Malta
Further & Higher
Education Authority

EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT REPORT

PROVIDER ACCREDITATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

THE MALTA FOUNDATION FOR HUMAN RESOUCES DEVELOPMENT (FHRD)

Carried out between
26th and 27th of February 2026

Quality education for confident futures .

Contents

Abbreviations List 4
Executive Summary 5
Overview of the Audit Process 5
Summary of the Conclusions Reached by the Peer Review Panel 5
List of Recommendations 6
Standards for Accreditation 9
Standard 1: Mission and strategic management 9
Standard 2: Governance, organisational structure and administration 9
The Peer Review Panel 11
Specific Terms of Reference 12
Institutional Background and Context 12
Standard 3: Quality management 17
Standard 4: Integrity, accountability and information management 20
Standard 5: Teaching and administrative staff 22
Standard 6: Design, monitoring, and review of programmes 26
Standard 7: Student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment 29
Standard 8: Student administration and student support services 31
Standard 10: Research, development and/or other creative activity 34
Standard 11: Institutional cooperation, service to society and internationalisation 35
Panel Member Signatures 36
Annexes 37
Annex 1: Review Panel Bio Notes 37
Annex 2: Agenda of the Onsite Visit 39

Abbreviations List

CPD	Continuing Professional Development
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
EQA/QA audit	External Quality Assurance Audit
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
MFHEA/the Authority	Malta Further and Higher Education Authority
MQF	Malta Qualifications Framework
NCFHE	National Commission for Further and Higher Education
NQAF	National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education
SAR	Self-Assessment Report

Executive Summary

Overview of the Audit Process

This report is a result of the External Quality Assurance (EQA) process undertaken by an independent peer review panel. The panel evaluated the documentation submitted by the educational institution and conducted an onsite audit visit. The panel is responsible for reaching conclusions on all Standards in line with the Minimal and Performance Indicators as outlined in the External Quality Assurance Provider Accreditation Manual For Higher Education Institutions. Through this report, the panel also highlighted areas of good practice which, in its view, make a positive contribution to academic standards and quality of education that are worthy of being emulated and disseminated more widely.

Timeline

EQA Audit Timeline – The Malta Foundation for Human Resources Development	
Induction meeting	*12. 1. 2026*
Pre-Accreditation Provider meeting	*3. 2. 2026*
Desk-based analysis	*16. 2. 2026*
Audit visit	*26.-27. 2. 2026*

Summary of the Conclusions Reached by the Peer Review Panel

The panel considered 11 Standards. Of these, Standards 3, 5, 6 and 11 were considered fully compliant and Standards 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 and 9 were considered substantially compliant. Standard 10 (Research) was found not applicable for the institution since it deals only with programmes on the MQF level 5.

The panel did not make any Mandatory Recommendation.

The panel made 5 Key Recommendations. Of these, 1 should be addressed within 3 months from the date of publication of this report, 2 within 6 months from the date of publication of this report, and 2 within 9 months from the date of publication of this report.

The panel also made 9 Recommendations.

List of Recommendations

Mandatory Recommendations

None

Key Recommendations

KR1: The FHRD should strengthen strategic planning processes by setting an explicit agenda for a longer period of time than it is covered in the Business Plan now, within nine months of the publication of this report.

KR2: The FHRD should develop a formal mechanism ensuring that the staff satisfaction (incl. trainers' satisfaction) is surveyed and worked with, within nine months of the publication of this report.

KR3: The FHRD should update its Privacy Policy to ensure that all relevant disclosures required under the General Data Protection Regulation are clearly included. This should be completed within three months of the publication of the report.

KR4: The FHRD should consider introducing a mechanism to identify whether prospective students belong to vulnerable groups. This could be incorporated at the application or enrolment stage. A procedure should also be established outlining how such cases would be managed and supported where necessary. This should be implemented within six months of the publication of the report.

KR5: The FHRD should adopt a formal appeals procedure within six months of the publication of this report.

Recommendations

R1: Consider formulating a formal policy mandating gender balance.

R2: Notwithstanding the small size of the Foundation, the FHRD could explore ways of further integrating quality management considerations into its strategic planning processes.

R3: The FHRD could consider introducing a more formalised mechanism through which the development and effectiveness of its internal quality culture can be monitored and evaluated.

R4: The FHRD could define an indicative similarity threshold for plagiarism detection in order to minimise the risk of subjective assessment.

R5: The FHRD could consider developing a more formalised framework for the professional development of teaching staff. Such an initiative would support continuous pedagogical enhancement and further strengthen the quality of programme delivery.

R6: The FHRD could formalise and document its programme monitoring and review procedures within a structured framework. While monitoring activities are currently taking

place through various mechanisms, the establishment of a clearly defined and documented procedure would further strengthen consistency, transparency, and institutional quality assurance processes.

R7: The FHRD could consider further strengthening student support mechanisms, particularly by providing more structured guidance on career development or orientation for new students.

R8: The FHRD could consider further expanding access to digital learning resources to complement the face-to-face delivery format.

R9: The FHRD could consider including staff involvement in international activities into staff performance review.

About the External Quality Audit

The scope of external quality assurance in Malta is firstly to evaluate the education providers against the indicators included in the External Quality Assurance Provider Accreditation Manual for Higher Education Institutions (https://mfhea.mt/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/EQA-Accreditation-Manual.pdf), through the analysis of the self-assessment documentation as well as through the information recorded by the peer review panels during the accreditation visits. Secondly, it is in the scope of external quality assurance to evaluate the progress the providers have made since the previous external quality assurance process, aimed at the continuous enhancement of quality and institutional capacity building of the higher education sector in Malta.

Based on this scope, the external quality assurance processes conducted based on the Manual aim to:

- certify the compliance of the providers with the indicators included in the Manual;
- consolidate the internal quality assurance systems at institutional level;
- support the providers in the quality enhancement and continuous development of their operations;
- increase the quality of learning outcomes across the Maltese higher education sector;
- enhance the student learning experience.

Standards for Accreditation

Standard 1: Mission and strategic management

Standard 2: Governance, organisational structure and administration

Standard 3: Quality management

Standard 4: Integrity, accountability and information management

Standard 5: Teaching and administrative staff

Standard 6: Design, monitoring and review of programmes

Standard 7: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Standard 8: Student administration and student support services

Standard 9: Learning resources and facilities

Standard 10: Research, development and/or other creative activity

Standard 11: Institutional cooperation, service to society and internationalisation

The Standards and indicators as per the Manual have been drafted in alignment with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

The MINIMAL INDICATORS included in the Manual reflect the mandatory level of achievement that providers have to demonstrate compliance with for accreditation purposes and therefore must be met both before the commencement of their operations (at licensing stage) as well as throughout their activities (during every audit process).

