

New NAMHE Committee member biographies

Katharine Ellis is Reader in Music at Royal Holloway, University of London. She studied at Oxford University and the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and took up academic posts at St Anne's College Oxford and the Open University before joining Royal Holloway in 1994. Her research centres on the cultural history of music in nineteenth-century France. Recent and forthcoming publications include articles on the concept of embellishment [*broderie*], on music education, and on women brass players. Her study of early music in nineteenth-century France, *Historic Presents*, will be published by OUP New York in 2005. Katharine Ellis is a former editor of *Music & Letters*, and current editor of the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*.

Jan Smaczny taught at the universities of Oxford and Birmingham and is currently Hamilton Harty Professor of Music and Head of School at Queen's University, Belfast. He was part of the QAA benchmarking team which devised the benchmark statements for music in higher education. His research interests cover many aspects of Czech music and the life and works of Dvorak in particular

Robin Stowell is Professor and Head of the School of Music, Cardiff University. Educated at the University of Cambridge (MA, PhD) and at the Royal Academy of Music, where he was Leverhulme Scholar (violin), he was elected ARAM in 1990. His *Violin Technique and Performance Practice* (CUP, 1985) was a pioneering work in its field, and he has published widely on issues of performance practice, organology, music of the 'long 18th century', chamber music and string playing in general. His most recent major publications include *The Early Violin and Viola: a Practical Guide* (CUP, 2001) and *The Cambridge Companion to the String Quartet* (CUP, 2003), of which he is editor and principal contributor. He is co-editor of the series of 'Cambridge Handbooks to the Historical Performance of Music' and currently serves on the Editorial Board for CUP's new journal *Eighteenth-century Music*.

EDITORIAL

Dear Colleagues

Welcome to the first Newsletter of 2004. Most of this issue is given over to a comprehensive and thorough review of this year's conference 'Practice as Research: Towards Consensus' which took place at Oxford Brookes University on May 4th. This review has been prepared by our Secretary Dr Amanda Bayley and I am sure all those of us who were present would like to congratulate Amanda on the comprehensiveness of the review, and we trust that all those whose thoughts are represented here are happy with the way in which the detail of what they said has been encapsulated. We would certainly be pleased to hear from anyone wishing to elaborate, take issue or comment upon the Conference. The next NAMHE committee meeting will be right at the beginning of October so please feel free to communicate with any member of the committee on this, by e-mail or by snail mail. It would be good to have some feedback for the next newsletter – please communicate with Stephen Banfield and/or myself if you would like to make any comments which could be printed (and, thinking about how I just put that, those that couldn't be printed, as well!).

Also in this issue is a letter from Professor Sheila Whiteley (Salford University and IASPM) and some draft guidelines on copyright in relation to use in musicological contexts. If we can support this, and I am sure we should, the group intends to contact publishers with a view to obtaining their agreement. This is a vital area for all who write about music and an agreement with the publishers can only make our life that much easier.

This Newsletter also contains a summary report of previous committee minutes (including a digest of a meeting on June 17th whose minutes are not yet confirmed). Finally we conclude with brief biographies of Dr Katharine Ellis and Professor Roger Stowell, both new members of the committee.

RICHARD MCGREGOR
r.mcgregor@ucsm.ac.uk

LETTER

from

Professor Sheila Whiteley
on copyright issues

April 25th 2004-06-19

Dear Amanda

We are writing with reference to an issue that faces music scholars in all fields, namely how to provide the lyrical or musical quotes necessary for published academic analysis whether in article or in book form. The problem is that while publishers accept in general terms that quotation for scholarly purposes is regarded as fair dealing under British copyright law and therefore does not legally need permission from copyright holders, when it comes to musical or lyrical quotation they nonetheless routinely require authors to get permission from copyright holders for every quotation used, of whatever length. Moreover there is no consistency or economic logic in the responses of copyright holders, and the result is that preparing an article or manuscripts with music quotations is time consuming and often expensive. Publications are being held up or having to be rewritten with different examples, so that there are important issues of academic freedom being raised by publishers' policies here, even if inadvertently.

