Programme (designed together with partners under the ERASMUS KA210 project, 2024) was presented.</p>	Judgement: Action completed

	<p>In summary, it can be stated that the information provided does not reveal the full picture as to how the Programme Design and Review Policy is implemented.</p>	
<p>MR 9: The institution shall, within 6 months of the publication of this report, ensure that all programme documentation reflects, with consistency, the features included in the NQAF Standard 3.</p>	<p>All academic course descriptions are presented on the MLI website. These course descriptions contain: a) the list of the overall competencies and learning outcomes upon completion of the respective course; b) an expected student workload in terms of ECTS learning credits; c) the requirements for learning dynamics and tutor-learner interactions; and d) the forms of relevant assessment.</p> <p>However, the presented MLI Programme Design and Review Policy (version 1.2, 2025) is not required to define the expected student workload in terms of ECTS learning credits and all other requirements mentioned above. Therefore, the Programme Design and Review Policy (version 1.2) should be updated and supplemented by the requirements included in the NQAF Standard 3.</p> <p>The Student Handbook determines the student admission requirements, but this document is not legalised yet.</p> <p>The case on how alumni were involved in the programme update was presented by the graduates of the MLI to the follow-up audit panel.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>

STANDARD 4: STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
MR10: MLI shall revisit the rubrics of assignments, within 6 months of the publication of this report, to reflect alignment with the Learning Outcomes of the course.	MLI has reviewed the assignment rubrics to ensure they align with the learning outcomes. In the follow-up documentation, MLI provided multiple pieces of evidence to demonstrate the implementation of these rubrics. Additionally, both lecturers and students whom the panel met during the onsite visit confirmed that the rubrics are being used for all modules in every course offered by MLI.	Judgement: Action completed
MR 11: The institution shall standardise, within 6 months of the publication of this report, and implement procedures for the internal verification process of assignments compiled by lecturers prior to being submitted to students.	MLI has standardised and implemented procedures for the internal verification of assignments compiled by lecturers before they are submitted to students. During the onsite visit and through documentation, MLI provided evidence that this internal verification process is being implemented in accordance with regulations. Lecturers confirmed that they verify assessment titles to avoid repeating the same titles. Another aspect of the verification process involves checking the assignment questions against the assessment guidelines outlined in the Learning Management System (LMS) and ensuring alignment with the learning outcomes of the module and the overall course level.	Judgement: Action completed
MR 12: MLI shall formulate, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a standardized procedure for the internal verification of assignments submitted by students by a second assessor to ensure consistency and fairness on the marking of assignments.	MLI has formulated a standardized procedure for the internal verification of assignments submitted by students by a second assessor. According to the discussions with the lectures, the panel learnt that lecturers select 30% of the modules, but not exceeding five assignments, and they fill in a QA report after the internal verification. They also confirmed that they did a retrospective assessment of previous assignments.	Judgement: Action completed

<p>R 1: The institution could demonstrate the procedure on how students should access the EBSCO database and invite students to use it when they are conducting their research endeavours.</p>	<p>Following the EQA report, MLI made EBSCO available and more visible to its students through the LMS. However, due to financial constraints, the subscription to EBSCO has been suspended for over six months. The Head of MLI emphasised that they will be provided a free two-month trial. In the meantime, students will have access to other open resources like Google Scholar and ResearchGate. The continuation of the regular subscription to EBSCO, according to the Head of MLI, will depend on new developments following the follow-up report.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, all students confirmed that they were informed about EBSCO. They also stated that they have access to electronic literature, including PowerPoints and slides posted individually by professors on the LMS.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR 5: MLI should ensure, within 6 months of the publication of this report, that lecturers adhere to the 6 weeks' timeframe for marking assignments.</p>	<p>MLI has established and implemented a six-week assignment timeline. Lecturers are required to submit grades by the fourth week, allowing internal verifiers two weeks to review and verify the grades. This process ensures that students receive their results within the six-week period.</p> <p>All stakeholders with whom the panel met, i.e., respectively students, lecturers, representatives of the Core Group and the QA Committee, confirmed that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Members of staff confirmed that they had QA meetings about the new procedures in place and that they receive reminders on email about the time to deliver results in order to not have any issues with respecting the deadlines.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 6: The institution should define, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a formal two-way procedure for students to communicate effectively with MLI administration so as to reduce as much as possible the other forms of informal communication.</p>	<p>During the onsite visit, the panel learnt that communication with the administration has improved. The primary communication platform between the administration and students is the LMS, but there are also WhatsApp groups that allow students to communicate quickly with the administration. None of the students or lecturers the panel met with expressed any dissatisfaction regarding communication with the administration. In fact, some mentioned that the recent improvement at MLI includes quicker communication through emails.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

<p>MR 13: MLI shall develop, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a standardized students' complaints procedure and implement it in practice by not accepting any other form of communicating a complaint.</p>	<p>According to the follow-up report, MLI states that it has developed and fully implemented a standardized student complaints procedure to ensure that all complaints are documented, tracked, and resolved promptly and transparently. According to the follow-up report, the updated policy has been communicated to students and staff, and all relevant documentation is easily accessible via the LMS.</p> <p>However, during the onsite visit, none of the students demonstrated knowledge of the revised policy. Students stated that if they are dissatisfied with a grade, they either send an email to the administrator or speak directly to the professor. They noted that since the implementation of the rubrics, the grading system has become more transparent, and they have not had any complaints.</p> <p>Although MLI adopted a Complaints and Appeals Policy on 13th February 2025, the panel recommends that the institution continue its efforts to inform students about its provisions. Additionally, given the lack of administrative staff and the small scale of the institution, the panel believes that more work is needed to ensure that student anonymity is protected and that they feel encouraged to bring forward any complaints they may have.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>MR 14: The institution shall update, within 6 months of the publication of this report, the Learners' Policies and Procedures manual to reflect current practices and upload it on the LMS platform for the students' perusal.</p>	<p>MLI has drafted a Student Handbook which is available on the institutional website and also on the LMS. Half of its content is identical with the content of the Admissions Policy (admission and application process) whereas the other half contains other information about assessment, teaching methods, including appeals and complaints, recognition of prior learning, information about the LMS, etc.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, the panel learnt that international students were especially well-informed about the institution's policies and procedures. They specifically noted that the induction process was very well organised, consisting of three stages, and that they received all the necessary information prior to the start of the academic year.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

STANDARD 5: STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
<p>KR 7: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, draft a policy on student admission with clearly defined procedures and eligibility criteria and make it available on its website.</p>	<p>MLI has drafted and published a separate Policy on Student Admission (31st January 2024). This regulation outlines the principles, criteria and procedures for the admission of students to various programmes.</p> <p>While the policy describes the application processes for local students and non-EU nationals, it states that “Eligibility criteria must be verified, and necessary certificates presented before the course starts.” However, it does not specify any minimum requirements based on MQF levels.</p> <p>Although entry criteria and requirements for each study programme are detailed on the institutional website, the panel believes that minimum entry criteria should be outlined according to the institution's legal acts before being published online.</p>	<p>Although MLI has addressed the recommendation by drafting a separate Policy on Student Admission, it is still recommended to revise the document by better defining the minimum entry requirements for each MQF level.</p> <p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR 8: The institution should, within 3 months of the publication of this report, publish the procedure for the acceptance of third county nationals on its website.</p>	<p>MLI has added a new link titled “International Students” in the main menu of the website. The menu provides information about the Malta context, visa requirements, the acceptance procedures for international students, application links, available courses, and an option to submit inquiries.</p> <p>Evidence1: https://maltaleadershipinstitute.com/international-students/</p> <p>Evidence 2: https://form.jotform.com/jesfrig/Internationalstudents</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

