



Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama

Date: MONDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 2021
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 3 AND ACCESSIBLE VIA TEAMS

Members:

Graham Packham (Chairman)	Alderman William Russell
Randall Anderson (Deputy Chairman)	Andy Taylor
Vivienne Littlechild	Neil Greenwood
George Abrahams	Dr Paula Haynes
Deputy David Bradshaw	Munsur Ali
Professor Geoffrey Crossick	Harry Plant
Professor Maria Delgado	Natasha Bucknor
Amatey Doku	Andrew Mayer
Simon Duckworth	Jonathan Vaughan
Marianne Fredericks	
Steven Gietzen	
Jeremy Mayhew	

Enquiries: julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at
<https://youtu.be/HJAKMyholc0>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

NB: Certain matters for information have been marked * and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting

Certain non-contentious matters for decision have been marked + with recommendations to be agreed without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 20th September 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 14)

4. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF RECENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS ***

To receive the following sets of public minutes :

For Information

- a) Remuneration and Nominations Committee - 2nd November 2021 (draft) - TO FOLLOW
- b) Governance and Effectiveness Committee - 4th November 2021 (draft) - TO FOLLOW
- c) Finance and Resources - 8th November 2021 (draft) - TO FOLLOW
- d) Audit and Risk Management - 9th November 2021 (draft) - TO FOLLOW

5. **PRINCIPAL'S PUBLIC REPORT**

Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

For Information
(Pages 15 - 26)

6. **STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH CUC CODE OF GOVERNANCE**

Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

For Decision
(Pages 27 - 44)

7. **ACADEMIC BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21**
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 45 - 82)
8. **REMUNERATION ANNUAL REPORT 2021 +**
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama.
For Decision
(Pages 83 - 106)
9. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**
10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
11. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non Public Agenda

12. **NON PUBLIC MINUTES**
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 20th September 2021.
For Decision
(Pages 107 - 112)
13. **NON PUBLIC MINUTES OF RECENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS***
To receive the following:
For Information
- a) Remuneration and Nominations - 2nd November (draft) - TO FOLLOW
 - b) Governance and Effectiveness - 4th November (draft) - TO FOLLOW
 - c) Finance and Resources - 8th November (draft) - TO FOLLOW
 - d) Audit and Risk Management - 9th November (draft) - TO FOLLOW
14. **PRINCIPAL'S NON PUBLIC REPORT**
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 113 - 130)

15. **TARGET OPERATING MODEL - REQUEST FOR A DELEGATED DECISION**
Principal to be heard.
For Decision
16. **NSS ASSESSMENT RATINGS - SCHOOL'S RESPONSE**
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 131 - 138)
17. **SAFEGUARDING UPDATE**
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 139 - 140)
18. **RESEARCH**
To receive 2 updates from the Head of Research, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
- a) Research strategy 2021-26 (Pages 141 - 144)
- b) Annual Report 2020/21 (Pages 145 - 162)
19. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA RISK REGISTER ***
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 163 - 254)
20. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL BUDGET REPORT – 2022/23 ***
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 255 - 260)
21. **MANAGEMENT DASHBOARD FOR THE SIX MONTHS TO SEPTEMBER 2021 ***
Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.
For Information
(Pages 261 - 268)
22. **NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**
23. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DRAMA

Monday, 20 September 2021

Minutes of the virtual meeting at 1.45pm streamed to:

<https://youtu.be/byFF1-Bz7JU>

this recording will be available for one year from the date of the meeting

Present

Members:

Graham Packham (Chairman)	Professor Maria Delgado
George Abrahams	Marianne Fredericks
Munsur Ali	Steven Gietzen
Randall Anderson	Andrew Mayer
Professor Geoffrey Crossick	Jeremy Mayhew
Simon Duckworth	Harry Plant
	Jonathan Vaughan

In Attendance

Lew Hodges	– Member of the Finance Committee of the Board
Michael Herington	– Member of the Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Board

Officers:

Katharine Lewis	- Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Andrew Lavender	- Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Alison Mears	- Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Hetsie Van Rooyen	- Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Amy Grimes	- Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Cornell Farrell	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Jonathan Poyner	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Charlotte Lythgoe	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Hannah Bibbins	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Sean Gregory	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Sarah Wall	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Graeme Hood	- Guildhall School/Barbican Centre
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerks

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy David Bradshaw and Andy Taylor.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. **PUBLIC MINUTES**

The public minutes of the meeting held on 17th May 2021 were approved as a correct record.

4. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF RECENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS ***

The Board received the public minutes of the following Committees:

4.1 Governance and Effectiveness Committee - 5th July 2021

4.2 Audit and Risk Management Committee - 15th July 2021

The Board noted that the Audit and Risk Committee had held a 'Special' meeting on 7th September, to consider the Financial Statements and recommend them to the Board. The draft minutes would be included in the next Board agenda and the Chair (of the Audit and Risk Management Committee) would provide an update under Agenda Item 8.

4.3 Finance and Resources Committee - 8th September 2021

The Board noted that a finalised version of these minutes, approved by the Chairman, had been included in the Supplementary Agenda pack.

5. **TO APPOINT A DEPUTY CHAIRMAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 30**

Being the only Governor willing to serve, it was RESOLVED, that – Randall Anderson be elected as Deputy Chairman for the ensuing year.

The Chairman thanked Vivienne Littlechild for her service as Deputy Chairman.

6. **TO CONFIRM AN APPOINTMENT TO THE GOVERNANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE**

Members noted that Paula Haynes had intended to stand for the Governance and Effectiveness Committee at the last Board meeting on 17th May 2021 but had experienced IT difficulties so was unable to put her name forward. Paula had declared her willingness to serve to the Clerk, the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the Committee, immediately after the meeting, and attended the last Governance and Effectiveness Committee as an observer.

RESOLVED, that – Paula Haynes be appointed to the Governance and Effectiveness Committee.

7. **PRINCIPAL'S PUBLIC REPORT - INCLUDING STRATEGIC AND BUSINESS PLAN UPDATES**

The Board received the Interim Principal's public report. Governors noted that enrolment numbers were higher than expected for both overseas and home students. However, given the difficulties that some students had been experiencing with travel arrangements, exact numbers could not be confirmed for another 3-4 weeks.

Governors commended a constructive report and during the discussion and questions, the following points were noted:

- a) Whilst the initial response to BLM had required a 'top down' approach, it was clear that further community engagement was required. There had been extensive discussions around changing artistic practices and reading lists, and guest artists from diverse backgrounds had been visiting the School. The Interim Principal stressed that senior managers had devoted a lot of time to this work and, whilst actual targets had not been set, the desired outcomes were well understood and would be tested to ensure they could be delivered.
- b) An External Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Consultant had been appointed over the past year and an appointment for a Head of EDI was underway. A number of 'listen and learn' sessions had taken place, with staff and students, and their findings had resulted in the first iteration of an action plan. A set of objectives arising from the Anti-Racism Task and Finish Group had led to the formation of an EDI Committee, which had met several times. The EDI Committee had agreed strongly that it needed more time to revisit the recommendations and objectives. However, the various faculties were working through them, to produce a joint action plan, and the Interim Principal was confident that their findings could be presented to the Board in a timely manner.
- c) Achievements over the past year had included the appointment of a new Head of Equality and Inclusion, the roll out of training and development of staff and students, and a mandate and Terms of Reference for the EDI Committee. It was accepted that visible change was likely to take time but, in due course, the Board would need to see more tangible targets in respect of the various EDI dimensions of the curriculum and productions, with descriptions as to where real change was happening.
- d) The School is responsible for ensuring that students are able to cope, given that the arts world is a strong force for positive transformation in areas such as BLM and 'Me Too'. The Interim Principal confirmed that this would be a fundamental part of its courses.
- e) The School was congratulated on its strong NSS results and Career Fellowships. Each Director goes through the NSS, line by line, suggesting mitigations on perceived weaknesses. The suggestions are then presented to the Academic Boards and objectives are set for each department.
- f) The Chamberlain and Finance Committee Members have indicated that they would be supportive of the School's request for a Chief Operating Officer (COO). The Interim Principal stressed that the role would be essential to achieving the School's 5-Year Strategy. The School was awaiting a final decision from the City Corporation in respect of strategic investments.
- g) Drama courses work as an ensemble of 24 to a unit but music tuition is more likely to be on a 1-1 basis. Therefore, marking assessment ratings were better for music, as the pandemic had compromised group tuition. The Dean and Secretary advised that the Programme Boards were due to meet

early this term, to look at both sets of data. Historically, their findings had been presented to the November Board, together with an action sheet setting out areas of concern.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

8. **ANNUAL FINANCIAL RETURN TO THE OFFICE FOR STUDENTS +**

The Board considered a report of the Principal in respect of the documents required for submission to the Office for Students by 30th September 2021.

The Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee presented the report and advised that the Committee had received these documents at a ‘Special Meeting’, to ensure that they were scrutinised in good time for this Board Meeting. The Chair advised that, next year, the meeting scheduling would accommodate this, without the need for a Special Meeting. The Committee had also included an ‘in-camera’ session with the External Auditors and received the completion statement. The Chair was pleased to report that there were no significant issues.

The Board noted the change in the reporting deadline: i.e. – the return represented 8, and not 12 months this year, but this had not compromised the audit. The Committee had made some suggestions in respect of the presentation and amendments to the commentary, in order to reflect the distinctive character of the School.

The Chair confirmed that the Audit and Risk Management Committee had been satisfied with the documents, and recommended their approval to the Board of Governors, subject to their being no significant issues arising from the City Corporation’s full External Audit, which had not been completed at the time of the Committee meeting. The Board noted that the External Auditors had asked for this caveat to be added. The Group Accountant confirmed this position and advised that there had been a few further minor changes to the commentary, since the despatch of the papers, and was happy to provide them to Governors on request.

RESOLVED, that - the supporting documents set out in 8.1-8.4 below, and appended to the report, be authorised for return to the Office for Students in accordance with the filing requirements:

- 8.1 Audited Financial Statements for the eight months to 31 March 2021.
- 8.2 Management Letter from the External Auditors regarding the Financial Statements.
- 8.3 The Annual Financial Return setting out the School's results for the last two years and Forecasts for the following five years.
- 8.4 A commentary covering the main year on year variances contained within the Annual Financial Return.

9. **INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT AND OPINION ***

The Board received the Annual Report and Opinion of the Head of Audit and Risk Management, which had been scrutinised by the Audit and Risk Management Committee at its meeting on 7th September 2021.

RESOLVED, that – the Opinion of the Head of Audit and Risk Management 2020-21 be noted; i.e. - the School's systems of risk management, control and governance, economy, effectiveness and efficiency are generally robust and can be reasonably relied upon to ensure that School's objectives are achieved.

10. **ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

The Board considered the Annual Report of the Audit and Risk Committee, which had been recommended for approval by the Board at its meeting on 7th September 2021.

The Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee presented the Committee's Annual Report, which set out how the Committee had sought to strengthen its way of working in 2020-21. The Chair felt that the Committee was operating as an effective and cohesive unit; with the ability to challenge effectively. In order to achieve this, the Board had approved some extensive changes to the Committee's Terms of Reference earlier in the year.

The Committee had worked well with the Internal Audit Team, noting that the pandemic had affected the work programme, and the Chair thanked the Head of Audit and Risk Management and his team for their co-operative approach. The Board were asked to note an amendment to the report in that Internationalisation had received 'substantial' and not 'moderate' assurance.

In terms of Risk Management, the Committee had sought to develop a new summary Risk Register, which focussed less on process and more on the strategy behind the risk and implementation of actions. The Board noted that the report on today's non-public agenda demonstrated this new approach. The Group Accountant was thanked for his excellent work in producing the new format, and the constructive approach of senior colleagues was also commended. Finally, the Chair advised that, whilst retaining oversight, scrutiny of governance risks falls within the remit of the Governance and Effectiveness Committee.

RESOLVED, that – the report of the Audit and Risk Management Committee be approved for inclusion in the submission of documents to the Office for Students, as referenced in agenda item (8) above.

11. **CAPITAL AND CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

The Board considered a report of the Director of Operations and Buildings, which provided an update on the School's building and refurbishment projects (under the Capital Cap Programme), together with those approved for delivery under the Cyclical Works Programme (CWP). The Board noted that the report had been approved by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee of the City of London Corporation.

The Board noted that the fire alarms were almost at the end of their defects period and the project was complete. However, some general contingencies had been requested in order to provide a link between the School buildings. The officer advised that a quotation had been received but this would need to be presented to the Projects Sub Committee, as it represented a change of scope.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

12. CARBON REDUCTION KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPI'S) AND APPROVED STRATEGY

The Board considered a report of the Director of Operation and Buildings in respect of the Guildhall School's original Carbon Reduction Strategy, which was first approved and published in February 2011, to run until 2020/21. The Board was, therefore, asked to approve a new Carbon Management Plan for 2021 to 2027. Governors commended an interesting and comprehensive report which demonstrated the School's commitment to addressing climate change.

RESOLVED, that - the revised Carbon Reduction Strategy, appended to the report, be approved.

13. SAFEGUARDING POLICY

The Board considered a report of the Principal in respect of the Safeguarding Policy, which had been updated to incorporate the latest statutory guidance and to make the document more user friendly. The Board noted that the current Safeguarding Lead Governors are Vivienne Littlechild and Natasha Bucknor.

The Head of Safeguarding advised that 'Keeping Children Safe in Education' had been updated and a link has been included in the policy and on the website. The Board also noted that on-line safeguarding training had been rolled out to all Governors, to include the new cohort.

RESOLVED, that – the revised Strategy, appended to the report, be approved.

14. ARRANGEMENTS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman was heard in respect of arrangements for future meetings and sought Governors views as to their preferences for virtual, hybrid or 'in-person' meetings.

Whilst there was some preference for returning to full 'in-person' meetings eventually, the hybrid model was supported for its convenience for those members who need to travel to Guildhall. Furthermore, it respects any health concerns they might have and enables them to make their own judgements. It was also agreed that virtual meetings are a convenient way of holding call-overs, agenda planning and more general officer meetings. The Interim Principal advised that the School was experimenting with hybrid technology and agreed with these views. The Chair endorsed these comments and added

that, should more restrictions be necessary over the Winter, the Hybrid model remains the most flexible option.

15. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

There were no questions.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no items.

17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

Item	Paragraph
19- 20	3
21	2,3
22	1 & 2
23-25	3
27	1,2 & 3

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 17th May 2021 were approved as a correct record.

19. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF RECENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS ***

The Board received the following non-public minutes:

19.1 Governance and Effectiveness Committee - 5th July 2021

19.2 Audit and Risk Management Committee - 15th July 2021

19.3 Finance and Resources Committee - 8th September 2021

20. **PRINCIPAL'S NON-PUBLIC REPORT**

The Board received the Principal's Non-Public Report.

21. **STUDENT UNION ANNUAL REPORT**

The Board received the Annual Report of the Student Union.

22. **SAFEGUARDING NON-PUBLIC REPORT**

The Board received the non-public Safeguarding report.

23. **MANAGEMENT DASHBOARD FOR THE FOUR MONTHS TO JULY 2021**

The Board received a report of the Principal.

24. **RISK REGISTER**

The Board received a report of the Principal.

25. **TOWN CLERK'S 'REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN' RE Barbican and Guildhall School Fire Safety Projects (Multiple) and Confined Spaces Project - Gateway 2 - Issues Report**

The Board received a report of the Town Clerk reporting the above urgent decision.

At 3.40pm Governors agreed to extend the meeting until 4pm in order to conclude the business on the agenda.

26. **NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

There were no questions.

27. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

Two items of business were considered and approved whilst the public were excluded in respect of :

1. The Appointment of a new External Governor.
2. Guildhall School Capital Bids 2022/23.

The meeting ended at 4pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Julie Mayer tel. no.: 020 7332 1410
julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

FINANCE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA

Monday, 8 November 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama held via Microsoft Teams on Monday, 8 November 2021 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Graham Packham (Chairman)	Neil Greenwood
Randall Anderson (Deputy Chairman)	Lew Hodges
George Abrahams	

Officers:

Jonathan Vaughan	- Guildhall School of Music & Drama
Graeme Hood	- Guildhall School of Music & Drama
Aqib Hussain	- Chief Operating Officer's Department
Sarah Phillips	- Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. PUBLIC MINUTES

The public minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2021 were approved as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Annual Financial Return to the Office for Students (page 5) - Officers reminded the Sub-Committee that, at the last meeting, the need for audited City Cash accounts as part of this process had been flagged. Officers reported that these were not yet available and that, as a consequence, they had written to the Office for Students to request an extension. This request had been granted and the School now had a revised deadline of 14 January 2022 by which to file their returns. There was an expectation that City Cash accounts would be available in December 2021.

It was reported that the response from the Office for Students seemed to suggest that they thought that this delay could have been avoided and Officers questioned whether the School ought to respond to re-iterate that this matter was out of their hands. It was decided that, on balance, this was probably not advisable and that efforts should be concentrated on working with colleagues in

the City Corporation to ensure that, in future, appropriate solutions were in place to ensure that the School was able to file returns in accordance with the original deadlines. A Member commented that the City Corporation's Finance Committee had been given fairly strong assurances that the accounts would be ready by the new deadline. He went on to highlight that this was a much broader issue around insufficient capacity in terms of local authority auditing.

4. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE FINANCE & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

5. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

6. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

Item No.	Paragraph No(s)
7-10	3
11-12	-

7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 8 September were approved as a correct record.

8. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL BUDGET REPORT – 2022/23**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Principal of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama regarding the budget for 2022/23.

9. **MANAGEMENT DASHBOARD FOR THE SIX MONTHS TO SEPTEMBER 2021**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Principal regarding the Management dashboard showing the projected out-turn for the year to 31 March 2022.

10. **VERBAL UPDATES**

Officers provided the Sub-Committee with verbal updates on the ISTA Review and recent deep dives to both the Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee and the Audit and Risk Management Committee.

11. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE FINANCE & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

There were no questions raised in the non-public session.

12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 11.26 am

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Julie Mayer
julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA

Tuesday, 9 November 2021

Minutes of the virtual meeting held at 10 am and streamed to You Tube:

https://youtu.be/shH3_rAiTwA

please note the public recording will be available for 12 months from the date of the meeting

Present

Members:

Professor Geoffrey Crossick (Chairman)	Michael Herington
Randall Anderson (Deputy Chairman)	Dr Paula Haynes
Christopher Costigan	Andrew Mayer

In Attendance

Officers:

Jonathan Vaughan	- Interim Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Graeme Hood	- Group Accountant, Guildhall School of Music and Drama/Barbican Centre
Katharine Lewis	- Dean and Secretary, Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Jonathon Poyner	- Director of Building and Operations, Guildhall School of Music and Drama/Barbican Centre
Matthew Lock	- Head of Audit and Risk Management, Chamberlain's Department
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. PUBLIC MINUTES

The following were approved:

4. Public minutes and non-public summary of the Meeting held on 15th July 2021.

5. **Public minutes of the Special Meeting held on 7th September 2021.**

Matters arising:

Members noted that the School's External Auditors were relying on the outcome of the Audit of the City of London Corporation's City's Cash Statements to complete their opinion. The Head of Audit and Risk Management advised that this was due for completion next month and an extension had been granted to 14th January 2022, by the Office for Students, which would still be in good time for the ISTA Review.

6. **WORK PLAN**

The Chair advised that this agenda was busier than usual, and that it was encouraging that all of the items had been requested by the Committee during its previous meetings.

Members noted that, as a decision was pending on the investment from the City Corporation, together with number of other matters critical to the implementation of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), a progress report on the MTFP would be presented to the Committee on 1st February 2022.

Two issues arising from the City Corporation's Risk Protocol had originally been scheduled for this Committee but, as they were not urgent, they too would be deferred to the February Meeting.

There was an item later on the agenda in respect of 'future deep dives' and the Chairman suggested that one of them was likely to arise from the discussion on the deep dives on today's agenda.

Members noted that two of the deep dives on the agenda had touched on staffing/HR matters and were 'confidential' in accordance with the City Corporation's Protocol. The Town Clerk explained that this was an extra level of exemption, whereby only those officers directly involved in the drafting of such reports can be present when they are discussed at Committee.

7. **INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee considered the Internal Audit Update report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management.

During the discussion and questions, the following points were noted:

- a) Sector Guidance relates to the Higher Education Sector, the CUC Code of Practice and other relevant Office for Students Guidance. Internal Governance is specific to the School's management structure and its internal committees and boards.
- b) The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to define the split between mandatory and non-mandatory recommendations in student housing and circulate this to Members. Members noted that all but 2 of the

green recommendations in the Code of Compliance Review related to mandatory elements of the Code.

- c) Members noted an update since the publication of the report in that the School had sufficient capacity to cover two data quality reviews in respect of financial returns and research. The research data quality review would cover: (a) the process in respect of the recent REF submission, together with lessons learnt and preparations for what might be the data requirements of the next REF cycle; and (2) HESA's Business and Community Interaction survey, how the School might improve the potential income return. The Chair and Members welcomed this approach as both the Committee and the School need assurance in both areas.
- d) In respect of facilities management, it has been necessary to prioritise a number of matters; i.e. – those categorised in terms of risk to life, business critical and other variables, over the implementation of some recommendations. However, the Director of Operations and Buildings gave assurance that none were critical. Members noted that evidence had been produced and was being validated by Internal Audit. The Principal advised that the Director had inherited a lot of issues on the estate, presenting high risks to health and safety, and had managed a restructure through a very difficult time. The Director further advised that the alignment with city processes had required standardisation of processes, but this work was progressing well.
- e) Student Affairs would be completed by 19th November. Members noted that, although this had been categorised as 'amber', it was likely that the rating resulted from the way in which the information had initially been recorded and presented, rather than being due to an area of specific concern.
- f) Whilst noting the delay in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), it was suggested that it might be helpful for the Committee to gain assurance of a structured and systematic approach to its progression, setting out a timetable of objectives and any conditional arrangements which might vary it. The Principal agreed to provide a skeletal framework in his report to the Board on 22nd November. Internal Audit would then be able to give assurance as to the correct control environment being in place to deliver it.
- g) There are a number of vacancies in key areas of the school, with Registry currently running at 1/3 vacancies; 1/3 new in post and a further recent resignation. Members noted that the resignations had been for different and valid reasons, and most staff were required to give one month's notice. Furthermore, re-evaluating job descriptions also took about a month. As a consequence it was not easy to get replacements in place and the consequent vacancies has a serious impact on the Registry's work.
- h) The volume of work across the School had grown very substantially and it was recognised that it needs to build capacity and resilience. As an outcome of the pandemic, there had been an increase in mental health

issues and case work, which can have a severe impact on a small institution. Furthermore, the regulatory framework continues to generate a lot of additional work. It was suggested that this should be a risk in its own right and the Chair suggested discussing this further under the report on the Risk Register.

