

Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students

The College of Health Ltd

Review Report

March 2020



Working as the Designated Quality Body for England

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons	1
About this report.....	13
About the College of Health Ltd	13
How the review was conducted.....	14
Explanation of findings	17
S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.....	17
S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers	24
S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them	30
S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.....	34
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system	40
Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses	45
Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	52
Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience	57
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.....	63
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students	67
Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.....	70
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.....	75

Summary of findings and reasons

Ref	Core practice	Outcome	Confidence	Summary of reasons
S1	The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.	Met	High	<p>From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the College of Health's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The review team also considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>The review team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the College of Health's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also considers that the College of Health's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team concludes that staff fully understand the College of Health's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on its scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.</p>
S2	The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably	Met	High	The review team, based on the evidence presented, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the College of Health's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considers that the standards

	comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.			<p>described in the approved programme documentation and in the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>The review team determined that the standards that will be achieved by the College of Health's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considers that the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the review team concludes that staff at the provider fully understand the College of Health's approach to maintaining such standards. The review team considers the College of Health's plans for maintaining comparable standards appropriate, well documented and understood by staff members.</p> <p>Therefore the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications should have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met.</p>
S3	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.	Met	High	The College of Health has demonstrated that it has well developed plans for the management of partnership working to ensure that the standards of the awards it will deliver on behalf of its awarding bodies are credible and secure. Planned partnership agreements with both the awarding universities are current, collaborative and governed by up to date comprehensive academic regulations and policies. The College of Health has

				carefully considered plans which are robust and credible to ensure the maintenance of standards within the partnership agreement. The College of Health's governance and academic regulations are designed to meet both Universities' requirements to ensure that academic standards are securely and credibly maintained in line with respective partnership agreements. The governance arrangements will support effective collaboration through linked designated officers and ongoing engagement within specific deliberative committees. External examiner reports seen by the review team confirm that the standards of programmes, which will become the Colleges of Health's programmes, credibly and securely meet both threshold standards and standards beyond the threshold. Staff understand their responsibilities to the respective awarding bodies in line with partnership agreements. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.
S4	The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.	Met	High	The College of Health will use external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. The College of Health's plans to engage external expertise in maintaining standards and assessment and classification are credible, robust and evidence based. This is because the College of Health's plans for external engagement for these purposes are informed by the robust requirements of its awarding bodies and its own internal academic and policy frameworks. The significance of engaging externally for these purposes is also explicitly prioritised and credibly situated within the College of Health's strategic plans and operational plans. The comprehensive academic regulations and policies that the College of Health will apply to ensure external expertise is engaged in the maintenance of academic standards and assessment and

				<p>classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the College of Health will apply the academic regulations of both Universities and the College of Health's internal draft governance and academic regulations and policies frameworks which explicitly require the need to engage external expertise in the maintenance of academic standards and assessment and classification processes. The programme approval and review documents confirm that external references points are systematically applied in line with awarding bodies' regulations and there is evidence of independent external expertise being involved in the programme approval processes and external examiners for the monitoring of standards processes. Staff fully understand the importance of using external expertise to inform the maintenance of standards and the College of Health's proposed assessment and classification processes. Students confirm that the assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.</p>
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	<p>The College of Health has a clear policy for the recruitment and admission of students, which demonstrates how it plans to operate an admissions system that is reliable, fair and inclusive. The College of Health has a comprehensive draft Admissions Policy, fully aligned with the recruitment and admissions requirements of BPPU and the University of Ulster. Programme documentation within programme handbooks and specifications include details on admissions criteria, which reflect policy, procedure and practice. The College of Health plans to implement a system to rigorously record and analyse all stages of the recruitment process, from application to admission, to ensure that the fairness and inclusivity of its systems can be demonstrably assessed.</p>

				<p>Staff that will be involved in admissions understand their role and are appropriately skilled. Information for applicants will be mainly electronic, and is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The process for handling complaints and appeals is clearly set out to applicants, and explicitly included in standard admissions correspondence. All students who met with the review team explained that the admissions process was a demonstrably positive experience and gave them all opportunities to understand their course in detail. They highlighted in particular the high quality of the advice and support they received at all stages of the process, and the way in which adaptations for specific needs were considered and acted upon. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met</p>
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	High	<p>The College of Health has robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high-quality courses. This is because the plans confirm that the College of Health's approaches will be informed and guided by the policies and procedures of its two awarding bodies along with its own comprehensive internal processes for programme design and delivery. These plans will be implemented by senior staff and academic and professional teams with substantive experience in designing and delivering programmes. The academic regulations and policy frameworks of its two awarding bodies and its own internal regulations will facilitate and support the College of Health to design and deliver high-quality programmes. Approved course documentation shows that programmes are designed to deliver high-quality learning and assessment experiences and to ensure programme learning outcomes can be achieved; for example, through modules that focus on clinical management and assessment. The review team heard from students how</p>

				<p>staff engaged with learning outcomes through teaching sessions, and they described the positive experiences they have within practical sessions in classes and clinics. The review team can confirm that teaching observations evidence a strong focus on practice outcomes and sessions are planned and highly interactive. Learning outcomes are consistently shared, and staff enthusiastically engage students in their learning. Academic staff whom the review team met were able to explain how they ensured that programmes were of high quality, addressing chiropractic and animal manipulation specific practice-based priorities. External examiners commend the staff team for the highly effective way in which the programmes are designed, delivered and assessed and for the targeted support they offer students to facilitate their learning. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q3	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	<p>The College of Health will have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because staff delivering the curriculum, and professional support staff in areas such as library and learning resources, finance and student support who will transfer over to the College of Health, have been appointed under existing arrangements. Where additional skills are required in, for example, human resources, arrangements are in place for the College of Health to contract with specialists in this field. The College of Health has robust and credible plans in place for the future recruitment of staff, which includes a detailed suite of policies and procedures that have been drafted to cover areas including recruitment and appointment against established job descriptions, and ongoing review, development and appraisal of staff-in-post. The review team felt that these will ensure continuity</p>

				<p>in the level of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This priority is supported by the transitional and validation arrangements put in place with both BPPU and the University of Ulster, both of which stipulate the human resources required by the College of Health as part of these processes. Students met by the team fully agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled and qualified staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience, and the review team's observations of teaching and learning indicate that the teaching staff, who will transfer to the College of Health, are appropriately qualified and skilled to deliver high-quality academic and professional outcomes for the students. Staff are externally engaged with professional bodies and have other external practitioner-based engagement which significantly informs teaching, learning and assessment strategies within programmes. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.</p>
Q4	<p>The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.</p>	Met	High	<p>The College of Health will have sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The College has credible plans which are fully articulated within its Strategic Plan. Its operational plan is comprehensive and realistic and prioritises the need for skilled staff and appropriate learning facilities to give students a high-quality learning experience including the necessary practice-based engagement to achieve programme and modules outcomes. These plans demonstrably seek to ensure that students have effective clinical learning experiences and highlight a priority of further engagement with communities and specialist groups to offer students broader and more varied clinic-based study experiences. The College of Health's</p>

				<p>potential accrediting professional bodies have confirmed in relevant reports that the planned staffing and learning facilities, including those for clinical studies, are appropriate for professional accreditation. The review team's direct assessment of the facilities including laboratories and clinics, and scrutiny of relevant documentation on the facilities, confirmed that these are and will be appropriate for the delivery of the planned programmes and the necessary student support services will be sufficient to address the support needs of the planned student cohorts. Senior staff fully understand their responsibilities for ensuring that resources are in place for students to have an effective and productive learning experience at both the Manchester and the Abingdon delivery sites. They understand the level of supporting infrastructure necessary in terms of staffing and physical resources and already have robust plans to realise these priorities. Academic and professional support staff are experienced in delivering higher education programmes and specifically those that relate to Chiropractic and Animal Manipulation disciplines and confirmed that they know their responsibilities and how they plan to collaborate to ensure that the students have good academic and professional outcomes. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.</p>
Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met	High	<p>The College of Health has clear policies and credible plans for actively engaging with students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The College of Health's future operational plan explicitly confirms the importance of engaging students collectively and individually and having representations with key deliberative committees as partners in quality assurance. The College of Health will have a proactive approach to engaging students to feed back individually and</p>

				<p>collectively on their learning experiences, through comprehensive module reviews and the committee structure. Its planned approach for student support along with the policy frameworks of its two awarding bodies and its own internal policies is designed to ensure that students will have clear and effective opportunities for individual and collective engagement that are robust and credible. From both the documentation examined, student comments and student feedback in general, the College of Health has included within its plans improvements that will improve the students' learning experience. Students unanimously confirmed that they fully use the different opportunities that have been provided and that they are listened to and the team considers this is likely to continue. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q6	<p>The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.</p>	Met	High	<p>The College of Health's plans for handling complaints and appeals are robust and credible because they will be accessible to students and are definitive, fair and transparent. They encompass a structured, transparent, accessible and fair complaints process with clearly identified escalation stages, associated staff responsibilities, annual review and oversight by the College of Health's Academic Council, and an established route for appeals to partner universities and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator or equivalent. There are established BPPU policies and procedures in place for dealing with complaints and academic appeals, and the College of Health's future plans include working with the two awarding bodies' policies and procedures, along with its own. Information for complainants and appellants is accessible to students, being clear and comprehensive. Students are fully aware of the complaints and appeals process and said the information can be found quickly</p>

				and easily both electronically, and by reference to Student Support services. They also confirm that they have no concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures, or their application. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.
Q8	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.	Met	High	Where the College of Health works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. The College of Health will have clear and comprehensive regulations and policies with appropriate academic governance arrangements for the management of its partnership agreements with both its awarding bodies which are fully informed by their current regulatory and policy frameworks. These regulations are comprehensive and seek to collaboratively ensure that students can have a high-quality learning experience. The College of Health's plan for its partnership work is robust because it is credibly articulated and thoughtfully developed with clear identified milestones in a comprehensive operational plan. Staff understand this plan and how it will work operationally, with considered and realistic targets for both the immediate post-registration period and for the future phases of development. The partnership agreements with both Universities are shaped by their collaborative partnership agreements and clearly articulate mutual responsibilities and opportunities. The agreements will be fully implemented with specific deliberative committees to oversee the partnership work within both the university partners and the College of Health. Existing external examiners confirm that students have a high-quality learning experiences, and both partner universities and the College of Health have robust processes for ongoing

				engagement of external examiners to ensure that students have a high-quality learning experience within the planned partnership agreements. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.
Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	The College of Health's approach to student support has the potential to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes for all students. The College of Health has produced detailed and comprehensive academic regulations, which align with the requirements of both BPPU and the University of Ulster in the context of student support, and which form the framework for its student support service provision. This framework sets out a robust approach to the provision of tutorial and professional support services, clearly and carefully designed to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes, which is responsive to student needs. There is a draft Student Support and Inclusion Strategy which underpins this approach by recognising students as individuals and identifying the priority to support them with advice and guidance, counselling, and remedial support. Professional support staff are able to describe a comprehensive approach to careers and professional development, including direct input from professional and business leaders. Because of this, the review team was able to conclude that all staff, both academic and professional support understand their role in supporting student achievement. External examiners for all courses explicitly comment that the support is well structured and as an outcome develops safe and competent healthcare professionals. Students wholly agree that they are currently well supported by staff to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes and state in particular that the individual tutor allocated to each student at the start of each year is effective in

				facilitating this process. Students see staff as positive role models, and specifically stated how satisfied they were with responses to their views, and their sustained emphasis on developing them as practitioners. Assessed student work demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.
--	--	--	--	--

About this report

This is a report detailing the outcomes of the Quality and Standards Review for providers applying to register with the Office for Students (OfS), conducted by QAA in March 2020, for the College of Health Ltd.

A Quality and Standards Review (QSR) is a method of review QAA uses to provide the OfS with evidence about whether new providers applying to be on the OfS Register meet the Core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code), based on evidence reviewed by expert assessors. This report is structured to outline the review team's decisions about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices through detailing the key pieces of evidence scrutinised and linking that evidence to the judgements made.

The team for this review was:

Name: Professor David Gardner
Institution: University of Nottingham
Role in review team: Subject Specialist Reviewer Veterinary sciences

Name: Ms Penny Renwick
Institution: Manchester Metropolitan University
Role in review team: Subject Specialist Reviewer Subjects allied to medicine

Name: Dr Mandy Robbins
Institution: Wrexham Glyndwr University
Role in review team: Institutional Reviewer

The QAA Officer for the review was: Mrs Roshani Swift.

The size and composition of this review team is in line with published guidance and, as such, is comprised of experts with significant experience and expertise across the higher education sector. The team included members with experience of a similar provider to the institution, knowledge of the academic awards offered and included academics with expertise in subject areas relevant to the provider's provision. Collectively the team had experience of the management and delivery of higher education programmes from academic and professional services perspectives, included members with regulatory and investigative experience, and had at least one member able to represent the interests of students. The team included at least one senior academic leader qualified to doctoral level. Details of team members were shared with the provider prior to the review to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

About the College of Health Ltd

The College of Health Ltd (the College) is a not-for-profit company limited by shares, formed in 2017, which is currently dormant. BPP University (BPPU) currently has, within its Health Faculty, a group of chiropractic-related courses which are collectively referred to by their historical name of McTimoney. The College of Health plans, following registration with the Office for Students, to acquire the BPPU chiropractic provision, and it has been agreed that BPPU will move from being the current provider of the chiropractic curriculum, to being its short-term validating body until September 2020. After that time, a new five-year validation agreement with the University of Ulster will be activated. As part of the transfer agreement, the College will take over all of the McTimoney curriculum, and directly associated academic staff, professional support staff, premises and facilities. Continuity will be provided by the

Principal designate of the College of Health, who has been associated with these arrangements for almost 20 years and is one of three individuals (along with the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Operating Officer) who will lead this provision.

The College of Health has developed its own regulations, policies and procedures, approved course documentation, admissions systems, programme approval processes and arrangements for staff appointments, which mirror those of BPPU and are in alignment with the requirements of the University of Ulster. Students will be offered the opportunity to continue with their BPPU studies to conclusion, or to switch to those validated by the University of Ulster.

The current course portfolio consists of the following (number in brackets refer to the number of full-time students currently registered on programmes):

- Pathway to HE (Level 3) - 2019-20 Cohort (20)
- Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) 2020 programme not yet commenced
- MChiro (Level 7) Four-year programme (Abingdon) - 2019-20 Cohort (70)
- MChiro (Level 7) Five-year programme - 2019-20 Cohort (104)
- MChiro (Level 7) Five-year programme - 2019-20 Cohort (73)
- MSc Paediatric Chiropractic (Level 7) - 2019-20 Cohort (10)
- MSc Animal Manipulation (Level 7) - 2019-20 College of Cohort (24).

All provision is delivered at Abingdon, with the Level 3 and the Level 7 MChiro also offered at premises in Manchester. There is a subsidiary agreement with Warwickshire College to deliver some of the practical sessions involving animal manipulation on their premises, and this will transfer over to the College of Health on the College securing registration.

How the review was conducted

The review was conducted according to the process set out in [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

When undertaking a QSR all 13 of the Core practices are considered by the review team. However, for this review it was clear that the provider does not offer a research degree programme. Therefore, the review team did not consider Q7 (where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments).

To form its judgements about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices, the review team considered a range of evidence that was submitted prior to the review visit and evidence gathered at the review visit itself. To ensure that the review team focused on the principles embedded in the Core practices, and that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews, the team used Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that review teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and randomised sampling.

While the College of Health is an in-prospect provider, in that it has yet to commence the delivery of its higher education provision, on registration with the OfS the College of Health will be acquiring the BPPU chiropractic programmes. As noted above, the College of Health will deliver the chiropractic curriculum through current academic staff, professional support staff, premises and facilities, practices, processes and procedures. Therefore, the College of Health has been able to submit, in support of demonstrating how it meets the Core practices of the Quality Code, evidence not normally available to in-prospect providers including giving

the review team access to external examiners' reports, third party endorsements, assessed student work and students' views collected through internal surveys. While the review team has not assessed or tested this evidence in any way it has referred to it in order to establish the likelihood of the College of Health meeting the Core practice based on the continued use of the practices, processes and procedures that generated the evidence submitted.

In this review, therefore, the review team had sight of the following evidence in support of demonstrating how the College of Health intends to meet the Core practices of the Quality Code:

- To test that specified sector-recognised standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks and reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for the courses sampled, the team considered a representative sample of two programme handbooks, MChiro and the MSc in Animal Manipulation, and three programme specifications Pathway programme (Level 3), Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) and MChiro (Level 7). This sample reflects curriculum studied by 90% of current students.
- To identify external examiners' views regarding sector-recognised standards being consistent with national frameworks, that external examiners regard that standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those threshold standards have been met; to establish their views on the credibility and security of standards; to identify their views about the quality of the courses sampled, and to test that they consider courses delivered in partnership to be of high quality, the team had sight of a representative sample of external examiner reports for the 2018-19 academic year in the form of four courses (MChiro; MSc in Animal Manipulation; Pathway programme (Level 3) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6)) covering over 90% of the current student cohort.
- A random sample of admissions records was considered by the team to determine whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled. The sample comprised 20 admissions records, including one rejected applicant, comprising five from each of the following programmes: Level 3 Pathway to Higher Education in Health, Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy, MSc Animal Manipulation, MChiro. The sample included a range of application types reflecting both student progression and mature students.
- To determine whether course delivery is likely to be high-quality and whether academic staff will deliver a high-quality experience, the team observed four separate teaching sessions, selected at random from those operating at the time of the visit, to observe academic staff delivery. The sessions were Clinic Case Studies Level 7 Presentation of case histories by students; MChiro Studies Level 6 Practical hands-on delivery session; Neuroscience Level 4; and Human Function Level 4.
- To identify students' views about the quality of courses sampled; the sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff; facilities, learning resources and support services; student engagement in the quality of their educational experience; the quality of courses delivered in partnership; and about student support mechanisms, the review team considered a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses, covering 90% of the current student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

- To determine that assessed student work will reflect the relevant sector-recognised standards; that marks and awards given to students will be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; that the standards of awards will be credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements; and to consider whether the feedback given to students will be comprehensive, helpful and timely, the team had sight of a representative sample of 40 pieces of assessed student coursework from a Level 3 (Pathway) through to Level 7 (MChiro) from all four programmes.
- The team also held two meetings with students. In the first meeting the team met with 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students). In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met a representative sample of eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives.

Explanation of findings

S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks

1 To meet this Core practice a provider must ensure that threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The threshold standards for its qualifications must be articulated clearly and must be met, or exceeded, through the delivery of the qualification and the assessment of students.

2 The sector-recognised standards that are used in relation to this Core practice are those that apply in England, as defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. That is, those set out in Table 1, in paragraphs 4.10, 4.12, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, in paragraphs 6.13-6.18 and in the Table in Annex C, in the version of [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#) (FHEQ) published in October 2014. These sector-recognised standards represent the threshold academic standards for each level of the FHEQ and the minimum volumes of credit typically associated with qualifications at each level.

3 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

4 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4), which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations (GARs)
- b BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20
- c Programme handbook for MChiro
- d Programme handbook for Animal Manipulation
- e Plans for the transition from BPP to the College of Health
- f Validation agreement with the University of Ulster
- g GCC Accreditation Standards
- h Accreditation reports from the European Council on Chiropractic Education
- i Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners Accreditation
- j Animal Health Professions Register Accreditation
- k MChiro Revalidation Report
- l Grad Cert MSc Animal Manipulation (Osteopathy) Revalidation Report
- m External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- n External examiner reports for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- o External examiner report for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- p External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19

q	External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
r	University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019
s	College of Health draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook
t	Draft College of Health Programme Specification MChiro
u	Draft College of Health Programme Specification Animal Therapy
v	Draft College of Health Programme Specification MSc Animal Manipulation (MChiro)
w	Marking descriptors
x	Marking schemes
y	Clinical assessments
z	Programme Development Committee minutes August 2019
aa	Programme Development Committee minutes May 2019
bb	Programme Development Committee minutes March 2019
cc	Assessment Tracking
dd	Draft College of Health Operational Plan
ee	Draft Student Transfer Document
ff	College of Health QSR Request for Additional Evidence
gg	Sample testing sheet for assessed student work
hh	Meeting with senior staff
ii	Meeting with academic staff
jj	Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

5 To test that specified sector-recognised standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks, the team considered a representative sample of two programme handbooks - MChiro and the MSc in Animal Manipulation, and three programme specifications - Pathway programme (Level 3), Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) and MChiro (Level 7). This sample reflects curriculum studied by 90% of current students.

6 To identify external examiners' views regarding sector-recognised standards being consistent with national qualifications' frameworks, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards have been met, the review team had sight of a representative sample of external examiner reports for the 2018-19 academic year for four courses: MChiro; MSc in Animal Manipulation; Pathway programme (Level 3) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) covering over 90% of the current student cohort.

7 To consider whether students' assessed work will reflect the relevant sector-recognised standards, the team considered a representative sample of 40 pieces of assessed student coursework at Level 3 (Pathway) through to Level 7 (MChiro) from all four programmes that will be offered by the College.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

8 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

9 To identify the institutional approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, and to interrogate the robustness and credibility of the College of Health's plans for ensuring sector-recognised standards, the review team considered the BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20; the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20; governing programme approval procedures, along with the MChiro Revalidation Report and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy and MSc Animal Manipulation Revalidation Report; programme approval records and programme development minutes and verified these by reference to the programme handbooks relating to the MChiro and the MSc Animal Manipulation.

10 To interrogate the robustness and credibility of the College of Health's plans for ensuring sector-recognised standards, the review team considered the plans for the transition from BPPU to the College of Health, the planned College of Health Governance Structure together with a validation agreement with University of Ulster, the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019 and College of Health draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook. In addition, the team examined the draft College of Health Operational Plan to check the College is clear about its responsibilities under the transfer.

11 To identify how other organisations regard sector-recognised standards and award procedures, the review team considered third-party endorsements in the form of the General Chiropractic Council annual report and the European Council on Chiropractic Education, together with the register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners and the Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation.

12 To test that they understand and apply the College of Health's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards, the team held meetings with senior, academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

13 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

14 The College of Health will operate immediately after registration within the academic regulations of BPPU as its awarding body and once the partnership with the University of Ulster is activated within that University's academic regulations. The College of Health has also developed its own academic regulations which are aligned fully with the academic regulations of both BPPU and those of the University of Ulster.

15 The BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20 will ensure that the standards of awards that the College of Health intends to deliver will be fully in accordance with standards set out in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). The College of Health will follow BPPU's General Academic Regulations 2019-20 and Manual of Policies and Procedures which incorporate comprehensive rules on programme and assessment design, assessment marking and moderation, feedback requirements for awards, assessment classification and grading criteria. The BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures confirms that the validity and soundness of the assessment methodology and its relationship to the learning outcomes and the standards specified are also scrutinised by the University, and programme approval documentation is required to be formally approved by BPPU. Further, the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures (Part H Examination and Assessment) includes information on the assessment regulations which set out how credit is awarded on the basis of achievement of the intended learning outcomes in assessed work, and states that all of a programme's intended learning outcomes specified for an award must be assessed and passed. The information on marking policy within this Manual includes processes to be followed to ensure the validity, accuracy and consistency of the marking

policy. This includes details on the purpose and scope of marking, a comprehensive and clear list of definitions of terms used, training requirements, information on first and second marking, and written and diagrammatic representation of the moderation processes and the role of external examiners.

16 Once the College of Health's partnership with the University of Ulster is activated, the College of Health will then follow the academic regulations included within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook. The University of Ulster Validation Agreement also explicitly confirms that the academic standards of all higher education awards offered within the College of Health will meet the requirements of the FHEQ. The rules within the University of Ulster's Partnership Handbook require the College of Health's programmes to align with the University's regulations on the design of programmes, assessment marking, feedback and moderation requirements, assessment classification and grading criteria.

17 The College of Health has also developed its own draft Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook, which addresses the requirements of both BPPU and the University of Ulster. These academic regulations are comprehensive and include confirmation that the programmes meet the requirements of sector-recognised standards within the FHEQ. They include rules on programme and assessment design, credit and assessment grade classification which relate to its validated awards. On the basis of the above evidence, the review team considers that the College of Health will have clear and comprehensive academic regulations and frameworks to support the maintenance of academic standards at the relevant sector-recognised standards.

18 The College of Health's plans for the maintenance of academic standards for its BPPU awards is covered with the validation agreement, which confirms that the processes within the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures will apply to the partnership between the two parties. The College of Health and BPPU validation agreement outlines the obligations of each of the partners and requires the University to nominate staff to carry out annual reviews of programmes which monitor, among other aspects, the maintenance of sector-recognised standards. To ensure assessed student work demonstrates that credit and qualifications are awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards are attained, generic level descriptors and mark band descriptors and marking schemes are required to be used. Similarly, for the University of Ulster programmes, the College of Health will ensure that the maintenance of sector-recognised standards is informed by the procedures within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook for programme approval and programme monitoring by the University.

19 The College of Health's own draft Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook includes comprehensive and robust plans to ensure that the College of Health's validated programmes meet the requirements of both its awarding bodies for the maintenance of sector-recognised standards. For such awards, these Regulations include plans for the College of Health to initially have an internal approval event before an external University event takes place to assure itself that the programmes meet sector standards and are in line with awarding body programme approval regulations. The draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations also include plans for internal oversight by the College of Health's Academic Council of the maintenance of sector-recognised standards for its validated programmes. The plans within these draft regulations provide further evidence of the College of Health's intention to put comprehensive and robust internal systems in place to maintain sector-recognised standards in line with its partnership agreements with its awarding bodies. The draft College Operational Plan sets out the post-registration and future plans for the College of Health, which includes comprehensive plans to ensure that it is able to fully meet its responsibilities for the maintenance of standards which are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The review team concludes that the College of Health has robust and credible plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards.

20 The draft College of Health Programme Approval Record and Certificate for the MChiro, Graduate Certificate, and MSc Animal Manipulation contain information on individual awards, programme structures and content linked to the relevant credits, programme learning outcomes, information on assessment and grade classifications, and sector-recognised standards. Further, the programme handbooks for the MChiro and MSc Animal Manipulation have clear written and diagrammatic illustrations of the design of programmes and learning outcomes, and comprehensive details on assessment design linked to levels of study, credit accumulation and grade classifications. These details are clear and comprehensive and include programme learning outcomes that reflect sector-recognised standards, and a structured table of assessment with information on assessment design, classification and grades for achieving the required standards. The information on programmes of study for the granting of awards within these handbooks include details on the distribution of credits for the whole programme and grade classifications. Each handbook also contains comprehensive details on individual modules, which cover learning outcomes and module specific assessment design and grading. Based on the analysis of all the evidence above the review team can confirm that specified sector-recognised standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks.

21 External examiners' reports for the MChiro and those for the MSc Animal Manipulation confirm standards across the current student cohort. For example, the external examiner for the MSc Animal Manipulation confirms that standards are consistent with the stated academic level of the awards, and that student performance and marks awarded are consistent with the standards set. The report also notes the external examiner is very satisfied with the assessment process and that the marking and second marking processes are consistent and effective. Similarly, the external examiner for the MChiro notes they are very satisfied that the standards set and achieved by students are in line with sector-recognised standards, and credits and qualifications are only confirmed when students have achieved these standards. A further external examiner report for the same programme confirms that the module content corresponds to the expected academic level, and that assessment choices provide opportunities to enable students to achieve these outcomes. Going forward, the information included within the College of Health's draft Governance and Academic Regulations confirms that the information that external examiners will need to report on once the College gains registration will continue to meet BPPU regulations and address the requirements of the University of Ulster. These draft regulations include details of provision in line with awarding bodies' requirements for external examiners to comment on standards set and achieved. On the basis of the above, the review team concludes that the external examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' framework, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards have been met.

22 The sample of assessed student work evaluated by the review team covered clinical and theoretical examinations and assignments. Use of assessment criteria and marking schemes was evident within assignments, and grades are awarded appropriately. There is clear evidence of first and second marking. The marking criteria require achievement of sector-recognised standards, and the range of marks awarded in the sample tested demonstrates achievement of sector-recognised standards. The review team is satisfied that the assessed student work will demonstrate that credit and qualifications are awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards have been met.

23 In a meeting with senior staff the review team heard how the programmes have been designed to ensure that sector-recognised standards were applied during validation and confirmed that the Academic Council will be the principal committee to ensure that these standards are achieved and maintained. Academic staff explained how they used marking schemes to direct and support students to achieve the relevant standards. They outlined their experiences of working with academic regulations and their involvement in maintaining

standards and described how their ongoing engagement with professional bodies enables them to inform and update learning outcomes at module and programme levels. In meetings with the professional support staff the review team heard how the Programme Committees are central to ensuring that standards are maintained. The review team is satisfied the staff who are planned to be part of the College of Health understand and will be able to apply the planned approaches by which the College intends to implement its responsibility for maintaining sector-recognised standards.

Conclusions

24 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

25 From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the College of Health's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The review team also considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.

26 The team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the College of Health's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also considers that the College of Health's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the College's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on their scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.

27 The College ensures that the sector-recognised standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. On the basis of the evidence examined the review team considers that the College of Health's students will be able to achieve standards that are in line with those within paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework and credits and qualification will only be awarded when students have achieved the relevant sector-recognised standards. The review team can confirm that the staff met at the visit are experienced and fully understand their responsibilities to design programmes to reflect the sector-recognised standards and how to use marking schemes and marking practices to ensure these standards are achieved. The review team considers the College of Health's future plans are well thought out, robust and credible and staff are fully aware of these plans. Senior staff articulated in detail how these plans will be implemented and academic and support staff are very positive about the future trajectory within these plans. The College of Health will have the academic regulations and frameworks of its awarding bodies and its own internal regulations to support the maintenance of relevant sector-recognised academic standards. Based on the scrutiny of the College of Health's programme documentation, the review team considers that standards set by the awarding bodies are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks and future plans are in place to ensure that programme documentation consistently addresses sector-recognised standards. The external examiner reports seen by the review team confirm that they are very satisfied that standards met are consistent with sector-recognised standards and credit and qualifications are only awarded when these standards are met. Therefore, based on the

evidence scrutinised, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.

28 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers

29 This Core practice expects that the provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

30 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

31 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20: Programmes of Study
- b The BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20: The Assessment Strategy and Framework
- c MChiro Programme Handbook
- d External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- e External examiner reports for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- f External examiner report for MChiro (Part) 2018-19
- g External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19
- h External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
- i University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019
- j College of Health draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook
- k Draft College of Health Programme Specification MSc MChiro
- l Draft College of Health Programme Specification GCert Animal Therapy
- m Draft College of Health Programme Specification MSc Animal Manipulation (MChiro)
- n Marking descriptors and schemes
- o Sample of three annual monitoring reports from the 2018-19 academic year
- p Sample of exam Board minutes from past three academic years
- q Samples of marked student work
- r Assessment Sample Summary Sheet
- s Meeting with senior staff
- t Meeting with students 1
- u Meeting with students 2
- v Meetings with academic staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

32 To identify external examiners' views regarding standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled being reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met, the team had sight of a representative sample of external examiner reports for the 2018-19 academic year in the form of four courses: MChiro; MSc in Animal Manipulation; Pathway programme (Level 3); and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) covering over 90% of the current student cohort.

33 To consider whether marks and awards that will be given to students will be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the team considered a representative sample of 40 pieces of assessed student coursework at Level 3 (Pathway) through to Level 7 (MChiro) from all four programmes that will be offered by the College.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

34 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

35 To identify the College of Health's approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the team considered the College of Health Academic Regulations, Assessment Strategy and Framework contained in the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20 and the programme design process, along with the University of Ulster validation agreement and its Partnership Handbook.

36 To interrogate the robustness of the College of Health's plans for maintaining comparable standards and to ensure that plans are credible and evidence-based, the team considered the College of Health's prospective regulations and the BPPU Academic Regulations.

37 To test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled will be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the review team considered the prospective College of Health course documentation: draft Programme Specification MSc MChiro, draft Programme Specification GCert Animal Therapy, draft Programme Specification MSc Animal Manipulation (MChiro), the current MChiro Programme Handbook and the annual programme review reports.

38 To test that staff understand and will apply the College of Health's approach to maintaining comparable standards, the review team met with senior and academic staff.

39 To assess whether students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold, the team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting the team met 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives.

What the evidence shows

40 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

41 The BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20 provide the College of Health with a framework for the operation of all modules and programmes of study which include specific regulations on programme design, assessment and student progression. The BPPU Manual of Principles and Procedures contains regulations which deal with programme design and assessment rules for Postgraduate, Undergraduate and Graduate Certificate and Diploma Awards. These rules provide a secure foundation for the maintenance of academic standards beyond threshold level and pay sufficient regard to external frameworks to ensure that programmes delivered are comparable with those delivered by other UK providers. The rules also detail the marking policy which is committed to ensuring validity, accuracy and consistency in the marking process and applies to all modules within BPPU programmes. This marking policy guides staff who are involved in marking and moderating student work to conform to the regulatory requirements within the BPPU General Academic Regulations.

42 Once the partnership agreement between the College of Health and the University of Ulster is activated, the academic regulations of the University will provide the framework for the College to ensure that students have opportunities to achieve beyond threshold level. The partnership agreement, reflected within the validation agreement, confirms that the University has ultimate responsibility for academic standards and/or quality assurance of its awards. The University's Partnership Handbook requires that, in relation to validated courses, the College of Health apply the University's curriculum design framework to reflect the module credits, the number of outcomes and assessment regulations. This handbook confirms that the College of Health, as a collaborative partner, will be directed to apply the University's guidance on assessment policy and practice and the University's generic assessment criteria to enable students to achieve beyond threshold level.

43 The College of Health's draft Governance and Academic Regulations include details of rules on programme and assessment design. The inclusion of assessment rules within the College of Health Regulations also provides guidance on assessment elements, assessment components, marking and grade classification which in turn provides students with the opportunity to achieve outcomes beyond threshold levels. The review team is satisfied from the scrutiny of the above documentation that the College will have academic regulations and assessment frameworks to provide opportunities for students to achieve standards which are beyond threshold and comparable to other UK providers.

44 The BPPU General Academic Regulations and the BPPU Manual for Policies and Processes will guide the College of Health's approaches to maintaining comparable standards. The collaborative section within this manual includes the approach to be taken in relation to the maintenance of comparable academic standards. This approach will require the College's programmes to be equivalent in quality and standards to comparable awards delivered by the University.

45 The programme approval and reapproval procedures are included within the Manual for Policies and Procedures and incorporate an approval stage led by a University Approval Panel, which will take into account the programme design principles; levels of study; validity and relevance of the learning outcomes and assessment methodologies in line with relevant University policies; and strategic and academic development plans to ensure comparable standards are achieved. The degree classification policy within the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures provides detailed information on the grading of assessed work for undergraduate and postgraduate awards to enable standards beyond threshold to be achieved. This is illustrated within the MChiro Handbook's learning, teaching and assessment strategy section which embeds the current BPPU's General Academic

Regulations and the Manual of Policies and Procedures. For example, the programme design, assessment and classification rules within the MChiro Programme Handbook show that successful students can achieve an award classification ranging from a Third-Class Pass, Second Class Honours Lower Division, Second Class Honours Upper Division and First-Class Honours. The approach to the maintenance of standards is recorded within the BPPU Manual for Policies and Procedures and includes oversight by the University's Academic Council based upon an annual programme monitoring procedure as to whether the programmes and modules have reliably provided students with opportunities to convincingly meet the expected comparable academic standards. The annual monitoring process will focus on student achievement, encourage reflection on the achievement of standards beyond threshold level and provide the foundation for differentiation of achievement.

46 When the partnership agreement between the College of Health and the University of Ulster is activated, the College of Health will be required to work within the University's approaches for programme approval and review for the maintenance of comparable academic standards. The University's Partnership Handbook details the approach to be taken for validated collaborative provision which includes the establishment of the Evaluation Panel to ensure that the programmes developed are in accordance with the University's scheme of qualifications and that the standard and student workload are comparable to similar programmes. Programme approval processes require the College of Health to accept the University's assessment rules which require details on assessment classifications at threshold level and above to be included. The University's validated course management approach is included within the Partnership Handbook and this will enable the standards set within the College of Health's programmes to be maintained.

47 The College of Health's approaches to internal scrutiny of the standards of its validated programmes is directed by its draft Governance and Academic Regulations. When implemented, these approaches should enable the robust scrutiny of standards of its programmes in terms of programme and assessment design, grade classifications and marking and moderation requirements at programme development stages and programme review stages to ensure they meet the awarding bodies' requirements and confirm comparability of academic standards. Such planned internal oversight is to be carried out within the College of Health's deliberative committee structure in particular by the Programme Board and the College of Health's Academic Council. On the basis of the evidence above, the review team can confirm that the College of Health has robust, credible and evidence-based plans to ensure that comparable standards are maintained.

48 The programme handbooks and the draft programme approval record and certificate for the MChiro programme, the draft Graduate Certificate Programme and the draft MSc Animal Manipulation include details of programme outcomes and assessment components, and assessment instruments. For example, the Clinic Management Case Report for the MChiro programme includes detailed criteria which signposts how to achieve above threshold level. Further evidence within the generic module marking descriptors for all levels and contextualised marking schemes for the MChiro, Graduate Certificate and MSc in Animal Manipulation programmes provide clear evidence of the opportunity to achieve grade classifications of satisfactory at threshold level progressing to good, very good and excellent at the highest level. For example the Marking Descriptor for Level 6 shows that an excellent classification requires highly detailed specific knowledge and understanding of the main concepts/theories linked to the level and an awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base as distinct from a threshold level, which enables satisfactory achievement by demonstrating an understanding of key aspects of the field of study and some coherent knowledge at least in part informed by current research in subject discipline. On the basis of the above information, the review team is satisfied that the approved course documentation demonstrates that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are

reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

49 External examiners covering the Pathway to Higher Education in Health programme, 2018-19 those covering specific modules within MChiro programmes 2018-19, the MSc Animal Manipulation programmes 2018-19, and the Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19 all confirm that standards beyond the threshold are achieved and that these are comparable with other UK providers. For example, the external examiner for the MChiro programme confirms that they were very satisfied and that the performance of students is comparable to the performance of students within other higher education providers. Further, the minutes of the exam boards demonstrate that external examiners confirm that the assessment process is robust and also commented that feedback was used to enable students to improve their work to achieve standards beyond threshold level. In the exam board minutes the external examiner notes in relation to the MSc in Animal Manipulation programme that where students were awarded high marks for clinical evaluation, there was clear evidence of high-quality work from the students. The external examiner reports also confirm that assessment instruments provide opportunities to demonstrate achievement of standards set within the programme and module learning outcomes, and this ensures that credit and qualifications are only awarded when these standards are met. On the basis of the evidence above the review team is satisfied that external examiners consider that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only when these standards are achieved.

50 In respect to assessed student work, the review team found that the standardised pro forma with grading criteria explicitly identifies what threshold level achievement is and supports students to understand what needs to be done to achieve beyond threshold level. The feedback given to students also explicitly signposts if they have actually achieved beyond threshold level as evidenced within the Level 6 modules within the MChiro programme. The sampled assessed student work reviewed confirms that credit and qualifications will be awarded only where the relevant standards have been met.

51 Academic staff involved in assessment, explained how the marking schemes give students the opportunity to achieve beyond threshold levels. They also explained how they are involved in the maintenance of academic and professional standards' requirements. Academic staff described how they support students to achieve beyond threshold level through, for example, referencing workshops. Senior staff also told the review team that students understand what they need to do to achieve beyond threshold level and explained how staff encourage students to do so through targeted feedback. The team is satisfied that, on the basis of the above, staff understand their responsibilities in respect to supporting students to achieve beyond the threshold and will apply approaches such as feedback to encourage students to do so. The team further confirms that staff understand and will apply the College of Health's approach to maintaining standards.

52 Students from the Manchester campus met by the team confirmed they were aware of what they needed to do to achieve higher grades. They explained how they were supported with feedback to gain higher grades beyond threshold level. Students from Abingdon also confirmed that marking schemes make students aware of their opportunity to achieve above threshold levels, and that assessment criteria and grade descriptors explain clearly what needs to be done to gain higher marks. The review team confirms from discussions with students that they understand what they need to do to achieve grades beyond threshold levels.

Conclusions

53 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to

form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

54 The review team, based on the evidence presented, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the College of Health's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation and in the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.

55 The team determined that the standards that will be achieved by the College of Health's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considers that the College of Health's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the review team considers that staff at the provider fully understand the College of Health's approach to maintaining such standards. The review team considers the College's plans for maintaining comparable standards appropriate, well documented and understood by staff members.

56 Therefore, the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications should have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met.

57 Students who are awarded qualifications will have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The College of Health has comprehensive and clear academic regulations and frameworks that are fully aligned with those of its awarding bodies. Its plans to ensure comparable standards are maintained are comprehensive, considered, robust and credible. Assessed student work demonstrates that students will be required to achieve set standards for the programme before credits and qualification can be awarded and marking criteria explicitly direct what standards need to be achieved for the different classification levels. Approved course documentation demonstrates that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. External examiners consider that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only when these standards are achieved. Staff have experience of and fully understand their responsibility maintaining the academic standards including those beyond threshold of the programmes. Senior staff explained the planned institutional approach to support academic staff in carrying out their responsibility in this context and academic staff articulated how they will support students in achieving standards above threshold levels. Students met by the review team fully understand how they can achieve beyond threshold standards and confirmed how the assessment feedback supported them further to achieve this.

58 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them

59 This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.

60 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

61 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations
- b BPPU Manual of Policies & Procedures
- c College of Health and BPPU Validation Agreement
- d College of Health and BPPU Transitional Services Agreement
- e Warwickshire College Agreement
- f College of Health and University of Ulster Validation Agreement
- g External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- h External examiner reports for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- i External examiner report for MChiro (Part) 2018-19
- j External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19
- k External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
- l University of Ulster Partnership Handbook
- m Draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook
- n BPPU College of Health Interface named contacts
- o University of Ulster and College of Health Interface named contacts
- p Summary of assessed work
- q Meeting with senior staff
- r Meeting with academic staff
- s Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

62 To identify external examiners' views regarding the credibility and security of standards, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team had sight of external examiner reports for the 2018-19 academic year, covering MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19, MChiro (part) 2018-19, MChiro (Part) 2018-19, MSc Animal

Manipulation (part) 2018-19, MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19.

63 In order to test that standards of awards will be credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team considered a representative sample of 40 pieces of assessed student coursework at Level 3 (Pathway) through to Level 7 (MChiro) from all four programmes that will be offered by the College.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

64 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

65 To identify how the College of Health will ensure the standards of awards it delivers on behalf of partners are credible and secure, the team considered relevant academic regulations or policies, including BPPU General Academic Regulations (GARs) 2019-20 and the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures (MoPPs) 2019-20, along with the equivalent prospective College of Health Academic Regulations and transitional contact lists.

66 To assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for securing standards in partnership work, the team considered the College of Health and BPPU Validation Agreement, College of Health and BPPU Transitional Services Agreement, College of Health and University of Ulster Validation Agreement and University of Ulster Partnership handbook.

67 To interrogate the basis for the maintenance of academic standards within the specific partnerships, and to confirm that those arrangements are in line with the College of Health's regulations or policies, the team examined existing partnership agreements and associated documentation encompassing the General Academic Regulations, Manual of Policies & Procedures, the Warwickshire College facilities agreement, the University of Ulster Validation Agreement, the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook and the draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations.

68 In order to test that standards of awards will be credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team examined a sample of student work.

What the evidence shows

69 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

70 The curriculum that the College of Health intends to offer is currently delivered as part of the BPPU provision and operates under the University's degree awarding powers and academic regulations set out within the BPPU General Academic Regulations (GARs) 2019-20 and the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures (MoPPs) 2019-20. Once the College of Health gains registration with the OfS and acquires the curriculum, it will operate within both the College of Health and BPPU Validation Agreement and the College of Health and BPPU Transitional Service Agreement with BPPU. The former has details of the nature of the partnership and the respective rights and responsibilities of both parties during the transition period. As part of its future plans, the College of Health has already entered into a validation agreement with the University of Ulster, which requires the partnership between the College

of Health and the University of Ulster to be governed by the academic regulations within the University of Ulster's Partnership Handbook. The College of Health's draft academic regulations contextualise and align with the requirements of both of its awarding bodies' academic regulations. The review team is satisfied that the College has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for securing standards in partnership work.

71 The draft Academic Regulations for the College of Health explicitly set out the organisational committee hierarchy planned to be put into operation upon securing registration with the OfS. These flow to and from the Board of Directors, through the Academic Board, which in turn is supported by regular meetings of subcommittees dealing with the Student and Staff Experience, Programme Approval and Review Boards, Boards of Examiners and panels for considering reasonable adjustments and academic malpractice. The Academic Board is the key committee within these arrangements and addresses specifically partnership working in terms of collaborative provision, and agreements with validating, accrediting and other awarding bodies. The draft Academic Regulations of the College of Health also incorporate the roles and functions of key personnel, and in this context it is the role of the Principal to approve returns to regulatory bodies. The specific arrangements for the transition have been addressed by the College of Health with respectively BPPU and the University of Ulster with schedules of key contacts from both partners attributed to key subject areas.

The College of Health's intended approach to partnership with its two university partners will be governed by the processes and procedures directed by the universities. During the transitional period, the approach to the College of Health's partnership with BPPU is governed by BPPU's Manual of Policies and Procedures, which include the processes for monitoring and review of collaborative provision. This is further confirmed within the College of Health-BPPU Transitional Services Agreement (TSA) which includes details on how the partnership will be managed during the transitional period by nominated contact managers within the College of Health and BPPU. The approach for the College of Health's University of Ulster partnership will be governed by the arrangements within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook October 2019, which requires the management of validated programmes to be consistent with the requirement of the University of Ulster's programme management processes. These processes include the arrangements for new validations, revalidations, programme management and course monitoring processes. The College of Health and the University of Ulster Validation Agreement provides for the appointment of a joint Management Board including designated officers from both parties. The terms of reference for this Management Board within Schedule 3 of the College and University of Ulster Validation Agreement focus on the strategic contractual oversight of the key operations of the partnership. The College of Health's draft Academic Regulations recognise its responsibilities within its validation agreements with awarding bodies and acknowledge the requirements to comply with the quality assurance requirements of such partnerships. The College of Health also plans to take over the current service-level agreement between BPPU and Warwickshire College to provide students on the MSc Animal Manipulation with access to animals for clinical practice. On the basis of the above arrangements the review team is satisfied that the approach the College of Health plans to take when implementing its partnership and service-level agreements will address respectively the standards and requirements of both BPPU and the University of Ulster.

72 External examiners appointed by BPPU have reviewed and commented on student work on the current MChiro and Animal Management programmes. The external examiner reports for the MChiro confirm that the overall standard of student work is very good and in line with sector standards. Similarly, the external examiner reports for the MSc Animal Manipulation programme confirm that the learning outcomes specified for the programme are appropriate and sufficient and they are satisfied with the standards achieved across these programmes. For the College of Health's partnership with the University of Ulster,

future arrangements for the engagement of external examiners is specified within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook, College and University of Ulster Validation Agreement, and the College of Health's own draft Academic Regulations. On the basis of the above, the review team can verify that the external examiner reports confirm that the standards of awards delivered in partnership are credible and secure.

73 The sample of student work seen by the review team shows that the standards of awards are credible and secure. The marking criteria and range of marks awarded are appropriate to meet threshold and above threshold standards. There is evidence of second marking and moderation against standardised assessment criteria. On the basis of this evidence the review team concludes that the standards of awards will be secure and effective under the new partnership arrangements.

74 Senior staff demonstrated their understanding of the transition period and how that will be effectively managed between BPPU and the University of Ulster. There is a communication policy in place for working with staff and students which is already underway. Academic staff and professional support staff confirm that they have been consulted over the College of Health's plans for registration with the OfS and the partnership agreements with both BPPU and the University of Ulster. There are documented plans in place to identify College lead staff for different aspects of the transition, and their counterparts at both BPPU and the University of Ulster. All staff are positive about these developments and confirm that they are also aware of plans for further consultation in June 2020, and that they understand their responsibilities and how these should be implemented. The review team is satisfied, based on the staff discussions above, that staff understand the responsibilities they will have to partner awarding bodies.

Conclusions

75 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused.

76 The College of Health has demonstrated that it has well developed plans for the management of partnership working to ensure that the standards of the awards it will deliver on behalf of its awarding bodies are credible and secure. Planned partnership agreements with both the awarding universities are current, collaborative and governed by up-to-date comprehensive academic regulations and policies. The College of Health has carefully considered plans that are robust and credible to ensure the maintenance of standards within the partnership agreement. The College of Health's governance and academic regulations are designed to meet both Universities' requirements to ensure that academic standards are securely and credibly maintained in line with respective partnership agreements. The governance arrangements will support effective collaboration through linked designated officers and ongoing engagement within specific deliberative committees. External examiner reports seen by the review team confirm that the standards of programmes, which will become the College of Health's programmes, credibly and securely meet both threshold standards and standards beyond the threshold. Staff understand their responsibilities to the respective awarding bodies in line with partnership agreements. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.

