

**Academic Board**  
**November 2019**  
*and*  
**Board of Governors**  
**25.11.2019**

**Academic Board annual report for 2018/19 to the Board of Governors  
on academic strategy, standards, assurance and enhancement**

**1. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP**

Six meetings of the Academic Board were held, two each term, with staff from all teaching departments, including Guildhall Young Artists represented on the membership. 2018/19 was the last full year for the School's External Peer, Professor Chris Hamnett, whose period of office is due to expire at the end of the 2019 calendar year. A new External Peer is currently being sought for next year.

Following staff changes during 2018/19, the membership of Academic Board was amended to reflect current management arrangements. The terms of reference and membership of the Board will be reviewed in more detail as part of the quinquennial review of the School's academic governance frameworks.

**Action arising**

*1) to conduct a quinquennial review of the Academic Board, its sub-committee structure and academic governance frameworks during 2019/10*

**2. STRATEGY**

**2.1 School Strategic Plan**

The Academic Board received rolling updates throughout the year on the development of a new School Strategic Plan. Strategic objective one, covering HE provision, had a significant impact on the work of the board as existing programmes were revalidated, and new ones initiated. Building on the cluster MA proposed in 2017/18 further work was undertaken on a new MA in Arts in Society. However, after extensive discussions at the Academic Board and Executive Team it was determined that academically and financially

the programme was not yet ready for validation. The development of a new cross-discipline programme would be put on hold until the new Head of Interdisciplinary Practice had been appointed.

The proposal for a cross-discipline Institute for Social Impact was considered and well received; it was hoped it would make more visible the work already done in this area within the School, and provide a catalyst for further activity.

## **2.2 Teaching and Learning Strategy**

The current strategy expired at the end of 2017. However, the development of the School's main strategic plan covers many elements of an emerging teaching & teaching strategy from new academic programmes to the digital strand (with a new learning technologist recently appointed, a new on-line streaming service Guildhall Stream etc).

Following recent changes at Vice-Principal level it has now been agreed that an Associate Dean for Teaching & Learning, reporting to the Secretary & Dean of Students, should be recruited. One of their first activities will be to lead on the development of a new strategy. The advertisement for this new role has now closed and recruitment is underway.

## **2.3 Access & Participation**

The Board considered Access matters throughout the year including the monitoring return summary for 2017/18 and regular reports on the development of the five-year Access & Participation Plan for 2020/21 to 2024/25.

## **2.4 Teaching Excellence Framework**

The School entered into the TEF3 assessment exercise during the 2017/18 and scored an excellent Gold rating for the maximum three years. Therefore, the School did not enter TEF4 during 2018/19 as there was no advantage but it will be engaging in the next round.

## **2.4 Brexit**

The UK government confirmed that fees and funding would remain the same for 2020 EU entrants for the duration of their programme, even after the point the UK exits the EU. However, the impact of Brexit on student recruitment and progression to employment remains a concern.

# **3. STANDARDS OF TAUGHT AWARDS**

## **3.1 Assessment results 2018/19 cycle (appendix A)**

Assessment results were considered by the School Board of Examiners at two meetings in July and two meetings in September 2019, based on the recommendations of the respect Programme Assessment Board. External Examiners attend the Programme Boards.

Data contained in appendix A are the results confirmed as at 1 November 2019.

Sector-level concerns about grade inflation remain. Decisions to upgrade at a classification borderline (up to 0.5% below) were taken very carefully following detailed discussion at both the relevant Programme Assessment Board involving the External Examiners and also at the School Board of Examiners. Overall the proportion of higher classifications (first and upper second) has slightly decreased. From 2019/20 onwards the discretion to consider for upgrade at a classification boundary will not be exercised for any programme and the Academic Board has removed the discretion from the *Academic regulatory framework*.

The UK Standing Committee of Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) has proposed that institutions should publish a degree outcomes statement following an internal review analysing their institutional degree classifications including the profile of classifications by protected characteristic, assessment and marking practices, and classification algorithms. The Programme Leaders group will start this term looking at the rationale behind the different programme classification algorithms.

**Action arising**

*2a) to undertake an (undergraduate) degree outcomes review and prepare a public statement for consideration by both Academic Board and Board of Governors*

**3.2 Summary of External Examiner reports and responses 2018/19 cycle**

External Examiner reports and responses from Programme Leaders are considered both at relevant Programme Boards and Academic Board. Feedback from External Examiners is also reflected upon in Annual Programme Evaluation Reports (and revalidation self-assessments) and responses embedded in relevant action plans.

At its meeting in November 2019 the Board looked at feedback from all the External Examiners from the 2018/19 cycle with attention given to the comparability of standards and also to identifying any common themes in the feedback for further consideration (see Appendix B). The common themes were (i) assessment criteria (the action from last year (no 4) is carried forward into this year as part of the Teaching & Learning strategy discussions) and (ii) evidence of feedback to students and alignment of feedback with assessment criteria

**Action arising**

*2b) as part of degree outcomes review, to consider (particularly where feedback is verbal) how evidence can be kept of alignment of feedback to assessment criteria.*

### **3.3 Equality assessment strands 2016/17 cycle (appendix c)**

Annual analyses were conducted separately on undergraduate and postgraduate assessment outcomes 2017/18 for the following equality streams, Age, Disability, Ethnicity and Sex, showing:

- i) Year on year changes of each equality group as a proportion of the total
- ii) Year on year changes of conversion rates of each equality group

Graduating numbers were small in some degree programmes making statistical analysis unreliable but there were some differences in performance highlighted in the attached appendix C.

Under the new Access & Participation Plan framework, the Office for Students will be expecting institutions to be analyse and eliminate attainment gaps between undergraduate students with specific characteristics. This analysis will be done as part of the School's Access monitoring requirements. However, the School will be adjusting its methodology for its broader equality analysis to ensure alignment and early identification of potential issues. In 2017/18 there had under-reporting of disability (ie not all students who were receiving support for a disability in that academic year had self-declared a disability and the government statistics are based on the self-declaration) and this may have distorted the School's statistics. In 2018/19 any student getting support for a disability from the School was deemed to have declared a disability by seeking and accepting support and their self-declaration was changed. The next analysis will determine whether this has made a material difference.

#### **Action arising**

*3) The methodology going forward will be amended to distinguish between home domiciled (UK) students and other students in order that there is a better alignment with the presentation of data provided by the Office for Students. The OfS age boundaries will also be used.*

## **4. METHODOLOGIES TO IMPROVE THE STUDENT ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE AND STUDENT OUTCOMES**

### **4.1 Academic Governance**

The Academic Board maintained responsibility for standards, quality and awards, with the Music, Production Arts and Drama Programme Boards overseeing detailed programme development and review, and the effect of delivery of the programmes on the student

experience. The Drama Programme Board took responsibility for the PACE programme pending its managerial transfer to Drama.

In addition to the Programme Boards, a further sub-committee of Academic Board – the Collaborative Board of Studies for the BA in Acting Studies – met on Wednesday 21 March 2019 via video conferencing between Beijing and London. It is the recommendation arising from the internal review of the BA in Acting Studies programme, that these detailed discussions are embedded within the Drama and this is underway.

The Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, responsible for the School's research activity and programmes, reported to the City, University of London Course Board once during the 2018/19 academic year with further contact administratively later in the year in respect of negotiation over amendments to the School's *Research degree regulations*.

#### **4.2 Regulatory framework**

Clarification amendments to the regulations across all sections were approved by the Board but there were no substantial changes.

