



## Education Visitors' Report (Approval of a Programme)

<b>Name of Educational Institution</b>	AECC University College
<b>Programme Name</b>	Master of Science (Chiropractic)
<b>Proposed Start Date of Programme</b>	September 2018
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> March 2018

<b>Panel Chair</b>	Alison Attfield
<b>Panel Members</b>	Rabia Ahmed, Mark Webster
<b>Observers</b>	Annemarie McNeely
<b>Panel Secretary</b>	Anouska Annan

### Introduction

The AECC University College (formerly the Anglo European College of Chiropractic) made a submission to the General Chiropractic Council (GCC) to be considered by the Education Committee at its November 2017 meeting for its proposed Master of Science (Chiropractic) degree programme due to commence in autumn 2018.

The programme submission was analysed by one chiropractic and one lay Education Visitor. The analysis of the programme submission revealed that the proposed MSc Chiropractic would be a "3 plus 2" year award whereby students would complete the first 3 years of the MChiro degree and then elect to either remain on the MChiro programme or transfer onto the new MSc.

There was initially a lack of specific information about the course structure which made it difficult for the Approval Panel to ascertain whether the proposed course would meet the newly developed Education Standards. For this reason, AECC University College was asked to map its MChiro to the new standards which assured the Panel that the GCC's requirements would be met.

<b>Staff members, groups, facilities and resources seen</b>			
	Yes	No	N/A
Dean/ pro-vice-chancellor/deputy vice chancellor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Representative(s) from validating institution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senior management responsible for programme resources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patients**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clinic facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning Resources ( e.g. IT, library facilities)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	Please specify		

\*The students met with were on the current MChiro and MSc programmes

\*\* A meeting with patients was not required.

#### **How areas of concern were addressed.**

##### Meeting with the senior management team

The senior management team was asked for a general update on changes within the institution since being granted Taught Degree Awarding Powers (TDAP); the team reported that general processes and procedures had been adapted to better suit the institution. Staff also indicated that the institution had a strengthened relationship with other HEIs since becoming independent of Bournemouth University.

The senior team was also asked about the rationale for introducing the new award. The team explained that the qualification would have a closer alignment with European requirements as well as allowing students who wished to go on to study for a PhD to experience a programme with more of research focus.

##### Meeting with students

The Approval Panel met with a group of students who were at various stages of the MChiro course and one of whom was in the final year of the previously recognised MSc.

All students spoke highly of the support that they received in relation to student services (e.g. counselling) and reported that learning facilities had improved (such as the extended opening hours of the library.) However, students reported that there was still some concern over the loss of BU facilities as it had resulted in less study space being available.

Regarding the new MSc award, most students, with the exception of the student union representative, appeared to have had very little information about it. They reported that the AECC University College had organised sessions that students were invited to for the purpose of informing them about the new award but that these sessions had been poorly attended. Students confirmed that they had not had any involvement with the development of the new programme. Some students expressed frustration as they believed that the award would not be available to them due to the inability of UK students to access funding.

### Teaching, learning and assessment

The members of AECC University College's faculty who were responsible for teaching, assessment and quality assurance were asked questions in relation to these areas. It was reported that the quality assurance procedures that had already been put in place by Bournemouth University had been adapted to better suit the institution since Taught Degree Awarding Powers (TDAP) had been granted. The Approval Panel enquired about the number of teaching staff who either possessed or were working towards a teaching qualification. It was reported that through appraisals, all current staff are encouraged to work towards a teaching qualification.

With regard to the AECC University College's policies on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), the Panel was concerned that there was no clear strategy for developing such policies. It was reported that the institution worked closely with the Dorset Race Equality Council and were mindful that more staff training may be required on equality and diversity issues. The institution was asked about its plan to apply for any quality marks, it was explained that the institution was considering applying for the Athena SWAN and Stonewall awards.

Faculty staff were questioned over the assessment strategy of the *Reflective Practice* module that is taught over the course of two years, but assessed at the end of the two year period. The Panel had some concern that this would result in 'end loading', with too much pressure being put on students in the final year. Staff explained that this strategy was developed to allow students sufficient time to reflect upon work undertaken in the previous year and that the assessment is timed, so not to clash with other assessment requirements of the course.

### Clinical Components

A meeting was held with the institution's staff responsible for the management, assessment and delivery of clinical components.

The Panel had concerns regarding the differences in delivery and duration of the Clinical Internship between the MSc and MChiro awards. With the MSc students taking two year to complete the same 60 credit Clinic Internship module, that the MChiro students complete in one year. The staff explained that both cohorts have the same duration of clinical exposure and meet the same clinical requirements at the end of the module. This is achieved by the MSc students' spending less time a week in clinic (3 days) over their two years, compared to the MChiro students (5 days). This reduced clinic time spreads the clinical requirements over two years and allows the MSc students more time to complete their other academic requirements.

**Account of verbal summary given to the institution**

The Approval Panel informed AECC University College's senior management team that it would recommend approval of the course without conditions, although there was a total of four recommendations made that were in relation to student support, the assessment strategy and the development of EDI policies.

**Recommendation to Education Committee**

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

**Commendations to the institution**

N/A

**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.

N/A

**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 recommended the following:

1. The institution should review the contact hours between students and tutors in relation to unit 407 to ensure that the support being given to all students is clear and equitable.
2. The institution should adequately consult students on the new course in order to ensure that sufficient resources and support is being provided and that students are aware of how to access these resources.
3. The institution should monitor student progression based upon the assessment strategy and the structure of the award (i.e. modules being taught over two years.)
4. The institution should adopt a more strategic approach to the development of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies and procedures.

<b>Further Evidence Required (Recommendation 3)</b>
---

N/A
-----

<b>Conclusion</b>
-------------------

The Approval Panel was impressed by how the institution had adapted to becoming independent of Bournemouth University. The Panel concluded that the programme content adequately met the GCC's Education Standards.
---

Signed:



Panel Chair: Alison Attfield

Date: 15.03.2018