

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	MA Music Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	29 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15498-D0M1J9

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Karen Diamond	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Elaine Streeter	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09054

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### **Further evidence required**

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### **2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.**

**Reason:** The education provider did not highlight changes to this SET in the mapping document. However, in the report on annual monitoring of delivery (appendix 4), the visitors noted under analysis of equality, diversity and inclusion that no data was available to quantify the performance of the school by these measures. As such the visitors were unsure that this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the education provider's implementation of, and monitoring of, equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants.

#### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Reason:** The education provider did not highlight any changes to this SET. However, the visitors noted that questions have been raised as to the effective management of the programme by the external examiner in the external examiner's report dated 8 July 2019 which states:

"The continued restructure of faculties and departments has had a significant impact upon the staff providing the MA in Music Therapy programme. I am concerned that:

- a) There is no official Head of Therapies and the Head of School for Creative Industries is only acting in this role.
- b) That management through the Deputy Head of School for Music and Music Technology leaves no oversight or Head who is clinically qualified to consider the HCPC standards of proficiency."

In response to this report, the course leader stated:

"This situation has not been resolved; the previous Deputy Head for Therapies has been asked to continue to retain responsibilities for the Therapies until her protected post ends on 30.9.2020. Whilst the continuation of the role has been supported by the acting Head of School, this has not been agreed by University management."

As such the visitors considered they had not seen evidence to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further documentation that shows how the overall management of the programme operates effectively.

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

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors were unable to ascertain the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff secured to deliver the programme. The visitors were unclear how many staff hours have been reduced, currently exist, or are planned for the programme delivery:

- i) The SETs mapping document states that: 'The course has been staffed by 3 part-time Music Therapy lecturers (0.2WTE, 0.5WTE, 0.6WTE) 'The 0.2 staff member retired at the end of 2018- 19 academic year. The post was frozen and plans made for the teaching hours to be covered by associate (hourly paid) lecturers for 2019/20. It is not known if the post will be unfrozen for 2020-21'.
- ii) The external examiner's report states that: 'The curriculum delivery has been achieved with a very small core of staff, which will further reduce with the retirement of one 0.4fte member at the end of this academic year. At present there are no plans to replace this member of staff.'

As there is no 0.4WTE post referred to at SET 3.9 in the mapping document, the visitors were unclear how many teaching staff hours have been withdrawn in total. The visitors could not see any evidence that can provide this clarification. Although the visitors were made aware that some of the lost teaching hours could be covered by hourly paid

lecturers – however the visitors could find no information about the numbers of hours and numbers of lecturers, or their CVs - Faculty minutes dated 4 March 2019 indicate that there are concerns about the sustainability of the music department as a whole, given falling recruitment to their courses. The minutes state that:

‘Due to the financial climate the Faculty has been required to make 40% cuts to Associate Lecturer and Visiting lectures costs. HL has successfully fought against this and retained most associate lecturer hours, however, there will continue to be reductions given the current climate.’

A job specification for a Senior Lecturer post was supplied. However, the visitors noted it is undated, and they were unclear from the documentation whether such a staff member has been secured. As such the visitors were not clear whether this standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide a breakdown of existing staff posts and staff hours related directly to the delivery of the programme, i.e. which posts cover the teaching of which modules, to ensure the resources provided for the programme allow for an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

### **3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.**

**Reason:** The education provider did not indicate changes to this standard. However, the visitors noted in the evidence for SET 3.9 that hourly paid lecturers are providing some of the teaching. The visitors were unable to ascertain whether these new educators have the required specialist knowledge and expertise.

**Suggested evidence:** A list of any new educators delivering the programme together with their CV's.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 12 November 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).