#### **4.3 Validation & revalidation of programmes**

The **BA & MA in Acting** was due to be revalidated during 2018/19 but a one-year extension was requested and approved by the Academic Board to accommodate the arrival of the Vice-Principal for Drama.

The **BA in Production Arts** (previously Technical Theatre Arts) was due to be revalidated during the current academic year 2019/20 but a one-year extension was requested and approved by the Academic Board to allow alignment with the revalidation for the BA in Video Design for Live Performance and to accommodate the new shorter academic year due from 2023/24 onwards.

The **PGCert in Performance Teaching** was revalidated during the year with a five-year revalidation approved by the Academic Board. It had a number of minor conditions concerning mentoring, student representation, and minor edits to the programme and module specification. There were also three commendations: the commitment of the Programme Team and the enthusiasm students showed for the programme, the exemplary mapping against the UKPSF (UK Professional Standards Framework, Advance HE), and the support to the programme demonstrated by Library staff.

The **BA in Performance & Creative Enterprise** went through the revalidation process. Whilst there were also commendations for the programme (the enthusiasm, commitment and passion that the Programme Team and the students showed for the programme, and

the attention given to the individual and the extraordinarily bespoke nature of the programme), there was a large number of conditions and these were not met by the deadlines or by the time the programme leader scheduled departure. There are now being worked through by officers outside of the programme.

The programme closure documentation for the programme was considered at the September 2019 Academic Board and will be presented to the Board of Governors in November. The programme closure process aims to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the student experience for those currently enrolled on the programme, and the value of their degree and those of previous graduates is maintained.

#### **4.4 Student Feedback**

Academic Board considered a wide variety of student feedback during 2018/19, including data from the two principal surveys - the National Student Survey (NSS) and Whole School Survey (WSS) – and feedback received directly from student representatives through the Programme Boards and Academic Board itself.

#### **4.4 Annual programme evaluation**

Annual Programme Evaluation Reports (APERs) for each programme were considered by both the relevant Programme Board and by Academic Board, with input from staff and students from across the School. Good and innovative practices were highlighted for the sharing and enhancing of practice, and actions plans proposed for improvement to respond to any issues or aspects of the provision in need of development. APERs are not required in the year of revalidation.

### **5. STUDENT ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE AND STUDENT OUTCOMES**

*The Board of Governors received overview tables for both the NSS and the WSS in 2019 at its September 2019 meeting.*

#### **5.1 The National Student Survey Jan to April 2019**

Once again the School performed well in student NSS participation with a 94% (up from 81%) and the national average response rate was 81%. Because of the small number of students on the BA VDLP programme the quantitative results have not been published but are combined into the aggregate results. For the first time BA PACE results were published and with very strong results, demonstrating that although the programme is closing students have had an excellent experience at the School.

In 2017 the School achieved its highest level of satisfaction since 2012, achieving 90%. Unfortunately, in 2018 the level of satisfaction dropped to 81%, but rose to 88% in 2019. In all sections and questions, the overall results were higher than last year. Organisation & Management was the lowest performing section, as in last year's survey, however this was the most improved section when compared with last year's survey.

Looking at the survey data by groups of students will be necessary to target improvement in results.

- Students on the Theatre Technology pathway were unsatisfied in a number of areas, notably Assessment & Feedback, however other sections which received poor feedback last year (receiving advice, Organisation & Management, and Learning Resources) improved.
- Jazz students were still notably unsatisfied with Assessment & Feedback and with Organisation & Management, with some results going down for a second year in a row though it should be noted that students were satisfied that marking and assessment is fair (despite thinking that the criteria used is unclear). Only 45% of students were satisfied that they had the right opportunities to provide feedback, but 91% felt their views and opinions were valued. Scores ranged from 9% to 91%.
- The section that PACE students were least satisfied with was Organisation & Management.

#### **Action arising**

*4a) Departments to address NSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations*

## **5.2 The Whole School Survey**

The whole School survey combines,

- Programme evaluation
- Module evaluation
- Detailed questions about Student Affairs
- Student experience questions (eg Finance, IT, Registry, Library, Student Affairs and other services that contribute to the student experience)

All students were invited by email to complete the survey (via Survey Monkey) and by their respective departments and the event was promoted in the foyer on a number of occasions. The participation rate in 2018 had been disappointing, only reaching 47%, but in 2019 59% of students participated.

Students gave many more free-text comments than in previous years, which allows for a better interrogation of what may lie behind the quantitative scores.

Student comments highlighted the following issues;

- Academic scheduling including late notice in general of the timetable or projects or of last minute changes. Students want to be able to plan their time effectively
- Problems with Aurelia, the functionality for the Ear Training module.
- Pacing where activity not spread out across day/week/year, including deadlines for submissions, not enough space in the timetable for personal 'admin' as the timetable is too intense.
- Room scheduling
- Programme and departmental handbooks are not easy to access, do not always contain vital information, or contain conflicting information.

Issues relating to handbooks and the timetable were highlighted in the 2015, 2016 and 2017 and 2018. There is currently a handbook review to improve clarity (of information and where information can be found), accuracy and access, and whether some information is duplicated on MyGuildhall (the School's intranet)

#### **Action arising**

*4b) Departments to address WSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations*

### **5.3 Student employability**

The last available destination data (DLHE) was for 2016/17 and was considered in last year's annual report. Results of the first Graduate Outcomes survey for 2017/18 leavers will be published in 2020. Please note the survey is now conducted 15 months after graduation instead of six months after graduation.

### **5.4 Student regulatory activity during 2018/19 (appendix D)**

The level of regulatory activity was generally consistent with the previous year; some areas up, some down. Acting still attracts the largest number of **admission complaints** but it has substantially more applications than all other programmes added together.

The number of **breaches of the Student Code of Conduct** was up and Tier 4 non-compliance was a recurring theme, but 11 disciplinary cases were Library offences and completely avoidable by the students concerned. However, by the time four over-due notices and an invoice has been issued, the items have been overdue for many months, other students have lost out on the opportunity to access these resources and it becomes a disciplinary matter.

Three **Completion of Procedures** (COP) letters were issued (one in each of the following categories - academic appeal, disciplinary, and progress review). One complaint arising

from an academic appeal in 2017/18 went to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator but case was found to be not justified.

### 5.5 Equality admission strands entry 2017 (appendix F)

Annual analyses were conducted by programme on undergraduate and postgraduate applications, offers and enrolment for the following equality streams, Age, Disability, Ethnicity and Sex, showing:

- iii) Year on year changes of each equality group as a proportion of the total
- iv) Year on year changes of conversion rates of each equality group

The issue for the School has generally been one of low applications from some under-represented groups and while offer and conversion rates may be consistent, if the number of applications is low there is little change in overall demographics of the School.

Entry numbers are very small for acting and when split by BA and MA even smaller so whilst no offers have been made to MA students declaring a disability in recent years, the numbers are too small to make a definitive statement. Nevertheless, the Acting Department is looking at the issue of **disability**, and reasonable adjustments in the curriculum as it goes into its revalidation.

From 2018/19 the School had to issue a “transparency return”, the overall figures, for all the School’s undergraduate programmes were:

Characteristic	Characteristic split	Number of applications	Percentage of applications that received an offer	Percentage of applications that accepted an offer	Percentage of applications that led to a registration
Ethnicity	BAME	380	10%	8%	6%
	White	2,230	10%	7%	6%
EIMD quintile	1 and 2	610	10%	7%	6%
	3 to 5	1,760	11%	7%	6%
Gender	Female	1,480	8.3%	5.1%	4.5%
	Male	1,130	12.8%	9.0%	7.7%
	Other	N	N	N	N

This shows that males overall are more likely to be made an offer than females but when looked at on a programme by programme, and instrument by instrument level the picture is not as clear.

