

and many works in the live electronic medium. The core of his output, however, is ensemble music, which issued from a number of long-term collaborations: for example with the Ensemble 20jh of Vienna, with the London Sinfonietta, the Nash Ensemble, the Scottish Chamber Orchestra and the City of London Sinfonia. Larger orchestral pieces include *Sinfonia 1* for the BBC Symphony Orchestra and for the Philharmonia Orchestra *The Sun of Venice*. He is currently part-time Reid Professor at the University of Edinburgh, and adviser to the charity War Child, responsible for the implementation of a humanitarian aid programme in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

**John Rink** is Professor of Music at Royal Holloway, University of London. He studied at Princeton University, King's College London, and the University of Cambridge, where his doctoral research was on the evolution of tonal structure in Chopin's early music and its relation to improvisation. He specialises in the fields of performance studies, theory and analysis, and nineteenth-century studies, and has produced two edited books for Cambridge University Press: *Chopin Studies 2* (1994; with Jim Samson) and *The Practice of Performance: Studies in Musical Interpretation* (1995). He has also published a Cambridge Music Handbook entitled *Chopin: The Piano Concertos* (1997), which draws upon his experience in performing these works. He is currently preparing another book on performance studies for Cambridge University Press, which will publish his edited volume *Musical Performance: A Guide to Understanding* in 2002. John Rink is President of the Society for Music Analysis, and he sits on the editorial boards of *Music Analysis*, *Music & Letters*, and *Musicae Scientiae*. He is Project Director and one of three Series Editors of *The Complete Chopin – A New Critical Edition*, and he is also Director of a major research project funded by The Leverhulme Trust which will culminate in an *Annotated Catalogue of Chopin's First Editions* (CUP, forthcoming 2004) prepared in conjunction with Christophe Grabowski.

**Michael Russ** is Head of Media and Performing Arts at the University of Ulster. As well as his responsibilities for Media Studies and Drama he is Subject Leader and Research Unit Coordinator for Music. He has published on late Romantic and twentieth-century music and on music analysis. He has taken a strong interest in learning and teaching matters, assuming a leading role in Ulster's FDTL project 'Peer Learning in Music' and in other

institutional projects and has also been closely connected with CTI and PALATINE. He has taught music from pre-degree to PhD and has wide examining experience. He was given a Distinguished Teaching Award by the University of Ulster in 1996 and won a Westrup Prize for musicology in 1994.

**Bruce Wood** is Senior Lecturer in Music at the University of Wales, Bangor. His main research interests centre on English music in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, especially Purcell and Blow, and in the 20<sup>th</sup> (especially Elgar and Walton); he is involved in editorial work on all four of these composers, and he is Hon. Secretary of the Purcell Society Committee. His brief as a NAMHE committee member includes library and copyright issues.

**Amanda Bayley** has agreed to be co-opted for this current year. Her biography will appear in the next newsletter, as will details of the responsibilities of the various committee members, which are currently being reviewed.

**Richard McGregor**  
Newsletter Editor

## NAMHE MEMBERSHIP

Members of NAMHE are reminded that it is the responsibility of institutions to keep the Secretary, John Irving (J.Irving@bris.ac.uk) informed of any changes to departmental contacts (to whom annual subscriptions will be sent). In view of the recent changes to membership of the NAMHE Committee, and in particular change of Officers, the Secretary requests that ALL existing members of NAMHE confirm current contact details for their institutions as soon as possible and certainly before the Annual Conference at the Royal College of Music on Tuesday 7 May 2002.

Welcome to this first Newsletter of 2002. In it you will find a copy of Professor Nicholas Cook's RAE report, a report from Professor John Rink on a recent AHRB Research Strategy Seminar and a short article by Dr Michael Russ on the future of subject review. There is also a brief introduction to this year's conference (details are attached separately), and biographies of the current NAMHE committee.

