

Education and Training Panel – 10 June 2008

MA Dramatherapy, Iron Mill Institute

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

At the last meeting of the Education and Training Panel, the Panel considered the visitors' report from the approval visit to the MA Dramatherapy programme at Iron Mill Institute alongside the representations received from the education provider. The Panel decided that they wished to seek the professional view of the Arts Therapist member of the Education and Training Committee, before making a final decision on whether to accept the visitors report, or accept it and vary the conditions. The professional view has now been received.

Decision

The panel is asked to –

accept the visitors' report for the above named programme, including the conditions recommended by the visitors.

Or

review the visitors' report for the above named programme, and vary the conditions recommended by the visitors, in the light of information included in the education provider's representations and the professional view of the Arts Therapist member of the Education and Training Committee.

Background information

The visit to the MA Dramatherapy programme at Iron Mill Institute was held on the 5 and 6 March 2008. The outcome of the visit was a recommendation by the visitors that the programme should be approved, subject to a number of conditions.

The visitors' report was sent to the Iron Mill Institute and after a 28 day period the Iron Mill Institute submitted representations. These representations were submitted in two stages.

At the Education and Training Panel meeting on 29 May 2008, the Panel decided that the conditions against SETs 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 should remain. However, they deferred making a decision on the condition against SET 6.4.

The Panel agreed that the condition against SET 6.4 and accompanying reason were not clear in the visitors report and appreciated the difficulty that the education provider had in establishing how and why the standard was not met. The Panel agreed that the documentation detailing the assessment criteria needed to be scrutinised before a decision could be made on the appropriateness of the condition.

The Panel decided that professional advice was necessary from the Arts Therapist member of the Education and Training Committee. They agreed that this member would consider the relevant documentation which had been available to the visitors and then report back to the next meeting of the Education and Training Panel.

The professional view of the Arts Therapist member of the Education and Training Committee was submitted to the Executive on 9 June 2008. In summary, the member has made a recommendation that the condition against SET 6.4 be changed to a recommendation. They are satisfied that the criteria are adequate, but agreed that improvements could be made.

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

- 1) Visitors' report
- 2) Observations from Iron Mill Institute

Date of paper

9 June 2008

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-11-02	a	EDU	PPR	Iron Mills Institute - follow up paper	Final	Public
					DD: None	RD: None

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Iron Mill Institute (Validated by the University of Worcester)
Programme name	MA in Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapy
Relevant modality	Dramatherapy
Date of visit	5 and 6 March 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	10
Commendations.....	10

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 13 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 25 April to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Thursday 29 May 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 6 May 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Thursday 3 July 2008.

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 University of Worcester validated the programme. The University of Worcester and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the University of Worcester. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. 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 University of Worcester, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Dr Susan Hogan (Art Therapist) Dr Bruce Bayley (Dramatherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Abigail Creighton and Miss Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	18 students
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2008
Chair	Mr Joe Hodgson (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Ms Deborah Hodson (University of Worcester)
Members of the joint panel	Ms Linda Rolfe (External Panel Member) Mr David Powley (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' report from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not meet with student as 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 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 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 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 have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that references to the roles and requirements of the professional body and the regulatory body are accurate and up-to-date.

Reason: The documentation currently fails to distinguish the different roles and requirements of the regulatory and professional bodies. For example, in the additional course requirements in the programme specification, there are numerical values quoted as HPC requirements and these are actually requirements of BADth (British Association of Dramatherapists), not HPC.

The documentation does not consistently tell students about the link between completing the programme and eligibility to register with the HPC. For example, the wording in the letters of introduction could be misleading as all students would need to apply to register with HPC after they have completed their programme. You should make sure that your documents clearly tell students that completing the programme means they are “eligible to apply for registration with HPC”. There is no guarantee that they will be able to register with the HPC and use the protected title. It is important that the information is updated so that applicants have the correct information they require to take up a place on the programme.

2.2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must review the admissions procedures to ensure that criminal convictions checks have been completed by the point of registration onto the programme.