## 6. STANDARDS OF RESEARCH AWARDS

The Academic Board received status updates on continuing doctoral students throughout the year via the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee. The doctoral programme has continued to expand and the Research Department anticipates the number of students

will eventually level out at c. 55 and remain steady for the foreseeable future (there are currently 54 research students enrolled (including writing up), a further 3 on intermission, and a further 10 completing their assessment). It remains the School's intent to apply for research degree awarding powers after its next (OfS) Assurance Review (or similar) once the School has had sufficient research degree conferments.

During the year, doctoral teaching assistants were discussed in a number of fora, including the Academic Board and the City Course Board and a firmed up proposal was recently presented to the Academic Board. A Graduate Teaching Assistantship (GTA) is intended to provided selected doctoral students with some training in. and experience of, teaching and learning in higher education, supported by classes and mentoring.

Preparatory work for a Research Degree Awarding Powers application (RDAP) has been on hold pending the appointments of the Associate Dean of Teaching & learning (as TDAP will need be revisited) and Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance).

## **7. ACADEMIC BOARD ACTIVITIES FOR 2019/20**

### **7.1 School Strategic Plan & validation**

Academic Board will continue to receive updates in relation to the plan. It is expected that as the year progresses, further programme developments will be considered. The BA in Performance Design has passed the programme in principle stage and now full documentation is being developed.

### **7.2 Learning and Teaching Strategy**

A new Learning and Teaching Strategy will be developed, aligning with the key strands of the School Strategic Plan, for approval late 2019/20 (subject to appointment).

<b>BA Acting Studies</b>	<b>BA Performance Design</b>		<b>BA/MA Acting</b>
--------------------------	------------------------------	--	---------------------

### **7.3 Revalidation**

The **BA & MA in Acting** programme were due to be revalidated during 2018/19 but with the new Vice-Principal and Director of Drama not arriving until January 2019 it was carried forward into 2019/20

The **BA in Acting Studies** is due to be revalidated in November 2019 and the **Artist Diploma** in Spring 2020.

## 8. ACTION PLAN 2019/20

Academic Board and the Board of Governors received a report in May on progress towards the implementation of the 2018/19 actions, and those that were completed. All actions have been completed bar the three actions from 2018/19 are being carried forward into 2019/20.

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Assigned</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
<b>Carried forward from 2018/19</b>			
1)	<i>to develop a new Teaching and Learning Strategy and Action Plan in line with the School Strategic Plan for approval during 2020.</i>	<i>Associate Dean of Teaching &amp; Learning - tba</i>	<i>September 2020</i>
4)	<i>to consider, as part of Teaching Strategy discussion, the tension between the School's previous whole-School approach to assessment criteria and the desire of the External Examiners to see greater programme/module/assessment-type specificity.</i>	<i>Programme Leaders</i>	<i>Ongoing (will be part of new action 2.</i>
11)	<i>RDAP preparation survey to capture current levels of staff engagement in scholarly activities (eg external examinerships, membership of learned societies etc)</i>	<i>Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)</i>	<i>During 2019/20</i>
<b>2019/20</b>			
1)	<i>to conduct a quinquennial review of the Academic Board, its sub-committee structure and academic governance frameworks during 2019/10</i>	<i>Associate Dean of Teaching &amp; Learning with Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)</i>	<i>AB Summer 2 meeting</i>
2a)	<i>to prepare (undergraduate) degree outcomes review and prepare a public statement for consideration by both Academic Board and Board of Governors</i>	<i>Programme Leaders Group</i>	<i>AB Spring 2</i>
2b)	<i>as part of degree outcomes review, to consider (particularly where feedback is verbal) how evidence can be kept of alignment of feedback to assessment criteria</i>	<i>Programme Leaders Group</i>	<i>AB Spring 2</i>
3)	<i>the methodology going forward to be amended to distinguish between home domiciled (UK) students and other students in order that there is a better alignment with the presentation of data provided by the Office for Students. The OfS age boundaries will also be used.</i>	<i>Registry</i>	<i>AB reports for Spring 1 and Spring 2</i>
4)	<i>Departments to address NSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations</i>	<i>Jazz, Theatre technology, PACE</i>	<i>Autumn 2019</i>

Katharine Lewis  
 Secretary & Dean of Students  
 November 2019

# Appendix A: Assessment results 2018/19

Outcome of 2018/2019 assessment cycle to date (with 2018 & 2017 comparisons)

*Undergraduate classifications (2018/19 data provided 1 November 2019)*

Program. & Year	No. of students in cohort	Degree class					Other assessment outcomes		
		1 <sup>st</sup>	Upper 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Lower 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Third	Ord	Resits	Defers	Misc
<b>2018/19 Assessments</b>									
BMus	108	35	47	6	1	8		2**	6 WD 3 FWD (5 CertHE 4 DipHE)
BA TECH	36	14	18	2					1 WD 1 FWD (2 DipHE)
BA Acting	20	5	15					1	
BA VDLP	5	4	1						
BA PACE	12	3	8	1					
<b>Totals</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2017/18 Assessments</b>									
BMus	109	33	54	8	1	5		1	4WD 3 FWD (5CertHE 2DipHE)
BA TECH	33	14	17	1	1				
BA Acting	21	5	16						
BA VDLP (new)	2		2						
BA PACE (new)	4	1	3						
<b>Totals</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2016/17 Assessments</b>									
BMus	106	35	56	3	3	9			2 WD 6 FWD (CertHE)
BA TECH	31	14	14	3					1 WD
BA Acting	22	6	16						
<b>Totals</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>			<b>9</b>

Int= intermit

FWD=Fail/Withdraw

WD= Withdrawn

\*\*continuing extenuating circumstances

Total 2019 181 UG cohort students: % split	
1st	33.7
2.1	49.17
2.2	4.97
3	0.55
Ord	4.42

Total 2018 169 UG cohort students: % split	
1st	31.36
2.1	54.44
2.2	5.32
3	1.18
Ord	2.96

Total 2017 UG cohort 160 students: % split	
1st	34.59
2.1	54.08
2.2	3.77
3	1.88
Ord	5.66

*Postgraduate classifications (2018/19 data provided 1 November 2019)*

Award	No. of students on Prog.	Classification			Progression to next part	Other assessment outcomes		
		Dist.	Merit	Pass		Resit	Defer	Misc
<b>2018/19 assessments</b>								
MMus in Performance	134	27	27	4	76			4 WD
MMus in Composition	5		2		3			
MMus in Leadership	7	3	3	1				
MPerf, MComp, MLead Guildhall Artist	74	53	19	2		1	2	1 WD
MA in Opera Making & Writing	5	3	2					
Artist Diploma	11	10	1				2	1 WD
Graduate Certificate	6		2	4				
MA in Music Therapy	13	1	7	2				
MA Training Actors	2	1		1				
MA Acting	3	1	2					1 WD
MA CTPD	8	2	5	1				
<i>Totals</i>	<i>268</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>6</i>

Award	No. of students on Prog.	Classification			Progression to next part	Other assessment outcomes		
		Dist.	Merit	Pass		Resit	Defer	Misc
<b>2017/18 assessments</b>								
MMus in Performance	135	20	33	5	73	1	3	3 WD
MMus in Composition	6	1	2		3			
MMus in Leadership	8	3	4	1				
MPerf, MComp, MLead Guildhall Artist	70	54	16					7 WD
MA in Opera Making & Writing	6	6						

