

**Health Professions Council
Education and Training Panel – 28 March 2007**

**INSTITUTE OF ARTS IN THERAPY & EDUCATION
(VALIDATED BY LONDON METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY)**

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

On 12/13 July 2006, HPC Visitors undertook an approvals visit to the MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy programme at the Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education (IATE). On 10 October 2006, the Approvals Panel accepted the Visitors' report for the aforementioned programme, including the conditions recommended by the Visitors.

On 31 October 2006, the HPC Executive was informed by the IATE that the named programme leader had reduced her contact time with for the education provider. On 5 December 2006, the Approvals Panel agreed that the Executive should request more information from IATE about the change to the programme leader's contact time, to clarify the extent and implications of the change. The Panel agreed that there could be an impact on how the programme meets the following Standards of Education and Training;

- 3.3. There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced
- 3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.
- 3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

On 5 January 2007, the HPC Executive wrote to IATE and the attached response was received on 26 January 2007.

The programme has still to meet the conditions of approval set at the visit. Documentation in response to the conditions is currently with the visitors for their consideration.

Decision

The Panel is asked to consider all the information and agree on one of the following options -

Accept the visitors' report as approved by the Approvals Panel on 10 October 2006 and not vary the conditions

or

Re-visit the Visitors' report and vary the conditions recommended by the Visitors, in the light of information provided.

or

Request that the visitors consider the recent response from the IATE and provide a recommendation to Panel, in light of the information available to them from the visit

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors' report

Extract from minutes of the Approvals Panel on 5 December 2006

Letter from executive to IATE

Response letter from IATE to executive

Date of paper

16 March 2007

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	<i>tbc</i>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 of 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 practice 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 difference 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 its 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:

The Panel received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.

- 10.2 The Panel noted that on 12-13 July 2006, an approvals visit had been held at the MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy programme at the Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education (IATE). On 10 October 2006, the Approvals Panel had accepted the Visitors' report for the programme, including the conditions recommended by the Visitors.
- 10.3 The Panel noted that, on 31 October 2006, the Executive had been informally notified by the education provider that the named programme leader had reduced her contact time with the education provider. This could have an impact on how the programme met SETs 3.3 and 3.5, although there were currently no conditions against those standards. The Visitors had imposed a condition against SET 3.4, which related to the core programme including at least one appropriately qualified Arts Psychotherapist or Art Therapist.
- 10.4 The Panel agreed that it appeared that the education provider did not fully appreciate the need to notify the HPC of significant changes to the programme. The Panel agreed that the reduction in contact time of the programme leader could adversely affect the programme. The Panel agreed that the Executive should request more information from the education provider about the change to the programme leader's contact time, to clarify the extent and implications of the change. The Panel agreed that this requirement should be imposed and that depending on the response from IATE, an additional condition may need to be included on the Visitors' report. This decision would be made at a future Panel meeting, if and when necessary. In the meantime, it was noted that the Visitors and Panel would require a satisfactory answer to this issue before the programme could be approved.

Date Error! Unknown document property name.	Ver. Error ! Unkn own docu ment prop erty nam e.	Dept/Cmte Error! Unknown document property name.	Doc Type Error! Unknown document property name.	Title Error! Unknown document property name.	Status Error! Unknown document property name. DD: Error! Unknown document property name.	Int. Aud. Error! Unknown document property name. RD: Error! Unknown document property name.
--	--	---	--	--	--	---

Ms Mary Holyoake
Academic Registrar
Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education
2-18 Britannia Row
Islington
London
N1 8PA

05 January 2007

Dear Mary,

I am writing on behalf of the Education and Training Committee regarding the approval of the MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy programme.

At the December meeting of the Approvals Panel (a sub committee of the Education and Training Committee), members discussed the fact that the named programme leader had reduced their contact time with IATE and the potential impact that this could have on how the programme meets the following Standards of Education and Training;

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

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

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

The Approvals Panel decided that the reduced contact time of the Programme Leader could adversely affect the programme and agreed that more information should be requested from IATE. A future Approvals Panel will then consider this response to determine whether the Visitors' report and existing conditions need to be revisited. If necessary, the Panel may agree that an additional condition needs be included and met before the programme can be approved.

The Approvals Panel noted that the existing condition against SET 3.4, which related to the core programme including at least one appropriately qualified Arts Psychotherapist or Art Therapist, remained regardless of this change.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-01-05	a	EDU	COR	Letter to IATE - December 2006 Approvals Panel	Final DD: None	Confidential RD: None

In the likelihood that the programme meets the existing conditions, the Approvals Panel agreed that both the Visitors and Approvals Panel would require a satisfactory answer to this issue before programme approval could be granted.

Please can you provide detailed information about the change to the programme leader's contact time to clarify the extent and implications of the change?

I have enclosed the minutes from the December meeting of the Approvals Panel and relevant extracts from our Standards of education and training guidance (soon to be published in its final version) to provide more background information on this decision and request for additional information.

If you have any queries, please contact me either by email (Abigail.Creighton@hpc-uk.org) or by telephone (020 7840 9769).

Yours sincerely,

Abigail Creighton
Education Manager

Enc.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-01-05	a	EDU	COR	Letter to IATE - December 2006 Approvals Panel	Final DD: None	Confidential RD: None

RECEIVED 26 JAN 2007



The Institute for Arts in Therapy & Education
2-18 Britannia Row, London N18PA
Tel: 020 7704 1022

Health Professions Council
Park House
184 Kennington Park Road
London SE11 4BU

23 January 2007

Dear Abigail

I am writing in response to your letter dated 5 January regarding the information requested as a result of the December meeting of the Approval Panel.

Although Jocelyne Samuels has resigned her role as Principal she has retained overall responsibility as Course Leader for the M.A. in Integrative Arts Psychotherapy. She is the main tutor for this course and there has been no reduction in her contact time with staff or students.

I have no hesitation in confirming that our programme continues to meet the following Standards of Education and Training:

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

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

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

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me either by email: maryholyoake@artspsychotherapy.org or by telephone on 020 7704 1022.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Holyoake
Academic Registrar