Performance review report, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, Review Period 2018-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Guildhall School of Music and Drama. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- The areas we explored focused on:
  - How the education provider has embedded the new standards of proficiency to ensure that learners are promoting public health and preventing ill health.
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in 4 years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
  - We have referred one area to their next performance review. This relates to the further integration and involvement of service users and carers in the education providers processes.

Previous consideration	N/A This was not referred to from another process. This review is part of the education providers' periodic engagement with us and the first performance review in this model.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be • whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how
Next steps	• Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year. • Subject to the Panel's decision, we will undertake further investigations as per section 5, through the performance review exercise.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which 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.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:
- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are approved on an open-ended basis, subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:
- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:
- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view on our website.

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Rachel Bell	Lead visitor, Arts Therapist, Music Therapy
Kathryn Campbell	Lead visitor, Physiotherapist
Jenny McKibben	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer
Jonathan Isserow	Advisory visitor, Arts Therapist, Art Therapy

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we had the professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider through our assessment panel. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied, they and the support visitor could assess performance and risk without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme for the Arts (Music) therapist profession. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2013.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in Appendix 2 of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Arts therapist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2013

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes[1].

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary

---

[1] An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available here

Numbers of learners	15	12	2023-24	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of leaners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission. The education provider is recruiting learners broadly at the benchmark which suggests we do not need to further explore resources for the programme solely linked to the number of learners.
Learner non continuation	3%	N/A	2020-21	There is no data available for this data point. We use the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data in our processes, but the education provider's approved programme is postgraduate level and out of scope of HESA. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and (internal) other data points through this performance review assessment. We explored this by making the visitors aware of this ahead of their review. We also shall advise the education provider the best way to provide this data in future. The visitors' findings are contained in the findings section of this report.

Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	97%	2020-21	This data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.
Learner satisfaction	77.4%	80.3%	2023	This data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 7% but still remains around 3% above the benchmark. We explored this by making the visitors aware of this ahead of their review. The visitors' findings are contained in the findings section of this report.

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the thematic areas reviewed section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

<u>Quality theme 1 – Ensuring the curriculum enables those who complete programmes to promote public health and preventing ill health.</u>

Area for further exploration: We note the reflections and work the education provider has conducted to embed the revised standards of proficiency. However, we have not found specific evidence withing the portfolio submission that the standard on promoting public health and preventing ill health is embedded and that learners understand their role in this area. Therefore, we asked the education provider to supply evidence that this is embedded, specifically focusing on ensuring learners are informed to proactively promote public health and prevent ill health.

Quality activities agreed to explore the theme further. We chose to do so by allowing the education provider to submit further documentation and a narrative response. We also raised the opportunity to discuss this further before a documentary submission via a virtual meeting.

Outcomes of exploration: We explored this further through a virtual meeting, during which the education provider supplied further evidence and the visitors could question the provider directly. Here the education provider also advised how they run a lecture for learners on their responsibilities.

The education provider also supplied further documentary evidence, including the programme handbook, which contains references and links to the SOPs. The handbook details the learners' responsibilities to meet the SOPs and details future seminars and workshops on the SOPs. This includes their professional practice seminars, which aim to provide knowledge and skills for working in the field of music therapy.

The visitors were satisfied that the education provider understood and embedded all SOPs, including the SOP on promoting public health and preventing ill health. They found the additional information supplied to have addressed their concerns and that the education provider had demonstrated their embedding of the new SOPs.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this