Artist Diploma	13	10	1				1	1 WD
Graduate Certificate	11	1	1	2	7			1 WD
MA in Music Therapy	11	3	6	2				
MA Training Actors	2	1	1					
MA Acting	4	3	1					
MA CTPD	5	2	3					
<i>Totals</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>
<b>2016/17 assessments</b>								
MMus in Performance	119	17	24	3	71	2	2	6 WD
MMus in Composition	8	1	3		4			1 WD
MMus in Leadership	5	4	1					
MPerf, MComp, MLead Guildhall Artist	76	55	20				1	3 WD
MA in Opera Making & Writing	6	4	1	1				
Artist Diploma	12	10	2					1 WD
Graduate Certificate	15			1	13		1	1 WD
MA in Music Therapy	12	4	6	2				
MA Training Actors	1		1					
MA Acting	4		4					
MA CTPD	3		3					
<i>Totals</i>	<i>261</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

<b>Total 2019 PG cohort 189 awards</b>	
	<b>% split</b>
Distinction	54.3
Merit	37.63
Pass	8.06

<b>Total 2018 PG cohort 182 awards</b>	
	<b>% split</b>
Distinction	57.14
Merit	37.36
Pass	5.49

<b>Total 2017 PG cohort 167 awards</b>	
	<b>% split</b>
Distinction	56.88
Merit	38.92
Pass	4.19

# Appendix B: External Examiner Reports (extracts) 2018/19 cycle

## Part B: Comparability of standards

### BA (Hons) Acting

*Standards and student achievement are wholly comparable with the other 'first division' UK schools*

*The School is clearly exceeding threshold standards in all cases*

### BA in Acting Studies

*YES:*

*Having observed several classes, as well as evaluating the assessments of Project 4, 5, and 6, I am satisfied that the academic standards, teaching delivery, and achievements of the students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions. The students worked with great intensity and commitment, and engaged in deep learning through the teaching processes offered by very experienced and dedicated teachers at GSMD. Classes were well-structured, with formative feedback as lessons progressed to achieve the learning outcomes of the modules. Teaching standards are extremely high, delivered by highly skilled, knowledgeable, and experienced tutors. Class material is always employed to achieve a relevant learning purpose.*

*Student performance showings evidenced a high level of discipline, skills and artistic expression. Reb Project 4 (Level 5), shows the 'accumulation' of the learning process, and Reb Project 5 and 6 (Level 6) lead towards professional performance, drawing heavily upon previous learning.*

*Conclusion: student output corresponds with their level of learning.*

*Yes. Threshold standards at Level 5 and 6 are maintained according to the Programme specification and the QAA subject benchmarks.*

### BA (Hons) in Technical Theatre Arts

*GSMD continues to be amongst the leading institutions in the country. The level of work produced is very much comparable, thanks to its excellent resources and, more importantly, appropriate level of staffing and additional support.*

*The documentation remains the same, with minor amendments, and continues to refer to the appropriate benchmarks.*

### BA in Video for Live Performance

*The academic standards are comparable with other similar programmes I am familiar with, along with the component modules. The overall academic standard of the modules are also comparable to other programmes I am familiar with. At the Exam Board there was an open discussion about the parity of assessment grading in relation to other institutions, this was monitored from comments made last year.*

*The School is clearly aware of comparative standards across its different courses and this broader picture in relation to national benchmarks, successfully maintaining the appropriate standards.*

### **BA in Performance & Creative Enterprise**

*The academic standards of the School seem consistent with those in other institutions with which I am familiar. There are still some inconsistencies in terms of the academic achievements of students:*

- *Limited use of literature by some candidates, and some reliance on non-peer-reviewed knowledge e.g. films and popular culture, conspiracy theories, Sbe-ra and Star Wars suggests some students are not engaging critically with literature, and grounding their knowledge in popular culture rather than peer-reviewed knowledge;*
- *Student reflections can therefore be critically ungrounded, and often quite descriptive, solipsistic or self-referential;*
- *Some stronger students display very strong analytical skills, while weaker students provide characteristically descriptive responses with minimal analysis, and with very inconsistent referencing standards;*
- *A tendency to reward technique and situated practical skills over critical understanding. Some students are therefore achieving high grades despite limited critical engagement with peer-reviewed literature e.g. in PREP3 a grade of 78 for a portfolio containing no critical references is unusual in my experience of other institutions, especially when assessment criteria include:*
  - o *Synthesise theory and practice, as it relates to a range of artistic work*
  - o *Reflect critically and constructively on the development and application of their own and others' skills, knowledge and artistic practice.*
  - o *Demonstrate a comprehensive and sophisticated understanding of current trends and debates within the field of socially engaged creative practice and other relevant discourses and practices*

*[threshold standards]*

*Yes, this has been addressed through the revalidation process.*

### **BMus (Hons) Music**

*Coming from a 'redbrick' university, this is my first External Examinership held within the Conservatoire sector. Given the different emphases in programme structures, I would expect different levels of attainment when comparing 'university' music degrees and 'conservatoire' programmes. This has been largely borne out by the work I have seen/heard this year: as performers and composers GSMD students are operating at a very high level indeed, with even weaker students demonstrating good levels of competence in their specialist areas; the best students are able to demonstrate a level of attainment and competence at a professional level and beyond those in a 'university' setting, as I would expect. The academic work of many students, although more limited in scope, has also been very impressive and comparable in achievement to students studying in the 'university' context. The lesser emphasis on academic work inevitably means that some students, who are either weaker in this respect or less interested in it, perform at a lower level than elsewhere, but their achievements are still creditable and the marks awarded fair.*

*The programme specification clearly indicates how the learning aims and outcomes relate to specific points in the QAA Subject Benchmark statement. It also lays out clearly the levels of*

*attainment expected at Levels 4, 5, and 6 of the NQF, using clearly comprehensible vocabulary, and relating these both to the NQF and the music profession. With some exceptions (see below) these are also appropriately graded and developmental over the three stages of the programme.*

*Exceptions include C4.7 and C4.8 and their equivalents at Levels 5 and 6 (team work and IT skills) which remain the same throughout the programme and, in the case of IT skills, no qualitative level of achievement is indicated. NBI would not expect an indication of which computer programs (for example) a student should be able to use at each level, but an indication of progression would be welcome. Similarly, a sense of progression would be welcome in D4.3: while I would hope that students would always 'demonstrate effective personal presentation, organization and time management', an awareness that the standard expected at professional level (i.e. at or immediately after graduation) is higher/more consistent/more rigorous than at entry could be articulated (briefly) here.*

*The School operates at the forefront of its sector, nationally and internationally and this is reflected in the standards expected of and achieved by students. At their best, I found academic submissions to be well researched, imaginative and confidently expressed, while across the sample of recitals attended, the overall standard was extremely high. In repeated instances the standard of performance work was exceptional.*

*I am confident that the School meets the threshold standards set for its awards in accordance with the national frameworks for HE education qualifications and the applicable subject benchmark statements. The School is also clearly focused on meeting the standards articulated within the Programme specification for the BMus and is demonstrably achieving these in all areas.*

### **PGCert**

*This report is based on the scrutiny of course related paperwork, assessments for the modules on the award and information provided related the revalidation of the award during the academic year. Evidence of course moderation and discussions has also been scrutinised. As a result, I can confirm that the academic standards of the award and achievement of students are comparable to my own institution and expectations we have for Level 7 postgraduate study in this area. I can also confirm that the standards appear comparable to my experience as a previous external at other UK HEIs. The reflective elements of the award and the links between theory and practice are clearly evidenced in each module, learning materials, resource lists and student assignments. This is an important aspect of the course and an element that comes across strongly.*