### UoA 67: Overview Report by Professor Nicholas Cook, Research Professor, University of Southampton, Chair of RAE Music Panel

1. A total of 59 institutions returned 487.3 FTE category A/A\* researchers (631 individuals) to the 2001 RAE under UoA 67, as against 57 institutions returning 422.4 category A researchers in 1996. In addition, 41 category C researchers were returned.
2. While some submissions focussed strongly on one particular area, the majority covered a wide range of musicological sub-disciplines and/or practice-based research, reflecting the breadth of profile typical of academic departments in this field. The two most widely represented categories of output were composition and scholarly writing, for both of which there was at least one submission from the overwhelming majority of institutions. The third broad category of submission, performance, was represented more unevenly, with some institutions (mainly but not only the conservatories) making large numbers of performance submissions, while others made none.
3. Within these three broad categories, the following patterns were discernible.
  - Scholarly writing included submissions across a considerable diversity of approaches, including historical/cultural musicology, ethnomusicology, theory and analysis, psychology of music, music therapy, acoustics, and computer applications; historical/cultural musicology was the most widely represented, with a primary but by no means exclusive focus on music of the 'art' tradition. The other sub-categories were represented less consistently, with some institutions concentrating in fields (such as ethnomusicology or psychology of music) that were not found at all in the majority of submitting institutions.
  - Composition included both vocal/instrumental and electro-acoustic submissions (with a predominance of the former); there was a small representation of work in popular idioms, film music, other forms of commercial music, and mixed media.
4. The panel consisted of eleven researchers selected, following consultation, for their expertise across a range of musical sub-disciplines; four had served on the 1996 Panel. It was assisted in its work by specialist advice in the areas of music education (2 advisors), organology (2), electroacoustic music and technology (1), performance (1), commercial music (1), and music therapy (1). Individual submissions were cross-referred to the panels 29 (Electric and Electronic Engineering), 48 (European Studies), and 66 (Dance, Drama and Performing Arts). In line with practice across the 2001 RAE, advice was also solicited from a total of five non-UK based experts located in the US (3) and continental Europe (2); these individuals were again selected on the basis of disciplinary representation as well as individual eminence.
5. Evaluation of individual and departmental submissions proceeded in conformity with the panel's published criteria. The total number of departments assessed at an international (5/5\*) level remained the same at 21 (which means that the proportion fell slightly, from 36.8% in 1996 to 35.6% in 2001), with the proportion of FTE researchers in these departments falling from 49.4% of the total in 1996 to 42.6% in 2001. Within this band, however, there was a significant increase in the proportion of departments rated at the highest international (5\*) level, from 6 (10.5%) to 9 (15.3%); as a result, the number of research active staff now working in 5 and 5\* departments is almost identical (in each case 21.3%). At the other end of the scale there was a general upward movement. 5 departments (8.5% of the total) were rated 1-2, as against 8 (14%) in 1996; their submissions did not always provide evidence of an

- adequate appreciation of the RAE definition of research.
6. Departments were rated at international level in three out of the four national regions, and individual work of international quality was noted in all of them. Work was assessed at international level in all principal areas of the discipline, encompassing composition of all types (including commercial), performance, historical and critical musicology, ethnomusicology, theory and analysis, popular music studies, organology, and music psychology.
  7. In a significant number of institutions the panel identified work which was of a much higher standard than indicated by the overall rating awarded to the department. Virtually all such instances reflected the work of single individuals, who were eligible for flagging only when they were not part of a lower-rated research group in their institution. Given that the practice of flagging would therefore be inconsistent, the panel chose not to engage in it, but instead identified all eligible cases (possible only in departments rated at 4 or below) in the institutional feedback.
  8. Practice-based research contributed fully to the ratings achieved by those departments that submitted it, with the proportion of researchers assessed at the highest level of international distinction being comparable to those in other areas of activity. There was a significant increase in the number of practice-based researchers returned as against 1996 (the conservatory sector, the research activity of which is predominantly practice-based, returned 180 researchers as against 108 in 1996, including 34 returned by one institution entering the RAE for the first time). While the principles governing the assessment of performance remained substantially the same as in 1996, they were spelt out in considerably more detail in the 2001 Criteria, which benefited from the input of panellists with specific expertise in this area; in line with other panels assessing practice-based research, a distinction was drawn between professional practice *per se* and practice as research. A significant proportion of submitted outputs were considered to fall primarily or wholly within the former category and assessed accordingly.
  9. Among those institutions which responded to the invitation to supply further details of the research embodied in practice-based outputs, the most helpful statements tended to be those which specified aims and objectives, research methods, and significance. Not all institutions responded to this invitation, however, and a substantial proportion of the details that were supplied did not address the issues specified in the Criteria (paragraph 3.58.8). The panel viewed the statements as no more than aids to assessment and thus attempted to make a fair assessment of

- submitted work regardless of the presence or absence of statements. This position is rather different from that of other UoAs in which documentation of the research process is seen as an integral element of practice-based research, and the panel considers that it will be helpful for all concerned if there is further debate on the nature and assessment of practice-based research in advance of any future RAE.
10. The panel was most impressed by textual commentaries that linked inputs to outputs, and placed both within a coherent strategic context. Information on research funding provided in RA4, for example, became much more meaningful when specifically linked to the outputs that had resulted (or were expected to result); in the same way, information regarding postgraduate student performance and funding provided in RA3 became more meaningful when linked to discussion in RA5 of the role played by postgraduate studies within the overall departmental research strategy. In general, as suggested by paragraph 3.58.19 of the Criteria, textual commentaries which provided well-defined objectives and plans were considered more impressive than those which provided vague statements of intent, or which described institutional structures and strategies without clearly linking them to specific departmental achievements.
  11. There was wide variation of practice in the submission of category C researchers, the quality of whose outputs was often assessed as lower than that of the department with which they were associated. Rarely was sufficient information provided on the contribution of such researchers to the departmental research culture to enable the panel to view their inclusion as a positive feature.

**AHRB Research Strategy Seminar,  
18 January 2002**

Report by Professor John Rink

**What is research in the creative and performing arts?**

An AHRB Research Strategy Seminar entitled 'What is research in the creative and performing arts?' was held at the British Academy in London on Friday 18 January from 10 am to 4 pm. Attended by some 90 delegates, the day consisted of presentations by Professor David Eastwood (Chief Executive, AHRB), Dr Michael Jubb (Director of Policy and Programmes,

*Continued overleaf*

On a related issue, members may have wondered what has happened to the NAMHE webpage and discussion list. We are grateful to PALATINE who have taken over the administration of both of these and they can be accessed at the following address:  
www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine.

**The NAMHE COMMITTEE 2002**

Three members of the NAMHE committee came to the end of their period in office in December. We want to thank Hilary Bracefield for the dedication and commitment she showed to all the work of the Committee, and also to thank her for her willingness to undertake many jobs on behalf of the membership. We wish her all the very best in her retirement. David Kimball served as the Treasurer for NAMHE for a number of years and was always very thoughtful and perceptive in his work for the committee and on behalf of the membership. We are very grateful to David for all his efforts and for his willingness to serve as Treasurer. The final member of the NAMHE committee standing down was the Chair, Graham Barber. There is no question that Graham served the membership with dedication and commitment, but that hardly does justice to his abilities and achievements. His insight, thoughtfulness, inventiveness, concern and energy were evident in everything he did, and he gave unstintingly of his time and effort to the various tasks connected with the association. The recognition currently awarded to the work of NAMHE is due in no small part to Graham's careful chairmanship. I am sure the membership-at-large would want to give him the most sincere thanks, and to wish him well in subsequent ventures.

**CURRENT MEMBERSHIP**

**Stephen Banfield** is Elgar Professor of Music at the University of Birmingham, having also been Head of the Department of Music and School of Performance Studies there at various periods in the 1990s. Before that he was Lecturer, then Senior Lecturer, at Keele University. He studied at Cambridge, Oxford and Harvard Universities. He is the author of *Sensibility and English Song* (1985), *Sondheim's Broadway Musicals* (1993) and *Gerald Finzi* (1997), and editor of the 20th-century volume of *The Blackwell History of Music in Britain* (1995). He is currently on AHRB research leave writing a book on Jerome Kern for a new series, *Yale Broadway Masters*, on whose advisory board he sits. Future projects include an edition of

*Love Life* for the Kurt Weill Edition and possibly a history of music in the British Empire. He is on the editorial committee of *Musica Britannica* and the publications committee of the RMA, and is a trustee of the Tallis Scholars.

**Amanda Glauert** read music at Clare College, Cambridge, and began her doctoral research on post-Wagnerian music under Robin Holloway. Her first lecturing job was at Trinity College, Dublin, followed by an eleven-year period at Colchester Institute. Since 1994 she has been teaching at the Royal Academy of Music, where she is now Head of Postgraduate Programmes and Research. Her own research centres on the German Lied and she is currently writing a book on Beethoven song. Apart from acting as a committee member of NAMHE, Amanda has served on the subject Benchmarking group for music.

**John Irving** is Senior Lecturer in Music at the University of Bristol. He has been a member of the NAMHE committee since 2000, and Secretary since January 2001. His research and teaching interests focus on Mozart's instrumental music and music of the English renaissance, on both of which areas he has published widely.

**Richard McGregor** is Principal Lecturer in Music at St Martin's College Lancaster where he was also for some years Head of Performing Arts. He studied at Glasgow and Liverpool Universities and for a short time at the Accademia Chigiana di Siena. He has for some years been engaged in the study of the Maxwell Davies sketches and has published in *Tempo*, in *Perspectives of New Music* [on the interpretation of Maxwell Davies's devised hieroglyphic alphabet], and has edited the most recent volume devoted to studies of the composer's music. He is currently working on the sketches and music of Wolfgang Rihm and Sofia Gubaidulina at the Paul Sacher Institute in Basle, with two articles current in preparation. Aside from this, in August and September he usually finds some time to add to a small *corpus* of chamber and choral works. He has served NAMHE in the past as a co-opted member and most recently was a member of the Benchmarking Group.

**Nigel Osborne** studied composition at Oxford with Egon Wellesz and Kenneth Leighton, and in Warsaw with Witold Rudzinski. While in Poland, he co-founded one of the first live-electronic performing groups in Eastern Europe, and worked at the Polish Radio Experimental Studio, the beginning of a special relationship with electroacoustic music which continued with residencies at IRCAM in the 1980s

*Continued overleaf*

institutional audits and what information HEIs should be required to publish, given the overall desire to provide information to stakeholders that is consistent and reliable. Responses are still being considered. The following points give a flavour of the document, but final decisions have yet to be made.

The emphasis is on using information readily available in institutions (e.g. information on admission, progression and completion, and strategies for quality control and enhancement). Where the document becomes interesting is in the recommendations on what information should be published. Performance indicators such as data on entry qualifications, progression, completion, classes of degree and first destination statistics, are a fairly obvious choice; but it is also suggested that HEIs publish summaries of external examiners' reports and possibly their reactions to them. Furthermore, HEIs may be required to publish the results of student satisfaction surveys, particularly the views of recent graduates. The HEFCE working group is also considering a proposal for a national student satisfaction survey (possibly managed by an external polling agency such as MORI), the results of which would be published annually.

Each HEI will be required to develop and publish their rolling institutional strategy for teaching and learning, which will be published to dovetail with the institutional review. Along with programme specifications, summaries of annual programme monitoring and major programme reviews, will be published (though avoiding excessive programme-specific detail is recognised as being problematic). Strategies and programme specifications will also need to report the views of employers on courses. Each HEI will need to demonstrate that it has an effective mechanism for determining the needs of the workplace and soliciting the opinions of employers.

In Scotland there is a similar desire to move to institutional audit and SHEFC have been watching the English developments closely. However, while they are keen that there should be a high degree of commonality across the UK, there are aspects of the English model that they don't like. 'Drilling down' to subject level is not part of the Scottish model, and there is a wish to give greater prominence to subject enhancement. The publication of external examiners' reports or summaries of them is not to take place. A subject review process based on the current system will be retained for use where an institution has an insufficient track record, or where there are serious concerns about quality in particular areas of provision. Wales and Northern Ireland have yet to decide on the way forward, but the likelihood is that they will adopt some hybrid of the English and Scottish models. What are the implications for our subject? Paperwork trails need to be good and policies on everything you

can think of need to be in place, known to students, and shown to be implemented. Being able to demonstrate active and thoughtful participation in peer observation and in annual and periodic reviews will be crucial. We will need to think about where music courses are likely to show up badly in institutional statistics (for many of us range of socio-economic groups participating and access may well be issues that raise eyebrows). Student views will become increasingly important, and while it is not always proper and appropriate to act on them, we will need to show that they have been properly considered. It may also be wise to think deeply about who employs our graduates and how we can identify more closely with their needs and opinions.

With thanks to Janet Alleyne of the Quality Management and Enhancement Department at the University of Ulster.

## NAMHE Annual Conference 2002

This year's conference will be held on Tuesday May 7th in the Royal College of Music, Prince Consort Road, London. With this Newsletter you should find a copy of the invitation programme and booking form for the day. We begin at 10.10 with a short AGM of 30 minutes' duration as has been the custom in recent years. Thereafter we share sessions with LiTMus and PALATINE, with a particular emphasis on ILT and LiTMus Online. Colleagues will be particularly interested to note that Professor Nicholas Cook, Chair of the Music RAE Panel, has accepted our invitation to be a keynote speaker on the recent RAE, and his report which is printed in this Newsletter will no doubt generate much discussion. We are grateful to Nick for rearranging his commitments to be available for us on this occasion.