Reason: The current admission procedures require the criminal convictions checks to be completed during the first term and before students go onto placements. The visitors felt that the current timing was too late and that unidentified criminal convictions could affect students’ participation in training groups, personal development groups and supervision groups and in addition might affect their ability to negotiate their first placement.

2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must review the admissions procedures to ensure that occupational health clearance been completed by the point of registration on to the programme.

Reason: The current admission procedures require the occupational health clearance to be completed during the first term and before students go onto

placements. The visitors felt that the current timing was too late and that unidentified health issues could affect students' participation in training groups, personal development groups and supervision groups and in addition might affect their ability to negotiate their first placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide written confirmation that the University of Worcester has successfully validated the programme.

Reason: The visitors received a partnership agreement during the visit between the University of Worcester and the Iron Mill Institute. They heard the discussions between the two bodies and are aware that the University of Worcester is intending to approve the programme subject to conditions. The visitors are confident that progress will be made, in terms of meeting the conditions set by the University of Worcester's validation panel; however there is no guarantee of validation until all the conditions will be met. The visitors felt that final written confirmation of the validation was needed to assure the security of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must recruit an additional clinical process supervisor to the programme team.

Reason: The education provider intends to recruit a cohort of up to 18 students. There is currently enough qualified and experienced staff to deliver two clinical process supervision groups which would mean 9 students in each group. The visitors felt that smaller student numbers in each group were needed to ensure effective delivery. In the meeting with the programme team, the programme team explained that they wish to have a maximum of 8 students in each group and intended to recruit an additional clinical process supervisor so they can recruit 18 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 education provider must provide evidence that the work rooms at the X-centre are suitable for confidential work.

Reason: During the tour of facilities, the visitors saw the work rooms which will be used for supervision groups, training groups and personal development groups. The space currently has open exits and glass walls which are not suitable for the confidential teaching and learning activities. The visitors and the programme team discussed options of using screens, furniture and signage to close off spaces. Evidence is required to show that the work rooms are modified for confidential work.

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: The programme team must provide evidence that core texts and internet access are available on site at the X-Centre.

Reason: The visitors saw the list of textbooks and journals due to be ordered, the lists of textbooks and journals currently available and saw the space of the future library. They received confirmation from the senior team that the finances are in place to buy the textbooks and journals and create the library space. However, they explained that they wished to wait until the validation event, until making the final commitment to purchase the new textbooks and journals.

Whilst the visitors were encouraged by the progress and plans to date, they wished to receive confirmation that all the text books and journals (already identified in the booklet provided during the senior team meeting) were on-site at the X-Centre and accessible to students. In addition, they wished to receive confirmation that the on-line resources available through the University of Worcester virtual learning environment were accessible at the X-Centre, following successful validation.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the information which details the number, duration and range of placements, so that it is clear how students gain access to a wide range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments.

Reason: It was unclear from the documentation how students access a range of groups and individual placements and a variety of placement experiences (e.g. schools settings, hospital settings, prison settings). During the meeting with the placement providers it was clarified that groups and process supervision allowed students to learn from other students' placement experiences and one module included a short compulsory prison and school placement.

The placement tutors have a role in ensuring that students see a range of clients groups. The visitors felt that it was important this information is included in the documentation so that students and future programme team members can see what is expected of them and that practice is consistent.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the system used for approving and monitoring all placements and must articulate it in the documentation.

Reason: The documentation was not clear about the system used for approving and monitoring all placements. The meeting with the placements providers clarified this but the visitors felt that this must be articulated in the documentation so that students and future programme team members can see what systems are used.

For example, the documentation should be updated in order to include; policies and processes for approving placements; systems for ongoing monitoring and assessing placements; how feedback from students is collected, analysed and acted on; how the education provider gains feedback from practice placement educators and co-ordinators, and make sure that channels of communication are clear; how the education provider feeds this information back into their processes; and how the education provider deals with placements where difficulties arise.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Condition: The education provider must review the assessment criteria in order to demonstrate a clear link between each criterion and the achievement of the HPC standards of proficiency.