77 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent

78 This Core practice expects that the provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

79 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

80 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20
- b BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures
- c Master's in MChiro Programme Handbook
- d MSc Animal Manipulation Programme Student Handbook 2020
- e College of Health University of Ulster Validation agreement
- f General Chiropractic Council Accreditation Standards
- g General Chiropractic Council Approval Panel Report
- h Privy Council letter February 2019
- i European Council of Chiropractic Accreditation standards
- j European Council of Chiropractic Education Accreditation Report
- k European Council of Chiropractic Education Accreditation Certificate
- l Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners
- m Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation
- n BPPU Revalidation Report MChiro
- o BPPU Revalidation Report MSc Animal Manipulation and Graduate Certificate
- p External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- q External examiner reports for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- r External examiner report for MChiro (part) 2018-19
- s External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19
- t External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
- u University of Ulster Partnership Handbook
- v Draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook
- w College of Health draft MChiro (4 years)
- x College of Health draft MSc Animal Manipulation
- y College of Health draft Master's in Animal Manipulation
- z Marking descriptors
- aa Marking schemes
- bb Response to external examiner report MChiro (Part) 2018-19
- cc Response to external examiner report MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19
- dd Response to external examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19

- ee College of Health draft Operational Plan
- ff Meeting with senior staff
- gg Meeting with students (Abingdon)
- hh Meeting with students (Manchester)
- ii Academic staff meeting
- jj Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

81 To assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for the courses sampled, the review team considered approved course documentation in the form of programme specifications for three sampled programmes representative of the College of Health's provision. These are the Pathway programme (Level 3), Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) and MChiro (Level 7). These programmes comprise 291 students, encompassing 98% of the College of Health's proposed higher education provision.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

82 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

83 To identify how external experts will be used in maintaining academic standards, and how the College of Health's assessment and classification processes will operate, the team reviewed the academic regulations and institutional policy describing requirements for involvement of external expertise, and assessment and classification processes, with reference to the BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20, the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures, programme handbooks, the College of Health University of Ulster Validation Agreement, the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook, the College of Health draft MSc Animal Manipulation, and met with senior and academic staff.

84 To assess whether plans for using external expertise in maintaining academic standards and plans for assessment and classification processes are credible, robust and evidence-based, the team considered the plans for using external expertise in maintaining academic standards, and the plans for assessment and classification processes by reference to the BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20, the BPPU Revalidation Reports for MChiro and MSc Animal Manipulation and Graduate Certificate, the draft Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook, the College of Health draft MChiro, the marking descriptors and marking scheme, and in discussions with senior staff and academic staff.

85 To identify external examiners' views about the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the team had sight of external examiner reports; MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19; MChiro (part) 2018-19; MChiro (part) 2018-19; MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19; MSc Animal Manipulation (part); and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19.

86 To interrogate the use of external examiners and to identify that the College of Health will consider and respond appropriately to externals' reports regarding standards, the team considered the responses to these reports: MChiro (part) 2018-19; MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19; MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in

Animal Therapy 2018-19.

87 To identify how other organisations regard the use of externals and the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the team considered the third-party endorsements encompassing: Privy Council letter February 2019; General Chiropractic Council Approval Panel Report; European Council on Chiropractic Education Accreditation Report; European Council on Chiropractic Education Accreditation Certificate; Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners; and the Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation.

88 To test that all staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise, and the College of Health's assessment and classification processes, the team held meetings with senior, academic and professional support staff.

89 To identify how students regard the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting it met 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held through a video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives.

What the evidence shows

90 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

91 The portfolio of programmes: Pathway to Higher Education; MChiro; MSc Chiropractic Paediatrics; Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy; and MSc Animal Manipulation that the College of Health plans to offer are those currently delivered through BPPU. The programme outcomes of each of the above programmes meet the requirements within the BPPU General Academic Regulations and result from the application of the programme development and assessment processes within the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20. The BPPU Academic Regulations require a Programme Approval Scrutiny Panel to be convened by the Academic Council to safeguard the standards of all its academic awards and professional qualifications. Further, the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20 requires the Programme Approval Panel to include an external member with relevant academic and specialist experience, and representatives from relevant professional bodies or employer association or equivalent personnel. This manual requires titles, content and learning outcomes of programmes to align fully with the relevant external reference points, and to support sector, employer, students and professional body expectations. It also includes clear information on the requirements for the assessment and award classifications for its undergraduate and postgraduate awards, linked to externally referenced level and credit requirements.

92 The College of Health plans to adopt its awarding body regulations and incorporate procedures on the use of external expertise within its own draft Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook (2020/2021). These regulations explicitly require the engagement of an external academic and specialist expert and professional body or employer association representative or major employer as panel members for the approval, reapproval and review of all programmes offered. They also incorporate comprehensive rules on the nomination, appointment and induction of external examiners, processes for responding to external examiner reports for the design assessment and classification requirements of programmes.

93 With regard to the transition to the University of Ulster, the College of Health will be required to apply the equivalent academic regulations of the University of Ulster, included within its Partnership Handbook. This handbook includes transparent information on the

principles to be applied for the assurance of standards, and explicitly confirms that the programme structures align with the FHEQ. The handbook also includes the University's award framework and directs that curriculum development requires the application of the University's curriculum design framework to shape assessment and classification processes. The handbook further requires the appointment of external examiners to review the College's programmes and to report on its operation in terms of both quality and standards. This is confirmed within the College of Health and the University of Ulster Validation Agreement, which requires the College's programmes to meet the academic standards regulations of the University.

94 The College of Health draft Governance and Academic Regulations also include clear and comprehensive detail on the assessment rules for the Bachelor's and Integrated Master's awards, Graduate Certificate and Diploma awards and Postgraduate awards which meet awarding body requirements. This information includes a comprehensive list of definitions, assessment elements and assessment components. The programmes will apply the assessment and classification rules of the awarding bodies, and external examiners will be required to review and confirm that these assessment and classification processes have been applied within programmes.

95 Because of the foregoing, the review team is satisfied that the regulatory framework of the current and planned future awarding bodies, together with the College of Health's draft Academic Regulations, will provide a robust and credible framework for the College of Health to ensure the engagement of external expertise in programme approval, review and assessment, and classification.

96 Currently all programmes which are planned to become the curriculum for the College of Health have external examiners appointed to ensure academic standards set are maintained. The external examiner reports provide external confirmation of the maintenance of academic standards and include identification of areas for further development in the form of specific recommendations. The details within the external examiner reports from the different levels of the MChiro and the MSc Animal Manipulation provide evidence that external examiners are satisfied with the robustness of the assessment and classification process, and the responses of programme teams to any feedback and recommendations. They confirm that the standard of work relates appropriately to marks awarded across the different modules, is consistent across modules reviewed, and enables students to demonstrate knowledge gained from their studies.

97 As part of its future plans, the College of Health's draft Operational Plan includes actions to be carried out post transfer, and specifically notes that once the University of Ulster programmes become active external examiners will be appointed (or reappointed) by the University. The review team is satisfied that the College of Health's plans will ensure the use of external expertise in the maintenance of academic standards.

98 The Programme Approval Record and Certificate for the MChiro programme, the Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy and the MSc in Animal Manipulation includes detailed information on the programme structure and content of the programme regulations which include details on assessment and classification. The programme handbooks also include such information as evidenced within the MChiro programme and the MSc in Animal Manipulation programme, which contain transparent and comprehensive information providing consistent and reliable evidence of the application of external reference points and information on assessment and classification details. For example, the MChiro Programme Handbook and MSc in Animal Manipulation Programme Handbook explicitly include details of the programme learning outcomes which address external reference points and professional standards and include a table with detailed information on assessment and classification requirements. The marking descriptor and marking scheme provide evidence

of transparent assessment criteria and classification information being used effectively to ensure that external reference points, assessment criteria and classification information are made available to students and used by staff to feed back to students. On the basis of the above, the review team can confirm that approved course documentation provides evidence that the assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent.

99 The College of Health's proposed programmes have undergone regular revalidations in line with BPPU General Academic Regulations, which require independent external expertise to be involved in every programme approval process. The review team saw evidence of this in, for example, the MChiro which included two external experts, one of whom was from the Welsh Institute of Chiropractic and the other from the private chiropractic sector. Similarly, the MSc in Animal Manipulation (Osteopathy) revalidation report includes evidence that the approval panel included two external specialists from the private sector. On the basis of the above the review team can confirm that there will be appropriate engagement with external expertise in the establishment of assessment and classification processes in line with the regulations and policies.

100 Professional bodies have externally endorsed both programmes for their external expertise, and how external priorities have been addressed within the learning outcomes. For example, the ECCE has endorsed the MChiro and granted accreditation to meet its criteria, which include the extent to which the programme embeds sector-specific knowledge, skills and attitudes for the necessary competencies of chiropractic graduates. It also confirms that the programme has substantial engagement with external professional expertise, and constructive engagement with external bodies.

101 Senior and academic staff articulated the importance of ensuring that the programmes have had the benefit of being informed by external expertise. They explained in detail how they are practitioners and members of relevant professional bodies. Academic staff are also able to discuss their involvement in ensuring that external reference points are embedded within programme development and how they are involved in maintaining these standards. They understand assessment and classification processes and explained how marking schemes and marking descriptors are used to direct students to understand what they need to do to achieve the different grades. The review team is satisfied that staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise, and the College of Health's assessment and classification processes.

102 Students who met the review team explained how assessment and classification processes are fair in making the information transparent within the assessment tasks and attached criteria and confirmed that such information supports them to understand what is required to achieve higher grades. They are also aware that external examiner reports are accessible within the virtual learning environment (VLE). The review team is satisfied that the students regard the assessment and classification processes as reliable, fair and transparent.

Conclusions

103 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

104 The College of Health will use external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. The College's plans to engage external

expertise in maintaining standards and assessment and classification are credible, robust and evidence based. This is because the College's plans for external engagement for these purposes are informed by the robust requirements of its awarding bodies and its own internal academic and policy frameworks. The significance of engaging externally for these purposes is also explicitly prioritised and credibly situated within the College of Health's strategic and operational plans. The comprehensive academic regulations and policies that the College of Health will apply to ensure external expertise is engaged in the maintenance of academic standards and assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the College of Health will apply the academic regulations of both Universities and the College's internal draft governance and academic regulations and policies frameworks, which explicitly require the need to engage external expertise in the maintenance of academic standards and assessment and classification processes. The programme approval and review documents confirm that external reference points are systematically applied in line with awarding bodies' regulations and there is evidence of independent external expertise being involved in the programme approval processes and external examiners for the monitoring of standards processes. Staff fully understand the importance of using external expertise to inform the maintenance of standards and the College of Health's proposed assessment and classification processes. Students confirm that the assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.

105 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system

106 This Core practice expects that the provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.

107 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

108 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations in relation to the principles of Admission Policies and Procedures (Part F) and equality and diversity (Part L)
- b BPPU manual of policy and procedures 2019-20
- c MChiro Programme Handbook
- d College of Health BPPU Validation agreement
- e University of Ulster validation agreement
- f College of Health Academic regulations, as related to admissions
- g College of Health draft MChiro
- h College of Health template offer letter
- i College of Health template rejection letter
- j Student submission
- k Applicants complete journey
- l College of Health strategic plan 2020-21
- m Resources template screenshot
- n Draft College of Health Operational Plan
- o Admissions sample summary sheet
- p Meeting with senior staff
- q Meeting with Abingdon students
- r Meeting with Manchester students via video link
- s Meeting with academic staff
- t Meeting with professional support staff.

109 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

110 Arrangements with recruitment agents because the College of Health reported that they will not use recruitment agents.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

111 A random sample of admissions records was considered by the team to determine

whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled. The sample comprised 20 admissions records, including one rejected applicant, comprising five from each of the following programmes: Level 3 Pathway to Higher Education in Health, Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy, MSc Animal Manipulation, MChiro. The sample included a range of application types reflecting both student progression and mature students.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

112 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

113 To identify institutional policy relating to the recruitment, selection and admission of students; roles and responsibilities of staff involved in the admissions process; support for applicants; how the College will verify applicants' entry qualifications; how the College will facilitate an inclusive admissions system; and how it will handle complaints and appeals, the review team considered the BPPU Validation agreement, University of Ulster Validation agreement, BPPU General Academic Regulations, and the equivalent draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook in relation to Admission Policies and Procedures (Part F), the BPPU manual of policy and procedures 2019-20, applicants complete journey, draft template offer letter, draft template rejection letter, College of Health Strategic Plan 2020-21.

114 To assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that admissions systems will be reliable, fair and inclusive, the team considered College of Health academic regulations, as related to admissions, draft template offer letter, draft template rejection letter, the student submission and the College of Health's strategic plan 2020-21.

115 To test whether admissions requirements for courses reflect the College of Health's overall regulations and policy, the review team considered the College of Health General Academic Regulations in relation to the Admission Policies and Procedures (Part F) and the BPPU manual of policy and procedures 2019-20, MChiro Programme Handbook, draft academic regulations as related to admissions, College of Health draft MChiro.

116 To test whether admissions requirements reflect draft College of Health documents, the team reviewed programme specifications for three programmes. These are the MSc Animal Manipulation, the Graduate Certificate and MChiro.

117 The review team met with senior staff academic staff and professional support staff who will be responsible for making decisions about admissions to test whether they understand their responsibilities, are appropriately skilled and supported and can articulate how the College of Health's approach to inclusivity is manifest in the admissions process.

118 To identify students' views about the admissions process the team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting the team met 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students). In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives.

What the evidence shows

119 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

120 Current students have been recruited under the academic regulations of BPPU, which provides detailed requirements for admissions processes, encompassing general and specific requirements, including admission for candidates with disabilities or learning difficulties, admissions with credit, and registration requirements. These regulations are mirrored within the draft College of Health Academic Regulations, which incorporate the same requirements, and which will apply going forward both under the transitional arrangements with BPPU and under the validation agreement with the University of Ulster. Complaints and appeals with respect to admissions are governed by the BPPU regulations, and these are reflected in the draft College of Health Customer Service Complaints and Appeals, Policy and Procedure.

121 The College of Health has set out how it plans to recruit students, and these are included in the draft Admissions Policy supported by draft standard letters. The College policy sets out that the College of Health will adopt the five key principles of fair admissions as outlined in the Schwartz report: transparency, minimising barriers to entry, selecting for merit, potential and diversity, professionalism and using assessment methods that are reliable and valid. The College plans to review all applications based on candidates' personal references, academic achievements and personal background/experience, taking into account their personal statement. The College will interview all applicants and the decision as to whether an applicant will be offered a place and admitted to a programme of study rests with the Programme Leader, or by delegation with the Head of Admissions (or their nominee). Following interview, successful applicants will receive an offer letter within two weeks. Under the transitional services agreement with BPPU, the College of Health will be able to access support from the BPPU Admissions Office and Equality and Diversity Team. In future plans under the agreement with the University of Ulster, the College of Health will adopt these roles and will maintain, record and analyse the distribution of its applicants from admission to acceptance.

122 The College of Health demonstrated how the types of programmes that they promote will achieve an inclusive and diverse admissions system. For practical-based courses, there are clearly differing issues in regard to inclusivity for applicants with a disability or specific learning need. All such applicants will be invited to interview to discuss the support required to complete the programme with a trained and specially designated member of staff. Academic and professional support staff confirmed that students can disclose specific learning differences on the application form or after offer, or upon arrival at the College, and due consideration and support will be given to enable them to achieve successful outcomes. The College of Health also plans to conduct post-admissions surveys in order to obtain qualitative information on their admissions system from the point of view of applicants; for example, why choose the College, speed of response, and useful information presented at Open Day, so as to improve the experience for applicants. These will be reported through to the Academic Council, to inform the continuous review of the admissions experience. Based upon all of the foregoing, the review team can confirm that the College of Health's plans for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive are robust and credible.

123 The review team considered the College of Health draft programme specifications, which detail both generic requirements regarding tariff points or progression from the Level 3 pathway provision; provision in relation to prior learning and specific requirements; English language proficiency for students for whom English is not a first language (Score of 6.5, with a minimum of 6.0 in each element); and specific points (for example experience of a chiropractic treatment) and confirmed that they were consistent with the College of Health

draft Academic Regulations. Because of this, the review team concluded that the admissions requirements set out in approved course documentation are consistent with the College of Health's policy or policies.

124 The plans for the College of Health in respect to providing information to applicants include a new website and an accompanying suite of admissions information, which is planned to go live approximately one month after OfS registration, as confirmed in the meeting with senior staff and in the draft operational plan. That information includes full programme specifications, entry requirements including DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks, financial information, relevant policies and procedures, and the provision of open days. The review team concludes that the College of Health has robust plans in place to provide information for applicants that is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose.

125 Staff who will be involved in admissions understand their role, can articulate the provider's approach to inclusivity and feel appropriately skilled and trained at all levels. Staff who will be involved in admissions also feel adequately supported to undertake their roles. They point to the focus on data when considering the inclusivity of the applications process, and highlight the success of the College in recruiting female students, and mature students who see this as a second career. Academic staff place particular emphasis on the comprehensive nature of the admissions process in seeking evidence of basic skills and qualifications, and highlight specifically the value of face-to-face interview in assessing basic practical skills such as animal-handling skills (such as handling small animals). Professional support staff highlighted their awareness of plans to further strengthen the admissions process under the College of Health, including the appointment of a further dedicated student support officer, who will assist the admissions team in the provision of student support.

126 Students tend to agree that they feel the admissions system to be reliable, fair and inclusive. They comment positively on their experience of application and admissions noting that the different stages of the admissions process are dealt with in a timely manner and that staff at all levels are responsive to their individual needs. In the student submission, and confirmed in the meetings with students, students report satisfaction with regard to application, registration and general admission procedures, and found the open days particularly useful. The quality of support they received was praised by students, and they highlighted examples where the declaration of specific disabilities at admission led to the provision of comprehensive help and support.

Conclusions

127 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

128 The College of Health has a clear policy for the recruitment and admission of students, which demonstrates how it plans to operate an admissions system that is reliable, fair and inclusive. The College of Health has a comprehensive draft Admissions Policy, fully aligned with the recruitment and admissions requirements of BPPU and the University of Ulster. Programme documentation within programme handbooks and programme specifications include details on admissions criteria, which reflect policy, procedure and practice. The College of Health plans to implement a system to rigorously record and analyse all stages of the recruitment process, from application to admission, to ensure that the fairness and inclusivity of its systems can be demonstrably assessed. Staff who will be

involved in admissions understand their role and are appropriately skilled. Information for applicants will be mainly electronic, and is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The process for handling complaints and appeals is clearly set out to applicants, and explicitly included in standard admissions correspondence. All students who met with the review team explained that the admissions process was a positive experience and gave them all opportunities to understand their course in detail. They highlighted in particular the high quality of the advice and support they received at all stages of the process, and the way in which adaptations for specific needs were considered and acted upon. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

129 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses

130 This Core practice expects that the provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.

131 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

132 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20
- b The BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20: programme design process
- c College of Health BPPU validation agreement
- d College of Health University of Ulster Validation Agreement
- e Accreditation reports from the General Chiropractic Council
- f General Chiropractic Council Annual Monitoring Report April 2019
- g Accreditation reports from the European Council on Chiropractic Education
- h Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners Accreditation
- i Animal Health Professions Register Accreditation
- j External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- k External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19 and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
- l University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019
- m Draft College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook
- n Draft College of Health Programme Specification MSc MChiro
- o Draft College of Health Programme Specification GCert Animal Therapy
- p Draft College of Health Programme Specification MSc Animal Manipulation (MChiro)
- q College of Health draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy
- r Sample of three sets of minutes of the School of Health Board
- s Programme Development Committee minutes
- t Module Surveys 2017-19
- u Sample assessment task
- v Draft College of Health Operational Plan
- w Learning observations review record
- x Meeting with senior staff
- y Meeting with students 1
- z Meeting with students 2
- aa Meeting with academic staff
- bb Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

133 To determine whether course delivery is likely to be high-quality, the team observed four separate teaching sessions, selected at random from those operating at the time of the visit, to observe academic staff delivery. The sessions were Clinic Case Studies Level 7 Presentation of case histories by students; MChiro Studies Level 6 Practical hands-on delivery session; Neuroscience Level 4; and Human Function Level 4.

134 To identify students' views about the quality of courses sampled, the review team had sight of a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses, covering 90% of the current student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

135 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

136 To identify the College of Health's approach to designing and delivering high-quality courses the team reviewed relevant academic regulations, including the BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20, the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20, and validation agreements with BPPU and the University of Ulster.

137 To assess whether the College has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for designing high-quality courses, the review team assessed the draft College of Health Academic Regulations, draft College of Health Operational Plan, Minutes and Terms of Reference of the School Education and Standards Boards, Programme Development Committee minutes, the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019, and the College draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.

138 To test that all elements of the courses will be of high quality (curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches) and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes, the team reviewed approved course documentation in the form of programme handbooks, draft College programme specifications for MChiro, GCert Animal Therapy, and MSc Animal Manipulation (MChiro).

139 To identify other organisations' views about the quality of the courses, the team considered third party endorsements from the General Chiropractic Council and the European Council on Chiropractic Education.

140 To test whether course delivery is of high-quality the team observed four separate teaching sessions selected at random from those operating at the time of the visit. The sessions were Clinic Case Studies Level 7 - Presentation of case histories by students, MChiro Studies Level 6 - Practical hands-on delivery session, Neuroscience Level 4, and Human Function Level 4.

141 To ascertain students' views about the quality of courses the review team had sight of annual course module surveys. These included three of the six courses, covering 90% of the student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

142 To identify external examiners' views about the quality of the courses, the team had sight of external examiner reports for provision in the 2018-19 academic year for four courses: MChiro; MSc in Animal Manipulation; Pathway programme (Level 3) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy (Level 6) covering over 90% of the student cohort.

143 To assess how staff will ensure courses are high quality, the review team held meetings with senior staff, academic staff and professional support staff.

144 To identify students' views about the quality of the courses, the team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting it met 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students). In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives.

What the evidence shows

145 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

146 The College of Health will operate within the BPPU General Academic Regulations and the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures programme design process. These documents set out the frameworks and processes that underpin good quality course design and the processes to be followed for secure programme approval and programme monitoring. The details on programme approval and reapproval are comprehensive, and require all programmes to be proposed, designed and documented, and scrutinised in line with specified procedures. These regulations require, among other things, the need to ensure that learning opportunities and assessment processes are designed to enable students to fairly and reasonably achieve expected academic outcomes. Programme monitoring processes are also comprehensive and critically examine the extent to which the programmes and modules continue to be academically and professionally contemporary and valid. The BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures includes further detail on how these regulations should be implemented with clear and detailed information on policies and procedures for programme and module development and approval/reapproval which also apply to collaborative partners. This manual also includes rules for the critical review of programmes with a focus on how the programme has operated and developed since approval. The manual also details policies and procedures for annual programme monitoring to ensure the ongoing maintenance of quality and standards and requires evaluation of, among other things, the effectiveness of programme design in terms of currency, teaching and learning and assessment strategies.

147 Once the partnership with the University of Ulster is activated, the College of Health will operate under the University's regulations in line with the Validation Agreement and the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook. The latter in particular includes details on the procedures for the approval of partner institutions. This information details the approaches to the validation of programmes for collaborative partners and requires critical examination of the structure, content and design of the teaching, learning and assessment process from the initial proposal stage to approval to ensure the design of high-quality courses.

148 Aligned with the requirements of both prospective awarding bodies' requirements for high-quality course design and delivery, the College of Health's own Governance and Academic Regulations include internal policies for ensuring direct assurance that course design and delivery are of a high quality. The regulations contain rules and principles for programme approval and review. The principles underpinning this are to ensure that students are able to develop and introduce creative approaches, independent judgment and self-awareness, and allow students to make professional and societal contributions and

promote professional career development. On the basis of its scrutiny of the above documentation, the review team is satisfied that the academic regulations of its two awarding bodies, along with its own internal governance and academic regulations, will support the College of Health in the design and delivery of high-quality courses.

149 The key management and academic team within the College of Health have established experience of working with BPPU General Academic Regulations and the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures for designing and delivering high-quality courses, and the review team saw evidence of this in the discourse and deliberations within the different committees and in particular the Programme Development Committee.

150 Once the College of Health secures registration with the OfS, the BPPU General Academic Regulations and the BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures will continue to inform the College of Health's programme design and delivery activities. This entails interaction within academic governance structures, particularly those regulating collaborative partnership programmes which are required to ensure high-quality student experiences and consistency in how the programmes operate between the University and the collaborative partner. This collaborative policy also confirms that the College of Health, as a collaborative partner, will have support and transparent guidance on expectations, policies and procedures of the University. To this end a validation agreement already exists between BPPU and the College of Health whereby the programmes delivered will be subject to operational oversight by the BPPU Education and Standards Boards (ESB) and the BPPU Education and Standards Committee (ESC). The terms of reference for these make explicit their responsibility to ensure that each programme of study is delivered in a manner that provides, in practice, a learning opportunity and resources that give students a fair and reasonable chance of achieving the academic standards required for successful completion and thus have a key role in supporting the delivery of high-quality courses.

151 Once the University of Ulster validation has been activated, the College of Health will be required to address the programme design and delivery approaches within the University of Ulster validation agreement and its Partnership Handbook, which set out the frameworks and processes to be followed for secure programme approval and robust programme monitoring. This handbook also provides that the resources including the quality and sufficiency of teaching staff and support staff are required to be assessed as part of the programme approval process. The specific approaches to validation of collaborative provision including the appointment of a specifically constituted Evaluation Panel to oversee the process and make the final recommendation for approval will provide assurance that the programmes' design and delivery will be of high quality.

152 The College of Health's own approach to programme development and review will ensure it responds to its awarding body priorities while also taking internal ownership to ensure it has processes for safeguarding the design and delivery of programmes facilitating the design and delivery of high-quality courses. The procedures involve a targeted, staged process with an explicit focus on critical and comprehensive review of documentation to assess, among other things, the effectiveness of design and delivery in shaping the quality of the programme. Following this, the approach includes the consideration of the proposal by a programme approval and review panel including members from the relevant awarding body. The decision of the panel is forwarded to the Academic Council with a recommendation to approve the programme. For partnership provision, these processes for internal scrutiny will have to be completed before submitting an application to the awarding body partner.

153 The approaches to the review of programmes are also aligned to the requirements of the College of Health's awarding bodies and will include specific examination of the continuing design and delivery of high-quality courses. The College of Health Programme

Board will play a key operational role in reviewing programme delivery and design and the locus of institutional academic oversight will lie with the Academic Council. This review is currently undertaken by the Programme Development Committee, which has programme design and delivery as standing items and those recent outcomes include, for example, the greater use of online delivery to support students, additional resources allocated to the Manchester site, and further integration of research and evidence-based practice into training within clinics.

154 The College of Health draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and the College of Health draft Operational Plan demonstrate that the College is putting in place a strategic approach that will enable it to develop robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high-quality courses in anticipation of the new College of Health being established. The review team concludes, based on the above evidence, that the College of Health has robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high quality courses.

155 Approved course documentation in the form of College of Health programme specifications for the MChiro programme, the Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy, and the MSc in Animal Manipulation contain learning and teaching strategies and detailed learning outcomes and targeted teaching methods together with specific details of diverse assessment tasks and contact hours. The overview of the programme within, for example the MSc in Animal Manipulation, emphasises the active learning environment that the programme is focused to deliver and makes explicit references to professional development. Similarly, the overview for the MChiro programme highlights the regulated healthcare context in which the Chiropractic profession operates, and states that this has been used to inform the quality of design and delivery of the programme, incorporating the study of academic sciences, clinical sciences and practical clinical studies. The emphasis on practice is particularly evident within assessment tasks which require case presentations involving the analysis of simulations, and clinic exit examination assessments. The review team is satisfied that approved programme documentation shows that the College of Health will be able to ensure that the programmes it offers are of high-quality in terms of curriculum design, content, structure and assessment opportunities to enable students to demonstrate the intended programme and module learning outcomes.

156 External examiner reports for MChiro, MSc Animal Manipulation, and MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19 further confirm that the quality of the course content, design and delivery and assessment processes support students in achieving their planned learning outcomes. For example, the external examiner for the MChiro programme confirms that the module content links well with the expected academic level, and the assessment instruments for modules enable students to achieve learning outcomes. They also commented on how the students who needed further support to achieve better were supported through targeted feedback and that the process, as a whole, enabled students to reflect on their learning. The MChiro programme team was commended for their commitment to develop students both in terms of their knowledge and professional attributes and the programme itself was reported to be well structured and focused on developing health professionals capable of engaging safely and competently in practice. The external for the MSc in Animal Management also noted that the programme supported the development of professional competencies and that practical assessments were well designed and clear. The importance of ensuring review by externals of the quality of the design and delivery of the programme has been explicitly addressed within the College of Health Governance and Academic Regulations and is required within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook. The review team is satisfied that the above evidence shows that external examiners are very satisfied with the quality of the programme design, delivery and assessment process and the College of Health's future plans will ensure that these views are consistently gathered and addressed.

157 The accreditation reports of both the General Chiropractic Council and the European Council on Chiropractic Education confirm that the design and arrangements for delivery of the MChiro courses fully meet their respective quality priorities. For example, the annual monitoring feedback from the GCC commends the programme team for progress made in enabling students to have the full breadth of patient engagement to support their applied studies. The MSc in Animal Manipulation is also externally accredited as meeting the design and delivery requirements of both the Animal Health Professions Register and the Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners. On the basis of the above, the review team is satisfied that both external examiners and professional bodies consider that the courses are high quality.

158 A sample of module surveys was examined by the team to ascertain students' views about the quality of the courses and these indicated a consistent view that the courses are designed and delivered to provide an appropriate level of challenge and to give them the opportunity to study ideas or concepts. The team was able to confirm that students value their learning experiences, and the review of the prospective arrangements in place for the College of Health to undertake equivalent surveys will ensure that these systems and processes will provide a robust approach to gathering student views on the quality of the design and delivery of their courses of study.

159 The students told the review team that academic staff introduce the learning outcomes at the beginning of each lesson and refer back to them at the end. They speak positively about practical sessions being very good in supporting them to get good grades. They feel the small classes enable them to get instant feedback, and that there is good communication between academic staff and students. The review team concludes that students tend to regard their courses as being of high quality.

160 Senior, academic and professional support staff were able to describe the ways in which they ensure courses are high quality and explained their roles as encompassing both education and professional practice, which provides them with currency. They could also point to roles as professional body representatives and as external examiners, and were able to explain how they used both supervision sessions and ongoing team meetings to disseminate and reinforce currency.

161 During the review, the team observed a range of clinical and classroom-based teaching sessions. These identified that all teaching has a strong focus on clinical application. Staff provide highly interactive sessions in which students are fully engaged, encouraged by knowledgeable and enthusiastic staff. The teaching approach is facilitated by flexible teaching spaces that permit students to move seamlessly from their desk to a clinical bench. The review team concluded that the observed sessions demonstrated that course delivery is of a high quality.

Conclusions

162 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

163 The College of Health has robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high-quality courses. This is because the plans confirm that the College's approaches will be informed and guided by the policies and procedures of its two awarding bodies along with its own comprehensive internal processes for programme design and delivery. These plans will

be implemented by senior staff and academic and professional teams with substantive experience in designing and delivering programmes. The academic regulations and policy frameworks of its two awarding bodies and its own internal regulations will facilitate and support the College of Health to design and deliver high-quality programmes. Approved course documentation show that programmes are designed to deliver high-quality learning and assessment experiences and to ensure programme learning outcomes can be achieved, for example through modules that focus on clinical management and assessment. The review team heard from students how staff engaged with learning outcomes through teaching sessions, and they described the positive experiences they have within practical sessions in classes and clinics. The review team can confirm that teaching observations evidence a strong focus on practice outcomes, and sessions are planned and highly interactive. Learning outcomes are consistently shared, and staff enthusiastically engage students in their learning. Academic staff whom the review team met were able to explain how they ensured that programmes were of high quality, addressing chiropractic and animal manipulation specific practice-based priorities. External examiners commend the staff team for the highly effective way in which the programmes are designed, delivered and assessed and for the targeted support they offer students to facilitate their learning. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

164 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience

165 This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

166 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

167 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Accreditation reports from the General Chiropractic Council
- b Accreditation reports from the European Council on Chiropractic Education
- c The College of Health staffing structure diagram
- d Student Engagement and Support Diagram
- e College of Health Staffing Structure
- f University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019
- g Draft Peer Observation of Teaching Guidelines and forms
- h College of Health draft Recruitment and Selection Policy
- i College of Health draft Induction Policy
- j College of Health Plans for recruiting, selection and developing staff
- k All available Academic CVs and Job Descriptions
- l Professional Support Staff CVs and Job Descriptions
- m College of Health draft Staff Development Policy
- n College of Health draft Employee Appraisal PDR Guidelines
- o Module surveys
- p Student submission
- q Qualification check when recruiting staff
- r College of Health HR Consultant Agreement
- s Draft College of Health Operational Plan
- t Teaching observations
- u Meeting with senior staff
- v Meeting with students 1
- w Meeting with students 2
- x Meeting with academic staff
- y Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

168 To identify students' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff, the review team had sight of a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses, covering 90% of the current student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

169 To determine whether academic staff will deliver a high-quality learning experience, the team observed four separate teaching sessions selected at random from those operating at the time of the visit. The sessions were Clinic Case Studies Level 7 Presentation of case histories by students; MChiro Studies Level 6 Practical hands-on delivery session; Neuroscience Level 4; and Human Function Level 4.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

170 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

171 To identify how the College will recruit, appoint, induct and support staff so that it meets the outcome, the review team examined the College of Health's policies for the recruitment, selection and development of staff.

172 To assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that it will have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered the draft Recruitment and Selection Policy, the draft Induction Policy, the draft Staff Development Policy, the draft Employee Appraisal PDR Guidelines and documents, the proposed processes for recruitment of academic staff and professional support staff, the draft College Operational Plan.

173 To identify the roles and posts the College of Health will require to deliver a high-quality learning experience and assess whether they will be sufficient, the review team considered the planned staffing structure diagrams and lists of academic staff delivering the MChiro and MSc in Animal Manipulation, along with the student engagement and support diagram.

174 To assess whether the College of Health staff will be appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively under future arrangements, the review team considered draft academic CVs and job descriptions, draft professional CVs and job descriptions, draft executive job descriptions, draft Staff Development Policy, draft Peer Observation of Teaching Guidelines and forms, along with the arrangements for a contract with an HR Consultancy service.

175 To test that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, the review team met with senior staff, academic staff and professional support staff who will prospectively transfer under new arrangements to the College of Health.

176 To identify other organisations' views about the sufficiency, qualifications and skills of the staff, the review team assessed third party endorsements in the form of Accreditation reports from the General Chiropractic Council and the European Council on Chiropractic Education 2019.

177 To assess whether students consider that the College of Health will have sufficient staff and that those staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, the team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting it met with 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study

and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives. The review team also considered in this context the views of the students set out in their submission.

What the evidence shows

178 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

179 The College of Health Recruitment and Selection Policy sets out what will be undertaken by the College and what will be outsourced to a Human Resources provider. This documentation aligns with that currently in place. Within the validation agreement, the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook 2019 stipulates the resources (human and physical) to be provided for a proposed programme and the College of Health's capability to provide them have been considered as part of the programme approval process.

180 The College of Health has developed a suite of draft policies to support staff recruitment, selection and induction that provide an appropriate framework for the recruitment and retention of a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and skilled staff once the College of Health is established. The draft Recruitment and Selection Policy sets out how to ensure that the best people are recruited on merit and that the recruitment process is free from bias and discrimination, including guidance on the shortlisting process, a gender-neutral panel composition, and the use of selection tests and presentations. It states academic qualifications, professional registration, the right to work and any other specifics considered essential for the post must be verified by the College of Health at the time of interview. The draft Induction Policy sets out the College of Health's approach to induction and indicates how appropriate inductions will be provided to enable all staff to become effective and efficient in their role as quickly as possible. The College of Health draft Staff Development Policy and College of Health draft Employee Appraisal PDR Guidelines and documents provide a framework for staff development and annual reviews of individuals' personal development. The draft College of Health Operational Plan sets out in detail the staffing plans for the new College and makes provision for a range of appointments. The team concludes that the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that it will have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience

181 The team was able to examine the current staffing structure in terms of managerial, academic and professional support staff, and noted that the proposed approach in the staffing structure for the College not only provides for equivalence, but also incorporates a number of additional posts, including filling posts currently left vacant. The proposed staffing structure for the College includes a Senior Team of three, which comprises the Principal and Chief Executive who will line manage the Chief Operating Officer and the Chief Academic Officer, along with all academic staff. The Principal and Chief Executive also directly line manages the Director of Research and Director of Programmes. Staff who will be involved in managing and coordinating the resources, including Facilities Manager, IT Assistant, Finance and the VLE will be line-managed by the Chief Operating Officer, while the Chief Academic Officer will manage the Director of Student Services, Student Liaison Manager, Data Analyst, Librarian and Student Support Officer. The student engagement support diagram provides a pictorial representation of how students will be able to access the appropriate resources to support their learning, including academic staff as module leaders, an inclusion support officer, personal tutors, administrative support and clinical practical support. The review team concludes that the proposed staffing structure for the College of Health is credible and the roles and posts are sufficient to deliver a high-quality experience.

182 The team considered the qualifications and skills of the cohort of staff who it is proposed will transfer to the College of Health. The draft job descriptions and current CVs

for proposed College of Health staff in both academic and professional grades demonstrate that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively. Individual CVs examined by the team provided evidence that staff hold relevant qualifications, are industry practitioners, and have positions outside the immediate environment in terms of being external examiners or members of relevant professional committees.

183 The College provided a draft staff recruitment, selection and development policy outlining how they will support and develop staff to become positive role models for the students they teach. The College has plans in the next two to five years to employ three to five more core staff, and also to employ additional professional support staff to cover such roles as marketing, course organisation, student support and data analytics. The review saw evidence in support of appropriate qualifications that staff have been supported to attend continuing professional development (CPD) training, for example conferences, to present their own research, and also to obtain further post-graduate qualifications, as appropriate, to develop their knowledge base. For example, select staff have recently completed a research fellowship to obtain a PhD, an MA in distance learning and an MSc in Chiropractic Paediatrics. Academic and professional support staff described the processes followed for recruitment and induction, including the verification of qualifications. They confirm that as new staff they have induction, including health and safety, and are supported by their line manager. All staff (academic and professional support) will have scheduled appraisals where CPD will be discussed. The review team concludes that there will be sufficient appropriately and qualified staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience, and that the plans to transfer staff to undertake the same roles under the College of Health are credible and robust.

184 The review team spoke to senior staff who confirmed that the proposed appraisal process is key, that it explicitly links to staff development for which a budget is in place, and that new staff will have mentoring to support them with teaching and assessment. They confirmed, by reference to the plans in place, that peer observation of teaching will form a part of the in-house staff development identified in the College of Health draft Staff Development Policy. Proposed academic and professional support staff confirm their professional development is supported as part of the appraisal process. Staff feel supported and receive an appropriate induction to the College, which includes compulsory training in 'Prevent', Data Protection, Consumer Law compliance, Equality & Diversity, Anti-bribery and Fundamentals in Student Welfare and Pastoral Care. Academic and professional support staff also confirmed that they are aware of plans by the College of Health to continue peer observation of teaching, and that Peer Observation of Teaching Guidelines and supporting documents are in draft form.

185 In their student submission current students tend to agree that teaching on the courses is excellent and the quality of the teachers' experience is outstanding. Students the review team met referred to the practice-based experience of staff as helping to inform their future. The staff research experience is also helpful as it assists in keeping up to date with current practice-based developments.

186 A recent accreditation by the ECCE reports that the profile of full and part-time staff, chiropractors and non-chiropractors fits the current structure of the programme and size of the student body. The number of teaching staff is sufficient and there is an appropriate student/staff ratio. Clinical staff have a supervised training year and new staff are offered training in assessment techniques appropriate for the level of learning.

187 During teaching observations the review team was able to see staff working with students in a variety of classroom and clinical settings. Staff are knowledgeable and skilled in their professional discipline and demonstrate their ability to engage students and promote their learning, therefore delivering a high-quality learning experience. Under the plans for

future arrangements, these staff will transfer to perform the same roles for the College of Health.

Conclusions

188 As described above, the review team considered all the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

189 The College of Health will have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because staff delivering the curriculum, and professional support staff in areas such as library and learning resources, finance and student support who will transfer over to the College of Health, have been appointed under existing arrangements. Where additional skills are required in, for example, human resources, arrangements are in place for the College of Health to contract with specialists in this field. The College of Health has robust and credible plans in place for the future recruitment of staff, which includes a detailed suite of policies and procedures that have been drafted to cover areas including recruitment and appointment against established job descriptions, and ongoing review, development and appraisal of staff in post. The review team felt that these will ensure continuity in the level of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This priority is supported by the transitional and validation arrangements put in place with both BPPU and the University of Ulster, both of which stipulate the human resources required by the College of Health as part of these processes. Students met by the team fully agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled and qualified staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience, and the review team's observations of teaching and learning indicate that the teaching staff, who will transfer to the College of Health, are appropriately qualified and skilled to deliver high-quality academic and professional outcomes for the students. Staff are externally engaged with professional bodies and have other external practitioner-based engagement which significantly informs teaching, learning and assessment strategies within programmes. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.

190 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience

191 This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

192 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

193 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Warwickshire College agreement
- b GCC Approval Panel Register 2018
- c ECCE Accreditation report 2019
- d Facilities, Learning Resources and Student Support Services
- e MChiro Teaching Resources
- f Animal Teaching Resources
- g Library resources
- h Online learning resources
- i Library journal list
- j Student engagement support diagram
- k College of Health Staffing Structure
- l College of Health Plans for recruiting, selecting and developing staff
- m Academic CVs
- n Academic job descriptions
- o Professional CVs
- p Professional job descriptions
- q College of Health draft Executive job descriptions
- r College of Health draft New Hire job descriptions
- s College of Health draft Staff Development Policy
- t College of Health draft Employee Appraisal Personal Development Review
- u College of Health draft Employee Appraisal Personal Review Preparation Form
- v College of Health draft Personal Development Forward Job Plan
- w College of Health draft Managers Appraisal Personal Development Review Appraisal Guidelines
- x College of Health draft Manager Appraisal Personal Development 1-2-1 Review Form
- y College of Health draft Appraisal Personal Development Review Performance Criteria
- z College of Health draft Mid-Year Review

aa	Module surveys
bb	College of Health draft Student Support and Inclusion Strategy
cc	College of Health Student Engagement Support Diagram
dd	Student submission
ee	Clinic Handbook
ff	Proposal for IT support
gg	VLE proposal
hh	College of Health Strategic Plan 2019-20
ii	Draft College of Health Operational Plan
jj	Review of resources and facilities
kk	Meeting with senior staff
ll	Meeting with academic staff
mm	Meeting with professional support staff
nn	Meeting with students in Abingdon
oo	Meeting with students in Manchester by video-conferencing.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

194 To identify students' views about facilities, learning resources and support services, the review team considered a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses covering 90% of the student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

195 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

196 To identify how the College of Health's facilities, learning resources and student support services will contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered the College of Health's plans for facilities, learning resources and student support services, encompassing the draft Learning and Teaching Assessment Strategy, the Student Engagement Support diagram, draft Student Support and Inclusion Strategy, Student Engagement Support Diagram, Plans for Recruiting Selecting and Development of Staff, and the Strategic Plan for 2019-20.

197 To assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that they will have sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience, the team considered the Warwickshire College agreement, MChiro Teaching Resources Statement, Animal Manipulation Teaching Resources Statement, library resources, online learning resources, library journal list, Student Engagement Support diagram, draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook, draft Strategic Plan 2019-20, draft Operational Plan, and the team's review of resources and facilities.

198 To identify the College of Health's facilities, learning resources and student support services, the team examined job roles, structures and resources, encompassing the Facilities, Learning Resources and Student Support Services, Staffing Structure, plans for recruiting selecting and developing staff, the role of the Education and Standards Committee, and the Clinic Handbook.

199 To determine whether the roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered the job descriptions of staff employed in relevant functions, encompassing academic CVs, academic job descriptions, professional CVs, professional job descriptions, draft executive job descriptions, draft new hire job descriptions, draft Staff Development Policy, draft Employee Appraisal Personal Development Review, draft Employee Appraisal Personal Review Preparation Form, draft Personal Development Forward Job Plan, draft Managers Appraisal Personal Development Review Appraisal Guidelines, draft Manager Appraisal Personal Development 1-2-1 Review Form, draft Appraisal Personal Development Review Performance Criteria, and draft Mid-Year Review.

200 To identify other organisations' views about facilities, learning resources and student support services, the review team appraised the third-party endorsements in the form of GCC Education Standards, GCC Approval Panel Register 2018, GCC Privy Council Letter, ECCE Accreditations procedures and standards, ECCE Accreditation Report 2019, ECCE Accreditation Certificate 2019, Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners, Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation.

201 To test whether staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and understand their roles and responsibilities, the team held meetings with senior staff, academic staff and support staff, all of whom are planned to transfer over to the College of Health.

202 To test that the facilities, resources or services under assessment will deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team undertook a direct assessment of facilities, learning resources and support services at Abingdon, and associated proposals for IT support and VLE enhancement.

What the evidence shows

203 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

204 The College of Health's Strategic Plan 2019-20 includes a commitment to the maintenance and development of staff and learning resources to underpin the student experience. It focuses particularly on ensuring a high-quality clinical experience, and how this will be facilitated through engagement with local communities and specialist groups. The College of Health's draft Operational Plan identifies the need for phased development of the VLE and the continued use of current physical premises and their libraries. The future plans focus on the College of Health becoming independent in areas including marketing, student support, learning and inclusion and personal tutor support systems, which are currently provided by BPPU.

205 The draft Learning and Teaching and Assessment Strategy supports the future resourcing for the College with an explicit priority to be student and practice-centric, and research and employability focused. The strategy confirms that learning resources and student support systems will be implemented to facilitate a high-quality learning experience. The draft Student Support and Inclusivity Strategy's goal is to enable students to achieve their full potential, both academically and professionally. The plans for recruiting, selecting and developing sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff confirms arrangements to transfer the employment status of all existing BPPU staff currently engaged in the programmes to the College of Health. This plan also includes a drive to recruit additional staff in the areas of sales and marketing, administration and library in 2019-20, with two further full-time teaching staff, a course administrator, a student support officer and a data analyst during 2020- 21. The review team is confident that these plans for facilities, learning resources, and student support services are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students.

206 The review team also examined the current Facilities, Learning Resources and Student Support Services statement, which provide evidence of the comprehensive nature of these within the Abingdon and Manchester Centres. These details include information on the buildings themselves, lecture and seminar rooms, practical session rooms including a student clinic facility and a 'wet lab' for anatomy and biology sessions, along with library and IT facilities, student common-room facilities and staff rooms. There is a Library and Information Service at both centres to ensure that students have access to all of the information they need to be successful in their programmes of study, and both provide flexible opening hours to maximise student access opportunities. Online resources such as video tutorials and professional journals are also available. The review team was also able to view resource statements in relation to both the Chiropractic and Animal Manipulation programmes, including skeletal diagrams and skeletons. Students are provided with a Clinic Handbook, which includes details of clinic facilities, clinical coursework and examinations, patient records, professional conduct and interpersonal communication. The College has already sought and received written proposals and bids for the provision of IT support and for development of a bespoke replacement VLE, and plans to transfer the existing contract between BPPU and Warwickshire College to the College of Health to continue to provide practical resources for its MSc in Animal Manipulation programme. Given the evidence above, the review team can confirm that there are sufficient and appropriate facilities and learning resources to deliver a high-quality academic experience, and that both current and future plans are credible, robust and evidence based.

207 The student submission evidences that students are satisfied that both libraries are well stocked, and have good online access, and were aware of plans to supplement existing library staffing to further support access to learning materials. Module reviews include a specific question regarding IT resources and facilities to support learning, and the outcome of these is that a very high proportion of respondents in each cohort are satisfied with the current provision. The student submission notes that the students have a positive view of the learning resources, facilities and staff, and on the provision of help and support for specific learning needs. On the basis of the above evidence the review team is satisfied that students tend to regard facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate, and facilitate a high-quality academic experience.

208 The GCC and ECCE, which accredit the MChiro and the MSc in Animal Manipulation programmes, review the learning resources and support systems both at accreditation stage and also on an ongoing basis during programme review. The accreditation report on the MChiro by the ECCE confirms that for both the Manchester and Abingdon centres the physical and clinical resources meet accreditation requirements.

209 The proposed staffing structure for the College of Health includes a Senior Team of three, which comprises the Principal and Chief Executive who will line manage the Chief Operating Officer and the Chief Academic Officer, along with all academic staff. The Principal and Chief Executive also directly line manages the Director of Research and Director of Programmes. Staff involved in managing and coordinating the resources including Facilities Manager, IT Assistant, Finance and the VLE are line-managed by the Chief Operating Officer, while the Chief Academic Officer manages the Director of Student Services, Student Liaison Manager, Data Analyst, Librarian and Student Support Officer. The Student Engagement Support diagram provides a pictorial representation of how students will be able to access the appropriate resources to support their learning, including academic staff as module leaders, inclusion support officer, personal tutor, administrative support and clinical practical support.

210 Job descriptions align with the organisation structure and show that the Principal will have overall responsibility for the effective operation of the College of Health, the Chief Operating Officer will have responsibility for operational planning and strategic leadership

infrastructure functions, and the Chief Academic Officer will be responsible for the academic quality assurance and the continuous enhancement of the student experience. The review team was also able to examine the job descriptions for key future appointments including the student support officer, data analyst and librarian. The job descriptions of existing academic and professional support staff identify key responsibilities and skills requirements, and the CVs confirm that both academic and professional support staff are appropriately qualified to support students in their learning experience. The College of Health's Staff Development Policy demonstrates a commitment to ensuring that staff keep up with professional and pedagogical practice managed through the Personal Development Review. A comprehensive staff appraisal process is planned for all employees, including managers, with a follow-up mid-year review. The review team is satisfied that the College has planned to ensure that there are appropriate professional support staff to enable the delivery of a high-quality learning experience for students.

211 Senior staff described their responsibilities for ensuring that learning resources and support services are appropriate to facilitate high-quality learning experiences. They highlighted their plans for establishing a support infrastructure at both the Abingdon and Manchester centres, and the detail of the transitional agreements with BPPU. Academic staff explained how they use resources, including the VLE, to achieve parity of the student learning experience between the Manchester and Abingdon centres, and the process for completing business cases to obtain further equipment. Academic staff also informed the review team about their expertise and how they are involved in professional body committees and external examiner roles. Professional support staff including the Financial Controller, Facilities Manager, and Director of Student Services stated that they understood their roles and responsibilities in relation to student support. They explained how resources are managed, and discussed the arrangements for the purchase of learning resources to enhance the student learning experience. All staff spoke positively about the College of Health's developments and are passionate about future opportunities. The review team can confirm, based on the above discussions, that staff are appropriately qualified, experienced and skilled and understand their respective roles and responsibilities.

212 In meetings with the review team the students from both the Abingdon and Manchester sites confirmed that they are satisfied with the overall support and resources for the programmes. Both student groups confirmed that they are aware of the College of Health's future developments and are fully supportive. They are particularly appreciative of the College's focus on improving the VLE provision and its plans to appoint a dedicated librarian. They stated how the two centres are coordinated to ensure that both groups have the benefit of collaboration and shared resources and support. The review team can confirm from its discussions with students that they are satisfied with the facilities, learning resources and support services and are fully aware and supportive of the College of Health's development plans.

213 The review team's tour of the facilities within the Abingdon site demonstrated that the learning space for students is appropriate and of high quality. The facilities are specifically designed to meet the specialist priorities of the programme, such as laboratory facilities and clinical facilities for engaging and offering treatment to the general public. Teaching spaces equipped with chiropractic benches and other equipment enable students to put theory into practice. The review team is satisfied from what they have seen that the facilities, resources and services provide a high-quality learning environment, and will deliver a high-quality learning experience.

Conclusions

214 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this

judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

215 The College of Health will have sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The College has credible plans which are fully articulated within its Strategic Plan. Its operational plan is comprehensive and realistic and prioritises the need for skilled staff and appropriate learning facilities to give students high-quality learning experiences including the necessary practice-based engagement to achieve programme and modules outcomes. These plans demonstrably seek to ensure that students have effective clinical learning experiences and highlight a priority of further engagement with communities and specialist groups to offer students broader and more varied clinic-based study experiences. The College of Health's potential accrediting professional bodies have confirmed in relevant reports that the planned staffing and learning facilities, including those for clinical studies, are appropriate for professional accreditation. The review team's direct assessment of the facilities including laboratories and clinics and scrutiny of relevant documentation on the facilities confirmed that these are and will be appropriate for the delivery of the planned programmes and the necessary student support services will be sufficient to address the support needs of the planned student cohorts. Senior staff fully understand their responsibilities for ensuring that resources are in place for students to have an effective and productive learning experience at both the Manchester and the Abingdon delivery sites. They understand the level of supporting infrastructure necessary in terms of staffing and physical resources and already have robust plans to realise these priorities. Academic and professional support staff are experienced in delivering higher education programmes and specifically those that relate to Chiropractic and Animal Manipulation disciplines and confirmed that they know their responsibilities and how they plan to collaborate to ensure that the students have good academic and professional outcomes. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.

216 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience

217 This Core practice expects that the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

218 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

219 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20
- b The Student Engagement Support diagram
- c College of Health draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook
- d MChiro Module Review Summary 2018-19
- e Graduate Certificate Module Review Summary 2018-19
- f Programme Development Committee minutes August 2019
- g Programme Development Committee minutes May 2019
- h Programme Development Committee minutes March 2019
- i Thematic SSLC Summary Report
- j College of Health plans for recruiting, selecting and developing staff
- k Module surveys
- l Examples of action taken as a result of feedback
- m Student submission
- n Student voice representative
- o IT management proposal
- p VLE upgrade proposal
- q Meeting with Abingdon students
- r Meeting with Manchester students via video link.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

220 To identify students' views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses covering 90% of the student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

221 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the

provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

222 To identify how the College of Health intends to actively engage students in the quality of their educational experience, the General Academic Regulations were considered in relation to the structure of the Staff-Student Liaison Committee, student engagement in the complaints and appeals procedure and policy, the Student Engagement Support diagram, validation agreement with University of Ulster, and the draft Governance Academic Regulations Handbook.

223 To assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience the review team considered the Student Engagement Support diagram, Programme Development Committee minutes, Summary Report of the Staff-Student Liaison Committee, College plans for recruiting, selecting and developing staff, module surveys, student voice representative, and the student submission.

224 To illustrate the potential impact of the College of Health's approach, the review team considered the College proposals for changing or improving provision as a result of student engagement, including through the documents, 'action taken as a result of your feedback', and the proposals for enhanced IT and VLE arrangements.

225 To determine whether students consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience and to identify their views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience, the team held two meetings with students of the College. In the first meeting it met a random sample of 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met a representative sample of eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives. The team also considered the student submission and outcomes of annual programme reviews.

What the evidence shows

226 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

227 BPPU Academic Regulations note that students are important members of all key committees, including the Academic Council; Education and Standards Committee; Equality and Diversity Committee; and Staff-Student Committee. The draft regulations of the College of Health build upon this basis and provide, at paragraph 13, that the governance of the College will principally be undertaken at the Academic Council, devolving to subcommittees as appropriate. The planned membership of the Academic Council includes two student representatives from the registered students of the College, and its remit extends to academic governance, the standards of its awards and the quality of the student learning experience. The only direct subcommittee of the Academic Council at this stage is the Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC), which includes elected student representatives and which is required to meet termly to provide a forum for communication between programme management and students regarding the student experience, and to report back to the student body on actions taken and issues. The future plans in this regard provide for the work of the SSLC to be supported by Programme Boards with two co-opted student representatives each, which will be tasked with monitoring student feedback on the delivery of modules and programmes. The review team concludes that this planned approach within

the draft regulations of the College of Health describes a clear and effective approach to engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

228 The College of Health has robust and credible plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The student engagement mechanisms are set out in the planned Student Engagement Support diagram, and include Staff-Student Liaison/Experience Committee (SSLC), using course representatives from year groups, and committees such as the Programme Development Committees where learning resources and general support mechanisms such as the VLE are considered and addressed. Students will be appointed to committees through an informal, self-nomination process, and will receive a formal induction training for their roles and responsibilities. The mechanisms that will be adopted provide opportunities for student engagement in their educational experience and for the College to inform students of actions taken because of their feedback at all levels. Because of the foregoing, the review team was able to confirm how student feedback will be individually and collectively sought by the College of Health, which bodies are accountable for such actions, and how actions taken are communicated back to students. Given this, the review team considered that the College of Health's plans to individually and collectively engage students in the quality of their educational experience are credible and robust.

229 There were a number of examples of changing and improving students' learning experience as a result of student engagement, which are confirmed to students through a 'you said, we did' process. These include the provision of more charging points for laptops, the provision of an additional examination board to provide improved turnaround times for results and providing lecture material in advance of the delivered session, and this process is set to continue. However, the team was also provided with evidence that, following student feedback more generally, the College of Health has already put plans in place to improve both IT support and the VLE. Students met by the team confirmed this level of responsiveness and cited improvements to the facilities in student common rooms and changed library opening hours as additional evidence. All students met by the team confirm that feedback is responded to in a timely manner. Because of the foregoing, the review team can confirm that changes and improvements to students' learning experience are made as a result of student engagement and that this is likely to continue.

230 The review team considered the student submission to obtain student views on their opportunities to feed back on the depth and breadth of their engagement. Students comment on a perceptible level of social and pastoral contentment on both campuses, and highlight in this context that they feel their voice is 'heard', both in formal settings such as the SSLC, and informally in meetings where the Principal sees student groups informally to 'gauge feelings' and hear directly their views and concerns. Students report that they identify additional mental health support as an area for consideration. The College of Health has incorporated this in its plans going forward, and a priority in 2020-21 is to employ a full-time mental health and well-being support officer to support this need. This was confirmed in the meeting with professional support staff, specifically the student welfare/liaison officer, and further underscores that the College of Health is likely to continue to be responsive and to respond positively to identified student needs. Student views captured in module surveys and in the module review summaries demonstrate clearly that students have regular structured opportunities to engage with the process of review of all aspects of their experience.

231 Students who met the team confirm that they are currently engaged in the quality of their educational experience, and particularly highlight their representation on the Staff-Student Liaison Committee. Students perceive student engagement, individually and collectively, to be a major strength. They report that they are listened to, supported and that they are having an effective and high-quality learning experience. Students and student representatives are aware of the mechanisms available to them to engage in the quality of

their educational experience at course and institutional level and attest to the responsiveness to the student voice. Based on the foregoing, the review team concludes that there is a clear and effective approach to engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience and that this is likely to continue.

Conclusions

232 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

233 The College of Health has clear policies and credible plans for actively engaging with students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The College of Health's future operational plan explicitly confirms the importance of engaging students collectively and individually and having representations with key deliberative committees as partners in quality assurance. The College of Health will have a proactive approach to engaging students to feed back individually and collectively on their learning experiences, through comprehensive module reviews and the committee structure. Its planned approach for student support along with the policy frameworks of its two awarding bodies and its own internal policies is designed to ensure that students will have clear and effective opportunities for individual and collective engagement which are robust and credible. From both the documentation examined, student comments and student feedback in general, the College of Health has included within its plans, improvements that will enhance the students' learning experience. Students unanimously confirmed that they fully use the different opportunities that have been provided and that they are listened to and the team considers this is likely to continue. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

234 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students

235 This Core practice expects that the provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.

236 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

237 The QAA review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a College of Health policies and procedures for handling complaints
- b BPPU General Academic Regulations 2019-20
- c BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20
- d MChiro Programme Handbook (four year)
- e MSc Animal Manipulation Programme Handbook
- f Validation agreement with BPPU
- g University of Ulster validation agreement
- h What to do when things go wrong, narrative guide
- i What to do when things go wrong, student complaints procedures
- j The Formal Complaint Form
- k Specific instances of complaint and appeal
- l Formative committee meeting minutes
- m College website (www.bpp.com/terms-and-conditions/Complaints)
- n Meeting with Abingdon students
- o Meeting with Manchester students via video link.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

238 The review team did not sample any evidence as this was not appropriate under this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

239 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

240 To identify the College of Health's processes for handling complaints and appeals and to assess whether the College of Health has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students, the review team considered the validation agreement with BPPU, the validation agreement with the University of Ulster and the College of Health draft Academic Regulations.

241 To assess whether information for potential and actual complainants and appellants will be clear and accessible, the team examined the programme handbooks MChiro and MSc Animal Manipulation, along with specific documentation including What to do when things go wrong narrative guide, What to do when things go wrong diagram, formal complaint form, and also had sight of the electronic appeals form available on the VLE. In respect of the future arrangements under the College of Health, the team assessed plans within the draft College of Health Academic Regulations.

242 In order to identify whether complaints and appeals are likely to be dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner, the review team examined the available evidence relating to the single complaint and single appeal.

243 To establish its views about the clarity and accessibility of the complaints and appeals procedures that will be adopted by the College of Health, the team met students from both Abingdon and, by video link, Manchester.

What the evidence shows

244 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

245 Under present arrangements, all formal appeals and complaints are centrally administered by BPPU within the provisions of its academic appeals and complaints policies and procedures set out at part K of the General Academic Regulations and the Manual of Policies and Procedures. Under the transitional agreement when BPPU becomes a validating partner for the College of Health, this will continue in that informal stages of the complaints and appeals process will be the responsibility of the College of Health, and the formal stages will remain with BPPU. Under this arrangement, students will retain the ultimate right of redress, once the BPPU processes are completed, to take their case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).

246 The plans for the College of Health under its validation agreement with the University of Ulster were examined by the team, who noted that the College of Health will be responsible for administering all initial stages of the complaints and appeals policies and procedures. This is reflected in the detailed College of Health Academic Regulations, which specify time limits for the consideration of first stage appeals and complaints (15 working days) and the appeals stage (20 working days). Initial formal complaints and appeals will be considered by managers independent of the curriculum area concerned, with appeals to the Chief Academic Officer and to the Principal within the College itself. These regulations also provide a right of appeal to the University of Ulster and ultimately to the Northern Ireland Public Sector Ombudsman. The team concluded that these plans are credible, robust and evidence-based.

247 Currently, students receive information regarding both complaints and appeals in their programme handbooks - MChiro and MSc in Animal Management. In addition, there are written 'What to do when things go wrong' narratives and schematics as to how the complaints and appeals procedures operate, and there are standard forms available from Student Services and on the VLE. Under future plans, the College of Health will set out the complaints regulations and procedures on its website and the VLE. In addition, offer and rejection letters will make the complaints process clear to applicants at admission and again

during induction. The current BPPU documentation in the form of a short guide and schematic accompaniment will be replicated under the College of Health.

248 The record of numbers and types of complaints is presently aggregated and reported at BPPU centrally. The College of Health plans to contextualise this approach for its purposes in the future, and the Chief Academic Officer will report annually to the College of Health's Academic Council with statistical data on complaints and appeals, feedback from students on their experiences of the appeals and complaints processes, and any recommendations for change. As an integral part of these reports, the appeals and complaints policy will be reviewed by the Academic Council.

249 Under BPPU there has only been one instance of a complaint and one instance of an appeal in the past three academic years (both in 2018-19) which related to this provision. A review of the handling of both the complaint and appeal confirmed to the team that the processes set out in the regulations were followed and that in both cases, from the available evidence, the response was timely, and the complainant and appellant were given detailed written guidance as to the further recourse available. From this the team concludes that the College of Health is likely to process complaints and appeals according to its procedures.

250 Students confirm that they know about the current complaints and academic appeals processes, and where they can access information on how to submit a complaint or a formal appeal, in particular referring back to programme handbooks. They are also aware of the location of guidance. They also confirm that they understand the possibility of escalating a formal appeal to their awarding body such as BPPU and, ultimately, to the OIA. They confirm that none of them have had occasion to use either complaints or appeals processes, and feel that matters are dealt with at course level before they can escalate.

Conclusions

251 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

252 The College of Health's plans for handling complaints and appeals are robust and credible because they will be accessible to students and are definitive, fair and transparent. They encompass a structured, transparent, accessible and fair complaints process with clearly identified escalation stages, associated staff responsibilities, annual review and oversight by the College of Health's Academic Council, and an established route for appeals to partner universities and the OIA or equivalent. There are established BPPU policies and procedures in place for dealing with complaints and academic appeals, and the College of Health's future plans include working with the two awarding bodies' policies and procedures, along with its own. Information for complainants and appellants is accessible to students, being clear and comprehensive. Students are fully aware of the complaints and appeals process and said the information can be found quickly and easily both electronically, and by reference to Student Support services. They also confirm that they have no concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures, or their application. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

253 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them

254 This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

255 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

256 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU General Academic Regulations
- b BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures
- c College of Health BPPU Validation Agreement
- d College of Health University of Ulster Validation Agreement
- e General Chiropractic Council Education Standards
- f General Chiropractic Council Approval Panel Report
- g General Chiropractic Council Privy Council Letter
- h Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners
- i Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation
- j External examiner report for MChiro (part) and Pathway 2018-19
- k External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) 2018-19
- l External examiner report for MSc Animal Manipulation (part) and Graduate Certificate in Animal Therapy 2018-19
- m UU Partnership Handbook
- n College of Health draft Academic Regulations
- o Module surveys
- p Student Engagement Support Strategy and diagrams
- q Student submission
- r Draft College of Health Operational Plan
- s College of Health and BPPU interface contacts
- t College of Health and the University of Ulster interface contacts
- u Meeting with senior staff
- v Meeting with students in Abingdon
- w Meeting with students in Manchester by video link
- x Meeting with academic staff
- y Meeting with professional support staff
- z Final meeting.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

257 To identify students' views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership, the review team considered a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included three of the six courses, covering 90% of the student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

258 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

259 To assess how the College will ensure courses are high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them, the team considered relevant academic regulations and policies, including the BPPU General Academic Regulations, BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures, College of Health and BPPU Validation Agreement, College of Health and University of Ulster Validation Agreement, Transitional Service Agreement, Warwickshire College Agreement, Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners Accreditation, and the draft College of Health Operational Plan.

260 To assess whether the College has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring a high-quality academic experience in partnership work, the team considered the plans for this, including the College of Health draft Academic Regulations, College of Health and University of Ulster Validation Agreement, Transitional Service Agreement, committee structures, University of Ulster Partnership Handbook, the Student Engagement Support Strategy and diagrams, and the interface named schedule contacts lists for BPPU and the University of Ulster.

261 To test the basis for the maintenance of high quality within specific partnerships, and that those agreements are in line with the College of Health's regulations or policies, the review team considered partnership agreements encompassing the General Chiropractic Council Education Standards, General Chiropractic Council Approval Panel Report, General Chiropractic Council Privy Council Letter, General Chiropractic Annual Monitoring Report, and the Warwickshire College Agreement.

262 To assess how other organisations regard the quality of courses delivered in partnership, the review team considered the third party endorsements from the European Council of Chiropractic Education Accreditation Procedures and Standards, European Council of Chiropractic Education Accreditation Report, European Council of Chiropractic Education Accreditation Certificate, Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners, and the Animal Health Professionals Register Accreditation.

263 To test whether staff understand and discharge effectively their responsibilities to the awarding body, the team met with senior staff, academic staff and professional support staff.

264 To identify students' views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership, the team held two meetings with students of the College. In the first meeting, the team met with 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held by video link, the team met eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In

both cases students were from all levels of study and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives, in order to assess students' views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership. The team also considered the views expressed in the student submission.

What the evidence shows

265 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

266 During the initial post-registration with the OfS phase, the College of Health's partnership with BPPU will be governed by the BPPU General Academic Regulations, which provide that the University retains ultimate authority and responsibility and incorporates arrangements for the approval of partners and processes for approval, monitoring and review of collaborative provision. The College and University of Ulster Validation Agreement confirms that the operations of all partnerships approved by the University will conform to associated standards, quality assurance and administrative procedures of the University.

267 The College of Health's plans for future partnership working are firstly with BPPU as a validating body, and then with the University of Ulster. The BPPU Manual of Policies and Procedures 2019-20 includes details on the management of partnerships within the collaborative provision section which applies to these arrangements. This section includes rules on approval of partners and processes for approval, monitoring and review of collaborative provision. Future planned arrangements with the University of Ulster will operate under that University's regulations, specifically supported by the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook, with quality processes for validated courses covering, for example, approval stages and course management requirements. The College of Health's draft Academic Regulations require the Programme Approval and Review Board to include members who reflect those required within the BPPU General Academic Regulations. Similarly, the course monitoring requirements within the University of Ulster Partnership Handbook include the terms of reference for a course committee, which aligns with the Programme Approval and Review Board included within the College of Health's draft Academic Regulations. Similarly, the College of Health's draft Academic Regulations also provide for the review of the quality requirements of the professional bodies.

268 The University of Ulster Partnership Handbook includes quality processes for validated courses that cover both approval stages and course management requirements. In alignment with the requirements of both Universities the College of Health's draft Governance and Academic Regulations Handbook 2020-21 confirms that where the College works in partnership with degree-awarding bodies its own regulations will be aligned and will remain consistent with the relevant awarding body. The College of Health's operational approaches within its Academic Regulations, aligned with the requirements of its awarding bodies, is contextualised by centralising oversight of academic partnerships within its Academic Council. This is explicitly confirmed within the regulations which require the Academic Council to ensure compliance with the terms of the validation agreement of any awarding body. To facilitate inclusivity, the Academic Council is planned to include representatives from academic staff, elected students, and professional support staff along with the Principal, Chief Academic Officer and Chief Operating Officer. The terms of reference identify the Academic Council as the principal committee for overseeing academic quality, with the power to make recommendations to the Board of Directors on matters relating to collaborative provision and agreements with validating, accrediting or awarding bodies. The review team is satisfied that the College of Health has clear and comprehensive regulations and policies for the management of partnerships with other organisations, to ensure that the academic experience is high quality, irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

269 Partnership agreements have been put in place with BPPU for the transitional validation of the curriculum and with the University of Ulster for their longer-term agreement. These are supported by the particular mechanisms specified by the partners for the maintenance of quality during their operation. These are underpinned in each case by detailed partnership interface agreements, identifying named link individuals at each partner organisation to act as the lead officer for a wide range of areas including academic governance of the partnership. These provide clarity as to the responsibilities for each organisation in understanding respective responsibilities for quality. The partnership agreements themselves are current, and the review team is satisfied that there is explicit alignment between these agreements and the College of Health's draft Academic Regulations. Because of this, the review team concludes that the College of Health has clear and comprehensive regulations or policies for the management of partnerships with other organisations to ensure that the academic experience is high quality, irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

270 External examiners express satisfaction with the quality of the programmes offered in partnership with the awarding body. The external examiner for the MChiro, for example, is 'very satisfied' with all aspects of the programme, notes that the overall standard is high, and comments positively in particular on the feedback within research projects. The external examiners for the MSc Animal Management praise the strong focus on professional competences and confirm that the academic quality of the programme addresses academic guidelines, is consistent with the level of the award, and in line with agreed professional and industry standards. Because of these reports, the review team is satisfied that external examiners consider that courses delivered in partnership are of high quality and that this is likely to continue.

271 Professional body endorsement for the College of Health's curriculum is evidenced within the GCC Privy Council Letter 2019 and the ECCE accreditation certificate, both of which comment favourably on the quality of programmes offered in partnership in awarding their endorsements. The information within the Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners Accreditation and the Animal Health Professions Accredited Educational Provider recognition represent further evidence that professional bodies are satisfied with the quality of the programmes delivered in partnership.

272 Senior staff in meetings with the review team described how their development of the College of Health's draft regulations emerged from the current BPPU Regulations. They were able to explain how the transitional partnership agreement is intended to work and that staff and students have been informed of the future changes. Academic and professional support staff described their experience of working in partnership with external bodies in the past, and expressed confidence in their ability to adjust to delivering a high-quality academic experience under both the transitional arrangements with BPPU and the equivalent partnership with the University of Ulster. Because of this, the review team is satisfied that staff have established experience of working in partnership, and understand their respective responsibilities for quality.

273 Student views expressed within the student submission provide evidence that students appreciate the partnership arrangements existing at present and understand that they will be carried forward into the validation agreements with BPPU and subsequently, the University of Ulster. They specifically note the continuing partnership focus on a practice-based ethos and the opportunity to engage with real patients and clinics. The module review forms capture positive student satisfaction with the courses offered in partnership.

274 Students described how they benefited from the professional accreditation of their programmes, and from the partnership with Warwickshire College which allows them access to facilities necessary for the animal manipulation and animal management aspects of their

studies. Both groups of students are aware of the College of Health's developments and were fully supportive of the partnerships with BPPU and the University of Ulster as validating bodies for their qualifications.

Conclusions

275 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

276 Where the College of Health works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. The College of Health will have clear and comprehensive regulations and policies with appropriate academic governance arrangements for the management of its partnership agreements with both its awarding bodies which are fully informed by their current regulatory and policy frameworks. These regulations are comprehensive and seek to collaboratively ensure that students can have a high-quality learning experience. The College of Health's plan for its partnership work is robust because it is credibly articulated and thoughtfully developed with clear identified milestones in a comprehensive operational plan. Staff understand this plan and how it will work operationally, with considered and realistic targets for both the immediate post-registration period and for the future phases of development. The partnership agreements with both universities are shaped by their collaborative partnership agreements and clearly articulate mutual responsibilities and opportunities. The agreements will be fully implemented with specific deliberative committees to oversee the partnership work within both the University Partners and College of Health. Existing external examiners confirm that students have a high-quality learning experience, and both partner universities and the College of Health have robust processes for ongoing engagement of external examiners to ensure that students have a high-quality learning experience within the planned partnership agreements. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core practice is met.

277 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes

278 This Core practice expects that the provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

279 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

280 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BPPU Academic Regulations: processes and plans for monitoring student assessment and retention
- b MChiro Programme Handbook
- c College of Health and BPPU Validation Agreement
- d College of Health and BPPU Transitional Services Agreement
- e College of Health University of Ulster Validation Agreement
- f Personal Tutor Support Policy in College of Health draft Governance Academic Regulations
- g MChiro 5-year Annual Program Review Report Form
- h MChiro 5-year Module Review Summary 2019
- i Grad Cert Annual Program Review Report Form
- j Grad Cert Module Review Summary 2018-19
- k College of Health draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy
- l Thematic SSLC summary report
- m Draft College of Health plans for recruiting, selecting and developing staff
- n Module surveys
- o Careers Guidance and Employability skills
- p Student submission
- q Samples of marked student work
- r Online VLE grades screenshot
- s Observations sample summary sheet
- t Assessed student work summary sample sheet
- u Meeting with senior staff
- v Meeting with students in Abingdon
- w Meeting with students in Manchester by video link
- x Meeting with academic staff
- y Meeting with professional support staff.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

281 To identify students' views about student support mechanisms the review team considered a representative sample of completed module surveys. The sample included

three of the six courses, covering 90% of the student cohort at multiple levels of educational delivery from Level 3 (Pathway) to Level 7 (MChiro) courses.

282 To consider whether the feedback given to students will be comprehensive, helpful and timely the review team examined a random and representative sample of 40 pieces of assessed student coursework at Level 4 (Gateway) through to Level 7 (MChiro) from all four programmes that will be offered by the College of Health.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

283 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

284 To identify the College of Health's approach to student support, including how it will identify and monitor the needs of individual students, the review team considered the BPPU Academic Regulations, the College of Health draft Academic Regulations, and the College of Health University of Ulster Validation Agreement, together with the MChiro Programme Handbook, Validation Agreement, Transitional Services Agreement between BPPU and the College of Health, the College of Health draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and the College of Health plans for recruiting, selecting and developing staff.

285 To assess whether the College has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the review team considered the College of Health draft Academic Regulations, along with the Annual Programme Review Report Form, Module Review Summary 2019, Grad Cert Annual Programme Review Report Form, Module Review Summaries 2018-19, Thematic Staff-Student Liaison Committee Summary Report, and the Careers Guidance and Employability Skills Statement.

286 In order to test whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported, the review team met with senior staff, academic staff and professional support staff all of whom are to transfer to the College of Health following OfS registration, and who are involved in providing academic and non-academic support to students.

287 To identify students' views about student support mechanisms, and to identify whether students who have made particular use of student support services regard those services as accessible and effective, the review team held two meetings with students. In the first meeting it met with 13 students currently studying at Abingdon, covering the MChiro (11 students) and MSc Animal Manipulation (two students) programmes of study. In the second meeting, held by video, the team met with eight students from the current Manchester MChiro programme. In both cases, students were from all levels of study, and included both student-appointed representatives and students who were not representatives. The team also considered in this regard the views expressed in the student submission.

What the evidence shows

288 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

289 The Academic Regulations of BPPU, and the validation and transitional agreements with BPPU and the University of Ulster form the framework for the arrangements for the provision of student support. The College of Health has produced its own draft Academic

Regulations which will apply post-registration and have been specifically designed to be complementary to the requirements of both validating bodies. These draft Academic Regulations address student support in relation to both tutorial support and arrangements for monitoring academic progress. In relation to tutorial support, the Academic Regulations provide for trained members of the academic team to both support each student in their academic studies, and to signpost them to the appropriate member of the professional support team in relation to any pastoral issues they may have. The regulations recognise that formal tutorial sessions need to be in place, but also encourage the use of technology, for example video calls and instant messaging to supplement these. The arrangements to monitor academic progress provide for a structured arrangement of continuous review to identify any additional student support needs at an early stage, and to put these in place where necessary. Based on the foregoing, the review team was satisfied that the College of Health's draft Academic Regulations contain a detailed approach to student support which facilitates successful academic and professional outcomes.

290 To ensure that all students will be supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the effectiveness of student support services provided by the College of Health is planned to be monitored and reviewed across the quality cycle. The College of Health plans encompass a draft Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy which aims to ensure that there is a sufficient and appropriate resource and support infrastructure in place to enable students to gain discipline-specific knowledge, and to develop them as critical thinkers with appropriate key practice-focused skills and capabilities. The curriculum is designed to consistently embed employability, and specific aspects including clinical records, ethics and fitness to practise are embedded within it. This strategy also recognises that the approach to supporting students should be effective in meeting the academic, professional and personal priorities of each student by the provision of targeted student tutorials. This approach is further articulated within the College of Health's draft Student Support and Inclusion Strategy which recognises students as individuals and identifies, in particular, the priority to support them with advice and guidance, counselling and remedial support.

291 The College of Health plans a system of student support that includes a robust pastoral and academic support network, with a named personal tutor allocated to all students at induction. A series of regular contacts (at least twice per term) means that the College will be able to monitor students' well-being and progress and students met by the team felt that they could always contact either the tutor or school office for support in regard to their health and well-being. The review team also notes that the College has plans to recruit a dedicated student support officer for mental health in 2020-21. Academic staff confirmed that, as a relatively small college, they are all in regular contact with students, know them well and feel that any student can approach them. Academic staff gave various examples of this happening recently, when family problems had arisen, or when coronavirus had impacted an international student's ability to complete practical examinations. Students are allocated to personal tutors at an early stage of their studies and while timetabled tutorials take place throughout the year, staff feel that students raise issues as and when they arise. Students report that they are very satisfied with the advice, guidance and support they receive from professional support staff and academic staff and, in particular, course managers.

292 The College also plans to implement an active Careers Guidance Policy, which is specifically tailored to support and encourage students with existing careers (for example, being a Chiropractor) to further develop their employability skills through good communication, IT skills and reflective practice. An employability matrix is outlined in the draft MChiro Programme Handbook that illustrates how careers guidance and employability is embedded. For students on the Graduate Certificate course or MSc Animal Manipulation, personal and professional practice skills (including business and financial planning) will be

embedded within the course. Professional support staff outlined how they bring external practitioners into the College to talk to students about their future career plans. All students, regardless of course or location are encouraged to attend an additional careers day, where industry representatives and business leaders, along with professional association representatives talk about the challenges of being a practising professional. Given the above, the review team considers that the College of Health's plans to support students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are comprehensive, robust and credible.

293 Assessed student work at all levels including that for the MSc Animal Research dissertation and the Level 6 MChiro Philosophy demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. The College of Health will have a balance of assessment methods in order to test student learning, from short answer questions, case studies to assessed practical skills. Samples of examinations for all levels of student, on at least three different courses, show clear instructions and standardised rubrics, which are implemented in practice. Formative assessments provide each student with sufficient feedback for them to improve, as confirmed in the meeting with students. Development of an online VLE where students may take formative exams and receive feedback is also welcomed by both staff and students. The assessed student work seen by the review team at the visit demonstrates that students are given comprehensive and helpful feedback and students who met the team confirm this to be the case. External examiners for all courses explicitly comment that the course is well structured and develops safe and competent healthcare professionals.

294 Senior and academic staff, and professional support staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported to facilitate and engender a culture of student support. In the meeting with staff, the review team confirmed that they all understand their role in supporting student achievement and, to an extent, this is evidenced by the high retention rates of students on all courses at the College. Professional support staff confirmed their individual roles in the provision of support to students, and emphasised in particular the employability aspects, including arranging events for students approaching the end of their MChiro studies to meet with practitioners who are seeking associates, and running specific dedicated sessions on the practical aspects of working as a self-employed chiropractor. Based on the above, the review team concludes that staff, both academic and professional support, understand their role in supporting student achievement.

295 Evidence from internal student surveys conducted in the 2018-19 academic year, which were completed by a representative and quorate proportion of the students on most courses, report that students feel supported to achieve their professional outcomes.

296 The student submission emphasises that students are positive about the support provided by staff, feel that their experience as a whole is structured and well-prepared, and state that 'nothing is too much trouble' for the staff. Specifically, the submission points out that students with individual learning needs, or any additional help, feel 'well supported'. This viewpoint is echoed in student surveys, where in answer to the questions about being able to contact staff when necessary, and about the level of support and guidance, each module group returned a satisfaction score of over 90%. This is further reflected in the annual course monitoring reports for MChiro which identify 'satisfaction' with the support provided to students.

297 Students confirm that they think very highly of staff involved in teaching and agree that they are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The students see staff as positive role models and are aware of the continued professional development of staff, including those that had taken further higher level qualifications such as PhD. In the meeting with the review team, students reported strongly that they feel the

College is very responsive to their feedback, replies to them promptly and provides support as and when needed, for example by helping to fund specific sessions for dyslexia or dyspraxia whether in college or with external agencies. The review team concludes that students tend to agree that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

Conclusions

298 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

299 The College of Health's approach to student support has the potential to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes for all students. The College of Health has produced detailed and comprehensive academic regulations, which align with the requirements of both BPPU and the University of Ulster in the context of student support, and which form the framework for its student support service provision. This framework sets out a robust approach to the provision of tutorial and professional support services, clearly and carefully designed to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes, which is responsive to student needs. There is a draft Student Support and Inclusion Strategy which underpins this approach by recognising students as individuals and identifying the priority to support them with advice and guidance, counselling, and remedial support. Professional support staff are able to describe a comprehensive approach to careers and professional development, including direct input from professional and business leaders. Because of this, the review team was able to conclude that all staff, both academic and professional support, understand their role in supporting student achievement. External examiners for all courses explicitly comment that the support is well structured and as an outcome develops safe and competent healthcare professionals. Students wholly agree that they are currently well supported by staff to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes and state in particular that the individual tutor allocated to each student at the start of each year is effective in facilitating this process. Students see staff as positive role models, and specifically stated how satisfied they were with responses to their views, and their sustained emphasis on developing them as practitioners. Assessed student work demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. The review team concludes, therefore, that this Core Practice is met.

300 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

QAA2567 - R12017 - Nov 20

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2020
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557050
Web: www.qaa.ac.uk