

## Visitors' report

|                                      |                                       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | Queen Margaret University             |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | MSc Art Psychotherapy (International) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time and Part Time               |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Art therapist                         |
| <b>Relevant modality / domain</b>    | Art therapy                           |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 20 - 21 April 2010                    |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| Conditions.....           | 6 |
| Recommendations.....      | 8 |

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Art Therapist' or 'Art Psychotherapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2010. At the Committee meeting on 26 August 2010, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Art Therapy and MSc Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins). The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Sue Strand (Art Therapist)<br>Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)   |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance)                   | Ben Potter   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 30   |
| Initial approval  | September 2005   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010   |
| Chair   | Michael Stewart (Queen Margaret University)  |
| Secretary   | Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Gordon Campbell (Internal Panel Member)<br>Mairghread Ellis (Internal Panel Member)<br>Maciej Czajka (Internal Panel Member) |

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

|  | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

|   | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the approval of the programme is confirmed.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology such as ‘...currently eligible to achieve HPC registration’ (Doc. A, p2). They also noted the suggestion that the HPC sets certain expectations on attendance (Doc. D, p17). The HPC sets no such attendance requirements. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate a commitment to resolving the issues around the suitability of the rooms in which the programme is delivered.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation that there historical and ongoing issues surrounding the suitability of teaching facilities for the programme. These issues were further highlighted on the tour of facilities as well as in discussions with the students, programme team and senior staff. This demonstrated that the studio facilities needed additional work to ensure they effectively supported the learning and teaching activities of the programme. While the education provider recognises that these issues need to be resolved the visitors were unable to identify tangible written plans for this work to go forward. The visitors therefore require a written statement and an indicative timetable of work to demonstrate the education providers’ commitment to address these issues as soon as is practicably possible to ensure that these resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or to propose alternative arrangements.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that in the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the assessment regulations and current external examiner. However they require evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners for the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

## Recommendations

### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students in module bibliographies as well as reviewing documentation to cite it fully to avoid any possible confusion.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that in the documentation and in discussion with students that the students did understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This was particularly in evidence in the placement modules. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However they recommend that the programme team review the current bibliographies for other university based modules to include the HPC's guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also recommend that instances where the guidance referred to in the documentation should use the full title of the guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics to avoid any possible confusion for students. This would also further embed the standards in learning throughout the curriculum.

### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue to monitor the training and support given to non-HPC registered practice placement educators and consider providing additional support and training where necessary

**Reason:** The visitors noted in discussions with the students, practice placement providers and programme team that there were some practice placement educators who had not undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and were not HPC registered practitioners. They also noted that the education provider undertakes regular training days at the University and at various practice locations and acknowledge the difficulties in acquiring practice placement educators due to the practical difficulties involved in providing a service such as this in this location. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However, to maintain consistency across practice placements the visitors felt that the efforts to train practice placement educators, particularly non-HPC registered practice placement educators should be monitored and additional support provided where necessary. This would be to ensure that all students continue to achieve their learning outcomes from practice placements especially those placed with non-HPC registered or non traditional practice placement educators.



## **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the progression regulations for students to identify if the generic education provider regulations would be more suitable than those clearly specified in the documentation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that on page p68 (programme document 2010) of the regulations for re-assessment and progression are clearly stated. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However in discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the regulation in paragraph 10.10.6 may not best suit the students undertaking the programme due to the module structure. It was recommended by faculty staff that this regulation be reviewed and brought in line with the education provider wide regulations. If this occurs the visitors recommend that the documentation is updated straight away to avoid confusion for students and that the programme would continue to meet the SET.

Sue Strand  
Margaret Foster