Reason: Although the assessment criteria for written assignments were clear, the assessment criteria for continuous assessment (used to assess the ability to use supervision effectively) and clinical practice placements was less clear. The criteria are currently very broad and because of this it is not explicit how each criterion contributes to the achievement of the standards of proficiency. The visitors need to make sure that a student has been assessed in each of the standards of proficiency, so they can practice their profession safely and effectively. As there is no clear link between the criteria used in continuous and clinical assessment and the individual standards of proficiency, the visitors currently do not have this assurance. The education provider's review of the assessment criteria could include the rewording of specific criterion, the insertion of additional criteria or the referencing of the standards of proficiency to the criterion.

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what the elements are that underpin each assessment criteria.

Reason: The assessment criteria used for continuous assessment (used to assess the ability to use supervision effectively), dramatic presentation and performance and clinical practice placements is currently very broad. The visitors were concerned that without more explicit guidance these broad criteria could be interpreted subjectively. They felt further clarification about what underpins each criteria would assure them that objective and consistent criteria would be applied when assessing students.

Recommendations

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing guidelines for the practice placements mentors' role.

Reason: The information the placement mentors received about their role is limited, and there is no annual refresher training organised by the education provider. As the placement mentors do not have a significant role in the assessment of students on placement and those met during the meeting were content with the information they received, the visitors did not wish to insist on any mandatory training. Instead, the visitors felt that the development of guidelines for placement mentors could help make their role clearer to them.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme,

Commendation: The organic and holistic environment in which the programme has been placed and the optimism and energy that informs the positive potential of this programme.

Reason: The education provider delivers the programme within an environment that has an established tradition of arts therapy and creative arts activities on site. It has active links with creative and therapeutic arts projects in Europe and abroad via the on-going work and links of the Director of the education provider. The X-Centre provides the programme with a fertile and active holistic approach to creative arts and community life linking this actively to training and development initiatives.

Commendation: The clear progression of students from year to year and the achievement of the awards entitled Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma and MA.

Reason: The stages of achievement within each year are clearly titled and valued, which is useful for students who receive a Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma. The visitors felt that the approach employed in this programme should be commended as it values each stage of learning in its own right by giving each stage a clear place in the development of the MA. It demonstrates a caring and creative way of valuing the learning of each student at each stage of the programme, giving a sense of worth to each developmental level of the programme, regardless of whether or not the student continues past the Postgraduate Certificate level or Postgraduate Diploma level.

Dr Susan Hogan
Dr Bruce Bayley

Details of correspondence between the HPC Executive Officers, the visitors (Susan Hogan and Bruce Bayley) and The Iron Mill Institute, Exeter following the sending of the visitors' report to the Education provider on 28 March 2008 concerning the condition 6.4.

Email sent by Sarah Scoble, The Iron Mill Institute, Exeter to Elisa Simeoni, Education Officer, on 4 April 2008.

Dear Elisa,

Good to talk with you yesterday.

This is to confirm that it is 6.4 of the visitors' report, which still baffles me. It would be helpful to have further explanation as to exactly what is required.

Year on year the programme has been commended by the external Examiner for the rigour of its assessment procedures.

e.g. From the two most recent reports from the External Examiner: 2005/2006 "The internal assessment is rigorous and well managed. Commendation must go to the internal assessors, not only for the thoroughness of the marking in summative assessment tasks, but also the formative assessments."

2006/2007 "The overall attention to the assessment, both administratively and in the quality of feedback was exemplary. The feedback is both robust and specific, referring to both the criteria and in some cases broader questions that the work provoked."

I hope that I am not sounding defensive! I am simply unsure what more the visitors would like to see by way of assessment procedures.

