



Self-Assessment Report



GBSB Global Business School

March 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Approach to the Self-Assessment Process	4
1. Mission and Strategic Management	6
Standard 1: Evidence	8
Standard 1: SWOT Analysis	9
2. Governance, Organisational Structure, and Administration	10
Standard 2: Evidence	12
Standard 2: SWOT Analysis	13
3. Quality Management	14
Standard 3: Evidence	16
Standard 3: SWOT Analysis	17
4. Integrity, Accountability, and Information Management	18
Standard 4: Evidence	20
Standard 4: SWOT Analysis	21
5. Teaching and Administrative Staff	22
Standard 5: Evidence	24
Standard 5: SWOT Analysis	25
6. Design, Monitoring, and Review of Programmes	27
Standard 6: Evidence	29
Standard 6: SWOT Analysis	30
7. Student-centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment	31
Standard 7: Evidence	33
Standard 7: SWOT Analysis	34
8. Student Administration and Student Support Services	35
Standard 8: Evidence	38
Standard 8: SWOT Analysis	39
9. Learning Resources and Facilities	40
Standard 9: Evidence	42
Standard 9: SWOT Analysis	43
10. Research, Development, and/or Other Creative Activity	44
Standard 10: Evidence	46
Standard 10: SWOT Analysis	47
11. Institutional Cooperation, Service to Society, and Internationalisation	48

Table of Contents

Standard 11: Evidence	51
Standard 11: SWOT Analysis	52

Introduction

GBSB Global Business School Limited (Reg. No. C91738) is a private higher education institution incorporated in Malta and licensed by the Malta Further and Higher Education Authority (MFHEA) (Licence No. 2020-12). The institution delivers MFHEA-accredited programmes in Malta and through online provision. In Spain (Barcelona and Madrid), delivery is limited strictly to those MFHEA-accredited programmes for which explicit authorisation has been granted for cross-border delivery; in line with MFHEA requirements, these programmes are furthermore subject to authorisation by the relevant local educational authorities in Spain. The full Malta portfolio is not offered in Spain.

Mission, Vision and Strategic Orientation

The mission of GBSB Global is:

“To educate the next generation of ethical leaders who will contribute to the sustainable development of the global economy and create positive change through entrepreneurship and business innovation.”

The vision of the institution is:

“We aspire to be an innovative and world-class business school that nurtures an entrepreneurial mindset, an ethical perspective, and a global vision in our students.”

The institution’s core values include innovation; diversity, inclusion and equality; opportunity creation; sustainability and social impact; and a culture of excellence and integrity.

The Strategic Plan 2024–2028 defines five overarching institutional goals:

- Strategic Goal 1. Continuously Improve the Educational Programmes.
- Strategic Goal 2. Improve Market Positioning and Recognition as an Innovative and Entrepreneurial Business School.
- Strategic Goal 3. Extend GBSB Global Relationships and Outreach.
- Strategic Goal 4. Become a High Performance and Digitally Oriented Organisation.
- Strategic Goal 5. Contribute to the Advancement of Knowledge and Innovation via GBSB Global Research Centre.

Each goal is operationalised through defined objectives and measurable Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), including graduate employment rates, student satisfaction, accreditation achievements, research outputs and mobility indicators.

Governance and Management

Governance is exercised through a centralised corporate structure combined with decentralised academic delivery. The Director/Legal Representative holds statutory responsibility for institutional compliance and oversight. The Head of Institution, based in Malta, is responsible for academic leadership, operational management of MFHEA-licensed provision, and regulatory compliance.

Strategic and operational functions are organised through defined units, including Academic Coordination, Quality Assurance, Admissions, Marketing, Finance, Human Resources, Student Affairs, International Office, Online Education and Registrar services. Responsibilities are formally allocated across corporate, Malta campus and satellite campus levels.

Institutional decision-making is supported by standing committees, including the Executive Committee, Academic Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, Ethics Committee, Budgeting Committee, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee, and Staff Performance Evaluation and Development Committee.

Introduction

These committees provide structured oversight of academic standards, financial sustainability, ethical conduct, staff development and quality assurance processes.

The Internal Quality Assurance framework underpins institutional governance and aligns with MFHEA Standards.

Infrastructure and Staffing Arrangements

The Malta campus, as the licensed main campus, hosts the Head of Institution's Office, academic coordination, student services, campus management and faculty functions. Satellite campuses in Barcelona and Madrid provide delivery infrastructure under formal subcontracting arrangements.

Teaching facilities are equipped with digital presentation systems, high-speed internet connectivity and appropriate learning technologies. The institution operates a Moodle-based Virtual Learning Environment to support online and hybrid provision. An integrated Student Information System is currently being enhanced to strengthen academic administration, monitoring and compliance processes. Library provision is ensured through digital databases and on-campus resources.

Staffing comprises academic and administrative personnel across campuses. Faculty appointments include both full-time and adjunct lecturers. Recruitment and deployment are aligned with programme requirements and institutional strategic priorities. Collaboration agreements and employment records are maintained in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Primary Areas of Academic Provision

GBSB Global offers MFHEA-accredited programmes with corresponding exit awards at MQF Levels 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, including:

- Foundation Programme in Business with Academic English (Level 4);
- Bachelor of Business Administration and Digital Innovation with defined specialisations (Level 6), including corresponding exit awards (Level 5);
- Master of Science in Management with defined specialisations and Master of Business Administration (Level 7), including corresponding exit awards;
- PhD in Innovation Management (Level 8).

All programmes are delivered in English and are aligned with the Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF) and the European Qualifications Framework (EQF). Provision is available onsite (Malta and authorised sites in Spain), online, and in hybrid formats.

As of September 2025, total enrolment stands at 639 students across online, Malta-based and overseas delivery.

Students and Socio-Economic Characteristics

The institution enrolls a predominantly international student body representing over 100 nationalities. The student population includes recent secondary school graduates entering undergraduate provision, early-career professionals pursuing master's qualifications, and experienced managers enrolling in MBA and doctoral programmes.

All students must demonstrate English language proficiency. The majority are self-funded, with some supported by family resources, employer sponsorship or public funding schemes where applicable. Students may relocate to Malta or Spain for onsite study or pursue their studies through online or hybrid modalities due to professional or personal commitments.

The international composition of the student body requires compliance with visa regulations, cross-border delivery requirements and multi-jurisdictional quality assurance obligations.

Operating Context

GBSB Global operates within regulated higher education frameworks in Malta and Spain. In Malta, it is subject to MFHEA licensing conditions, periodic review and ongoing compliance requirements. In Spain, delivery of MFHEA-accredited programmes is authorised in accordance with applicable regulatory provisions.

The institution operates in a competitive and internationalised higher education environment characterised by increased digital provision, market consolidation among private providers, and sustained demand for business, digital and innovation-oriented programmes. Its operating model combines centralised governance, controlled cross-border delivery and online provision to ensure regulatory compliance, operational oversight and financial sustainability.

Audited financial statements and forward projections indicate continued revenue growth and operational viability. The institution does not rely on external borrowing to support its core operations.

The following section outlines the institutional approach adopted for the preparation of this Self-Assessment Report, including the methodology used, the role of supporting evidence, and the structure applied in analysing the MFHEA Standards.

Approach to the Self-Assessment Process

This Self-Assessment Report has been prepared as part of the institutional reaccreditation process conducted by the Malta Further and Higher Education Authority (MFHEA). The report provides a structured evaluation of GBSB Global Business School's compliance with the MFHEA Standards for Licensed Higher Education Institutions and reflects the institution's internal review of the effectiveness of its governance, academic provision, and quality assurance framework.

The preparation of the report was coordinated by the Head of Quality Assurance and involved contributions from relevant academic, administrative, and governance units responsible for the areas covered by the Standards, with due consideration of stakeholder involvement in institutional processes. Institutional policies, procedures, operational documentation, and quality assurance records were systematically reviewed to ensure that the report accurately reflects institutional practices and regulatory compliance. The preparation process involved internal consultation, the collection of stakeholder-informed evidence, and coordination across institutional units through meetings, communication exchanges, and document review.

The self-assessment process was conducted as an evidence-based institutional review. Particular emphasis was placed on demonstrating the implementation of institutional policies and procedures through supporting documentation rather than solely describing regulatory frameworks. More detailed descriptions of relevant institutional processes are provided in the supporting evidence files. Evidence files referenced throughout the report constitute a central element of the self-assessment and provide documentary confirmation of the governance arrangements, academic processes, and operational mechanisms described in the narrative. Evidence sources include institutional policies and guidelines, committee terms of reference and minutes, strategic planning documents, internal quality assurance records, statistical reports, and extracts from operational systems.

The preparation of the report was also informed by the outcomes of the MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit conducted internally prior to the submission of the present document. Observations and notes arising from this internal audit were taken into consideration during the self-assessment process and contributed to the identification of areas where further development may strengthen institutional practices. In this respect, the self-assessment process functions not only as a compliance exercise but also as a continuous improvement mechanism supporting the ongoing enhancement of institutional governance, academic provision, and quality assurance processes.

The institutional Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual serves as the overarching framework guiding the institution's approach to quality assurance and regulatory compliance. The policies, procedures, and governance mechanisms described in this report and referenced through supporting evidence are implemented within the structure established by the IQA framework, which ensures that institutional practices remain aligned with MFHEA regulatory requirements and internal quality standards.

In order to ensure consistency and clarity of presentation, each of the eleven Standards addressed in this report follows a common analytical structure. Each section includes:

- **Narrative analysis** – describing institutional policies, governance arrangements, and operational practices relevant to the specific standard. The narrative explicitly references the relevant MFHEA indicators in order to demonstrate how the institution addresses each requirement. References to indicators are provided using the notation the MI (Minimal Indicator), PI (Performance Indicator), and AI (Additional Indicator) as defined in the MFHEA Standards for Accreditation (e.g., MI_1.1, PI_1.10, AI_1.12).
- **Evidence subsection** – listing the documentary evidence supporting the narrative statements and enabling verification of institutional practices.

Approach to the Self-Assessment Process

- **SWOT analysis** – presenting the institution’s self-evaluation of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in relation to the specific standard. The SWOT analysis reflects the institution’s internal quality assurance processes and the outcomes of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

This structured approach ensures that the report provides a coherent, transparent, and verifiable account of institutional practices while enabling the review panel to clearly identify the relationship between the narrative description, the supporting evidence, and the institution’s critical self-reflection.

The final version of this Self-Assessment Report was reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee on 16 March 2026 prior to its submission to MFHEA.

The following sections present the institution’s self-assessment against each of the eleven MFHEA Standards for Licensed Higher Education Institutions, in accordance with the analytical structure described above.

1. Mission and Strategic Management

GBSB Global Business School's mission and strategic management framework is formally articulated in the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01*), which defines mission alignment, strategic planning processes, operational planning, budgeting, and risk management within the institutional governance structure (MI_1.1¹).

The institutional Mission, Vision and Values are concise, clearly defined, and publicly available on the institutional website (*Evidence_01-02*). They articulate the institution's commitment to ethical leadership, sustainability, innovation, entrepreneurship, and internationalisation, and are explicitly aligned with institutional strategic planning (MI_1.1).

The Strategic Plan 2024–2028 (*Evidence_01-03*) translates the mission into five overarching strategic goals supported by measurable objectives and defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The Plan is time-bound and establishes performance targets relating to student satisfaction, graduate employability, accreditation milestones, research outputs, mobility indicators, and digital transformation priorities (MI_1.2, PI_1.8²).

Each strategic goal is operationalised through the Operational Plan (*Evidence_01-04*), which defines specific initiatives, assigns responsibility to initiative owners, establishes timelines, and sets measurable KPIs to monitor progress. The Operational Plan ensures that future institutional activities are directly derived from the Strategic Plan and that accountability for implementation is clearly allocated (MI_1.3, PI_1.11).

Monitoring of strategic and operational implementation is supported by institutional dashboards and KPI tracking mechanisms (*Evidence_01-05*), governed by the Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy (*Evidence_01-06*). KPI performance is systematically collected, analysed, and reported to governance bodies to support evidence-based decision-making and corrective action where required (PI_1.10).

Institutional financial planning is implemented through Annual Budget Plans (*Evidence_01-07*), structured around Growth/Transformation initiatives and Business-as-Usual operations. The budgeting framework forecasts the human and financial resources required to implement operational initiatives and supports alignment between strategic objectives and resource allocation (MI_1.3, MI_1.4).

The Budgeting Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_01-08*) and Budgeting Committee Minutes (*Evidence_01-09*) demonstrate formal governance oversight of budget preparation, approval, and monitoring processes (MI_1.4).

