

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<b>Programme name</b>	MA Dramatherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Dramatherapy
<b>Date of visit</b>	4 November 2009

## Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence.....	3
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions .....	6
Recommendations .....	13

## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'dramatherapist' 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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010. At the Committee meeting on 20 May 2010, 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 HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Dianne Gammage (Dramatherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	9 January 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Jeff Braham (University of Derby)
Secretary	Holly Reid (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Heather Kemp (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review a programme specification or external examiner reports prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit them.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not meet with the senior managers, placement providers or students as the major change did not affect placements, and did not rely on the senior management team or students so there was no requirement to meet with them.

The HPC did not see the facilities as the nature of the major change did not affect learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation, so there was no requirement to visit them.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing 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 recommendation 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 ongoing 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 advertising materials for the programme (including website information) and update them to accurately reflect the amendments made to the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that will replace this and that the visitors were reviewing. From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the information supplied to applicants to the programme. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the documentation supplied or advertising materials for the programme. The visitors were therefore concerned that applicants would not have sufficient information to be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, particularly in relation to the modules that they would be undertaking, and felt that the materials must be updated. The programme team must also ensure that references to the art therapy programme should be removed from the programme documentation.

### **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 review the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including website information) to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, HPC ‘approves’ educational programmes; we do not ‘accredit’ programmes. It should also be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme but rather to ‘eligibility to apply for HPC registration’ and that anyone who wishes to practise using the title ‘dramatherapist’ must be on the HPC register. Finally, the terms ‘state registered’ and ‘licence to practice’ are no longer used by the professions we regulate and should not be incorporated into any materials relating to an HPC approved programme.

In order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion for students on the programme the programme documentation must be amended.

## **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including website information) and update them to accurately reflect the selection and entry requirements for the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that auditions were part of the selection and entry criteria for applicants to the programme. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the advertising materials and there was no clear indication of the criteria or procedure in place for these auditions in the programme documentation. The visitors were concerned that people interested in applying to the programme would not have sufficient information about the entry criteria; therefore the materials must be updated.

## **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the process used to obtain consent in order to ensure this covers all situations appropriate to the programme, and to demonstrate this information is clearly articulated to students.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the full process of obtaining student consent for participation in programme activities was unclear. Following discussions with the programme team and a review of the consent form in use the visitors noted that the current process did not include obtaining written consent from students regarding the sharing of personal material. The visitors require further evidence that obtaining this consent is part of this system, and that the communication of this information to students makes this process clear.

## **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:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly reflect how the standards of proficiency listed below in the area of 2b.1 are addressed and delivered within the programme, with particular emphasis on the Independent Scholarship module:

- be able to use research, reasoning and problem-solving skills to determine appropriate actions
- be able to engage in evidence-based practice, evaluate practice systematically and participate in audit procedures
- be able to evaluate research and other evidence to inform their own practice

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how the standards of proficiency listed above are addressed in the

programme to ensure that graduates from the programme would meet these standards.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, it was not apparent where within the programme students would be required to formulate a research proposal linked to a client group. Information such as this needs to be clear from the programme documentation and linked in with the learning outcomes for specific modules.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students and members of the programme team would not have all the information required on the programme and that the assessment processes would not be clear and standardised for all involved. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how the delivery and learning outcomes ensure this standard is being met in order to ensure that those who complete the programme successfully attain all of the required standards of proficiency.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how theory and practice is integrated in the programme.

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how theory and practice were integrated in the programme.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, it was not apparent from the documentation for this module that the students' clinical experience would inform the creation of the body of work. This information needs to be clear in the programme documentation.



The visitors were concerned that students would not have all the information required on the module and require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates the link between theory and practice clearly to ensure that this standard is being met.

#### **4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate how evidence based practice is developed by students within the programme.

