
Education and Training Committee (Panel), 5 July 2018

Annual monitoring audit – Decision whether to visit the Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society

Executive summary

This programme was approved in 2014, with the education provider (Nordoff Robbins) running approved programmes in music therapy continuously since 1995. As part of our normal approval and monitoring processes, we assessed the programme at an annual monitoring assessment day on 16 January 2018. The assessment was made by two arts therapist visitors, one in the music therapy modality and one in the art therapy modality.

The annual monitoring process is intended to ensure programmes continue to meet the standards, with a particular focus on whether any changes made are appropriate within the context of our standards.

Following the assessment, the visitors required further evidence to determine whether several specific standards continued to be met (section 4 of the report, provided as appendix 1). The education provider responded to this request, and the visitors considered that all areas except two were addressed by the response. In section 5 of the report, the visitors have recommended that we visit the programme, and note why they consider that this is an appropriate course of action to ensure the standards continue to be met.

When the visitors made this recommendation, the Executive decided to seek an opinion from another music therapist visitor about whether the standards continue to be met by the programme. We decided to ask for this because:

- from the submission it appears that the programme has not made significant changes; and
- one of the outstanding issues stems from the music therapist visitor's specific professional view of how the standards of proficiency for music therapists should be delivered by the programme.

We provided all documentation submitted by the education provider through the course of this submission to this visitor to allow them to make a judgement, and asked them to specifically consider the two outstanding issues flagged through the visitors' report. This opinion (provided as appendix 2) is intended to provide the Panel with another view about whether visiting the programme is a proportionate course of action, within the context of the programme continuing to meet our standards.

We also gave the education provider the opportunity to provide observations as part of this process, which are included as appendix 3 and 4.

Decision

The Panel is asked to decide whether the programme continues to meet the standards through the annual monitoring audit process, or if a visit is required to assess the programme further.

If the Panel decide a visit is required, it is asked to also consider:

- whether the scope of the visit should be narrowed to focus on specific areas of the standards, and;
- whether the visit should be held earlier than our normal lead in time of six months in the future.

Resource implications

- If the decision is to visit, there will be resource implications in line with a normal approval visit.

Financial implications

- If the decision is to visit, there will be financial implications in line with a normal approval visit.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Annual monitoring visitors' report
- Appendix 2: Recommendation of Jennifer French, additional music therapist visitor appointed to review submission
- Appendix 3: Observations from the education provider
- Appendix 4: Statement from the validating body

Date of paper

26 June 2018

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Nordoff Robbins
Validating body	Goldsmiths, University of London
Name of programme(s)	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society, Full time
Date of initial assessment	16 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-12371-Q6F4L1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	6
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation	8

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Elaine Streeter	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Julie Allan	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07333

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors reviewed external examiners’ reports from the last two academic years. They noted that some of the external examiner’s concerns appeared to recur from year to year. For example in the 2016 – 17 report, the external examiner noted that “students were still weak in their ability to critically reflect on their work in relation to diversity and this needs further attention”, and also that “comment about the therapeutic relationship” was still “less evident in the presentations”. As a result of this the visitors were not able to be clear that the education provider was responding appropriately to issues raised by external examiners, and so could not see how the education provider

was acting on information gathered through their monitoring and evaluation systems. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme's effectiveness.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensures that feedback from external examiners is incorporated appropriately into the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the education provider's responses to external examiner's reports. In the response for 2016 – 17, they highlighted a "concern that for the majority of students there is little evidence of the use of wider or more recent literature." The external examiners had noted that "students rarely refer to music therapy or other relevant journals or more contemporary research, Cochrane reviews etc." The visitors also noted the concerns raised by the external examiners about the therapeutic approach encouraged by the programme. These included a lack of evidence around the learners' familiarity with the use of verbal interventions when dealing with clients with complex emotional needs. From the education provider's response to these concerns, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for arts therapists, inclusive of music therapists. The responses were narratives rather than descriptions of specific actions that had been taken or would be taken in response.