Current procedure for internal marking and moderating: Students are provided with a handout which describes the aims, requirements and assessment procedures of each assignment as it occurs within the course. As I explained at the visit, the assessment-specific criteria sheets used by the members of the marking team to focus them on the key areas of each assessment and to guide them in establishing the appropriate marking band of Fail through to Distinction. The detailed grade Classification and Marking Criteria then guide the assessor in establishing the student's specific % mark in a consistent and objective manner. The assessors work separately in the first instance and then meet to discuss their marks, to moderate and to agree the final marks to be awarded.

I look forward to receiving further guidance regarding this condition.

All good wishes, Sarah

Email sent by Elisa Simeoni on 8 April 2008 to the two HPC visitors, Susan Hogan and Bruce Bayley.

Hello Susan and Bruce,

I hope you are both well.

Following the sending of the visitors' report to the education provider, Sarah Scoble, the programme leader of the MA in Dramatherapy at the Iron Mill Institute in Exeter, would like to have more information about the condition 6.4. Please see her email below.

Please could you get back to me with further explanation and clarification about what you expect them to do concerning this condition 6.4 in order I can give her more information? Could you please liaise first together to make sure about what you are expecting and then get back to me by this Friday (11 April) at the latest?

If the education provider considers that this condition is not justified, they might make a representation about this.

The condition 6.4 of the visitors' report is the following:

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition: *The education provider must clarify what the elements are that underpin each assessment criteria.*

Reason: *The assessment criteria used for continuous assessment (used to assess the ability to use supervision effectively), dramatic presentation and performance and clinical practice placements is currently very broad. The visitors were concerned that without more explicit guidance these broad criteria could be interpreted subjectively. They felt further clarification about what underpins each criteria would assure them that objective and consistent criteria would be applied when assessing students.*

I am also attaching the visitors' report you have agreed on to this email.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Elisa

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2008-05-19	a	EDU	APV	Details of correspondence - The Iron Mill Institute, Exeter - Condition 6.4	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Because the two visitors didn't agree on the response that should be given to the education provider, and as Elisa Simeoni was out of the office, Osama Ammar, Education manager, got back to visitors on 16 April 2008 for further clarification.

Dear Bruce and Susan,

Thanks for your email and phone call. Apologies for continuing the negotiation around this area, but I feel Sarah will need to be guided by us to be able to understand specifically what is required of her. I just wanted to restate where it looks like we are in terms of providing details to Sarah.

Firstly, we are not able to provide another institution's methodology as an answer to Sarah's questions as it implies that it may be the only solution and that we are being prescriptive in our approach. Therefore, we need to find a way to this without an example.

Having discussed the matter with Bruce, it appears to be the case that the conditions placed on SETs 6.1 and 6.4 are essentially tackling the same area but with different specific approaches. The condition under SET 6.1 indicates that the assessment criteria in certain areas does not relate clearly to demonstrating fitness to practice. The condition under SET 6.4 indicates that the assessment criteria in certain areas does not illustrate a defined and objective framework within which to allocate marks / grades.

It appears that what we need to do is communicate clearly to Sarah the areas in which you feel the assessment criteria are not meeting these two standards. I believe from the reasons for both conditions that we are looking mainly in the continuous assessment and assessment related to clinical placement, but I also note that for the condition in relation to SET 6.4 an additional specific area is dramatic presentation and performance.

Perhaps it would be useful to agree what the minimum amount of work required to meet these conditions would be? Bruce has indicated that to meet SET 6.1 there would need to be an articulation of the relationship between assessment criteria and standards of proficiency. Would this also meet the condition under SET 6.4 by underpinning the assessment criteria with the objective framework of the SOPs? If this is the case, we can get two standards met by the same exercise.

If this is the case, we can state to Sarah that **the two conditions require her to revisit the assessment criteria in the areas above (ie not written assignments which appear to have much more robust criteria) and ensure that they are linked to the standards of proficiency. This exercise will ensure that the assessments are demonstrably governed by a design that not only assures fitness to practice but is also objective in its methodology.**

I'm sure you can understand that coming at it from my viewpoint is challenging so please forgive me if this is gross over-simplification. I hope at least it works as the starting point from which to send a few brief sentences to Sarah to put her on the right track.