The PERFORMANCE INDICATORS included in the Manual reflect the mandatory level of achievement that providers have to demonstrate compliance with during the audit process in order to have their accreditation confirmed. Therefore, performance indicators must be met, starting with the first audit that a provider undergoes five years after the commencement of its operations as well as throughout their entire licensing period.

Where applicable, additional indicators have been developed in the context of online provision through the Guidance for Quality Assurance for Online Learning Providers in Malta.

The peer review panels are nominated by the MFHEA. Each panel shall have a minimum of three members: a Chair, between one and five experts, and at least one student. The panel has the duty to gather, verify and exchange information and supporting elements so as to be able to check the statements made in the self-assessment documentation, as well as during the accreditation visits, and to formulate their own assessments on the performance of the provider against the Standards included in the present Manual. The peer review panels shall discuss and exchange the collected evidence, verify the comprehensiveness and interpretation of the data, and analyse various sources in order to come to a consensual, coherent and consistent conclusion through triangulation and cross-referencing. All peer review panel members are required to sign a Declaration of Interest Form prior to starting work on the external quality assurance process.

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

Peer review panels will consider the indicators included in the Manual when determining the judgement for each Standard. The judgement for each Standard will be expressed as follows:

- Fully compliant - The institution is entirely in alignment with the Standard, which is implemented in an effective manner.
- Substantially compliant - The institution is to a large extent in alignment with the Standard, the general principles of which are followed in practice.
- Partially compliant - Some parts of the Standard are met while others are not; the implementation of the Standard is not effective enough.
- Non-compliant - The institution fails to comply with the Standard.

As part of an enhancement-led approach, the review team will issue recommendations linked to all parts of the operations of the institution. The report therefore distinguishes between:

- Mandatory Recommendations (MR) which are crucial to meet a Standard and shall be implemented within the timeframes decided by the panel and indicated in this report.

- Key Recommendations (KR) which are important to improve a Standard and should be implemented expediently by the institution, within the indicated timeframes, to address weaknesses.

- Recommendations (R) for improvement which are merely suggestions based on the panel's analyses and observations; these could be implemented by the institution.

The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) considered this report and forwarded it, along with the accreditation decision, to the MFHEA Board for endorsement.

The Peer Review Panel

The peer review panel was composed of:

Chair of Review Panel:	Milan Pol
Peer Reviewer:	Peter Calleya
Student Peer Reviewer:	Milica Kavedžič
Accreditation Coordinators (MFHEA):	Giacomo Annese, Sibby Xuereb

Specific Terms of Reference

As defined in the MFHEA Quality Audit Manual of Procedures, the panel was responsible for examining how the institution manages its responsibilities to ensure the provision of the quality and standards of the education they offer.
A number of issues were addressed, including the fitness for purpose and effectiveness of the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) processes, including an examination of the systems and procedures that have been and are planned to be implemented, together with the documentation that supports them; the compliance of providers with the established regulations and any conditions or restrictions issued by the MFHEA; the governance and financial sustainability of providers, including assurance about the provider's legal status, the appropriateness of corporate structures and the competence of staff with senior management responsibilities, and more.

Institutional Background and Context

The Malta Foundation for Human Resources Development (FHRD) is a registered NGO (VO/0294) which was established in 1990. Since then, it has worked with its corporate members, a broad network of HR practitioners, service providers, industry leaders and other stakeholders. The FHRD currently provides eight accredited MQF Level 5 programmes, from 2 to 6 ECTS. They are as follows: Award in Human Resources Management and Training; High Impact Recruitment and Selection Techniques Award; Award in Training the Trainer; Award in the Practical Applications of Maltese Employment Law; Award in Public Speaking; Award in Employer Branding and Communications for HR and Marketing Professionals; Award in Leader as a Coach; and Award in Conflict Resolution and Mediation at Work. The portfolio of programmes is adapted in the course of time, with regard to perceived changes and needs of the labour market. The number of students varies, typically not extending 20. The FHRD is a small organisation comprising four employees, two of whom are full-time. It operates in the premises which include one lecture/seminar room, small library, and offices. A part of external relations of the FHRD are - apart from relevant bodies in Malta - Leicester University, AIHR (The Netherlands), and some other relevant institutions. Also, the FHRD is a full member of European Association for People Management (EAPM).

Analysis and Findings of Panel

Standard 1: Mission and strategic management

Main Findings

It can be confirmed that the mission statement of the FHRD is concise, clear, and aligned with plans of the FHRD. The mission is formulated as follows: to advance the Human Resources profession by promoting best practices, ethical standards, research-driven policies, and lifelong learning, while fostering HR excellence, professional development, and positive employer-employee relationships. At the same time, the FHRD explicitly states that it is striving to achieve the mission through the following focus areas: promote the Human Resources Profession; promote the best Human Resources practices; create a point of reference for HR Practitioners; promote research-based human resources policies and practices; facilitate networking and provide high-quality specialist service provision; to be a catalyst for change in the domain of people management; facilitate the improvement in the Employer-Employee relationship; provide training programmes to develop HR Practitioners and enhance employee skills; advocate lifelong learning at the place of work and beyond; and uphold and promote the highest ethical standards in human resources practice, as stated in the SAR.

Planning documentation of the FHRD reflects the size of the institution. Strategic and operational plans in a traditional form are not worked with. Instead, the pivotal role plays the Business Plan here. In this plan, formulated for one-year, specific annual targets are defined. Also, introduction of new programmes is dealt with in this plan. Objectives formulated in the Business Plan can be seen as realistic, time-bound and measurable. The Board of Administrators comes up with its priorities set for three years - and this can also be considered as a part of planning processes at the FHRD.

Delivery of five accredited programmes per year is considered a key performance indicator at the FHRD. Annual budgeting supports realisation of the programmes; management accounts are prepared and reviewed quarterly, and the organisation's financial statements are subject to annual external audit.

Close internal monitoring and direct oversight by the Board of Administrators and the CEO are key elements in the management of risks at the FHRD.

Although the mission statement of the FHRD was established in 2017 and since then it remains unchanged, the FHRD stated in its SAR that the mission statement was developed through a structured consultation process with both internal members, and the FHRD Board (involving

external members). This was confirmed during the interviews to some extent. The same can be said about recognition and sharing of the mission by the members of the FHRD community.

This can be agreed that the Business Plan, a main planning document at the FHRD, is grounded in reality and takes full account of the internal and external environment affecting the development of the institution. The FHRD monitors trends and developments in the field of human resources and education landscape in order to draft relevant strategies for its development. This is done via desk research, engagement with the HR community, feedback mechanisms, networking and partnerships, board and sub-committee discussions.

The planning has features of a participatory process in which sub-committee meetings, settings with trainers, and internal planning meetings play a role.

Data related to the FHRD main activities are collected. The FHRD presented SWOT analysis, and it was documented how – with regard to the performance analysis - the institution plans further activities.

The FHRD has a lean structure, given its small size. Although the expectations related to the staff performance are communicated, and the institution seems to be emphasising "a practical and flexible approach", as it stated in the SAR.

1.12 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable.

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

KR1: The FHRD should strengthen strategic planning processes by setting an explicit agenda for a longer period of time than it is covered in the Business Plan now, within nine months of the publication of this report.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 2: Governance, organisational structure and administration

Main Findings

The FHRD has clearly refined procedures and criteria for the appointment and election of leadership positions and governance bodies. The CEO appointment procedure was revised with regard to recommendations made by the MFHEA following the last audit. The procedure is clear, transparent and it was applied in 2022 during the appointment of the current CEO. As for the members of the Board of Administrators, they are elected following the rules formulated in the Statute of the FHRD. Candidates, who are expected to perform their duties voluntarily, must be members of FHRD for at least three consecutive years; possess a minimum of five years´ experience in an HR role; and have at least three years in a senior management role, as stated in the SAR.

This can be confirmed that the persons in leadership positions and also those who are members of the governing body, are qualified and fit for the responsibilities of their roles. They have extensive expertise in human resources and other relevant fields.

According to the Statute of the FHRD, the Board of Administrators "shall be composed of: a) seven (7) voting Administrators appointed from among the Sponsors, who shall serve on the board for a term of three years from appointment but who may submit their re-nomination for another term of three years in accordance with Clause 7.3 below; and b) another two (2) non-voting Administrators whereby one is to be nominated by the Maltese Minister responsible for Employment and another by the Maltese Minister responsible for Education. Provided that both such appointments nominated by the government shall be individuals employed full-time with the Public Sector in an HR role." Students are not explicitly mentioned in this context and in reality, their representative is not a member of the Board.

The FHRD has a clear organisational structure where governance, decision making, and distribution of responsibilities are clearly defined, and it is done in an achievable and realistic manner. While the roles and responsibilities of members of the Board of Administrators are defined in the organisational statute, roles and responsibilities of the CEO are defined in the working contract.

The Board of Administrators and the CEO seem to be in frequent contact which gives opportunities to review their own effectiveness and develop and implement plans for improvement. Meeting minutes are formally recorded and maintained.

The FHRD does not have a formal policy mandating gender balance, yet there are five female and four male members - in reality the gender balance is in place.

The Statute of the FHRD does not provide for student membership on the Board of Administrators - the student representatives do not participate as formal members of the governance body.

This can be agreed that the organisational structure of the FHRD is fit for purpose and operates effectively with the implementation of the plans. The administration is effective, operating as a small organisation.

The FHRD does not conduct formal and systematic staff satisfaction surveys. Instead, it relies on communication channels and embedded feedback mechanisms of an informal nature which

is to some extent understandable, considering a small size of the institution. There are meetings with trainers held before and after the courses to review objectives, expectations and outcomes.

2.10, 2.11 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

KR2: The FHRD should develop a formal mechanism ensuring that the staff satisfaction (incl. trainers' satisfaction) is surveyed and worked with, within nine months of the publication of this report.

R1: Consider formulating a formal policy mandating gender balance.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 3: Quality management

Main Findings

The panel notes that the FHRD has developed and approved a Quality Management Policy which outlines the purpose, scope, responsibilities, and includes a policy statement guiding the Foundation's approach to quality management. In addition, the Foundation has established a Quality Manual that incorporates a Quality Assurance Policy outlining its commitment to maintaining and continuously enhancing quality standards. The Panel verified that the Quality Manual is publicly accessible through the Foundation's website, thereby supporting transparency.

The panel observed that the Quality Manual clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the Board and the Executive Team in relation to quality management. It further outlines the Foundation's approach to teaching and learning, quality management and ongoing quality assurance processes, programme design and approval procedures, course delivery and assessment, recruitment of trainers, data collection and analysis, as well as student admission processes. The panel considers that these documented procedures provide an adequate framework for the management of quality within the Foundation.

Given the relatively small size of the Foundation, quality management processes are primarily driven by the CEO and President, under the strategic oversight of the Board. The Panel observed that the Foundation demonstrates a clear strategic direction, with particular focus on areas that directly support the effective management and assurance of quality within its educational provision.

The FHRD does not have a dedicated quality management unit, nor a staff member assigned exclusively to quality management functions. Instead, quality management responsibilities are distributed among team members in line with the Foundation's small operational structure. Day-to-day quality management activities are undertaken by the Training/Projects Executive, while the CEO holds overall responsibility for the quality management of accredited courses. This includes ensuring that programme implementation aligns with established standards and that annual reviews are conducted to assess effectiveness, compliance, and opportunities for continuous improvement.

The CEO is responsible for the quality assurance of programmes. In cases where programmes are not developed internally, the FHRD ensures the quality of programme development and delivery through collaboration agreements with external providers. The Panel further notes that the Foundation does not subcontract any of its educational activities.

During the interviews conducted, the panel observed a clear commitment from the President and Board members towards strengthening quality management within the Foundation. The CEO is actively engaged in quality management processes and plays a central role in promoting and sustaining a quality-oriented culture within the organisation.

Quality assurance measures are integrated into the planning and operational management of the Foundation. Programme outcomes are reviewed and resources assessed following each programme delivery, taking into account feedback from trainers, students, and other relevant stakeholders. Where necessary, appropriate actions are taken to introduce changes or improvements. The panel was presented with documentation demonstrating that these review processes are formally recorded.

While the FHRD does not have a dedicated academic or administrative unit specifically responsible for quality management, the panel observed that, in practice, staff members demonstrate a strong level of engagement and commitment to maintaining and enhancing quality within the Foundation's activities. Given the size and organisational structure of the Foundation, the panel considers this approach to be appropriate.

The panel notes that students contribute to the quality assurance processes primarily through the completion of the Unit Content and Trainer Evaluation Form at the end of each programme. In addition, informal feedback is collected through direct discussions, meetings, and email communication. This feedback is reviewed by the CEO, the Training/Projects Executive, and the Operations Executive, as well as by the Programmes Sub-Committee, and is recorded in the meeting log.

The panel also noted that the FHRD engages students in quality management processes through questionnaires administered after each intake. The responses are analysed internally and reported accordingly. Evidence was also presented of discussions within the Programmes Sub-Committee regarding engagement with external stakeholders, ensuring that relevant feedback is considered during the programme design and approval stages. The Quality Manual clearly outlines the procedures through which the Foundation analyses and evaluates the quality of its study programmes.

