

Education & Training Panel – Monday 4 February 2008

MINOR/MAJOR CHANGES (2)

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The major/minor change process requires education providers to notify the HPC of any major changes to approved programmes. The process aims to recognise changes which may impact significantly on the provision of a programme and on the standards of education and training and standards of proficiency and determine the action that the HPC should take.

Visitors have assessed the changes to the programmes listed below, by correspondence. The visitors' reports are attached.

The visitors are satisfied that although the changes are major, the programmes continue to meet the standards of education and training, so there is no requirement for an approvals visit.

| Education Provider | Programme Name | Delivery Mode |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education | MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy | Part time |
| Manchester Metropolitan University | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) | Full time |

Decision

The Panel is asked to approve the above named programmes as having undergone major change and that the programmes continue to meet the HPC's standards of education and training.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors' reports (2)

Date of paper

Wednesday 23 January 2008

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-07-23 | a | EDU | PPR | Major & Minor Changes 2 - Aug 07 | Draft DD: None | Public RD: None |

Visitors' Report Major/Minor Change

Section One: Programme details

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of education provider | Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education (IATE) |
| Name of awarding body (if different from above) | London Metropolitan University |
| Programme title(s) | MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Name and profession of HPC Visitor(s) | David Edwards (Art Therapist) Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist) Eileen Thornton (Physiotherapist) |

Please list the documents submitted by the education provider, in support of the major/minor change form:

- Written proposal nominating new Programme Leaders (Chris Rowan and Lynne Gerlach) and describing how leadership responsibility will be shared between Chris Rowan and Lynne Gerlach.
- Teaching timetable for 2007-08 for all three years of the programme, showing teaching responsibility of all staff, including HPC registered Art Therapists (Tina Leslie, Marianne Behm and Joy Schaverein).
- Statement of days of employment for Chris Rowan and Lynne Gerlach, showing teaching and administration allocation.

Please provide a summary of the proposed changes below.

- To nominate Chris Rowan (HPC Dramatherapist) as Programme Leader (replacing Jo Samuels) for HPC purposes
- That the role of Programme Leader will in practice be shared between Chris Rowan and Lynne Gerlach.

Section 2: Recommendation of the Visitor(s)

Visitors' are asked to select one of the following recommendations –

- The following documentation is requested before a final recommendation can be made:

SET 3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and who should either be on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

The visitors were not able to determine from the submitted documentation how the two individuals identified as programme leaders would cooperatively manage and deliver the programme. The visitors required an indication of the number of hours the two programme leaders would contribute to the programme and what responsibilities each will have to the programme. In addition, the visitors required information to distinguish between the hours of employment as programme leader to the MA Integrated Arts Psychotherapy programme and other IATE responsibilities.

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

The issue raised by the visitors about this standard reflected the issues in the above standard. The change in programme leader changed the overall staff number and so the visitors sought information to assist them in determining the number of staff was still appropriate.

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

The visitors had questions about how the two new programme leaders would input into how this standard is met. The visitors were eager to see the role of specialist staff as members of the core programme team. Given the programme's aim of producing safe and effective art therapists the visitors were interested to understand how specialist expertise and knowledge was drawn from HPC registrants. The visitors referred back to evidence submitted to them to meet the condition placed on this standard at a recent approval visit and recognised the input into the programme from two registrants. However, the visitors wanted to understand how the registered programme leader would input into driving the profession specific knowledge, skills and agenda throughout the programme. Confirmation of the continued and significant involvement of registrants in delivery of the programme was sought.

The following is a summary of the information the visitors requested to assist them in making their decision:

- A rationale for having two programme leaders.
- An indication of the number of hours the programme leaders are expected to contribute to this particular programme of study. The

breakdown was requested to provide some indication of the teaching/administration split and provide details of commitments to other IATE programmes.

- An indication of the breakdown of responsibilities for managing and delivering the programme between the two programme leaders.
- Confirmation of the continued involvement of Marrienne Behm and Tina Leslie and in details of the capacity of that involvement (ie visiting lecturer / permanent member of staff).

After the requested documentation was submitted and reviewed by the visitors the following recommendation was made.

- The programme has undergone a major change, but continues to meet the Standards of Education and Training, so no approval visit is required. Upon successful completion, students continue to meet the standards of proficiency.