The Committee fully accepted the above issues and, given that similar problems might occur in the future, suggested that future target dates be scheduled to ensure that they were realistic.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE AUDIT & RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no urgent items.

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

Item	Paragraph
12-15	3
18-19	2
20	-

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15th July 2021 were approved.

12. **UPDATE ON THE TARGET OPERATING MODEL (TOM) AND LISVANE GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

The Principal was heard.

13. **OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL STATUTORY RETURNS - 2020/21 CYCLE**

The Committee received a report of the Principal.

14. **ONGOING CONDITIONS OF REGISTRATION WITH THE OFFICE FOR STUDENTS (OFS)**

The Committee received a report of the Principal.

15. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA RISK REGISTER**

The Committee received a report of the Principal.

16. **NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE AUDIT & RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There were no urgent items.

18. EQUALITY DIVERSION AND INCLUSION (EDI)

The Committee received a report of the Principal,

19. HUMAN RESOURCES

The Committee received a report of the Principal.

20. FUTURE DEEP DIVES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Chairman and Principal were heard.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Committee	Date:
Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama	22/11/2021
Subject: Principal's Public Report September 2021	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	3, 4, 7,8,10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N/A
If so, how much?	
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	
Report of: Jonathan Vaughan, Interim Principal, Guildhall School	For information
Report author: Interim Principal	

Summary

This report updates the Board on a number of current issues:

- COVID
- Productions and Performances
- Graduation
- Enrolment
- Parliamentary Debate
- Quality of learning and teaching environment by department (including Music, Drama, Production Arts, innovation & Research, Under 18s and Advancement)
- Awards and Prizes

Recommendation: that the Board receives the report and notes its contents.

This page is intentionally left blank

Principal's Public Main report

- **Covid:** The School continues to maintain appropriate Covid measures and some limited online provision remains in place but service is largely back to normal. However, we remain alert and responsive to any new guidance from Government. The Outbreak Plan and risk assessment have both recently been updated.
- **Productions and Performances:** Autumn term main stage events included the Barbican opening season concert of Mahler Symphony No 2, Drama's productions of Emilia and Julius Caesar, the Chamber Orchestra's Appalachian Spring, the Opera Double Bill, and the Jazz big band. All were highly successful and well received.
- **Graduation:** It was a joy to return to a live graduation at the Guildhall with the Lord Mayor in attendance for the morning ceremony.
- **Enrolment:** In common with most HEI's we are still working through the implications of actual enrolment numbers for the current academic year, with a couple of students still temporarily enrolled (unusual at this time of year but owing to visa issues). The consequences of Brexit continue to impact the School with a reduction in EU students. However, the mitigations put in place for recruiting more Home and OS students has been highly successful and this year we have recruited slightly more students than usual. However, there are still EU students in the system who have "(pre-) settled status" and until this population has worked through the system we will not know the full impact of Brexit.
- **Parliamentary Debate:** Members may find it useful to read some of the transcript from this month's **All- Party Parliamentary University Group report on 5th November (relevant extracts):**

"On Monday 1 November, the Education Secretary, Nadhim Zahawi MP alongside Universities Minister, Michelle Donelan MP and Minister for Skills, Alex Burghart answered education questions from MPs. The session began with a question from Labour MP, Chi Onwurah on the reallocation of the Office for Students' (OfS) strategic priorities grant, away from arts courses. Answering on behalf of the government, the Education Secretary said that although he recognised the 'incredible role' of arts courses in enriching young minds and inward investment and exports from the UK, that the grant was reallocated to better suit the needs of higher cost and strategically important subjects like those in STEM. He also stated that the OfS would be providing an additional £10 million in funding for specialist institutions, many of which provided arts courses."

"Labour's Paul Blomfield MP and Conservative Dr Julian Lewis both highlighted their concerns about the rumoured government plans to lower the payment threshold for student loans. In response, the universities minister said that more details would be announced 'shortly' in the government's response to Augar."

"Finally, on the Higher Education (Free Speech) Bill, the minister was asked how the Bill would uphold the right to freedom of speech at university campuses, in relation to recent high-profile cases of harassment. The minister did not directly

address how it would address such cases but reiterated that the Bill would uphold and help promote free speech on campus more widely.”

“Rachael Maskell (York Central): To ask the Secretary of State for Education, what assessment he has made of the potential merits of a reduction in student tuition fees. [62772] 7 Michelle Donelan (Chippenham): The department remains committed to a sustainable funding model for the higher education system which supports high value provision, meets the skills needs of the country and maintains the world-class reputation of UK higher education. We continue to consider carefully the recommendations made by the independent panel that reported to the Review of Post-18 Education and Funding. This includes their proposals relating to changes to tuition fee caps and the level of Strategic Priorities Grant funding that is paid directly to providers by the Office for Students. The department plans to set out a full conclusion to the Review in due course. The government has announced that maximum tuition fee caps for academic year 2022/23 will be frozen at their current levels to deliver better value for students and to keep the cost of higher education under control.”

Quality of Learning and Teaching

Music

Performances & Curriculum

**Academic Assurance:
student outcomes**

1. The Induction period culminated in a rousing return to in-person orchestral performance, with Mahler's Second Symphony in the Barbican Hall, conducted by Takuo Yuasa. The students' performance drew a spontaneous standing ovation. Meanwhile, Jazz, Keyboard, Composition and Electronic & Produced Music students presented their own well-received public induction events.
2. The Historical Performance Department is collaborating with the Museum of London to perform the Musicbooks of Emma Hamilton. This music in praise of Nelson has remained unheard since 1805. National media coverage of the project includes The Times, Telegraph, Guardian, Radio 4 World at One. Further Radio 4 and BBC London coverage is planned.
3. The Wind, Brass, Percussion Department has launched three new ensembles, running each term to increase performance opportunities for students: Guildhall Symphonic Wind Orchestra; Guildhall Brass Soloists; Guildhall Wind Soloists.
4. In Strings five students were selected to participate in a special project on 18 October in Milton Court, curated by pianist Mark Knopfler. Students performed side-by-side with the Plus-Minus Ensemble in a Celebration of composer/Guildhall professor Laurence Crane, recorded for future broadcast on BBC Radio 3. This event also included students from the WBP and Vocal Departments.
5. Renowned pianist Robert Levin returned to the School for masterclasses hosted by the Keyboard Dept and the School's Centre for Classical Improvisation.
6. The Opera Department's Autumn double bill included a neglected gem, *Cendrillon*, by Pauline Viardot in an acclaimed newly-commissioned chamber

- orchestration by Amy Cranksaw – Guildhall doctoral composer and a graduate of the School's MA in Opera Making & Writing programme.
7. The Vocal masterclass/in conversation series, generously supported by an anonymous donor, has begun with visits from singers Ann Murray DBE, Roderick Williams, Hera Hyesang Park, Davóne Tines and Alison Buchanan; and conductors and young artist programme directors Adrian Kelly (Zurich), Joshua Weilerstein, Craig Terry (Chicago), Tobias Truniger (Munich), David Gowland (Royal Opera House), and Richard Hetherington (ROH).
 8. String Department masterclasses have begun with visits from two violinists, Wolfgang Redik (Hans Eisler Academy, Berlin) and alumna Tasmin Little.

Student Recruitment

9. UK applications for 2022 entry to most Music programmes have closed and panels are assessing recorded auditions, while in-person auditions will return from the end of November.
10. New York auditions are scheduled for January 2022, after last year's pandemic hiatus.
11. The strategy for UK recruitment continues to develop, with staff visits to schools and specialist centres. This work has recently included visits to the Purcell School by the Heads of Strings and Chamber Music, to Chetham's School by the Strings Chamber Music Coordinator and to Wells School by the Interim Director of Music/Head of Vocal Studies.

Equity, Diversity & Inclusion

12. The Music Division has launched its EDI Advisory Group, facilitated by Roger Wilson from *Black Lives in Music*. Members include professors from Jazz, Research, Keyboard, Vocal and WBP, as well as the Interim Director of Music. The agenda of the initial meetings has covered topics such as staff training needs and the School's Wellbeing, Support and Complaints processes.
13. A Town Hall style meeting was held to discuss issues of prejudice experienced within the community. Also facilitated by Roger Wilson, this was attended by students, teaching staff, Heads of Departments, the Interim Principal, the Vice Principal for Innovation and the Interim Director of Music. Future Town Hall meetings are being considered, to expand attendance and embed the conversation.
14. The public performance programme continues to profile diverse repertoire, this term including the Chamber Orchestra's performances of Roxana Panufnik and William Grant Still, the Jazz Department's *Dizzier and Dizzier* and *Women in Jazz Day* projects, the Opera Department's presentation of Pauline Viardot's *Cendrillon* and an associated Vocal & Chamber Music Songs at Six performance of Viardot songs and chamber music.
15. Curriculum initiatives to diversify content and role models include classes dedicated to song by Black British and African American composers, Music & Politics talks and elective options, and masterclasses/in conversations across

departments with Alison Buchanan, Hera Hyseang Park, Davóne Tines, Felix Klieser and others.

16. The Harp Department's efforts to diversify repertoire and champion British women composers have led to several new commissions, among them a new harp solo from Hannah Kendall to be premiered by students at the Final Recitals in June '22.
17. The Jazz Department leadership team has begun a series of training sessions, 'New Paradigms in Jazz Leadership', facilitated by Guildhall Coaching Associates, to support a safer, more equitable environment for women in Jazz.

Student Employability

18. Recent Vocal graduate Jade Phoenix made her debut with Wexford Festival Opera while Vocal graduate Erika Baikoff made her Metropolitan Opera debut and sang the role of Musetta in *La Bohème* at the Verbier Festival.
19. BMus 4 violinist Krystof Kohout received a Hattori Foundation Junior Award (he is the second Guildhall Undergraduate to receive this distinction this year) and was invited to join the award-winning string ensemble LGT Young Soloists for concerts at Konzerthaus Berlin and Musikverein, Vienna.
20. BMus 3 violinist Luna del Mol performed Mozart's 4th violin concerto with orchestra three times at the Arte Amanti International Chamber Music Festival, gave three solo recitals in Belgium and one in the Netherlands, and played the first concert with a newly formed piano trio in Brussels (now booked for multiple concerts in 2022) and was invited to join the international Ensemble Esperanza.
21. Violinists Violetta Suvini (MMus) and Zoe Hodi (BMus 4), along with violist Georgia Russell (BMus 3) are members of the Orchestra For the Earth project which recently recorded a traditional song by the Noke Koi tribe (arr. Misha Mullov Abbado) documenting the devastating effects of the Rubber Boom on indigenous communities. It featured at the COP26 Conference where the ensemble played at the delegates' arrival. Violetta Suvini is also participating in a new, multi-sensory chamber opera production of Michael Gordon's *Van Gogh*. It charts major points of Van Gogh's life and aims to build a synaesthetic environment for the audience using innovative AI technology, featuring scent dispersal, visual projections and a tasting menu.
22. The Fibonacci Quartet (all BMus 3-4 students) continues broadening its European network, being selected for workshops and concerts in Milan, Amsterdam and Paris.

**Academic Assurance:
student employability**

Drama

Highlights

1. Every single graduating student from the 2021 cohort has representation. Many of these graduates are working at the very highest industry level.
2. We successfully launched our new acting programme revalidated in September.

**Academic Assurance:
student employability**

3. We began our in depth training on consent with the School of Sexuality. All students on the acting programme and full time staff have now begun this training.
4. Our bi-monthly departmental staff Reflective Space sessions continue into their second year and provide a vital space for staff to reflect on the challenges and opportunities of the culture change ongoing within the department. This space has enabled us to move collectively, strategically and confidently towards our ambition to provide a more equitable and inclusive teaching and learning environment.
5. We celebrated Black History month with a student-led rehearsed reading of a Debbie Tucker Green play. It was very well attended and supported.
6. The first 2 3rd year public productions of Emilia and Julius Caesar were produced successfully. Very good houses and positive audience responses with many of the actors are already securing representation.
7. We have overhauled our auditions process, including updating recruitment methods and training for panellists and the audition criteria itself to ensure equity of opportunity in staffing and relevance to the new acting programme.
8. There has been much media and industry interest in the work of the department, including coverage in *The Stage* of our philosophy on decolonisation of the curriculum, our training initiative with the School of Sexuality and an invitation to meet with the artistic team at the RSC to discuss engaging with Shakespeare in the 21st century.
9. The ongoing restructure of the acting programme means we are finally now in a position to recruit for the 2 fulltime senior posts of:
Head of Acting and Programme Leader and Head of Acting Practice. Once these positions are filled we will be in a position to recruit for the 2 new acting tutor posts.

Production Arts Highlights Highlights

The Production Arts Department held a busy and well-received Industry and Alumni Networking Reception on 6 October. The event took place across four floors of Milton Court. It replaced what would have been Graduate Exhibitions for the cohorts of 2020 and 2021, which we had been unable to programme due to the pandemic.

**Academic Assurance:
student employability**

Jonathan Vaughan (Interim Principal) introduced the evening. Andy Lavender (Vice Principal and Director of Production Art) spoke about the department's activities and vision, and the Chair of the Board of Governors presented a Fellowship of Guildhall School to Prema Mehta, lighting designer, alumna and founder of Stage Sight (an organisation that promotes an offstage workforce that is more reflective of our society today, inclusive of ethnicity, class and disability). Prema spoke movingly about her journey from Guildhall to her current eminence as a practitioner and leader

in culture-change. Jason Barnes (a Production Manager at the National Theatre for over thirty years) spoke briefly about the Hazel Sharples award, which commemorates a Black British stage manager, before Prema made the award to its winner in 2021, Max Rodriguez-Thorp (Design Realisation pathway). It was particularly enjoyable for these presentations to occur in person in front of a co-present audience – and a welcome return to a kind of conviviality and celebration that we'd previously taken for granted.

The Reception featured exhibitions of graduates' work (undertaken as Guildhall students), including costumes, hats and masks, props, scenic items and video designs. We also featured some examples of individual graduation projects by students. These included Matt Dean's portable production desk, which can be set up in any auditorium to support technical rehearsals prior to opening; Finlay Anderson's Lightshare, a new piece of lighting software that allows a lighting team to manage information for a show in a collaborative way, in real-time, by sharing design and programming information in the cloud; and Sam Levy's video game, a quest/journey set in a club in which the game-player finds themselves standing in for a drummer suddenly taken ill at a concert.

This work – and other projects like it – is inventive, innovative and has wider industry application. We've been discussing it with colleagues in Guildhall Innovation, with a view to establishing an incubation hub to help students find partners and support for onward project development and explore entrepreneurial and commercialising prospects.

Innovation and Engagement Highlights

- We have launched a new funding opportunity for Guildhall alumni. The Guildhall Futures fund has been created with the purpose of providing professional support to our alumni community in order to address issues raised during the period of crisis for the creative industries. We have received 77 applications in response to the first call out. A will be reviewed and shortlisted by a panel this month, with funding awarded in December.
- Open Programmes: The autumn season of evening courses is going well. The season comprises 11 courses: 7 online and 4 in person, and we have a total of 160 participants. New courses include; 'In the Studio: Music Production with Glen Scott', 'Introduction to the Music Business' as well as new courses in collaboration with Barbican 'Women in Architecture' and 'Understanding Contemporary Art: Painting Today'. Spring 2022 evening courses opened for booking on 1 November. We are also working on the launch of the summer 2022 programme.
- Guildhall Coaching Associates have commenced delivery of a major training initiative in resilience coaching for the Homelessness Sector. Working with City

**Academic Assurance:
continuous improvement of
student experience**

Bridge Trust, HomelessLink and 12 Organisations in London, we are finding the work on resilience is helpful in other professional or organisational development contexts, such as Leadership.

- We are currently delivering Leaders on (and off) Stage for orchestral leaders. The interim feedback is incredibly positive. Participants report belief that the challenges they have faced in their professional lives can be addressed, supported and resolved. Participants have joined from a range of leading orchestras, including London Symphony Orchestra, Chineke!, the Academy of St-Martin-in-the-Fields, the Royal Scottish National Orchestra, English Concert and Royal Northern Sinfonia attending as well as participants from Denmark and Holland.
- In October Guildhall Coaching Associates delivered training for the Fishmongers Company in public speaking and presence.
- Partnerships & Programming: Music Bank with Age UK East has continued with a series of in person interactive 'juke box' sessions with a memory group in Golden Lane. This will continue into next year as we build our partnership with them.
- We are producing an event with the Museum of London with performances from the Historical Music Performance to celebrate the discovery of songs dedicated to Horatio Nelson. The project has gained significant media interest.
- Guildhall Live Events: The team has had a very busy autumn, co-delivering a large number of in-person events ranging from *Arrival* (a major projection onto the Millennium Mills building in Victoria Dock), *Harmony* at London Wall Place (an augmented reality project with Culture Mile for Brookfield Properties), to Bloomsbury Festival (projection onto the British Library to mark 50th anniversary of Bangladeshi independence & on Holy Cross Church in Cromer Street).

Research

- The recently announced funding allocations from Research England (i.e. the last before the new ones derived from REF2021, of which we expect to have confirmation in August 2022), continue to put us in a strong position with respect to our immediate comparator institutions. We really need to leverage this to put ourselves in the best possible position, whatever the results of REF2021.
- We have been awarded funding from the Natural Environment Research Council for the very first time. *Raise a Voice: A Rebellious Songbook for Our Time* is an innovative music-based project run by Toby Young (one of our Leverhulme Early Career Fellows) that uses choral singing to challenge how we think about climate culture. The project will centre around a new 25-minute choral composition for adult and youth choirs to perform together, that celebrates ways that humankind benefits from the natural world whilst challenging listeners with the reality of what we risk losing from climate change. Songs from the songbook will be written in collaboration with environmental researchers and policy makers, and highlight multiple aspects of the climate emergency, with accompanying material such as programme notes and pre-concert talks acting as a catalyst for discussion and education. Project partners include the City of Bristol Choir, Bristol Youth Choir,

poet Jennifer Thorp, Prof Alix Dietzel (University of Bristol) and Prof James Longhurst (University of the West of England). It's being evaluated by Dr Maia Mackney at Guildhall.

Under 18

- 5 Senior School ensembles (17 students) will lead mini residencies in all CYM centres and host schools/colleges during November 2021. This is the first time a full in-person programme has been possible in 6 terms.
- Autumn recruitment across the GYA division, following strategic marketing campaigns and busy holiday courses, has seen numbers return to 2019/20+ levels. There are currently 1,517 students enrolled in programmes across the division which incorporates 6 physical centres and a small online offering at present which we hope to develop in the near future.
- The July 2021 integration of Norfolk County Youth Orchestra into Norfolk Centre for Young Musicians has already seen two successfully holiday/performance courses delivered. July and October programmes featured Beethoven's Symphony No. 5 and Tchaikovsky's Symphony No.2 respectively.
- Junior Guildhall student Leia Zhu is currently musician in residence with London Mozart Players and has recently returned from concert tours in Dubai and Switzerland.
- As part of our development, a new Guildhall Young Artists brand identity to ensure that we have a coherent look and feel will be rapidly rolled out across the network. During November and early December 2021 Guildhall Young Artists Taunton, Saffron Walden, Norwich, and Junior Guildhall will have publicity materials and media changed. A range of merchandise will also be available in time for Christmas.
- Our Music Education Islington partnership continues to strengthen, with recent performances by young people taking place at Music for Youth Royal Albert Hall event and a free-stage performance at the Barbican linked to the *Up for Grabs* concert commissioned by the Barbican in association with Mark Anthony-Turnage / Arsenal football club / BBC SO.

Advancement

- In September, the Development team was delighted to close scholarships fundraising for 2021/22 at £1.1m against the £910k target. The team has also raised £650k so far towards the £1.4m target for scholarships for the 2022/23 academic year. This target is an increase of £500k on last year and the team needs new introductions and help from all parties to achieve this lift.
- The School is in the early planning stages for the £50m fundraising campaign to mark our 150th Anniversary in 2030. As well as building the Campaign Board, we are scoping out the potential for support from existing and new donors and preparing the campaign narrative in a vision brochure for leadership gift prospects.
- The Campaign Board, dedicated to raising funds towards the campaign, is taking shape and now has the following external members: Professor Chris Wood

(Chair), Sir Andrew Parmley, Prem Goyal, Catherine McGuinness (from April 2022), Graham Packham and Deborah Lincoln.

Prizes and Awards

The Paddington Trio (Tuulia Hero, Patrick Moriarty & Stephanie Tang)

**Academic Assurance:
student employability**

- 2nd Prize in The first International Piano Chamber Music Competition at the Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre in Tallinn

Ami-Louise Johnsson (BMus Viola)

- Joint 2nd prize and Prize for the best interpretation of Oskar Nedbal Romantic Piece op.18

Hannah Hughes (BMus Soprano)

- 1st Prize in The 4th New Talent British International Youth Music Competition and Festival

Alumni

Ewan McGregor (Drama, graduated 1992)

- Winner of a 73rd Primetime Emmy Award for lead Actor in a Limited or Anthology Series or Movie

Mimi Doulton (Music, graduated 2018)

- Winner of the 2nd prize at the John Cage Interpretation awards

Cerys Ambrose-Evans (Music, graduated 2016)

- Appointed to Principal Bassoon of the Scottish Chamber Orchestra

Simon Baker (Production Arts, graduated 1992)

- Winner of the Tony Award for Best Sound Design in a play

Jon Roskilly (Music, graduated 2011)

- Appointed Principal Trombone in the Kuopio Symphony Orchestra in Finland.

Nikesh Patel (Drama, graduated 2010)

- Nominated for National Comedy Award for Outstanding Comedy Actor

Caleb Roberts (Drama, graduated 2017)

- Nominated for Black British Theatre Awards for Best Supporting Male Actor in a Musical

Staff

AV Awards: The School won in two categories for Best Education Project & Best Event / Entertainment project

Report author

Jonathan Vaughan, Interim Principal
principal@gsmd.ac.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Committee	Dated:
Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama	22 November 2021
Subject: Statement of compliance with CUC Code of Governance	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	N/A
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	
If so, how much?	
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	
Report of: Professor Jonathan Vaughan, Interim Principal	For approval
Report author: Katharine Lewis, Secretary & Dean of Students	

Summary

The Committee of University Chairs (CUC) *Higher Education Code of Governance* has had a number of iterations, the latest version was published in June 2020 at height of the pandemic.