Institutional risk management and continuity of operations are supported through an integrated governance framework implemented by the institution. The Risk Assessment Framework (*Evidence_01-10*) establishes procedures for systematic identification, assessment, and mitigation of institutional risks across academic, operational, financial, and regulatory domains. Institutional risks are documented in the institutional risk register, assigned to designated risk owners, and monitored through governance oversight mechanisms including periodic review by the Executive Committee (*Evidence_01-11*). These arrangements enable the institution to identify potential disruptions and implement mitigation measures safeguarding the continuity of major academic, operational, and administrative processes. The continuity of academic provision is further supported through institutional regulations governing the lifecycle of academic programmes. In circumstances where programme modification or discontinuation may be required, the institution implements structured transition arrangements defined in the Programme Termination Policy (*Evidence_01-12*) to ensure that enrolled students are able to complete their studies or transition to alternative study pathways with minimal disruption. Financial and operational resilience is further supported

¹ MI – Minimal Indicator as defined in the MFHEA Standards for Licensed Higher Education Institutions.

² PI – Performance Indicator as defined in the MFHEA Standards for Licensed Higher Education Institutions.

Standard 1. Mission and Strategic Management

through the institutional budgeting and financial monitoring framework overseen by the Budgeting Committee (*Evidence_01-08; Evidence_01-09*), ensuring that institutional resources remain aligned with operational requirements and strategic priorities (MI_1.5). Strategic and operational objectives cascade across governance and management structures and are reflected in institutional performance and planning processes, linking institutional objectives to individual responsibilities and benchmarks (PI_1.11).

The MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13*) confirms the existence of a structured strategic governance framework while identifying opportunities to further strengthen documentary traceability between strategic objectives and budget allocations and to consolidate strategic monitoring outputs (MI_1.4, PI_1.10).

Strategic monitoring outputs are consolidated in the Annual Strategic Monitoring Report (*Evidence_01-14*), which presents annual KPI performance analysis, risk review outcomes, and agreed follow-up actions by governance bodies (PI_1.10).

Stakeholder consultation records supporting strategic planning processes, including Advisory Board input, staff consultation workshops, and Student Council feedback, are documented and archived (*Evidence_01-15*) (PI_1.6, PI_1.9).

The mission is communicated through institutional governance processes, strategic planning discussions, and operational planning activities, contributing to its recognition within the academic community (PI_1.7).

Strategic monitoring extracts from Executive Committee Minutes (*Evidence_01-16*) demonstrate periodic formal review of KPI performance and institutional risk exposure (PI_1.10).

Strategic and operational planning explicitly incorporates multi-campus delivery, online provision, and hybrid learning modalities, as reflected in the Strategic Plan (*Evidence_01-03*) and Operational Plan (*Evidence_01-04*) (AI_1.12³).

Overall, mission definition, strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, operational implementation, budgeting, risk management, performance monitoring, and cascading of objectives operate as an integrated governance framework embedded within the Internal Quality Assurance system (*Evidence_01-01*) and aligned with MFHEA Standards (MI_1.1–1.5, PI_1.6–1.11, AI_1.12).

³ AI – Additional Indicator as defined in the MFHEA Standards for Licensed Higher Education Institutions.

Standard 1: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-02 – Mission, Vision and Values – Website (*Evidence_01-02_Mission_Vision_Values_Website*)
- Evidence_01-03 – Strategic Plan 2024–2028 (*Evidence_01-03_Strategic_Plan_2024-28_EC-approved_2025-05-22*)
- Evidence_01-04 – Operational Plan (*Evidence_01-04_Operational_Plan_Implementation_2025*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_01-06 – Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy (*Evidence_01-06_Institutional_Data_Reporting_and_Analysis_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_01-07 – Annual Budget Plans (*Evidence_01-07_Annual_Budget_Plans_QA*)
- Evidence_01-08 – Budgeting Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_01-08_Budgeting_Committee_ToR*)
- Evidence_01-09 – Budgeting Committee Minutes (*Evidence_01-09_Budgeting_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2025-03-24*)
- Evidence_01-10 – Risk Assessment Framework (*Evidence_01-10_RAF_EC_Approved_2024-03-26*)
- Evidence_01-11 – Executive Committee Minutes (*Evidence_01-11_EC_Meeting_Minutes_2026-02-24*)
- Evidence_01-12 – Programme Termination Policy (*Evidence_01-12_Programme_Termination_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_01-14 – Annual Strategic Monitoring Report (*Evidence_01-14_Annual_Strategic_Monitoring_Report_2025*)
- Evidence_01-15 – Stakeholder Consultation Records (*Evidence_01-15_Stakeholder_Consultation_Records*)
- Evidence_01-16 – Executive Committee Strategic Monitoring Extracts (*Evidence_01-16_Executive_Committee_Strategic_Monitoring_Extracts*)

Standard 1: SWOT Analysis

Table 1-1 below provides an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) related to this standard and reflects the institution’s self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 1-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 1: Mission and Strategic Management

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulated mission, vision, and values aligned with ethical leadership, sustainability, innovation, entrepreneurship, and internationalisation. - Strategic Plan supported by operational plans with defined KPIs, timelines, and assigned responsibilities. - Institutional risk management framework integrated into strategic planning and Executive Committee oversight. - Evidence-based decision-making supported by institutional data reporting and performance monitoring. - Strategic objectives cascade to operational units and staff through performance evaluation and HR planning mechanisms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formal linkage between budget allocation and strategic objectives is not yet consistently documented. - Insufficient alignment and consolidation of strategic monitoring outputs with KPI reporting mechanisms. - Annual SWOT review is not yet embedded as a formal component of strategic monitoring cycles. - Strategic planning processes are primarily Executive Committee-driven with limited systematic engagement of broader stakeholders. - Institutional operations remain dependent on a limited number of senior leadership roles.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adoption of international strategic management best practices within higher education institutions. - Increased engagement of stakeholders in strategic planning processes. - Alignment with international accreditation frameworks and governance best practices. - Growing global interest in sustainability, innovation, and entrepreneurship aligns with the institutional mission. - Development of stronger strategic partnerships with industry and alumni networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing regulatory expectations regarding evidence-based institutional governance and planning. - Changes in regulatory frameworks affecting cross-border or online education. - Economic instability affecting international student mobility and institutional planning assumptions. - Rapidly evolving labour-market demands requiring continuous strategic adaptation. - Increasing competition among international business schools.

2. Governance, Organisational Structure, and Administration

The governance and organisational framework of GBSB Global Business School is formally defined through institutional regulations and internal documentation that establish the structure of leadership, decision-making processes, and institutional oversight mechanisms. The Internal Quality Assurance Manual outlines the governance framework, organisational structure, and the distribution of responsibilities across institutional bodies and administrative units (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_2.1, MI_2.4).

Procedures for the appointment of leadership positions and the composition of governance bodies are established in institutional documentation and implemented through formal organisational arrangements. Individuals occupying key leadership positions possess academic and professional qualifications appropriate to their responsibilities. Evidence of such qualifications is reflected in the professional profile of the Head of Institution (*Evidence_02-01*) (MI_2.1, MI_2.2).

Institutional governance is exercised through formally established committees and leadership bodies responsible for academic oversight, quality assurance, and operational management. These bodies operate according to defined terms of reference which establish their membership, responsibilities, and reporting lines. An example of such governance documentation is the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee (*Evidence_02-02*) (MI_2.4, PI_2.5).

External stakeholder engagement in institutional governance is facilitated through the Advisory Board, which brings together external experts and industry representatives to provide strategic advice to the institution. Advisory Board meetings provide a forum for discussion of institutional strategy, including the Strategic Plan and its associated performance indicators. During Advisory Board meetings, members review strategic priorities and provide feedback on institutional development and market positioning (*Evidence_02-03*) (MI_2.3, PI_2.5, PI_2.6).

Student participation in institutional governance is facilitated through the Student Council, whose role and functioning are defined in the Student Guidelines and Academic Policies (*Evidence_02-04*) (MI_2.3, PI_2.7). The Student Council operates as a representative body through regular meetings in which student matters are discussed and decisions are taken on issues affecting the student community (*Evidence_02-05*) (PI_2.7).

Meeting minutes of institutional governance bodies are systematically recorded and maintained as institutional records, documenting discussions, decisions, and action points arising from governance meetings and demonstrating ongoing oversight of institutional operations and strategic initiatives (*Evidence_02-06*) (PI_2.5).

Student representatives may also be invited to governance meetings to present student initiatives and perspectives on matters affecting the student body. For example, the President of the Student Council participated in an Executive Committee meeting and engaged with institutional leadership on matters related to student representation (*Evidence_02-07*) (MI_2.3, PI_2.7).

The institution promotes an inclusive governance environment and seeks to ensure appropriate representation and participation of stakeholders across governance and administrative processes (PI_2.6).

Administrative structures support academic delivery and institutional management across campuses and delivery modes. Roles and responsibilities of academic and administrative staff are defined through institutional documentation and operational procedures as described in the Internal Quality Assurance Manual (*Evidence_01-01*) (PI_2.8).

Standard 2. Governance, Organisational Structure, and Administration

Feedback from staff and students regarding institutional operations and governance is collected through institutional mechanisms such as surveys and feedback processes, enabling the institution to monitor satisfaction and identify opportunities for improvement (*Evidence_02-08*) (PI_2.9).

Given the institution's provision of online and blended learning modalities, managerial oversight of digital learning environments and technological infrastructure forms part of institutional management responsibilities, ensuring appropriate operational and academic support for online and hybrid learning delivery (AI_2.10, AI_2.11).

Overall, the governance framework of the institution is supported by documented organisational structures, formal governance bodies, stakeholder participation mechanisms, and institutional processes that collectively ensure effective management, transparency in decision-making, and alignment with institutional strategy and quality assurance principles (MI_2.1–2.4, PI_2.5–2.9, AI_2.10–2.11).

Standard 2: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_02-01 – Curriculum Vitae of the Head of Institution (*Evidence_02-01_Patena_Wiktor_CV*)
- Evidence_02-02 – Executive Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_02-02_Executive_Committee_ToR*)
- Evidence_02-03 – Advisory Board Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_02-03_Advisory_Board_Meeting_Minutes_2024-05-28*)
- Evidence_02-04 – Student Guidelines and Academic Policies (*Evidence_02-04_Student_Guidelines_Academic_Policies_v1_0*)
- Evidence_02-05 – Student Council Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_02-05_Student_Council_Meeting_Minutes_2025-05-07*)
- Evidence_02-06 – Example Minutes of Institutional Committee Meeting (*Evidence_02-06_SPED_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2025-11-19*)
- Evidence_02-07 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_02-07_Executive_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2025-03-04*)
- Evidence_02-08 – Staff Satisfaction Survey Results (Management) (*Evidence_02-08_Staff_Satisfaction_with_Management*)

Standard 2: SWOT Analysis

Table 2-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 2-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 2: Governance, Organisational Structure, and Administration

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined governance structure formalised within the IQA framework. - Institutional committees and governance bodies operate under documented Terms of Reference and reporting cycles. - Stakeholder representation embedded through structures such as the Advisory Board and Student Council. - Structured recruitment procedures ensuring transparent and merit-based selection of leadership roles. - Highly qualified leadership and academic staff supporting institutional governance capacity. - Flexible organisational structure enabling institutional responsiveness and operational adaptability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appointment mechanisms for members of governance bodies could be further formalised. - Documentation evidencing qualification criteria and fitness for governance roles could be further consolidated. - Formal documentation of student representation mechanisms within governance structures could be strengthened. - Governance-level monitoring mechanisms for gender balance are not yet fully formalised. - Certain strategic roles remain concentrated in individual positions, creating potential succession risks. - Multi-campus operations may create coordination challenges for organisational cohesion.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adoption of international governance transparency practices to strengthen institutional credibility. - Development of leadership development programmes preparing staff for governance roles. - Expansion of advisory board membership with industry leaders and external experts. - Increasing international mobility of academic professionals creating opportunities to attract experienced leadership talent. - Continued digitalisation of institutional processes supporting governance efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing regulatory expectations regarding governance transparency and accountability. - Evolving regulatory requirements related to online education governance. - Competitive higher education labour markets affecting recruitment of qualified leadership staff. - Changes in employment regulations affecting institutional HR planning. - Rapid organisational growth may increase governance complexity.

3. Quality Management

Quality management at GBSB Global Business School is governed through a formally adopted Quality Management Policy and the broader Internal Quality Assurance framework described in the Internal Quality Assurance Manual. The IQA Manual serves as the central document defining the organisation of the institution's quality management system, including its processes, monitoring mechanisms, reporting arrangements, and continuous improvement instruments (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_03-01*) (MI_3.1).

Responsibilities for quality management are distributed across institutional governance structures and organisational units. Leadership bodies, academic units, administrative departments, and quality assurance structures participate in the implementation and monitoring of these processes as defined within the institutional framework (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_3.2).

