Health Professions Council

Visitors' Report

Name of education provider	Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education
Validating body	London Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	12/13 July 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist) David Edwards (Art Therapist) Eileen Thornton (Physiotherapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mark Maybe (Chair)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**20**

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: IATE should submit the information, which is given to prospective students about the programme. This information should include details about the travel and cost implications of placements, the requirements for CRB and health checks and an explanation of the role and relationship with HPC in terms of approving the programme and providing eligibility to register as an Art Therapist or Art Psychotherapist.

Reason: The documentation currently available to prospective students does not include CRB and health requirements as part of the admissions procedure, nor did it provide detailed information on placements. It was felt that prospective students should be aware of the potential relocation and/or increased travel costs associated with placements at the earliest opportunity. From the meeting with the students, it was apparent that there was still some confusion over the role of the HPC and the specific protected title that graduates would be eligible to use. The Visitors acknowledged that the current publications had been designed to meet the requirements of UKCP registration, but felt that in order to meet this Standard; they needed to be satisfied that future applicants would be fully prepared for the experience and expectations of their Art Therapy training programme.

The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including 2.2.5 accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The documentation given to students must be revised to reflect the common understanding of APL (as defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations) and the course-specific regulation that this programme operates under, which means that APL is not available.

Reason: There is currently an inconsistency between the use if the term 'APL' as defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations and that referred to in IATE's policy document. Through discussions, it became apparent that London Metropolitan University has validated the programme with a course-specific regulation that did not permit students to claim APL on this programme. It was felt that it needed to be made explicit to students that there was no mechanism for APL and that course-specific regulation superseded London Metropolitan University's regulations.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The core programme team must include at least one appropriately qualified Art Psychotherapist or Art Therapist.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Given the professional identity of Art Therapy and the increased focus on visual art, it was felt that at least one Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist was essential to delivering an effective Art Therapy programme. In discussion, the programme team explained that they had already entered into discussion with an Art Psychotherapist about joining the programme team.

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition: The documentation given to students must be revised so that both applicants and students are aware of the facilities and support which is available to them through the partnership with London Metropolitan University.

Reason: Throughout the duration of the visit, it became evident that a great deal of support and facilities (both academic and welfare) were available through London Metropolitan University to students on this programme. However, from the tour of facilities and meeting with the students, it was obvious that the support and facilities at London Metropolitan University were not being fully promoted or utilised. The Visitors had no concerns about the adequacy of the facilities and support available to students, but felt that the full range of facilities should be made more accessible to students.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must clarify how they ensure students have access to adequate resources in placements.

Reason: Currently, students are responsible for supplying their own resources (e.g. paint, materials) whilst on a placement. There is no requirement on the placement provider to provide resources. The Visitors acknowledged that IATE allowed students to take resources from their supplies, but felt that there should be a mechanism in place to ensure a parity of experience at all placements.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: IATE must enhance their IT facilities available to students on the programme.

Reason: IATE currently only has one PC station dedicated to students on site. The visitors acknowledged that many students had their own laptops and PCs at home, however, they felt that additional resources should be available to allow students to be able to access on-line resources (e.g. library catalogue, London Metropolitan University's virtual learning environment) whilst on site. Given the attendance patterns and timetabling, there could be up to 40 students wishing to use the IT facilities at any one time.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: IATE must revisit the documentation so that it is clear where the Standards of Proficiency **-** 1b.3, 2b.4 and 1b.4 are met.

Reason: There was much discussion about where the students covered these Standards, both in the taught part of the programme and the placements. The visitors were satisfied that the Standards were covered, however they felt that the documentation needed amending so that it was explicit from the learning outcomes and award requirements that they were guaranteed to be met by all graduates.

SET 5. *Placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Condition: IATE must devise a system to ensure that placement liaison officers are appropriately qualified.

Reason: There are currently no requirements on the background and qualifications of the individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt that in some instances, the placement liaison officer was a psychotherapist, or Arts Therapist, but in others, it was a person in a position of management or administration within the placement organisation. When questioned, those in the latter group felt that it would be inappropriate for them to be signing off reports on student performance, which would contribute towards a student's final award and eligibility to practice. The visitors

agreed and felt that a mechanism was needed to ensure that where staff in placements were expected to comment on students' progress and ability to meet specific learning outcomes, their suitability was assessed and monitored against set criteria.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: IATE must provide detailed information on how visits to placements will be developed and implemented as part of their system for approving and monitoring placements.

Reason: The programme team explained verbally that they intended to visit placements in the future, now that the placement officer position was secured. They envisaged the visits taking place annually and including a meeting with the student and placement liaison officer and a tour of facilities. The visitors explored this development in the meeting with the placement providers and it was received enthusiastically. The placement providers praised the new tutor handbook and welcomed this addition of face-to-face interaction at the location of the placement. The visitors felt that these proposed visits needed to be developed as a priority to ensure a parity of standards across all placements.

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement, which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: IATE must provide more guidance on the assessment procedures and communication between students and their placement liaison officer.

Reason: During the meetings with the students and the placement providers, it became apparent that there were variations in practise across placements in some areas. When the placement liaison officers were asked what they would do if a student were underperforming and risking failure, there was a variation in responses. Likewise, when students were asked how often they spent with their placement liaison officers, there was a marked different from once a term to fortnightly. The visitors felt that IATE needed to take responsibility for ensuring a consistent approach by providing more information on the learning outcomes for a successful placement.

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: IATE must revisit the expectations of, and the required training for those individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'.