*The programme continues to maintain the appropriate thresholds for postgraduate study and aligns with the FHEQ framework. There is no specific QAA subject benchmarks within this area; however, the subject content, assessment requirements and skills development are, in my opinion, very appropriate.*

### **MA Training Actors (voice) or (movement)**

*Appropriateness of the assessment methods in relation to module and programme learning outcomes, student progression and acquisition of knowledge were clearly demonstrated on all External Examiner visits. Evidence of understanding, practical skills and key skills, by each student were excellent with exemplary leadership from the Academic Lead Eliot Shrimpton.*

*Congruence of the programme with external standards elsewhere in the HE Sector including FHEQ and benchmark statement(s) was in line and appropriate. The marking criteria used ensured there were a good spread of marks. Constant, formative, feedback must be particularly noted as exceptional; especially where a student had a specific educational need such as dyspraxia, the staff support was excellent.*

### **MA in Acting**

*Standards and student achievement are wholly comparable with the other 'first division' UK schools*

*The School is clearly exceeding threshold standards in all cases*

*MA in Collaborative Theatre Production & Design – report not yet received*

### **MA in Opera Making & Writing**

*The academic standards of Guildhall and the professional standards of student composition work is comparable with my own institution and other HE institutions with which I'm familiar.*

*The School maintains standards set within the QAA subject benchmark statement for Music. The creative, critical and practical dimensions of music are all well catered for by the programme. Students achieve well and learn to appreciate and understand musical creation. Students' intellectual, practical, creative, technological, personal and communication skills are all developed by various modules within the programme.*

### **MA in Music Therapy**

*The academic standards are comparable with other MA trainings in the sector. Students have a high level of achievement and assessments are fair and accurate.*

*The School is maintaining the relevant HE standards and the HCPC requirements for validation of the programme.*

### **Guildhall Artist Performance**

*The academic standards of the School and the achievement of these Masters programme students match and exceed comparable institutions in the UK. The annual examination diet produces well over a hundred hours of videoed recitals and performances which demonstrate just how high those standards are. The relaxed and supportive ambience of these occasions, and the recitals and performances I attended in person, were designed to bring out the best in the students. The overriding criticism I have of most conservatoire Masters programmes at conservatoires in the UK is that they are, in substance, Bachelor's programmes with the bar set six inches higher. This does not apply to the Guildhall programme. It is a truly distinct Artist Masters and as such is in a field of its own. This makes the student's achievement truly significant. And the staff commitment to delivering such an innovative programme truly remarkable.*

*The School is continuing to achieve and surpass the threshold standards set for this award, in line with QAA subject benchmark statements and the national HE qualifications framework. The professional practice standards required by the programme specification is clearly being achieved*

### **Guildhall Artist Composition**

*The academic standards of Guildhall and the professional standards of student composition work is comparable with my own institution and other HE institutions with which I'm familiar.*

*The School maintains standards set within the QAA subject benchmark statement for Music. The creative, critical and practical dimensions of music are all well catered for by the programme. Students achieve well and learn to appreciate and understand musical creation. Students' intellectual, practical, creative, technological, personal and communication skills are all developed by various modules within the programme.*

### **Artist Diploma**

*The performance standards that prevailed in the two recitals that I heard were both of an excellent standard and absolutely in line with those of other comparable institutions in the sector with which I am familiar.*

*The School is effectively maintaining the threshold standards set for Music Art Diploma Level 7 as evidenced by the performance in recitals and by the information in the Artist Diploma handbook.*

## **Part C: Teaching, Learning and Assessment Processes**

### **Q: Do the Teaching & Learning methods enable students to achieve the Intended Learning Outcomes?**

The general perception from External Examiners is **positive**, all who have provided feedback remark as such:

#### **BMus (Hons)**

*"The overall balance and quality of teaching and learning methods, from individual lessons to large-group activities is a defining characteristic of the student learning experience at the School and a key component in its success."*

*"I was very impressed overall by the level of attainment students demonstrated in the Final Year Recitals I witnessed, and the written work I inspected. The School clearly has many very talented and committed students who are supported and encouraged to do their best by equally talented and committed teaching staff."*

#### **BA VDLP**

*"The student outputs that I've seen reflect a very high quality of teaching input and I consider the overall learning experience to be extremely high."*

#### **Artist Diploma**

*"The student performances that I heard were both of an excellent standard and bore an eloquent testimony to the excellence of the teaching and the overall learning experience."*

### **Q: Does the assessment process measure student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended learning outcomes of the programme in line with the School's policies and regulations?**

External Examiners responses to this were varied across the programmes, but in the main, they commented positively to this question. However, interestingly, the External Examiners for the BMus (Hons) provided polarising views (Cranmer & Rodmell):

*“Panels had clearly been carefully briefed in advance in relation to assessment protocols, however I noted a few minor discrepancies in the approach of panels in response to which the School may wish to enhance its written guidance. Firstly, where there are significant differences in the declared marks of panel members, the published criteria should be used as the starting point for the subsequent discussion (rather than the panel engaging in a more philosophical or general conversation on the various characteristics of the performance). Secondly, the multi-faceted role of the Chair (as an independent voice, a point of reference across different instruments, and as a mediator within the panel) might be further clarified in written guidance. Without suggesting the need for a formulaic definition of the role of the Chair, at times I witnessed different approaches on various panels – each of which might be considered valid in themselves if adopted as standard across the School.” – Cranmer*

=====

*“The assessment methods vary according to the module and are tailored to the needs of individual practical studies and academic requirements as appropriate. A wide variety of assessment methods is used, testing skills and knowledge comprehensively and appropriately, from ‘traditional’ essays and recitals, to interviews, oral presentations, portfolios, notation-based assignments and computer-based exercises. This wide variety reflects the diversity of the discipline. A clear sense of qualitative assessment prevails, meaning that students are awarded marks across the spectrum, with both excellent and weaker work recognized accordingly. On the basis of the work/recitals I viewed, feedback given to students and examiner panel discussions makes it clear how marks are determined and how levels of achievement are ‘ranked’ relative to each other (without comparing candidates directly for the purposes of determining marks).” – Rodmell*

**Q: Are the assessment criteria appropriate and fit for purpose?**

As with the previous question, Externals commented **positively** on the way assessment criteria is set up, and similarly to the previous question, **the two BMus** (Hons) Externals have raised matters.

*“In response to a comment in a previous report, I appreciate the reasons why the Programme team did not consider the development of similarly differentiated criteria for the assessment of Performance to be desirable. Notwithstanding this, I would hope that this might be kept under review, as it could be seen as an inconsistency within the School to conduct the assessment of some aspects of the Programme differentiated by Level, while the assessment of Performance adopts a more generic approach.” – Cranmer*

=====

*“I have some concern about the Assessment Criteria for Performance as currently articulated; while the ‘columns’ (e.g. Instrumental/vocal control, musical awareness and understanding) are clear and as comprehensive as can be expected when producing criteria intended to assess every instrument and voice, the ‘rows’ are rather vague. Merit (60-69) is,*

*for example, only individually differentiated by the single word 'good'. While it was clear that examiners had an understanding of what this meant, based on extensive experience, and were scrupulous in determining marks when some columns were agreed (for example) to be 'good' and others 'satisfactory', I am less convinced that these are helpful for students: at what point, for example, does instrumental/vocal control move from 'satisfactory' to 'good'? I understand that these Assessment Criteria are a 'work in progress' and that further revisions may follow; "In relation to written work, I was somewhat concerned to see that there is a flat rate penalty for inadequate referencing, which does not take into account either the Year of Study or the severity of the 'offence'. This is something that I would suggest the Academic Studies Department examines." - Rodmell*

**Q: Is feedback provided to students of sufficient quality to support their learning?**

The BMus, BA/MA Acting and BA Acting Studies programmes attracted extensive responses from the External Examiners which the departments will need to address in the coming year. Two External Examiners (Bowden and Wildman) did not have an opportunity to see feedback.