Regards

Osama

Following visitors' responses, this email has been sent to the education provider on 17 April 2008 in order to clarify, regarding their request, the condition 6.4. A document named "Personal skills in portrait format" was attached to this email (please see appendix 2).

Dear Sarah,

Elisa has asked me to move forward your request for clarification about one of the conditions whilst she has been away on a visit. There has been some discussion from the visitors and the following is the clarification that has been given. Elisa will be back in the office on Monday, so if you have any questions she will be able to deal with them then.

"This was the issue about lack of clarity around how assessments are made. This works on three levels. Good practice suggests assessments are benchmarked (attached is an example of benchmarking, which should not be considered to be a prescriptive requirement) then there should be further descriptors which help elaborate the content of the benchmarking aimed towards enhancing their clarity. Thirdly, this should be clearly linked to the assessment criteria.

The impression from the documentation was that assessment is rather ad hoc and subjective at present and that there was a need to develop published objective criteria to enable greater parity of assessment and lessen the possibility of student grievance procedures."

Regards

Osama

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2008-05-19	a	EDU	APV	Details of correspondence - The Iron Mill Institute, Exeter - Condition 6.4	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Part One: Personal Skills

	Very Poor F / 5	Unsatisfactory Fm / 8	Satisfactory D / 11	Good C / 13	Very Good B / 16	Excellent A / 22	Half Way	Final Mark
Integrate Feedback	The student is unable to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor despite significant support.	The student is sometimes able to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor with support.	The student is able to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor with support.	The student is able to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor with minimal support.	The student is very good in their ability to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor.	The student is excellent in their ability to accept guidance and direction and respond to feedback from clients, the team, and supervisor.		
Dependability	The student is unable to display appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks without significant guidance.	The student is sometimes able to display appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks with guidance.	The student is able to display appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks with guidance.	The student is able to display appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks with minimal guidance.	The student generally shows appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks.	The student always shows appropriate involvement without prompting; punctual arrival; and assumption of responsibility for agreed tasks.		
Appear Professional	The student is unable to dress appropriately for work and appear alert and interested without significant guidance	The student sometimes dresses appropriately for work and appears alert and interested with guidance	The student dresses appropriately for work and appears alert and interested with guidance	The student dresses appropriately for work and appears alert and interested with minimal guidance	The student generally dresses appropriately for work and appears alert and interested	The student is always dressed appropriately for work and appears alert and interested		
Behave Professionally	The student is unable to adhere to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adhere to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrate with the multidisciplinary team; liaise with appropriate personal; have appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrate professional ethics concerning confidentiality without significant guidance.	The student sometimes adheres to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adheres to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrates with the multidisciplinary team; liaises with appropriate personal; has appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrates professional ethics concerning confidentiality with guidance.	The student adheres to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adheres to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrates with the multidisciplinary team; liaises with appropriate personal; has appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrates professional ethics concerning confidentiality with guidance.	The student adheres to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adheres to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrates with the multidisciplinary team; liaises with appropriate personal; has appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrates professional ethics concerning confidentiality with minimal guidance.	The student is very competent in adhering to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adheres to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrates with the multidisciplinary team; liaises with appropriate personal; has appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrates professional ethics concerning confidentiality.	The student is excellent and highly reflective in adhering to the code of conduct for Art Therapists; adheres to the boundaries and regulations of the organisation; integrates with the multidisciplinary team; liaises with appropriate personal; has appropriate relationships with clients and staff; and demonstrates professional ethics concerning confidentiality.		
Respond Suitably to Pressure	The student is unable to be mature in coping with his or her own process; see problems in perspective and cope with demanding clients in stressful situations without significant guidance.	The student can sometimes be mature in coping with his or her own process; see problems in perspective and cope with demanding clients in stressful situations with guidance.	The student is mature in coping with his or her own process; able to see problems in perspective and able to cope with demanding clients in stressful situations with guidance.	The student is mature in coping with his or her own process; able to see problems in perspective and able to cope with demanding clients in stressful situations with minimal guidance.	The student is very good in demonstrating mature in coping with his or her own process; able to see problems in perspective and able to cope with demanding clients in stressful situations.	The student is excellent in demonstrating maturity in coping with his or her own process; able to see problems in perspective and able to cope with demanding clients in stressful situations.		
Demonstrate Self awareness	The student is unable to self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately without significant guidance	The student can sometimes self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately with guidance	The student can self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately with guidance	The student can self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately with minimal guidance	The student is very good in their ability to self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately	The student is excellent in their ability to self reflect in an open and honest way; and respond to constructive criticism appropriately		
Total								