One possible solution to this problem would be for publishers to agree guidelines on quotation that, if followed, would mean that authors did not have to seek individual permissions for every quote used. Our model here is the guidance agreed by the editors and the publisher, Oxford University Press, for articles in the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*. In particular, the section headed 'It's in copyright, but do I need permission?' explains the legality of quoting brief extracts from books, articles, or musical works for purposes of review or criticism, provided that the source is acknowledged. In this the *JRMA* guidelines are comparable to the advice provided by the Society of Authors on fair use (which are, in turn, quoted in Routledge's guide for authors).

Our immediate purpose in writing this letter is to gather the formal support of all professional organisations in the field, and we would be

grateful if you would read through the attached *JRMA* guidelines and let us know whether you consider them to be equitable, fair and to the point, and if there are any changes that should be made to them. Once we are confident we have your support, we will contact all publishers of academic music books and journals in the UK and ask them to sign up to the RMA guidelines, and, if they feel they can't, to explain why so that we can take further legal advice.

Our next move, if publishers turn out to be unhappy with the guidelines, would be to seek funding to get a QC's expert opinion on the fair dealing clauses of the 1988 Copyright Act and their implications for scholarly work in our field. But we hope we won't

need to take this step. Consensus on acceptable and unacceptable use of material is something taken into account in copyright cases and just establishing that there is a consensus among scholars on this issue would therefore be a significant step in itself.

Your support is needed and we look forward to your early reply.

Prof. Sheila Whitely (Salford University and IASPM)

and pp

Prof. Nick Cook (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Prof. Derek Scott (Salford University)

Prof. Simon Frith (Stirling University)

COPYRIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSICOLOGISTS

The law governing copyright, especially as it refers to non-print media, is far from clear but the following guidance is offered in good faith; of necessity, these guidelines are not comprehensive, but rather a simplification of the law governing copyright. Furthermore, these guidelines are based on English Law only. You should always seek advice when in doubt.

In essence it is necessary to ensure that clearance is gained for the following:

- **reproduction and distribution in printed form of copyright textual or graphic material or music;**
- **reproduction in electronic form and dissemination on-line of copyright textual or graphic material or music;**
- **reproduction in electronic form and dissemination on-line of copyright sound material (eg a sound recording); and**
- **reproduction in electronic form and dissemination on-line of performances of music and/or words (eg a piano performance embodied in a sound recording).**

While the owner of the rights in a sound recording may also own or control the rights (eg of the performer) in the performance recorded, it would be wise to get confirmation of this from that owner when seeking a clearance, and to make it clear that a licence of both categories of rights is being requested.

Finally you must respect the author's moral rights. This means being careful to ensure that the author and source of any material used are identified sufficiently, and that no material used is subjected to any derogatory treatment.

Is it in copyright?

There is no restriction on the inclusion of non-copyright materials in either printed on-line publications, but be aware that there may be rights in performances of public domain works. Terms of copyright in literary, dramatic, artistic and musical works (whether published or not) depend both on when and where the work was first published, and on if and when the author has died and on the residence and nationality of the author. The rules are complicated, but the general rule is:

- **copyright expires seventy years after the end of the calendar year in which the author died;**
- **if a work was unpublished (and this term has a broad meaning including public performance and broadcasting) at the date of the author's death, then the period of copyright protection will be the longer of:**
 - a. **seventy years after the end of the calendar year in which the author died; or**
 - b. **fifty years after the end of the calendar year in** ▶

commentary at least provided the opportunity to say what is special about a particular submission although Barber felt that commentaries tended to be either totally generic or totally trivial. Banfield suggested that in order to create a level playing field perhaps a third party needed to write the commentary.

McDonald and Dr Geraldine Harris (Department of Theatre Studies, Lancaster University, also co-director of PALATINE) were invited to the conference in their capacity as members of the AHRB Performing Arts panel, in order to comment upon and contribute to the issues and debates surrounding the presentations given in the morning session. Harris made a strong case for couching written commentary in the language of practice. She described several shocking instances in Theatre Studies where practitioners had used what they *thought* was academic language because they were writing in a research context. Conversely, she also identified a set of people now defining themselves as practitioners but who do not have the professional credentials to do so.

McDonald referred to practice-led research, practice-based research, and introduced yet another variant: research-led practice. As far as the RAE is concerned, doubting the validity of 'research' as a term is a redundant question. Theatre studies took the pragmatic line of accepting the term rather than entering a debate over terminology. McDonald drew parallels between composers and playwrights, which, in her opinion, is not as difficult to deal with as the live nature of performance. She suggested that music could adopt a college of auditors so that if an item was to be submitted there would be at least one person to review it. Poole, however, was not comfortable with equating composers with playwrights as composers were often designing the components of musical language. He agreed there were some parallels in creating a text but that is also evident in the conditions of performance.