Visitors' signatures:

Name: Donald Wetherick

Date: 14 January 2008

Name: David Edwards

Date: 13 January 2008

Name: Eileen Thornton

Date: 14 January 2008

SET1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register.

Reason:

SET 2: Programme admissions

Reason:

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; and

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

While the standards have been met, the visitors recommend that IATE seek ways to increase the training input from registered Art Therapists (visual arts modality), and that the quantity and quality of this input continue to be monitored through the HPC annual monitoring process.

Reason: The programme is approved by HPC as an art therapy/art psychotherapy programme and therefore is expected to be directed by a uni-modal art therapy agenda. Whilst the visitors recognise the commitment of IATE to deliver a programme which produces Art Therapists, this is balanced by a multi-modal approach. The level of specific art therapy input to the training from appropriate staff is therefore a key measure of how the programme continues to meet HPC standards for art therapy/art psychotherapy programmes.

SET 4: Curriculum standards

Reason:

SET 5: Practice placements standards

| | | | | | | |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------------|
| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
| 2008-01-14 | a | APV | PPR | Major Change Report - IATE - MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

Reason

SET 6: Assessment standards

Reason:

Visitors' Report Major/Minor Change

Section One: Programme Details

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of education provider | Manchester Metropolitan University |
| Name of awarding body (if different from above) | |
| Programme title(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of Delivery | Full time |
| Name of HPC Visitor(s) considering audit submission | Dr Jenny Morris Prof Karen Harrison |

Please list the documents submitted by the education provider, in support of the major/minor change form:

Current course structure

Proposed course structure

Current proformas for Patient Management 2,3 and 4 units

Proposed proformas for patient management 2,3 and 4 units

Current student's evaluation of patient Management 2 unit with reference to the sequencing of examination

Evidence of support for the proposed changes from the external examiner

Evidence of support for the proposed changes to examination timings in patient management 4 unit for students that will be accepted

Please provide a summary of the proposed changes below.

Three key changes are proposed as follows:

1. Introduction of examination period at the end of the first theme of patient Management 2 and Patient Management 4 units

This proposal aims to spread the assessments through out the unit to prevent bunching, and to also permit early recognition of students who may fail in order to provide them with feedback on their performance.

2. Change in sequencing of themes: musculoskeletal 2 in place of musculoskeletal 1 before practice placements 1 &2, musculoskeletal 1 in place of neurology 2 prior to practice placement 3 and neurology 2 covered after practice placement 3 in place of musculoskeletal 2

This proposal is designed to ensure that student receive the necessary taught input prior to going out on placement. In the existing format for instance they were taught upper quadrant but not lower quadrant, including of course gait and gait analysis. This did not provide the necessary theoretical underpinning to support practice.

3. Change is the examination and assessment structure: students to experience an oral/practical examination in place of a written examination for musculo-skeletal 2, and students to undertake a written examination instead of an oral practical in musculo-skeletal1.

It should be noted that the assessment load does not increase, but the mode of delivery and timing of assessment has been altered.

The changes have been made in response to student feedback, and referred through the formal quality mechanisms of the University. The External examiner to the course has been consulted and supports the changes made.

Section 2: Recommendation of the Visitor(s)

The programme has undergone a major change but continues to meet the Standards of Education and Training. Upon successful completion, students will meet the Standards of Proficiency.

Visitors' signatures:

Name: Professor Karen Harrison

Signature: K L Harrison

Date: 19th November 2007

Name: Doctor Jenny Morris

Signature: J G Morris

Date: 22 November 2007

SET1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register.

Reason:

No change to this SET.

SET 2: Programme admissions

Reason:

No change to this SET.

SET 3: Programme management and resource standards

Reason

The changes make better use of programme resources by improved sequencing of information and better spacing of assessed pieces of work.

SET 4: Curriculum standards

Reason:

The change would enhance the programme by providing better integration of theory and practice, (SET 4.3).

SET 5: Practice placements standards

Reason

The change would enhance the provision by improving the sequencing of information so that there is greater taught theoretical input prior to placement experience, and thus the student is better prepared for placement (SET 5.7).

SET 6: Assessment standards

Reason:

The distribution of assessment over a greater period of time will prevent 'bunching' of assessed work and permit feedback on initial assessment before later assessments are attempted.