The institutional quality management system is integrated within the strategic management framework of the institution and applies across academic and administrative activities. Quality assurance processes cover programme monitoring and review, teaching and learning processes, student assessment oversight, stakeholder feedback collection, and institutional performance monitoring (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_3.3).

The Internal Quality Assurance framework defines a structured quality improvement cycle which integrates monitoring, evaluation, and review mechanisms. These include programme monitoring processes, stakeholder feedback analysis, annual IQA audits, periodic review of institutional policies and procedures, and strategic performance monitoring through KPIs. These mechanisms collectively ensure that quality management operates within a continuous cycle of planning, implementation, assessment, and review supporting the ongoing development of institutional activities and resources (*Evidence_01-01*) (PI_3.7).

Quality management policies and procedures are reviewed and updated to ensure continued relevance and effectiveness, with document control and review arrangements defined within the institutional framework (*Evidence_03-02*) (PI_3.12).

Oversight of quality management is exercised through institutional governance structures including the Quality Assurance Committee, which operates under formally defined Terms of Reference (*Evidence_03-03*) (MI_3.4).

Quality assurance activities rely on structured monitoring and review processes. Institutional dashboards and reporting tools are used to evaluate performance and support evidence-based review of academic and operational effectiveness (*Evidence_01-05*) (MI_3.5, PI_3.10).

Student feedback is collected through structured survey instruments that form part of the institutional quality monitoring framework. The Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool evaluates module delivery, learning outcomes, assessment clarity, workload balance, lecturer performance and overall module experience, enabling systematic analysis of student perceptions of programme delivery (*Evidence_03-04*) (PI_3.6).

To support quality monitoring across multiple stakeholder groups, additional survey instruments are used to collect structured feedback from academic staff. The Faculty Satisfaction Survey Tool enables the institution to collect feedback regarding teaching conditions, academic processes, institutional support, and professional development needs, contributing to institutional quality monitoring and improvement processes (*Evidence_03-05*) (PI_3.6, PI_3.10).

Institutional data collection and performance monitoring are governed by the Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy and supported by institutional dashboards used to track key performance indicators across academic and operational areas (*Evidence_01-05; Evidence_01-06*) (PI_3.10, PI_3.11).

Quality Assurance Committee minutes demonstrate that quality oversight is operational and reviewed through governance structures. Committee discussions have addressed institutional accreditation

Standard 3. Quality Management

processes, monitoring of compliance requirements, and planning of quality-related initiatives, with defined follow-up actions and assigned responsibilities (*Evidence_03-06*) (MI_3.4, PI_3.11).

The institution uses the results of monitoring activities, surveys, and performance analysis to support institutional decision-making and quality improvement initiatives. Quality-related findings are reviewed within governance structures and contribute to continuous improvement processes across academic and administrative domains (PI_3.11).

The institutional quality management system involves academic and administrative units at all organisational levels. Leadership bodies, governance committees, programme teams, and administrative departments participate in the implementation and monitoring of quality management processes, reinforcing collective ownership of quality management across the institution (*Evidence_01-01*) (PI_3.8).

Stakeholder engagement forms an integral component of the quality management system. Structured mechanisms are implemented to collect feedback from students, alumni, faculty, staff, and employers through institutional surveys and representative bodies such as the Student Council. Feedback collected from these stakeholder groups is analysed and used to inform institutional decision-making and continuous improvement processes (*Evidence_03-04; Evidence_03-05; Evidence_01-05*) (PI_3.9).

The MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report identifies areas where evidence consolidation and traceability can be strengthened, supporting the ongoing development of the institutional quality management framework (*Evidence_01-13*) (MI_3.3, PI_3.12).

The institutional quality management framework also encompasses different modes of programme delivery, including on-campus, online, and hybrid (blended) learning modalities. Quality assurance procedures and institutional policies governing programme design, monitoring, and review apply consistently across these delivery modes, ensuring that online and blended learning provision is subject to the same quality assurance mechanisms as on-campus provision (*Evidence_01-01*) (AI_3.13).

Overall, GBSB Global demonstrates a structured and operational quality management system integrating governance oversight, monitoring mechanisms, stakeholder feedback, data analysis, and continuous improvement processes within a coherent institutional framework (MI_3.1–3.5, PI_3.6–3.12, AI_3.13).

Standard 3: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_01-06 – Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy (*Evidence_01-06_Institutional_Data_Reporting_and_Analysis_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_03-01 – Quality Management Policy (*Evidence_03-01_Quality_Management_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_03-02 – Control of Documents Policy (*Evidence_03-02_Control_of_Documents_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_03-03 – Quality Assurance Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_03-03_QA_Committee_ToR*)
- Evidence_03-04 – Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04_Student_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_03-05 – Faculty Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-05_Faculty_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2023*)
- Evidence_03-06 – Quality Assurance Committee Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_03-06_Quality_Assurance_Meeting_Minutes_2025-12-17*)

Standard 3: SWOT Analysis

Table 3-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 3-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 3: Quality Management

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive institutional quality management system embedded in the IQA framework. - Dedicated Quality Assurance unit and QA Committee providing structured oversight. - Regular internal audits, programme reviews, and performance monitoring processes. - Integration of quality management processes within institutional planning cycles. - Strong external quality recognition through international accreditations and rankings. - Institutional culture demonstrating awareness and engagement with quality assurance processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited QA staffing capacity may constrain strategic quality enhancement initiatives. - Some QA data collection processes remain partially manual. - Student and external stakeholder involvement in QA system design could be further formalised. - QA arrangements for online and blended learning require further consolidation. - Alignment between QA priorities and broader organisational objectives may require further coordination.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growing international emphasis on quality assurance in higher education provides opportunities to strengthen institutional frameworks. - Increased involvement of external stakeholders can enhance quality monitoring processes. - Participation in international accreditation initiatives can strengthen quality benchmarks. - Development of sector collaboration networks supporting quality exchange and benchmarking. - Alignment with emerging European higher education quality standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing regulatory scrutiny of quality assurance systems. - Divergence between national regulatory frameworks and international accreditation standards. - Rapid changes in higher education delivery models requiring QA adaptation. - Limited availability of sector benchmarking data within the national higher education contexts. - Increasing administrative complexity of compliance with multiple QA frameworks.

4. Integrity, Accountability, and Information Management

Integrity, accountability, and ethical conduct at GBSB Global Business School are embedded within the institutional governance framework defined in the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual, which establishes governance architecture, allocation of responsibilities, committee structures, and policy control mechanisms through which ethical standards and regulatory compliance are operationalised and monitored (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_4.1).

The Code of Ethics constitutes the core normative framework of the institution and defines institutional expectations regarding academic integrity, academic freedom, research ethics, professional conduct, conflicts of interest, non-discrimination, and responsible behaviour. The Code applies to students, academic staff, and administrative personnel and is formally acknowledged by students at the commencement of their studies (*Evidence_04-01*) (MI_4.1, MI_4.2, PI_4.6).

Academic integrity expectations are further operationalised through the Academic Honesty Policy, which defines institutional procedures for addressing plagiarism, cheating, falsification of academic work, and other forms of academic misconduct. The policy specifies reporting channels, investigation procedures, and disciplinary actions applicable to breaches of academic integrity (*Evidence_04-02*) (MI_4.2, PI_4.5).

The use of emerging technologies in academic activities is governed through the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy, which establishes principles for responsible and transparent use of AI tools in teaching, learning, research, and assessment contexts, ensuring that technological innovation does not compromise academic integrity or fairness. The policy also promotes awareness of the ethical implications of AI use and encourages responsible engagement with digital technologies within academic and professional contexts (*Evidence_04-03*) (MI_4.2, AI_4.9).

Research integrity is governed through the Research Ethics Policy, which establishes ethical principles for research involving human participants, personal data, or sensitive information. The policy defines the requirement for formal ethics approval and assigns oversight responsibility to the institutional Ethics Committee (*Evidence_04-04*) (MI_4.2).

The Ethics Committee operates under formally approved Terms of Reference defining its composition, quorum requirements, responsibilities, and decision-making procedures (*Evidence_04-05*) (MI_4.2).

Implementation of research ethics oversight is demonstrated through Ethics Committee meeting minutes documenting the review of research applications, ethical considerations, and committee decisions. These records confirm that research proposals are reviewed with documented feedback and conditional approvals where appropriate (*Evidence_04-06*) (MI_4.2).

Equal treatment and non-discrimination are safeguarded through the Equal Opportunities Policy, which defines institutional commitments to diversity, inclusion, equal access, and protection against discrimination and harassment within the academic environment (*Evidence_04-07*) (MI_4.1, MI_4.2).

Institutional accountability and procedural fairness are supported through the Complaint Procedure, which establishes structured mechanisms for informal and formal complaint resolution, defined timelines, investigation processes, and record-keeping requirements (*Evidence_04-08*) (MI_4.3).

The Research Application Procedure operationalises the Research Ethics Policy by defining structured submission, review, decision-making, and monitoring processes for research projects involving human participants or sensitive data (*Evidence_04-09*) (MI_4.2).

Standard 4. Integrity, Accountability, and Information Management

Information management and regulatory compliance are governed through the Data Protection Policy, which ensures compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and defines institutional responsibilities for the lawful processing, storage, and protection of personal data including the safeguarding of data subject rights and secure handling of institutional information (*Evidence_04-10*) (MI_4.4).

Operational information security is further governed through the IT Policy, which establishes standards for acceptable use of IT resources, system security, data protection, access control, and incident reporting ensuring the responsible and secure use of digital infrastructure within the institution (*Evidence_04-11*) (MI_4.4, AI_4.10).

Control of institutional documentation forms an integral component of institutional accountability and information management. The Control of Documents Policy defines document ownership, approval authority, version control, review cycles, and archiving requirements, ensuring that institutional policies and procedures remain current, accessible, and formally approved. Institutional policies, procedures, and directives are made accessible to the academic community through the institutional intranet, while updates and new institutional decisions are communicated through formally issued directives approved by governance bodies (*Evidence_03-02*) (MI_4.3, PI_4.7).

The institution utilises digital learning and management systems, including the institutional virtual learning environment (VLE), to administer surveys and manage academic data. A number of institutional surveys are administered through the VLE, while assessment data and student performance indicators are integrated into institutional dashboards used for monitoring institutional performance and supporting quality review processes. These digital systems generate data that are analysed as part of institutional monitoring and review activities, with full respect for data protection regulations (*Evidence_01-05; Evidence_01-06; Evidence_03-04*) (AI_4.11).

The MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report confirms the existence of operational mechanisms supporting ethical governance, academic integrity, and regulatory compliance, with observations focusing primarily on strengthening documentation traceability rather than the absence of institutional integrity safeguards (*Evidence_01-13*) (MI_4.1, MI_4.3).

Overall, GBSB Global demonstrates a coherent institutional framework safeguarding ethical conduct, academic integrity, research ethics, procedural fairness, equality of treatment, data protection, and accountable information management through documented policies, governance oversight, and operational procedures (MI_4.1–4.4, PI_4.5–4.7, AI_4.9–4.11).

Standard 4: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_03-02 – Control of Documents Policy (*Evidence_03-02_Control_of_Documents_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_04-01 – Code of Ethics (*Evidence_04-01_Code_of_Ethics_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-02 – Academic Honesty Policy (*Evidence_04-02_Academic_Honesty_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-03 – Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy (*Evidence_04-03_AI_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-04 – Research Ethics Policy (*Evidence_04-04_Research_Ethics_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_04-05 – Ethics Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_04-05_Ethics_Committee_ToR*)
- Evidence_04-06 – Ethics Committee Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_04-06_Ethics_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2025-06-20*)
- Evidence_04-07 – Equal Opportunities Policy (*Evidence_04-07_Equal_Opportunities_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-08 – Complaint Procedure (*Evidence_04-08_Complaint_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-09 – Research Application Procedure (*Evidence_04-09_Research_Application_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_04-10 – Data Protection Policy (*Evidence_04-10_Data_Protection_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-11 – IT Policy (*Evidence_04-11_IT_Policy_v1_0*)

Standard 4: SWOT Analysis

Table 4-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 4-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 4: Integrity, Accountability, and Information Management

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong institutional culture of integrity supported by the Code of Ethics and academic integrity policies. - Comprehensive policy framework covering academic honesty, research ethics, data protection, and IT governance. - Structured information management ensuring transparent access to institutional policies and procedures. - Clearly defined student agreements ensuring transparency of institutional commitments. - Established academic integrity mechanisms including plagiarism detection tools. - Secure digital infrastructure supporting institutional data protection and operational reliability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due diligence procedures for subcontractors and partners could be further formalised. - Verification of international academic credentials requires significant administrative effort. - Programme assessment formats require continuous adaptation to emerging AI-assisted content generation challenges. - Institutional monitoring of vulnerable student groups remains limited. - Institutional policies on lecture recording, intellectual property, and commercialisation require further consolidation. - Documentation of digital activity data usage in institutional reviews could be strengthened.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of innovative assessment methods responding to the growing use of artificial intelligence in education. - Adoption of specialised credential verification services for international admissions. - Development of ethics and compliance training programmes for staff. - Strengthening institutional governance frameworks for intellectual property and innovation management. - Increasing sector focus on transparency and ethical governance supporting institutional positioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expanding use of AI and contract-cheating tools may challenge academic integrity frameworks. - Changes in immigration and visa policies may affect international student recruitment. - Increasing regulatory expectations regarding institutional transparency. - Evolving data protection regulations requiring continuous compliance adaptation. - Operational risks associated with reliance on digital infrastructure and data systems.

5. Teaching and Administrative Staff

GBSB Global Business School maintains institutional policies and procedures governing the recruitment, management, responsibilities, performance evaluation, and professional development of teaching and administrative staff within the framework of its Internal Quality Assurance system (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_5.1).

Institutional expectations, operational procedures, and professional standards for faculty members are documented in the Faculty Guidelines, which define faculty duties, teaching-related responsibilities, administrative requirements, and institutional expectations (*Evidence_05-01*) (MI_5.1).

Recruitment and appointment of teaching and administrative staff are governed through institutional recruitment procedures that define transparent selection processes, qualification checks, and appointment arrangements (*Evidence_05-02*) (MI_5.2, PI_5.9).

Teaching staff qualification requirements are verified during recruitment and onboarding processes, with documentation retained to confirm academic qualifications and professional experience of teaching staff (*Evidence_05-03*) (MI_5.3).

Arrangements for adjunct (part-time) faculty include induction, access to institutional systems, and participation in relevant professional development activities to ensure they remain up to date with developments in their professional fields and with the methodological requirements of the programmes (*Evidence_05-01; Evidence_05-07*) (MI_5.4).

Roles and responsibilities for institutional staff are defined through position descriptions that support clarity of responsibilities and accountability across academic and administrative functions (MI_5.1).

The institution also maintains structured arrangements governing the distribution and monitoring of teaching workload. The Teaching Load Policy establishes limits for weekly and annual teaching hours, defines the balance between teaching, research, and service activities, and specifies faculty-to-student ratios to ensure adequate staffing for programme delivery (*Evidence_05-04*) (MI_5.5, MI_5.6). The policy ensures that teaching assignments take into account preparation time, supervision of student work, and other academic responsibilities.

The institution implements mechanisms to monitor teaching quality and staff performance. Student feedback on teaching performance is systematically collected through the Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool, which evaluates aspects of course delivery, teaching effectiveness, and achievement of learning outcomes (*Evidence_03-04*) (MI_5.4, PI_5.11).

Additional feedback mechanisms are used to collect input from academic and administrative staff regarding institutional processes, working conditions, and professional development needs. These include the Faculty Satisfaction Survey Tool and the Staff Satisfaction Survey Tool, which support institutional monitoring of staff experience and identification of areas for improvement (*Evidence_03-05; Evidence_05-05*) (MI_5.1, MI_5.7).

Professional development of staff is supported through the Staff Professional Development Policy, which establishes the institutional framework for identifying development needs and supporting staff participation in training and development activities (*Evidence_05-06*) (MI_5.7). Implementation arrangements are further defined through the Staff Professional Development Procedure, which describes processes for requesting, approving, and recording professional development activities (*Evidence_05-07*) (MI_5.7, PI_5.14). Participation in professional development activities is documented through consolidated records of professional development activities and attendance lists (*Evidence_05-08*) (MI_5.7, PI_5.14, AI_5.17).

Standard 5. Teaching and Administrative Staff

Staff performance evaluation is governed through the Staff Performance Evaluation Policy, which defines the principles and criteria used to evaluate staff performance and supports the alignment of performance management with institutional objectives (*Evidence_05-09*) (MI_5.8, PI_5.11, PI_5.12). Operational implementation of the evaluation process is defined through the Staff Performance Evaluation Procedure, which establishes the processes for conducting staff performance reviews and documenting evaluation outcomes (*Evidence_05-10*) (MI_5.8, PI_5.12, PI_5.13). Evidence of implementation is retained through staff performance evaluation records (*Evidence_05-11*) (MI_5.8, PI_5.13).

Employment and collaboration agreements are retained as part of staff documentation, demonstrating formal arrangements and terms of engagement (*Evidence_05-12*) (MI_5.2).

Staff satisfaction survey results, consolidated data and related action planning are compiled to support monitoring of staff experience and institutional improvement activities (*Evidence_05-13*) (MI_5.1, MI_5.7).

The results of student feedback surveys form part of the information considered during staff performance evaluations, contributing to the assessment of teaching effectiveness and identifying areas for professional development (*Evidence_03-04; Evidence_05-09; Evidence_05-10*) (PI_5.11, PI_5.12).

New teaching and administrative staff undergo an institutional orientation process designed to familiarise them with GBSB Global's programmes, services, policies, procedures, and operational systems. Induction activities include training on the use of institutional platforms such as the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), enabling faculty to manage course delivery, monitor student engagement and participation, and communicate with students through institutional channels (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_05-01*) (PI_5.10, AI_5.16). Through these systems and the institutional support structure, faculty can also guide students to appropriate academic or administrative support units when challenges arise.

Statistical data relating to staff profiles, qualifications, and distribution across institutional functions are compiled by the HR Department to support institutional planning and reporting. These records also allow the institution to monitor staff turnover and ensure that staffing continuity is maintained so that student learning is not adversely affected by personnel changes (MI_5.5, PI_5.15).

Overall, the institution maintains structured arrangements supporting recruitment and qualification verification, clear role allocation, monitoring of teaching quality, staff performance evaluation, and professional development support for teaching and administrative staff (MI_5.1–5.8, PI_5.9–5.15, AI_5.16–AI_5.17).

Standard 5: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_03-04 – Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04_Student_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_03-05 – Faculty Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-05_Faculty_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2023*)
- Evidence_05-01 – Faculty Guidelines (*Evidence_05-01_Faculty_Guidelines_v1_0*)
- Evidence_05-02 – Staff Recruitment Policy (*Evidence_05-02_Staff_Recruitment_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_05-03 – Sample Curriculum Vitae of Academic Staff (*Evidence_05-03_Joseph_Mallia_CV*)
- Evidence_05-04 – Teaching Load Policy (*Evidence_05-04_Teaching_Load_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_05-05 – Staff Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_05-05_Staff_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_05-06 – Staff Professional Development Policy (*Evidence_05-06_Staff_Professional_Development_Policy_v3_0*)
- Evidence_05-07 – Staff Professional Development Procedure (*Evidence_05-07_Staff_Professional_Development_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_05-08 – Sample Professional Development Activities and Attendance Records (*Evidence_05-08_Sample_of_PD_Activities_and_Attendance_Records*)
- Evidence_05-09 – Staff Performance Evaluation Policy (*Evidence_05-09_Staff_Performance_Evaluation_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_05-10 – Staff Performance Evaluation Procedure (*Evidence_05-10_Staff_Performance_Evaluation_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_05-11 – Sample Staff Performance Evaluation Record (*Evidence_05-11_2025-26_Performance_Evaluation_Sample*)
- Evidence_05-12 – Employment Contract Template (*Evidence_05-12_Employment_Contract_Template_Malta*)
- Evidence_05-13 – Examples of Staff Feedback Analysis and Action Plans (*Evidence_05-13_Staff_Satisfaction_Analysis_Examples*)

Standard 5: SWOT Analysis

Table 5-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 5-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 5: Teaching and Administrative Staff

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive HR framework covering recruitment, evaluation, workload allocation, and professional development. - Structured recruitment procedures ensuring transparent and merit-based selection. - Annual review of faculty qualifications ensuring compliance with academic standards. - Clearly defined academic ranks supporting career progression. - Performance evaluation framework incorporating student feedback and structured review. - Flexible faculty model combining full-time and part-time staff supporting programme development. - AI pilot initiative supported by the Innovation & Entrepreneurship Committee to assist staff in managing routine time-consuming tasks and improving operational efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited number of full-time faculty members may constrain research capacity. - Full-time staff may carry significant administrative responsibilities alongside academic duties. - Engagement of part-time faculty in institutional development activities may be limited. - Academic rank structures and remuneration frameworks are still being consolidated. - Some HR administrative processes remain partially manual. - Monitoring of certain HR processes could be further systematised and documented.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internationalisation of the academic labour market provides opportunities to recruit global talent. - Potential international accreditations can strengthen institutional attractiveness to research-active scholars. - Development of integrated HR management systems supporting workforce planning. - Expansion of professional development programmes in digital pedagogy and leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing global competition for qualified academic staff. - Regulatory changes affecting faculty qualification requirements. - Labour-market conditions influencing institutional recruitment flexibility. - Limited local talent pools in specialised disciplines. - Increasing workload expectations in higher education affecting staff retention.

Standard 5. Teaching and Administrative Staff

- Participation in international academic networks supporting faculty collaboration.	
--	--

6. Design, Monitoring, and Review of Programmes

Programme design, monitoring and review at GBSB Global Business School are governed through the Internal Quality Assurance framework described in the Internal Quality Assurance Manual, which establishes formal procedures for the development, approval, monitoring and continuous enhancement of academic programmes (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_6.1, PI_6.7).

Formalised policies and procedures regulating programme monitoring and review are defined through the Monitoring and Review of Programmes Policy and the Programme Quality Review Procedure. These documents define responsibilities, reporting structures and review mechanisms supporting systematic programme evaluation and improvement (*Evidence_06-01; Evidence_06-02*) (MI_6.1, PI_6.7, PI_6.10).

Programme development is guided by the institutional mission and strategic objectives and informed by analysis of labour-market needs and sectoral developments. Programme proposals consider relevant economic, technological, and demographic trends, as well as stakeholder expectations to ensure that academic provision remains aligned with professional and societal needs (*Evidence_06-03*) (MI_6.2).

Programme development is further informed by consultation with external academic experts, Advisory Board members and industry representatives. These consultations contribute to the identification of programme needs and support the alignment of programme learning outcomes with labour-market expectations and professional practice (*Evidence_06-03*) (MI_6.3j–k, MI_6.6, PI_6.11).

Programme proposals may also consider external reference points including expert input and insights from comparable programmes offered by other institutions where relevant, supporting the relevance and competitiveness of programme structures and learning outcomes (*Evidence_06-03*) (MI_6.5).

Programme design follows clearly defined academic parameters consistent with the Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF) and the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). Programmes define learning outcomes distinguishing knowledge, skills, and competences; specify expected student workload in ECTS credits; and include appropriate teaching methods, assessment approaches, and learning activities. (*Evidence_06-04*) (MI_6.3a–e, MI_6.3i).

Programme documentation also specifies the intended target audience, admission requirements, and the responsibilities of academic staff involved in programme delivery and support functions, including course design, teaching and academic coordination (*Evidence_06-04*) (MI_6.3b, MI_6.3g, MI_6.3h).

Programme structures ensure logical sequencing of modules and progressive development of knowledge, skills and competences. Curricula combine theoretical foundations with applied learning activities such as case studies, projects and collaborative work, allowing students to achieve the intended programme learning outcomes within the expected timeframe (*Evidence_06-04*) (MI_6.4).

External stakeholders, including representatives of industry and professional practice, may be involved in programme development and review processes, contributing to the relevance of programme learning outcomes and graduate competences in relation to labour-market expectations (*Evidence_06-03*) (MI_6.3j–k, MI_6.6, PI_6.11).

Monitoring and review of programmes are conducted through structured institutional quality assurance processes supported by institutional dashboards and data analysis mechanisms. Programme performance indicators, student progression data and achievement measures are monitored through institutional reporting tools used to support evidence-based decision making (*Evidence_01-05; Evidence_01-06; Evidence_06-05*) (PI_6.8, PI_6.9a).

Programme monitoring is informed by quantitative and qualitative indicators, including student enrolment, retention, graduation rates, academic achievement and stakeholder satisfaction metrics, enabling the

Standard 6. Design, Monitoring, and Review of Programmes

institution to identify trends and support evidence-based programme improvement (*Evidence_06-02; Evidence_06-05*) (PI_6.9a–f).

Programme monitoring is operationalised through annual programme quality review reports analysing programme performance indicators, student outcomes and identified areas for improvement. These reports support the identification of improvement actions and follow-up measures within institutional governance structures (*Evidence_06-06*) (PI_6.8, PI_6.9).

The Annual Programme Quality Improvement Report also includes follow-up actions from previous review cycles and an action plan defining responsibilities and timelines for implementing programme enhancements (*Evidence_06-02; Evidence_06-06*) (PI_6.9).

Institutional governance bodies review programme-related matters through formal meetings where programme performance, improvement actions and quality assurance outcomes are discussed and recorded. Evidence of such oversight is documented through meeting minutes of institutional governance bodies (*Evidence_06-07*) (PI_6.8, PI_6.11).

Programme information, including programme descriptions and learning outcomes, is made available through institutional documentation and the institutional website to ensure transparency regarding programme structure and academic expectations (*Evidence_06-08; Evidence_06-09*) (MI_6.3).

Programme monitoring operates through complementary review cycles, including an Annual Programme Quality Improvement Cycle focusing on continuous enhancement and a Programme Accreditation Cycle aligned with external regulatory and accreditation requirements (*Evidence_06-01*) (PI_6.10).

Institutional arrangements governing programme discontinuation are defined through the Programme Termination Policy, which establishes procedures for programme suspension, cancellation and teach-out arrangements ensuring that enrolled students can complete their studies without disruption and without academic or financial disadvantage (*Evidence_01-12*) (PI_6.12).

Programmes delivered through online or blended modes are designed and monitored through the same institutional quality assurance processes applied to all academic provision. Programme documentation defines appropriate learning activities, assessment approaches and student interaction mechanisms suitable for digital learning environments, while programme monitoring and review processes ensure that these delivery modes remain aligned with institutional quality standards (*Evidence_06-02; Evidence_06-04; Evidence_06-06*) (AI_6.13, AI_6.14).

The MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit confirms the existence of structured programme design and monitoring processes within the institution's quality assurance framework while identifying opportunities to further consolidate documentary evidence supporting programme review processes (*Evidence_01-13*) (MI_6.1, PI_6.7).

Overall, GBSB Global demonstrates formalised and operational processes for programme design, monitoring and review supported by structured governance oversight, stakeholder engagement and institutional performance monitoring mechanisms, ensuring the continuous enhancement of academic provision (MI_6.1–MI_6.6, PI_6.7–PI_6.12, AI_6.13–AI_6.14).

Standard 6: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_01-06 – Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy (*Evidence_01-06_Institutional_Data_Reporting_and_Analysis_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_01-12 – Programme Termination Policy (*Evidence_01-12_Programme_Termination_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_06-01 – Monitoring and Review of Programmes Policy (*Evidence_06-01_Monitoring_and_Review_of_Programmes_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_06-02 – Programme Quality Review Procedure (*Evidence_06-02_Programme_Quality_Review_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_06-03 – Programme Development – Expert Feedback (Samples) (*Evidence_06-03_Expert_Feedback_Samples*)
- Evidence_06-04 – Sample Programme Specification (*Evidence_06-04_MBA_(MQF_Level_7)*)
- Evidence_06-05 – Programme Monitoring Data Extracts (Sample) (*Evidence_06-05_Programme_Monitoring_Data_Extracts*)
- Evidence_06-06 – BA Annual Programme Quality Improvement Report 2023–24 (*Evidence_06-06_BA_Annual_Programme_Quality_Review_Report_2023-24_FINAL*)
- Evidence_06-07 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_06-07_Executive_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2025-02-18*)
- Evidence_06-08 – Sample Programme Information (Website Extract) (*Evidence_06-08_Sample_Programme_Information_(Website)*)
- Evidence_06-09 – Academic Calendar (*Evidence_06-09_Academic_Calendar*)

Standard 6: SWOT Analysis

Table 6-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 6-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 6: Design, Monitoring, and Review of Programmes

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined institutional policies governing programme design and review. - Structured programme review mechanisms supported by annual quality review reports. - Data-driven programme monitoring using institutional dashboards and KPIs. - Transparent programme information including syllabi and learning outcomes accessible to students. - Engagement of industry stakeholders supporting alignment with labour-market needs. - Innovative teaching approaches supporting applied learning experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consolidation of documentation supporting programme review evidence could be improved. - Programme monitoring across multiple programmes and delivery modes requires significant coordination. - Employer feedback on graduate outcomes remains limited. - Evidence supporting programme design decisions could be further consolidated. - Programme review outcomes could be more systematically integrated into redesign processes.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased availability of labour-market analytics supporting programme development. - Stronger collaboration with industry and alumni in programme design. - Rapid technological developments creating opportunities for curriculum innovation. - Partnerships with technology providers supporting new learning approaches. - Growing demand for programmes focused on innovation and digitalisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rapidly evolving labour-market requirements requiring continuous programme adaptation. - Regulatory approval requirements limiting agility in programme updates. - Programme approval timelines may slow the introduction of new programmes. - Increasing competition in business education. - Growing demand for shorter and more flexible learning formats.

7. Student-centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment

Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment at GBSB Global Business School are implemented through institutional policies and procedures defined within the Internal Quality Assurance framework, ensuring that teaching and assessment practices support student engagement, responsibility for learning and achievement of intended learning outcomes (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_7.1, PI_7.8).

Teaching methods are designed to support active learning and student participation through applied and interactive learning activities such as case-based learning, project work, presentations, and collaborative tasks, enabling students to engage actively with course material and develop analytical and practical competences (MI_7.1a–c, PI_7.9). All academic programmes are delivered in face-to-face, online, and hybrid modes, allowing students to select the most appropriate mode of study depending on their circumstances and, where applicable, to change their mode of study during their programmes. This flexible delivery model supports diverse learning needs and enables students to follow adaptable learning paths across the institution's programmes (MI_7.1a–b, PI_7.8). The learning environment encourages interaction between students and academic staff and supports the development of critical thinking and independent learning through structured feedback and academic guidance (MI_7.1d, PI_7.9).

Assessment practices are governed through the institutional Assessment Policy, which establishes requirements for alignment between assessment methods and intended learning outcomes and requires that assessment criteria are communicated clearly to students in advance. The policy also requires the use of varied assessment methods, timely feedback to support learning improvement, and the periodic review of assessment practices to ensure fairness, transparency and continuous enhancement of teaching and learning processes (*Evidence_07-01*) (MI_7.2a, MI_7.2c–e, PI_7.10b–d).

Institutional regulations also define the conditions under which students may repeat or improve assessments. The Make-Up Assessment Procedure establishes transparent rules governing eligibility, registration and evaluation of make-up and extended make-up assessments, ensuring fairness and clarity in situations where students must retake or improve final assessments (*Evidence_07-02*) (MI_7.3).

Students are provided with a formal and transparent grade appeal mechanism. The Grade Appeal Procedure establishes a structured process through which students may request clarification or review of assessment decisions (*Evidence_07-03*) (MI_7.4).

Academic integrity is supported through the Academic Honesty Policy, which defines institutional expectations regarding plagiarism, academic misconduct and appropriate use of external sources and tools in assessments (*Evidence_04-02*) (MI_7.2e, PI_7.10c).

Where applicable, work-based learning components such as internships are integrated into programmes through structured approval, agreement, monitoring, and evaluation arrangements. The Internship Agreement Procedure establishes the framework for internship organisation, supervision and evaluation, ensuring the educational contribution of such activities to programme learning outcomes (*Evidence_07-04*) (MI_7.5).

Assessment design and evaluation are further supported through guidance on the responsible use of artificial intelligence in assessment contexts. The AI in Assessment Guidelines provide recommendations for designing AI-resilient assessments and distinguishing between AI-free, AI-assisted and AI-integrated assessment approaches while preserving academic integrity. The guidelines also address assessment design for digital environments, including active and authentic learning approaches, structured student interaction, and the use of proctoring software for online assessments where appropriate (*Evidence_07-05*) (MI_7.2b–d, AI_7.13–AI_7.15).

Standard 7. Student-centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment

Students undertaking research projects and dissertations are assigned an academic supervisor who provides guidance and consultation throughout the research process, including support with topic selection, research design, methodology, literature review, and preparation for defence. Undergraduate Dissertation Guidelines define the dissertation working process, supervisory consultations, submission requirements, and defence arrangements, including evaluation by a panel of faculty members (*Evidence_07-06*) (MI_7.6, MI_7.7). Supervisors are appointed in accordance with institutional requirements to ensure appropriate academic expertise and research experience. For undergraduate and graduate programmes, supervisors must hold at least a Research Master's degree and have relevant supervision experience or subject expertise, while doctoral supervision requires a PhD qualification, with the principal supervisor being a recognised researcher in the relevant field. Institutional regulations governing doctoral research further establish independent examination procedures, including the appointment of an Examination Committee composed of qualified academic experts, with at least one member external to the institution (*Evidence_07-07*) (MI_7.6, MI_7.7).

To support transparency and consistency in grading practices, assessment rubrics are used to define performance criteria and expectations across different types of assessments (*Evidence_07-08*) (MI_7.2e, PI_7.10c).

Student feedback constitutes an important mechanism for monitoring teaching and learning processes. Feedback on course delivery, teaching effectiveness and assessment practices is systematically collected through the Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04*) (PI_7.11–7.12). In addition, academic coordinators periodically monitor teaching delivery through classroom observations, which support the evaluation of teaching practices and contribute to continuous improvement of learning and teaching processes within the institutional quality assurance framework (PI_7.11).

In addition to student feedback, teaching and assessment practices are also reviewed through the Faculty Module Satisfaction Survey Tool, which collects structured feedback from lecturers regarding module design, learning outcomes, assessment balance and teaching methodologies (*Evidence_07-09*) (PI_7.11–7.12).

Survey results and feedback data are periodically analysed and consolidated to identify strengths and areas for improvement in teaching, assessment design and module delivery. These analyses support continuous enhancement of learning and teaching practices within the institutional quality assurance framework (*Evidence_01-06; Evidence_06-06; Evidence_07-10*) (PI_7.11–7.12).

Through these arrangements, GBSB Global ensures that student-centred learning, teaching and assessment are supported by transparent regulations, structured feedback systems and institutional quality assurance processes that promote fairness, academic integrity and the continuous enhancement of teaching practices (MI_7.1–7.7, PI_7.8–7.12, AI_7.13–7.15).

Standard 7: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_03-04 – Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04_Student_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_04-02 – Academic Honesty Policy (*Evidence_04-02_Academic_Honesty_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-01 – Assessment Policy (*Evidence_07-01_Assessment_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-02 – Make-Up Assessment Procedure (*Evidence_07-02_Make-Up_Assessment_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_07-03 – Grade Appeal Procedure (*Evidence_07-03_Grade_Appeal_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-04 – Internship Agreement Procedure (*Evidence_07-04_Internship_Agreement_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-05 – AI in Assessment Guidelines v1.0 (*Evidence_07-05_AI_in_Assessment_Guidelines_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-06 – Undergraduate Dissertation Guidelines (*Evidence_07-06_Undergraduate_Dissertation_Guidelines_2025-2026*)
- Evidence_07-07 – Academic Rules and Regulations for the PhD Programme (*Evidence_07-07_PhD_Academic_Rules_and_Regulations_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-08 – Assessment Rubrics (*Evidence_07-08_Final_Project_and_Undergraduate_Dissertation_Rubric*)
- Evidence_07-09 – Faculty Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_07-09_Faculty_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_07-10 – Examples of Student Feedback Analysis and Action Plans (*Evidence_07-10_Student_Satisfaction_Analysis_Examples*)

Standard 7: SWOT Analysis

Table 7-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 7-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 7: Student-centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Student-centred learning approach embedded in institutional teaching practices. - Flexible delivery modes supporting diverse learner profiles. - Small class sizes supporting interactive teaching methods. - Diverse and innovative teaching methodologies enhancing student engagement. - Transparent assessment frameworks including rubrics and moderation processes. - Structured policies ensuring academic integrity and assessment fairness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some online courses could further strengthen synchronous interaction and engagement. - Digital proctoring and online assessment monitoring could be expanded. - Professional development in digital pedagogy could be further formalised. - Programme coordination capacity across programmes remains limited. - Limited elective availability due to cohort size in some programmes. - Institutional evaluation of teaching effectiveness could be further consolidated.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emerging digital learning technologies supporting personalised learning experiences. - Innovative assessment platforms enabling real-time feedback and learning analytics. - Integration of AI literacy into curricula and assessment design. - Expansion of experiential learning and extracurricular academic activities. - Alignment with international best practices in digital pedagogy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing use of AI and contract-cheating tools affecting academic integrity. - Rapid technological change requiring continuous teaching innovation. - Competition from global providers offering advanced digital learning platforms. - Regulatory changes affecting online learning delivery models. - Privacy and ethical concerns related to the use of monitoring technologies.

8. Student Administration and Student Support Services

Student administration and student support services at GBSB Global Business School are governed through the Internal Quality Assurance Manual, which establishes structured and quality-assured processes aligned with MFHEA standards and the Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF). The Manual defines institutional responsibilities in relation to admission, registration, academic standing (including suspension, reinstatement and dismissal), academic advising and support, recognition and certification, complaints handling, and student support services, ensuring consistency and academic oversight across campuses and delivery modes (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_8.3, MI_8.4, MI_8.7, PI_8.9, PI_8.11).

Accurate and reliable information about the institution, including programme offerings, admissions procedures and criteria, services, scholarship opportunities, tuition and administrative fees, and other relevant information, is made publicly available to prospective students and other interested parties through the institutional website, in line with the institutional public information requirements described in the IQA Manual (*Evidence_01-01*; *Evidence_08-01*) (MI_8.1).

Admission processes are regulated through formally approved admissions policies defining entry criteria, documentation requirements, and English language standards. These policies cover different categories of applicants including undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and transfer students, ensuring transparency and consistency in the admissions process (*Evidence_08-02*; *Evidence_08-03*; *Evidence_08-04*; *Evidence_08-05*) (MI_8.2). Admissions procedures are applied consistently and fairly across all applicants and programmes. Institutional admissions practices aim to support inclusive access to higher education and balanced student cohorts in line with institutional values of equity and diversity (PI_8.8).

Admissions applications and financial aid decisions are subject to governance oversight by the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. The committee's responsibilities are defined in its Terms of Reference, including setting admission criteria, ensuring compliance with institutional policies and accreditation requirements, and reviewing financial aid applications and scholarship decisions (*Evidence_08-06*) (MI_8.2, PI_8.10). Evidence of the committee's operation is documented through meeting minutes demonstrating the review of financial aid applications and scholarship decisions for MBA and PhD applicants (*Evidence_08-07*) (PI_8.10).

Policies applicable to the student lifecycle are communicated through the Student Guidelines and Academic Policies, which provide students with clear information on academic requirements and procedures, including key student responsibilities and institutional regulations (*Evidence_02-04*) (MI_8.3).

Recognition of prior learning is regulated through the institutional Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Recognition of Prior Learning Procedure. These documents establish the institutional framework for recognising previously acquired knowledge and competences obtained through formal, non-formal or experiential learning and provide an alternative pathway for programme access or credit recognition, ensuring transparency and consistency in the evaluation of prior learning (*Evidence_08-08*; *Evidence_08-09*) (PI_8.13).

The institution defines and applies institutional regulations governing academic standing, including probation, suspension, reinstatement, and dismissal, as set out in the IQA Manual (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_8.4). In addition, provisions regulating termination due to non-engagement/inactivity are maintained as part of the student lifecycle framework (*Evidence_08-10*) (MI_8.4).

A formal student agreement is concluded between the institution and each student, setting out rights and obligations of both parties and safeguarding student rights and lawful interests (*Evidence_08-11*). This is also confirmed in the MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit (*Evidence_01-13*) (MI_8.5).

Standard 8. Student Administration and Student Support Services

Academic integrity and academic misconduct provisions are established through the Academic Honesty Policy and are communicated to students as part of institutional requirements regulating academic conduct (*Evidence_04-02*) (MI_8.6).

Student orientation is provided for on-campus and online cohorts and is described in the IQA Manual. Orientation sessions introduce students to institutional academic policies, digital learning tools, career services information and student support contacts, and ensure students are informed about where key documents and guidance are accessible (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_08-12*) (PI_8.9). Orientation activities also include guidance on how students can access institutional administrative services and student support resources through the online learning environment and institutional digital platforms (AI_8.19).

Academic advising, career planning and other student support services are described in the IQA Manual, including academic advising and consultations and career services accessible to both online and on-campus students (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_8.7, PI_8.11). Administrative management of student records, enrolment status and academic documentation is coordinated through institutional administrative structures including the Registrar Office, as described in the IQA Manual (*Evidence_01-01*).

For programmes delivered in online or hybrid modes, students also receive academic and administrative support through digital communication channels integrated within the Virtual Learning Environment, including messaging tools, online consultations, video sessions and email communication (AI_8.16).

The MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit confirms that academic counselling and career planning/employment advice are structured and accessible, while also noting that access to dedicated personal or psychological counselling services was not evidenced as fully met at the time of audit (*Evidence_01-13*) (PI_8.11).

The institution offers financial support opportunities, including scholarships, with requirements and categories presented transparently. Institutional decision-making on financial aid is evidenced through the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee documentation (*Evidence_08-06; Evidence_08-07*) (PI_8.10).

The institution supports extracurricular activities and student initiatives through organisational arrangements and institutional procedures (*Evidence_08-13*) (PI_8.12).

Students also have access to formal institutional complaints procedures which allow them to raise concerns or appeals through defined institutional channels, as described in the institutional quality assurance framework (*Evidence_01-01*).

The institution collects and analyses reliable data on student profile, admissions and progression, success and drop-out measures and student satisfaction, using these data for institutional monitoring and quality management (*Evidence_01-05; Evidence_01-06; Evidence_06-06*) (PI_8.14). Learning management systems and institutional digital platforms also generate activity data related to student engagement with course materials and learning activities, supporting the identification of students who may require additional academic support (AI_8.17).

Student feedback is systematically collected through survey tools described in the IQA Manual, including the Student Module Satisfaction Survey and the Student Satisfaction Exit Survey (*Evidence_03-04; Evidence_08-14*), and results are analysed and used within institutional improvement processes (*Evidence_07-10*) (PI_8.15).

Information on how to access institutional digital systems and obtain technical assistance related to the Virtual Learning Environment, institutional email services and other digital learning tools is communicated to students through institutional guidance materials, orientation sessions and course information resources (AI_8.18).

Standard 8. Student Administration and Student Support Services

Through these mechanisms, GBSB Global ensures that student administration and student support services are implemented through transparent policies, structured governance arrangements, accessible student support services and systematic monitoring processes supporting the entire student lifecycle from admission to graduation. These arrangements promote fairness, transparency, student wellbeing and continuous improvement of student services within the institutional quality assurance framework (MI_8.1–MI_8.7, PI_8.8–PI_8.15, AI_8.16–AI_8.19).

Standard 8: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_01-06 – Institutional Data Reporting and Analysis Policy (*Evidence_01-06_Institutional_Data_Reporting_and_Analysis_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_02-04 – Student Guidelines and Academic Policies (*Evidence_02-04_Student_Guidelines_Academic_Policies_v1_0*)
- Evidence_03-04 – Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04_Student_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_04-02 – Academic Honesty Policy (*Evidence_04-02_Academic_Honesty_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-10 – Examples of Student Feedback Analysis and Action Plans (*Evidence_07-10_Student_Satisfaction_Analysis_Examples*)
- Evidence_08-01 – Institutional website extracts (*Evidence_08-01_Institutional_Website_Extracts*)
- Evidence_08-02 – Admission of Undergraduate Students Policy (*Evidence_08-02_Admission_Undergraduate_Students_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_08-03 – Admission of Graduate Students Policy (*Evidence_08-03_Admission_Graduate_Students_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_08-04 – Admission of PhD Students Policy (*Evidence_08-04_Admission_PhD_Students_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_08-05 – Admission of Transfer Students Policy (*Evidence_08-05_Admission_Transfer_Students_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_08-06 – Admissions and Financial Aid Committee Terms of Reference (*Evidence_08-06_AFA_Committee_ToR_2024-03-20*)
- Evidence_08-07 – Admissions and Financial Aid Committee meeting minutes (*Evidence_08-07_AFA_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_2024-09-30*)
- Evidence_08-08 – Recognition of Prior Learning Policy (*Evidence_08-08_Recognition_Prior_Learning_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_08-09 – Recognition of Prior Learning Procedure (*Evidence_08-09_Recognition_Prior_Learning_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_08-10 – Student inactivity rules (*Evidence_08-10_Student_Inactivity_Rules_Extract*)
- Evidence_08-11 – Sample Student Agreement (*Evidence_08-11_Student_Agreement_Template*)
- Evidence_08-12 – Orientation programme materials extract (*Evidence_08-12_Orientation_Materials_and_Programme_Extract*)
- Evidence_08-13 – Extracurricular activities (*Evidence_08-13_Extracurricular_Activities_Winter_2026*)
- Evidence_08-14 – Student Satisfaction Exit Survey Tool (*Evidence_08-14_Student_Satisfaction_Exit_Survey_Tool_v2_2023*)

Standard 8: SWOT Analysis

Table 8-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 8-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 8: Student Administration and Student Support Services

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive institutional policies covering the full student life cycle. - Structured student orientation and onboarding processes. - Academic advising and monitoring supporting early identification of at-risk students. - Formalised Student Council structure supporting student representation. - Dedicated student life teams supporting campus engagement and wellbeing. - Career development services supporting employability outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visibility of specialised wellbeing services could be further strengthened. - Participation in student engagement initiatives varies across delivery modes. - Communication of student life initiatives could be improved. - Student life activities are not fully integrated into academic calendars. - Absence of dedicated psychological support services. - Some administrative processes remain partially manual.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expansion of wellbeing and counselling services responding to sector trends. - Development of digital tools supporting identification of at-risk students. - Strengthening industry collaboration supporting employability initiatives. - Expansion of co-curricular activities aligned with programme learning outcomes. - Use of digital technologies to enhance student service delivery. - Deployment of specialised AI-supported assistants to enhance student support services and provide timely guidance addressing diverse student needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing expectations regarding student wellbeing support in higher education. - Competition among institutions in delivering high-quality student experiences. - Diverse student populations creating challenges for consistent engagement. - Economic circumstances affecting international student retention. - Time constraints for working students limiting participation in activities.

9. Learning Resources and Facilities

Learning resources and facilities at GBSB Global Business School are governed through the Internal Quality Assurance Manual (*Evidence_01-01*), which establishes institutional responsibility for ensuring that physical, digital and academic resources are adequate, accessible and aligned with programme delivery requirements. The Manual defines that learning resources must support teaching, assessment, research activity and student engagement across all campuses and delivery modes (*Evidence_01-01*) (PI_9.9, PI_9.10).

The premises dedicated for educational and administrative activities are maintained under lawful possession arrangements (*Evidence_09-01*) (MI_9.1). The institution provides an adequate, attractive and well-maintained physical environment, and facilities are maintained in accordance with applicable regulatory and safety requirements (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_09-02*) (MI_9.2, PI_9.10).

The institution provides classroom facilities equipped with appropriate presentation technologies, study areas and collaborative learning spaces. Physical facilities are subject to institutional oversight and periodic review mechanisms, ensuring that infrastructure remains aligned with academic delivery requirements (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_09-02*) (PI_9.9, PI_9.10). In addition, arrangements for students and staff with physical disabilities or other special needs are considered as part of facilities and learning resource planning (*Evidence_09-02; Evidence_09-03*) (MI_9.3, PI_9.10, PI_9.11).

Library and research resources are provided through a combination of digital access and integrated learning platforms. Students and staff have access to online academic databases and digital libraries, including EBSCO and Perlego, as part of the institutional learning ecosystem described in the Learning Resources Assessment Report 2025 (*Evidence_09-04*). The Student Guidelines and Academic Policies (*Evidence_02-04*) further confirm that students are provided with access to required learning materials and digital academic resources necessary to complete their programmes and that core literature listed in module syllabi is made available through institutional learning resources (*Evidence_02-04; Evidence_09-04*) (MI_9.6, AI_9.14).

Library access and associated learning resource services are organised to ensure availability beyond normal class time through digital resource access and platform availability, supporting student access when required (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_01-13*) (MI_9.4, AI_9.14).

The digital learning environment is centrally supported through the Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle), Microsoft 365 ecosystem and Salesforce Education Cloud Student Portal, as documented in the Learning Resources Assessment Report 2025 (*Evidence_09-04*). The report forms part of the IQA Plan and evaluates the adequacy, accessibility and effectiveness of institutional learning resources. It confirms the integration of Moodle for course delivery and assessment, Turnitin for academic integrity monitoring, QR-based attendance tracking, Single Sign-On authentication through Microsoft, and structured digital identity management. This integrated digital infrastructure supports secure, reliable and accessible academic delivery across campuses and online modes (*Evidence_09-04*) (MI_9.5, AI_9.14, AI_9.15).

Governance of digital infrastructure and cybersecurity is regulated through the IT Policy (*Evidence_04-11*), which defines acceptable use of institutional systems, access management, data security measures and maintenance of digital platforms (*Evidence_04-11*) (MI_9.7, MI_9.8). The Data Protection Policy (*Evidence_04-10*) further regulates processing of personal data, protection of student records and compliance with applicable data protection legislation, ensuring that learning environments operate within secure and compliant frameworks (*Evidence_04-10*) (MI_9.8).

Technical support is available to staff and students using institutional information and communications technologies, including support for online and on-campus students and remote assistance where needed,

Standard 9. Learning Resources and Facilities

as described in the IQA Manual provisions governing learning resources and facilities (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_9.7). Training and guidance on the effective use of digital learning platforms and institutional software tools are provided as part of staff development and student orientation activities supporting teaching, assessment and administrative processes (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_08-12*) (MI_9.7).