<p>KR 9: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, ensure that the process of vetting applications is transparent and fair to all learners.</p>	<p>Reference about vetting of applications is made in the section “Application Process for Non-EU Nationals” under the Policy on Student Admission. This section outlines that “<i>After verifying and vetting the application, if students meet the eligibility requirements of the course, they will be invited for an online interview</i>”. However, it does not provide further details on how the vetting process is conducted. Additionally, Appendix 1, which outlines the Criteria of Assessment for Interviews with International Prospective Students, includes some sample questions to serve as a guideline.</p> <p>Since there have been no student enrolments in the past year, the panel could not evaluate whether the recommendation has been fully implemented. However, in discussions with the current students, all confirmed that they had undergone an interview before being registered with MLI.</p> <p>MLI has produced an overall report about the verification and vetting process, which was carried out in alignment with internal quality assurance guidelines. The one-page report concludes that the verification and vetting process was successful, with many students meeting the necessary criteria. However, it notes that a subset of students had incomplete documentation. Consequently, the report recommends that MLI should adopt a more stringent approach to collecting digital documents from students during the admission process.</p>	<p>Although MLI has addressed the recommendation by drafting a separate Policy on Student Admission, it is still recommended to revise the document to clearly outline how the vetting process is conducted.</p> <p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR 10: The institution should, within 3 months of the publication of this report, publish the Regulation on Recognition of Prior Learning on its website.</p>	<p>MLI has published the Regulation on Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) on its website.</p> <p>Evidence: https://maltaleadershipinstitute.com/policies/</p> <p>However, there are multiple versions of the RPL regulation. It is recommended that MLI ensure that only the valid version of the regulation remains available on the webpage.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

<p>KR 11: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, ensure that the application procedure for the recognition of Prior Learning is implemented by the assessment team in line with its approved Regulation.</p>	<p>MLI has revised its Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Procedure (dated 23rd August 2023). In the documentation, MLI uploaded several correspondences with candidates who have submitted a Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Application Form. The information regarding exemptions granted based on applicants' requests is communicated by the Head of the institution. However, there is no evidence that an assessor reviewed the applications and made decisions on the candidates' competencies as required by the regulations.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR 12: The institution should establish a formal and systematic process in place to collect and manage student progression within 6 months of the publication of this report.</p>	<p>Regarding student progression, the panel did not find evidence of a formal and systematic procedure in place. Due to the decreasing number of students, it appears that monitoring student progress is primarily conducted by lecturers or the Head of the institution. During the onsite visit, the panel discovered that while there are generally no issues with Maltese students, international students often do not maintain contact with the school. The Head of MLI mentioned that they do not follow a generic procedure; instead, each case is treated individually.</p> <p>Lecturers also confirmed that they monitor whether students have submitted their assignments and if someone is not posting, they either contact the students directly or raise the issue at the administration. Then, depending on the situation, they either provide additional classes, or post additional information and literature. Sometimes, they also hold one to one meetings with students.</p>	<p>Although MLI has addressed the recommendation by paying more attention to student progression, the panel advises the institution to formalise the process.</p> <p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>
<p>KR 13: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, review and improve the storage and management of learner data.</p>	<p>MLI has submitted several student folders to demonstrate how learner data is stored and managed. These folders include essential documentation for each stage of a student's academic journey at MLI, starting from the application process to assessment, certificates, pictures, invoices and more.</p> <p>According to the students, academic records can easily be generated and requested via email to the administration. The same process applies to financial records. However, the panel reviewed the folders and found that not all of them contained the required documentation. Moreover, the</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>

	documentation is not stored in an electronic database that would enable easier access to the documents.	
R 2: The institution could better inform its learners about the learning opportunities offered by MLI.	<p>During the onsite visit, all students the panel met demonstrated understanding of the learning opportunities offered by MLI. They reported receiving information, literature and additional classes, noting that any further details they want are made available online on the LMS.</p> <p>The panel also had the chance to explore the LMS during the visit to facilities and is convinced that much information essential for students' academic journeys is available through the LMS.</p>	Judgement: Action completed

STANDARD 6: TEACHING STAFF		
JUDGEMENT: Requires improvement to meet Standard		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
KR 14. MLI should formalise, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a standardized document to encompass the recruitment and selection process and implement them in practice to ensure that the best lecturers are selected at MLI.	<p>The MLI Recruitment Policy and Procedure was updated on 31.01.2025 (version 2). This document defines the recruitment and selection procedure for academic and administrative staff of the MLI. For academic staff, the document determines the relevant competence, minimum term of teaching experience and minimum qualification level according to the MQF. The MLI Council appoints the Selection Board. This Board has to shortlist an applicant according to the established criteria and minimum qualifications, and conduct structured interviews and relevant assessments to evaluate applicants' suitability.</p> <p>According to the above Procedure, the Selection Board takes a decision on the most suitable candidate based on merit and documented assessment results, and presents the result to the MLI Council/Principal for approval.</p>	Judgement: Action completed

	<p>Part-time academic and administrative staff should be treated with the same level of respect and subject to the same standards, expectations and opportunities for development as full-time staff.</p> <p>MLI's lecturers are all part-timers and most of them are employed on a casual basis. The Principal holds an initial interview and there were instances where these interviews were held by the Academic Manager with the CEO. The MLI didn't kept the minutes of such meetings until now. A Selection Board was used just two times: to employ the Academic Manager (in November 2023) and one full-time lecturer (in 2020). The composition of the Selection Board was the CEO/Principal, the Head of Business and Management School, and the Head of Administration.</p>	
<p>KR 15. The institution should develop, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a standardized document delineating procedures for the Continuous Professional Development for staff and implement its practices to encourage staff to take up professional development activities.</p>	<p>MLI developed in 2018 and updated 13.02.2025 (Version 6) the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Policy and Procedures. This document defines the policy, scope and key principles of the MLI CPD. The above policy document determines the duties and requirements for academic and administrative staff as well as the duties for the Academic Support Department vis-à-vis the MLI lecturers and administrative staff. The policy document declares the relevance of the CPD for the staff and development of the institution. However, this aspect is not respectively reflected in the presented CPD forms of lecturers. It is also not clear how CPD activities are intended for respective institutional needs, and how respective resources are allocated. The MLI's presented CPD plan is confusing, because in the preamble of the document it is written: "<i>As per decision taken by the MLI Core Group on the 24th May 2025, Lecturers, Internal Verifiers, Assessors and other Academic Staff shall attend at least 5 hours CPD organised either by MLI or else they have to provide on the proper feedback form any related CPD that they have attended elsewhere</i>", but the above plan includes different trainings from September 2024 until January 2026.</p>	<p>Judgement: Still work in progress</p>

<p>MR 15. MLI shall compile, within 6 months of the publication of this report, a standardized document encompassing procedures for assessing the performance review of teaching staff and implement them in practice to ensure that teaching at MLI is carried out at high levels.</p>	<p>The MLI Quality Assurance Manual (30.03.2025, version 7) defines how the quality of planning, implementation, evaluation, and internal and external review of accredited and non-accredited courses should be assured, considering all aspects of the learning process and environment.</p> <p>This QA Manual can be recognised as a standardized document encompassing procedures for assessing the performance review of all MLI staff, lecturers and tutors. The Internal Quality Verifiers (IQV) are observing all tuition and assessment processes to ensure that the above methods, techniques and content align with MLI's quality standards.</p> <p>A standardized Observation Form is developed to assess various aspects of teaching performance, including instructional techniques, student engagement, and adherence to course objectives. This process can support continuous improvement of teaching.</p>	<p>Judgement Action completed</p>
<p>MR 16. The institution shall define, within 6 months of the publication of this report, standard measures for MLI to deal with students that commit plagiarism in their dissertation.</p>	<p>According to the MLI Academic Policy & Procedures (31.01.2025, version 1), lecturers have to and are responsible for configuring the Turnitin software tool (on the LMS) settings appropriately to ensure proper plagiarism checks are in place. (MLI Turnitin Guide for Lecturers).</p>	<p>Judgement Action completed</p>
<p>KR 16. MLI should ensure, within 6 months of the publication of this report, that a formal mechanism is set up to capture lecturers' suggestions and implement a procedure on how to furnish lecturers with feedback.</p>	<p>Lecturers of the MLI are being questioned by asking them to fill in the Lecturers' Feedback Forms and Observation Sheets annually. The academic year which ended in June 2025 was the first time this information was collected.</p> <p>The MLI presented the Meta-Synthetical Report which is the collection and analysis of the QA process drafted by the Academic Manager. The responsibility to analyse lecturers' suggestions and prepare the feedback will henceforth be jointly held by the Academic Manager and the QA Committee.</p>	<p>Judgement Action completed</p>