MA IN DRAMATHERAPY

University of Worcester (validated, subject to conditions, March 2008)

OBSERVATIONS:

This attachment is to set out observations on three conditions set by the Visitors at the approval meeting for the above programme, on 5th and 6th March 2008.

Condition 6.4:

The staff team has responded to this condition by fine-tuning and making a number of changes to their assessment procedures. However, we should like to make a formal 'observation' on this condition, in case the Visitors were to consider that the staff team has not met this condition satisfactorily.

The amendments and an explanation are outlined in the *Response to the Health Professions Council Visitors' Report of the meetings held on 5th and 6th March 2008 at the Iron Mill Institute, Exeter, to approve the MA in Dramatherapy provided by the Iron Mill Institute and to gain validation by the University of Worcester, of 5th May 2008.*

Conditions 2.2.2 and 2.2.3:

These conditions concern CRB (2.2.2) and Occupational Health (2.2.3) clearance. Documents and procedures have been changed in accordance with the conditions set, requiring that criminal conviction checks and occupational health clearance are completed by the point of registration onto the programme.

However, the staff team considers it appropriate to make an 'observation' on these conditions and requests that the HPC Education and Training Committee deliberates the consequences of the changes made:

Introductory statement:

Prior to the conditions being set, the programme operated a three-stage procedure as follows:

1. On applying for a place on the course, candidates were required to declare, in writing, any disabilities or special needs and any support required. They were also required to declare any relevant criminal convictions.
2. At interview, students were asked to declare if they had any health issues which they considered would prevent them from undertaking the education programme. They were also required to sign a form to declare any criminal convictions and cautions they had received, which might debar them from clinical placement practice in NHS or Social Services or in Education or, in the longer term refuse them entry to the prospective Health Council Register - or to declare that they had not received any criminal convictions or cautions, as outlined above, nor were under investigation for any such offence. This form was countersigned by the interviewer.
3. During induction at the start of the programme (September), procedures for CRB and Occupational Health checks were explained to students, who in turn were supported in completing paperwork to set the investigation/clearance in motion.

The staff team considers that these procedures allowed ample time to gain the required CRB and Occupation Health clearance by the start of term two (January), for the scheduled start of the programme's clinical placement practice.

Observations:

By bringing the requirement for CRB and Occupation Health clearance forward to prior to the point of registration, the staff team is concerned that:

- a) the University of Worcester programme has been brought out of line with the requirements of other MA in Dramatherapy programmes in the U.K., in relation to the checks
- b) students will not have the benefit of face-to-face staff support, during the induction period, when application procedures can be explained and students can be supported through the process of applying
- c) students may well find the procedures more onerous without the face-to-face support of staff and their peer group
- d) the new procedure would seem to be less efficient, since the staff consider it easier and more economical to deal with a group of applicants together, who tend to raise common questions, than with eighteen isolated individuals, who, prior to registration, may each wish to ask questions by email or telephone. The staff team considers that it is more effective to administrate and manage these procedures with the student cohort within the induction period of the programme.

Sarah Scoble
Programme Leader, MA in Dramatherapy
15th May 2008