Digital infrastructure continuity and safeguarding measures (including backup and resilience arrangements) are described within the institutional learning resources and facilities framework (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_9.8).

Up-to-date computer equipment and software are available and accessible for staff and students to support electronic access to resources and reference material, including institutional accounts and education technology tools enabling use across devices with average specifications (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_09-04*) (MI_9.5, AI_9.15). In addition, the institution considers arrangements that may support disadvantaged students or students with special needs in accessing required technology (*Evidence_09-03; Evidence_01-13*) (PI_9.11).

Importantly, the Learning Resources Assessment Report 2025 (*Evidence_09-04*) demonstrates active monitoring and enhancement of institutional learning resources. The report documents strengths and areas for improvement, with structured recommendations and implementation priorities, evidencing that resource adequacy is not only assessed but subject to continuous improvement under the IQA framework (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_09-04*) (PI_9.9, PI_9.12).

Monitoring of learning resources and facilities is further supported through structured feedback instruments. The Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04*) collects student evaluations of teaching resources and learning support mechanisms, while the Student Satisfaction Exit Survey Tool (*Evidence_08-14*) gathers feedback on IT systems, facilities, educational technology and overall learning environment satisfaction. These instruments provide evidence used in institutional enhancement planning (*Evidence_03-04; Evidence_07-10; Evidence_08-14*) (PI_9.12).

Where third-party digital resources are procured, institutional procurement and vendor management practices ensure that platforms are scalable, supported through vendor maintenance arrangements and service-level expectations, and based on widely used technological standards that minimise dependency on proprietary systems (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_01-13; Evidence_09-05*) (AI_9.13).

Through the integration of physical infrastructure oversight, digital ecosystem governance, formal IT and data protection regulation, structured monitoring reports and continuous feedback analysis, GBSB Global demonstrates that learning resources and facilities are adequate, accessible, systematically reviewed and aligned with MFHEA Standard 9 requirements (MI_9.1–9.8, PI_9.9–9.12, AI_9.13–9.15).

Standard 9: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_02-04 – Student Guidelines and Academic Policies (*Evidence_02-04_Student_Guidelines_Academic_Policies_v1_0*)
- Evidence_03-04 – Student Module Satisfaction Survey Tool (*Evidence_03-04_Student_Module_Satisfaction_Survey_Tool_v1_2024*)
- Evidence_04-10 – Data Protection Policy (*Evidence_04-10_Data_Protection_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_04-11 – IT Policy (*Evidence_04-11_IT_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_07-10 – Examples of Student Feedback Analysis and Action Plans (*Evidence_07-10_Student_Satisfaction_Analysis_Examples*)
- Evidence_08-14 – Student Satisfaction Exit Survey Tool (*Evidence_08-14_Student_Satisfaction_Exit_Survey_Tool_v2_2023*)
- Evidence_09-01 – Lease Contract (*Evidence_09-01_Lease_Contract_GBSB_Global*)
- Evidence_09-02 – Building Perit Declaration Report (*Evidence_09-02_Building_Perit_Declaration_Report_2020-04-30*)
- Evidence_09-03 – Accessibility and Special Needs Provisions (Extract from Building Inspection Reports) (*Evidence_09-03_Accessibility_and_Special_Needs_Extracts*)
- Evidence_09-04 – Learning Resources Assessment Report (*Evidence_09-04_Learning_Resources_Assessment_Report_v1_IQA_Plan*)
- Evidence_09-05 – Third-Party Digital Resources (Extract) (*Evidence_09-05_Third_Party_Digital_Resources_Extract*)

Standard 9: SWOT Analysis

Table 9-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution's self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 9-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 9: Learning Resources and Facilities

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional governance framework ensuring adequate learning resources and facilities. - Continuous monitoring of student satisfaction with infrastructure and resources. - Modern classroom infrastructure supporting technology-enhanced learning. - Strong digital infrastructure supporting teaching and administration. - Institutional investment in technological development and innovation. - Extensive digital library resources supporting programme delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued development of staff digital competencies may be required. - Access to specialised research databases remains limited compared with large research universities. - Absence of a dedicated librarian to support academic research skills. - Full accessibility for students with disabilities may be constrained in certain facilities. - Campus amenities remain limited in some areas. - Documentation and coordination of facilities management could be strengthened.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rapid development of educational technology enabling enhanced learning environments. - Expansion of digital learning resources supporting remote access to academic materials. - Integration of advanced digital platforms supporting institutional analytics. - Development of innovative learning technologies supporting experiential learning. - Continued collaboration with technology partners supporting infrastructure innovation. - Deployment of specialised AI-supported assistants to enhance student access to institutional learning resources and provide rapid support for resource-related queries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rapid technological change requiring continuous infrastructure investment. - Increasing expectations regarding hybrid learning environments. - Resource constraints affecting infrastructure upgrades. - Competition from institutions investing heavily in modern campuses. - Increasing student expectations regarding digital and physical learning resources.

10. Research, Development, and/or Other Creative Activity

Research, development, and scholarly activity at GBSB Global Business School are embedded within the institutional governance and quality framework articulated in the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01*). The Manual establishes research as an integral component of academic quality, staff development, and institutional positioning, ensuring alignment between research activity, programme development, and strategic planning (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_10.1, MI_10.4, PI_10.9).

The institutional commitment to research is formally articulated in the GBSB Global Strategy 2024–2028 (Extract) (*Evidence_10-01*), which identifies the advancement of knowledge and innovation through structured research development as a strategic priority. Strategic objectives include strengthening research infrastructure, encouraging faculty scholarly activity aligned with the UN Agenda 2030, developing innovation-oriented programmes, increasing doctoral enrolment, and enhancing research impact and publication output through defined Key Performance Indicators (*Evidence_10-01*) (MI_10.1, PI_10.9).

The operationalisation of this strategy is detailed in the GBSB Global Research Centre Proposal (*Evidence_10-02*). The Research Centre is structured as a formal academic unit with defined thematic research axes, membership tiers (Permanent, Associate, Visiting, and Doctoral Members), eligibility criteria, publication and affiliation requirements, annual activity reporting obligations, and a governance framework consisting of a General Assembly and Research Council. The governance structure ensures oversight of research priorities, project approval and transparent allocation of research funding, and compliance with ethical and data protection requirements. The Proposal also defines short- and long-term strategic objectives, structured research output targets, international collaboration ambitions, and institutional arrangements supporting research dissemination and academic engagement (*Evidence_10-02*) (MI_10.1, MI_10.3, MI_10.4, PI_10.9).

Institutional financial planning also includes allocations supporting research and scholarly activities, including conference participation, research dissemination and development of research initiatives, ensuring that institutional resources contribute to the achievement of research objectives defined in strategic planning documents (*Evidence_01-01*; *Evidence_05-06*) (MI_10.2).

Doctoral research governance is formally regulated through the Academic Rules and Regulations for the PhD Programme (*Evidence_07-07*), which define admission criteria, supervisory structures, research progress monitoring, annual status presentations, pre-defence procedures, examination committee composition, dissertation submission requirements, publication obligations, intellectual property provisions, and appeal mechanisms. These regulations ensure that doctoral research activities are subject to structured academic oversight and quality assurance processes consistent with MQF Level 8 expectations (*Evidence_07-07*) (MI_10.4, PI_10.9).

Research integrity and ethical compliance are governed through the Research Ethics Policy (*Evidence_04-04*) and implemented via the Research Application Procedure (*Evidence_04-09*), which establish formal ethical review mechanisms for research involving human participants or sensitive data. Oversight is exercised through the institutional Ethics Committee, ensuring that research activities comply with ethical standards and regulatory expectations (*Evidence_04-04*; *Evidence_04-09*) (MI_10.6).

Faculty scholarly activity is structurally supported through institutional frameworks defining expectations for academic performance and scholarly engagement. The Faculty Qualification Framework establishes criteria for faculty qualification categories and intellectual contribution expectations aligned with institutional academic standards (*Evidence_10-03*) (MI_10.5).

Standard 10. Research, Development, and/or Other Creative Activity

Research engagement is further supported through institutional staff development mechanisms defined in the Staff Professional Development Policy (*Evidence_05-06*) and Staff Professional Development Procedure (*Evidence_05-07*), which provide structured opportunities for conference participation, publication development, and professional academic engagement (*Evidence_05-06; Evidence_05-07*) (MI_10.4, MI_10.5).

Institutional workload arrangements recognise research engagement within academic responsibilities, as reflected in the Teaching Load Policy (*Evidence_05-04*), which ensures that scholarly activity can be integrated into academic workload planning (*Evidence_05-04*) (MI_10.4, MI_10.5).

Academic career progression further reinforces scholarly engagement through the Academic Ranks and Promotion Policy (*Evidence_10-04*) and Academic Ranks and Promotion Procedure (*Evidence_10-05*), which establish transparent criteria for academic promotion based on teaching quality, scholarly activity, research contributions, and service to the institution. The Faculty Promotion Committee evaluates promotion applications and reviews faculty portfolios including publications, scholarly outputs, and academic service contributions (*Evidence_10-04; Evidence_10-05*) (MI_10.4, MI_10.5, PI_10.9).

Teaching staff are encouraged to integrate insights from their research and scholarly activities into the courses they teach, ensuring that teaching content reflects current developments in the field and supports research-informed learning for students (*Evidence_05-06; Evidence_10-03*) (PI_10.7).

The institution also promotes collaboration between research activities and external stakeholders including enterprises, public sector institutions and civil society organisations, enabling research themes to respond to societal needs, labour-market developments and innovation priorities (*Evidence_10-01; Evidence_10-02*) (PI_10.8).

Doctoral research culture and scholarly dissemination are further supported through the GBSB Global Doctoral Conference Proposal (*Evidence_10-06*), which establishes a structured platform for doctoral researchers to present research work, receive feedback, and contribute to the institutional research community (*Evidence_10-06*) (PI_10.7, 1 PI_10.9).

Institutional research performance is monitored through strategic KPIs and dashboard mechanisms (*Evidence_01-05*), while the MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13*) confirms the existence of structured research governance mechanisms and institutional plans to further consolidate research documentation and monitoring processes (*Evidence_01-05; Evidence_01-13*) (PI_10.9).

Institutional monitoring of research outputs and scholarly contributions is supported through internal records of publications, conference participation, and other intellectual contributions produced by faculty and doctoral researchers (*Evidence_10-07*) (PI_10.9).

Through the integration of institutional strategy, structured governance, ethical oversight, staff development mechanisms, doctoral education frameworks, academic promotion structures, and performance monitoring systems, GBSB Global demonstrates that research and scholarly activity are systematically supported and aligned with institutional objectives and MFHEA Standard 10 requirements (MI_10.1–10.6, PI_10.7–10.9).

Standard 10: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_01-13 – MFHEA Reaccreditation Readiness Audit Report (*Evidence_01-13_MFHEA_Reaccreditation_Readiness_Audit*)
- Evidence_04-04 – Research Ethics Policy (*Evidence_04-04_Research_Ethics_Policy_v2_0*)
- Evidence_04-09 – Research Application Procedure (*Evidence_04-09_Research_Application_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_05-04 – Teaching Load Policy (*Evidence_05-04_Teaching_Load_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_05-06 Staff Professional Development Policy (*Evidence_05-06_Staff_Professional_Development_Policy_v3_0*)
- Evidence_05-07 Staff Professional Development Procedure (*Evidence_05-07_Staff_Professional_Development_Procedure_v2_0*)
- Evidence_07-07 – Academic Rules and Regulations for the PhD Programme (*Evidence_07-07_PhD_Academic_Rules_and_Regulations_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-01 – GBSB Global Strategy 2024–2028 (Extract) (*Evidence_10-01_GBSB_Global_Strategy_2024-28_Extract*)
- Evidence_10-02 – GBSB Global Research Centre Proposal (*Evidence_10-02_GBSB_Global_Research_Centre_Proposal_2025-03-25*)
- Evidence_10-03 – Faculty Qualification Framework (*Evidence_10-03_Faculty_Qualification_Framework_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-04 – Academic Ranks and Promotion Policy (*Evidence_10-04_Academic_Ranks_and_Promotion_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-05 – Academic Ranks and Promotion Procedure (*Evidence_10-05_Academic_Ranks_and_Promotion_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-06 – GBSB Global Doctoral Conference Proposal (*Evidence_10-06_GBSB_Global_Doctoral_Conference_Proposal_2025-03-25*)
- Evidence_10-07 – Selected Research Outputs (*Evidence_10-07_Selected_Research_Outputs_2021-2025*)

Standard 10: SWOT Analysis

Table 10-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution’s self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 10-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 10: Research, Development, and/or Other Creative Activity

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research objectives embedded within institutional strategy. - Dedicated Research Centre supporting research coordination and governance. - Academic rank structures supporting research expectations and career progression. - Doctoral programme supporting research culture and knowledge production. - Institutional policies supporting research ethics and responsible research practices. - Initiatives supporting research engagement including publication incentives and conferences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional research culture remains in development. - Research output in highly ranked journals remains emerging. - Limited number of full-time faculty constrains research capacity. - Engagement of part-time faculty in research remains limited. - Monitoring of research output could be further consolidated. - Structured allocation of research funding could be strengthened.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaboration with international research networks and partner universities. - Increased participation in international academic conferences. - Applied research partnerships with industry and public organisations. - Development of doctoral programme supporting research output. - Growing global interest in research related to innovation and entrepreneurship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing expectations regarding research output in higher education. - Competition for research funding. - Teaching and administrative workloads affecting research productivity. - Financial requirements for sustained research development. - Competitive publication standards in high-ranked journals.