The FHRD does not produce formal institutional annual performance reports. Instead, administrative and programme reports are prepared following each programme intake. The panel was presented with evidence of these reports. Considering the size and operational structure of the Foundation, the panel considers this practice to be proportionate and adequate for monitoring programme performance.

Student survey evaluations constitute the primary source of structured feedback within the Foundation. These are mainly reviewed by the CEO, the Projects Executive, and the Operations Executive. The Panel observed that student survey evaluations are not discussed at Board level; however, the CEO reports on programme-related matters to the Programmes Sub-Committee.

Furthermore, the CEO, the FHRD Executive Team, and the Programmes Sub-Committee engage regularly with external stakeholders, partners, and the wider HR community through a range of professional events and activities. These engagements provide opportunities to discuss the outcomes and relevance of the Foundation's educational provision. As many of these interactions occur informally or during externally hosted sector events, they are not always formally recorded. Nevertheless, relevant feedback received through these engagements is noted and subsequently discussed during Programme Sub-Committee meetings where appropriate.

The FHRD Quality Manual and Quality Management Policy have been reviewed and updated within the past year. Due to the Foundation's relatively small size and flexible organisational structure, improvements to processes and documentation can be implemented efficiently. The Foundation does not operate according to fixed review cycles; rather, policies and procedures are updated when the need or opportunity for improvement arises. The panel considers that this flexible approach allows the Foundation to respond effectively to evolving requirements and stakeholder feedback.

Good Practice Identified

The panel considers it good practice that the CEO, Executive Team, and the Programmes Sub-Committee engage regularly with external stakeholders, partners, and the wider HR community through a range of professional events and activities in order to discuss the outcomes and relevance of the Foundation's educational provision.

Recommendations for Improvement

R2: Notwithstanding the small size of the Foundation, the FHRD could explore ways of further integrating quality management considerations into its strategic planning processes.

R3: The FHRD could consider introducing a more formalised mechanism through which the development and effectiveness of its internal quality culture can be monitored and evaluated.

Judgement: Fully compliant

Standard 4: Integrity, accountability and information management

Main Findings

The panel notes that the FHRD has established a Code of Ethics which focuses on professionalism and integrity, respect and confidentiality, accountability and compliance, and the advancement of the HR profession. The Code of Ethics is publicly available on the FHRD website.

The panel observes that the principles outlined in the Code of Ethics are integrated and further elaborated in the Student Handbook, Quality Manual, and Employee Handbook. The Student Handbook outlines possible cases of misconduct, including plagiarism, the divulgence of confidential information, and other forms of academic dishonesty. The Student Handbook and the Quality Manual are made available for each respective course within the Course Details section of the public website.

The Employee Handbook includes policies relating to equal opportunities and workplace conduct, anti-harassment and bullying, and professional ethics and discipline. The panel notes that the Employee Handbook is an internal document and is not publicly available; however, all FHRD employees are required to adhere to its provisions.

The FHRD publishes information about its programmes on its website in order to provide prospective students with an initial understanding of the programme content, requirements, and expected learning outcomes upon successful completion. The panel further observes that FHRD facilitates requests for additional information, enabling prospective students to interact directly with the institution and obtain more detailed explanations regarding the academic programmes offered.

The FHRD has a Privacy Policy that is publicly accessible on its website. The policy includes reference to requirements under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). While the policy demonstrates general compliance, the panel considers that it would benefit from further elaboration to ensure that it clearly includes disclosures relating to the legal basis for processing personal data, data retention periods, third-party data sharing, the right to lodge a complaint, and international data transfers.

The panel notes that employee obligations regarding data protection and privacy requirements in relation to the GDPR are outlined in the Employee Handbook.

The FHRD uses Grammarly as its plagiarism and AI detection tool. The platform provides a similarity percentage report which is reviewed by FHRD in consultation with the trainer to determine whether the student's work meets acceptable standards. According to the information provided, similarity percentages detected to date have been low and no cases have required formal investigation.

However, the panel considers that the relevant policy should be updated to define an indicative similarity threshold. In cases where this threshold is exceeded, the matter should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the CEO and addressed through a formal escalation process where necessary.

The FHRD Code of Ethics is publicly accessible through the institution's website. Staff members are made aware of the Code through the Employee Handbook, which they are required to acknowledge and adhere to upon commencement of employment. Trainers engaged by FHRD are also required to sign a contract for services and acknowledge their obligation to comply with the Code of Ethics and the Quality Manual. Similarly, students are required to abide by the Code of Ethics as outlined in the Student Handbook.

Taking into consideration the size and organisational structure of the Foundation and the interviews held, the panel acknowledges that the Code of Ethics is effectively applied in practice.

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) indicates that all queries are addressed within a maximum of 24 working hours (three working days). Based on the evidence provided and interviews conducted with relevant stakeholders, the panel notes that communication within the institution is ongoing and that matters concerning staff, trainers, and students are addressed promptly in a transparent and timely manner.

The panel notes that student admission records and information, assessments, student profiles, class attendance records, retention and success rates, and student satisfaction feedback are appropriately maintained and archived. The panel further observes that FHRD does not currently enquire whether prospective students belong to a vulnerable group, and no such cases have been encountered to date. Students enrolled in the programmes are typically already employed within the HR sector and are often sponsored by their employers to attend courses.

4.9, 4.10, 4.11 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable.

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

KR3: The FHRD should update its Privacy Policy to ensure that all relevant disclosures required under the General Data Protection Regulation are clearly included. This should be completed within three months of the publication of the report.

KR4: The FHRD should consider introducing a mechanism to identify whether prospective students belong to vulnerable groups. This could be incorporated at the application or enrolment stage. A procedure should also be established outlining how such cases would be managed and supported where necessary. This should be implemented within six months of the publication of the report.

R4: FHRD could define an indicative similarity threshold for plagiarism detection in order to minimise the risk of subjective assessment.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 5: Teaching and administrative staff

Main Findings

The institutional framework regulating the employment and management of staff is clearly articulated across the Quality Management Policy, Employee Handbook (Administrative Staff), and Training Service Contract (Trainers). These documents collectively define provisions relating to recruitment, rights and responsibilities, performance evaluation and management, promotion, professional development, working conditions, professional ethics, disciplinary procedures, and employee health and safety.

The panel considers that the documentation provides a structured and coherent framework governing staff engagement and management, contributing to clarity of expectations and institutional accountability.

The FHRD has established structured procedures intended to ensure the fair, transparent, and effective recruitment of both administrative and teaching staff. The overarching approach is outlined in the Quality Management Policy, while operational procedures and requirements are detailed in the Quality Manual and Employee Handbook.