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how evidence based practice is addressed in the programme.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, it was not apparent where within the programme students would be required to formulate a research proposal linked to a client group. This information needs to be clear in the programme documentation and linked in with the learning outcomes for specific modules.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students would not have all the information required on the module. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how this standard is being met.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the teaching and learning approach in the Independent Scholarship module.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that

students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, it was not apparent from the programme handbook that there would be negotiation between students and the programme team around the format and content of the body of work referred to in one learning outcome for this module. This information needs to be clear in the programme documentation and there needs to be an indication of the range of possible forms the body of work might take.

The visitors were concerned that students would not have all the information required on the module. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how the negotiation of the relevant learning outcome on this module works in practice and how this process is adjusted in relation to each student involved.

### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly reflect how the standards of proficiency listed below in the area of 2b.1 are addressed and assessed within the programme, with particular emphasis on the Independent Scholarship module:

- be able to use research, reasoning and problem-solving skills to determine appropriate actions
- be able to engage in evidence-based practice, evaluate practice systematically and participate in audit procedures
- be able to evaluate research and other evidence to inform their own practice

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how the standards of proficiency listed above are assessed in the programme to ensure that graduates from the programme would meet these standards.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, it was not apparent where within the programme students would be required to formulate a research proposal linked to a client

group. This information needs to be clear in the programme documentation and linked in with the learning outcomes for specific modules.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students and members of the programme team would not have all the information required on the programme, and that the assessment processes would not be clear and have key elements of these standardised for all involved. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how the learning outcomes and assessments ensure this standard is being met so that those who complete the programme successfully attain all of the required standards of proficiency. They also require evidence that the assessment criteria for the Independent Scholarship module assessments are clearly articulated in order to ensure that all students and all assessors on the programme follow the same process.

## **6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the assessment processes and criteria in the Independent Scholarship module.

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how the Independent Scholarship module was assessed.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, the process behind each of the assessments within this module and the fact that these assessments were tailored to each student and would utilise different forms of evidence was not apparent. This information needs to be clear in the programme documentation and linked in with the learning outcomes for specific modules.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students and members of the programme team would not have all the information required on the programme, and that the assessment processes would not be clear and have key elements of these standardised for all involved. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how the learning outcomes and assessments ensure this standard is being met. They also require evidence that the assessment process and criteria for the Independent Scholarship module

assessments are clearly articulated in order to ensure that all students and all assessors on the programme follow an equivalent, transparent and equitable process.

### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how the assessment processes and criteria in the Independent Scholarship module ensure fitness to practice.

**Reason:** From reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not fully identify how the Independent Scholarship module was assessed.

The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the current format of the programme delivered by the education provider and not the format of the programme that would replace this and that the visitors were reviewing.

From discussions with the programme team clarification was obtained regarding the amendments to the programme, particularly in relation to the Independent Scholarship module in terms of the delivery, content and the assessments that students would undergo. However, the visitors could not see this information reflected in the programme handbook and the Independent Scholarship module handbook as the former had not been updated, nor the latter received, at the time of the visit. In particular, the process behind each of the assessments within this module and the fact that these assessments were tailored to each student and would utilise different forms of evidence was not apparent. Further clarification given by the programme team around the performance element of the body of work in this module needs to be clearly communicated within the programme documentation.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students and members of the programme team would not have all the information required on the programme, and that the assessment processes would not be clear and have key elements of these standardised for all involved. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation (particularly the module descriptor and handbook) articulates clearly how the learning outcomes and assessments ensure this standard is being met. They also require evidence that the assessment process and criteria for the Independent Scholarship module assessments are clearly articulated in order to ensure that all students and all assessors on the programme follow an equivalent, transparent and equitable process.

## Recommendations

### **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the performance assessment element of the body of work in the Independent Scholarship module once the module has been delivered.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team about the performance element of the Independent Scholarship module it was evident to the visitors that the design of the module was both innovative and appropriate. From these discussions and information given at the visit of how the assessment of this would work in practice the visitors felt that the assessment process should be further reviewed once the module has been delivered to students. The visitors felt that this review would be useful given the nature of the assessment methodology, to ensure that the process remained appropriate.

Dianne Gammage  
John Strange