11. Institutional Cooperation, Service to Society, and Internationalisation

Institutional cooperation, service to society, and internationalisation form integral components of the strategic development of GBSB Global Business School and are embedded within the institutional strategic planning framework. The Internal Quality Assurance Manual defines international engagement, cooperation with external stakeholders, and societal impact as core elements supporting the institution's mission and strategic objectives (*Evidence_01-01*) (MI_11.1, PI_11.4).

The institutional commitment to internationalisation and external engagement is further articulated in the GBSB Global Strategy 2024–2028, which identifies the development of international partnerships, academic collaboration, and engagement with industry and society as strategic priorities supporting institutional development and innovation (*Evidence_10-01*) (MI_11.1).

Institutional planning also allocates financial and organisational resources supporting international cooperation initiatives, partnership development, and engagement activities with external stakeholders and society. These provisions support the implementation of strategic priorities related to internationalisation and institutional cooperation and are monitored through institutional planning and KPI monitoring mechanisms (*Evidence_01-01; Evidence_01-05*) (MI_11.2).

GBSB Global develops institutional cooperation through formal partnerships and collaboration agreements with international higher education institutions and organisations. These partnerships are formalised through Memoranda of Understanding and cooperation agreements that establish frameworks for academic collaboration, research cooperation, joint academic activities, and exchange initiatives involving students, faculty and staff (*Evidence_11-01; Evidence_11-02*) (PI_11.7).

For example, cooperation agreements with international partners provide a framework for joint academic activities such as research collaboration, seminars, conferences, and the exploration of opportunities for student and faculty exchanges and collaborative research initiatives (*Evidence_11-01*) (PI_11.4, PI_11.7).

Institutional cooperation also includes collaboration with external organisations supporting international academic programmes and educational initiatives, including partnerships facilitating study-abroad programmes and other forms of international academic engagement (*Evidence_11-02*) (PI_11.4, PI_11.7).

In addition to bilateral cooperation agreements, the institution maintains relationships with a network of international partner universities supporting mobility opportunities, academic exchange, and collaborative activities within European and international frameworks. A substantial proportion of these partnerships are developed within the Erasmus+ programme, which serves as the primary institutional framework for structured international cooperation and mobility. Since joining the Erasmus+ programme in 2023, GBSB Global has established multiple cooperation agreements with partner universities and has secured funding under Erasmus+ Key Actions supporting student and staff mobility and traineeships (*Evidence_11-06; Evidence_11-07*). These activities contribute to the international exposure of students and staff and strengthen academic cooperation with European and international institutions (PI_11.4, PI_11.6).

International partnerships and cooperation initiatives are periodically reviewed through institutional governance structures, including discussions at Executive Committee meetings addressing international collaboration, partnership development, and strategic internationalisation initiatives (*Evidence_11-03*) (PI_11.4).

Engagement with external stakeholders and industry representatives is further supported through institutional advisory structures. Advisory Board meetings provide a forum for consultation with industry experts and external stakeholders regarding academic programme development, emerging skills

Standard 11. Institutional Cooperation, Service to Society, and Internationalisation

requirements, and broader institutional initiatives aimed at strengthening societal engagement and graduate employability (*Evidence_11-04*) (MI_11.3).

Service to society is also demonstrated through academic events organised by the institution, including conferences, seminars, workshops, and guest lectures involving academics, industry experts, and representatives of professional organisations. These activities contribute to knowledge dissemination and support dialogue between academia, industry, and the wider community (*Evidence_11-05*) (PI_11.5).

In addition, entrepreneurship development constitutes an important component of the institution's societal engagement activities. Entrepreneurship support initiatives are coordinated through the Career, Alumni Services and Entrepreneurship Centre (CAEC), which provides integrated services supporting career development, entrepreneurship education, alumni engagement and industry interaction (*Evidence_11-08*). Within CAEC, the G-Accelerator operates as an entrepreneurship platform providing mentoring, training, innovation challenges, and incubation opportunities for students, alumni, and external participants (*Evidence_11-09*). These initiatives are designed to cultivate entrepreneurial competences within the institutional community and facilitate collaboration between students, faculty members and industry stakeholders (PI_11.5).

The G-Accelerator programme contributes directly to service to society by supporting early-stage ventures and facilitating the development of innovative business ideas through structured pre-acceleration and acceleration activities. Certain G-Accelerator activities, including workshops, mentoring sessions and networking events, are made available free of charge not only to GBSB Global students but also to members of the wider entrepreneurial community, thereby expanding the institution's societal engagement beyond its immediate academic environment. The programme operates in collaboration with international partners and industry stakeholders and has supported multiple entrepreneurship projects through initiatives such as the G-Accelerator Impact Call programme (*Evidence_11-09*) (PI_11.5).

The entrepreneurship ecosystem surrounding GBSB Global is further reinforced through collaboration with regional innovation initiatives and sector-specific programmes aimed at facilitating knowledge transfer and innovation. For example, participation in initiatives such as Impuls Agritech, a pre-acceleration programme supporting technology transfer and innovation in the agri-food sector, demonstrates engagement with external research and industry ecosystems and contributes to the commercialisation of research outcomes and development of entrepreneurial competencies (*Evidence_11-10*) (PI_11.5).

Alumni engagement represents an additional dimension of institutional cooperation and service to society. Alumni relations are coordinated through CAEC and supported through structured communication channels and organised alumni activities designed to maintain professional connections and encourage continued engagement with the institution (*Evidence_11-11*) (PI_11.8). Alumni networking initiatives, alumni chapters, and professional events provide opportunities for graduates to contribute to mentoring activities, guest lectures, and collaborative initiatives supporting student development and institutional outreach.

Structured communication with alumni is maintained through dedicated communication channels including alumni community groups, targeted electronic communications and institutional career platforms. Alumni are regularly invited to participate in institutional events, mentoring initiatives and professional networking activities organised by the institution. Formal alumni feedback mechanisms, including alumni surveys conducted after graduation, provide insights into graduate career development and support the continuous improvement of academic programmes and institutional services (PI_11.8).

Internationalisation is further reinforced through the institution's research development initiatives. The GBSB Global Research Centre aims to facilitate international research collaboration and interdisciplinary knowledge exchange, while academic events such as the GBSB Global Doctoral Conference provide

Standard 11. Institutional Cooperation, Service to Society, and Internationalisation

opportunities for doctoral researchers to present research and engage with international academic communities (*Evidence_10-02; Evidence_10-06*) (PI_11.4, PI_11.6).

Institutional monitoring of cooperation, societal engagement, and internationalisation activities is supported through institutional planning and performance monitoring mechanisms, including institutional dashboards and KPI monitoring systems used to track strategic priorities and institutional development indicators (*Evidence_01-05*) (PI_11.4, PI_11.5).

Engagement in international cooperation initiatives, community outreach activities and institutional partnerships is also recognised within academic staff evaluation and promotion frameworks, where academic service, external collaboration and societal impact are considered as part of professional performance and career development (*Evidence_10-04; Evidence_10-05*) (PI_11.9).

Through the integration of international partnerships, governance oversight, research collaboration initiatives, external stakeholder engagement, entrepreneurship activities, alumni engagement mechanisms, and academic outreach initiatives, GBSB Global demonstrates that institutional cooperation, service to society, and internationalisation are systematically embedded within its strategic and quality assurance framework (MI_11.1–11.3, PI_11.4–11.9).

Standard 11: Evidence

- Evidence_01-01 – Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Manual (*Evidence_01-01_IQA_Manual_v2*)
- Evidence_01-05 – Institutional Dashboards and KPI Monitoring Extract (*Evidence_01-05_Institutional_Dashboards_and_KPI_Monitoring_Examples*)
- Evidence_10-01 – GBSB Global Strategy 2024–2028 (Extract) (*Evidence_10-01_GBSB_Global_Strategy_2024-28_Extract*)
- Evidence_10-02 – GBSB Global Research Centre Proposal (*Evidence_10-02_GBSB_Global_Research_Centre_Proposal*)
- Evidence_10-04 – Academic Ranks and Promotion Policy (*Evidence_10-04_Academic_Ranks_and_Promotion_Policy_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-05 – Academic Ranks and Promotion Procedure (*Evidence_10-05_Academic_Ranks_and_Promotion_Procedure_v1_0*)
- Evidence_10-06 – GBSB Global Doctoral Conference Proposal (*Evidence_10-06_GBSB_Doctoral_Conference_Proposal*)
- Evidence_11-01 – Memorandum of Understanding with Campus ESPRIT Industries – Management and Engineering Graduate School (*Evidence_11-01_Signed_IVAEN_MOU_CEI-MEGS*)
- Evidence_11-02 – Study Abroad Association Partnership Agreement (*Evidence_11-02_GBSB_Global-Study_Abroad_Association_Service_Agreement*)
- Evidence_11-03 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (*Evidence_11-03_EC_Meeting_Minutes_2025-12-09*)
- Evidence_11-04 – Advisory Board Meeting Presentation (*Evidence_11-04_Advisory_Board_Meeting_Presentation_2026-01-26*)
- Evidence_11-05 – Guest Lectures and Public Engagement Activities (*Evidence_11-05_Guest_Lectures_and_Public_Engagement_Activities_Extract*)
- Evidence_11-06 – Erasmus and International Partner Universities List (*Evidence_11-06_Erasmus+_Partner_Universities*)
- Evidence_11-07 – International Engagement and Erasmus+ Programme Overview (*Evidence_11-07_GBSB_Global_International_Office_Presentation*)
- Evidence_11-08 – Career, Alumni Services and Entrepreneurship Centre (CAEC) Presentation (*Evidence_11-08_GBSB_Global_CAEC_Presentation_Winter_2025*)
- Evidence_11-09 – G-Accelerator Entrepreneurship and Impact Call Programme Overview (*Evidence_11-09_G-Accelerator_and_Impact_Call_Overview*)
- Evidence_11-10 – Impuls Agritech Pre-Acceleration Programme Documentation (*Evidence_11-10_Impuls_Agritech_Pre-Acceleration_Programme*)
- Evidence_11-11 – Alumni Chapters Guidelines (*Evidence_11-11_Alumni_Chapters_Guidelines*)

Standard 11: SWOT Analysis

Table 11-1 below provides a SWOT analysis related to this standard and reflects the institution’s self-evaluation of its strengths and areas for development, taking into account internal quality assurance processes, stakeholder feedback, and the findings of the reaccreditation readiness audit.

Table 11-1 SWOT Analysis – Standard 11: Institutional Cooperation, Service to Society, and Internationalisation

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic institutional commitment to international cooperation and partnerships. - Active participation in Erasmus mobility programmes. - Entrepreneurship initiatives supporting innovation ecosystems and start-ups. - Strong international networks of mentors, investors, and industry partners. - Active alumni network supporting professional engagement. - Integration of careers, alumni, and entrepreneurship services supporting student development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International institutional visibility remains in a growth phase. - Depth of international partnerships could be further expanded. - Geographic dispersion of alumni complicates sustained engagement. - Limited institutional capacity for preparing large international funding applications. - Monitoring of partnership outcomes could be strengthened. - Documentation of societal impact of cooperation initiatives could be consolidated.
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expansion of Erasmus partnerships and mobility initiatives. - Increased participation in international research and innovation programmes. - Strengthening partnerships with global entrepreneurship ecosystems. - Leveraging alumni networks for international collaboration opportunities. - Collaboration with public institutions supporting societal engagement initiatives. - Leveraging international accreditations to build strategic partnerships with higher education institutions (HEIs) within the same accreditation networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visa regulations and geopolitical developments affecting mobility. - Increasing competition among institutions for international partnerships. - Economic changes affecting entrepreneurship ecosystems. - Reputational risks associated with international partnerships. - Rapid expansion of cooperation initiatives potentially exceeding institutional capacity.