<p>MR 17. The institution shall update, within 6 months of the publication of this report, the Tutors' Policies and Procedures manual to reflect current practices and upload it on the LMS platform for the lecturers' perusal.</p>	<p>The MLI has the Tutors' Policies and Procedures, which was updated on 20.06.2024. This document defines all necessary requirements for tutors' recruitment, selection, competence, experience and qualification. The above policy document determines the methods of assessment and communication, and is accessible on the LMS for all MLI teaching staff, including tutors.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
---	--	---

<p>STANDARD 7: LEARNING RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT</p>		
<p>JUDGEMENT:</p>		
<p>Recommendation (as per EQA Report)</p>	<p>Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation</p>	<p>Analysis and Judgement on Progress</p>
<p>KR 17: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, employ additional administrative staff to fully support student's needs and requirements.</p>	<p>Based on the follow-up report, it was mentioned that MLI has expanded its administrative team, recruiting additional staff to provide more personalised support. This was later confirmed by an employment contract signed in January 2024 with an Administrator, whose role was to manage all administrative tasks related to MLI and Administration Services, including those pertaining to students. However, due to issues arising from the lack of registration of new students, this individual resigned.</p> <p>Currently, MLI has four employees: a Maintenance Coordinator, a HR and Internationalisation Officer, an Accounts and Financial Officer, and a Marketing Officer. None of these roles includes responsibilities for student support. The primary administrative tasks are managed by the Head of MLI.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, students did not express any concerns regarding administrative support, emphasising that all their requests were handled in a timely manner. However, this does not diminish the importance of having a structured and systematic student support system in place to ensure that</p>	<p>While it was encouraging for the panel to hear from the remaining administrative staff that they continue to support MLI during this challenging time, it is essential that MLI employs administrative staff as recommended in the EQA report.</p> <p>Judgement: No significant progress made</p>

	student needs are met in a timely manner and to ultimately satisfy the MFHEA Standards.	
KR 18: The institution should, within one year of the publication of this report, expand the number of administrative and academic services provided to students.	<p>Based on the MLI Quality Charter of Education it is stated that “<i>MLI commits to providing a comprehensive array of counselling and support services, acknowledging the vital role of addressing students' emotional and academic needs. These services are designed to offer a holistic support framework, covering everything from emotional counselling to academic advice</i>”.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the panel did not find evidence of a structured academic support service being provided to students.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, all students expressed satisfaction with their communication with lecturers, noting that professors respond promptly when they (the students) need additional support or have questions. However, this does not diminish the importance of having a structured and systematic academic support system in place to ensure that student needs are met in a timely manner and to ultimately satisfy the MFHEA Standards.</p>	Judgement: No significant progress made
KR 19: MLI should, within 3 months of the publication of this report, increase the visibility of all learning resources for students, including EBSCO.	<p>Following the EQA report, MLI made EBSCO available and more visible to its students through the LMS. However, due to financial constraints, the subscription to EBSCO has been suspended for over six months. The Head of MLI emphasised that they will be provided a free two-month trial. In the meantime, students will have access to other open resources like Google Scholar and ResearchGate. The continuation of the regular subscription to EBSCO, according to the Head of MLI, will depend on new developments following the follow-up report.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, all students confirmed that they were informed about EBSCO. They also stated that they have access to electronic literature, including PowerPoints and slides posted individually by professors on the LMS.</p>	Judgement: Still work in progress

<p>KR 20: The institution should, within one year of the publication of this report, adjust the infrastructure by adding spaces for group and independent work of students.</p>	<p>The classrooms and infrastructure remain stable at MLI, providing a solid foundation for learning. During the onsite visit, the panel conducted a tour of facilities. From the previous EQA visit, the panel noted that a new room intended for students' independent learning is made available to students. This room is equipped with chairs and tables, and it also includes a small library section with available student dissertation theses for reference.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 21: MLI should, within one year of the publication of this report, adjust the infrastructure to ensure that facilities are fully inclusive for students with all types of needs.</p>	<p>During the onsite visit, the panel evidenced that the elevators were fully operational. Also, beside the new room intended for students' independent learning, MLI has also set up a workstation with a laptop for students.</p> <p>In the meeting with students, both Maltese and international, they confirmed that they were satisfied with the infrastructure, including the availability of rooms for independent learning.</p>	<p>Judgement: Significant progress made</p>
<p>KR 22: The institution should, within one year of the publication of this report, provide opportunities for professional development for its administrative staff.</p>	<p>MLI has drafted and approved the MLI Continuous Professional Development Policy and Procedures (dated 13th February 2025). It outlines that MLI staff should participate in relevant workshops, seminars and conferences that align with their professional goals and MLI's strategic objectives.</p> <p>MLI has provided evidence of multiple training sessions for its administrative staff. These training sessions cover various topics, including customer care, emotional intelligence, resistance to change, communication styles, teamwork and collaboration. Although the panel could not establish a clear connection between training sessions and professional goals as well as MLI's strategic objectives, it acknowledges the progress MLI has made in organising various training sessions for its staff.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 23: MLI should, within one year of the publication of this report, decide on a formal procedure to assess the performance of the administrative staff.</p>	<p>MLI has drafted and approved a Work Performance Policy and Procedure (dated 31.01.2025). The aim of this policy is to define roles and responsibilities of all administrative and academic staff together with the expectations through the clear formulation of the performance review process.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

	<p>The policy includes descriptions of job roles and specifies expectations for each staff member. According to the regulation, performance reviews are essential to evaluate whether the performance of academic and administrative staff is in alignment with the institution's strategic goals, to promote professional development, recognise achievements, and identify areas for improvement.</p> <p>MLI has also defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each member of the administrative staff. These KPIs are intended not only for objective performance evaluation but also to highlight areas for improvement, necessary training, and other performance-related issues.</p> <p>For the year 2024, MLI submitted KPIs for several members of its administrative staff, tailored specifically to each role within the institution. Furthermore, during the onsite visit, all administrative staff members with whom the panel met confirmed that they have been receiving KPIs and participating in performance reviews, and that the process is ongoing.</p>	
<p>R 3: MLI could adjust the infrastructure by creating a more attractive and inviting environment for its students.</p>	<p>As stated above, during the tour of the premises, the panel discovered that in addition to the new room intended for students' independent learning, MLI has also set up a workstation with a laptop for students.</p> <p>During the onsite visit, students indicated that they also appreciated the availability of balconies as an opportunity for relaxation and study.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

STANDARD 8: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT		
JUDGEMENT: Does not meet Standard		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
R 4. MLI could consider the development of a system to trace the destination of students by incorporating details of their employment and career development on completion of their studies.	An example presented by the MLI to the follow-up panel indicates an inconsistent nature of information related to the graduates' employment when former students are requesting the letter of verification of their qualification obtained with MLI. On the other hand, the institution does not consider it necessary to monitor the data on the employment of graduates because the absolute majority of them are employed right after graduation or even during their studies.	Judgement: Still work in progress
KR 24. The institution should establish, within 6 months of the publication of this report, an Information Management System to exploit the usage of salient data to inform management decision making or to connect to strategic and operations management.	LCTS Ltd Management Policies and Procedures (21.05.2025, v3.1.3) and MLI Information Management Policy and Procedures (21.05.2025, v1) are aiming to establish robust standards and practices for managing information effectively and securely within the Malta Leadership Institute. These two documents provide guidelines to ensure that information management practices comply with regulatory requirements, including support for efficient decision-making processes across all departments. Thus, it can be stated that MLI has a formal basis to ensure the IT requirements set out in Key Recommendation 24 of the previous MFHEA audit. The abovementioned changes have improved the efficiency of management decision making, according to the MLI's administrative and academic staff opinion. As an additional suggestion, more open information for students, staff and particularly for the public could be presented on the MLI webpage.	Judgement Action completed

