

Approval Panel Report (Approval of a Programme)

Name of Educational Institution	McTimoney College of Chiropractic
Programme Name	Masters in Chiropractic (Full Time/ FTE and Full Time Equivalent/ FTE programmes)
Proposed Start Date of Programme	September 2018 and January 2019

Panel Chair	Dr. Mo Telford
Panel Members	Mark Webster
Panel Secretary	Anouska Annan

Introduction

On 30th August 2018, a teleconference took place between the General Chiropractic Council's (GCC) Approval Panel and representatives from the McTimoney College of Chiropractic (MCC). The representatives from the MCC included the Principal of the College, the Vice Principal and the Director of Research.

This teleconference was scheduled following the completion of analysis of the MCC's submission documents for the re-approval of its two MChiro degree programmes; the full time (FT) programme delivered at its Abingdon campus and the full time equivalent (FTE) programme delivered at both the Abingdon and Manchester campuses. As the MCC is an institution known to the GCC that was seeking the re-approval of a degree that had been previously recognised against the GCC's 2010 Degree Recognition Criteria, the institution was asked to provide a programme submission that highlighted changes that had been made to the programme since the last approval process in 2013.

The programme submission was analysed by a panel consisting of one lay and one chiropractic education visitor and then discussed with the GCC's Education Committee at its meeting on 12th June 2018. At this meeting, the Education Committee concluded that further information would be required in order for the Approval Panel to decide whether a monitoring visit would be appropriate as it was noted that there were some discrepancies within the programme submission as well as information that needed further clarification.

The GCC sought further information from the MCC in June 2018 on; specific modular and delivery changes made to the programme since 2013, validation, the staff structure and roles and responsibilities, resources and clinic facilities and clarification on the noted discrepancies. This additional information was analysed by the approval panel and it was decided that a teleconference between the MCC and the GCC's panel was required in order for the GCC to be assured that standards were being met.

How areas of concern were addressed.

During the teleconference, the MCC was asked about the validation of the programme and what the timetable was for revalidation. The Principal of the MCC clarified that the institution had been through a revalidation process with BPP University in the spring of 2018 and both programmes had been validated for five years.

The Panel was concerned about the impact on the delivery and teaching of research and audit by the introduction of the optional Evidence in Practice module in the final years of both programmes. The Panel sought clarification on how the institution ensured that students who opted to do the traditional dissertation gained experience of clinical audit. The Director of Research reported that all students gained experience of clinical audit during the clinic year and the subject was introduced to students in the pre clinic year. It was clarified that although the EiP module had a greater emphasis on clinical audit than the dissertation, students would still be required to complete a clinical audit and undergo a summative assessment as part of their clinic portfolio.

The MCC was asked to provide clarification on the assessment strategies for a number of modules. It appeared that there was a number of learning outcomes from a handful of modules that were not assessed. The MCC reported that a large number of these learning outcomes were in fact assessed, but this had not been outlined in the paperwork due to some typographical errors. Other concerns had been raised such as the mismatch between the essential and recommended reading lists in particular modules; it was also clarified that this was due to a typographical error.

The Panel had noted that there were some discrepancies between one submission document and another in relation to the modules mapped against the GCC's Education Standards. The MCC clarified that the table of learning outcomes that they had submitted contained the correct information, whereas the other document that they had submitted contained inaccurate information and should be disregarded. The Panel had some remaining concerns over some learning outcomes not being included in the mapping document. The MCC clarified that only learning outcomes that were formally assessed had been included in that particular document.

From the analysis of the submission documents it was noted that some specific modular and delivery changes had been made to both the FT and FTE programmes since the last GCC approval process in 2013. The MCC was asked whether there had been an impact on student workload resulting from these changes to the modular delivery methods and whether any impact studies had been undertaken. The MCC explained that an analysis of student outcomes between the FT and FTE programmes had been done and that there was no difference in student outcomes.

The Panel informed the MCC that some further analysis of the programme submission would need to be undertaken in order for the GCC to ensure that all education standards were being met by the programme.

Following the teleconference and as a result of the MCC providing clarification on some aspects of the submitted paperwork, the registrant approval panel member conducted further analysis of the module information submitted by the MCC. Through this analysis, it became apparent that there had been some changes made to the content and delivery of Philosophy II in the FTE programme and Philosophy I, Chiropractic Studies I and Philosophy II in the FT programme. The Approval Panel felt that it would be good practice to submit the rationale for these changes to the GCC as part of the next annual monitoring process.

Through analysing the written evidence, the Approval Panel was assured that all of the GCC's education standards were being met, pending further clarification. It was not clear from the paperwork which of the MCC's module learning outcomes met standard 6 (*Demonstrate an understanding of the nature of professional accountability*); it was clear to the Panel that this was due to an oversight where the Education Standards document had been misread.

Account of verbal summary given to the institution

The MCC was informed by the Panel Secretary that a decision on the re-approval of the two MChiro programmes would need to be made based on further analysis of the evidence provided in the document that mapped the MCC's module learning outcomes to the GCC's Education Standards. The MCC would be written to at a later date outlining the panel's recommendation to the Education Committee.

Recommendation to Education Committee

1. Approve <u>without</u> conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Approve <u>with</u> conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. No approval (insufficient evidence due to serious deficiencies)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Commendations to the institution

No commendations were made.

Conditions for the institution with reasons and timeframe in which they must be met. (Recommendation 2)

* Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. If conditions are placed upon the programme by the GCC the

institution must disclose this decision to prospective and current students.

1. The MCC must send details of modules and learning outcomes specifically mapped against Standard 6 of the Education Standards as part of the annual monitoring process for the 2017-18 academic year.
 - There appeared to be an oversight in regards to the task of mapping the programmes' learning outcomes to the GCC's Education Standards document. However, in order to assure the GCC that all standards are being met, the MCC is required to submit the additional information (noted above) by the completion of the annual monitoring process for the 2017-18 academic year, which will be in April 2019.

Recommendations for the institution and reasons

* Recommendations do not need to be met before the programme is granted ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme.

The Approval Panel has recommended the following:

1. The MCC should submit details of the minor and major amendments that have been made to the content and delivery of the modules of both programmes together with a rationale for the changes as part of the next annual monitoring process.
 - On further analysis of the MCC's module descriptors, compared to those of 2013, there appeared to be several changes made to the content and delivery of particular modules that were not alluded to in the original programme submission documents.
2. The MCC should map the vertical and horizontal integration of the GCC's Education Standards across all modules to allow for clarity, including modules where these standards are not formally assessed.
3. The MCC should consider formally assessing GCC Standards across a wider range of relevant modules where these standards are already covered as part of the curriculum.
 - The panel suggested that the institution should provide assurance that students meet all learning outcomes by having relevant formal assessments.
4. The MCC should monitor the impact of the introduction of the Evidence in Practice module on students. In particular, the number of students opting to undertake the module, any effect on pass rates and the teaching and delivery of research within the programme.

Further Evidence Required (Recommendation 3)

N/A

Conclusion

Following the teleconference and confirmation from the MCC that the Learning Outcomes table contained accurate mapping of the MCC modules against the GCC's standards, the Approval Panel was of the view that the programme met the majority of the required criteria. It was noted that the MCC's failure to address Standard 6 in the submitted paperwork appeared to be an oversight.

The Approval Panel concluded that the programme content adequately met most of the GCC's Education Standards; however, the Panel agreed that the programme be approved on the condition that the institution submits evidence of the degree meeting Standard 6 of the GCC's Education Standards. In addition, a number of recommendations (noted above), were made in order to assure the GCC that the standards continue to be met.

Signed: *Mo Telford*

Panel Chair: Dr. Mo Telford

Date: 4 October 2018