Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales, Newport
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wales
Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Music therapy
Date of visit	23 – 24 February 2011

Contents

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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Music therapist' 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 approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2011 the programme was approved. 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 as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether 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 validated the programme. The visit also considered a different programme – MA Art Psychotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist) Susan Hogan (Art therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Jo Smedley (University of Wales, Newport)
Secretary	David Jacob (University of Wales, Newport)
Members of the joint panel	John Roberts (Internal Panel Member) Andy Smith (Internal Panel Member) Mike Simmons (Internal Panel Member) Carol Sibbett (External Panel Member) Claire Tilotson (External 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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒
Supporting commentary and university documentation	☒	☐	☐

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit; there are no external examiners' reports because the programme is new.

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☒
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HPC did not meet with students; the programme was new so there were no current or past students to meet.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 is recommended for 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 programme team must ensure the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including website information) clarify the equivalent musical skill level required for entry to the programme.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit included admissions information which stated the programme entry requirements. This information stated that applicants "without a degree in Music should be proficient to a professional standard with an instrument or voice" (Supporting Commentary, p13). Documentation also included information of the selection and interview procedures which would be provided for those who expressed an interest in applying for the programme. This information was similar to that given in the Supporting Commentary document but did not include the entry requirements for applicants without a degree in music. The visitors understood this as a professional music level was required for entry to the programme for applicants without a music degree. Discussion at the visit with the programme team indicated that a professional music level was not required; applicants would be required to be proficient to the equivalent of a professional standard. The visitors were satisfied with this clarification however felt this to be an important clarification for potential applicants. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to ensure programme documentation, where entry requirements are referred to, clarify the equivalent standard of musicianship needed on first study instruments and harmonic instruments for entry to the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the claim limits for Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for potential applicants and students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies would be in place for this programme. The Student handbook for the programme detailed the policy use and indicated the "limit of what may be claimed is 50% of the credit volume of the programme (in exceptional circumstances two thirds)" (Student Handbook, p17-18). The visitors were concerned that with a transfer onto the programme which claimed up to two thirds of the programme content, it may not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practise could not be fully assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated that the APA policies were the same for all programmes at the education provider, however as long as the limit was no less than 50% or two thirds of the programme content,

then the programme could have this limit waived in favour of a higher limit. The visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require further details of how much, and what, of the content of the programme could be claimed through APA policies to ensure the limits stated are suitable for this particular programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the APA policies for potential applicants and students.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provide details of a programme specific business plan.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider had been planning for this programme for some time; the 'health and creative arts' have been designated as 'priorities for growth' and the School of Education had developed 'two complementary strategies' which have resulted in the creation of the two programmes being approved at the visit (Supporting Commentary November 2010, p4-9). The visitors were aware that at the time of the visit the education provider was undergoing some restructuring which would affect the school the programme was located in. At the time of the visit the programmes were being held in an overarching business plan for the school which was under discussion as a result of the changes. Because of the broad and uncertain plans received, the visitors were unable to fully determine the security of the programme. The visitors require a programme specific 'business plan' which details the financial arrangements for the programme, in terms of resources (physical resources, library resources, equipment, staff resources) and the planned future growth for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors noted that once the programme would be approved there would come a point when all three years of the programme would be running at the same time. The visitors require further information to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules, where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme and indicative numbers of staff in place in relation to the number of students across the three years of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the staff in place delivering the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors require further information regarding the modules and delivering staff to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules and where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must provide clear details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that will be in place for this programme.

Reason: The visit included a tour of the facilities to be used for the programme. It was indicated that the final plans for the teaching rooms and spaces for the programme were yet to be confirmed due to the education provider undergoing some restructuring. The tour took the visiting parties round the facilities as they were being used at the time of the visit and described how aspects of the rooms would be changed depending on how the plans would be finalised. There were discussions around the various possibilities for the rooms including aspects of practice space, confidential storage, recording rooms and studio rooms along with how the rooms would be shared between the three cohorts and other programmes at the school. Because of the uncertainties around the final plans for the teaching spaces for the programme the visitors require specific details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that are planned to be put in place for this programme.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the clinical setting, in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear how the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and the student when considering there were various people, with differing roles and remits, working in liaison connected to the students (group supervisor, a clinical supervisor, a clinical tutor and a personal tutor).

 It was unclear who would hold professional responsibility for assessing the students' clinical practice bearing in mind that there is the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being an HPC registered music therapist. Additionally the lines of communication and responsibility for when there are conflicting views over students' performance between the placement, the education provider and the student were unclear.

During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the academic and clinical supervisors' assessments of the students' performance and practise would be looked at.

After discussion, the visitors were satisfied the programme team had considered the problems and had made arrangements for a third person to become involved. The visitors were concerned however with how exactly the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and what the roles and remits of each person were. The visitors were concerned how assessment at the education provider and the placement would be linked together and how procedures for any disagreements between the two supervisors would be managed. The visitors felt that there was also the possibility that a student may disagree with one or both of the assessment results and therefore there would need to be a way for their views to be taken into account.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the placement setting in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad. It was clear that the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The visitors, therefore, could not determine how the learning outcomes showed that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.2, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to more clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the programme reflects the specific skills and knowledge bases of the profession.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included module specifications which used learning outcomes that were very broad. The visitors were not able to determine how the programme intended to fully reflect different skills and knowledge bases in the curriculum. In particular, the visitors were concerned with where in the programme aspects of diversity and equality, and social, political and cultural perspectives within the therapeutic relationship are included in the curriculum. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence of where in the modules these specific aspects of diversity and equality, and social, political and cultural perspectives within the therapeutic relationship are being taught and assessed.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of how they plan to manage the third year placement experience and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the placements which were to run in the second and third years. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules. The visitors considered the final placement to be crucial for assuring the student understands fully the standards of proficiency and to be the last chance for the programme team to assess the students understanding of placement and their fitness to practise. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team could assure this with the third year placement for two reasons. Firstly, the duration of the third year placement was stated to be, "15 weeks Clinical practice 2 days per week" (Module Specifications, p50) and as such shorter in duration than the second year placement. The visitors considered this to possibly be too short to fully complete an assessment, analysis and treatment of a service user. Secondly, the visitors could not easily determine the standards of proficiency to be assessed at the placement because the learning outcomes in the module specifications were very broad. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team planned to manage the third year placement and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme team must ensure that a modality specific registered person ensures the achievement of the learning outcomes and manages the assessment of the students' clinical placements. The programme team must ensure that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students' clinical practice.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear who held professional responsibility for assessing the students' clinical practice bearing in mind that there was the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being a modality specific HPC Registrant. During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the

progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the assessments of the students' clinical performance and practise would be looked at. From discussion, the visitors understood that, if the clinical supervisor was not HPC Registered under the specific modality, then the academic supervisor would be, however the academic supervisor would have no direct contact with the clinical supervisor, contact would occur through the third person point of contact at the education provider. After this discussion the visitors were concerned how professional responsibility for the delivery of learning outcomes assessment of the students' clinical practice would be held by an HPC Registered modality specific professional when there was no direct link between the two supervisors. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure that a modality specific registered person manages the students' achievements of the learning outcomes and assessment of the students' clinical placements and that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students' clinical practice.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the assessment of learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the assessment of the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad and did not provide assessment criteria for summative assessments. It was clear the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The student handbook indicated a guidance sheet for each summative assessment would be provided for students which would give details of each assessment including "f) the learning outcomes to be assessed" (Student Handbook November 2010, p18-19). The guidance sheets were not provided as part of the documentation prior to the visit.

Due to the broad learning outcomes the visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes show that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors felt the guidance sheets would be valuable tools for students especially if they were designed to link the assessment of the learning outcomes to the standards of proficiency. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the module specifications and provide details of the assessments to more clearly demonstrate how the

assessments of the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and learning outcomes are in line with the standards of proficiency to ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included module specifications and a clinical placement handbook for use by all parties involved in placement. The clinical handbook included copies of all forms that the student and the clinical supervisor would fill in to track and comment on progress through the placement and of meeting the learning outcomes. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules.

From looking at the documentation, the visitors were concerned that it would be difficult for the programme team to maintain a consistent standard of assessment of placements and be able to ensure fitness to practise for three reasons. Firstly, the learning outcomes described in the module specifications were broad and could not be seen to directly relate to standards of proficiency. Secondly, the placement forms for the supervisor and the student to fill in and track progression had broad areas for focus. Thirdly the visitors had noted it could be possible for the clinical supervisor working with the student at the placement to not be HPC registered under the specific modality. The visitors felt that this could mean that they would not be fully aware of the required HPC standards of proficiency. The combined effect of these three points would be that assessment of practise at the placement could not easily be seen to link to learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency and so fitness to practise may not be fully assured. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.1 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes.

In light of this, the visitors were concerned with how the programme team could ensure that assessments against the learning outcomes would be conducted consistently across placements and the standards of proficiency could be linked to the learning outcomes to ensure fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and are in line with the profession specific standards of proficiency (such as by using explicit reference to the standards of proficiency).

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11 policies would be in place for this programme. The regulations detailed the marking scales and indicated that students "must, in addition to achieving a minimum average grade of D5 for a module, achieve at least an E4 in all elements in order to achieve credit" (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The regulations additionally stated that "Grade E4 shall be a marginal fail grade" (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The visitors were concerned that if a student should receive a grade of E4 in any one, or in all, aspects of the programme, they might not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practice could not be assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Assessment and Award Regulations were the same for all education provider programmes, however, as long as the minimum for a pass mark was no less than the regulations stated, the programme could have this minimum waived in favour of a higher minimum. The visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the marking scale details for students.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The programme team must revise the module specifications for this programme to correct the inaccuracies of the stated pre-requisite modules required for progression onto particular modules.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a Module Specification document. The modules detailed were for this programme and also an MA Art Psychotherapy which was being reviewed at this visit. There were some inaccuracies in the pre-requisite modules detailed for each module which made it difficult for the visitors to see where the programmes were being taught conjointly and where they were being taught on their own. For example, 'Theory and Practice of Music Therapy 2' (p24) has both 'Theory and practice of Music Therapy 1' and 'Theory and Practice of Art Psychotherapy 1' as pre-requisite modules although the module is music therapy specific. The visitors require the programme team to revise the module specification documents to ensure corrections are made to the pre-requisites for each module.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the reading lists for the programme to ensure that they reference current and up to date material.

Reason: From a review of the indicative reading lists the visitors noticed a number of resources listed within these that were not the most recent versions of the texts or that appeared dated. The visitors also noticed that the texts held by the library also included a number of books that again were not the most recent versions or that appeared dated. The visitors were satisfied this standard was met and realised that once the programme is running the funding for resources such as these will be in place and may increase as the programme grows. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team use external sources (professional bodies or other education provider programmes) to compare materials and reading lists to help maintain their own references and library stock in the future.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the balance of the core modality specific content against the infant observation content of the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors were aware that a programme such as this would not usually contain so much infant observation within the curriculum. While the visitors saw the valuable opportunities this will offer students on the music therapy programme they also saw that the time spent on infant observation could be spent focussing the students towards more modality specific content. The visitors suggest that once the programme is running the programme team continue to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum and make changes where necessary. The visitors also wish the programme team to note that if they do make changes to the curriculum once the programme is running that they will need to inform the HPC of this.

<div align="right">
Pauline Etkin
Jennifer French
Susan Hogan
</div>