*"At times, in the quest to advise students on areas for improvement, written feedback sometimes omitted to mention the positive aspects of their work. For example, in the Personal Research Project (BMus3), I found instances where students had justly been awarded strong marks (55, 65, 75), but had barely received a positive comment in their feedback! A solution here might be to advise markers always to start their feedback with reference to the positive aspects of student work before moving to areas for enhancement." – Cranmer BMus*

*=====*  
*"As I commented in my last report, the principal difficulty I have in answering this question is that currently feedback to students is not recorded. This, of course, does not mean that it is not effective, comprehensive and constructive, it's just not possible to verify this without either witnessing feedback sessions in action or meeting with representative groups of students to hear their views. I would certainly find meeting with students a useful exercise in relation to assessment, feedback and other aspects of their experience and would be grateful if this could be organized as part of this coming year's activities." – Hodgart BA/MA Acting*

*=====*  
*"There is no written evidence of feedback, except for Reh Project 5 (Acting Research Portfolio), nor was I privy to post-performance one-to-one feedback tutorials. Hence, it is not possible to comment on the sufficient quality of such feedback. However, judging on my experience of GSMD teaching standards and on-going feedback, I am of the opinion that the feedback would be of the highest standards to support learning.*

*In order for the external examiner to express an opinion, there needs to be some form of a record. I have made this point in my previous report. This will be looked at at re-validation of the programme." – Loke BA Acting Studies*

*=====*

*“One student clearly exhibiting vocal strain in performance and also a slightly out-of-tune guitar, neither of which is mentioned in feedback to them. Are they getting this feedback elsewhere? Certainly the vocal strain could produce damage to their voice if unaddressed;*

- *Watching a student work out how to use loop software badly suggests a lack of application during their time on the residency, but this is not commented on, with their 'charisma' praised instead. Whilst it is clearly beneficial to students to receive positive feedback, it should also be made clear to them when their efforts don't meet the expected standards of this level of study, and what they need to do to improve.*

- *Guidance notes for The Residential encourage students to think contextually - rather than critically - about 'current discourse'. For example, there was no encouragement to look at 'site-specific' art e.g. (Kaye, Kwon, Spring et al) or Socially-Engaged Art (Jackson, Bourriaud, Bishop, Kester et al) for a more critical underpinning of their ideas, and this could be made more explicit in the guidance.” – **Camlin PACE***

## **Conclusion**

The Academic Assurance Working Group has considered the issue of standards and will be recommending to the Board of Governors that the standards of awards for which the Academic Board is responsible have been appropriately set and maintained.

Individual departments have responded to the issues raised by their external examiners. However, the School (via the Programme Leaders Group) will need to look at the broader issue of evidence of feedback. Whilst a one-size fits all approach is unlikely to be appropriate, the Academic Board will need assurance that there is robust evidence of the assessment process in all instances.

Kalpesh Khetia

Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)

# Appendix C: Equality strands relating to assessment outcomes 2017/18

As part of the School's statutory responsibilities, an analysis of awards conferred in 2018 by Ethnicity, Sex, Disability and Age was undertaken for each undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme and compared against the figures for the previous five years. Numbers are too small for delving into the data at a smaller level of granularity and similarly numbers are too small for the other protected characteristics.

## Undergraduate assessment cycle 2017/18

The total of First classifications achieved by undergraduate students fell slightly, with a 1.8% decrease from 2017 whereas the number of Upper Second classifications rose by 2.7%. The number of higher classifications combined has therefore remained steady with a slight increase from 89.2% to 90.1%. The figures for lower classifications (Lower Second, Third) and Ordinary degrees involve very small numbers of students and there are no discernible trends across these academic cycles.

In 2018 there was a disparity in the overall achievement of undergraduate students when split by disability status (disability disclosed/disability not disclosed) or by ethnicity (White/BME). However, there is only slight variability in overall achievement when split by sex (male/female) and age (younger/older).

## Ethnicity

- 18% of undergraduate students awarded in 2018 identified as from a Black or Minority Ethnic group (BME). The numbers of students are too small to provide meaningful analysis unless all Black and Minority Ethnic groups are bunched (BME).
- The proportion of White students achieving higher classifications has seen minimal fluctuation over the past few academic cycles, with a slight increase of 2% from 2017 to 2018. The proportion of BME students achieving higher classifications in 2018 has decreased by 3.9% from 2017, to 86.2%. This goes against the trend across the previous three academic cycles: 60% in 2015, 70.5% in 2016 and 90.1% in 2017. 90.9% of White students achieved a higher classification in 2017 **therefore there was a difference of 4.7% between ethnicity groups in the most recent award cycle.**
- It is noted that overall the gap in attainment of higher classifications between undergraduates identifying as White and those identifying as having an ethnicity that was not white has reduced, and that it may be more critical for the institution to address the gap in entry rates. However, it is important that the institution continues to monitor any potential lapses, including at a programme level even when the numbers are small. For example, it is noted that 100% of White students awarded the BA in Technical Theatre Arts achieved a higher classification and 100% of Black students did not. Can this be explained by low numbers or other valid reasons, or is there an underlying issue that needs to be addressed?

## Sex

- 44.1% of the total cohort of undergraduate students awarded in 2018 were female and 55.9% were male.
- 87.3% of female students achieved a higher classification in 2018 compared to 92.2% of male students. The proportion of female students achieving higher classifications has fallen for the first time since 2013; there is no discernible trend for male students whose number of higher classifications has fluctuated.

## Disability

- Students who disclosed a disability formed 17.4% of the total cohort of undergraduate students being awarded in 2018; this is a decrease from 2017 (25.3%).
- 82.1% of students disclosing a disability achieved a higher classification compared to 91.7% of students who did not disclose a disability. **This is a gap of 9.6% between the attainment of disabled and non-disabled students, compared with only a marginal difference between the two groups in 2017 (1.1%).**
- This disparity is found in the BMus programme where 23.1% of students who disclosed a disability did not achieve a higher classification compared with 12.4% of the students who did not disclose a disability, and in the BA TTA where 40% of students who disclosed a disability did not achieve a higher classification compared with 0% of the students who did not disclose a disability (however overall graduating numbers are very small in TTA).

## Age

- For purposes of this analysis students are split into two groups: younger (age 22 and below) and older (age 23 and above). \*
- For BA Acting, BA PACE and BA VDLP there was no difference between the percentages of each age group achieving higher classifications. However, the younger group performed slightly better than the older group on the BMus programme (0.3%) and considerably better on the BA TTA programme (8.5%). For the BMus this has been the case for each year since 2012 with the exception of 2016. For the BA TTA the previous figures are more variable and a trend is not apparent.
- Overall, **younger undergraduates achieve a greater proportion of higher classifications than older undergraduates** (91% of younger students achieve a 1<sup>st</sup> or 2.1 compared to 88.3% of older students). Although the difference is reasonably small, it would be worthwhile looking more closely at the data to discern if older students require further support.

*\*Note the split for OfS is under 21 and then aged 21 to 25. This methodology will be adopted in future.*

## Postgraduate assessment cycle 2017/18

In 2017/18 there were disparities in the achievement of postgraduate students when split by disability status (disability disclosed/disability not disclosed) and ethnicity (White/BME). There is also variability in achievement when split by sex (male/female) and between age groups, although the small numbers of students in particular categories makes it difficult to make meaningful comparisons particularly relating to ethnicity, age, and disability. In addition, these variabilities are not in all cases part of a trend.