The panel considers that the recruitment framework demonstrates alignment with organisational needs, legal obligations, and recognised human resource management practices. Overall, the processes appear sufficiently formalised and proportionate to the size and structure of the institution.

The Quality Manual specifies that teaching staff are required to hold qualifications at MQF Level 7 or higher in their field of expertise, together with substantial professional experience enabling them to incorporate practical perspectives into training delivery. Trainers are also expected to demonstrate appropriate pedagogical awareness, communication and interpersonal skills, knowledge of adult learning principles, and commitment to ongoing professional development.

The panel considers that these requirements are appropriate for ensuring the academic and professional competence of trainers involved in programme delivery and are broadly consistent with expectations for higher-level training provision.

The FHRD maintains a pool of trainers who are engaged through service contracts, several of whom have collaborated with the Foundation over a number of years. Given that trainers are typically employed elsewhere and are engaged by the Foundation on a short-term or part-time basis, responsibility for professional development largely remains with the individual trainers.

Nevertheless, the Foundation provides opportunities and incentives for trainers to participate in events and activities organised by the FHRD, which may contribute to their professional development. The panel considers that while this approach reflects the contractual nature of the trainers' engagement, a more structured institutional approach to academic staff development could further enhance teaching quality.

The student–staff ratio appears appropriate for the scale of operations and facilitates effective delivery of training. Trainers are able to provide sufficient guidance, interaction, and individual attention to students during learning activities.

The panel therefore considers that the staffing arrangements support an effective learning environment.

Prior to each programme intake, the CEO and the Training Executive meet with trainers to discuss and agree on the expected workload and other relevant aspects, such as the demographics of the student cohort. This enables trainers to adapt their lectures to ensure more effective programme delivery. The information discussed is formally documented.

The panel observed that workload allocation appears proportionate and manageable given the scope and intensity of the programmes delivered.

The FHRD maintains a clear framework for the professional development of administrative staff, as outlined in the Employee Handbook. Staff members may be eligible for reimbursement of training or educational programmes relevant to their roles, subject to approval by the CEO based on defined criteria.

During the interviews, staff confirmed that they had participated in both internal and external training initiatives related to their professional responsibilities and personal development. The panel considers that the institution demonstrates a commitment to supporting the continuous development of administrative staff.

The Foundation has established a formalised performance management framework aimed at ensuring fairness, transparency, and alignment with organisational objectives. This framework, detailed in the Employee Handbook, is structured around key pillars that promote organisational effectiveness, accountability, and continuous improvement.

Trainer performance is primarily evaluated through student feedback surveys which assess aspects such as content relevance and clarity, trainer effectiveness and engagement, pace and structure of delivery, usefulness of learning materials, and overall learner satisfaction.

The panel noted that the CEO and/or Training Executive meet trainers both before programme commencement to discuss expectations and after programme completion to review student feedback and identify potential improvements. The panel considers that these processes provide a useful mechanism for monitoring trainer performance and supporting quality enhancement.

The panel observed that both academic and administrative staff recruitment processes are conducted through structured and transparent procedures. The recruitment of administrative staff follows a clearly documented process designed to ensure fair and objective selection in accordance with organisational requirements and legal obligations. The Employee Handbook also contains provisions related to employment law, including equal opportunities and anti-discrimination principles.

Similarly, the recruitment of trainers involves a structured procedure which extends beyond verification of formal qualifications to include evaluation of professional competence, relevant skills, and alignment with the Foundation's mission and values.

Recent recruitment activities have largely relied on online advertisements and professional referrals, followed by direct engagement with suitable candidates. The panel considers that the recruitment process is appropriate and consistent with the scale of the organisation.

Induction of new administrative staff is conducted by the CEO and covers institutional values, internal procedures, health and safety requirements, and role-specific guidance. New staff

members are provided with access to the Employee Handbook, which consolidates the institution's policies and procedures. A designated point of contact or mentor is also assigned to support staff during the onboarding process.

New trainers engaged on service contracts undergo an induction process led by the CEO, which includes an explanation of the Code of Ethics and the Quality Management Policy. Trainers are required to formally acknowledge receipt of and commitment to these documents.

The panel considers that these measures contribute to ensuring that staff and trainers are adequately informed of institutional expectations and quality assurance processes.

To strengthen quality assurance, FHRD has introduced a structured trainer observation process. This mechanism is designed to evaluate key aspects of training delivery, including participant engagement, the use of training materials, pedagogical approach, and overall training effectiveness. The panel reviewed the Trainer Observation Sheet used for this purpose.

Outcomes from trainer observations, together with student feedback, are shared with trainers in order to support reflective practice and continuous improvement. The institution also plans to introduce a peer-review system whereby experienced trainers will observe and mentor newly engaged trainers. The panel considers that the development of such peer-based mechanisms represents a positive step towards strengthening teaching quality and fostering collaborative professional development.

Student feedback is discussed directly between the CEO and the respective trainers following programme completion. Given the size of the institution and the contractual nature of trainer engagement, feedback has generally been addressed at this operational level.

The panel noted that, in practice, no major issues have arisen that required escalation to the Programmes Sub-Committee or broader institutional discussion. While this approach appears functional within the current organisational context, the panel notes that more systematic dissemination of feedback outcomes could further strengthen institutional learning.

Student feedback is collected systematically through the Training Programme Evaluation Form, which provides detailed insights into programme content, trainer effectiveness, learning materials, delivery pace, and overall learning experience. In addition, the Trainer Observation Sheet contributes further evidence on teaching quality.

The panel observed that feedback from both students and trainers is collected during and upon completion of each programme and forms part of the programme monitoring cycle. This information supports evidence-based evaluation and allows the Foundation to introduce improvements to programme design and delivery where necessary.

The panel considers that the integration of stakeholder feedback into the review process demonstrates a clear commitment to continuous quality enhancement.

As stated in the Employee Handbook, FHRD maintains a structured plan for the professional development of administrative staff, with the CEO playing a key role in facilitating and approving such opportunities.

In contrast, the panel observed that no formal institutional policy currently exists specifically addressing the professional development of teaching staff. Nonetheless, the Foundation contributes indirectly to trainer development through feedback from class observations and student evaluations, as well as by encouraging trainer participation in institutional activities.

While these measures provide some opportunities for professional learning, the panel considers that a more formalised approach to academic staff development would further strengthen the quality assurance framework.

The panel observed that the relatively small administrative team operates in a collaborative and supportive manner, with staff members assisting one another in order to ensure the smooth functioning of the Foundation and the effective delivery of programmes. Staff turnover in absolute terms is low, which contributes to organisational stability and continuity of operations.

5.16 – 5.17 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable.

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

R5: The FHRD could consider developing a more formalised framework for the professional development of teaching staff. Such an initiative would support continuous pedagogical enhancement and further strengthen the quality of programme delivery.