<p>R 5. MLI could consider setting up a formal IT function delineating the roles to undertake tasks such as data backups, data security, improved indexing when accessing documents in Google Drive and handling LMS technical issues.</p>	<p>LCTS Ltd Management Policies and Procedures (21.05.2025, v3.1.3) and MLI Information Management Policy and Procedures (21.05.2025, v1) require the establishment and following of robust standards and practices for managing information effectively and securely within the institution. The above documents provide guidelines to ensure that information management practices comply with regulatory requirements, safeguard data integrity, confidentiality and availability. Thus, it can be stated that MLI has a formal basis to ensure the IT requirements set out in Recommendation 5 of the previous MFHEA audit.</p>	<p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
---	---	---

<p>STANDARD 9: PUBLIC INFORMATION</p>		
<p>JUDGEMENT:</p>		
<p>Recommendation (as per EQA Report)</p>	<p>Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation</p>	<p>Analysis and Judgement on Progress</p>
<p>KR 25: MLI should, within 6 months of the publication of this report, make all policies and documents available on its website.</p>	<p>According to the Follow-Up Plan, MLI has conducted a comprehensive review of all its publicly available information. As part of this process, MLI has added a new link titled "Policies" to its website, where it has published all relevant policies and regulations.</p> <p>Evidence: https://maltaleadershipinstitute.com/policies/</p> <p>However, the panel has noted that this link may contain multiple versions of the same document listed under different years. The panel recommends that MLI adopt a consistent approach to the publication of regulations to prevent confusion among external readers.</p>	<p>MLI has implemented the recommendation concerning the publication of its policies and documents.</p> <p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

<p>KR 26: MLI should, within 3 months of the publication of this report, review and revise all information about each course individually in line with MFHEA requirements.</p>	<p>MLI has signed a new contract (as of October 2024) with a contractor for the maintenance of the website which among others includes continuous maintenance support. However, the panel has learnt that due to the shortage of administrative staff, the Head of MLI remains responsible for managing the publicly available information.</p> <p>The panel recognises progress in terms of the revision of the information about each course individually on the website. The majority of the courses reviewed by the panel provide clear information regarding the programme's aims, learning outcomes, course structure, fees, admission requirements and other relevant details. However, the panel has noted that some of the courses, particularly those at level 5 and below, do not have as much information published as those at level 6 and higher.</p>	<p>MLI has taken action to implement the recommendation concerning the revision of information published on the website for each course individually. Although the panel recognises the challenges in terms of website maintenance, it still recommends the institution continue to ensure that all courses contain the same information as required by the MFHEA Standards.</p> <p>Judgement: Action completed</p>
<p>KR 27: MLI should, within 3 months of the publication of this report, clearly indicate courses offered to international students.</p>	<p>MLI has added a new link titled "International Students" in the main menu of the website. The menu provides information about the Malta context, visa requirements, the acceptance procedures for international students, application links, available courses, and an option to submit inquiries.</p> <p>Evidence: https://maltaleadershipinstitute.com/international-students/</p>	<p>MLI has implemented the recommendation concerning the publication of information for international students.</p> <p>Judgement: Action completed</p>

R 6: MLI could consider involving students and other stakeholders when revising the website's content.	Based on the follow-up report and during the onsite visit, the panel found no evidence that MLI engaged its students or other stakeholders in revising its website content.	Judgement: No significant progress made
R 7: MLI could publish on its website more information about the students' life and extracurricular activities.	Based on the documents submitted by the MLI, the panel could see some initiatives to increase the number of publications regarding the MLI's activities through newsletters and updates about events on the website and social media. Although the newsletters are currently discontinued, the Head of MLI confirmed that one of the short-term objectives is to resume this practice.	Judgement: Significant progress made