means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

<u>Quality theme: Institution self-reflection</u>

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Resourcing, including financial stability** –
    - The education provider discussed how they were funded by the City of London until 2006 but they are now a publicly funded Higher Education Institution (HEI). They discussed how they have diversified their income streams, with 25% of their total revenue coming from the City Corporation, 20% from the Office for Students and Research England, and the rest from tuition fees, commercial income, and philanthropic funding. They operate semi-autonomously under the City of London Corporation, with a Board of Governors comprising elected City members, School staff, the Student Union President, and co-opted professionals from the Higher Education and Arts sectors.
    - The education provider discussed how they recorded a financial deficit for the year ending 31 March 2023 but aims to break even by 2025-26 as per its new strategic plan. This plan includes reviewing their academic offer, enhancing budget procedures, planning new programmes, and discussing the future operating model for maintaining the School estate with the City.
    - The visitors recognise that their funds come from various sources and that they are extending the clinical placement tariff to be available to other allied health professionals. The visitors found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations** –
    - The education provider has discussed how the programme has one formal partnership with an organisation, namely Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (since 2020). They have an agreement in place with them to supply an agreed number of practise-based learning placements (placements) per year and some other training services. These are aimed at developing learners' clinical competencies and employability. This agreement is reviewed annually through feedback from learners and staff on both sides. The high percentage of graduates from the programme gaining NHS employment indicates the success of this partnership.
    - Other partnerships with organisations providing placements are informal, at the practitioner or team level rather than the institutional level. As such, they rely largely on building and maintaining relationships of respect and goodwill with the individuals concerned, with additional efforts to re-establish them if the individual in post leaves. This is particularly true in work placement settings outside the NHS, where music therapists often work part-time posts without funded time to supervise trainees. The education provider states that there is a growing pool of graduates and alumni to support placements who are familiar with the programme requirements and provide excellent

support. They state these individuals value their learners' input and find the experience valuable as CPD in their own careers.

- o The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's work in this area over the review period. They recognise the partnerships they have in place and the work they are conducting to establish more link partnerships for future engagements.

- **Academic quality** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how they received a gold-level Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award in 2018 and 2023 for outstanding programme content, delivery, and learner engagement. This also recognised their effective approaches to learner success and progression.
  - o The education provider has discussed how their Academic Assurance Working Group manages academic quality and oversight. This group includes members of the Board of Governors, the Principal, the Dean of Students, the Student Union President, and the Assistant Registrar for Quality Assurance. They meet annually to review and affirm the standards and quality of provision. Their annual academic assurance report covers activities from Programme Boards, Academic Board, module and programme amendments, validation and revalidation, External Examiner appointments and reports, learner degree outcomes, learner surveys, updates to Academic Regulations, and Annual Programme Evaluation Reports.
  - o The education provider has discussed the efforts they are making in regard to ongoing improvements. This includes their assessment boards making adjustments to allow more time for scrutinising component-level marks and comparing anonymised data. They also recruited a data analyst to gain insights into learner outcomes and differential attainment gaps. The education provider also has plans to refresh and re-launch their internal feedback channels integrated with their Virtual Learning Environment to provide detailed feedback on modules, assessments, and teaching styles, enabling a more agile response.
  - o The visitors noted the information submitted for this review. This includes the commendation they received from their revalidation in 2021 for the quality of documentation, the TEF Gold level award they received in 2018 and 2023, and the integration of learner feedback on their virtual learning environment. The visitors found the education provider to be performing well in this area.

- **Placement quality** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how external bodies like the Care Quality Commission do not assess the quality of placements on their Music Therapy MA programme. Instead, this is monitored by programme tutors through weekly Clinical Seminars. Clear communication between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), learners, clinical supervisors, and placement hosts has been vital for the success of the program. The program has established effective systems for managing this through forward planning, communication with prospective supervisors, and considering the balance of each learner's package of placements.

- o They have detailed how learners are required to have clinical experience in two different placement settings in Year 1 and a balanced experience in Year 2 with placements for 2 days per week for 24 weeks. Learners are supervised by HCPC-registered music therapists and are allocated to placements by the Head of Music Therapy. The quality of practice-based learning is monitored through live formal assessments, a final exam at the end of the second year, and a viva discussion.
  - o The education provider has discussed how the biggest challenge is the wide range of settings and providers and the variation in how placements are selected and allocated. They have discussed that role-emerging placements in NHS mental health trusts have been a productive way to grow the workforce.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider supplied further information on how placements are managed and who is responsible for managing them in their internal hierarchy. Here, they detailed how roles are fluid, and how staff members can step in to manage staff absences. The also submitted examples of placement agreements used with placement providers.
  - o Following this expansion, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Interprofessional education** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how their programme is the only one of its kind at their institution. The learners on the programme will learn alongside from other healthcare professions. Opportunities are most common in NHS placements where learners can collaborate closely with other arts therapies learners and sometimes with clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses, and speech and language therapists. In educational settings, they have more contact with educational professionals. In special needs settings, they will encounter educational psychologists, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) practitioners and visiting allied health professionals.
  - o They reflect that given this variation, there are some challenges with achieving parity of learner placement experience. All learners attend three different placements during their training and learn to work in a range of organisational contexts and teams. They also meet client groups supported by a range of multidisciplinary teams. There are regular opportunities for learners to learn from each other in weekly seminar groups where clinical work with other professionals is presented, and learner feedback has consistently rated these learning experiences highly.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider supplied further information on IPE on their programme, including as detailed in the programme handbook.
  - o Following this expansion, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Service users and carers** –
  - o The education provider has reflected on how the programme has developed relationships with East London Foundation Trust and

MENCAP, which support service users with lived experience of mental illness and learning disabilities, respectively. These service users, reflect, and play various roles, including training healthcare professionals.
- o Service users from both organisations are supported by trained staff who attend seminars with them. These sessions include presentations by service users and open discussions where learners interact with service users. All learners are expected to attend these sessions.
- o Through clarification the education provider submitted further information on their approach to and involvement of service users and carers (SU&C's). They also submitted further document including a breakdown of SU&C involvement between academic years 2018-2024.
- o The visitors are satisfied that SU&C's are involved in their education provider processes. But found involvement to be limited to face-to-face contact with learners. There appears to be no input on curriculum design. We recommend for the education providers next review we would welcome further collaboration from SU&C beyond the seminars and more robust feedback from both learners and SU&C for this theme.

- **Equality and diversity** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how they are consulting on their schools Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (EDI) objectives and strategy. This will aim to strengthen the EDI Governance, ensure Equality Impact Assessments are a key element of the decision-making process. They want to ensure that both staff and learners are provided with a suite of EDI training and development. Their Equal Opportunities Policy is communicated to all staff at induction. Roles and responsibilities of staff required from the Equality Act 2010 and other EDI Legislation is included in the mandatory EDI training required of all staff.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider expanded on their submission by submitting further details of equality and diversity mechanisms. This includes how EDI is taught and how EDI is considered through the admissions process.
  - o Following this expansion, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Horizon scanning** –
  - o During the Covid-19 pandemic (2020-2022), the education provider faced challenges due to government restrictions, necessitating a switch between online, in-person, and blended learning. The education provider reflected that despite these challenges, they seized opportunities to advance strategic objectives, such as investing in low-latency technology for synchronous teaching and broadcasting public events online, significantly increasing audience reach. Post-pandemic, the institution achieved high rankings, including number one in Arts, Drama & Music by the Complete University Guide 2024, and received a 90% positivity rating in course teaching and academic support from graduating learners in the National Student Survey (NSS) 2023.
  - o The education provider has also reflected on how they have excelled in research, being the top-rated music conservatoire in the Research

Excellence Framework 2021. They have experienced substantial growth in research activities, particularly in music therapy. Leadership changes saw a new Principal focusing on cultural change and financial recovery. The institution's commitment to inclusivity and anti-discrimination continued, with efforts to diversify curricula and develop equity literacy. Community engagement initiatives, such as expanded youth programs and professional development courses, thrived post-pandemic.

- o The visitors recognise the major investment in new technology and reflect on their internal revalidation. The visitors are satisfied with their performance in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: We recommend by the next performance review that the education provider supply further reflections / details of service users and carer involvement. We recommend they reflect on the collaboration beyond the seminars and more robust feedback from both learners and SU&C on their involvement and interactions.