Judgement: Fully compliant

Standard 6: Design, monitoring, and review of programmes

Main Findings

The panel notes that the sequence of steps for the design of new courses is described in the Quality Manual and further outlined in the Self-Assessment Report. The requirements relating to student workload in terms of ECTS and Learning Outcomes are aligned with the Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF). The Quality Management Policy establishes procedures governing programme design and review, including benchmarking, market research, and expert consultation. The panel considers that these procedures provide an appropriate framework for ensuring that new programmes are developed in a structured manner and are informed by relevant sectoral considerations.

The panel observed that FHRD's approach to programme development is guided by its mission and informed by input from external stakeholders, including HR professionals, Board members, and graduates. Ideas for new courses emerge through monitoring of sectoral developments, engagement with HR professionals, networking opportunities during FHRD-led external events, and feedback from members, students, and trainers. The Foundation also undertakes desk research into local and international developments within the HR field. The panel considers that these activities contribute to maintaining programme relevance and alignment with labour market and professional development needs.

The CEO prepares an initial proposal for a new course, which is subsequently reviewed by the Programmes Sub-Committee and then submitted to the Board for approval prior to the commencement of the full programme design and accreditation process. The panel considers that this governance structure provides an appropriate level of institutional oversight.

The panel notes that the programme design process reflects the majority of the characteristics expected by MFHEA. In particular, programmes:

- define student workload in ECTS
- specify the intended target audience
- are learning-outcome based
- indicate the expected learning dynamics, including tutor–student and peer learning interactions
- specify the required resources and assessment methods
- outline minimum requirements for teaching staff
- identify staff responsibilities in relation to course design, content development, support, and delivery
- are aligned with the Malta Qualifications Framework
- involve consultation with external stakeholders
- incorporate student feedback.

Given that the FHRD offers short programmes of study, elective components are not included. The panel notes that final approval for new courses rests with the Board. As Board members serve in a voluntary capacity while occupying professional roles within the sector, their professional expertise also informs programme development. The panel considers that this contributes positively to the relevance of programme design.

The panel found that programmes are generally well structured and provide a balance between theoretical input and practical application, reflecting the professional orientation of the Foundation. Programme structure, sequencing, and the balance between theory and practice are determined collaboratively by the CEO, the Training Executive, and subject-matter experts. This collaborative approach aims to ensure that learning outcomes can be achieved within the short-course format adopted by the institution. Feedback obtained during interviews with stakeholders, supports the view that programmes are appropriately structured for their intended purpose.

The FHRD does not formally benchmark its programmes against other HR education providers. Instead, it relies on international benchmarking through its involvement in the European Association for People Management (EAPM), desk research, market scanning, expert consultation, and periodic programme review. These mechanisms contribute to maintaining awareness of international developments in the field.

Programme design is undertaken through a collaborative process involving both internal and external stakeholders. External input is obtained from students, graduates, trainers, professional experts, and relevant organisations such as EAPM, Academy to Innovate HR, and PeopleSmart. Internally, stakeholder roles are clearly defined as follows:

- CEO and Training Executive: lead programme development
- Programmes Sub-Committee: evaluates and recommends proposals
- Board: approves new programmes
- Trainers and subject-matter experts: contribute specialised content.

The panel considers that this delineation of responsibilities supports transparency and accountability within the programme design process.

The Quality Management Policy and Quality Manual outline the management roles, responsibilities, and key steps related to programme monitoring and review. The panel reviewed programme oversight meeting logs as evidence of these activities. The panel confirmed that programme monitoring is undertaken through student evaluation forms, trainer debrief meetings, internal discussions recorded in the meeting logs, and annual reviews. These processes may lead to updates, revisions, or, where appropriate, the discontinuation of programmes. The panel notes that these mechanisms support ongoing monitoring of programme delivery.

The FHRD seeks to ensure that its programmes remain aligned with institutional strategic goals, professional standards, sector developments, and student needs. Monitoring methods include surveys, classroom observations, feedback from trainers and students, and consultations with alumni, corporate partners, and other external stakeholders. The panel considers that the involvement of external stakeholders is particularly relevant given the professional orientation of the institution.

Student feedback is reviewed by the CEO and discussed with trainers upon completion of each programme. Issues identified through trainer observations are addressed in a timely manner, and ongoing communication between the CEO and trainers supports continuous improvement. Programme monitoring also includes consideration of admissions patterns, progression, completion rates, and student achievement. Input from trainers and external stakeholders,

including employers, is also taken into account. No external examiners are involved in the process.

Minor issues related to programme delivery, such as scheduling or access to learning materials, are addressed directly by the CEO and support staff. More substantial changes to programmes are managed through more formal internal processes. The panel notes that procedures are in place for the revision, updating, or termination of courses where necessary.

Overall, the panel observed that FHRD has established mechanisms for programme monitoring and review that combine internal oversight, governance through the Programmes Sub-Committee, and engagement with external stakeholders. The process is managed by the CEO and Training Executive in collaboration with the Programmes Sub-Committee. Programme effectiveness is assessed primarily through feedback loops with students, trainers, and the wider HR community.

The panel notes that FHRD is committed to ensuring that programmes are delivered and completed in accordance with their advertised structure, content, and accreditation requirements. In cases where a programme is phased out, students currently enrolled are provided with the opportunity to complete their studies. As stated in the Student Handbook, if a course is cancelled or cannot be completed, participants are entitled to a full refund of the course fees paid.

6.13, 6.14 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable.

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

R6: The FHRD could formalise and document its programme monitoring and review procedures. This will ensure that all monitoring activities that are currently taking place will clearly be stated within one documented procedure. This would further strengthen consistency, transparency, and institutional quality assurance processes.

Judgement: Fully compliant

Standard 7: Student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment

Main Findings

The FHRD ensures student-centred and stimulating teaching methods and a supportive learning environment by fostering student engagement and active participation, as confirmed during the audit. As the FHRD delivers programmes in a face-to-face study format, student engagement, interaction, and self-reflection are particularly effective. In this regard, a variety of innovative and experiential pedagogical methods are applied, such as role plays, simulations, reflective exercises, applied learning tasks, and group-work activities. During the audit, it was confirmed that teaching staff provide adequate support and actively motivate students.

Students are informed about the assessment system before the start of each programme through the Student Handbook and email communication, through which they may also request additional clarification. The Student Handbook is the main document that covers almost all procedures related to the student–provider relationship.

The FHRD team and teaching staff are jointly involved in defining the assessment approach. Learning outcomes are continuously reviewed, and corrective actions have already been implemented in situations where some students experienced difficulties completing the course on time. Mitigating circumstances are also taken into account, and students are informed about these procedures in the Student Handbook.

The introduction of anti-plagiarism software and clearly defined academic integrity procedures represents a strengthening of the assessment framework compared to the previous review, where formal plagiarism procedures were not documented.

The formal appeals procedure was piloted for the February intakes, and the documents regarding the appeals process were shared with students, trainers, HR Management & Training, and Conflict and Mediation.

Given that FHRD programmes are delivered in a short face-to-face course format, student feedback is monitored and collected during classes. Additionally, after the completion of each programme, students are asked to provide feedback, which was confirmed during on-site discussions with students. It was also noted that the FHRD takes student feedback into account and modifies teaching methods where necessary.

In addition to student feedback, trainer reflection after each course is considered in order to ensure continuous improvement of teaching practice. As confirmed during the visit, FHRD is equipped with a training room that supports interactive delivery. Students are encouraged and supported by trainers to apply their knowledge to real-world scenarios, thereby fostering creativity and innovation.

Considering the FHRD’s micro-provider size, formal external examiner structures are not applied. However, trainers maintain assessment competence through professional practice and consultation with the CEO. This collaborative review helps ensure that assessment methods remain appropriate. By collecting student feedback and analysing performance, the FHRD evaluates the effectiveness of its assessment practices.

The FHRD systematically monitors the quality and effectiveness of teaching, learning, and assessment through teaching observations, structured trainer feedback, and analysis of student assessment results. Observation records and the piloted Trainer Observation Sheet provide evidence of instructional quality and learner engagement, while assessment data are reviewed to identify trends and areas for improvement. These processes enable the FHRD to validate programme quality and implement evidence-based enhancements, ensuring that delivery remains effective and aligned with programme objectives. The FHRD's small organisational size also enables it to introduce improvements to its teaching, learning, and assessment practices in a timely and flexible manner.

Compared to the previous external quality assurance review, the monitoring of teaching practices has become more structured through the introduction of a Trainer Observation Sheet and documented classroom observations, providing a clearer framework for evaluating pedagogical practices. This development addresses the recommendation concerning the monitoring of pedagogical practices identified during the previous external review

The FHRD collects student feedback at the end of each course, a practice confirmed during audit discussions with students. Feedback is reviewed internally and acted upon promptly, and any relevant changes are communicated to trainers to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning.

During discussions with current students and alumni, it was evident that they were satisfied with the programme organisation and content. They stated that the programme had helped them advance in their careers or secure new employment. In some cases, students have undertaken two different programmes, which further demonstrates the perceived quality and relevance of the programmes delivered by the FHRD.

7.5 -7.7, 7.13-7.15 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable

Good Practice Identified

None.

Recommendations for Improvement

KR5: The FHRD should adopt a formal appeals procedure within six months of the publication of this report.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 8: Student administration and student support services

Main Findings

The FHRD provides all relevant information to prospective students through the Student Handbook, which is available on the FHRD's website and sent via email to interested applicants. The Student Handbook outlines all academic, administrative, and conduct-related policies, including admission requirements, assessment, attendance, course delivery, academic integrity, disciplinary procedures, certification, and institutional guidelines. Fees are not available on the FHRD's website but are included in the Brochure, which is sent via email to those who express interest, as noted during the audit.

During the audit, it was noted that the Student Handbook now serves as the central reference document governing the student–provider relationship, representing a more comprehensive and structured framework compared to the arrangements noted in the previous external review.

The Code of Conduct for both students and trainers is addressed in the Student Handbook.

The relationship between the student and the Foundation is regulated by the Student Agreement, which the audit member reviewed. The audit noted that a formal Student Agreement has been introduced since the previous external review, strengthening transparency in the relationship between the institution and its students.

The FHRD programmes are of short duration; therefore, the Foundation does not specify the maximum time a student may remain inactive. Still, procedures related to misconduct and conditions under which a participant may be dismissed or withdrawn from a programme are in place and stipulated within the Student Handbook.

Given the small scale of the provider and the short duration of programmes, student support services remain relatively limited and are mainly provided through direct communication with trainers and administrative staff. Although the provider does not offer formal career counselling, students receive informal guidance and feedback through discussions with trainers, who also remain accessible outside scheduled programme hours, as verified during the audit.

All applicants who meet the entry criteria are accepted without bias. Students receive clear pre-programme communication, including essential details and preparation requirements.

The FHRD students are eligible for financial assistance through national funding schemes such as Investing in Skills and Get Qualified. During the audit, students confirmed that several had applied for and received support through these schemes.

All applicants are required to hold at least a Level 3 qualification for admission. Additionally, the country in which the highest qualification was obtained is recorded, supporting improved validation of prior learning and international comparability.

The FHRD maintains student records, as confirmed during the audit, and provides relevant information to students upon request. Additionally, data from these records are analysed and used for continuous improvement.

During the audit and discussions with students, it was confirmed that at the end of the programme, students are asked to complete a feedback questionnaire to assess the quality, relevance, and effectiveness of the student services provided. This process ensures that student satisfaction is monitored, and, given the FHRD's small size, improvements can be implemented promptly, as evidenced during the audit.

8.16-8.19 Not applicable

Good Practice Identified

None.

Recommendations for Improvement

R7: The FHRD could consider further strengthening student support mechanisms, particularly by providing more structured guidance on career development or orientation for new students.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 9: Learning resources and facilities

Main Findings

The FHRD offers an exclusively face-to-face study format at premises leased from the Lands Authority under a 15-year agreement. The long-term lease provides stability regarding the use of the premises and supports the sustainability of programme delivery.

During the audit, members of the panel had the opportunity to become familiar with the premises and a training room that is well-equipped for course delivery and accessible to persons with disabilities.

The FHRD maintains a physical library containing materials owned by the University of Leicester, which can be loaned to students upon request. Additionally, the FHRD holds a subscription to the Harvard Business Review (HBR), which was confirmed during the audit. The availability of these materials represents an expansion of the learning resources available to students compared to the situation observed during the previous external review.

Materials for each programme are provided to students during lectures or distributed either before or after each session. It was noted that students bring their own laptops to follow the programme and complete assessments. Additionally, students receive access to programme materials in digital format, allowing them to consult resources both during and outside scheduled class hours.

During discussions with students, they confirmed that all necessary materials for attending the programme had been provided, and they expressed genuine satisfaction with this practice.

The training room is regularly monitored by the FHRD team to ensure a comfortable and conducive learning environment. Feedback collected from students in this regard is considered valuable input, and as evidenced during the audit, feedback is collected after the completion of each programme.

9.8, 9.13-9.15 Additional indicators in the context of online provision – Not applicable

Good Practice Identified

None.

Recommendations for Improvement

R8: The FHRD could consider further expanding access to digital learning resources to complement the face-to-face delivery format.