The Code comprises 6 "elements" and a number of subcomponents to each element; in previous versions of the Code these were supplemented by "requirements" that a governing body should do, and things that the governing body "could consider" but these additional parts no longer appear in the Code and have in some instances become a subcomponent.

The attached document is a self-assessment of the Board's compliance with the Code using the self-assessment tool-kit recommended by the CUC. A draft version was considered by the Governance & Effectiveness Committee on 4 November 2021 and the version before the board incorporates the comments and suggestions of that committee.

The last approved compliance statement was in 2017.

Recommendation

Members are asked to approve the attached and the actions identified with a view to this checklist being made publically available on the School's website.

Katharine Lewis

Secretary & Dean of Students

E: katharine.lewis@gsmd.ac.uk

T: 020 4526 4612

This page is intentionally left blank

Element 1 Accountability					
The governing body is collectively responsible and accountable for institutional activities, approving all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern within its remit.					
Requirements	Comply Yes/No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>1.1 The governing body has overall responsibility for all decisions that might have significant reputational implications for the institution's sustainability (including partnerships or collaborations). It therefore needs assurance that the institution:</p> <p>a) meets all legal and regulatory requirements imposed on it as a corporate body;</p>	In Part	<p>Given the School's legal status the Board does not necessarily have the final decision on all matters of fundamental concern, being a committee within the local authority committee structure of the City of London. However, as part of the agreement between the Office for Students (OfS) and the City in respect of the School's registration with the OfS, the City provided the OfS with a letter, dated 18 February 2019, which included the statement "The Corporation recognises the need for the Guildhall School's Board of Governors to enjoy operational autonomy and will not without good cause challenge any decision of the Board of Governors". The Board, like other higher education boards, has an Audit & Risk Management Committee and via that committee and the work of internal audit seeks assurance that the School meets its legal and regulatory responsibilities as a higher education institution.</p>	<p>Whilst the School will still be funded by the City of London, the Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future governance arrangements for the School and the level of autonomy. The Board will then need to assure itself that these new arrangements meet the expectations of the Code.</p>	G&E, BoG	Board to advise
<p>b) complies with its instruments of governance such as statutes, ordinances and articles; and</p>	YES	<p>The Board is governed by the Instrument & Articles of Government first approved by the Privy Council in 2006 and subsequently amended in 2016 to accommodate its taught degree awarding powers with a further minor amendment in 2019 in respect of the Board's quoracy arrangements. The Articles include the Board's statement of primary responsibilities.</p>			
<p>c) meets the requirements falling upon the institution in respect of public funding issued by bodies, including income from the Student Loan Company.</p>	YES	<p>The Audit & Risk Management Committee keeps under review the School's engagement with the ongoing conditions of registration with the Office for Students and similar requirements relating to Research England. Statutory returns relating to staff, students and the School's estate are submitted throughout the year, are monitored by the Principal's Office, and are subject to data audit under the direction of the Audit & Risk Management Committee (as well as the compliance checking and data validation arrangements of HESA and OfS). The Audit & Risk Management Committee receives yearly (starting 2021) an overview of all the returns made in the academic cycle and compliance with deadlines.</p>			
<p>1.2 The regulatory and legal requirements will vary depending on the constitution of individual HEIs, but, for most governing bodies, members are charitable trustees and must comply with case law and legislation governing charities in the exercise of their duties. Some institutions are constituted as companies, and governing body members are normally the company's directors; the primary legislation in this case will be the requirements of the Companies Act.</p>	N/A	<p>The School is not a company and does not have charitable status; charitable status resides with The Guildhall School Trust, an entirely independent body that has no responsibility for the management or governance of the School.</p>			

DRAFT Self-assessment of compliance with CUC Code

Requirements	Comply Yes/No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
1.3 In both instances, members must discharge their duties in line with the accepted standards of behaviour in public life and the values in this Code, accepting individual and collective accountability for the affairs of the institution.	YES	All members of the Board are bound by the seven principles of public life. All members are asked to complete a "Fit and Proper person" self-declaration. All members must complete a "Declarations of Interest" and these are published by the City of London at http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=387 for common Council members and for other Board members at http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13618 Conflicts of interest, whether pecuniary or other, must be recognised and declared and are then managed appropriately.			
1.4 All members of the governing body (including students and staff members) share the same legal responsibilities and obligations as other members, so no one can be routinely excluded from discussions. All members have a duty to record and declare any conflicts of interest.	In Part	Student and staff members receive the same paperwork as all other members of the Board. However, as the Board of Governors is a committee within the City of London Corporation structure and is not autonomous, the positions of the different types of Member on the Board are not the same: (i) as the Chairman or Deputy Chairman must be able to report to the Court of Common Council, only members of the Board who are drawn from the Court of Common Council can stand for election as the Chairman or Deputy Chairman. (ii) Quoracy is achieved by reference to the Court of Common Council members and co-opted members only.	The future governance arrangements to be explored under Lisvane and TOM could change the chairmanship and the position of Common Council members on the Board. The Board will then need to assure itself that these new arrangements meet the expectations of the Code.	G&E, BoG	tba
1.5 Governing bodies must, as far as practicable, conduct their affairs in an open and transparent manner. This includes publishing accurate information on the use of public funding, value for money and other performance information on their websites, as well as any other information that supports regulatory compliance and accountability to all stakeholders.	YES	The Board's affairs are conducted in an open and transparent manner. The public agenda, minutes and papers of the Board of Governors are published by the City of London at: http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=387			
1.6 There needs to be a clear separation of roles and responsibilities between the Executive and the governing body with delegated authorities to the HoI and any committees that exist.	YES	There is a clear separation of the roles and responsibilities of the Executive and the governing body, with delegated authorities to the Head of Institution. Whilst the Head of Institution is the Accountable Officer for higher education matters, other matters concerning the management of the School fall within the remit of other senior officers of the City of London and other committees outside of the Board of Governors and its committees. The City has a clear scheme of delegation relating to officers - see https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/appendix1-proposed-scheme-of-delegations.pdf . There are terms of reference for all committees of the Board which are reviewed annually.			

Element 2 Sustainability

Working with the Executive, the governing body sets the mission, strategic direction, overall aims and values of the institution. In ensuring the sustainability of the institution, the governing body actively seeks and receives assurance that delivery of the strategic plan is in line with legislative and regulatory requirements, institutional values, policies and procedures, and there are effective systems of control and risk management in place.

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
2.1 The governing body is responsible for the mission, character and reputation of the institution and therefore sets the values and standards that underpin the institution's strategy and operation.	YES				
2.2 The governing body must be engaged in development of the institution's strategy and formally approves or endorses the strategic plan in accordance with its constitution and the expectations of stakeholders, including students and staff. It will need assurance that the strategic plan is supported by plans or sub-strategies which ensure there are: a) enough financial, physical, human and information resources to support the institution's aims and objectives; meet academic standards; protect the collective student interest; ensure effective delivery and meet any regulatory or funding commitments, including the need to demonstrate value for money;	YES	The School's Strategy sets out the vision and the mission for the School, see https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Policies_and_Reports/Guildhall_School_Strategic_Plan.pdf The Board approves the Strategic Plan and receives an update from the Principal at each meeting on progress and other matters of strategic interest. The business case supporting the Strategic Plan identified a number of institutional performance measures. The Board receives regular updates on the Business Plan (and more recently the Business Recovery Plan post pandemic). The Board engages in the development of sub strategies such as the International Strategy (Nov 2019), Research Strategy (Feb 2021), Teaching & Learning Enhancement Strategy (due Feb 2022), and Access & Participation Plan 2020-2025 (Spring 2019 and revision Spring 2021)			
b) effective arrangements in place for the management of information which meet ethical standards, Freedom of Information requirements and other legislation on the use and protection of data;	YES	Data Protection training is mandatory for all staff. Data collected is governed by the privacy notices for the different aspects of the School's work, see overarching and specific policies at: https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/privacy Guildhall School is a department of the City of London Corporation ("the City of London") and the City of London is the data controller.			
c) arrangements in place to ensure that all forms of resources are used in a sustainable (financial, social and environmental), secure and effective manner which supports institutional success; and	YES	The Board receives an update on finances at every meeting, and supported by the detailed scrutiny of the accounts undertaken by the Finance & Resources Committee and Audit & Risk Management Committee			
d) policies and procedures in place which support the delivery of the institution's strategy in an environmentally sustainable way.	YES	List of policies in relation to this available here: https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/about_the_school/about_us/sustainability/ Carbon Management Strategy (replacing carbon Reduction Strategy) was considered by the Board in September 2021. All policies are subject to annual review undertaken in the first instance by the School's Operations Board.			
2.3 The governing body will need to receive regular, reliable, timely and adequate information to monitor and evaluate performance against the strategic plan. The governing body's role is to have oversight of performance and constructively challenge it, encourage quality enhancement, maintain and raise standards, celebrate achievements and learn from difficulties.	Yes	The Board receives: - at each meeting public and private reports setting out achievements and challenges across the wide range of School business - annual report from the Academic Board - regular reports in respect of the Business (Recovery) Plan The Board has established an Academic Assurance Working Group to scrutinise in detail the documentation to support assurances in the maintenance of academic standards and the enhancement of the academic student experience.			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
2.4 The governing body needs to understand the external environment and – along with the Executive – identify, understand and manage risk appetite and strategic risks and opportunities for the institution.	YES	<p>The Principal's regular reports bring the Board up-to-date with the external environment affecting the School and the strategic risks and opportunities.</p> <p>The Audit & Risk Management Committee considers risks in detail, including risks identified via Internal Audit outcomes, for report to the Board. An additional level of risk scrutiny is provided by the City of London both via the internal audit of corporate activity affecting the School and also by the regular risk challenges for officers by the City's Audit Committee.</p> <p>The Board has an annual away day (excluding 2020/21 pandemic year) to dig deep in to strategic issues and the impact of factors in the external environment.</p>	Board Away Day	Principal	Summer 2022
2.5 The governing body must actively seek and receive assurance that academic governance is robust and effective. Governing bodies also need to provide assurance on academic standards and the integrity of academic qualifications, and will work with the Senate/Academic Board (or equivalent, as specified in their governing instruments) to maintain standards and continuously improve quality. Governing bodies will also wish to receive assurance that specific academic risks (such as those involving partnerships and collaboration, recruitment and retention, data provision, quality assurance and research integrity) are being effectively managed.	YES	<p>The terms of reference of the Academic Board are approved by the Board of Governors in line with the Instrument of Government. The Board receives an annual report from the Academic Board in November covering a wide range of academic and student experience issues to help the Board arrive at the assurances required of the funding body; this includes a summary of all student casework including complaints and appeals and those matters that have been referred to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. The annual report also includes an action plan and an update on the action plan is received in the summer term each year. The Board also receives the Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee annual report in February.</p> <p>The Board has an Academic Assurance Working Group which considers annually (except during 2020/21) the robustness of the academic assurances given to the Board during the year. The Working Group considers the involvement of students and externals in quality assurance processes.</p> <p>Relevant internal audits: Student data returns audit (completed June 2018) (Academic) Programme development (final report October 2019) Students Affairs (final report February 2019)</p>	Academic Assurance Working Group to meet.	Dean of Students /AAWG	Feb-22
2.6 The governing body needs assurance that the institution is meeting the conditions of funding as set by regulatory and funding bodies and other major institutional funders. These include: a) the need to use funds in line with the principles of regularity, propriety and value for money; b) robust systems of financial control and governance; and c) assurances on social, financial and environmental objectives, e.g. those which support a sustainable environment, the widening of access and participation and civic engagement.	YES	<p>The Financial Management of the School is undertaken by the Finance Department reporting to the Chamberlain within the City of London. Financial systems and polices are, in the main, also City ones. The Board has its own Finance & Resources Committee and Audit & Risk Management Committee to seek assurance on the financial controls in place in respect of the School's finances.</p>			
[Widening access specifically]	YES	<p>The School has a five-year Access & Participation Plan 2020-21 to 2024-25 approved by the Office for Students - the Board was consulted as part of the extensive planning. The Board was also consulted on recent amendments to the plan which are currently with the OfS for approval. Plan can be viewed at: https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/policies</p> <p>The Board receives monitoring information annually and had a presentation on Access & Participation at its February 2021 meeting.</p> <p>Following successful submission of the 2019/20 monitoring return, the enhanced monitoring required imposed for the five year plan has now been removed.</p>			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
Furthermore, the governing body also needs assurances that: d) the institution's values are practised throughout the organisation;	In Part	Assurances are given through the Principal's reports to each meeting, where challenges in this area would be noted. More informally assurances are received through the Board's engagement with the Students' Union representative and staff presence on the Board. Further reporting needs to be developed.	(i) Formal yearly report on relevant case work. (ii) Formal report on the delivery of EDI objectives	(i) Head of HR/Dean of Students (ii) Principal/VP Innovation	Sept 2022 for preceding year
e) the collective interest of current and future students drives decision making, and growth and innovation throughout the institution;	YES	A Students' Union representative (usually the President of the SU) is a full member of the Board. The SU President also meets regularly with the Principal and has unfettered access to senior officers, notably the Dean of Students. Student representatives are present on many committees and working groups within the School (excluding management committees and student assessment). There is a regular Staff/Student Liaison Committee (twice a term, chaired by the Principal) giving student representatives direct access to senior members of staff across all directorates. Students are surveyed via the NSS and Whole School Survey and the Board of Governors receives the results and requires updates on action to address areas of concern.			
f) there is sufficient management freedom and institutional autonomy;	In Part	The City has a clear scheme of delegation relating to officers - see https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/appendix1-proposed-scheme-of-delegations.pdf . However, the Principal, whilst head of institution and Chief Accountable officer to the OfS, does not have the same level of autonomy as other heads of higher education institutions, particularly in respect of operational matters relating to HR, procurement, finance, and buildings.	Whilst the School will still be financially supported by the City of London, the Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future management arrangements for the School and the level of autonomy. The Board will then need to assure itself that these new arrangements meet the expectations of the Code.	G&E, BoG	tba
g) the institution has considered and taken appropriate actions to mitigate the impact of any risks to students' continuation of study e.g. the closure of a course, campus or location, the discontinuation of a discipline;	YES	A Student Protection Plan is in place https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/about_the_school/about_us/policies/			
h) there is an effective and proactive system of risk management in place by which risks are rigorously assessed, understood and effectively managed across the organisation;	YES	There is a risk register comprising corporate risk and local (School) risks which is considered regularly by the Audit & Risk Management Committee and supported by internal audit.			
i) high-quality and robust data is produced and managed to meet all relevant legal and regulatory requirements; and effective control and due diligence take places in relation to institutionally significant external activities, for example commercial transactions, collaborations with HEIs in other countries.	YES	Data submitted to meet legal and regulatory requirements is monitored by the Principal's Office. Audit & Risk Management Committee has commissioned in recent years two internal audits, one of student data returns (completed June 2018) and one on the financial returns (underway).			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
2.7 The governing body must understand and respect the principle of academic freedom, the ability within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges. The governing body must understand its responsibility to maintain, promote and protect the principle of academic freedom.	YES	The <i>Maintaining good campus relations in higher education</i> policy statement sets out the School's commitment to freedom of expression and the right to express and to challenge controversial views and opinions and for rigorous debate, subject to operating within the law. https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Policies_and_Reports/Maintaining_good_campus_relations_Jan_2018.pdf This was very recently updated to recognise the online public events in recent times and also to add an appendix relating to Prevent and external speakers.			
2.8 The governing body should also understand their institution's legal responsibility to uphold freedom of speech within the law.					
2.9 Effective remuneration of all staff, especially the Vice-Chancellor and their immediate team, is an important part of ensuring institutional sustainability, meeting regulatory requirements and protecting institutional reputation. The governing body should provide assurance on the extent of the institution's compliance with The Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code (published June 2018 by the CUC), and in particular ensure that no one is responsible for determining or influencing their own remuneration.	Yes	As the School is a department of the City of London, remuneration of all staff members, including the Principal and other senior staff members, is set by the City of London. The Remuneration & Nominations Committee has an advisory role only in respect of senior staff emoluments. The Board receives an annual remuneration report to provide assurance on the School's compliance with CUC's Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code (at the November Board meeting).			
2.10 Depending on the constitutional documents and regulatory requirements of the institution, some governing bodies will be required to establish a Remuneration Committee to consider and determine, as a minimum, the emoluments of the Vice-Chancellor and other senior staff.	In Part	Remunerations & Nominations is a sub-committee of the Board which is comprised of non-School members of the Board and is chaired by a co-opted member of the Board. This committee does not determine the emoluments of the Principal and Senior Staff because these are the responsibility of the City of London but it meets regularly to consider, amongst other things, comparative data on salaries and staffing profiles to inform discussions with the City. The Principal and other senior staff are invited to attend but are not present for discussions that directly affect them.	Regular cycle of reports on comparative institutional data to be established	R&N Committee	by end of academic year 2021/22
2.11 All institutions will have external auditors unless exempt under the Companies Act 2006 because of their small size. All institutions are encouraged to have an audit function, whether in-house or externally provided. Some regulatory requirements will specify the need for an internal audit service. The appointment and work of auditors will usually be overseen by an Audit Committee, comprising members that have no executive responsibility (although members of the Executive may attend by invitation). Further guidance on the role of Audit Committees is published separately by CUC and governing bodies should assess the extent to which they comply with that guidance.	YES	Internal audit is carried out via the City of London Audit Department with the scheme of work approved by the Audit & Risk Management Committee in consultation with the School's Senior Management Team. The School appoints external auditors to review the School's management accounts. The work of the auditors is overseen by an Audit & Risk Management Committee.			
2.12 The governing body will consider and, where necessary, act upon an annual audit report from the Audit Committee or equivalent (incorporating recommendations by internal and external audit) and approve the audited annual financial statements	YES	The Annual Audit Report and audited annual financial statements are considered at the November Board.			

Element 3

The governing body safeguards and promotes institutional reputation and autonomy by operating in accordance with the values that underpin this Code, its various elements and the principles of public life.

Requirements	Comply Yes/No/In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>3.1 Members of governing bodies must always act ethically in line with the principles of public life (the Nolan principles), the institution’s own ethical framework, and in the interests of the institution, its students and other stakeholders. This applies whether the Board members are elected, nominated or appointed. If a governing body member falls short of these standards, they must be dealt with in accordance with the institution’s constitution and Code of Conduct. Such cases must not be ignored.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>All members of the Board are required to abide by the principles of public life. The City of London has a Standards Committee whose main responsibility is to promote high standards of conduct by its Members and Members co-opted on to City of London Committees. It monitors the operation of the City of London's Code of Conduct for Members and any complaints of breaches. The City of London has an overarching s whistleblowing policy which encompasses the staff of the School: https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/how-we-make-decisions/Pages/whistleblowing.aspx. The scope of the policy does not cover Members of the Board. The School also has a Research Ethics Committee that provides guidance in relation to Research Ethics.</p>			
<p>3.2 Members of governing bodies need to act, and be perceived to act, impartially, and not be influenced by social or business relationships. Institutions must maintain, check and publish a register of the interests of members and senior executives. A member who has a professional, pecuniary, family or other personal interest in any matter under discussion which may be seen to conflict with the best interests of the institution must also disclose the interest in advance of any discussion on the topic. A member does not have a pecuniary interest merely because they are a member of staff or a student.</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>Details of the Common Council members of the Board of Governors and their declarations are published here http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=387 The declarations of other members of the Board are published separately at: http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13618</p>			
<p>3.3 In protecting institutional reputation and autonomy, the governing body must ensure that its decision-making processes and those of the institution are ethical and free of any undue pressures from external interest groups, including donors, alumni, corporate sponsors and political interest groups.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The School's Ethics Policy at: https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/Registry/2021-22/Policies/Ethics_Policy_2021.pdf sets out the broad ethical framework of the School including amongst other things the staff and student code of conduct, safeguarding, research ethics, and gift acceptance. A broad summary of the work of the Research Ethics Committee is included in the annual research report to the Board.</p> <p>The Guildhall School Trust is completely separate to the Board of Governors but as the School is in receipt of significant funding from this source, the Board is cognisant of the Trust's ethical policy which is aligned to the School's.</p>			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>3.4 If an individual member of the governing body has a view that is not consistent with the collective view of the governing body, they should abide by the principle of collective decision making and avoid putting specific interests or personal views before those of the institution. Individually they must not make any agreement for which they do not have authority. Breaches must be taken very seriously and be dealt with in accordance with the institution’s governing documents, which should include a Code of Conduct.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Due to the unusual governance structure of the School, some members of the Board, the Common Council Members, sit on the Board as elected representatives to a higher body within the City of London governance structure and have other duties and responsibilities. it is possible but infrequent for areas of tension to arise for these members of the Board and these are conflicts to be recognised, understood and managed. At the macro level the strategic objectives of the School and the City of London, which owns it, are aligned.</p> <p>The majority of the Board are non-executive and as such have no authority to make any agreement on behalf of the School.</p> <p>The City of London has a Standards Committee whose main responsibility is to promote high standards of conduct by its Members and Members co-opted on to City of London Committees. It monitors the operation of the City of London's Code of Conduct for Members and any complaints of breaches.</p>			
<p>3.5 Promoting trust in institutional governing bodies requires assurances that there is effective communication with relevant stakeholders, including the reporting of significant changes in circumstances. Governing bodies will need to consider how they engage stakeholders in decision making and how they publish information and report performance to stakeholders.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Board receives assurances through the regular flow of information in the Principal's reports and Academic Board and Research annual reports, with specific reference to funding bodies such as OfS and Research England, and also to the professions for which the School is training its students. The student interest is monitored also in these reports and via NSS and WSS survey results, and through SU representation on the Board itself. Any material change in the student experience, such as programme closure, must come to the full board.</p>			
<p>3.6 The governing body must take practical steps to ensure that the Students’ Union or association operates in a fair, democratic, accountable and financially sustainable manner.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>The Students’ Union of the Guildhall School is an unincorporated association and does not have charitable status. Its constitution is reviewed periodically by the Board of Governors (last reviewed and amended November 2020) and the schedules attached to the constitution set out the mechanisms for its organisation ensuring that it operates in a democratic, accountable and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The SU finances are considered annually by School officers (Finance & Dean of Students) - out-turn and budget forecast - to set the grant from the School for the following year. The SU President meets regularly with the Principal.</p>			

Requirements	Comply Yes / No / In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>3.7 The governing body requires assurance that there is a transparent, effective and published process for making and handling a complaint or raising a concern, and that any internal or external complaints or concerns are handled impartially, constructively and, in the case of student complaints, in accordance with any requirements of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (or equivalent for the devolved nations). The governing body should also ensure there is an effective process in place for investigating disclosures under whistleblowing legislation.</p>	YES	<p>Staff complaints are considered under the City's grievance procedures and the City has an overarching whistleblowing policy which encompasses the staff of the School. Student complaints and concerns, including academic appeals, disciplinary and other appeals against process, and formal complaints are covered in the Section B of the <i>Academic regulatory framework</i> available at https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/policies. The School subscribes to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for the consideration of student complaints after completion of internal procedures. There is an historical complaints procedure (also available at https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/policies). To assist students and staff in locating the correct mechanism for raising a concern, formal or informal, there is a dedicated page on MyGuildhall.</p>			
<p>3.8 If a governing body decides it is appropriate to remunerate governing body members and this is permitted in its constitution, it must ensure that payments are commensurate with the duties carried out, are reported in the audited financial statements, are consistent with charity and employment law, and reflect the institution's values and ethos.</p>	YES	<p>Members of the Board are not remunerated, but members may reclaim travelling and similar expenses incurred in attending meetings/events. Full details are available from the Clerk.</p>			

Element 4 Inclusion and Diversity

The governing body promotes a positive culture which supports ethical behaviour, equality, inclusivity and diversity across the institution, including in the governing body's own operation and composition. Diversity in this context does not just mean protected characteristics – it includes a diversity of voice, attitude and experience. It is a means of ensuring that under-representation and differences in outcomes are challenged and, where practicable, followed by a course of corrective action that ensures fair outcomes for all.

Requirements	Comply Yes / No / In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
4.1 HEIs are required by law to comply with equality and diversity legislation, and governing bodies are legally responsible for ensuring the institution's compliance. Legislation in this area does not distinguish between domestic and international students and staff.	YES	The School abides by equality and diversity legislation and there are internal procedures in place for when staff or students do not abide by the law or do not meet School expectations in the area of equality and inclusivity.			
4.2 The governing body must ensure that there are arrangements in place to: a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;	YES	There are various mechanisms: - micro-aggressions portal for staff and students - information provided gives a sense of the culture of the School For staff: - formal and informal complaints process (see How to raise a concern on My Guildhall) For students: - formal and informal complaints process (see How to raise a concern on My Guildhall) - Report and support page on my Guildhall (particularly aimed at sexual harassment) - Pilot consent training across the three student directorates (music online module also available to staff) - Policy on harassment, Bullying and Sexual Misconduct (see https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/policies)	Formal report on the delivery EDI objectives including training of staff, students and governors, and relevant casework	Principal/VP Innovation	Sept 2022 for preceding year
b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share and those who do not share a protected characteristic;	In part	Co-opted Board member recruited with extensive EDI experience (Autumn 2021) EDI Committee established 2020/21 to advance equality, role to be reviewed and refined EDI Officer to be recruited (level of role to be determined) There are local departmental action plans but whole School "Equality scheme and action plan" is now out of date and its revision is awaiting on the above.	Appointment of role holder Revised Equality Action Plan. Identified cycle of reporting both annually and at each meeting in Principal's reports	Principal, VP Innovation	2021/22
c) foster good relations between people who share and those who do not share a protected characteristic; and					
d) promote an inclusive culture.					

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>4.3 Governing bodies need to review and report on the institution's approach to equality, inclusivity and diversity. As a minimum, they must receive an annual equality monitoring report setting out work done by the institution during the year, identifying the achievement of agreed objectives and summarising the data on equality, inclusivity and diversity that they are required to produce and publish. The report needs to consider any significant differential educational outcomes by protected groups. For most institutions, an Equality Impact Assessment and proposals for widening participation in, and increasing access to, HE will be included in report.</p>	In part	<p>Annual monitoring in respect of student access to HE including performance against targets is provided in February each year to the Board as part of Access & Participation Plan monitoring.</p> <p>A snapshot of the student body by protected characteristics is provided to the Board each February (after 1 Dec HESES census). Equality monitoring in respect of admissions and assessment and student protected characteristics (where numbers sufficient for statistical analysis) is seen by the Academic Board and reported in the Academic Board annual report.</p> <p>Establishment staff data has also been considered by the Remuneration & Nominations Committee but data is not available for hourly paid academic staff in the same way.</p>	<p>(i) Regular Consolidated EDI reporting to the Board needs to be established (ii) more detailed staff data</p>	<p>(i) Principal/VP Innovation/EDI Officer role (ii) Head of HR with corporate HR</p>	<p>(i) by end of 2021/22 (ii) tba</p>
<p>4.4 The governing body must routinely reflect on its own composition and consider ways it can encourage diversity in all its forms, thus leading by example. This includes consideration of the impact of decisions on equality, diversity and inclusion.</p>	In part	<p>The SU President and staff members are elected by and from their constituent bodies, and the Principal is appointed through the City of London which has an equal opportunities policy. The Remuneration & Nominations Committee considers nominations in respect of the six co-opted members with an open recruitment process and vacancies advertised across a wide variety of platforms. A co-opted member was recently recruited with specialist skills in equality, diversity & inclusion.</p> <p><i>"Common Council members are elected members of the local authority. Whilst there can be no official statement promoting or encouraging diversity in those standing for election which might be perceived to interfere with the electoral/democratic process, when encouraging members of local networks/groups to attend meetings to find out more about standing for election to the Court, the City acknowledges its wish to increase the number of Councillors from a range of backgrounds and different experiences to enrich the City's knowledge and expertise and better reflect the communities it serves."</i> [This was original text provided by Town Clerk's Office who has been asked to review and provide update if appropriate.]</p>	<p>Whilst the School will still be provided for by the City of London, the Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future governance arrangements for the School including the composition of the board and the role of the Remuneration & Nominations Committee</p>	<p>G&E, BoG</p>	<p>Board to advise</p>

Element 5 Effectiveness

The governing body ensures that governance structures and processes are robust, effective and agile by scrutinising and evaluating governance performance against this Code (and other Codes where an institution constitutional form requires it) and recognised standards of good practice.

Requirements	Comply Yes / No / In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
<p>5.1 The Secretary (or Clerk) is responsible to the governing body for the provision of operational and legal advice in relation to compliance with governing instruments, including standing orders. They are also responsible for ensuring information provided to the governing body is timely, appropriate and enables informed decision making. The Secretary has a duty to keep governing body members briefed in respect of all relevant developments in governance and accountability. All members of the governing body should have independent access to the advice and services of the Secretary, who must ensure that governing body members are fully aware of the appropriate rules, regulations and procedures. The Secretary should be senior enough to ensure the governing body and the Executive acts in a way which is compliant with the institution's regulations and is independent enough to provide challenge when this is not the case. Arrangements for the appointment or removal of the Secretary may be defined by governing instruments; where they are not, it must be a decision for the governing body as a whole.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>The Town Clerk is the Clerk to Board; this is set out in the Instrument and Articles of Government. In practice, standard committee support is provided by the Committee and Members Team within the Town Clerk's Department. The Team also offers advice on City of London standing orders, processes and related legal matters. As the Town Clerk is a role within the local authority, the governing body does not have any decision or advisory role in the appointment to this role.</p> <p>Advice on HE operational and regulatory matters is provided to the Board by officers working within the School with particular responsibility currently residing with the Secretary & Dean of Students.</p> <p>Every member of the board has unfettered access to Town Clerk's Office and Secretary & Dean of Students.</p>	<p>Move of HE Secretary function from Dean of Students to new Chief Operating Officer role.</p>	<p>Principal</p>	
<p>5.2 The governing body needs the appropriate balance of skills, experience, diverse backgrounds, independence and knowledge to make informed decisions. Some constitutional documents specify governing bodies must include staff and student members.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>The Remuneration & Nominations Committee currently has no involvement in the appointment of Common Council members to the Board.</p> <p>There are two elected staff members and one student member on the Board.</p> <p>The Board has established a Remuneration & Nominations Committee to consider nominations for co-opted members and the balance of skills, knowledge and experience required by the Board.</p> <p>A survey of the skills and experience of all Board members was conducted in 2018 but a more granular follow-up is still awaited.</p>	<p>(i) Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future governance arrangements for the School including the composition of the board and the role of the Remuneration & Nominations Committee (ii) A further skills survey to be undertaken taking into account the detailed feedback fo the G&E Committee</p>	<p>(i)G&E, BoG (ii) Town Clerk's Office</p>	<p>during 2021/22</p>
<p>5.3 The size and composition of the governing body needs to reflect the nature, scale and complexity of the institution and governing bodies need enough time and resources to function efficiently and effectively. There is a need for a shared understanding of the division between independent non-executive governors and executive governors. The governing body will also need to consider having a committee sub-structure which supports its effective operation, with specific consideration being given to Audit, Finance and Nominations committees.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Structure: Board Committees: Audit & Risk Management, Finance & Resources, Remuneration & Nominations, Governance & Effectiveness Details at https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1 Plus Academic Assurance Working Group</p>			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No / In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
5.4 An effective governing body has a culture where all members can question intelligently, debate constructively, challenge rigorously, decide dispassionately and be sensitive to the views of others both inside and outside governing body meetings.	In part	There is nothing in the structure of the Board or the format and conduct of the meetings themselves to prevent constructive debate and rigorous challenge. It is recognised that there are problems with levels of engagement at meetings. This might be addressed at a Board Away Day and a specialist facilitator might help that discussion.	(i) Board Away Day (ii) Outcome of Lisvane may alter the size and shape of the Board which might impact on how members engage	Principal	Summer 2022
5.5 An effective governing body ensures the Board culture reflects the articulated values and culture of the institution. It also receives assurance that the prevalent behaviours in the institution are consistent with its articulated values.	In Part	Assurances are given through the Principal's reports to each meeting, where challenges in this area would be noted. More informally, assurances are received through the Board's engagement with the Students' Union representative on the Board. Further reporting needs to be developed.	(i) Formal yearly report on relevant case work. (ii) Further discussion at Away Day	(i) Head of HR/Dean of Students (ii) Principal	(i) Sept 2022 for preceding year (ii) Summer 2022
5.6 The governing body needs to focus on strategic risks and emerging opportunities for the institution and have enough flexibility to respond to these quickly and effectively.	YES	The City of London has a comprehensive risk register which incorporates the risks associated with the School. The School's risks are reviewed and monitored by the Audit & Risk Management Committee on behalf of the Board, however the Board receives a report at least annually on the School's risks. Recently the Audit & Risk Committee has worked with officers to develop a more accessible summary version of the risk assessments, which includes strategy for mitigating the risk, and this has enhanced discussions.			
5.7 The governing body needs a suitable arrangement for the continuation of business in the absence of the Chair. Arrangements for a Deputy Chair may be codified within the institution's governing instruments; if not, the Nominations Committee or equivalent can advise the governing body.	YES	The appointment of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman is codified in the <i>Instrument & Articles of Government</i> and both roles must be drawn from the Common Council membership of the Board.			
5.8 The governing body also needs to consider the benefits of appointing a Senior Independent Governor (SIG) or equivalent role and explain the rationale for decisions made in this regard. Their role is seen in other sectors as an important aid to good governance; to help advise the Chair, to be an intermediary for other Board members and to help facilitate an annual appraisal of the Chair. The role of the SIG is different to the Deputy Chair, who should be part of the leadership of the Board and deputise for the Chair as well as take on specific duties which are assigned to them. The SIG should be a voice and a sounding board for other governors to sense-check the effectiveness of the governance arrangements, and to formally lead the appraisal of the Chair (and the Deputy Chair).	NO	The School does not have a Senior Independent Governor (SIG) or equivalent role and there is currently no annual appraisal of the Chair or Deputy Chair.	Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future governance arrangements for the School including the composition of the board. Governance & Effectiveness has raised the role of a SIG and will further consider the role of the SIG at its next meeting	G&E, BoG	During 2021/22

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
5.9 The governing body needs a formal process to ensure that its members are fit and proper persons. The governing body also needs the power and process to remove any of its members from office, and must do so if a member breaches the terms of their appointment.	YES	All members of the Board are required to self-certify that they are a "fit and proper person" as defined by the OFS. The City of London has a Standards Committee whose main responsibility is to promote high standards of conduct by its Members and Members co-opted on to City of London Committees. It monitors the operation of the City of London's Code of Conduct for Members and any complaints of breaches.			
5.10 A Nominations Committee (or equivalent) is an effective way to advise a governing body on the appointment of new members, and must be established. The Nominations Committee can provide advice to the governing body on terms of office, the perceived skills balance required on the governing body, succession planning and skills refreshment. Normally, final decisions on appointment are taken by the governing body.	In part	The Board has established a Remuneration & Nominations Committee to consider nominations (for recommendation to the full Board for co-opted members) and the balance of skills, knowledge and experience required by the Board but has no involvement in the appointment of Common Council members to the Board who are drawn from the elected representatives within the City of London.	Lisvane & TOM reviews will explore the future governance arrangements for the School including the composition of the board and the role of the Remuneration & Nominations Committee	G&E, BoG	Board to advise
5.11 In making decisions about terms of office, the governing body needs to ensure there is a planned and progressive refreshing of membership – this includes evaluating the performance of governing body members. The terms of office for governing body members should not be more than nine years (either two terms of four years or three terms of three years) unless there is exceptional justification. This is in line with other Codes and recommended practice.	YES	All Board members are limited to three terms of three years with the exception of the Principal whose membership is ex-officio. This is set out in the <i>Instrument & Articles of Government</i> .			
5.12 Governing body members need induction, updates and development which supports understanding of their role and changes in their operating environment.	In part	The Clerk to the Board provides an induction to the City of London and its committees, and a handbook of information including relevant documentation about the School. The Principal meets with all new Board members to ensure an induction of Higher Education understanding. The annual away day provides an opportunity for members to look at matters in more detail.	(i) HE Glossary of acronyms, and HE policy and regulatory frameworks	(i) Dean of Students	Mar-22
5.13 HEIs must conduct a regular, full and robust review of governance effectiveness with some degree of independent input. This will provide assurance to internal and external stakeholders and allow a mechanism to focus on improvement and chart progress towards achieving any outstanding actions arising from the last effectiveness review. It is recommended this review takes place every three years.	In part	The Board reviews its effectiveness via the work of the Governance and Effectiveness Committee which is chaired by a co-opted member of the Board. Additionally, an extensive and thorough review of the City of London governance arrangements was conducted by Lord Lisvane in 2020; the findings and recommendations of that review are currently being considered within the City of London, through the City's Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee and elsewhere, and which will inform future discussions for the Governance & Effectiveness Committee.	Creation of New COO role	Principal	2021/22

Element 6 Engagement

Governing bodies understand the various stakeholders (especially staff and students) of the institution globally, nationally and locally, and are assured that appropriate and meaningful engagement takes place to allow stakeholder views to be considered and reflected in relevant decision-making processes.

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
6.1 The governing body needs to ensure the activities of the institution are in the interests of students (current and future) and other stakeholders. Donations, partnerships and similar activities must not inappropriately influence the institution's independence, mission or academic integrity. Governance processes and structures should be clearly visible to staff and students (current and future), who should have opportunities to engage with the governance of the institution, should they choose.	YES	<p>The School's Ethics Policy at: https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/Registry/2021-22/Policies/Ethics_Policy_2021.pdf sets out the broad ethical framework of the School including amongst other things the staff and student code of conduct, safeguarding, research ethics, and gift acceptance.</p> <p>The Board's affairs are conducted in an open and transparent manner. The public agenda, minutes and papers of the Board of Governors are published by the City of London at: http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=387 Details of the Common Council members of the Board of Governors and their declarations of interest are also published on this website. Declarations of interest of other members of the Board are published separately at: http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13618 The Board and its committees all have public sections of the agenda and these parts of the meetings are open to observation either in person or online depending on the meeting.</p>			
6.2 The governing body needs assurance of regular, effective two-way communication with students, staff and other stakeholders, and must be advised of any major issues arising.	YES	The Principal's reports provide assurance of regular, effective two-way communication with students, staff and other stakeholders, and will advise of any major issues arising.			
6.3 The governing body must promote and ensure the social, cultural, economic and environmental impact of the institution, and ensure that institutional success and achievements are reported to stakeholders. The governing body must also ensure that relevant stakeholders are advised of any material changes, adverse or other, in policy or circumstance.	YES	<p>Students' consumer and academic interests are considered at all stages of the student life cycle from admissions to graduation - and there are key documents that advise students of material changes - eg Offer Handbook, Student Handbook, Programme and module specifications (GOLD copy), departmental handbooks. The Governing Body is provided with a summary of complaints and appeals by students annually.</p> <p>Material changes to the institutions, eg retiring Principal, new Chair of Board, are reported to the Office for Student.</p>			

Requirements	Comply Yes/ No/ In Part	Evidence	Further Action Needed	By Whom	By When
6.4 Governing bodies need to promote a collegiate, collaborative and cooperative approach to liaison with students, staff and other stakeholders and ensure that interactions are guided by the values, ethics and culture of the institution.	YES	<p>The School makes efforts to engage with students at every level of governance. A Students' Union representative (usually the President of the SU) is a full member of the Board.</p> <p>Student representatives are present at many committees and working groups within the School (excluding management committees and student assessment). There is a regular Staff/Student Liaison Committee (twice a term, chaired by the Principal) giving student representatives direct access to senior members of staff across all directorates.</p> <p>Students are surveyed via the NSS and Whole School Survey and the Board of Governors receives the results and requires updates on action to address areas of concern.</p> <p>There are regular all-staff meetings at which staff have the opportunity to ask questions of senior officers and key concerns of staff are raised with the Board. There are two staff representatives on the Board of Governors.</p> <p>The Principal and other officers are engaged with officers at the City of London on a regular basis and the Principal talks at least weekly with the Chair of the Board.</p> <p>There are common meetings with key partners such as Barbican and LSO, and the Board has, in the past, had a joint away day with the Barbican Board.</p>			
6.5 Where institutions enter into significant partnership or working arrangements with other organisations, governing bodies need to be assured of the benefits and risks of the partnership, and need to be satisfied that there are effective governance and risk management arrangements in place to support the partnership.	Yes	<p>The Principal's reports provide assurance of regular, effective two-way communication with students, staff and other stakeholders, and will advise of any major issues arising.</p>			
6.6 Governing bodies should ensure the institution is accessible and relevant to its local communities, and should be open to, and engage with, their local communities in identifying their role in delivering public/community benefit and economic civic duties, cultural and social growth.	YES	<p>The School's strategy recognises the School's civic commitments, and commitment to social impact both through direct activity and research.</p> <p>The School is the biggest provider in the country of music education to under eighteens with a number of regional centres. It is engaged in significant outreach and community work through the short course programme, departmental activities and through its targeted Access & Participation work.</p> <p>The work of the School is open to the local public with numerous performances both ticketed and unticketed.</p> <p>The work of the Board is open to the public with all meetings of the Board and committees having public sections with relevant papers available online.</p>			

Agenda Item 7

Committee	Dated:
Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama	22/11/2020
Subject: Academic Board annual report 2020/21	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	N/A
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	
If so, how much?	
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	
Report of: Interim Principal, Guildhall School	For Information
Report author: Kalpesh Khetia, Assistant Registrar	

Summary

The Academic Board is established under the *Instrument & Articles of Government* and reports to the Board of Governors.

The report of the Board contributes to the Board's assurances on the student experience from admission to graduation, assurances around academic standards, and the School's commitment to continuous improvement of the student experience. In light of requests that academic risks are more prominently highlighted in School committees, in this report risks are tagged for ease of reference (all these risks are already linked to the existing risk register).

With staff (teaching and professional services) moved to work on more immediate priorities arising from the pandemic, a number of actions arising from previous reports have been significantly delayed. Recent professional services staff shortages is further hampering progress.

The Academic Assurance Working Group will consider this report, and other quality documentation, at its next meeting when it undertakes its review of academic assurances.

Recommendations:

- To note the contents of Academic Board annual report for 2020/21, in particular the action plan.

Katharine Lewis
 Secretary & Dean of Students
 E: katharine.lewis@gsmd.ac.uk
 Teams telephone number: +44 20 4526 4612

This page is intentionally left blank

**Academic Board 18 November 2021
and
Board of Governors 22 November 2021**

**Academic Board annual report for 2020/21 to the
Board of Governors on academic strategy, standards,
assurance and enhancement**

1. Terms of reference and membership

Five meetings of the Academic Board were held instead of six; two in autumn, one in spring and two in summer. All meetings took place online via Zoom or MS Teams. Staff from all teaching departments, including Guildhall Young Artists were represented on the membership.

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 and this will reflect discussions and decisions arising from a variety of meetings that have taken place with internal stakeholders. Due to the continuing priorities in meeting regulatory requirements arising as a result of the pandemic, progress on the quinquennial review has been slow. There is continuing discussion around the formulation of a quinquennial review working group as a vehicle to accelerate the process of review. The balance between the work (and the responsibilities) of the Academic Board (the oversight body) and the Programme Boards (the "doing" committees) is one of the main areas of exploration. Currently the Board meets more frequently than any Programme Board.

Action arising from 2019/20 and carried over in 2020/21

i) To ensure new equality and diversity arrangements link with Academic Board governance structure

2. Strategy

2.1 School Strategic Plan

The School published its updated strategic plan for 2017-2022 in May 2020. The ethos remains to deliver distinctive degree programmes which enable our artists to be world-class; virtuosi in their field; adaptable, purposeful and responsible artists in society. There will be a continued focus on strengthening bonds with the Barbican Centre and City of London; as well as contributing to the sustainability agenda, the School will be leading on positive cultural change which impacts on society and our industry and the wider world through professional development, research & knowledge exchange and public engagement.

2.2 Teaching and Learning Strategy

The current strategy expired at the end of 2017. A summary of key Teaching and Learning developments during the period 2017-20 was considered by Academic Board

at its first meeting of autumn term 2020/21. The Associate Dean of Teaching & Learning had undertaken this review in lieu of a formal Teaching and Learning Strategy for that period in order to provide background to the next strategy. During the period spanning 2020/21 and early autumn of 2021/22, the Associate Dean of Teaching & Learning in collaboration with colleagues across the School has developed a draft strategy document to bring to Academic Board for consideration on the 18 November 2021 and will be presented to the Board of Governors thereafter.

2.3 COVID-19

The School implemented a recalibrated blended curriculum from September 2020 following a further review conducted over the summer preceding the new academic year. Students and External Examiners were consulted on the proposed adaptations and all students were written to formally setting out the alterations to the School/student programme contract and the options open to them.

The blended delivery of teaching was received well by students in addition to the technological enhancements the School had made, namely with the introduction of low-latency technology to enable students to collaborate across several School venues.

In November 2020, the School re-engaged in the process of reviewing the curriculum and notified students and external examiners that it would continue delivering the curriculum on a blended basis from the 4th January 2021. However, on 30th December 2020, four days prior to the start of the new term, the School was notified that the national lockdown would continue and consequently all students were notified that teaching would be delivered online only. MA Music Therapy was the exception due to training allied to health professions being exempt from lockdown.

The School was able to restore some in-person teaching on site from 8th March 2021 but due to the difficulties of returning to School at short notice, particularly international students, students were given the option to continue with online learning until the Easter break.

The School utilised the advice and guidance available from the external regulatory bodies such as the Office for Students (OfS) and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and External Examiners to re-develop a coherent suite of programmes that continued to meet external regulatory requirements and maintain a high level of academic quality and standards.

The final meeting of Academic Board received an overview of all of the amendments to assessments that had been considered and approved over the period 2020/21 for official record and for auditing purposes.

Given the very low level of complaint about the School's provision, it would seem that the School's actions significantly mitigated the risk under consumer protection.

Action arising 2020/21

ii) As part of teaching & learning enhancement strategy, alternative modes of delivery developed under Covid to be incorporated into future delivery of existing or new programmes

2.4 Access & Participation

The Board noted in March 2021 that the School would be submitting the final Access & Participation Monitoring report for 2019/20 to the Office for Students (OfS). This would be the last time that the School would have to do monitoring of a 1-year plan. Since August 2020, the School has been working through the 5-year plan.

Covid and the first lock down disturbed Access work for the majority of higher education providers and the 2019/20 monitoring return questions, reflected the OfS's understanding of that fact.

Potential reputational risk: failure to meet targets. New plan 2020/21-2024/25 represents a shift in focus in Access activity to be more targeted.

2.5 Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF)

Towards the end of the 2020/21 academic year, Higher Education Providers were notified by the Office for Students (OfS) that references to TEF rating should be removed from all institutional publications (online and offline) from 1st September 2021. The School is awaiting the OfS consultation paper on the recommendations of an independent review of the process that will outline next steps for TEF.

3 Standards of taught awards

3.1 Assessment results 2020/21 cycle (appendix A)

Assessment results were considered by the School Board of Examiners at two meetings in July and September, unlike the previous academic year all assessment was completed as scheduled.

Data contained in appendix A are the results confirmed as at 20 October 2021.

At undergraduate level the proportion of higher awards at first-class is up (45% vs 35%) with some reduction in upper second (46% vs 53%) when compared with 2020 but the proportion of the award of higher classifications overall (first and upper second) increased.

The School saw almost double the number of BMus students being awarded a first-class degree despite a negligible difference in the number of students awarded (116 in 2020 vs 117 in 2021). Despite the School's amendment to the Academic Regulatory Framework in 2018/19 to depress grade inflation by removing the discretion to upgrade at a classification borderline (ie 0.5% below) the School still saw a high number of higher classifications.

Reputational risk: unexplained grade inflation

Actions arising 2020/21

iii) Academic Assurance Working Group to give particular attention to grade inflation and how the School maintains standards outcomes in the School

iv) Executive Team to consider grade inflation for report to Academic Board and Board of Governors May 2021

3.2 Summary of External Examiner reports and responses 2020/21 cycle (appendix B)

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 responses embedded in relevant action plans.

The sub-committees of Academic Board, namely the Programme Boards for Production Arts, Drama and Music looked at feedback from all the External Examiners for undergraduate programmes from the 2020/21 cycle at the respective meetings held in October 2021 with attention given to the comparability of standards. Common themes identified include (i) assessment criteria and (ii) evidence of feedback to students and alignment of feedback with assessment criteria. At its meeting in November 2021 the Board will receive a consolidated External Examiner overview document which will report on any specific issues raised in points (i) and (ii) above.

3.3 Equality assessment strands (appendix C)

The Board considered the annual analyses conducted separately for the undergraduate and postgraduate assessment outcomes of 2019/20 assessment cycle for the following equality streams: Age, Disability, Ethnicity and Gender, considering the relative proportions of higher awards (firsts and 2:1s, distinctions and merits) made. Very small numbers prevent statistical analysis of some protected characteristics.

Potential reputational risk:
unexplained differences in outcomes

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

Action arising 2020/21

v) Departments to reflect on data and respond through annual monitoring mechanisms

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.

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 in spring 2021 and a further meeting is to be scheduled in spring 2022.

The Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, responsible for the School's research activity and programmes, reports to the Academic Board, including matters relating to research ethics. Additionally, the doctoral programme that is validated by City, University of London convenes a course board meeting with Guildhall School on an annual basis but from 2021/22 there will be two course boards per academic year. Amendments to the doctoral regulations also require sign-off by City. City was kept apprised of any deviation related to student outcomes arising as a result of COVID-19.

The Course Board oversaw the revalidation of the doctoral programme in March 2021, and approved revalidation for five years from 1 September 2021 to 31 August 2026 (see below).

4.2 Regulatory framework

The Academic Regulatory Framework is reviewed annually. At its June meeting the Board considered and approved clarification amendments to the regulations across all sections. Notable amendments were as follows:

- (i) there were small tweaks to language throughout with creation of new roles within Registry and clarification of departmental roles.
- (ii) Programme responsibilities were clarified.
- (iii) Reference to Accreditation of Prior Learning was removed to confirm that the School does not recognise specific credit from other institutions for advanced standing, although general advanced standing (eg to year 2 or 3) is still accepted in some circumstances.
- (iv) Pass/Fail assessments – any assessments that miss the deadline shall be deemed a fail.
- (v) reference to School-wide assessment criteria was removed as a result of the amendments being made to criteria through revalidation.
- (vi) clarified about the membership of an e academic appeal
- (vii) in Section 5, the main amendments were to the code of conduct (appendix 5A) as a result of changes related to OfS clarification of sexual harassment.

The largest change to the regulations is around the course participation policy with the catalyst being the increased expectations of the UKVI regarding monitoring attendance and engagement. Whilst the fundamental building blocks of the original remain (eg attendance requirements and case consultations and progress reviews where attendance is lacking), this section has been completely rewritten to introduce defined trigger points (to ensure consistency across all programmes) and for clarity. New regulations are to be presented to 18 November Board meeting.

4.3 Validation & revalidation of programmes

At the last meeting of Academic Board, it approved the adoption of a 'Criteria for new HE programme proposals' guidance document. In the summer of 2020, the Strategic Planning group considered the need for a generic set of criteria that could apply to all new programme proposals. The prioritising of the criteria is informed by the imperative

that programmes are viable and sustainable within the School's resources and meet industry needs and HE standards and expectations.

The final cohort of the **BA in Performance & Creative Enterprise** has now completed all assessment and the programme is now closed.

The Board considered and approved for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the closure of the **MA in Acting** programme. There is now one cohort remaining, due to complete at the end of the 2022/23 academic year. Student numbers remain unaffected as this was delivered alongside the BA in Acting programme.

Four programmes were revalidated over a 4-week period in spring/summer 2021. The three programmes below were validated by Guildhall School of Music & Drama and were conducted online via MS Teams.

- BA Acting
- BA Production Arts
- BA Video Design for Live Performance

The following programme was revalidated by City, University of London:

- MPhil/DMus/PhD

The **BA Acting** programme saw a significant overhaul of its curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment to diversify its offering. This also entailed a significant reduction in credit and contact time. The programme team received a number of conditions to meet by the 1st September 2021 and was also commended in the following areas:

- Quality of the documentation, its accessibility and clarity.
- The clear direction of travel, particularly in respect of responding positively to the equality and diversity agenda and changes in the industry; introducing a wider array of production opportunities for students; and providing more opportunity for the students to develop and demonstrate their own creative agency.
- The reduction in credits, in response to concerns regarding the over-commitment of staff and students.
- The close engagement with students in developing the programme for revalidation.

The BA in Acting programme was revalidated for a further 5 years.

The **BA in Production Arts** programme altered the number of credits and hours offered on the programme to redress the balance of engagement with productions. The programme team received a number of conditions to meet by the 1st September 2021 and was also commended in the following areas:

- The panel recognised the application of sector based working practices during preparation for productions as good practice.
- Recruitment of 2 outreach workers to help the diversity agenda.
- Commitment to developing a Saturday and a term-time programme in collaboration with Guildhall Young Artists to provide opportunities to under-18s.
- Sharing good practice at marking review meetings.

- Good practice in the application of stepped learning outcomes and identification of FHEQ Levels in learning outcomes.

The BA in Production Arts programme was revalidated for a further 5 years.

The **BA in Video Design for Live Performance (VDLP)** saw a minor change in credits which also saw the programme align itself to the BA in Production Arts. Significantly, the department also received approval to change the name of the award to the **BA in Digital Design & Production** to come into effect from September 2022. The programme team received a number of conditions to meet by 1st September 2021 and were also commended in the following areas:

- The commitment of the staff to the programme, understanding of issues and complexities.
- The imaginative solutions to enhancing student learning, eg LinkedIn learning accounts.
- The strong sense of community within staff and students.

The BA in VDLP programme was revalidated for only a further 3 years given some continuing issues, particularly around recruitment and sustainability.

During the course of revalidation, the Panels also identified School level recommendations which would need to be discussed at Academic Board. The Revalidation Panels identified the following recommendations which should be considered over the validation periods:

- To consider reviewing programme and module specification templates to introduce Reading and Resources lists at module level where appropriate.
- To review and specify the School's policy on exit awards and their classification (particularly at level 4 CertHE); liaise with the BA Acting programme team in order to effect changes to the proposed exit arrangements, as appropriate.
- To review the processes by which the programme handbook is made consistent, comprehensive and user friendly across all School departments.

<p>Potential quality & standards and consumer protection risk: Programme Handbooks: duplication and inconsistent information to internal/external stakeholders; Level 4 awards: incomparable outcomes with competitor institutions</p>

The **Doctoral** programme was revalidated by City, University of London in spring 2021. The report noted that the Doctoral programme had matured since the last revalidation event. It had evolved a distinct offer in terms of performing arts research evidenced by the increasing student numbers and market. The programme team received one condition to be met by 31st August 2021 and several recommendations for consideration over the next revalidation period. It was also noted at the meeting the School's Research Department's intention to apply for Research Degree Awarding Powers during the next revalidation period.

The Panel noted the following areas for special commendation:

- The high-quality revalidation submission.
- The use of technology which had helped to support the student experience.
- The outstanding support given to students during the COVID-19 pandemic as emphasised by students too.

- The use of a mock Viva Voce was good practice and an excellent way to support students.

The Doctoral programme was revalidated for a further 5 years.

Action arising 2020/21

v) Detailed analysis of the work, locus of responsibilities and costs of RDAP particularly given current staffing issues.

The
MA

Music Therapy was due to be revalidated in 2020/21, however an extension until autumn 2021/22 was granted to permit the programme team more time to review the content of the curriculum, particularly in respect of EDI matters, whilst continuing to meet its regulatory obligations to The Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC).

4.4 Student feedback

The Academic Board considered a wide variety of student feedback during 2020/21, 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. Participation in the WSS was particularly low, possibly due to Covid.

4.5 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 at its September meeting overview tables for both the NSS and the WSS conducted in 2021. Departmental actions plans are included in the Principal's report to the Board of Governors in November 2021.

5.1 The National Student Survey January to April 2021

NSS participation decreased compared with last year (to 79% from 84%). The national average response rate was 69%. Final year BA PACE students were not surveyed as this was a closing programme. Because of the small number of students on the BA VDLP programme, quantitative results have not been published but are combined in the aggregate results. BA Acting studies was not included as there were no final year students in 2020-21.

In a reversal of the trend for the previous three years, in 2021 the overall satisfaction rate for the quality of the courses went down, (from 90% in 2020 to 79% in 2021). Satisfaction across all sections of the survey has generally declined or stayed the same. In the categories of teaching and academic support satisfaction fell by more than five percentage points. This trend in decreased satisfaction is reflected across the sector with many institutions falling in overall satisfaction by more than 10 percentage

points. Furthermore, Guildhall has done well to drop only 4 percentage points on organisation and management; a category that saw many competitors fall by 5-10 percentage points. This sector-wide trend likely reflects the ongoing frustration of students with COVID safety measures resulting in the hybrid and online delivery of courses.

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

- For Assessment and Feedback BA Acting saw a return of a less than 50% satisfaction in the category of 'Marking and assessment has been fair', returning a satisfaction rate of 42%
- Satisfaction with the organisation and smooth running of courses fell from 72% in 2020 to 59% in 2021 across the School. Satisfaction fell by more than five percentage points across all programmes.
- Jazz students saw a significant decrease in overall satisfaction from 80% in 2020 to 48% in 2021. There was significant decrease in satisfaction with teaching and learning opportunities, though increased satisfaction with learning resources, learning community and assessment and feedback.
- Singers saw notable decrease in satisfaction with learning opportunities, assessment and feedback and organisation and management.
- Overall satisfaction for WBP students fell by 21 percentage points, from 100% in 2020 to 79% in 2021. The most notable areas of dissatisfaction were with teaching, learning opportunities and academic support. WBP students did register an increase in satisfaction of more than five percentage points with assessment and feedback.

Action arising 2020/21

vii) Departments to address NSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations (and also report to the Board in November)

5.2 The Whole School Survey

The Whole School Survey combines questions regarding:

- Programme evaluation
- Student experience questions (Student Affairs IT, Facilities, Registry, Recording and AV, Library, Students' Union, Sundial Court, Departmental Offices and other elements that contribute to the student experience).

The survey was reduced this year as the School was required to rebuild the survey from scratch with new software as Survey Monkey was no longer considered a sufficiently secure medium. Detailed module questions will be reintroduced for the 2022 survey. However, student has plenty of opportunity to provide free text comments. There was also a re-formulation of some of the questions relating to work load management and the removal of the question relating to handbooks. There was one COVID related question (in relation to programmes) included in the 2021 survey was:

"The School has kept me informed of the changes made to my programme of study because of the COVID-19 pandemic".

and respondents were also asked to consider whether they would be open to online teaching in the future.

All students were invited to complete the online survey via email. The response rate for 2021 was substantially lower than hoped for at 32%. All efforts to increase response rates were made, including reminders in Students' Union newsletters and student e-zines, weekly email reminders, digital posters and pushes from departments. The survey was open for 9 weeks between May and July 2021.

Taking into account the low base rate and the low response rate for 2021, overall satisfaction with the quality of teaching has remained stable across all programmes between 2020-21.

5.3 Graduate Outcomes Results 2018/19 Undergraduate and Postgraduate combined

Graduate Outcomes is a survey of graduates approximately 15 months after they have completed. Although Graduate Outcomes replaces DHLE, the results of the two surveys should not be compared due to fundamental differences in time scale and methodology.

The latest results are from the 2018/19 academic year graduating cohort, which is the second year Graduate Outcomes has been run – the respondents graduated between 1 August 2018 and 31 July 2019, and were surveyed between December 2019 and November 2020. Given the period of some of the survey was during the height of the pandemic, the scores are particularly pleasing.

Total population			Graduates in paid employment or further education			Other statistics for Guildhall graduates	
<i>Eligible population</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Response rate</i>	<i>Guildhall graduates</i>	<i>Creative arts & design graduates (all UK HEPs)</i>	<i>All UK HEP graduates</i>	<i>Other activity*</i>	<i>Unemployed</i>
383	226	59%	89%	85%	87%	6%	5%

*Other activity includes voluntary or unpaid work, travel, caring for someone and retired

5.4 Student regulatory activity during 2020/21 (appendix D)

There was an increase in the number of cases in 2020/21 that fall under student regulatory activity that include: academic appeals, complaints, disciplinary investigations, case consultations and progress reviews. There was a notable increase in academic appeals and disciplinary cases. The complexity of some of the casework has been extraordinary taking hours of staff time almost on a daily basis.

Acting still attracts the largest number of admission complaints but it has substantially more applications than all other programmes added together.

Three Completion of Procedures (COP) letters were issued in the 2020/21 cycle with a further CoP issued recently as a complaint completed Stage 3.

5.5 Equality admission strands 2020 entry

The Board considered in spring 2021 a summary analysis of applications, offers and conversations for 2020 entry (see appendix D). Data is too small for some protected characteristics to be meaningful.

5.6 Student Protection Plan

Academic Board approved updates to the Student Protection Plan with the main amendments in respect of inserting online and blended learning as possible responses to a crisis, and reducing the reporting to the Board of Governors of a programme closure to a single stage.

6 Standards of research awards

6.1 Doctoral programme (validated by City, University of London)

The Doctoral programme was successfully revalidated by City, University of London for a further 5 years. The programme team were met with one condition which was met ahead of the deadline.

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 (in 2020/21 there were 77 research students enrolled (including writing up). It remains the School's intent to apply for research degree awarding powers during the period of the next revalidation but there are significant costs and challenges with such an application.

6.2 Research Environment

Research Strategy

At its November 2020 meeting the Academic Board was presented the latest iteration of the Research Strategy for review (2020-2025), it was highlighted that many of the proposals had emerged from discussions in the RKEC forum.

The department felt it was the right moment to redraft the research strategy for three main reasons:

- a. The School are approaching the end of the REF cycle and should have a blueprint for the future
- b. It has been very helpful in drafting the research environment template for the REF submission
- c. The work done on determining staff eligibility revealed the need for an institution-wide consultation about how we structure support and funding for research.

There were a number of inconsistencies that emerged in the staff eligibility exercise. These had largely arisen in response to a changeable outside context at various points, and to that extent demonstrate the institution's agility. However, the School is now at a point where it was appropriate and necessary to determine how to move forward and what is the most equitable and efficient way of achieving it. Some of the 'Key issues to address 2020–2025' are those most affected by the announcement

regarding a new Target Operating Model for the City. Namely: 'Internal structures', 'Research recruitment and remuneration', 'Progress towards RDAP' and 'Internal funding of research'.

REF

Following Covid-19, institutions were invited to submit revised codes of practice. There were no substantive changes made, and Research England immediately approved the revisions as 'minor amendments'.

KEF

The first set of KEF narrative statements were submitted to Research England. The narrative statements accompany the numerical data. The School benefits from these narrative statements as it allows to contextualise the relatively low financial figures. The narrative statements focus on local growth and regeneration and on public and community engagement, both areas where the research department is strong. This is the first time Research England had collected such narrative statements, the School was not obliged to submit but consider it helpful to present the information.

6.3 Conferment of title of Professor from 2020/2021

The Board noted that the following staff members were conferred the title of "Professor" for use from summer 2020/21 onwards

- Jonathan Vaughan (Vice-Principal & Director for Music)

7 Academic Board activities for 2021/22

7.1 School Strategic Plan

It is expected that as the year progresses, further programme developments will be considered this will also take on a broader scope of reviewing the size and shape of the institution and the viability of existing programmes.

7.2 Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy

The Associate Dean of Teaching & Learning has held a series of meetings with a variety of stakeholders across the School including Heads of Department and the President of the Students' Union to present at Academic Board in November 2021.

7.3 Revalidation

The following programmes were scheduled to be revalidated in 2021/22:

- MA Music Therapy (carried over from 2020/21)
- MA Collaborative Theatre Production & Design (CTPD)
- MA Opera Making & Writing

However, the CTPD programme has been deferred for validation for a further year at the autumn 2021 Academic Board this is due to changes in key staff in January 2022.

The Senior Management Team has approved the BA in Performance Design for further development. Subsequently, the BA in Performance Design will be taking the validation slot vacated by CTPD in March 2022.

Action Plan Summary

Carried forward from 2017/18 report			
Action	Assigned	Deadline	Update
<i>1. 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 & Learning</i>	<i>Original September 2020 New deadline March 2021</i>	<i>First draft to be presented at Academic Board meeting Nov 2021</i>
<i>4. 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</i>	<i>Action under new Teaching Enhancement Strategy</i>
<i>11. 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>Original during 2019/20 now 2020/21</i>	<i>Preliminary work delayed due to pandemic and also staff changes. Other more recent staff changes in Research will impact RDAP prep. – moved to 2021/22</i>
Carried forward from 2018/19 report			
Action	Assigned	Deadline	Update
<i>1. To conduct a quinquennial review of the Academic Board, its sub-committee structure and academic governance frameworks during 2019/20</i>	<i>Associate Dean of Teaching & Learning with Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)</i>	<i>AB Summer 2 meeting (now 2020/21)</i>	<i>Work is on-going, meetings continue with internal stakeholders</i>
<i>2.(a)To prepare (undergraduate) degree outcomes review and prepare public statement for consideration by both Academic Board and Board of Governors</i>	<i>Programme Leaders Group with Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)</i>	<i>Moved to end 2020 but now structure to be reviewed as part of wider discussion on grade inflation</i>	<i>External publication postponed – defined period of review to be decided</i>
<i>2.(b)As part of degree outcomes review, 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>As part of new T&L Strategy discussions on assessment</i>	<i>Some work in departments has taken place. Programme Leaders to follow this up.</i>

Actions arising from 2019/20 report		Deadline	Update
A) <i>To ensure new equality and diversity arrangements link with Academic Board governance structure</i>	<i>Associate Dean, Assistant Registrar in liaison with Task Group</i>	<i>AB Summer 2 meeting (now 2020/21)</i>	<i>Move to 2020/21 action plan</i>
B) <i>during Covid-19 crisis, to review curriculum on a termly basis in 2020/21 to ensure delivery enables the maintenance of academic standards and aligns with regulatory requirements</i>	<i>Programme Leaders Group</i>	<i>By end of 2020/21</i>	<i>Completed</i>
C) <i>Departments to address NSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations</i>	<i>Programme Leaders</i>	<i>Drama & Production Arts: revalidation 2021 Music: Autumn 2020</i>	<i>Completed</i>

Actions arising from 2020/21 report		Deadline	Update
<i>i. To ensure new equality and diversity arrangements link with Academic Board governance structure</i>	<i>Associate Dean, Assistant Registrar in liaison with Task Group</i>	<i>TBC</i>	<i>Part of quinquennial review process considerations and also pending further EDI discussions internally</i>
<i>ii. As part of teaching & learning enhancement strategy, alternative modes of delivery developed under Covid to be incorporated into future delivery</i>	<i>Programme Leaders</i>	<i>Period of teaching enhancement strategy</i>	
<i>iii. Academic Assurance Working Group to give particular attention to grade inflation and how the School maintains standards outcomes in the School</i>	<i>AAWG</i>	<i>February 2022</i>	
<i>iv. Executive Team to consider grade inflation for report to AB an BoG</i>	<i>Executive</i>	<i>Following AAWG</i>	
<i>v. Equality Assessment strands: Departments to reflect on data and respond through annual monitoring mechanisms</i>	<i>All departments</i>	<i>Drama, Production Arts & Music by 2nd spring Academic Board</i>	

		<i>via Programme Board</i>	
<i>vi. Detailed analysis of the work, locus of responsibilities and costs of RDAP particularly given current staffing issues</i>	<i>Research Department with Registry</i>	<i>By February 2022</i>	
<i>vii. Departments to address NSS scores and identify actions in the Annual Programme Evaluations</i>	<i>Programme Leaders</i>	<i>BoG November 2021 and Drama, Production Arts & Music by 2nd spring Academic Board via Programme Board</i>	

Kalpesh Khetia
 November 2021
 (KML amends)

Appendix A: Assessment results 2020/21 cycle
Outcome of 2020/21 assessments to date (with 2020 & 2019 comparisons)

Undergraduate classifications (2020/21 data provided as at 20 October 2021)

Programme. & Year	No. of students in cohort	Degree class					Other assessment outcomes		
		1 st	Upper 2 nd	Lower 2 nd	Third	Ord	Resits	Defers	Misc
2020/21 Assessments									
BMus	117	62	47	2		6	1	2**	2 x Int; 2 x CertHE; 2 x DipHE
BA TECH	31	9	15	7				2**	1 x Int; 1 x DipHE
BA Acting	23	7	16						
BA Acting Studies	No awards due until end of 21/22								
BA VDLP	2		2						
BA PACE¹	7	3	3	1					
Totals	180	81	83	10		6	1	4	3 x Int; 2 x CertHE; 3 x DipHE
2019/20 Assessments									
BMus	116	36	57	8		5		1**	9 WD (5 CertHE 4 DipHE)
BA TECH	34	16	14	3					1 FWD (1 DipHE)
BA Acting	21	4	17						
BA Acting Studies	12	6	4	1				1	
BA VDLP	3	1	2						
BA PACE	10	3	5	2					
Totals	196	66	99	14		5		2	10
2018/19 Assessments									
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					
Totals	181	61	89	9	1	8		3	11

Int= intermit FWD=Fail/Withdraw WD= Withdrawn **continuing extenuating circumstances

¹ In 2019/20, 10 PACE students trailed their programme into 2020/21. The total number of awards in 2020/21 recorded is officially 17, however the 10 students were recorded in last years' annual report and therefore this years' report shows 7.

Total 2021 UG cohort 180 students: % split		Total 2020 UG cohort 184 students: % split		Total 2019 UG cohort 181 students: % split	
1 st	45.00	1 st	35.68	1 st	33.7
2:1	46.11	2:1	53.51	2:1	49.17
2:2	5.56	2:2	7.57	2:2	4.97
3	0	3	0	3	0.55
Ord	3.33	Ord	2.7	Ord	4.42

Postgraduate classifications (2020/21 data provided as at 19 October 2021)

Award	No. of students on Prog.	Classification			Progression to next part	Other assessment outcomes		
		Dist.	Merit	Pass		Resit	Defer	Misc
2020/21 assessments								
MMus in Performance	60	24	34	2	65		2	1 WD, 1 FWD 7 Int
MMus in Composition	1	1			5			
MPerf, MComp, Guildhall Artist	66	55	11					
MA in Opera Making & Writing	6	5	1					
Artist Diploma	19	18	1				1	2 WD, 1 FWD, 4 Int
Graduate Certificate	2		2					
MA in Music Therapy	11	3	8					
MA Acting	3		3					
MA CTPD	9	3	6					
PgCert	18	7	7	4				
Totals	195	116	73	6			3	

2019/20 assessments								
MMus in Performance	145	19	32	2	80		2**	1 WD, 1 FWD 8 Int
MMus in Composition	6	1			5			
MPerf, MComp (Guildhall Artist)	72	51	12				8**	(1 fail- lower award)
MA in Opera Making & Writing	6	5	1					
Artist Diploma	15	7					8**	
Graduate Certificate	10		2		6			1 WD, 1 Int
MA in Music Therapy	9	1	8					
MA Acting	6	3	3					
MA CTPD	9	3	6					
Totals	278	90	64	2	91		18	13

2018/19 assessments								
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, (Guildhall Artist)	74	53	19	2		1	2	1 WD
MA in Opera Making & Writing	5	3	2					
Artist Diploma	11	10	1				2	
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				
Totals	268	101	70	15	79	1	4	6

Int= intermit FWD=Fail/Withdraw WD= Withdrawn **continuing extenuating circumstances

Total 2021 PG cohort 195 students: % split		Total 2020 PG cohort 156 students: % split		Total 2019 PG cohort 189 students: % split	
Distinction	59.48	Distinction	57.69	Distinction	54.3
Merit	37.43	Merit	41.03	Merit	37.63
Pass	3	Pass	1.28	Pass	8.06

Appendix B: External Examiner Reports for 2020/21 cycle

Comparability of standards

Q 9: Are the academic standards on the School and achievement of students comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions with which you are familiar?

BA (Hons) Acting

- *Academic standards and student achievement clearly demonstrate the School's standing as a leading UK institution. The quality of the programme and its delivery is borne out by the high standards of student performance and their confidence in their training as preparation for the profession.*

BA (Hons) Acting Studies

- *Having observed several classes, as well as evaluating the assessments of the three modules, 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 were extremely high, delivered by highly skilled, knowledgeable, and experienced tutors. Class material was always employed to achieve a relevant learning purpose. I attended the performance of Acting Creation 1: this was an exceptional performance by the students, which evidenced a high level of discipline, skills and artistic expression. It also showed the accumulation of the learning process of the past two years in acting, voice, and movement, applied to an intensive rehearsal process made possible by their extremely close working relationship with the tutor/director.*

BA (Hons) Production Arts / Technical Theatre Arts

- *Very much so, on two levels. The pandemic generated an "opportunity" to develop online and digital skills in the absence of physical attendance. These would have been, perhaps, lesser developed skills (usually due to time) and appealed to only certain students. Yet the industries response to the situation has made many of these skills more desirable in a candidate, therefore making these Guildhall graduates prepared for these changes and already possessing a high standard of competency. The productions produced were also of a very high standard, demonstrating that the adjustments made were effective and that students were able to achieve the required outcomes despite the upheaval of the last year or so.*

BA (Hons) Video Design 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 once again an open discussion about the parity of assessment grading in relation to other institutions.*

BA (Hons) Performance & Creative Enterprise

- *The grades are well spread given the small cohort and the range of work submitted. I think the team are mindful of grade inflation and have been realistic with their assessment.*

BMus (Hons) Music

- **EE1:** *In the sample of performance recitals that I attended this year, marks were concentrated in the upper bands giving testimony to the very high standards of performance achieved by students of the GSMD. These compare favourably with comparable institutions with which I am familiar. I viewed a wider range of standards of academic work with more representation of the lower bands. Nonetheless, there was some excellent work and the standards compare well with those of other comparable institutions.*
- **EE2:** *I reiterate the comments I made in last year's report: the best practical work produced by final year students is of an exceptional standard and it is immensely encouraging that, at such early stages in their performing careers, so many students are capable of producing such superlative work. A similar observation applies to the academic work I examined: the best is excellent, including dissertations that are intellectually engaged and sophisticated, and clearly written and presented. In all senses, the work is comparable in standard with work undertaken in other HEIs with which I am familiar – and, in the case of performance, regularly exceeds it.*

PGCert Performance Teaching

- *I can confirm that academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which I have experience (including my current institution, previous institutions at which I have held posts, and those in which I have acted as an external examiner). The work which I have sampled (including written and verbal assessments, plus teaching activities) confirms that standards are appropriate for PGCert/postgraduate study.*

MA Acting

- *Academic standards and student achievement clearly demonstrate the School's standing as a leading UK institution. The quality of the programme and its delivery is borne out by the high standards of student performance and their confidence in their training as preparation for the profession.*

MA Collaborative Theatre Production & Design

- *Academic standards and achievement of students are comparable to others I have experience of in the UK higher education sector. I would like to add that much of the teaching and learning practice on this course I would characterize as excellent and an example of some of the best I have encountered in HE practice.*

MA Opera Making & Writing

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

MA Music Therapy

- *An MA in music therapy requires the development of a wide range of skills and learning methods. The range of work I have seen has been of a good standard and in some cases excellent, and well in keeping with the academic standards of comparable awards and MA music therapy programmes I have been involved with. The standards of individual students have been well in keeping with the musical and academic requirements of the Health and Care Professions Council and the QAA benchmarks for MA. In particular the standard of Viva presentations was high. Especially in this time of pandemic with so many differing demands, the course leader, staff team and administration are to be congratulated.*

Guildhall Artist Masters (Performance)

- *The achievement of students clearly reflects strong academic standards within the institution, with the highest level of attainment being in line with that of emerging young professionals. There is a range of attainment in both performance and academic outputs, as one would expect; this is underpinned by a transparent framework for assessment, with criteria that are aligned to Level 7 expectations across the conservatoire sector.*

Guildhall Artist Masters (Composition)

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

Artist Diploma

- *Yes, indeed the academic standards of the Artist Diploma and the achievements of students on the course are comparable to the best here in the UK and abroad.*

Q 11: Is the School maintaining threshold standards set for its awards in accordance with the frameworks for HE education qualifications and the applicable QAA subject benchmark statements?

BA (Hons) Acting

- *The degree programme is firmly rooted in and supported by adherence to national benchmarks and standards.*

BA (Hons) Acting Studies

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

BA (Hons) Production Arts / Technical Theatre Arts

- *Yes it does, across the board. Students are required to regularly work in groups and have the skills needed for the realisation of practice-based work, drawing on their understanding of interdisciplinary elements and how to apply this knowledge. They also work independently, manage personal workloads and contribute to the creative journey that their work will take. Finally, they also demonstrate a high level of independent research and personal development, all fitting of this level of study.*

BA (Hons) Video Design for Live Performance

- *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 (Hons) Performance & Creative Enterprise

- *The degree, by its nature, struggles to fit neatly into the benchmarking process but I am confident that the graduate skills were met (and more) due to the individual and independent nature of Year 3.*

BMus (Hons) Music

- **EE1:** *The work presented to me gives strong evidence that the threshold standards for the BMus are being maintained in accordance with the framework for HE education qualifications and the music subject benchmarks.*
- **EE2:** *I reaffirm the observations made in last year's report, i.e. that the School has maintained its practical and academic standards in the current year and that these conform to the established frameworks for HE qualifications and benchmarks. I noted in 2018/19 that the Programme Learning Outcomes Cx.7, Cx.8 and Dx.3 (teamwork, IT skills and personal conduct) are the same at all three Levels; I understand that these are now being revised, especially in relation to IT skills, which have taken on new relevance and significance in light of the Covid pandemic's impact on working practices.*

PGCert Performance Teaching

- *I believe that programme standards are appropriate for PGCert/Level 7 study. No relevant QAA subject benchmark statements currently exist at this level, but programme standards accord with those outlined in the QAA Master's Degree Characteristic Statement (2020) and I agree with the previous EE that students successfully completing the PGCert would be well prepared should they wish to pursue their studies at full Masters degree level.*

MA Acting

- *The Masters programme is firmly rooted in and supported by adherence to national benchmarks and standards.*

MA Collaborative Theatre Production & Design

- *Yes.*

MA Opera Making & Writing

- *The School continues to maintain 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 Music Therapy

- *Yes, from the work I have seen so far in this my 1st year as external examiner, I believe that threshold standards are being well met as per HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPS) <https://www.hcpc-uk.org/standards/standards-of-proficiency/arts-therapists/> and HCPC Standards of Education and Training (SETS) <https://www.hcpc-uk.org/standards/standards-relevant-to-education-and-training/set/>*

Guildhall Artist Masters (Performance)

- *The GAM programmes are delivered and assessed in a way that ensures threshold standards are maintained in relation to Level 7 frameworks and benchmarks, as articulated by the QAA and the Association of European Conservatoires Learning Outcomes document.*

Guildhall Artist Masters (Composition)

- *The School continues to maintain 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

- *Yes*

Appendix C: Equality strands relating to assessment outcomes 2019/20 (reported to Academic Board in spring 2021)

As part of the School's statutory responsibilities, an analysis of awards conferred in 2020 by Ethnicity, Sex, Disability and Age has been undertaken for each undergraduate programme and compared against the figures for 2015 to 2020.

It is noted that the 2019/20 cohort completed their courses in unprecedented circumstances relating to Covid-19 and in some cases this necessitated changes to assessments, including format and weightings within modules. Assessment arrangements were carefully considered (including consultation with External Examiners) to ensure that the following principles were met: assessment was related to the learning outcomes specified in the associated programme/module specification; assessment was transparent in process; assessment was rigorous and designed to support high standards; assessment would be equitable in both design and operation.

It is noted that this analysis covers the first year with a graduating cohort of students on the BA in Acting Studies course.

Overall, there was not a significant change in the proportion of higher classifications in 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. For the second consecutive year, no undergraduate student was awarded a Third Class degree. In 2019/20, there is a slight increase in the proportion of students awarded a Lower Second, and a slight decrease in the proportion of students awarded an Ordinary Degree.

When looking at the data for UK domicile students only, there is a decrease in the proportion of First Class awards, from 39.2% in 2018/19 to 32.8% in 2019/20, and a slight increase in the proportion of Second Class awards, from 51.7% in 2018/19 to 56%.

Overall, in 2019/20 a greater proportion of postgraduate students were awarded a Distinction or Merit compared to 2018/19 (97.6% in 2019/20, 91.5% in 2018/19). Within the higher classifications, this rise is seen in the proportion of Distinctions, increasing from 49.6% to 56.9% in 2019/20.

It is noted that several postgraduate courses have seen 100% of students achieving a higher classification (Distinction or Merit). Within courses that have students who have been awarded the full range of classifications (Guildhall Artist Masters, PG Cert in Performance Teaching), the numbers awarded a Pass are still very small, and lower proportions compared to 2018/19. Only 4 postgraduate students out of 167 did not achieve a Distinction or Merit. This may pose a question of whether our approach to analysing attainment in relation to equality strands would be more insightful if focused on award marks rather than classification.

Further points are outlined below for each equality strand and the Academic Board is encouraged to review the accompanying spreadsheets for more details.

Undergraduate Assessment Outcomes 2019/20

Ethnicity

- In 2019/20, 75.4% of students identified as White, 22.2% as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse and 2.4% declined to provide this information.
- 90.6% of White students achieved a higher classification in 2019/20 compared with 85.4% of Black, Asian and ethnically diverse students. Although this had increased

by 3% for Black, Asian and ethnically diverse students compared to 2018/19, a gap exists between the categories and this is consistent with the data in all but one of the past five years.

- Looking at this data split by course, it is notable that the Artist Diploma, MA CTPD and MA Acting had zero UK domicile students who declared their ethnicity as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse, and the MA in Opera-Making & Writing and MA in Music Therapy had students of any domicile who declared their ethnicity as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse. This would suggest an admissions-related concern and means there is an absence of attainment data to analyse in relation to ethnicity.
- It is noted that (excluding Ordinary degrees) only 14 UG students didn't achieve a First or Upper Second, and 42% of those 14 identified as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse, yet overall Black, Asian and ethnically diverse students only make up about 22% of the undergraduate awards.

Gender

- In 2019/20 2 undergraduate students declared their gender as Other (1.1%). 103 students declared their gender as Female (56%) and 79 students declared their gender as Male (42.9%).
- When split by gender, the proportion of students achieving a First or Upper Second has not increased from 2018/19 in any gender category. This means that the trend of a greater proportion of Female students achieving a higher classification (first and upper second) compared to Male students was maintained in 2019/20 (though this gap of around 4% is narrower than in some previous years).
- It is also noted that when looking at this data just for students with UK domiciles, the proportion of Female students achieving a higher classification in 2019/20 is 87.7%, compared with 92.9% in 2018/19. 89.8% of Male students with a UK domicile achieved a higher classification. This suggests an even narrower gap between Female and Male students with a UK domicile, compared to the gap when students of all domiciles are included.
- Since students have been able to select 'Other' as a gender option, 100% of students in this category have achieved a First or 2.1.

Disability

- 40 undergraduate students awarded in 2019/20 declared a disability (21.7%). 97.5% of those students achieved a higher classification compared with 90.6% of non-disabled students.
- This is a larger discrepancy than is found in the postgraduate data, but it does not appear to be a trend. In the previous five years the gap has been much narrower, or reversed.

Age

- Please note from 2019, the analysis of age uses the students' age on commencement as opposed to age on completion, in line with the requirements of the OfS. This data is being built up since last year, so there are only two years' worth of data split in this way.
- 82.6% of students awarded in 2019/20 were in the 'young under 21' category, 16.3% were in the 'mature 21+' category and 1.1% were in the 'mature 21+' category.
- There is very little difference in the proportions of higher classifications achieved in each age category in comparison with 2018/19. The exception to this is in the 'mature 21+ category', which had two students in 2019/20 and there had been zero students in this category in 2018/19. One of the two students in this category achieved a higher classification.

- When looking at the data by course, there are some more notable differences, however, due to the small numbers of undergraduate students in the 'mature' categories, a slight change in numbers has a larger impact on the proportions compared with the 'younger' category.

Postgraduate assessment outcomes 2019/20

Ethnicity

- In 2019/20, 75.4% of students identified as White, 22.2% as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse and 2.4% declined to provide this information.
- 99.2% of White students achieved a Distinction or Merit compared with 91.8% of White students in 2018/19. 91.9% of Black, Asian and ethnically diverse student achieved a Distinction or Merit in 2019/20, compared with 90.9% of Black, Asian and ethnically diverse students in 2018/19. While both categories achieved a greater percentage of higher classifications compared to the previous year, the gap between White and Black, Asian and ethnically diverse students in 2019/20 was wider than in 2018/19, however this gap has jumped from between 6-9% to less than 1% every year since 2016.
- Looking at this data split by course, it is notable that the Artist Diploma, MA CTPD and MA Acting had zero UK domicile students who declared their ethnicity as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse, and the MA in Opera-Making & Writing and MA in Music Therapy had students of any domicile who declared their ethnicity as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse. This would suggest an admissions-related concern and means there is an absence of attainment data to analyse in relation to ethnicity.
- It is noted that of the four students who did not achieve a higher classification, three declared their ethnicity as Black, Asian and ethnically diverse.

Gender

- In 2019/20 no students declared their gender as Other, compared with one in 2018/19. 97 students declared their gender as Female (58.1%) and 70 students declared their gender as Male (41.9%).
- The proportion of Female students achieving a Distinction or Merit increased from 92.7% in 2018/19 to 97.9% in 2019/20. The proportion of Male students achieving a Distinction or Merit increased from 90.2% in 2018/19 to 97.1% in 2019/20. This means there was a slightly narrower gap between Female and Males categories in 2019/20. It is noted that of the four students who did not achieve a higher classification, two were Female and two were Male.

Disability

- 15 students awarded in 2019/20 declared a disability (9%). 100% of those students achieved a higher classification compared with 97.4% of non-disabled students.
- Though the discrepancy is not large (about a 3% higher proportion of disabled students achieving a D/M compared to non-disabled), it is consistent with the discrepancy that was raised last year between UK domicile disabled and non-disabled students, and for students with all domiciles not just for UK domiciles. It was noted last year that should this difference become a trend, it would be worth monitoring the support and mitigation mechanisms that are in place, to ensure that this isn't advantaging students who have disabilities rather than creating the level playing field that we aim for.

Age

- Please note from 2019, the analysis of age uses the students' age on commencement as opposed to age on completion, in line with the requirements of the OfS. This data is being built up since last year, so there are only two years' worth of data split in this way.
- 65.9% of students awarded in 2019/20 were in the 'mature 21+' category and 34.1% were in the 'mature 21+' category.
- In 2019/20, students in the 'mature 26+' category achieved a higher proportion of Distinctions and Merits than they did in 2018/19, increasing from 84.1% to 96.5%. There was a smaller increase in higher classifications in the 'mature 21 to 25+' category, from 95.5% to 98.2%, and the gap between the categories has therefore narrowed. It will be of interest to monitor if this is a trend, and consider whether factors particular to this year (such as online learning) have benefitted older students with the result of levelling out their attainment with that of younger students, though we must be mindful that with our cohort sizes sometimes percentage changes can be caused by a very small number of individuals.
- Notably, there was an increase in higher classifications achieved by Guildhall Artist Masters students in the 'mature 26+' category from 86.7% in 2018/19 to 95.5% in 2019/20.

Appendix D: Data relating to student regulatory activity during 2020/21

There was an increase in the number of cases in 2020/21 that fall under student regulatory activity which includes academic appeals, student disciplinaries, case consultations and progress reviews. There was a notable increase in academic appeals, disciplinary cases and complaints. The complexity of some of the casework has been extraordinary taking hours of staff time almost on a daily basis.

Acting still attracts the largest number of admission complaints but it has substantially more applications than all other programmes added together.

Three Completion of Procedures (COP) letters were issued in the 2020/21 cycle [one with a further CoP issued recently as a complaint completed Stage 3.

(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.

Total School cases 2020/21	6 (2 Music, 4 Acting)	1 upheld, one partially upheld, and 4 not upheld but a goodwill gesture of free audition made in one of these cases
Total School cases 2019/20	6 (1 Music, 5 Acting)	
Total School cases 2018/19	5	
Total School cases 2017/18	6	
Total School cases 2016/17	2	

(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).

	2020/21 cycle	2019/20	2018/19	2017/18
Music	4	2	6	6
Drama	0	0		0
Production Arts	0	0		0

(c) Academic appeals arising from 2020/21 assessment cycle (as at 08/11/2021) with yearly comparisons

Academic appeals are submitted, in the first instance, to the Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance) in Registry. The initial investigation is undertaken by the Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance) 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 error has occurred, immediate corrective action may be taken without recourse to either Panel. At the time of writing this report, the final deadline for the submission of academic appeals has passed and there are currently four academic appeals pending outcomes.

Programmes with Appeals	Assessment Cycle							
	17/18	Upheld	18/19	Upheld	19/20	Upheld	20/21	Upheld
BMus								
Against Class/Award							1	0
Against Fail Withdraw			1	0 [CoP issued]			1	0
Against module mark					2	1	2	Upheld 1; Partially upheld 1;
Against capped mark								
Against resit/resit mark	2	1	1	0				
Academic advice								
General exten circ.			1	0				
General conduct of assessment			1	0				
Production Arts (UG and PG)								
Against Class/Award	1	0			1		1	0
Postgraduate music								
Against Class/Award	1	0					2	2 In progress
Against Fail Withdraw								
Against non-progression							1	1
Against resit/resit mark			2	2 partly upheld				
Against module mark							2	0
	2	1	1	1				
Drama (including PACE)								
Against Class/Award					1		1	0
Against resit/resit mark			1	1				
Against class award (multiple parts)							1	1 in progress
TOTAL	6	2	8	4	4	1	12*	tbc

* in one case a completion of procedures letter issued.

(d) Disciplinary cases (Senior School)

Allegations of misconduct are referred to the Head of Registry Services (or Dean of Students). Where there is corroborative evidence 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. Corroborative evidence 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, as well as 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.

	Type of allegations	No of students involved	Level of procedure	Outcome
Covid-19	Failure to self-isolate upon return to the UK	1	Informal	Written Warning
	Breach of Covid secure rules (illegal ensembles)	3	Informal	Referred to HoD
	Breach of Covid secure rules	3	Informal	Verbal warning
	Failure to follow correct procedures	1	Informal	Written warning and £80 fine
	Illegal household gathering/party	Multiple	Police	Police action and fines
Library	Library (overdue notices and no action taken by the student)	1	Informal	Fines
Other	Physical assault	1	Ongoing	Outcome pending
	Harassment towards another student	1	Informal	Written warning
	Various minor - inappropriate communications, failure to follow reasonable instruction	3	Informal	Verbal warnings and apologies
	Student complaints against another students (one carried over from 2019/20)	4	Various	One instance: no breach One instance: some breaches upheld and final written warning issued Two instances: ongoing
	Misuse of alcohol during production	2	Informal	Written warning / letter issued outside of disciplinary
Total senior School cases 2020/21		20		
2019/20		12		
2018/19		19		

Additionally, in a number of other cases where students had complained about students, further information requested by Registry was not provided, or the complaining student decided not to proceed. Student complaints about other students seems to be on the increase with ambivalence about the formal reporting (ie the complaining student wants action but doesn't want to report formally and be named)

(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. In 2020/21 there were two progress reviews conducted.

Total Progress Review Cases 2020/21	2*
Cases 2019/20	0
cases 2018/19	5

* One case leading to an appeal submission, not upheld and Completion of procedures issue

(f) Principal's Emergency Powers

The Principal, or his/her delegate (usually the Dean of Students), may exclude a student to (i) protect the health and safety of an individual student and/or the School community or (ii) pending disciplinary investigation for serious misconduct.

During 2020/21 one student was temporarily removed from their studies. There was three temporary exclusions in 2019/20 and one temporary exclusion in 2018/19.

(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.

	Complaints	No complaints	Stage of concluding procedure	Outcome
Music*	Programme delivery complaint	1	Stage 1	Apology due to technical error
	Programme delivery complaint	1	Stage 1	Not upheld (January 2021)
	Programme delivery complaint	1	Stage 1	Not upheld but apology for delay issued
	Complaint about handling of complaint against another student	1	Stage 3	Not upheld, Completion of procedures issued
	Total cases 2020/21	4		
2019/20	8			
2018/19	19			
2017/18	16			
2016/17	12			
2015/16	23			

Appendix E: Equality strands relating to admissions 2020 entry (reported to Academic Board in spring 2021)

Equality Monitoring Report September 2020 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

Undergraduate

In **BA Acting** there was a 3.6% decrease in total applications across all age ranges compared to 2019. This is due to the 4% reduction in applications in the Under 21 and 21-24 age category. Applications in the 21-25 age bracket remained stable at 23.5% and despite issuing fewer offers, conversion to enrolled students increased 25%. Applications in the 25-39 bracket also remained stable at 6.5% and conversion rate in this bracket also saw a 10% increase. The first offer in the 40 and over group for 10 years was also converted to an enrolled student. Overall, the proportion of offers to enrolled students increased from 78% to 84%, reversing the general trend since 2015 of falling conversion rates.

Applications to **BMus** maintained the trend to attract over 600 applications. Despite a 1% drop in offers across the programme, a 4% increase in conversion resulted in a slight increase in recruitment numbers, continuing the general trend since 2015.

Applications for **BA Production Arts** fell 4%, which is the first drop in application numbers since 2015. The reduction of 9.5% in applications from the Under 21 age bracket was the main cause. There was a 30% increase of offers to those aged 21-24 which resulted in 100% more offers being made in this category.

Overall, applications for UG courses fell 3.25% in comparison to 2019. The fall in applications led to a 4.5% decrease in offers made, however, due to increased conversion rates across the programmes, this led to only 2 fewer students being enrolled in comparison to 2019.

It should be noted that due to the pandemic, the School permitted a number of deferred places to be taken up in September 2021. Had those students enrolled in Sept 2021, the overall enrolments would have increased from 2019.

Postgraduate

Applications to PG courses remains healthy and consistent when compared with the last three-years with an even spread of applicants across the 25 and over range. **Guildhall Artist Masters (Performance)** remained the most popular programme, attracting an increase of 6.5% of applications. Conversion of offers to students on GAM Performance remained at 51% as it has for the last 4 years.

Applications across all other PG programmes remained relatively stable with the only exception being in Research, which saw a 30% decrease. However, increased offer making and conversion resulted in a 45% increase of enrolled students.

MA Acting saw a 15% drop in applications compared to 2019. This was mainly due to the 24% drop in applications in the 21-24 age bracket. Combined with the decision to only offer

24 places instead of the usual 28 available across the two acting programmes, there were only 3 offers to the programme but all 3 were successfully converted into enrolled students.

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

Disability:

Following the trend of the last 3 years, nearly all programmes saw an increase in applicants declaring a disability. This has resulted in an increase of offers to those disclosing a disability compared to those without, with the exception of GAM Performance

BMus: 44% vs 37%

BA Acting: 1.3% vs 1% (this seems negligible but given how few offers we make is significant)

BA Production Arts: 42% vs 38.5%

GAM Perf: 35.5% vs 38%

Further analysis shows that the percentage of applicants declaring a disability are more likely to take up an offer compared to an applicant without. For example for courses with the highest total applications:

BMus: 78% vs 52%

BA Acting: 75% vs 86%

BA Production Arts: 88 vs 64%

GAM Perf: 69% vs 50%

NB: While figures for remaining courses are negligible and sample size small, the trend for increased conversion from offer to enrolled is mirrored across nearly all programmes.

Ethnicity:

In 2020, the School received 4460 applications across all Programmes and 78% were from White applicants. The remaining 22% of applicants were from Black, Asian and ethnically diverse backgrounds, and 21.5% of these applicants received offers in comparison to 14.5% White students. Offers to BA Acting students were split 50/50 between White applicants and other made no offers to those of mixed ethnicities for the first time for 3 years. In 2020, we saw a 50% drop in applications from those of Mixed background but a 200% increase in those from Other Ethnicity, it is not clear if this is due to a change in how students choose to identify or other reason. In BMus 72% of the applicants were white, 37% received an offer. The remaining 28% of applicants also received offers at the rate of 37%. In GAM 37% of White and 37% Black, Asian and Ethnically Diverse applicants received an offer. There is a disparity in that Black, Asian and Ethnically Diverse applicants made up nearly 30% of the total but this only translated into 20% of the student body indicating that some more conversion work needs to be done.

Gender:

Applications for BA & MA Acting continue to be split around 60/40 with Females making the most applications. Offers remain 50/50 split between the genders.

BA Production Arts dropped in female applications for the first time in 4 years while applications from males increased for the first time in 3 years. The split in enrolled students was 50/50, but conversion among male offer holders was 83% and 60% with females.

GAM Performance saw applications, offer and enrolments hold steady amongst females. Amongst males there was a 20% increase in applications but this did not translate into equivalent increases in offers or enrolments.

Applications across the School from applicants stating Other as their gender increased from 11% to 21%, a 100% increase.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Remuneration & Nominations Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama	Date(s): 02/11/2021
Subject: Remuneration Annual Report 2021	Public
Report of: Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama	For Decision
Report author: Head of HR, Barbican & Guildhall School of Music & Drama	

Summary

This paper sets out the Remuneration Annual Report for 2021 for the Guildhall School as required by the Office for Students.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the Remuneration Annual Report set out in Appendix 1.

Main Report

Background

1. The Office for Students (OfS) does not have legal powers to regulate the pay of senior staff in the higher education sector directly. However, they have a duty to take into account the value for money higher education providers offer for the public money they receive.
2. The OfS set conditions for the public money which higher education providers receive. In the case of staff pay, providers must:
 - share specific information with the OfS
 - publish specific information in their audited financial statements
 - take into account the code for senior staff remuneration published by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC). This CUC code requires the production of a Remuneration Annual Report. The code sets out a suggested format of the report and we have followed this in the production of the report for the Guildhall School in line with the report produced last year.

3. The Corporation already publishes a Pay Policy Statement (see Appendix 2) covering the remuneration of staff, including those at the Guildhall School, and the proposed Remuneration Annual Report will therefore refer to the overall Pay Policy Statement.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Remuneration Annual Report
- Appendix 2 – Corporation Pay Policy Statement
- Appendix 3 – HE Remuneration Code

Contact:

Steve Eddy

Head of HR (Guildhall School of Music & Drama and Barbican)

0207 382 6148

steve.eddy@barbican.org.uk

Appendix 1

Guildhall School of Music & Drama

Annual report on Senior Staff Remuneration for year ended 31/07/2021

1. Introduction

The Guildhall School of Music & Drama's Remuneration & Nominations Committee provides advice to the Board of Governors. It is recognised that all matters relating to the employment and remuneration of staff fall within the purview of the City of London's Establishment Committee – further details of this committee are available here <https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=253>.

Terms of reference for the Remuneration & Nominations Committee of the Guildhall School are available here

<https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=1273>

2. Remuneration & Nominations Committee Membership

Membership of the Committee is as follows:

- Chair of the Committee: a co-opted governor who is not the Chair of the Board

Other members:

- The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- The Deputy Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- At least two non-Common Council Governors
- At least one other Common Council Governor
- An elected staff member of the Board
- May include up to two other co-opted members (who are not necessarily members of the governing body)

Members appointed at the Board Meeting on 17th May 2021

- Vacancy (Chairman) - *Neil Greenwood has indicated a willingness to fill this vacancy following the resignation of the past Chairman. The Chairman is appointed by the Membership of the Committee*
- Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
- Randall Anderson
- Jeremy Mayhew
- David Bradshaw
- Simon Duckworth
- Vivienne Littlechild
- Andy Taylor

Members in the year 2020/21

- Shreela Ghosh (Chairman) – *resigned November 2020*
- Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
- Randall Anderson
- John Chapman
- Jeremy Mayhew
- Deputy David Bradshaw
- Vivienne Littlechild
- Andy Taylor

Members in the year 2019/20:

- Shreela Gosh (Chairman)
- Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
- Vivienne Littlechild
- Randall Anderson
- John Chapman
- Marianne Fredericks
- Andy Taylor

3. Remuneration & Nominations Committee Meetings

The Committee met during the year on 02/09/2020, 02/11/2020 and 21/04/21. Details of the meetings are available here:

<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=163>

4. Definition of senior post holders

The Guildhall School defines senior postholders as the following:

- Principal
- Vice Principal & Director of Music
- Vice Principal & Director of Drama
- Vice Principal & Director of Production Arts
- Vice principal & Director of Innovation & Engagement
- Vice Principal & Director of Advancement

5. Approach to remuneration for all staff

The Guildhall School is part of the City of London Corporation and the approach to remuneration of all staff is outlined in the Pay Policy Statement which is available here <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/pay-policy-statement-2019-20.pdf>

6. Approach to remuneration for senior staff

The approach to senior staff remuneration at the Guildhall School follows the City of London Corporation's wide pay system as detailed in the Pay Policy Statement.

Being a small specialist institution and based in the City of London, there are some posts which are difficult to recruit. Accordingly, there is often the need to use market forces supplements to attract, recruit and retain highly sought after skills. Any request for a market supplement must be supported by independent market data and is considered by a panel of senior officers and the Establishment Committee of the City of London where appropriate. The Establishment Committee is responsible for personnel and establishment matters throughout the City of London, including negotiations with the recognised trade unions and is not within the Guildhall School's governance structure. The data that supports remuneration recommendations is drawn from a variety of sources including:

- Higher Education Statistics Agency data
- Times Higher Education salary data
- Reports and reviews from external experts commissioned by Human Resources
- Internal analysis of salary distributions, performance and contribution to the strategy of the Guildhall School

7. Pay multiple of the Principal

The Principals basic salary is 4.42 times the median pay of staff (2019/20: 4.3 times), where the median pay is calculated on a full-time equivalent basis for the salaries paid to Guildhall School staff.

The Principals total remuneration is 4.3 times the median total remuneration of staff (2019/20: 4.25 times), where the median total remuneration is calculated on a full-time equivalent basis for the median total remuneration paid to Guildhall School staff.

8. Total Remuneration for the Principal

The total remuneration for the Principal, with year on year comparison is set out below.

Emoluments of the Principal	Eight Months ended 31/03/2021	Year ended 31/07/2020
	£000	£000
Salaries	128	183
Social Security costs	14	24
Other Pension contributions	27	39
Total	172	246

9. External appointments and expenses

The policy on income from external appointments is set out in the City of London Corporation's Code of Conduct for employees. Any work undertaken on behalf of the Guildhall School or City Corporation or which contributes to the work of the Guildhall School or City Corporation or is requested/delivered on the basis of being an employee of the City Corporation and which attracts a fee/ is paid e.g. a presentation or lecture, will need approval by the Principal and the fees will need to be paid to the City Corporation. In the case of the Principal, approval from the City Corporation's Town Clerk is required.

All expenses are paid in accordance with the City of London Corporation's Expenses Policy

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION

PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019/20

Introduction

1. Section 38(i) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) has required local authorities since the financial year 2012/13 to produce a Pay Policy Statement for each financial year. The Act requires local authorities to set out in their Statements their policies on a range of issues, particularly those relating to remuneration for their most senior and lowest-paid staff. This must include significant information on pay and reward for Chief officers (as defined in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). The Statement must be reviewed annually and agreed by “*a resolution of the authority*”, in the City of London Corporation’s case by the Court of Common Council. This document meets the requirements of the Act for the City of London Corporation for the financial year 2019/20.
2. The provisions of the Act require that authorities are more open about their local policies and how local decisions are made. The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency enshrines the principles of transparency and asks authorities to follow three principles when publishing data they hold: responding to public demand; releasing data in open formats available for re-use; and releasing data in a timely way. This includes data on senior salaries and the structure of the workforce.
3. The Act applies to the City of London Corporation only in its capacity as a local authority. It should be noted that not all of the pay and employment costs incurred by the City of London Corporation are carried out in this capacity, or even funded from public resources. As well as having statutory local authority functions, the Corporation undertakes other public functions, such as those of a police authority and of a port health authority. It also has private and charitable functions which receive funding through income from endowment and trust funds, and the pay and employment costs of these functions are met from these funds.
4. In general, and in keeping with the spirit of openness, this Statement does not try to distinguish between information which applies to the City Corporation as a local authority and that which applies to it in any of its other capacities. However, insofar as the Act specifically excludes police authorities from its remit, this Statement does not include information about Police Officers. Likewise, paragraph 7 of the Government Guidance for authorities on “*Openness and accountability in local pay*” (which has statutory effect under s40 of the Act for authorities in the preparation of their Pay Policy Statements) advises that “*The provisions in the Act do not apply to the staff of local authority schools and therefore teaching staff need not be brought within the scope of a pay policy statement*”. The City of London Corporation does not directly manage any local authority schools, but it does directly run three independent schools, and while some information about the remuneration of the teaching staff in these schools is provided in the Statement, in general the Statement follows the Government Guidance and leaves teaching staff outside of its scope.

5. The Act does not require authorities to publish specific numerical data on pay and reward in their pay policy document. However, information in this Statement should fit with any data on pay and reward which is published separately. The City Corporation operates consistent pay policies which are applied across all of our functions. Further details of the current Grade structures and associated pay scales can be seen below.

Salary Scales effective from 1 October 2018:

Grade	Min Salary (£)	Max Salary (£)	No. of employees
Grade A	£15,200	£16,150	184
Grade B	£17,090	£19,840	620
Grade C	£22,310	£25,890	832
Grade D	£28,140	£32,640	691
Grade E	£32,640	£37,810	546
Grade F	£41,320	£47,920	399
Grade G	£49,340	£57,240	177
Grade H	£57,240	£66,320	84
Grade I	£66,320	£76,870	25
Grade J	£79,190	£91,810	19
Senior Management Grade (SMG)	£80,770	£248,300	15
<p>The figures given are for Base pay only. Employee numbers are those at the time of the January 2019 pay roll. Any employee on Grades A-J who manages or supervises another employee on the same Grade has a separate pay scale paying up to 6.1% greater than the salary on the substantive Grade. Any employee on Grades A-J who is in a residential post has a separate pay scale paying 12.5% less than the salary on the substantive Grade. The figures for employees in each Grade in the table above include those on the relevant supervisory and residential scales. All employees on Grades A-J and in the SMG also receive a London Weighting allowance. The allowance does not differ between Grades of staff.</p>			
Teacher Grades	£29,200	£59,650	
Senior Teacher Grades	£69,650	£146,030	
<p>Figures for Teacher Grades exclude any additional responsibility allowances payable. Figures for Senior Teacher Grades include all payments.</p>			

This information is reviewed, updated and published on a regular basis in accordance with the guidance on data transparency and by the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. It should be noted that all Police Officer pay scales are

nationally determined and as such do not form part of the City Corporation's Pay Policy.

6. A two-year Pay Award covering 2018-20 for staff in Grades A-J and the SMG was negotiated with the recognised Trade Unions and staff representatives for these employees in 2018, and agreed by the Court of Common Council in July 2018. The Pay Award provided for a 2.45% increase on all salaries in Grades A-C and a 2% increase on all Graded salaries in Grades D and above, including the SMG, and a 5% increase on London Weighting allowance rates for all staff. These increases would be applied in each of the two years of the agreement, from 1 July 2018 in the first year and from 1 July 2019 in the second. The Pay Award also provided for restructures of Grade A (the City of London Corporation's lowest pay Grade) from 1 October in each of the years covered by the Award. The bottom point of the scale will be removed in each year and the top point of the scale will move up one point. The Base pay scales for employees in Grades A-J and the SMG that will apply from 1 July 2019 are as given below:

Grade	Min Salary (£)	Max Salary (£)
Grade A (from 1 July 2019)	£15,570	£16,550
Grade A (from 1 Oct 2019)	£16,040	£17,020
Grade B	£17,510	£20,330
Grade C	£22,860	£26,520
Grade D	£28,700	£33,290
Grade E	£33,290	£38,570
Grade F	£42,150	£48,880
Grade G	£50,330	£58,380
Grade H	£58,380	£67,650
Grade I	£67,650	£78,410
Grade J	£80,770	£93,650
Senior Management Grade (SMG)	£82,390	£253,270
The figures given are again for Base pay only. Employees on Grades A-J who manage or supervise another employee on the same Grade will continue to have a separate pay scale paying up to 6.1% greater than the salary on the substantive Grade, and employees on Grades A-J in residential posts will continue to have a separate pay scale paying 12.5% less than the salary on the substantive Grade. All employees in Grades A-J and in the SMG will continue to receive a separate London Weighting allowance, not differing between Grades of staff.		

The two-year Pay Award does not cover Teachers and their pay scales will be subject to the usual negotiations with their recognised Trade Union and staff representatives next year.

7. The Act's provisions do not supersede the City Corporation's autonomy to make decisions on pay which are appropriate to local circumstances and deliver value for money for local taxpayers. We seek to be a fair employer and an employer of choice - recognising and rewarding the contributions of staff in an appropriate way. We set

pay fairly within published scales and, in doing so, have regard to changing conditions in differing occupational and geographic labour markets.

Background

8. All pay and terms and conditions of service are locally negotiated with our recognised trade unions or staff representatives. In 2006/07 extensive work was undertaken on a review of our pay and grading structures. As a result, the principles set out in the guidance to the Act have already generally been addressed although the Act set out some additional requirements which are covered by this statement.
9. In 2007 we implemented a number of core principles, via collective agreement, to form the City Corporation's pay strategy. This moved the pay and reward strategy from one based entirely on time-served increments to one which focusses on a balance between incremental progression, individual performance and contribution to the success of the organisation. The Grades A-J and the Senior Management Grade retain incremental progression, but this is always determined by performance measured through appraisal over the year 1 April - 31 March the following year. The Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade also have access to "Contribution Payments" for employees at the top of the Grades. Achievement of these is also determined by appraisal over the same time period. All increments and Contribution Payments earned by appraisal are implemented on 1 October following the ending of the appraisal year. A fundamental element of the strategy is that achievement of payments related to performance is more onerous and exacting the more senior the member of staff.
10. All non-teaching staff employed by the City Corporation below the Senior Management Grade are allocated to one of the 10 Grades (Grades A-J), other than in a very small number of exceptional cases, such as Apprentices. All such posts were reviewed under Job Evaluation, ranked in order and allocated to a Grade following the 2077 Review. The evaluation scheme was independently equalities-impact assessed to ensure that it was inherently fair and unbiased. New posts and any existing posts that change their levels of responsibility etc. continue to be evaluated and ranked under the scheme. The scheme, how it is applied, the scoring mechanism and how scores relate to Grades are published on our Intranet, so staff can be assured that the process is fair and transparent. In addition, there is an appeal mechanism agreed with the recognised trade unions and staff representatives.
11. In addition to basic salary, all Graded staff are paid a London Weighting allowance which varies depending on where they are based and whether they are supplied by the employer with residential accommodation. This is to assist staff with the higher cost of living and working in London. Current levels of London Weighting for non-residential staff are £6,090 for those based in inner London and £3,650 for those based in outer London.
12. As most of the work of the organisation is undertaken in the City of London, there are some types of posts which are difficult to recruit to (e.g. lawyers, IT staff etc.). Accordingly, there is often the need to use market supplements to attract, recruit and

retain highly sought-after skills. These, where used, can be applied to employees in Grades A-J. Any requests for a market supplement must be supported by independent market data and is considered by a panel of senior officers and, where appropriate depending on the amount proposed to be paid and the Grade of the post, by the Establishment Committee. All market supplement payments are kept under regular review, and regular reports on payments made are produced for the Establishment Committee.

13. The London Living Wage (LLW) is applied as a minimum rate for all directly employed staff, including Apprentices since April 2017. Casual staff and agency workers have also been paid the London Living Wage since 2014. Until 2018, LLW increases have been applied from 1 April each year in line with the most recently announced LLW increase. However, in October 2018, the City Corporation's Policy & Resources Committee agreed that LLW increases should be applied in this and future years to affected employees and other staff from the date of the increase's announcement, which in 2018 was on 5 November.
14. The Establishment Committee has specific authority to deal with or make recommendations to the Court of Common Council where appropriate on all matters relating to the employment of City of London Corporation employees where such matters are not specifically delegated to another Committee. These matters include the remuneration of senior officers. The Establishment Committee has delegated this to the Senior Remuneration Committee.

Employees below the Senior Management Grade

15. The lowest Graded employees are in Grade A as determined by the outcomes of the Job Evaluation process. In 2016, the bottom two incremental points of this Grade were removed and an additional point was added to the top of it, and the two-year Pay Award for 2018-20 further restructures Grade A to give it additional points at the top while removing points from the bottom. The current lowest point on Grade A is now £21,290, including a London Weighting allowance for working in Inner London. The current pay range for Grades A - J is £21,290 to £97,900 inclusive of Inner London Weighting of £6,090 for non-residential employees.
 - Grades A-C are the lowest Grades in the City of London Corporation. Grade A has 4 increments and Grades B and C have 6 increments, and progression through each Grade can be achieved by annual incremental progression subject to satisfactory performance. There is no Contribution Pay assessment. However, employees at the top of these Grades have the opportunity if they have undertaken exceptional work to be considered for a Recognition Award up to a maximum level set corporately each year (this has been £500 in each year since 2010).
 - Grades D-J have 4 'core' increments and 2 'contribution' increments. Progression through the 4 'core' increments is subject to satisfactory performance. Progression into and through the 2 'contribution' increments requires performance to be at a higher than satisfactory level. Once at the top of the scale, for those

who achieve the highest standards of performance and contribution, it is possible to earn a one-off non-consolidated Contribution Payment of up to 3% or 6% of basic pay depending on the assessed level of contribution over the previous year.

16. For the appraisal year ending March 2018 (i.e. for payments awarded on 1 October 2018), 62% of eligible employees were allowed to move into the two higher contribution increments and 62% of eligible staff received a one-off non-consolidated contribution payment.

Senior Management Grade

17. The Senior Management Grade comprises the most senior roles in the organisation, as determined by Job Evaluation. Posts on the Senior Management Grade (SMG) are those which are the professional lead for a significant area of City Corporation business, with the nature of the professional responsibility held being that the postholders are not only directing the function for which they are responsible towards meeting corporate strategic goals but are required to determine from their professional point of view how these corporate goals should be constructed. As the SMG posts are distinct roles, they are individually evaluated and assessed independently against the external market allowing each post to be allocated an individual salary range within the Grade, which incorporates market factors as well as corporate importance. Any increase in salary (whether through incremental progression or a cost-of-living award) is entirely dependent on each individual being subject to a rigorous process of assessment and evaluation, based on the contribution of the individual to the success of the organisation. SMG posts are not necessarily the best-paid in the organisation, as other posts in Grades I and J may be better paid than some SMG posts, depending on the separate market supplements applied to the Graded posts.

18. The Senior Management Grade incorporates the following posts:

- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Chamberlain
- Comptroller & City Solicitor
- Remembrancer
- City Surveyor
- Director of the Built Environment
- Managing Director of the Barbican Centre
- Principal of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Director of Community & Children's Services
- Director of the Economic Development Office
- Executive Director of Mansion House and the Central Criminal Court
- Director of HR
- Director of Markets & Consumer Protection
- Director of Open Spaces
- Chief Grants Officer & Director of the City Bridge Trust

19. The Head Teachers of the City of London School, City of London School for

Girls and City of London Freeman’s School are not part of the Senior Management Grade for the purposes of pay (their pay is governed by a separate senior teaching pay scale, as outlined in paragraph 5). The pay of the post of Remembrancer is aligned to Senior Civil Service pay scales.

20. Following the principles outlined above, the pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade were set with reference to both job evaluation and an independent external market assessment. The principles of this were agreed by the Court of Common Council in 2007 and, subsequently, the specific unique range for each senior management post was agreed by the Establishment Committee in October 2007, subject to alteration thereafter when the duties or responsibilities of posts or other external factors relevant to their pay and reward change. Current Senior Management salary scales are from £80,770 to £248,300, excluding London Weighting.
21. Each Senior Management Grade post is allocated a range around a datum point. There is a maximum and minimum (datum plus 9% and datum minus 6% respectively) above and below which no individual salary can fall. Where a pay increase for a member of staff would take them above the maximum in a given year, the excess amount above the maximum may be paid as a non-consolidated payment in that year. This does not form part of basic salary for the following year and will, therefore, have to be earned again by superior performance for it to be paid.
22. Each year the datum point advances by a percentage equivalent to any ‘cost of living’ pay award. Individual salaries would move according to the table below:

Contribution Level	Salary Change
A Outstanding	Datum % change + up to 6%
B Very Good	Datum % change + up to 4%
C Good	Datum % change
D Improvement Required	0.0%

23. The average payment based on contribution alone has been 3.06% for the appraisal year ending in March 2018. The payments have been largely non-consolidated i.e. they have to be re-earned each year based on superior performance.
24. The Town Clerk & Chief Executive determines all salary matters for SMG posts (other than in relation to himself) within the existing individual Grades and reward policies, in consultation with elected members and the Senior Remuneration Committee. The Director of HR coordinates any such matters in relation to the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, in consultation with elected members and the Senior Remuneration Committee.

25. Set out below are the broad pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade, with the numbers in each band, excluding London Weighting. Each member of staff will have an individual salary scale within these broad ranges.

£80,770 - £115,130	(4)
£111,800 - £150,220	(6)
£154,710 - £195,000	(4)
£214,170 - £248,300	(1)

Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers

26. The Act specifies that information should be given in Pay Policy Statements about the determination of remuneration for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers as defined under the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, including approaches to the award of other elements of remuneration including bonuses and performance-related pay as well as severance payments. This should include any policy to award additional fees paid to Chief Officers or Deputy Chief Officers for their local election duties. The 1989 Act applies to the City Corporation only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority, but as with other parts of this Statement, details are given for all employees who would satisfy the basic definitions of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers given in the 1989 Act, other than schoolteachers and those who work in general for the City Corporation in its capacity as a police authority.

27. According to the definitions given in the 1989 Act (but widened in their interpretation as described in the paragraph above), as of 25 February 2019, the City Corporation had 31 Chief Officer posts and 118 Deputy Chief Officer posts. The 31 Chief Officer posts comprised the 15 posts within the Senior Management Grade plus the following numbers of posts within the A-J Grades:

- Grade J 12
- Grade I 3
- Grade H 1.

The 118 Deputy Chief Officer posts were made up of posts at the following Grades:

- Grade J 8
- Grade I 20
- Grade H 54
- Grade G 18
- Grade F 15

plus three posts paid at spot salaries owing to the nature of their employment and/or funding.

28. The distinctions between SMG pay and payments made to employees on other Grades are outlined in the relevant sections of this Statement above. The most significant element of pay able to be received by employees in Grades A-J that is not

available to SMG posts is market supplements. 12 Chief Officers in Grades H-J receive these payments as do 40 Deputy Chief Officers in Grades G-J. 4 of the Deputy Chief Officers in Grade F receive additional payments for working contractual hours in addition to the standard 35 per week on most City Corporation contracts. One Grade G Deputy Chief Officer receives additional payments for taking part in a Standby rota to provide a 24-hour on-call service. One Deputy Chief Officer on Grade F receives occasional additional payments for participating in electoral activities.

29. In cash terms, the payments per annum made to Chief Officers (including those in the SMG) and Deputy Chief Officers fall into the following broad pay bands:

<u>£ per annum</u>	<u>Chief Officers</u>	<u>Deputy Chief Officers</u>
40,000 – 50,000	-	12
51,000 – 60,000	-	18
61,000 – 70,000	-	39
71,000 – 80,000	4	20
81,000 – 90,000	-	11
91,000 – 100,000	3	5
101,000 – 115,130	11	9
111,800 – 150,220	8	3
154,710 – 195,000	4	1
214,170 – 248,300	1	-
Total employees	31	118

All payments outlined in the table above exclude London Weighting payments.

30. The schemes for incremental pay increases and Contribution Payments for employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade are set out in the relevant sections of this Statement above. These apply to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers, depending on whether they are in one of the D-J Grades or the SMG. No Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer has an element of their basic pay “at risk” to be earned back each year. Progression through Grades is, however, subject to successful performance assessed through the application of the performance-appraisal scheme. Contribution Payments for any Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer are only available to those at the top of their Grades. These must also be earned through performance appraisal, and all such payments are non-consolidated, meaning that any recurrence of the payment has again to be earned through performance in future years.

31. The Act requires authorities to set out their policies on remuneration for their highest-paid staff alongside their policies towards their lowest-paid staff, and to explain what they think the relationship should be between the remuneration of their highest-paid staff and other staff. The City Corporation's pay multiple - the ratio between the highest paid and lowest paid staff - is approximately 1:12. The ratio between the pay of the highest paid member of staff and the median earnings figure for all staff in the authority is 1:7.

Transparency

32. The Government guidance to the Act (which has statutory effect) requires the pay policy statement to make reference to policies in relation to staff leaving the authority, senior staff moving posts within the public sector, senior staff recruitment, and re-employment of senior postholders who have left the authority, particularly in relation to arrangements which might be made in such an event that would appear to have the intention of minimising tax payments made by the re-engaged former employee.

Recruitment

33. New staff, including those in the Senior Management Grade, are normally appointed to the bottom of the particular pay scale applicable for the post. If the existing salary falls within the pay scale for the post, the new employee is normally appointed to the lowest point on the scale which is higher than their existing salary provided this gives them a pay increase commensurate with the additional higher-level duties. In cases where the existing salary is higher than all points on the pay scale for the new role, the member of staff is normally appointed to the top of the pay scale for the role.

For posts where the salary is £100,000 or more, the following approvals will be required:

- (i) in respect of all new posts, the Court of Common Council;
- (ii) in respect of all existing posts, the establishment Committee.

Payments on Ceasing Office

34. Staff who leave the City Corporation, including the Town Clerk & Chief Executive and staff on the Senior Management Grade, are not entitled to receive any payments from the authority, except in the case of redundancy or retirement as indicated below.

Retirement

35. Staff who contribute to the Local Government Pension Scheme who retire from age 55 onwards may elect to receive immediate payment of their pension benefits on a reduced basis in accordance with the Scheme. Unreduced benefits are payable if retirement is from Normal Pension Age, with normal pension age linked to the State Pension Age from 1 April 2014, unless protections in the Pension Scheme allow for an earlier date. Early retirement, with immediate payment of pension benefits, is also possible under the Pension Scheme following redundancy or business efficiency grounds from age 55 onwards and on grounds of permanent ill-health at any age.

36. Whilst the Local Government Pension Scheme allows applications for flexible retirement from staff aged 55 or over, where staff reduce their hours or Grade, it is the City Corporation's policy to agree to these only where there are clear financial or operational advantages to the organisation. Benefits are payable in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the City does not make use of the discretion allowed by the LGPS Regulations to waive any actuarial reduction in pensions awarded under the flexible-retirement provisions.

Redundancy

37. Staff who are made redundant are entitled to receive statutory redundancy pay as set out in legislation calculated on a week's pay (currently a maximum of £508 per week). The City Corporation currently bases the calculation on 1.5 x actual salary. This scheme may be amended from time to time subject to Member approval, and has most recently been so amended for staff made redundant on or after 25 October 2017. The authority's policy on discretionary compensation for relevant staff under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 is published on our website.

Settlement of potential claims

38. Where a member of staff leaves the City Corporation's service in circumstances which would, or would be likely to, give rise to an action seeking redress through the courts from the organisation about the nature of the member of staff's departure from our employment, such claims may be settled by way of a settlement agreement where it is in the City Corporation's interests to do so based on advice from the Comptroller & City Solicitor. The amount to be paid in any such instance may include an amount of compensation, which is appropriate in all the circumstances of the individual case. Should such a matter involve the departure of a member of staff in the Senior Management Grade or the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, any such compensation payment will only be made following consultation with the Chairmen of Policy & Resources and Establishment Committees and legal advice that it would be legal, proper and reasonable to pay it.

Payment in lieu of notice

39. In exceptional circumstances, where it suits service needs, payments in lieu of notice are made to staff on the termination of their contracts.

Re-employment

40. Applications for employment from staff who have retired or been made redundant from the City Corporation or another authority will be considered in accordance with our normal recruitment policy. The City Corporation does not engage former staff on contracts that enable tax payments to be minimised.

Publication of information relating to remuneration

41. The City Corporation will seek to publish details of positions with remuneration of £50,000 or above in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency Code issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

42. This Pay Policy Statement will be published on our public website. It may be amended at any time during 2019/20 by resolution of the Court of Common Council. Any amendments will also be published on our public website.
43. This statement meets the requirements of the: Localism Act 2011; the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance on “Openness and accountability in local pay: Guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act” (including any supplementary Guidance issued); “The Local Government Transparency Code 2015”; and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.
44. From 2018, the City of London Corporation is required under the Equality Act 2010 to publish information every year showing the pay gap between male and female employees. The organisation’s first such report was published in March 2018.

February 2019

The Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code

June 2018

Introduction

1. Fair and appropriate remuneration is key to the success and development of the UK's HE sector, operating as it does in an intensively competitive global environment¹. To support members of governing bodies, this Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code (the Remuneration Code) has been developed after wide consultation with CUC members and HE stakeholders. This Code will be reviewed every four years, in consultation with the sector.
2. The different regulatory frameworks of the HE sector within the UK mean that governing bodies will need to decide how best to use the Remuneration Code. Institutions are bound by the relevant accounts direction issued by their regulator. In addition, Welsh institutions have agreed to more extensive senior pay reporting and are working towards developing annual pay policy statements. In Scotland, institutions will use the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance², which indicates how institutions should meet the key principles of good practice in remuneration. They may choose to use the Remuneration Code as an additional source of accepted good practice. In England, in assessing compliance with conditions of registration, the Office for Students (OfS) may consider the provider's information about the pay of senior staff within its audited financial statements and whether the governing body publishes its written commitment to comply with this Code.
3. By visibly adopting the Remuneration Code, governing bodies demonstrate leadership and stewardship in relation to remuneration within their institutions, and in doing so help to protect institutional reputation and provide greater assurances to key stakeholders and partners, including the student community and wider society.
4. The use of this Code is voluntary, and it can be used by all HE providers. Some elements may not be appropriate for all providers, for example, those with an owner-manager who may take a dividend from the business. The Remuneration Code is therefore to be used on an 'apply or explain' basis. This means that institutions should either publicly state that they have abided by the minimum requirements of this Code, or should provide meaningful explanations for non-compliance and how their alternative arrangements meet its principles.
5. Throughout this Code the word 'must' identifies the CUC's view of the minimum requirements for an institution wishing to comply with it. Governing bodies are free to meet 'must' statements by the means and mechanisms appropriate to their own context. The Remuneration Code is supported by a set of explanatory notes which are designed to assist governing bodies in developing their own responses. The use of the word 'should' identifies good practice which institutions are encouraged to adopt.
6. The principles outlined in this Code apply to all remuneration decisions affecting the emoluments of the Vice-Chancellor and other senior post holders as prescribed in constitutional documents or by the governing body as being within the remit of the Remuneration Committee. In England, they also apply to senior staff as defined in the OfS accounts direction.

¹ The context the sector operates within is explored in greater detail at www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/HE-Remuneration-Code-Context.pdf.

² www.scottishuniversitygovernance.ac.uk

The Remuneration Code

Elements of fair and appropriate remuneration

Fair and appropriate remuneration³ requires three key elements – namely that there is:

- I. a fair, appropriate and justifiable level of remuneration;
- II. procedural fairness; and
- III. transparency and accountability.

Each of these elements are underpinned by several supporting principles.

Element I - A fair, appropriate and justifiable level of remuneration

Remuneration starts with a clear understanding of the responsibilities, context and expected contribution of a role and the attributes required to undertake that role effectively. Fair and appropriate remuneration then recognises an individual's contribution to their institution's success in that role, and is sufficient to recruit, retain and motivate staff of appropriate calibre in the context of the market for that role, balanced with the need to demonstrate the achievement of value for money in the use of resources.

Principles

- a) Remuneration should take account of the context in which the institution operates.
- b) Remuneration must be linked to the value, based on a number of components, delivered by an individual acting within a role.
- c) Remuneration must consider matters of equality, diversity and inclusion with a view to ensuring that there are no biases pertaining to gender or other protected characteristics within the pay structure.
- d) Institutions should be clear about what they expect from staff, i.e. what is 'normal' and what is 'exceptional'. There should be a robust and consistent process for setting objectives and assessing an individual's contribution.
- e) Remuneration can vary according to individual performance.⁴
- f) Awards made in respect of annual bonus arrangements linked to the achievement of specific annual objectives should not be consolidated.
- g) From time to time the value of a role may need to be reviewed in light of changing conditions, sustained performance, experience etc.
- h) Non-achievement of an individual's expected contribution should have consequences.
- i) Any severance payments must be reasonable and justifiable.
- j) There should be a clear and justifiable rationale for the retention of any income generated by an individual from external bodies in a personal capacity.

³ Remuneration includes not only basic salary but also bonuses, expenses and other allowances, and the monetary value of benefits in kind including housing and cars, etc.

⁴ The decision to apply performance-related pay is for individual HEIs to make. Nothing in this Code is intended to imply that performance-related pay is a requirement for fair and appropriate remuneration.

The Remuneration Code

Element II – Procedural fairness

Procedural fairness requires remuneration to be set through a process that is based on competent people applying a consistent framework with independent decision making using appropriate evidence and assessing the value of roles, the context and individuals' performance in them.

Principles

- a) Senior post holder remuneration should be determined in the context of each institution's approach to rewarding all of its staff, and in particular, consideration should be given annually to the rate of increase of the average remuneration of all other staff.
- b) No individual can be involved in deciding his or her own remuneration.
- c) Remuneration Committees must be independent and competent.
- d) The head of the institution (HoI) must not be a member of the Remuneration Committee.
- e) Remuneration Committees, when considering HoI remuneration, must be chaired by a lay governor who is not Chair of the governing body.

Element III - Transparency and accountability

The process for setting remuneration must be transparent. For senior post holders there must be an institutional-level justification for remuneration that relates to the competitive environment, the value of the roles and institutional performance. The remuneration of the HoI must be separately justified, published and related to the remuneration of all staff within the organisation.

Principles

Each institution must publish a readily accessible annual statement, based on an annual report to its governing body, containing:

- a) a list of post holders within the remit of Remuneration Committee;
- b) its policy on the remuneration for post holders within the remit of Remuneration Committee;
- c) its choice of comparator institutions/organisations;
- d) its policy on income derived from external activities;
- e) the pay multiple of the HoI and the median earnings of the institution's whole workforce, illustrating how that multiple has changed over time and, if it is significantly above average, an explanation of why; and
- f) an explanation of any significant changes.

Explanatory notes

1. Institutions will be able to apply the above principles in a way that is appropriate to their circumstances. These notes do not expand the Remuneration Code, but are intended to assist institutions' discussions as to their use of it.
2. Remuneration must be linked to the value delivered by an individual acting within a role. The value of a role is based on a number of components and criteria for assessing the value of roles, which could include:
 - complexity (scale and range of decision making, collaboration and contact, time-critical activity);
 - impact (on students, research, finances and people, including employees, partners and citizens);
 - discretion (level of accountability, degree of autonomy and decision-making authority);
 - levels of experience;
 - knowledge and skills (including specialist skills) required;
 - reputation and academic/professional credibility needed for the role;
 - an ability to recruit and retain key staff; and
 - external comparisons.
3. To retain staff, Remuneration Committees need to consider market position – typically by looking at a set of comparator institutions/organisations. The choice of these comparators will usually be linked to institutional strategy. Comparator selection may depend on the type of post being filled – for example private and public sector comparisons are often used for professional services staff, whereas NHS and international HEI comparisons may be more appropriate for certain academic staff.
4. Institutions also need to reflect on what the consequences will be in instances where individuals do not deliver the expected contribution. Consequences for individuals will depend on the nature of the remuneration package offered, but might mean no uplift of basic pay, no participation in bonus payments⁵, or some form of performance management.
5. For institutions that use metric-driven performance assessments, a balance should be achieved between the achievement of institutions' long and short-term objectives and, for those that use them, the impact of team-based assessments.
6. In making severance payments, institutions must meet their contractual obligations and be able to explain the reasons for any payments made. HEIs will need to carefully consider any advice that is available from regulators, together with detailed CUC advice. Remuneration Committees have specific responsibilities in this area – in particular, ensuring that contracts agreed with senior post holders are fair, reasonable and justifiable and do not expose the institution to significant potential liabilities, for example by being able to explain notice periods of more than six months.
7. It is important for institutions that staff represent them on various bodies and boards and carry out academic and civic responsibilities at other organisations, e.g. non-executive director roles. There should be a clear and published policy on any such activity that generates additional income for the individual from the external body. Hols are generally unlikely to be able retain significant sums, but any income they do retain needs to be disclosed and explained.
8. The approach to expenses can be a sensitive topic, and generally institutions should identify normal business costs separately and adopt a single published scheme that applies to all staff. Remuneration Committees should receive assurance that the scheme is operating effectively.

⁵ If available

9. Remuneration Committees must be comprised of people who are independent of the institution's management – primarily lay members of the governing body⁶. Membership must include the institution's Chair, but not the HoI⁷. Remuneration Committees should be able to engage external independent expertise if required.
10. Institutions must publish the multiple of the remuneration of the HoI and the median earnings of the institution's whole workforce annually. This should be accompanied by sufficient explanation and context to enable useful comparison. They may also wish to publish other multiples, such as the ratio of HoI salary to:
 - a) the median academic salary;
 - b) the median professorial salary; and
 - c) the median professional staff salary.

To assist with consistency and comparison, the definition for the multiple should be based on the methodology used by UCEA which is available from its website. Institutions will adopt a range for their chosen pay multiples that they regard as acceptable. The diversity of the sector means these ranges will differ between institutions. Institutions that position themselves in the highest quintile will need to be prepared to provide additional explanations to stakeholders and their regulators as to why this is desirable.

11. Each year, Remuneration Committees must produce an annual remuneration report to the governing body. That report will need to provide sufficient assurance to the governing body that the Remuneration Committee has effectively discharged its responsibilities.
12. The institution must also publish a readily available remuneration annual statement. This may be within the annual report and accounts (as an Annex or separate section), or it may be published as a standalone document. Ideally, the published annual statement will be the same as the annual remuneration report to the governing body. However, modifications may be necessary to preserve commercial confidentiality.

⁶ They may choose to co-opt additional external members with particular expertise.

⁷ The HoI may be invited to attend meetings but must not be present for discussions affecting him or her. Where the Remuneration Committee is responsible for all senior staff pay, including professors, it is very important that the HoI is present at meetings to discuss these staff and ensure that the Committee's decisions are well informed.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank