

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Art Psychotherapy (International)
Mode of delivery	Full time, one cohort per year Part time, one cohort every two years
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Art therapist
Date of visit	12–13 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At the Committee meeting, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. 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 HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards – programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that 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 also reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Art therapist) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, per year, across full time and part time
First approved intake	September 2010
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	October 2015
Chair	Richard Bent (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Dawn Martin (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Sally Chalmers (Queen Margaret University) Louise Cotton (Queen Margaret University) Mairghread Ellis (Queen Margaret University) Gemma Holloway (Queen Margaret University)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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 HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure it is accurate and reflects the current regulation for art therapists.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noticed a number of inaccuracies. For example the student handbook, page 36, states “On qualifying, students can register with the Health and Care Professions Council”. This is incorrect as students will be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, students will not automatically be registered with the HCPC. Further to this, the visitors noted a number of reference to music therapy. For example the Art Psychotherapy Student Handbook, page 14, states “The MSc Art Psychotherapy programme aims to prepare students for registration as a music therapist...” This is incorrect as successful completion of the programme will provide eligibility to apply for registration as an art therapist, not a music therapist. The visitors noted that the above mentioned information, alongside a number of other noted inaccuracies, could be confusing to a student on the programme and provides incorrect information. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflects the current regulation of art therapists.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the service user and carer involvement in the programme and how they are adequately supported.

Reason: From the documentation and meetings with different stakeholders during the visit, the visitors were unable to determine if the education provider has an effective service user and carer involvement strategy. The visitors met with service users and carers at the visit where they heard that they were benefitting greatly from receiving art therapy on the programme, however, were not currently involved in the programme itself. It was stated that this meeting was the first time they had been asked to assist the programme in some way, other than receiving art therapy, and was also the first time they had met the programme team. Further to this it was noted that the service users and carers did not seem to be well supported in their role for the meeting, in particular there were some gaps in assisting them with accessible documentation as well as travel and directions to the campus. From discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users throughout the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the involvement of service users and carers on the programme to ensure that they are both involved and adequately supported in their role.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the requirements for practice educators to attend practice educator training to ensure that attendance is compulsory.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could see that the education provider facilitates training sessions for practice placement educators. For example the Art Psychotherapy Validation Document, Page 49, states “Practice Educators are invited to attend an annual meeting at the University specific to art psychotherapy, as well as practice education training days provided by QMU”. However in a meeting with practice placement educators, the visitors heard that initial or refresher training was not compulsory, it was always offered by the education provider but was not always undertaken. Further to this, some practice educators stated that they had not attended training at all. The visitors noted that practice educator training is imperative to ensuring students are well supported on placement and the practice educators are up to date on the current curriculum. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the requirements for attendance at the current practice educator training session, or, for other training arrangements to be made. The visitors will also require evidence of how the education provider is monitoring the attendance of practice educators to both initial and refresher training sessions to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider reviewing and updating the information that is provided to practice educators.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and meeting with both practice educators and the programme team the visitors were satisfied that there is regular and effective collaboration and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However the visitors noted that there were some areas of information which were not as clearly communicated to practice educators as others. For example the programme intends to reduce the number of placement days which students are required to attend, however, some practice educators were not currently aware of this. Also, the visitors note that there was some confusion around the clinical responsibility of students whilst on placements, as discussed in the recommendation under SET 5.12 of this report. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisits their current communication strategy with practice placements to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider providing further clarity on the ownership of the clinical supervisor role.

Reason: The visitors note that there was some confusion around the clinical responsibility of students whilst on placements. The practice educators thought this responsibility stayed with them whilst the education provider stated it was with themselves. From conversations at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that students were being well looked after and it was clear that clinical responsibility was being delivered throughout the placement. However, the visitors note that with the current confusion there is a risk that the responsibility of clinical responsibility would be lost and therefore a risk to safe and effective practice whilst on placement. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisits their current communication on the role and ownership of clinical responsibility to ensure that this standards continues to be met.

Julie Allan
Jonathan Isserow
Ian Hughes