STANDARD 10: ON-GOING MONITORING AND PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAMMES		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
MR 18: MLI shall establish, within 6 months from the publication of this report, a policy and procedure for programme reviews.	On paper, MLI has a policy for programme reviews. This Programme Design and Review Policy, however, is formulated in the most general of terms. Not clear is who initiates a programme review, based on what input is a programme selected, what requirements for reviewers are, who reviewers are (members of Programme Design and Review Committee or other experts) and what framework reviewers are to use. Clear procedures for the programme reviews are missing as well.	Judgement: Still work in progress
MR 19: The institution shall, within one year from the publication of this report, review its qualifications, based on a defined cycle, in order to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them, to review the content of the programme in the light	Modules at MLI are reviewed by so-called Internal Verifiers. This process seems to be an important part of the institution's QA of learning and teaching. The Standard for on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes, however, explicitly asks for monitoring and review at programme level. Whereas monitoring and review at module level could be input for a process at programme level, the panel did not see activities at programme level carried out. According to the provided schedule, programme reviews should	Judgement: No significant progress made

of the latest research/practice in the sector to ensure that the programme is up to date and to respond to the changing needs of students and society.	have been carried out; in the conversations the panel had with the institution it was acknowledged that this has not happened. The Programme Design and Review Committee, playing an important role in the programme reviews, has not been implemented yet. Reasons given were referencing the current situation of the institution and the related suspension of the MLI Council.	
KR 28: MLI should ensure that, within one year from the publication of this report, all relevant stakeholders are integrated into the programme review procedures.	The Programme Design and Review Committee, that seems to be tasked with overseeing of the programme review procedures, can propose experts from the relevant field to be programme reviewers. There is no mention of students as (potential) reviewers.	Judgement: Still work in progress

STANDARD 11: Cyclical External Quality Assurance		
JUDGEMENT:		
Recommendation (as per EQA Report)	Take-up and Implementation of Recommendation	Analysis and Judgement on Progress
-	-	-

Bio notes

Chair of Peer Review Panel - Mr Eltjo Bazen

Mr 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). Mr Bazen 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 Mr Bazen 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. Mr Bazen'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 and quality management.

Peer Reviewer - Dr Vaidotas Viliūnas

Dr Vaidotas Viliūnas is an independent consultant in Higher Education. Before, he worked as a Policy and Project Officer at the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) during 2018-2021. Dr Viliūnas also used to work at several universities in Lithuania: Kaunas University of Technology, University of Management and Economics, Vytautas Magnus University, and Marijampole UAS where he held academic and top management positions. He was the Vice-President of the European University Foundation Campus Europea during 2007-2011. Dr Viliūnas delivered lectures on Project Management at Lithuanian and foreign Universities (2006-2018). During 2016-2018 he represented the Rectors' Conference of Lithuanian UAS at the General Assembly of EURASHE. He took part in the evaluation of several HEI in Armenia, Georgia, Malta, Slovakia, Estonia and Romania. Currently, Dr Viliūnas is a Senate member of the Kazimieras Simonavičius University, a Board member of HE Higher Education Ranking and member of EURASHE Quality Assurance Community of Practice.

Student Reviewer - Ms Furtuna Mehmeti

Ms Furtuna Mehmeti has been working in the field of quality assurance in higher education for 15 years. During this time, she has actively been part of working groups at the policy level for drafting and reviewing quality assurance legislation, policies and other regulations related to higher education in Kosovo, and specifically quality assurance. She has worked at the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA) for five years, of which she served as the Acting Director for three years. Currently, Ms Mehmeti works in the Quality Assurance Office at AAB College and in addition she serves as national expert for several international projects in Kosovo which deal with higher education and quality assurance. She is conducting her PhD studies at the Faculty of Education of University of Ljubljana and her research work deals with the impacts of the accreditation process in the strategic planning and quality improvement of HEIs.

July 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Eltjo Bazen

Chair of Peer Review Panel

A handwritten signature in blue ink, featuring a stylized, cursive script with a long horizontal tail.

Vaidotas Viliūnas

Peer Reviewer

A handwritten signature in blue ink, written in a cursive style with a prominent 'F' and 'M'.

Furtuna Mehmeti

Student Reviewer