Based on all of the above, the visitors had particular concerns about the following SOPs, which say that learners must:

8.1 be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate verbal and non-verbal skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to service users, colleagues and others

8.4 be able to select, move between and use appropriate forms of verbal and non-verbal communication with service users and others

8.5 be aware of the characteristics and consequences of verbal and non-verbal communication and how this can be affected by factors such as age, culture, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status and spiritual or religious beliefs

9.6 understand the need to establish and sustain a therapeutic relationship within a creative and containing environment

12.1 be able to engage in evidence-based practice, evaluate practice and participate in audit procedures

13.9 understand the core processes in therapeutic practice that are best suited to service users' needs and be able to engage these to achieve productive outcomes

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating how the programme learning outcomes ensure that learners are able to meet these standards of proficiency for arts therapists, inclusive of music therapists.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that in a previous annual monitoring submission the education provider had stated an intention to introduce a new seminar, described as “songwriting”, to develop learners’ psychodynamic understanding of verbal interactions, and to “address the area of verbal and musical interactions with the clients”. From their review of the current submission it was not clear whether or not this seminar had been introduced. They were therefore not able to be clear whether there had been changes to how the learning outcomes ensured that learners met the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for arts therapists, inclusive of music therapists.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence clarifying whether this seminar has been introduced, and if so how the education provider ensures that, after any changes to learning outcomes, learners are still enabled to meet the SOPs.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that in a previous annual monitoring submission the education provider had stated an intention to introduce a new seminar, described as “songwriting”, to develop learners’ psychodynamic understanding of verbal interactions, and to “address the area of verbal and musical interactions with the clients”. From their review of the current submission it was not clear whether or not this seminar had been introduced. They were therefore not able to be clear whether there had been changes to how assessment strategy and design ensured that learners met the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence clarifying whether this seminar has been introduced, and if so how the education provider ensures that, after any changes to assessment strategy and design, learners are still enabled to meet the SOPs.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted that in a previous annual monitoring submission, the visitors who assessed that submission had expressed concerns about a research paper used on the programme which discussed the use of therapy outside of therapeutic settings, where alcohol was being used. The concern was that this paper was not adequately contextualised and so learners might not be clear that this kind of practice may impact on how a professional would be able to demonstrate that they continue to meet the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). It was not clear to the visitors reviewing this submission what, if any, action had been taken to ensure that learners were made aware of this consideration. They were therefore unable to be clear that this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence clarifying whether the education provider still uses this research paper, and if so how the education provider ensures that learners understand the implications for the HCPC SCPEs.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the further evidence request for this standard, the education provider submitted a narrative response explaining its systems for monitoring and evaluation of the programme, and documents showing a plan which had been formulated in response to feedback from these systems (the Equality and Diversity Review). The narrative response also attempted to contextualise some of the comments from external examiners which led to the visitors' further evidence request. For example, the education provider noted that having recently moved to a new validating body, they had made changes to their pedagogical approach to lay a greater stress on anti-oppressive practice in their therapeutic approach.

The education provider also addressed the external examiner's concerns about some learners' understanding of the therapeutic relationship. For example, in the 2015-16 report the external examiner highlighted "a lack of comment on the therapeutic relationship" in some learners' work, and in 2016-17 expressed a concern that "for a minority [of learners] their therapeutic insight is less developed". The education provider stated that concerns about this area formed a relatively small part of the external examiner's concerns, and that the concerns themselves arose from ongoing professional discussion within the field of music therapy about therapeutic approaches.

Regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems themselves, the education provider described the various committees and feedback mechanisms through which they gathered data about the effectiveness of the programme. They mentioned the Nordoff Robbins Goldsmiths Programmes Committee, as well as processes internal to the programme. These took the form of weekly meetings involving programme staff, which consider ongoing matters relating to the programme and learners, and termly National Tutors' Meetings which take a broader perspective across all Nordoff Robbins programme. The education provider referred to actions that had been taken into response to concerns raised through these processes.

However, the visitors were not able to view any specific evidence relating to these meetings and processes, for example minutes of the meetings or lists of action points generated and some indication of when the action points had been completed. Therefore, although the visitors could see what policies and processes are in place, they were not able to make a judgement that they are being used effectively. As such, the visitors cannot determine that this standard continues to be met by the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider submitted a narrative response to the visitors' further evidence request relating to external examiner comments. These fell into two main categories:

- learners' apparent lack of familiarity with relevant literature: for example the 2016-17 report mentions that for some modules there is a "concern that for the majority of students there is little evidence of the use of wider or more recent literature", and suggests that in some modules "for the majority of students there is little evidence of the use of wider or more recent literature".
- learners' understanding of appropriate therapeutic approaches. For example, as noted above in the 2015-16 report the external examiner highlighted "a lack of comment on the therapeutic relationship" in some work, and in 2016-17 expressed a concern that "for a minority [of learners] their therapeutic insight is less developed".

Regarding the learners' lack of references to music therapy literature in their work, the education provider stated that this applied to presentations in only one module, and laid out the steps they had put in place to address the issue. They also stated that a review of written work in other modules had shown an appropriate level of engagement with the literature.

Regarding learners' familiarity with appropriate therapeutic approaches, the education provider stated that they did not consider that the external examiner comments referenced above applied to the overall Nordoff Robbins approach to teaching music therapy, but to the work of some of the learners who had not demonstrated sufficient familiarity with how to make appropriate verbal interventions. The education provider stated that they have considered this feedback within their weekly tutor meetings, and will incorporate it into the "Pause For Thought" reflection sessions on the programme and into personal supervisions with learners.

The education provider also provided a narrative showing how they considered that each of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) referenced in section 4 of this form were addressed by learning outcomes on the programme. According to this narrative each SOP is addressed by multiple learning outcomes.

However, it was still not clear to the visitors from the additional evidence how the SOPs that they highlighted, around the core skills of music therapy practice, could be met by all learners, if not all learners were having to develop their skills in verbal interventions and to develop a therapeutic relationship outside the music-making context. The visitors came to this conclusion based on the introduction of a new "Songwriting" workshop, which may affect how the learners are enabled to meet the standards of proficiency for music therapists, and was not a part of the programme at the initial approval. They could not see how the education provider would ensure in a systematic way that all learners on the programme develop appropriate skills and discernment around verbal communication, as required by the SOPs for music therapy, and were therefore unable to be satisfied that the standard is met.

The education provider has had two opportunities to demonstrate that these standards are met via a documentary submission. In this case, they consider a visit is the most

appropriate process to gather evidence around the standards that have not been met at this time. It would be appropriate to visit this programme to focus on SET 3, Programme management and resources, and SET 4, Curriculum, and to hold discussions with appropriate stakeholders.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 July 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Annual Monitoring

Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society

From the documentation provided I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

Reasoning:

1. As noted in the paperwork, this course differs slightly from other music therapy trainings, in that it focuses on musical relating and draws from sociological and systemic theory as well as therapeutic theory. This is an approved programme that has demonstrated it meets the HCPC standards and the SETs mapping document does not indicate any changes.
2. A reading of the internal quality documents describe a system for monitoring the course that includes the internal processes of the provider, Nordoff Robbins, and the governance procedures of the validating body, Goldsmiths College. The programme is judged to have met the required standards. I note the Goldsmiths academic link representative is a qualified art therapist, previous convenor of the art therapy training course at Goldsmiths, and current chair of the school the programme sits within, and therefore would be well placed to identify any areas of particular concern.
3. The external examiners reports indicate she is satisfied that the standards of the training and the achievements of the graduates are appropriate and comparable to other HEIs.
4. Comments and recommendations raised by the external examiner have been accepted and responded to by the programme leader. There is evidence that changes have been made in response to comments, and that the external examiner is satisfied these are having some impact.
5. There is evidence of an ongoing dialogue between the external examiner, the HEI monitoring team and the programme leader/team with regard to continuing to improve areas highlighted for comment, specifically in respect to issues of equality and diversity, and in relation to knowledge of different therapeutic models.
6. SoPs mapping is not provided for annual monitoring, however this would have been part of original approvals and there is no evidence to suggest that the issues identified by the external examiner for comment / improvement are indicative of serious or systemic failings in the ability of the programme to deliver the the SoPs.
7. Whilst the course advocates for its particular model of community music therapy, I found nothing to suggest the course was not delivering the SoPs in full; or to suggest that students were not aware of, or equipped to draw from, a variety of different theoretical models and approaches to evidence and evaluation.

a) SoPs 8.1, 8.4, 9.6, and 13.1: The visitors' comments appear to indicate some underlying concern around the capacity of the course to equip trainees to work therapeutically, including understanding the therapeutic relationship and use verbal therapeutic interventions.

The basis for this concern wasn't clear to me as the external examiner's comments (2016) indicate she felt this was lacking in presentations but evidenced in viva and in written work, and she was satisfied these areas were being addressed and improved upon (2017).

In addition, the programme convenor's response, including citations and additional evidence, make clear that these areas are fundamental to the course, and are addressed within the delivery and assessment of learning outcomes in various different parts of the programme, and covering several different models of therapy.

b) SoP 8.5 there is sufficient exposition and evidence from the programme convenor to demonstrate these areas are being addressed in the programme. Equality and diversity are clearly central to the rationale of the course and the ethos of the school, and the programme is active in continuing to develop learning in this area.

c) SoP 12.1: although the external examiner noted some shortfalls in referencing of research in presentation / viva, the programme convenor has provided explanation and evidence of other areas of the programme which deliver and assess these learning outcomes, and also offered amendments (for 2018) to encourage students to bring this into presentation/viva. I could not find any other grounds for concern in this area.

8. The programme leader's response to the HCPC visitors' comments provides full reasoning, along with appropriate referencing and evidence, to answer concerns raised. I am satisfied this provides sufficient assurance that, whilst there may be ongoing areas for attention, the programme is able to demonstrate that it meets the baseline standards and that there are robust mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

Jennifer French
21.5.18

To whom it may concern,

We have been asked to supply our observations relating to the Annual Monitoring audit process for the Master of Music Therapy (MMT) training programme which is provided by Nordoff Robbins and validated by Goldsmiths, University of London. As requested, our observations ultimately address the issue of whether or not it is necessary for the HCPC to visit the programme as a proportionate outcome of the process.

The report from the two initial visitors highlights two SETs that they feel need to be addressed. Our first two observations address each of these in turn.

1. SET 3.3. – The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place

Regular monitoring and evaluation systems are indeed in place, and a letter to this effect from Goldsmiths (as the validating institution) is appended. The External Examiner is properly appointed and supported by Goldsmiths and consistently reports being well supported by programme staff at Nordoff Robbins too. Goldsmiths also provides an Academic Link to the programme, who ensures that assessment procedures as well as evaluation and liaison systems are comparable with those applicable to students on comparable courses within Goldsmiths itself. As noted by the third visitor, the Academic Link is Head of Department at STACS (the Social, Therapeutic, and Community Studies department) at Goldsmiths and an eminent art therapist (whose theoretical background contrasts with the Nordoff Robbins approach), so we are confident that these processes are robust.

Comments from an External Examiner relating to the performance of some students do not necessarily warrant immediate changes to a programme: rather, they should be demonstrably responded to and engaged with by the programme, a process which may or may not eventually involve changes to teaching, to systems, or to the structure of the programme. As a programme we welcome critique and engage directly with challenge, as shown in the current work with Goldsmiths to introduce an explicitly anti-oppressive stance to the teaching which highlights lived aspects of diversity. This assures us that students are receiving a training which is well-rounded as well as specific to the approach which it sets out to teach. Furthermore, we have a history of appointing External Examiners who are well placed to provide us with precisely such critique.

The Nordoff Robbins Goldsmiths Programmes Committee (NRGPC), which includes student representation and the Academic Link from Goldsmiths, meets regularly: minutes are circulated to all students as well as to staff and to Goldsmiths so that the process is transparent and accountable. Useful discussions are documented and actions are taken.

2. SET 4.1 – The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of the proficiency for their part of the Register

We are clear that this is indeed the case. As noted in the Executive Summary to the report, it is apparent that the original music therapy visitor has a particular professional/theoretical approach to how the standards of proficiency should be interpreted and hence delivered by the programme.

Within Goldsmiths, Nordoff Robbins is linked to STACS – the Social, Therapeutic, and Community Studies department. This hosts a diverse range of trainings and research in various kinds of work

with people, including psychoanalytic therapy, humanistic counselling, arts therapies, CBT, social work and community work, and some of these training programmes are also HCPC-approved. These encompass a wide range of theoretical approaches, and we believe this to be a healthy situation. Adherence to a particular theoretical stance should not be confused with the question of whether a programme enables students to meet the standards of proficiency.

Furthermore, the revised learning outcomes of all Parts of the programme were mapped onto the HCPC's SOPs within the Programme Handbook which was approved by the HCPC as part of the Major Change process when the programme transferred its validation to Goldsmiths from January 2016, and no changes have been made since. It is therefore surprising that this mapping should be questioned at a later annual monitoring audit.

3. Observations on the process itself

As an education provider, we have been surprised both by the length of time that this process has taken so far (our previous experiences of the annual monitoring audit process having been both timely and straightforward) and by the evident theoretical leanings of the objections expressed in the original report. The delay (without explanation until very recently) has hampered both our usual annual review processes and our ability to plan future developments, and created unnecessary uncertainty amongst stakeholders in relation to what we consider to be a well-managed programme.

We would also note that the original music therapy visitor has published on her opposition to the "music-centred" approach being taught on this programme and is well known for this stance in the profession. Whilst this is entirely welcome as part of academic debate and professional discourse, we feel that such combative stances are not appropriate within regulatory mechanisms such as the HCPC's annual monitoring audit, where the focus needs to be firmly on each programme's meeting (or not) of the SETs.

We would therefore suggest that visitors are asked to declare any such stance that might cause them difficulty in adopting a clear focus on the meeting of SETs in relation to a particular programme, and it should be made explicit that they are expected to set this stance aside when acting in the role of visitor.

4. The proposal of a visit to the programme

Given the problematic nature of the original visitors' report which seems to have caused the delay, we feel that the priority now needs to be to resolve this matter promptly.

The specially commissioned report from the third visitor (who we note is also a well-established music therapist) seems to present a more detached view of the programme's observance of HCPC requirements. We therefore agree with her finding that there is no need for a visit to this programme.

Simon Procter

26th June 2018

25 June 2018

To whom it may concern,

I would like to clarify the annual quality assurance processes that Goldsmiths undertakes with regards to the Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society programme.

Goldsmiths have validated the Nordoff Robbins MMT programme since January 2016. During this time we have implemented various QA processes including appointing an Academic Link and External Examiner for the programme and implementing an Annual Programme Review (APR) process.

The Academic Link is an academic based in the corresponding Department at Goldsmiths, who is responsible for subject-level liaison with the programme teams at Nordoff Robbins. The purpose is to provide assurances to Goldsmiths that the integrity of the assessment process, the level of student achievement and academic standards are comparable to programmes delivered at Goldsmiths. Ahead of the Board of Examiners meeting the Academic Link is invited to report on the consistency of the application of the grading criteria across the sample and the internal marking processes, and how these compare to cognate subject areas at Goldsmiths.

The Academic Link's report is considered by the Goldsmiths Quality and Standards Sub-Committee.

The External Examiner is appointed by Goldsmiths. Following the Board of Examiners meeting held in July, the External Examiner submits a written report to Goldsmiths. The report is then forwarded to Nordoff Robbins so that the programme team can respond to any comments or suggestions made by the External Examiner. The report and Nordoff Robbins' response is then considered at the Nordoff Robbins/Goldsmiths Programme Committee before being sent back to the Collaborative Provision team at Goldsmiths. The External Examiner's report and programme team response are then considered by Goldsmiths Quality and Standards Sub-Committee. Any action plan resulting from the External Examiner report is included by Nordoff Robbins in its MMT APR report.

The APR takes account of feedback from students, staff, the Academic Link and External Examiner. Within the APR the programme team are asked to report on the previous year's action plan, actions planned for the next academic year, recruitment, student achievement and retention data, resources to support the programme (including staff), employability and innovative practice/enhancements. Once completed the APR is sent to Goldsmiths (once it has been considered at the autumn term meeting of the Nordoff Robbins-Goldsmiths Programmes Committee). The APR report is considered by the Goldsmiths Learning, Teaching and Enhancement committee as part of its Annual Review process and any resulting feedback is given to Nordoff Robbins.

Please do let me know if you have any specific questions regarding the quality assurance processes.

Yours faithfully



Martin Conreen

Academic Director – Collaborative Provision