### Ethnicity

- 22% of postgraduate students awarded in 2018 identified as from a Black or Minority Ethnic group (BME). The numbers of students are too small to provide meaningful analysis unless all Black and Minority Ethnic groups are bunched (BME).
- The proportion of White postgraduate students achieving higher classifications has fluctuated minimally in the past five academic cycles, with a small decrease of 0.5% from 2017 to 2018. The proportion of BME students achieving higher classifications has also fluctuated over the past five years, in an overall upward arc. However, the total fell from 97% in 2017 to 90.5% in 2018. 96.6% of White students achieved a higher classification in 2018; **there was therefore a difference of 6.1% in attainment of higher classifications between White and BME students in the most recent award cycle.**

### Sex

- 55% of the total cohort of postgraduate students awarded in 2018 were female and 44% were male. 0.5% of the total cohort identified as other. Overall 96.2% of female students achieved a higher classification compared to 94.1% of male students. 100% of students identifying as Other achieved a higher classification (it is noted that this represents such a small number of students that it is difficult to make a meaningful comparison).
- There is no variation in the total of higher classifications achieved by students on Part 2 of the Guildhall Artist Masters, 100% of students achieved a Distinction or Merit. There is however a difference in the number of higher classifications achieved by male and female students on Part 1 of the programme. Female students achieved 4.2% more Distinctions and Merits than male students, and this appears to be a trend.

### Disability

- Students who disclosed a disability formed 5.8% of the total cohort of postgraduate students awarded in 2018, a decrease of 4.1% from 2017; once again, this is notably smaller than the 17.4% of the undergraduate cohort who disclosed a disability.
- **81.9% of students disclosing a disability achieved a higher classification compared to 96.1% of students who did not disclose a disability.** This is consistent with an overall trend of disclosing a disability attaining a smaller proportion of higher classifications. It is noted that the reversal of this in 2017 appears to be an anomaly.

- It appears that this is an area that may require some further attention, from both an admissions and assessments perspective.

### **Age**

- For purposes of this analysis students are split into four age groups: 19-20, 21-24, 25-39 and 40+.\* However the majority of students awarded in 2017/18 fall into the middle two groups, with 0 students in the 19-20 group and 11 students in the 40+ group.
- Overall, the two middle groups achieved similar numbers of higher classifications (98% of 21-24 year olds and 94.6% of 25-39 year olds achieved a Distinction or Merit). For both groups this is a slight decrease from 2017. Ten students in the 40+ group achieved a Distinction or Merit, and one achieved a Pass, so 90.9% were awarded a higher classification. This is an increase from 2017 however the very small number of students in this age group (there were just three awarded in 2017) should be kept in mind when reviewing this data.
- The number of higher classifications achieved by students on the Guildhall Artist Masters programme varies very little between the two age groups that the majority of students fall in to. 97.7% of students in the 21-24 group and 95.7% of students in the 25-39 group achieved a Distinction or Merit. 66.7% of the three Guildhall Artist Masters students in the 40+ category achieved a Distinction or Merit.

*\* Going forward the OfS age splits will be used.*

## Appendix D: Data relating to student regulatory activity during 2018/19

### (a) Admission complaints (Senior School)

All complaints are referred to the Head of Registry Services in the first instance who either investigates them herself, where there is no conflict of interest, or appoints another member of staff to investigate.

<b>Total School cases 2018/19</b>	<b>5 total</b> (1 Music, 4 Acting)	Four complaints dismissed and one partly upheld and an apology issued.
<i>Total School cases 2017/18</i>	<i>6</i>	
<i>Total School cases 2016/17</i>	<i>2</i>	
<i>Total School cases 2015/16</i>	<i>2 Drama</i>	
<i>Total School cases 2014/15</i>	<i>3</i>	

### (b) Academic misconduct: plagiarism or similar cases (Senior School)

Academic Misconduct allegations are investigated at the local level and reported to the relevant Programme Assessment Board (and School Board of Examiners).

	<b>2018/19 cycle</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2015/16</b>
<b>Music</b>	6 cases (2 not found)	2 major first instances, 2 minor instances	6	5	4
<b>Drama</b>			0	0	0
<b>Production Arts</b>			0	0	0

### (c) Academic appeals arising from 2018/19 assessment cycle (as at 14/11/2019) with yearly comparisons

Academic appeals are submitted, in the first instance, to the Quality Assurance Officer (Programme Development) in Registry.<sup>1</sup> The initial investigation is undertaken by the Quality Assurance Officer and where there is a prima facie case, an appeal is referred to the next meeting of the Extenuating Circumstances Panel or to an Academic Appeal Panel as appropriate. In cases where a material administrative or other has occurred, immediate corrective action may be taken without recourse to either Panel.

<sup>1</sup> Quality Assurance Officer (Operations) for 2018 and 2019 whilst post vacant.

<b>Programmes with Appeals</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>Upheld</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>Upheld</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>Upheld</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>Upheld</b>
<b>BMus</b>								
Against Class/Award	1	0						
Against Fail Withdraw	3	3	1	0			1	0 [CoP issued]
Against module mark	1	0	1	0				
Against capped mark	1	1	1	1				
Against resit/resit mark					2	1	1	0
Academic advice								
General exten circ.							1	0
General conduct of assessment							1	0
<b>Production Arts (UG and PG)</b>								
Against Class/Award	1	0			1	0		
<b>Postgraduate music</b>								
Against Class/Award	1	0	2	0	1	0		
Against Fail Withdraw								
Against non-progression			1	0				
Against resit/resit mark							2	2 partly upheld
Against module mark								
					2	1	1	1
<b>Drama (including PACE)</b>								
Against Class/Award			1	0				
Against resit/resit mark							1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>

*CoP = Completion of internal procedures letter which signposts students to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Students have one year from the issuing of a COP letter to complain to the OIA.*

#### **(d) Disciplinary cases (Senior School)**

Allegations of misconduct are referred to the Head of Registry Services (or Dean of Students). Where there is a prima facie case of minor misconduct this will be dealt with under the “informal” procedure and the Head of Registry, or her nominee, is able to issue low level fines, written warnings, and short term suspensions/exclusions. A prima facie case of serious misconduct (Or second offence) will be referred to a hearing of the Student Disciplinary Committee (DCH); the committee has the power to issue higher fines, final written warnings, and longer suspensions and exclusions, including expulsion.

Breaches of the Sundial Court lease are dealt with locally by facilities staff and are not recorded here except final written warnings and/or where a student has appealed and has been issued with a completion of procedures letter.

	<b>Allegations</b>	<b>No of students involved</b>	<b>Level of procedure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Music</b>	Tier 4 visa working non-compliance	1	Appeal	Not upheld, COP issued
	Persistent failure to follow a reasonable instruction	1	Informal	Verbal warning issues
	Tier 4 attendance non-compliance (2 offences)	1	DCH	2 <sup>nd</sup> offence in academic year, final written warning and Registry advised to temporarily curtail visa to enforce intermission of studies.
	Library (4 overdue notices and no action taken by student)	8	Informal	Fines paid before meeting or by agreed date
	<b><i>Total cases 2018/19</i></b>	<b><i>11</i></b>		
<b>Drama (Acting &amp; PACE)</b>	Violence in basement bar	1	Informal	Written warning
	Entering bar when banned	1	DCH	Final written warning
	Failure to follow instructions	1	Informal	Written warning
	Library (4 overdue notices and no action taken by student)	2	Informal	Fines paid before meeting or by agreed date
	<b><i>Total cases 2018/19</i></b>	<b><i>5</i></b>		
<b>Prod. Arts</b>	Inappropriate behaviour against a fellow student	1	Informal	Case dismissed
	Library (4 overdue notices and no action taken by student)	1	Informal	Fines paid before meeting
	<b><i>Total cases 2018/19</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>		
<b>Sundial Court</b>	Breach of fire safety	1	Appeal	Appeal upheld: final written warning and fine annulled
	<b><i>Total cases 2018/19</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>		
<b>Total senior School cases 2018/19</b>		<b>19</b>		
	<i>2017/18</i>	<i>16</i>		
	<i>2016/17</i>	<i>12</i>		
	<i>2015/16</i>	<i>23</i>		
	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>10</i>		
	<i>2013/14</i>	<i>7</i>		
	<i>2012/13</i>	<i>5</i>		

*DCH = Student Disciplinary Committee*

**(e) Academic progress review cases (Senior School)**

Under the *Course participation policy* there are a number of mechanisms for monitoring student participation allowing for timely intervention to keep students on track with their studies; from letters and reminders, to more formal case conferences. Where there has been a persistent lack of participation, or a significant incident, that is not a disciplinary matter, a case will be considered by the Progress Review Committee. For enforced suspension/intermission, or termination of student status there is an appeal mechanism. Progress Reviews are administered at faculty level, and appeals against a progress review decision are administered by Registry.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Outcome of Progress Review Committee meeting</b>	
Engagement and non-attendance, complicated by Tier 4 issues	Second progress review meeting. Termination of student status. Student's appeal not upheld, COP issued	
Non-attendance and non-participation	Student decided to withdraw so progress review was stopped	
Non-attendance and wellbeing concerns	Student required to intermit and return in September	
Well-being concerns under fit to study policy and impact of health condition on assessed work	Action plan	
Non-attendance and non-participation	Termination of student status.	
<b>Total cases 2018/19</b>	<b>5</b>	
<i>Total cases 2017/18</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>Total cases 2016/17</i>	<i>3</i>	
<i>Total cases 2015/16</i>	<i>4</i>	

**(f) Principal's Emergency Powers**

The Principal, or his/her delegate (usually the Dean of Students), may exclude a student to protect the health and safety of an individual student and/or the School community.

During 2018/19 one student was temporarily removed from their studies for two weeks and subsequently had some of their activities restricted on health & safety grounds. There were three temporary exclusions in 2017/18 and three in 2016/17.

**(g) Student complaints (formal)**

The student complaints procedure has four parts. All students are encouraged to resolve their complaint as near to the point of origin as possible. After this point, the formal procedure can be invoked, Stage 1 Head of Department level, Stage 2 Corporate level investigation (organised by the Head of Registry Services), Stage 3 Appeal. Informal statistics are not collected.

<b>Dept</b>	<b>Nature of complaint</b>	<b>Level of procedure &amp; outcome</b>	
<b>Acting</b>	Complaint about a member of staff's behaviour	Stage 1	Not upheld
	<b><i>Total cases for School 2018/19</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>	
	<i>Total cases for School 2017/18</i>	<i>2</i>	
	<i>2016/17</i>	<i>3</i>	
	<i>2015/16</i>	<i>6</i>	
	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>3</i>	

## **h) Other**

There was one formal complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) in respect of an academic appeal outcome in the previous cycle. OIA found the case to be **not justified**. There was one appeal against a decision not to grant a place in Sundial on medical grounds; this was not upheld.

## Appendix E: Equality strands relating to admissions data 2018 entry

An annual analysis of figures for applications, offers and enrolment by Age, Disability, Ethnicity and Gender reviews the following in each equality stream:

- i) Year on year changes of each equality group as a proportion of the total
  - ii) Year on year changes of conversion rates of each equality group
- All years listed relate to year of entry.

### Baseline data:

	2018 offers (% of apps)	2017 offers (% of apps)	2018 enrolled (% of offers)	2017 enrolled (% of offers)
<b>BMus</b>	39.7	41.3	47.1	49.3
<b>BA Acting</b>	1.2	1.0	86.2	84.0
<b>BA Technical Theatre</b>	38.1	38.8	73.1	69.2
<b>BA Video Design</b>	100.0	66.7	100.0	75.0
<b>BA Performance and Creative Enterprise</b>	48.5	44.1	62.5	86.7
<b>GAM Performance</b>	42.1	40.7	51.1	53.8
<b>GAM Leadership</b>	0.0	56.3	0.0	77.8
<b>GAM Composition</b>	30.0	32.0	33.3	50.0
<b>MA Music Therapy</b>	30.6	38.7	72.7	83.3
<b>MA Opera Making &amp; Writing</b>	42.9	50.0	83.3	100.0
<b>Artist Diploma</b>	18.2	23.1	70.0	60.0
<b>MA Acting</b>	1.7	2.1	60.0	83.3
<b>MA Training Actors</b>	0.0	28.6	0.0	100.0
<b>MA Collaborative Theatre Production &amp; Design</b>	81.3	64.7	61.5	45.5
<b>MPhil/ DMus/ PhD</b>	26.8	29.8	72.7	85.7
<b>PG cert Performance Teaching</b>	91.3	100.0	71.4	91.3

### Analysis:

#### Age:

There appeared to be an increase in the number of applications to the GAM performance programme aged 25-39 compared to last year, with a higher offer to enrolment ratio. There was a significant drop in the under 21 age group, with zero offers made (although this is not surprising given a four-year music degree is the entry point), and a slight drop in applications, offers and enrolments in the 21-24 category.

While the proportion of applications and offers has increased for GAM composition programme aged 21-24 and 25-39 the conversion from offer to enrolled remains low.

The age balance in all other programmes has remained relatively steady, with fluctuations within normal parameters.

### **Disability:**

There was an increase in applications, offers and enrolments for the BMus programme who declared a disability compared with last year (from 6.3% in 2017 to 10.8% in 2018)

As in the last three years, no offers were made for 2018 entry to MA Acting students who declared a disability. The percentage of applicants who declared a disability within this period ranged from 6.2% (2015) to 9.6% (2018). This continues a trend seen over the past nine academic cycles – from 2010 to 2014 applicants with a declared disability made up approximately 10% of total applications with one offer in both 2013 and 2014 and no offers in the other years.

### **Ethnicity:**

Applicants continue to be majority white across all programmes except BA PACE. BA Video Design programme remained the highest proportion of white applicants at 100%, and BBA TTA in second highest at 89.4% which is less than last year.

BA Acting programme saw a rise in offers made and accepted in 2017, which remains steady in 2018, however enrolment rate came down by 8.6% from last year.

### **Gender:**

Applications to the MA CTPD programme continued to be majority female, with a slight decrease in the percentage of male applicants (from 17.6% in 2017 to 6.3% in 2018).

BA TTA programme has seen a rise in female applications from last year with higher offers (from 56% in 2017 to 66.4% in 2018), in comparison to male applications, which were less when compared with last year (from 42.5% down to 32.8%).

While the proportion of applicants for MA Music Therapy programme are largely female, there has been a decline in the number of applications since last year (from 87.1% to 72.2%), and the number of male applications went up by 14.9%.

Similarly, the same trend follows with MA Collaborative Theatre programme.

Offers to females for the MA Acting programme have gone up significantly, from 0% in 2017 to 40% this year, and offers to males are fewer in 2018 compared to 2017 (from 100% to 60%).