Member departments of NAMHE may send up to two colleagues free of charge, with a charge of £10 for each additional member, while non-member departments are invited either (preferably) to join NAMHE or to send colleagues at a cost of £20 each. Coffee, tea and a buffet lunch will be provided for all delegates. Bookings should be returned to John Irving, Department of Music, The University of Bristol, Victoria Rooms, Queen's Road, Clifton, BRISTOL BS8 1SA by 15 April.

*Continued overleaf*

AHRB), Professor Sir Christopher Frayling (Rector, Royal College of Art), Dr Janet Ritterman (Principal, Royal College of Music), Professor Janet Lansdale (Head, School of Performing Arts, University of Surrey) and Dr David Durling (Director, Advanced Research Institute, School of Art and Design, Staffordshire University). These were followed by questions and discussion, and then, after lunch, small-group consideration of four important themes, which were meant to be addressed across the span of visual arts, design, performing arts, music and creative writing. The aim was to determine whether commonality could be achieved across the different domains in answering these questions:

- In what sense can research in the practice-based and creative arts be developed as the research base for the creative and cultural industries?
- What is a research question in the creative and performing arts?
- Is it possible to distinguish between research and practice?
- How do we develop research environments in the creative and performing arts, and the infrastructure to support them?

Key points for each discussion were articulated by nominated rapporteurs in a final plenary session. Some of the themes emerging in the discussion of research environments and corresponding infrastructures focused on educational and staff-related issues, redefinition of university research/practice environments while preserving established and flourishing cultures, and procedures for preparing applications for research funding.

Janet Ritterman's paper in the morning raised especially relevant points concerning the question 'What is research in Music?', focusing in particular on the possible ways in which research, practice-based research and practice might be distinguished. Questioning whether common definitions could be found across all the relevant disciplines, she traced musicology's 'journey' and encouraged fresh re-evaluation of music as a discipline and of the way in which we think about music, with the hope that 'music as performance' could become a more established or prevalent conceptual paradigm. The goal, she said, was not 'either/or' but 'both/and'.

On the whole, the mood at the seminar was positive, as was the AHRB's approach to the topic in general, but more applications were encouraged for both research grants (of all sizes – not just for very large sums) and especially for studentships in the creative and performing arts. Competition D's Music application rate in the latter is disappointingly low, and unless that increases, the implications for throughput to research grants are less sanguine than they might be.

## Subject Review: The Future by Dr Michael Russ

Teaching quality in music was last put under scrutiny in the 1994-5 Teaching Quality Assessment. I'm sure all of us are aware that subject-by-subject examination of Higher Education provision across the land is not likely to happen again, if for no other reason than cost. But what will take its place? The short answer is that the focus is likely to shift towards institutional audit and the publication of performance indicators. What complicates the issue is that the mechanisms are likely to take different forms in each constituent country of the United Kingdom. Furthermore, HEFCE will wish to gain ministerial support for their proposals and there are some alarmist rumours that Margaret Hodge may not be happy with the lightness of touch proposed, and may go for an inspectorate-type system.

HEFCE has published some important consultation papers on quality assurance over the last few months. The key documents are 01/45 (July 2001) and 01/66 (November 2001). 01/45 establishes the primacy of internal quality arrangements 'the presumption is that every HEI approves, monitors and reviews its quality and standards through internal procedures. The external element then 'audits' on a highly selective basis, the robustness and effectiveness of that internal framework'. What is then at issue is the intensity of the audit. In the English proposals, there is a strong advocacy of the need to 'drill down' to the point of delivery in some subject areas so as to test the validity and reliability of the audit. So provision would remain for a more detailed review of a small number of 'subject areas or themes' within an institution and this could involve peer review. Up to 10% of any HEIs provision (defined in terms of student numbers) could be subjected to this more detailed scrutiny. However, there is also the desire to exert 'lightness of touch'. So where success is clearly evident, external review is likely to be less intense.

It is intended that the new system will be implemented over a 3-year period beginning in 2002/3. Thereafter the cycle of audits will be spread over 5 years. If an institution has recently been the subject of a continuation audit, then it is likely that the new audit will not take place for a couple of years. However, if your institution is in that position, and you were self-assessed as satisfactory under the old system without a visit taking place, there is a chance you will be given a subject review under the transitional arrangements proposed for 2002/3.

01/66 seeks opinion on what information on quality and standards of teaching should be available for the

*Continued overleaf*