<u>Quality theme: Thematic reflection</u>

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
    - o The education provider has discussed embedding the new SOPs into their approved programme. The revised SOPs were considered by their programme staff at meetings, and necessary changes were made to the programme. They also reflect that many new areas were already in place and embedded through practice-based learning placements.
    - o The education provider reflected that the new theme of Promoting public health and preventing ill health is addressed formally through Placement Supervisors' assessment of learners' work on each placement.
    - o They also found no changes to teaching or placement experience and assessment necessary to further centralise service users. They found that the teaching and assessment of learners about placement practice continue to ensure learners can meet the revised standards and remain primarily focused on the needs of their service users.
    - o They reflected that learners' mental and physical health and self-care are already well supported on the programme with one long module each year on personal awareness, which includes compulsory personal therapy and experiential, reflective practice groups, and regular personal tutor contact, with referral to Student Welfare services available where appropriate. A Professional Practice session in Year 2 is devoted to self-care with advice on continuing this into their professional life. No changes were found necessary to enable their learners to meet the revised standards.
    - o For digital skills and new technology, the education provider uses a blended approach combining in-person lectures and practical sessions with online materials via Moodle. Each module has a dedicated Moodle

site with curated materials, lecture recordings, reading lists, and assessment briefs. Resources are available in alternative formats for accessibility. Learners are encouraged to develop independent learning and research skills and can share insights via online forums. A separate study skills site supports writing, note-taking, and other skills, especially for those returning to study. Updates to Moodle sites are made regularly, and a neurodivergent-friendly format is being trialled.

o For the Music Therapy MA programme, learners use audio and video recordings on placement, with confidentiality procedures in place. They use the same digital technologies as in their placements and undertake mandatory training. For this area the education provider found no changes necessary to ensure students meet the revised standards.

o They reflect that learners already have extensive experience on placements where, like their supervisors, they are the only Arts Therapist in a given setting, as well as placements where they may be part of a larger team. This is typical of Arts Therapy practice. Learners, therefore, have experience of taking a leadership role in both representing Music Therapy and working with other staff (e.g. teachers, teaching assistants, occupational therapists, health care assistants, etc.) in a leading, rather than following, role as a specialist in their discipline. This capacity is assessed through their Clinical Placement modules in Years 1 and 2, and meets the SOPs related to leadership.

o The visitors found the education provider to have demonstrated the work they have conducted to embed the new standards of proficiency. However, we have not found specific evidence that this area is embedded and that learners understand their role in promoting public health and preventing ill health. We therefore chose to explore this further via quality theme one.

o Following this, the visitors were satisfied that the new SOPs have been embedded in the programme. The visitors have no further concerns and are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Learning and developments from the Covid-19 pandemic** –
    o The education provider reflected that the Covid-19 pandemic significantly impacted them. Especially their performing arts-focused programmes. For the MA in Music Therapy, all placements were suspended in the summer term of 2020. This required postponing Year 1 placements to the autumn term and running Year 2 placements from January to July 2021 to meet the minimum clinical hours. Despite the challenges, the support from programme staff and professional colleagues ensured learners could complete their requirements.

    o Throughout the 2020-21 academic year, many placements were unavailable due to Covid-related restrictions. However, the education provider reflected that those who could take learners were highly supportive, showcasing the strong relationships built over the years. The Guildhall maintained onsite practical activities with safety measures while theoretical and research teaching moved online. In January 2021, government restrictions limited teaching to online, but exceptions were made for subjects like Music Therapy, allowing essential in-person teaching to continue.

- o By January 2021, Music Therapy learners were the only ones receiving in-person classes, with tutors and facilities staff being the only staff in the building. This, the reflect, was a unique situation highlighted the programme's resilience and adaptability. From the 2022-23 cohort onwards, in-person teaching resumed as the institution-wide policy. The experience underscored the value of online platforms for meetings and tutorials, the challenges of engaging with online clinical lectures, and the difficulties of delivering interactive musical therapy online.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider supplied more information about how they supported learners during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic. This included their annual programme evaluation document from 2021-22 that included results from their learner satisfaction survey. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider performance in this area and found them to be performing satisfactorily.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how music therapy training involves live role-play to simulate clinical situations rather than technical simulation. The programme includes teaching on using music technology in Music Therapy practice, particularly for service users with profound and multiple learning and / or physical disabilities.
  - o The education provider has implemented a Generative AI policy allowing learners to use AI tools in their assessable work, provided it does not compromise the principle of 'own work'. Learners must be transparent about their use of AI, attribute sources correctly, and use AI ethically. Since Music Therapy learners' clinical assignments are based on their personal experiences, there is no risk of plagiarism. The policy covers academic assignments, and learners are encouraged to use AI for templates and reports, with regular monitoring as the technology evolves.
  - o The visitors note how the education provider actively links in with their professional body (British Association of Music Therapists) and its training and education committee. The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area, finding them to be performing satisfactorily.
- **Apprenticeships in England** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how they do not offer apprenticeship places on any of its programmes and is not a registered provider with the Skills Funding Agency. While there is interest in accommodating apprentices in the future, the current workload to validate new part-time study pathways, resource additional delivery modes, and meet reporting requirements for HESA and the Skills Funding Agency is not feasible. They reflect that apprenticeships are currently not an option for prospective learners due to the need for additional validation work and reporting requirements. Expansion to include apprenticeships will only be possible once these resources are available.
  - o The visitors recognised the education providers' explanation in this area and that they are not planning on providing apprenticeships.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** –
  o The education provider has stated that there have been no assessments, reviews or audits related to this area in the review period.
- **Office for Students (OfS)** –
  o The education provider has reflected how during the reference period, there was no OfS monitoring. As the Accountable Officer, the Principal ensures the education provider complies with the OfS' Conditions of Registration, with advice from the School Executive and briefings to the Board of Governors. Oversight of academic standards and quality management is delegated to the Governance & Effectiveness Committee, which advises on strategic changes.
  o To prepare for compliance with new registration conditions, the education provider has formed a Strategic Advisory Group with members from various departments. This group reports to the Principal and School Executive, determining necessary actions such as regulatory changes, training, and new processes, which are then approved and implemented by the Principal and School Executive.
  o Through clarification the education provider submitted evidence in response to ongoing OfS conditions.
  o The visitors welcomed the additional information for this area and are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area, finding them to be performing satisfactorily.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
  o The education provider has discussed how the MA in Music Therapy is their only programme approved by a regulatory body. They have no other relationships with professional regulators or bodies in the healthcare sector. The professional body British Association of Music Therapists (BAMT) does not formally assess their programmes. All the tutors are members, and three of the programme staff have been past chair of the organisation.
  o The Programme Leader and established staff are members of the BAMT Training and Education Committee, along with staff from the other HCPC-approved Music Therapy programmes. This, they reflect, is a collaborative and well-functioning forum that allows programmes to exchange information and ways to meet challenges (especially during the Covid-19 pandemic) and share support and guidance. The programme leader at Guildhall has provided input to a joint document titled "Curriculum guidance for the pre-registration education and training of music therapists".
  o The visitors note how the education provider actively links in with their professional body and its training and education committee. The

visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area, finding them to be performing satisfactorily.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Curriculum development** –
  - o The education provider's approved programme underwent significant curriculum changes from 2018 to 2023. Internally driven changes included module amendments in 2019 and 2021, aimed at reducing assessment complexity and broadening the evaluation of learners' academic and professional skills. For instance, the assessment tasks for Musical Resources were reorganised, and the Applied Theoretical and Research Skills module saw a reduction in assignments. Additionally, the programme documentation was revised to remove gendered and ableist language and to include references to neurodiversity and cultural diversity.
  - o Externally driven changes were influenced by the Covid-19 pandemic, the BAMT Diversity Report, and the revised HCPC Standards of Proficiency in 2023. The education provider updated its online admissions portal to be more inclusive and adjusted its teaching on diversity issues to be delivered by tutors with lived experience. The revised HCPC standards were integrated into the programme, ensuring that learners meet the new requirements through various assignments and practical experiences.
  - o They also established a Strategic Advisory Group to prepare for compliance with new registration conditions. This group, reporting directly to the Principal and School Executive, determines necessary actions such as regulatory changes, training, and new processes. These actions are then approved and implemented by the Principal and School Executive to ensure ongoing compliance and improvement of the programme.
  - o The visitors recognise how internal feedback from learners and external examiners had driven change in the curriculum. They also note how external drivers of curriculum change over the review period have included the new SOPs. The education provider has demonstrated here more evidence of how the SOPs have been implemented. The visitors are satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –
  - o The education provider has stated that no new sector guidance was relevant to the MA in Music Therapy published during the review period. They reflect that their programme team are actively contributing to curriculum guidance being developed by the BAMT, and the programme already meets and, in several instances, exceeds these expectations. An example of this includes how they offer a third clinical

placement, while sector guidelines will recommend two. They reflect that it can be challenging to identify a third placement.
- o They reflect that they have received overwhelmingly positive learner feedback who felt that a third placement was invaluable and expanded their expertise and employability prospects. When it was considered during internal revalidation to reduce the number of placements, it was ultimately kept at three on the strength of learner feeling.
- o The visitors found the education provider to be exceeding sector expectations by offering three placements on their programme. They noted that the necessity of this was reviewed and the number maintained in light of learner feedback. The visitors are satisfied with their performance in this area finding them to be performing well.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level)** –
  - o Learners in the 2-year programme must complete clinical placements, with Year 1 requiring experience in two different settings and Year 2 involving two days per week for 24 weeks in a single setting. This structure ensures a balanced and in-depth clinical experience. Each academic year, 36 placements are organized across various sectors, including NHS Trusts, voluntary and 3rd sector organizations, schools, and day centres. The Programme Leader, acting as the placement coordinator, secures agreements from supervisors, with past graduates providing valuable placement opportunities.
  - o Challenges include varying experiences due to the diversity of placement organizations and support levels for music therapy. Some NHS placements require learners to compete for positions through interviews. Strong connections between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and placement providers, along with the establishment of placement coordinators within some trusts, have proven effective in developing and maintaining placements.
  - o Through clarification the education provider submitted more information and documentation on how they manage their placement capacity. This included their placement agreement for second year learners which details the responsibilities of all parties.
  - o The visitors were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in relation to this area. Evidence show they have processes to ensure sufficient practice-based learning placement capacity for their learners and mechanisms to monitor these placements.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Learners** –
  - o The education provider reflected that the most consistent theme in their learners' feedback is resourcing and their busy learning environment. This caters predominantly to performing arts learners who often have

pedagogical requirements for being timetabled in their largest, most modern spaces.

- o Following the pandemic and the ability of some other programmes to integrate remote learning into their provision, they were able to benefit from the use of a wider array of learning environments, and their learners have appreciated this.
- o Other feedback has centred around the language used in assessment feedback and a feeling amongst learners to relate the written feedback to the mark they are given. In response to this, efforts have been made to align the language used in assessment feedback to assessment criteria and learning outcomes. learners receiving difficult feedback or whose mark is on the borderline will also have meetings with their personal tutor to go through the feedback in depth for clarification, support and guidance.
- o The visitors were satisfied how the education provider is performing relating to this area. They have processes in place to collect feedback from learners and take actions in response to that feedback.

- **Practice placement educators** –
  - o The education provider had discussed how feedback from their placement hosts has been generally been positive and placement providers reflect that they are grateful for high calibre learners.
  - o The education provider does reflect that a small number of instances have arisen where placement hosts have felt learners have been insufficiently prepared for the particular professional demands placed upon them in clinical settings. These, they state, are isolated incidences concerning professional conduct and the challenges of transitioning between a learner environment to a professional setting. In response, the Programme team introduced a session early on in the first year addressing professional accountability and making learners aware of the HCPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPE's). No further feedback of this nature since this new session was introduced.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider explained how the annual reporting and assessment of the programme is conducted. Additionally, they provided examples of the recent programme evaluations.
  - o Following this, the visitors were satisfied that the education provider is responding appropriately to practice educator feedback and reporting. Noting how actions have been taken in response to this feedback. We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **External examiners** –
  - o The education provider has referred to the external examiner's reports which highlight the structure and curriculum of the music therapy programme. The report discusses how these align with HCPC standards and also comparable MA training. The programme is praised for its progressive and regularly assessed elements, ensuring learners achieve high academic standards. The curriculum's relevance and responsiveness to professional standards are consistently noted, with learners demonstrating strong performance in assessments and viva presentations.

- The reports also emphasise the programme's commitment to diversity and inclusion, particularly through the incorporation of recent literature by the majority of global therapists. The programme has made efforts to address issues of cultural sensitivity and inclusion, as suggested by the external examiner. This ongoing review and adaptation of reading lists and resources reflect the programme's dedication to maintaining an inclusive and current curriculum.
- Additionally, the programme's focus on employability and pastoral support is highlighted. Learners, they reflect, appreciate the practical workshops and instrumental teaching, which enhance their clinical practice. The external examiner commends the programme for providing a supportive environment that prepares learners for their future roles as clinicians, with a clear emphasis on meeting HCPC standards and fostering professional growth.
- Through clarification the education provider submitted further information including recent External Examiner (EE) reports. They also included responses to EE questions and documents from their re-validation.
- Following this, the visitors were therefore satisfied that the education provider is addressing external examiner feedback appropriately and working to improve on any areas highlighted. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

<u>Data and reflections</u>

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Learner non continuation:**
  - The visitors were unclear how the public data sourced by the HCPC applied to the HCPC-approved programme at the education provider. The asked the education provider to provide specific information on this if available.
  - Through clarification the education provider detailed how this remains low with only one music therapy learner withdrawing in the review period. The education provider also submitted further information including information on their programme re-validation and annual programme monitoring processes.
  - The visitors welcomed this expansion and were satisfied that the education provider's reflection showed that they have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - The visitors found the data and reflections on learner's outcomes / outcomes from those completing the programme to be unclear. The asked the education provider to provide specific information on this if available.
  - Through clarification the education provider discussed how they are performing above the benchmark and how their low learner numbers

can impact the data available. They discussed the kind of support that has been provided to learners and graduates in recent years. The education provider also submitted further information including information on their programme re-validation and annual programme monitoring processes.

- o The visitors welcomed this expansion and were satisfied that the education provider's reflection showed that they have performed satisfactorily in this area.

- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - o The visitors note how the education provider has reflected that no learner satisfaction data is available for them. This is because we use the OfS's Nations Student Survey (NSS) in our processes. The education provider-approved programme is postgraduate level and, therefore not covered by the NSS. However, they recognise there is a post-graduate taught education survey (PTES) available. They asked for clarification if learners complete the PTES and if the education provider obtains this data.
  - o Through clarification the education provider submitted further information on how they assess learner satisfaction. Including information on their programme re-validation and annual programme monitoring processes.
  - o The visitors welcomed the expansion and note that mechanisms are available to monitor learner satisfaction. They were satisfied that the education provider's reflection showed that they have performed satisfactorily in this area.

- **Programme level data:**
  - o The visitors found there to be clear data available for the education provider and recognise how the education provider is implementing changes to assist this data collection. They also note the small learner intake and also the high staff to learner ratio.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Further centralising service user and carer involvement

Summary of issue: We noted from the education providers' reflections that service users and carers are involved in their process. However, we have found these to be limited to face-to-face interactions only. By the next performance review, we recommend that the education provider supply further reflections / details of service users and carer involvement. We recommend they reflect on the collaboration

beyond the seminars and more robust feedback from both learners and SU&C on their interactions. SU&C feedback should also be collected on this and used to help inform positive change.

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2027-28 academic year
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in section 5 of this report

Reason for next engagement recommendation
- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engages with the professional body for music therapy. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
  - The education provider did not engage with other professional or system regulator(s). This is because the MA in Music Therapy is their only programme approved by a regulatory body.
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply:
  - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
  - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2027-28 academic year

Reason for this decision: The Education Training Committee Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended ongoing monitoring period. They agreed this recommendation for the reasons noted throughout the report.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Guildhall School of Music and Drama	CAS-01358-B3L0W5	Kathryn Campbell Rachel Bell	4 years	We are recommending a four-year ongoing monitoring period for this education provider. We are choosing a shorter period than five years as we have one area of referral. We considered that four years is sufficient time for the education provider to consider and act on our referral. This also reflects their performance in this process.	We noted from the education provider's reflections that service users and carers are involved in their process. However, we have found these to be limited to face-to-face interactions only. By the next performance review, we recommend that the education provider supply further reflections / details of service users and carer involvement. We recommend they reflect on the collaboration beyond the seminars and more robust feedback from both learners and SU&C on their interactions. SU&C feedback should also be collected on this and used to help inform positive change.

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
MA Music Therapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Music therapy	N/A	01/09/2013