McDonald discussed the AHRB's accountability in terms of justifying its expenditure. When public money is involved a person's peers should be informed that the project is viable. Richard McGregor (St. Martin's University College, Lancaster) took issue with the word 'accountability' because it implies value judgement rather than value. In this context, Harris introduced the reality that innovation requires failure. By allowing artists to push boundaries research must be given the right to fail because this produces new knowledge in a way that success seldom does.

The last session of the day was devoted to summing

up the proceedings and making any further observations for the purpose of producing a position statement or subject guidelines. In particular, James Wishart (University of Liverpool) requested a more inclusive attitude towards performance as professional practice. The division between professional practice in performance, and research in performance, was still not clear, and the problems of the 2001 RAE were likely to recur if this was not resolved. A list of action points was made and the consensus towards practice-as-research will be published in the next Newsletter.

One of the achievements of the conference was the recognition that commentaries on practice outputs should:

- a) **provide a greater understanding of the context of the submitted artefact itself.**
- a) **remain optional in RAE 2008 where music is concerned.**
- a) **not necessarily be written by practitioners themselves but perhaps by a third party.**
- a) **possibly use the existing science model based on providing an account of an experiment. This could be done by taking a more relaxed approach to the text, writing straightforwardly, and focusing on personal practice rather than becoming artificially theoretical.**

Given the positive responses from AHRB panel members during the day, an important outcome was to try to encourage the AHRB to enter into a dialogue with the RAE regarding recommendations, especially regarding the definition of research and what it encapsulates. In the meantime NAMHE announced its own objective to keep up its dialogue with the AHRB and to formulate recommendations based on the conference, in consultation with its membership. More immediately, NAMHE members were being given the opportunity to nominate sub-panel members for RAE 2008.

Dr Amanda Bayley
University of Wolverhampton

AHRB as well as to the RAE, there was a risk of the distinction between the two becoming blurred. Cook reminded the conference that the RAE was a retrospective exercise, and Everist pointed out that the AHRB affects only 10% of the research community whereas the RAE affects everyone.

Dr Dai Griffiths (Oxford Brookes University) recommended more diversity in how activities are assessed: at the moment there is a preconception that local is bad but global is good. Cook equated this with intercontinental excellence compared with parish excellence and assured delegates that the AHRB panel is sensitive to the fact that for musicologists it might be easier to publish in the USA than in the UK but for composers the opposite is true.

Speaking on 'Composition as Research', Professor Roger Marsh represented the institution with the highest number of PhD students in composition in the country, the University of York. He reflected upon his own integration of scholarly and practical endeavour in order to provide a professional world to which students would aspire. He proposed that the word 'research' be replaced with 'Relevant Professional Output'. He criticised the AHRB for assessing the commentary on a composition, rather than valuing the composition in its own right, which implies that creative outputs cannot stand alone as research. This again highlighted the different approaches between the AHRB and the RAE. McDonald reminded everyone that the AHRB has insisted on commentary whereas the RAE has not, and the AHRB has not pronounced how the next RAE will work – this is the role of NAMHE and other professional bodies. Poole queried the force of the AHRB document if it is just one of recommendation to which McDonald replied that it would be considered by funding panels.

Contrary to Marsh, Professor Piers Hellawell (Queen's University, Belfast) thought it was dangerous to equate research in composition with research in musicology. The most compelling aspect of a composition might be nothing to do with research. Peter Nelson (University of Edinburgh) also viewed composition and research as separate activities. From his own experience he commented that the description of composition as research should be adapted to suit the funding body. In other words, the source of funding determines to what extent composition is viewed as research.

The issue of funding also arose from the presentation on 'Performance and Musicology' given by Dr Fiona

Palmer, professional double bass player and academic at Queen's University, Belfast. Her dual talents meant that she was uniquely placed to discuss a number of contentious issues between practice and research. She argued for greater interdisciplinarity in a research context, as well as in a teaching and learning context, in order to break down the perceived barriers between performance and academia. Performance should not be considered the poor relation to composition or musicology, especially as performance is a key part of the curriculum in attracting students. The decision to remain an academic as well as a professional performer had proved necessary if Palmer was to sustain both interests; it was impossible to include performing activities as part of a full-time job. Yet Banfield alerted the audience to the fact that as far as HEFCE was concerned Palmer is already being paid as a performer. To avoid such dilemmas Dr John Potter (University of York) insisted that there must be a more effective way of enabling performers to function *within* a department.

Professor Peter Hill (University of Sheffield) was just the person to comment on the problems facing specialist performers working in universities, though Banfield delivered Hill's paper *in absentia* on 'Performance as Research'. Reflecting on recent discussions with the AHRB, Hill asserted that it is inappropriate for performers to respond to research questions and there remains a problem to be solved in this respect. Performers perform – that is their life – whereas research is the natural medium for communicating ideas about music. Whilst Hill was becoming impatient with the current situation, which is not so much a question of value but of terminology, he felt compelled to continue to promote performance as a valuable and legitimate activity. His proposed way forward is to attract first-rate performers into universities and to reassure universities that their work will receive due recognition. One way in which research can count towards performance is through the contribution to knowledge and understanding of the repertoire played.

Cook identified a CD as assessable evidence of public output. Performance can be assessed from a recording, though assessing a live performance is more problematic. There are different roles in which performance can function but evidence from the inappropriate submissions in RAE 2001, commented upon in the overview report, suggested that not everyone knew where to draw the line between performance as research and performance as professional practice. An accompanying

which the work was first published (in the case of works first published before 1 August 1989) and fifty years from 1 January 1990 (in the case of works first published after 1 August 1989).

In the case of an unpublished document you will need to seek permission from the owner of the document as well as the owner of any copyright in the document.

A new copyright may exist in a new edition of an existing work. If the new edition contains material alterations which suffice to make the totality of the new edition an original work, then the new edition will be a new copyright work. This is so whether or not the existing edition is in the public domain. Copying the existing work will require no consent if it is in the public domain, but that copying must be done from the existing work and not from the new edition. If the existing work is still protected by copyright, then permission for use must be obtained from the rights owner. If the new edition is used and the old edition is still in copyright, permission must be obtained from the owner of the rights in the new edition and, if that owner does not also own the rights in the old edition, from the person who owns the rights in the old edition. Copyright on typography and music setting (engraving) lasts for 25 years from publication.

In the case of sound recordings, copyright in the recording generally lasts for fifty years from release. Release has a wide meaning and includes broadcast and public performance. That means that you do not need permission to reproduce clips from *original* recordings that were released over 50 years ago; reissues (for instance CD compilations of historical recordings) may however be protected by a new copyright. Rights of performers performing on sound recordings generally last for the same period as the copyright in the sound recording.

As you will gather from the above, a single publication will have multiple copyrights. For a musical score, these typically include the composer, the editor (if any), and the music setting; in the case of songs and operas the lyrics or libretto will be copyright, too. The publisher will normally handle all these rights. For a recording there will be a number of separate copyrights relating to the performance but they will usually all be handled by the record company, although it may sometimes be necessary to get separate permission from performers; you should check with the record company. Where the work itself is copyright, however, you will have to obtain permission for that separately. Material can be considered out of copyright only if *all* the relevant copyrights have expired.

It's in copyright, but do I need permission?

Make sure you do not apply for permission when you do not actually need it! There is one important circumstance under which permission is not required, and you should consider carefully whether it applies in your case.

Where copyright is in force, it is legal to quote brief extracts from books, articles, or musical works for purposes of review or criticism, provided that the source is acknowledged. In this context 'musical works' is believed to include scores, lyrics and recordings, and this provision is believed to extend to electronic as well as to print publication. However you must note the following:

- **'brief' is generally understood to mean no more than 5% of the work and, in any event, no more than is necessary for the criticism or review in question (note that individual items in collections, eg songs, count as works in their own right)**
- **you cannot include the materials just for illustration; the legality of the quotation depends on the presence of critical commentary on it or its use for critical commentary on another work. For instance it might only be legal to reproduce an extract from a recording if you were commenting on the performance or the work recorded. Note that the requirement for critical commentary applies to *each* relevant copyright.**

These provisions do not however apply to illustrations or figures in books, since each illustration or figure is treated as a separate copyright item. You will need to obtain permission to reproduce them from the publishers, or where they are credited to third parties from those third parties.

[Editor's note: it is always difficult to persuade colleagues to actually send in intimations of support for such as this: the NAMHE Committee will assume that you are all in support, unless we hear otherwise, but, comments and suggested clarifications would be very welcome. Please e-mail these to me at: r.mcgregor@ucsm.ac.uk]

Minutes of previous committee meetings

Meeting of the NAMHE Committee held on 17 September 2003 at the University of Birmingham

A significant part of the meeting focused on plans for the next Conference, as well as other member services, including the Newsletter and the Web site. Other business follows:

CURRENT ISSUES, CONSULTATIONS, CORRESPONDENCE

Review of Research Assessment: Report by Sir Gareth Roberts to the UK Funding Bodies

The Committee received a draft response prepared by the Research Sub-Committee, led by Professor Everist, together with feedback from the membership. The response was finalised and sent shortly after the meeting.

AHRB

The Committee heard that there had been three expressions of interest in the ring-fenced AHRB awards, but only one of these had been in touch with the Research Sub-Committee.

Theses Database

Following a request from a NAMHE member, a database of UK Music PhD Theses 1967-2001 has been compiled and is available on the NAMHE web site.

HEFCE

The Chair had been informed that HEFCE was not planning to set up standing committees for research in disciplines. It is likely that NAMHE, as the nearest equivalent to a standing committee, will be expected to provide guidelines for the RAE Music Panel, once established.

PALATINE

The Committee received a recent briefing paper from PALATINE, which was agreed to be very useful. Amongst other issues, it reported the forthcoming process whereby institutions would bid for Centres of Excellence; the process would involve the subject centres i.e. PALATINE for Music. Dr Mike Russ represents NAMHE on PALATINE and feedback on PALATINE activities may be directed to him.

Meeting of the NAMHE Committee held on 21 January 2004 at the University of Birmingham

Following the elections of autumn 2003, the new Committee assembled for the first time. The Committee agreed unanimously to invite Professor Banfield to continue as Chair during 2004. Continuing members of the Committee will retain their 2003 portfolios. Professor Smaczny will join the Pre-HE Sub-Committee on his return from study leave in September 2004 and Dr Ellis will lead on Infrastructure.

A significant proportion of the meeting was devoted to detailed planning of the 2004 Conference.

CURRENT ISSUES, CONSULTATIONS, CORRESPONDENCE

External Examiners Database

The Secretary reported that she had received responses from only 16 institutions. In order for the database to be effective, NAMHE members are strongly advised to respond.

AHRB

The Committee learned that five areas had been selected by AHRB for ring-fenced doctoral awards, with six awards to be made per year over the next three years.

HEFCE – Improving standards in postgraduate degree programmes

NAMHE's response to HEFCE had been quoted in the THES.

Popular Music Research & Copyright

The Committee agreed that guidelines on interpretation of copyright laws should be published on the web site; this issue is a possible topic for discussion at a future NAMHE Conference.

RMA

The Committee has proposed a joint meeting with PALATINE and the RMA to discuss a range of issues.

In the comments that followed, speaking from the floor, Dr Amanda Glauert (Royal Academy of Music) questioned performance speaking for itself because, within a professional context, she argued that performers always engage with issues *around* performance, such as programme notes, pre-concert talks, etc. This is a result of public expectation and nothing to do with the RAE. Russ questioned to what extent the issues around performance constitute research and to what extent they are regarded as professionalism. He acknowledged the difficulty in, yet importance of, identifying a boundary between them in order to avoid the danger of the scholarly programme note being submitted to the RAE.

Regarding the issue of context, Glauert made reference to an example that Dr Peter Johnson (Birmingham Conservatoire) had given of the Lindsay Quartet destroying their parts and starting their interpretation from scratch. In doing this they had made the choice to engage in a dialogue with research but were wearing different hats: one for commercial market audiences; another for RAE/AHRB research audiences. This example illustrated the clarity and sophistication required in defining contexts. Had the Lindsay Quartet been given time and resources to produce their outputs?

In his presentation on the RAE Professor Nicholas Cook compared music with other practice-based disciplines such as engineering, medicine and law which are not allowed to submit practical outputs, only journal papers describing them. He also compared the situation with continental Europe where, if people do research, they do so in their spare time. He identified the entrenched problem that lies between conditions of contract and conditions of employment. Regarding the value of written commentaries, Cook advised delegates that the AHRB has adopted a harder line than the RAE, the latter only inviting them when it seemed appropriate. Cook suggested that there needs to be some recognition of differences between different kinds of research outputs: it's not a question of text and practice but distinguishing between those that are self-documenting and those that aren't. Cook made reference to Professor Geoff Poole's helpful statement within his article on 'Composition as research':

If these questions are currently difficult to resolve in the RAE context, they have in a sense been resolved already in the PhD context by self-commentary. Peer review obtains in composition with remarkable agreement, no less than in

scholarship. In every area of the humanities there is room for divergent opinion, but less room to dispute whether something has been done with rigour and ability and to admire it accordingly.¹

Cook also endorsed the conundrum Poole identifies later in the same article, regarding the comparability of research questions and funding sources for musicology and composition: where the composition is popular enough to sustain a career *outside* university then it could be argued that funding sources come from elsewhere.

Cook pointed out that the RAE was no more than a funding mechanism designed with engineering, science and medicine in mind; it was never designed or intended for funding in the creative arts. He ended by quoting the salutary statement from Poole:

My last university's Department of Philosophy split itself down the middle, both sides of the schism refusing to acknowledge the value of the other. Who won? Silly question - it was closed down altogether.

From the floor, Professor John Whenham (University of Birmingham) took issue with the AHRB lumping all practical research together as though it was all one and the same. Whenham suggested that having to identify research questions before composing was very difficult, if not impossible, whereupon Banfield pointed out that identifying research questions in musicology is just as problematic. Poole extended the argument by identifying that the problem for composers is that they are not always happy with their outcomes, yet are still required to fulfil the criteria they have set themselves. In response to this point, and parallel concerns in musicology, Professor Mark Everist (University of Southampton) spoke on behalf of the AHRB, reassuring the conference that they are happy to engage in dialogue with funding recipients as their research progresses [this was also endorsed by Professor Jan McDonald (Department of Theatre, Film and Television Studies, University of Glasgow), another member of the AHRB Performing Arts panel]. In the case of composers, should they wish to change the composition or its scoring then this can be agreed and signed off. There is more room for manoeuvre than the AHRB cares to disclose.

With many questions and concerns relating to the

¹ www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine/namhe/geoff.doc p.3.

represented on the 2001 RAE panel, NAMHE is firmly committed to making recommendations to the next RAE panel in response to an invitation from the government.

Banfield opened up the debate by suggesting various ways of addressing the problem, including the possibility that members might choose to resist the term 'research' altogether and demand third stream funding for composition and performance in HE institutions, though the question would remain as to who would fund these activities. However, he acknowledged that Professor Nicholas Cook (Royal Holloway, University of London) had already strongly advised against this possibility in his report of the last RAE. Banfield suggested that another alternative might be to 'play the game' of research questions relating to *all* creative work. One misgiving about this idea is that although it is the artefact that is being assessed it may not strictly speaking be the result of a research activity. Another misgiving is that very little performance would come under this remit and there would be a tendency to descend into absurdity. Banfield questioned whether explanation killed creativity and briefly concluded that composers, performers and musicologists must keep talking to each other; the disciplines must remain symbiotic. He directed the audience towards recent public statements by Professor Martin Butler (University of Sussex) and Professor Geoff Poole (University of Bristol) which were made available to NAMHE members prior to the conference as a way of initiating these debates, and to which reference was made throughout the conference.

As coordinator of the working party report on *Practice as Research*, Darla Crispin (Royal College of Music) represented the work it has been doing over the last nine months and distributed a discussion document compiled in the wake of consultations from various funding bodies:

The Joint Funding Bodies' Review of Research Assessment (the 'Roberts Report'): HEFCE

'Improving standards in postgraduate research degrees': HEFCE

'Research in the Creative and Performing Arts': AHRB

Initial decisions by the UK funding bodies' on the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise': HEFCE

'Centres of Excellence in Teaching and Learning': HEFCE

Much of the feedback for this report has concerned how specific responses concerning practice-as-research might be made to the funding bodies. Actions arising, for consideration at the conference, included:

- **The 'written/verbal component' of research assessment**
- **The constitution of the RAE 2008 panels**
- **Approaches to assessment laid out in the RAE consultation exercises. Self-assessment processes to be discussed in relation to practice-as-research**
- **Mapping ideas about excellence in practice-as-research onto the new structure of four starred levels of excellence for RAE 2008**
- **The effect of the consistent need to apply for research funding on members of the community in terms of the nature of their employment.**
- **Making a convincingly strong case for practice-as-research to the funding bodies by addressing the different needs of researchers in performance, composition and musicology.**

The first of these points, how to balance the document *about* creative process with the process itself, attracted a great deal of debate throughout the day. Representatives of the AHRB subject panel affirmed that the point about supporting texts was not to assess them in their own right but to gain a greater understanding of the context of the submitted artefact itself.

Within the session on 'Internal issues: statements and general debate', Dr Mike Russ talked about 'Implications for the curriculum' in relation to his own institution, the University of Huddersfield where, out of 12 research-active staff, only 2 pursue practice-as-research and 5 are composers. Undergraduate modules in 'Studies in Performance' or 'Studies in Composition' encourage students to act as thinking practitioners where they keep learning journals and reflect upon practical projects carried out in the community. Russ questioned what constitutes practice and how practice sits within a larger context, suggesting that some instrumental teachers would fit the term 'practice-as-research' whilst others would not. His examples ranged from choral training to the psychology of ensemble performance. He urged that purely musical communication must be prioritized above any reflective commentary that might accompany it. He also commented on the somewhat blurred distinction between research-led practitioners, practice-based research and professional practitioners.

PALATINE

The Committee noted that PALATINE had been running an interesting range of workshops but that these had not been well attended. It was suggested that NAMHE might run a joint annual conference with PALATINE, which would include one of their workshops and that it might be worth PALATINE repeating their workshops at a range of venues. The Chair was going to discuss these suggestions with them

A meeting of the committee was held on March 3rd, but as this was purely for Conference planning no formal minutes were taken.

Digest of the NAMHE Committee meeting held on 10 June 2004 at the University of Birmingham

There were two principal agenda items at this meeting: the preparation of a Position Paper on Practice as Research, following the May Conference and nominations from NAMHE for the RAE 2008 Music Panel.

The draft Position Paper arising out of the Conference, prepared by Dr Nick Fells, was tabled. The Committee expressed its delight that the Conference had been so well attended and that it had managed to achieve some consensus on this issue. The Position Paper was discussed at length and Professor Mark Everist agreed to finalise it and circulate it to the membership for comment. It will be made clear that the document will be a position paper of interest to various groups, rather than a response to another document.

Nominations for the RAE Panel were also discussed at length. The Committee agreed to a suggestion from the University of Lancaster to nominate double the number of the expected final panel. It was decided that the final nominations should cover the following specialist areas: Ethnomusicology, Performance, Composition, Electro-acoustic Composition, Music Technology, Psychology of Music, Popular Music, Historical Musicology, Theory/Analysis and Multimedia Composition. A provisional list of nominees was agreed upon; this will be refined over the summer and submitted to HEFCE in September.

Other issues discussed included:

1. a review of the current situation of the Music Department at Reading; and
2. requests from members for statistics, mailing lists and advertising web space. NAMHE's web space is provided free of charge by PALATINE and therefore we are not in a position to sell advertising space. The other requests are being considered in the light of Data Protection and resourcing issues.

Review of the NAMHE Annual Conference

4 May 2004
Oxford Brookes University

Practice as Research: Towards Consensus

This year the conference attracted a large number of delegates from all areas of the discipline. Nine guest speakers addressed the main conference question: *When (and how) can (and should) practice and research be made to coincide in the British higher education music system?*

Chair of the NAMHE Executive Committee, Professor Stephen Banfield (University of Bristol), set the tone of the conference by identifying the fact that NAMHE is uniquely placed in representing the entire subject area. He took issue with a recent statement made by Alan E. Williams in an article on 'Composers and the RAE' published in *New Notes* (Society for the Promotion of New Music, March 2004): research does *not* represent Musicology alone. If anything, composition and musicology are more integrated compared with performance, which tends to be treated separately because so much of it takes place in specialist Conservatoires. Banfield discussed the AHRB in the context of the RAE, providing figures that show how the AHRB research leave scheme, for example, favours musicology above composition and performance. As a consequence of performance faring badly in RAE 2001, and composers being under-