Judgement: Substantially compliant

Standard 10: Research, development and/or other creative activity
(applicable only to universities and providers that deliver programmes at MQF level 8)

Main Findings

N/A

Good Practice Identified

N/A

Judgement: N/A

Standard 11: Institutional cooperation, service to society and internationalisation

Main Findings

The FHRD strives to support the development of HR in Malta, emphasising excellence in program delivery, responsiveness to the market needs, capacity building for Malta´s HR profession, growth and sustainability, and strategic differentiation. Within this, there are clear indicators relevant for service to society and to some extent to internationalisation, too.

Budgetary allocations to support these activities are in place, as seen in the Financial Plan Projections 2025.

Involvement of local employees and members of professions is taking different forms, one of them are sub-committees which are open to FHRD Board of Administrators´ members who come from a wide range of sectors.

As already stated above, the FHRD has a relevant selection of partners. Also, it uses adequate monitoring processes for partnership outcomes.

Organisation of the national HR conference can be considered an institution's contribution to the development of the HR community.

Mechanisms to support the cooperation with international partners are in place at the FHRD. As already mentioned, among the international partners of the FHRD are the European Association for People Management, AIHR in the Netherlands, and PeopleSmart, Italy/France. Also, the FHRD is in partnership with the University of Leicester (through which it offers undergraduate and master level distance learning programmes in HR).

Some of these cooperations are also formalised via agreements (AIHR, University of Leicester).

The FHRD keeps in contact with alumni of its programs, mainly by means of the FHRD Newsletter which is distributed to those who subscribe to it in line with GDPR regulations. The newsletter offers updates on institutional developments and relevant activities.

Staff involvement in international activities is recognized and valued, but it is not a part of the promotion criteria and staff performance review.

Good Practice Identified

None

Recommendations for Improvement

R9: The FHRD could consider including staff involvement in international activities into staff performance review.

Judgement: Fully compliant

Panel Member Signatures

The Audit Report is compiled by the Peer Review Panel:

Chair of Review Panel: Milan Pol 

Peer Reviewer: Peter Calleya 

Student Peer Reviewer: Milica Kavedžič



Annexes

Annex 1: Review Panel Bio Notes

Chair of the Panel:

Dr. Milan Pol is Professor of Education and, in 2014-2022, he was Dean of the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University (Brno, Czech Republic). At this faculty he is head of the doctoral programme of Educational Sciences. His professional interests are leadership in education and evaluation in education. In the field of evaluation, he has been invited to evaluations arranged by ENQA and has been the head or the member of evaluating panels such as QAA (UK), FINEEC (Finland) and SQAA-NAKVIS (Slovenia). He participates frequently in institutional/programme evaluations in higher education internationally (Estonia, Georgia, Kosovo, Kazakhstan, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, UAE, and more). In 2010-2016 he was a member of the Accreditation Commission of Slovakia. He is author of numerous publications (https://www.muni.cz/en/people/75-milan-pol/publications) and works as editor-in-chief of Studia Paedagogica, a Scopus-databased journal. He is a former chair (2004-2005, 2022-2023) of the European Network for Improving Research and Development in Educational Leadership and Management (ENIRDELM). In 2023, he was awarded an honorary doctorate at the University of Latvia.

Peer reviewer:

Peter Calleya has been a financial services professional for over 40 years and is currently Head of Client Tax Reporting and Analytics for the Malta subsidiary of an International Bank. Previous roles included Head of Governance, Head of Strategic Planning and Senior International Marketing Manager. He is also a Visiting Senior Lecturer at the University of Malta where since 2007 he has lectured various courses from Diploma and Bachelors to Masters level and also served as an examiner, paper-setter and reviewer. Since 2003 he has been elected for consecutive terms to the Board of Directors of the Institute of Financial Services (ifs Malta) and has been serving as President since 2023. He has also been re-elected to a sixth consecutive three-year term to serve on the Board of Directors and Executive Committee of the Brussels-based European Banking and Financial Services Training Association (EBTN) for 2026-2028. He holds an MBA (Bangor), MA Marketing (Melit.) and BA (Hons) Business Management (Melit.). He is also a Chartered Banker, Chartered Marketer and Fellow of both the London Institute of Banking and Finance and Chartered Banker Institute (UK). Mr Calleya is a peer reviewer with MFHEA and has been working with the Authority for a number of years, forming part of panels in several audits.

Student reviewer:

Ms Milica Kavedžić is an expert in higher education quality assurance, currently serving as the Deputy Director of the Agency for Control and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (ACQAHE) in Montenegro. In this role, she ensures that Montenegro's higher education system complies with European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), manages international relations, and leads research initiatives to enhance the national education framework.

As Montenegro's representative in the Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG), Milica contributes to the ongoing monitoring and development of the Bologna Process. Her career includes diverse roles such as Officer for International Relations at ACQAHE, Advisor to the Deputy Prime Minister, and PR Manager at the Montenegrin Pavilion at Expo Milano. Milica also has extensive experience in project management, having successfully developed EU funding applications, overseen project implementation, and managed reporting processes.

Milica holds a degree in Economics from the University of Montenegro, where she graduated as the top student in her class. She has participated in exchange programmes at the Vienna University of Economics and Business, and is currently pursuing postgraduate studies to further expand her expertise in economics and quality assurance

Annex 2: Agenda of the Onsite Visit

Date: 26th and 27th February 2026
Venue: No.5, Clock Tower Building,
Tigne' Point, Sliema TP01, Malta

I Day	Meetings
8:30 (30m)	MFHEA EQA Panel preparation meeting for Day 1 of the institutional audit
9:00 (30m)	President
9:30 (15m)	Internal Meeting
9:45 (30m)	Board
10:15 (15m)	Internal Meeting
10:30 (60m)	CEO/QA/Facilitator
11:30 (15m)	Internal Meeting
11:45 (60m)	Training Executive
12:45 (60m)	Internal Meeting / Lunch Break

II Day	Meetings
8:30 (30m)	MFHEA EQA Panel preparation meeting for Day 2 of the institutional audit
9:00 (60m)	Students
10:00 (15m)	Internal Meeting
10:15 (60m)	Alumni
11:15 (15m)	Internal Meeting
11:30 (60m)	External Stakeholders
12:30	Internal Meeting – Lunch Break

13:30	Any Other Meeting for Any Clarifications / Panel Consultation
15:45	Presentation of Initial Findings
16:00	Close Day 2



Malta Further and Higher Education Authority (MFHEA)
Higher Education Unit
J Abela Scolaro Street, Hamrun. HMR 1304, Malta.
Email: higher.education@mfhea.mt
Tel: +356 2598 1489

www.mfhea.mt