Reason: There are currently no requirements on the background and qualifications of the individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt the role could be undertaken by someone who is a psychotherapist, or Arts Therapist, as well as by someone who is within a position of management or administration within the placement organisation. Given the significance of this role and the contribution towards assessment, the visitors felt that careful consideration needed to be given to who was appropriate to take up this role and what support would be necessary for them from IATE.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: IATE must revise the assessment design to require that at least two practical assessments are undertaken using the art-therapy modality specifically. Both assessments must use the visual art modality and at least one of these assessments must be in the final year of training and no more than one may use the sandplay modality.

Reason: In order to ensure that graduates of the programme are fit to practise as Art Therapists/Art Psychotherapists it is necessary that they are assessed specifically in this modality before the end of their training. The Visitors noted that the programme teaches a range of therapeutic modalities, including art therapy, and that the existing assessment design does not specify the arts modalities that will be assessed. This condition will ensure that future graduates will all have to demonstrate specific competency in the art therapy modality before graduation. The Visitors consider that sandplay alone does not demonstrate a sufficient range of art therapy competencies, and so the condition requires that at most one of the two art therapy assessments may use this modality.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: IATE must revise the assessment design and procedures across the programme to ensure that the award of MA is synonymous with meeting the Standards of Proficiency.

Reason: The programme is currently designed to meet the requirements of UKCP registration, which includes a period of further training and assessment after the award

of MA. Registration with the HPC operates differently; the award of MA provides eligibility to register, there is no further assessment by an external body on a graduate's fitness to practice. To this end, the requirements for the MA award must include checks and balances to ensure that a graduate can practise safely and effectively. During the meeting with the programme team, it was agreed that various components of assessment in the current programme (e.g. 'personal readiness', the clinical supervisor reports, and placement attendance reports) would need to be incorporated into the assessment design of the MA. There was an acknowledgement that the timing and criteria of the clinical placement exam would need to be readdressed too.

6.7.3 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: IATE must revisit their assessment regulations so that it is explicit that an aegrotat award does not to provide eligibility to register with the HPC.

Reason: The requirements for an aegrotat award are defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations, but there is nothing in IATE's policy document to suggest that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to register with the HPC. The visitors felt that it needed to be made explicit to students that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to register with the HPC. An aegrotat award could still be conferred as long as students were aware that it could not be recognised for professional regulation.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: IATE must ensure that an External Examiner from the Art Therapy part of the Register is appointed.

Reason: The current external examiner is not an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist. During the meeting with the programme team, there were discussions about whether a replacement or second external examiner should be appointed and IATE agreed to discuss this issue further with London Metropolitan University, taking the regulatory, financial and succession planning implications into consideration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: TBC
Report to be submitted to Approvals Panel/Committee on 10 October 2006

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation: IATE should consider including an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist interview process.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Once an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist has been appointed to the programme team, the visitors felt that they should be involved in the interview process to help assess applicants' potential in the visual arts. This recommendation is in line with the QAA subject benchmark statements.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: IATE should continue the internal process of reviewing the remit and membership of their management committees.

Reason: The visitors were pleased with the self-critical approach adopted by IATE that had led them to review their management structure to ensure transparency and reduce conflicts and wished to encourage it early completion.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: IATE should consider how the appointed Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist is best utilised in the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Before an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist is appointed, the visitors felt that the programme team should carefully consider how their experiences were best used, given that they could contribute to a range of areas (e.g. admissions, teaching, learning, assessment, placements).

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: IATE should maximise the staff development opportunities available to them at London Metropolitan University, especially in the areas of research and teaching development.

Reason: Through the meeting with the senior team, it became apparent that there was a range of staff development opportunities available to IATE staff at London Metropolitan University. The visitors felt that all staff should be encouraged to take up these opportunities especially in research development.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: IATE should take advantage of the resources available to them at London Metropolitan University and review and enhance their stock of journals specific to art therapy.

Reason: During the tour of facilities, it was clear that a number of resources available through London Metropolitan University were not being fully utilised (e.g. electronic journals, inter-library loan facilities). There was also some confusion over the full stock of art therapy journals and this was reflected in their absence in reading lists.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Recommendation: IATE and London Metropolitan University should consider the programme's alignment with the QAA subject benchmarks at the next revalidation of the programme.

Reason: At the next revalidation of this programme, the programme should be an approved Art Therapy programme and therefore it would be good practice to consider the programme alongside the subject benchmarks when determining its fitness for award.

4.5 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: IATE and London Metropolitan University should consider including an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist as an external specialist at the next revalidation of the programme.

Reason: At the next revalidation of this programme, the programme should be an approved Art Therapy programme and therefore it would be good practice to include an independent Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist to scrutinise the programme and offer advice on the currency of the curriculum.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: IATE should consider broadening and deepening their placement opportunities.

Reason: During the meeting with placement providers, it was apparent that not all placements would offer students the opportunity to work with Arts Therapists. The visitors were aware of the difficulties of finding suitable placements, but wished to encourage IATE to develop more opportunities for placements in art therapy settings.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Recommendation: IATE should consider developing a tri-partite contract between the student, placement provider and themselves.

Reason: The idea of a contract was discussed during the meetings with the placement providers and programme team and was felt to provide an additional safeguard to ensuring the roles and responsibilities of all parties were clearly understood.

Commendations

- The clarity of the marking criteria
- The emphasis based on ethical conduct and standards throughout the programme.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Donald Wetherick
David Edwards
Eileen Thornton

Date: