

## EDITORIAL

RICHARD MCGREGOR

Welcome to a new academic year! The first Newsletter of 2003-4 contains a report on our annual conference, which was held at Leeds last May. Our Secretary Amanda Bayley gives an overview of the proceedings and this is followed by summaries from the afternoon break-out sessions. With this Newsletter we begin the debate on **Practice as Research**, which will lead us towards next year's conference during which we hope we might be able to achieve a consensus view to put to the next RAE panel. You will also find a financial

snapshot from our treasurer, Mike Russ, and an executive summary of the July committee meeting. We hope that these will demonstrate the range and scope of the work of the committee.

There is no doubt that recent years have seen a great increase in calls on NAMHE to respond on a number of issues as well as make representations on the behalf of members. To be effective we must be able to represent the views of the whole sector, and not just part of it. We hope you will continue to support this vital work. We do want to clarify one point about timing: the subscription year runs from October to September but elected members of the committee serve from January to December. There may be some confusion here which has caused subscription payment to be delayed.

## ANNUAL CONFERENCE

May 13 2003

Held at the University of Leeds

## SECURING AND EXPLOITING RESOURCES

***Taking command of new sources and resources was the title of the morning session which included five guest speakers. Some of the main points they covered are summarised below:***

Pam Thompson (Chief Librarian, Royal College of Music) reinforced the importance of subject-specific librarians for academics and discussed the development of online catalogues to unify collections across the country. Her presentation, *Music library developments, initiatives and problems, including copyright*, provided an update of what is happening in music libraries and identified projects that have been underway, including her own which has since been published, *Access to Music: Music Libraries and Archives in the United Kingdom and Ireland - current themes and a realistic vision for the future* (1 July 2003). This is available from the International

Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres (IAML).

Speaking on *Funding for research: the AHRB and others*, Professor Mark Everist (University of Southampton) drew a distinction between HEFCE Quality Research Funds and project funding from the AHRB and other bodies; he discussed the importance of the former which, although not very visible, pays for research in the vacation, 'research days', and statutory sabbaticals. The proportion of HEFCE Quality Research funding to AHRB funding for the Arts and Humanities, and therefore for Music, is around 9:1. Two styles of project funding (AHRB, BA, Leverhulme etc.) were identified: *ab initio* projects (frequently carrying large overheads because of their high volume), sometimes constructed for the purpose of attracting funding and occasionally to satisfy the university senior management; and 'would-do-it

anyway' research, whose reliance on support from funding bodies cannot be over-emphasised. The speaker highlighted the types of research activity that are fundable and advised that – for the AHRB, on whose Research Panel 7 he sat – the smaller the grant the higher was the success rate. He observed that there are large numbers of unfunded but A+ rated applications at the top end of the AHRB but a very small number of applications to some funds, such as the AHRB small grants.

Professor Robert Pascall (University of Wales, Bangor) and Professor Graham Barber (University of Leeds) spoke in turn about *Getting a new building and what to do with it once you've got it*. Both described the convoluted and lengthy procedures by which new buildings were secured for their respective music departments at the time – Nottingham University and Leeds University – though they each had very different experiences in raising the capital. Professor Pascall's sources came from public funds of various kinds, his tales ranging from wining and dining the landed gentry to launching a public appeal. Professor Barber encountered internal politics as a consequence of the funding received from a capital programme within the University. Since Leeds was the chosen venue for the conference delegates were able to admire the results for themselves. A building design which would accommodate both academic and performance functions was a critical factor in both projects.

Professor Alan Pearman (Pro Vice Chancellor, University of Leeds, Professor of Management Decision Analysis in the University of Leeds Business School) reviewed and reflected upon the proposals on widening participation put forward in the government's white paper of January 2003, *The Future of Higher Education*, and related these to his own institution. These included the importance of increasing accessibility to HE by raising participation and standards through reforms of secondary and further education. He gave several examples from Leeds University Music Department of regional partnerships that had been set up as a way of building links between schools, colleges and universities. Leeds has also addressed this by revising its curriculum to include new programmes of study and revisiting its admission procedures. Leeds is also providing Educational Maintenance Awards to support students from families with the lowest incomes. All these issues, and more, were to feature in the afternoon break-out sessions of the conference.

In the closing session of the day, *What and where next?*, the education consultant for youth music, John Stevens, identified some of the key issues arising from his report, *Creating a land with music*, which was commissioned by HEFCE and published in September 2002 (now available at [www.youthmusic.org.uk/pdfs/creating\\_a\\_land\\_txt05.pdf](http://www.youthmusic.org.uk/pdfs/creating_a_land_txt05.pdf)).

Areas he researched included the training needs for a musician's portfolio career, nurturing musical talent and widening opportunities. The report was written in order to stimulate debate and subsequent action amongst trainers and teachers at all levels and to ensure that the musical talent of future generations is fully equipped to meet the needs of changing patterns of employment for musicians. There was, however, some criticism of its consultative processes from the floor.

Dr Amanda Bayley  
University of Wolverhampton

## REPORTS ON THE AFTERNOON BREAK-OUT GROUPS

### Group 1 SOURCES

This discussion group discussed three main issues:

- Online resources: opportunity or challenge?
- Copyright or 'copywrong'?
- Linking libraries: yet another 'efficiency saving'?

The points raised are summarised below.

#### ONLINE RESOURCES: OPPORTUNITY OR CHALLENGE

Fragmentation: there is a diversity of resources providing access to digital materials. The *Cecilia* project of the UK & Ireland branch of IAML will help to pull these together. It was discussed whether there were too many 'one-stop shops'; that maybe the project-oriented approach to creating digital resources results in duplication of effort and confusion (for instance between JISC/HEFCE projects). Such activities need co-ordination at high managerial levels.

The following was received from HEFCE as a response to a letter from the Chair, and is printed here for information. The suggestion that NAMHE might offer guidelines to the Music Panel was one of the prompts which encouraged the committee to designate 'Practice as Research' as the topic for the 2004 conference:

Northavon House  
Coldharbour Lane  
BRISTOL BS16 1QD

Professor Stephen Banfield  
Department of Music  
University of Bristol  
Victoria Rooms  
Queens Road  
Bristol BS8 1SA

Dear Professor Banfield

NAMHE RA Review response

Thank you for your letter regarding the NAMHE response to the RA review's invitation to contribute.

As you noted in your letter, the invitation to contribute received over 400 responses and we anticipate a similar response to the current consultation on Sir Gareth Robert's report. The HEFCE research team log all responses and undertake a full and extensive analysis. It is through this analysis process that we take into consideration the comments and suggestions made. Unfortunately resources do not allow us to respond to each letter individually.

The review group have not taken forward your suggestion for disciplinary standing committees for research. The broader issues you raised will be for the music panel to consider, within the context of that particular discipline and using the information available, including any guidelines you may be developing.

Yours sincerely

Vanessa Conte  
Policy Officer  
[HEFCE]

## ELECTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS 2003

Three members of the current NAMHE Committee complete their term of office at the end of 2003. They are:

**Professor Stephen Banfield, University of Bristol\***

**Professor John Rink, Royal Holloway, University of London\*\***

**Dr Bruce Wood, University of Wales, Bangor\*\***

\*eligible for re-election    \*\*retiring

Nominations are now invited to fill these vacancies (each for three years) and nomination papers have been sent to your NAMHE representative. The deadline for nominations is Friday 7 November.

We should like to thank John and Bruce for their service to the Committee.

## DIARY DATE

### ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2004

DATE: **May 4th 2004**

PLACE: **Oxford Brookes University**

SUBJECT:  
**PRACTICE AS RESEARCH: TOWARDS CONSENSUS**

## ENDNOTES

**WEBSITE:** External Examiner Database  
Colleagues have found the external examiner list which is on the website to be useful, but it is now out of date. Once the committee know who the reps are for all the member institutions we shall be contacting them to help update the list.

**COMMITTEE SIZE:** Should the NAMHE committee be larger? The workload has increased and there is scope for expansion. Should we increase the number of committee members? We would like to discuss this at the next AGM (to be held on May 4th 2004).

particular item of expenditure or income. The first of these snapshots is presented below. It covers the subscription year 1st October 2002 to 30th September 2003.

<b>Bank Balance at 30 September 2002</b>	<b>£8051.3</b>
<b>Income:</b>	
Subscriptions	£3900
Bank interest	£14
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>£3914</b>
<b>Expenditure:</b>	
Secretarial support	£160
Conference Catering	£727
Travelling expenses	£1678
Research assistance	£132
Newsletter printing	£1107
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>£3804</b>
<b>Bank Balance 30 September 2003 (estimate)</b>	<b>£8161</b>

The snapshot indicates that although the reserves of the Association are healthy, in the year that has just ended our income just about covered our expenditure.

Dr Michael Russ  
Treasurer

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Meeting of the NAMHE committee held on 1 July 2003 at the University of Birmingham

The committee has decided to produce a summary of issues discussed on your behalf at committee meetings. The committee normally meets three times a year, in January, July and September. A summary of the main items of business of the July meeting follows.

### NAMHE Conference Report

The committee noted that attendance at Conference had been lower than normal in 2003. It was thought that this might be due to the location or the change of date. Conference will revert to its usual position in 2004 i.e. the day after the May Bank Holiday,

Tuesday 4 May, and will take place at Oxford Brookes University. The committee hopes that this location will be accessible for most people. The theme of the Conference will be **Practice as Research: Towards Consensus**.

### NAMHE Portfolios

As listed elsewhere

### Current issues, Consultations, Correspondence

- Review of Research Assessment: Report by Sir Gareth Roberts to the UK Funding Bodies
- NAMHE will be submitting a response to this report, addressing subject specific items only.
- AHRB  
The Chair had received a letter from the AHRB announcing the establishment of six doctoral scholarships of three years in each subject area. The Research Sub-committee was asked to investigate likely subject areas. NAMHE does not have the mechanism to co-ordinate bids for Music, but has asked to be kept informed of expressions of interest and will comment on mechanisms and their likely impact on the community.
- Subject Specialism Consultation  
The committee welcomed this report and agreed to respond to a question on the role of the Subject Association.
- HEFCE – Improving standards in postgraduate degree programmes  
HEFCE has proposed new guidelines suggesting that a department should have at least five members of staff with PhDs and ten PhD students before it may take in more postgraduates. The committee agreed to write to HEFCE to point out the likely adverse effect of the proposed guidelines on Music and other small departments.
- Academy for Teaching & Learning  
The committee discussed the establishment of the new academy, separate to QAA, which will provide advice to HE and support professional development.
- Data Collection  
The committee agreed to sponsor the provision of a breakdown of UK Music theses of 1967-2001 by category. This information is now available to NAMHE members.

Expense of subscription: subscriptions can be very expensive. This can have a major impact when geographical location makes it necessary to rely on resources being available electronically.

Group licensing: large group license agreements could be sought, serving all UK Music Departments for instance. But then, maybe resource providers would not secure enough income to make it worth their while.

### COPYRIGHT OR 'COPYWRONG'?

Publishers take different views on 'fair dealing': different rules may be applied for printed and online versions of a journal, for instance. It should be emphasised to publishers that academic use encourages interest in their products.

The group discussed the number of prosecutions made by publishers over materials used in scholarly journals, as well as the way institutions negotiate copyright with individual authors.

### LINKING LIBRARIES: YET ANOTHER 'EFFICIENCY SAVING'?

Sharing libraries: this could be done in some cases (by the London conservatoires for instance); but this would result in loss of overall control of those resources by individual institutions. It was noted that Westminster libraries had been contracted out.

Sharing online services could be of use, facilitating the negotiation of group licences with providers.

Local solutions can also be effective; this could be as simple as a 'delivery van' travelling between closely located libraries (e.g. for inter-campus loans). It is important also to maximise existing subscriptions: often they include more than one thinks (such as the provision to photocopy material freely).

Dr Nick Fells  
University of Glasgow

## Group 2 RESOURCES

### SPACE AND EQUIPMENT

A problem area that mainly occupies the thoughts of Heads of Departments.

- Two areas that appear to cause most frustration are:
- The cost of keeping music technology equipment maintained and up to date
- The 'space charges' levied by many institutions; these have to be paid from department budgets and are usually worked out by the square metre. Obviously, you can't pack as many students into a music practice room as the space economists would like!

### RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FUNDING

Most of the discussion revolved around AHRB funding. Some useful advice is to think small. Many people think of making big bids, yet the success rate here can be as low as 9 per cent, compared to a 60 per cent success rate for those applying for small bids. Moreover, the impact on music in HE of lots of institutions winning small grants may actually be more significant than one or two universities a year getting a large grant.

Collaboration will give a bid competitive edge IF IT IS RELEVANT. It is wrong to think collaboration is necessary for success.

SRIF2 bids are for infrastructure – i.e. for equipment.

Don't neglect to consider European bids.

The case for practice (performance and even composition) still needs to be made. There are still those who cannot bring themselves to place practice on an equal footing with theory and methodology. An AHRB speaker was quoted as having said his organisation was there "to support those working out how to build bridges, not to fund those who are building bridges".

Prof Derek B Scott  
University of Salford

Group 3 FORCES

Having participated in the morning session talks based around sources and resources, the group worked through some of the ramifications for music departments, conservatoires, and those who work within them. With the widening participation imperatives of government comes the need for a curriculum that becomes more broad, and that develops a high degree of flexibility without compromising quality. This has a strong and often serious impact upon those who teach; the introduction of new sub-disciplines within music has challenged lecturers and practical musicians to consistently develop their skills and knowledge. Yet the changes in these areas can provide vigorous, tonic choices for students and those who teach. Popular music was one example given of a relatively new area about which those exploring it had developed some effective new interpretative languages.

The necessity of creating and learning such new languages means the definition of 'professionalism' is also a constantly changing one. Music students of today need to be prepared to enter a world of work that demands a variety of skills and the ability to manage themselves. Institutions have to prepare their students for this altered, more business-oriented climate. Those involved in music need to become ever more entrepreneurial, developing community links for outreach work, effective strategic partnerships and curricula that are inviting to a wider population.

This ethos does not always sit easily with that of research. Funding bodies require ever-increasing level of this entrepreneurialism, but do so while their processes become ever more bureaucratic. For many institutions, particularly smaller music departments or monotechnics, the time resource is stretched ever more thinly. The reflective time needed in order for effective research to take place is progressively drawn away. The way the White Paper is interpreted, and the outcomes of the Roberts consultation, will be crucial indicators of whether this process is to be intensified or ameliorated.

Darla Crispin  
Royal Academy of Music

COMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS

At its July meeting, the committee agreed to reconfigure its members' portfolios, previously driven by representation on outside agencies, so that working groups could be set up and remain, responding efficiently to on-going areas of concern and activity. The committee also felt that outside volunteer experts should be able to join these groups by committee request for specific tasks, where appropriate. Their input would not therefore necessarily have to cease after a limited period of committee co-option, as has been the case hitherto. Dr Ronald Woodley has joined the Research Group on this basis for its job of drafting a Practice as Research Report. The new groups and their members (working group leaders underlined> are listed and described below:

- **RESEARCH (Mark Everist, Darla Crispin, John Rink)**  
NAMHE's research group functions as a standing committee on research in music; it co-ordinates the discipline's view on research assessment, research funding and graduate studentships, as well as monitoring trends in research in the subject.

- **HE TEACHING & LEARNING (Mike Russ, Richard McGregor)**  
This group monitors government policy on teaching and learning in Higher Education and how it impacts on Music. The recent White Paper was given detailed scrutiny and a response made to HEFCE. Developments at the QAA are also kept under review and Mike Russ represents NAMHE on PALATINE.

**EXTERNAL RELATIONS (Stephen Banfield - Chair, Amanda Bayley -Secretary).**  
Outside bodies with which the Chair has been in recent communication include the statutory funding bodies (HEFCE, AHRB, British Academy), our sister subject associations (SCUDD, Standing Committee of University Drama Departments, and SCODHE, Standing Conference on Dance in Higher Education), the Royal Musical Association and the Times Higher Educational Supplement. ▶

- **INFRASTRUCTURE (Bruce Wood)**  
Copyright issues can be a minefield for those of us writing about 20th-century music, or teaching large classes with small resources, while funding, especially for individual or small-group research, is less a minefield than a jungle; the sub-group exists to provide general advice on both.

- **CONFERENCE (Chair, Secretary, Richard McGregor)**  
Preparation for conference involves negotiating with venue, speakers and committee members on the content and thrust of the day's proceedings.

- **NEWSLETTER AND WEB (Richard McGregor, Mike Russ, Chair)**  
This group is responsible for the communication with the membership as a whole and has within its remit oversight of the content of the webpage (under review) and the NAMHE Mailbase.

- **NON-HE LINKS (Nick Fells, Richard McGregor)**  
This group liaises with governmental and non-governmental bodies concerned with pre-HE music (National Association of Music Educators, DfES, Music Education Council etc).

A MESSAGE FROM THE COMMITTEE

NAMHE seeks to represent the entire HE community in music. It:

- makes responses to consultation from Government and other agencies
- gives Subject Support for departments under pressure from larger institutional structures
- makes data available though its website
- co-ordinates a mailbase of all departments in the United Kingdom
- maintains watching briefs on: Research, HE Teaching and Learning, Infrastructure and Non-HE matters which have a bearing on our work.

We need the support of individual departments and groups both to enable the decisions that we make to

be truly representative, and to fund our activities: these include the Annual Conference, Newsletter, *ad hoc* research and website.

Annual fees for membership are £100.00. This guarantees two issues of the *Newsletter* each year, and two free places at the annual conference. Without the annual fee, the Association could not function at the level that its membership expects. Our subscription year runs from 1 October to 30 September. Invoices are enclosed with the current *Newsletter* and should be returned to the Treasurer, Dr Michael Russ. For those who have neglected to pay their subscription for one or more years we have included an arrears statement of £100.00 in addition to this year's fees. The closing date for receipt of subscriptions for the year 2003-04 is 31 December 2003. We will only accept free conference bookings from member institutions, and the charge for non-members (which remains to be confirmed) is likely to be in the region of £50.00.

While we are sensitive to the difficulties of processing invoices through university finance offices and pressures on departmental budgets, we are anxious to reverse a modest reduction in subscription over recent years. When sending in your subscription form please also return the form enclosed with the invoice that asks you to confirm who your departmental representative is, and give the contact details requested. It is important that there is a reliable point of contact for us in your Department who will ensure NAMHE matters are dealt with.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY FOR THE YEAR 2002-03

**FINANCIAL SNAPSHOT**  
During the year the committee considered whether the accounts should be audited. However, once this matter was investigated it was found that our income was well below that which would require us to undertake an audit and that if we were to proceed and commission one it would cost around £1000.

In place of the audit we shall provide an annual financial snapshot in the Newsletter and will also make the ledger available at the Annual General Meeting should members wish to query any ▶