

September 2002. She is active as a solo performer and accompanist in the United Kingdom, Continental Europe and Canada, has done radio work for the NCRV Netherlands World Service, specialising in musical modernity in both her performance work and music scholarship. She is the principal pianist for the Amsterdam-based Schreck Ensemble's Luigi Nono retrospective, 'Ascolta', and is completing a Doctoral Degree in Historical Musicology at King's College, University of London, under the supervision of Professor John Deathridge. This study involves a re-evaluation of Arnold Schoenberg's string quartets.

Mark Everist

Mark Everist's research focuses on the music of western Europe in the period 1150-1330, French opera in the first half of the nineteenth century, Mozart, reception theory, and historiography. He is the author of *Polyphonic Music in Thirteenth-Century France* (1989), *French Motets in the Thirteenth Century* (1994) and *Music Drama at the Paris Odéon, 1824-1828* (2002), as well as editor of volumes of the *Magnus Liber Organi* for Editions de l'Oiseau-Lyre (2001-2003). He was editor of the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* from 1990 to 1994 and is currently the editor of its monographs series. A member of the Arts and Humanities Research Board's Advanced Research Panel 7 (Music and Performing Arts), he is an institutional auditor for the Higher Education Council for England

Nick Fells

Nick Fells is a composer at the University of Glasgow. He works mainly in electroacoustic media, and is principally interested in using interactive technologies to extend and enhance performance possibilities. In 1997 he obtained a DPhil in Composition from the University of York, and he now teaches composition and music technology at Glasgow. He is also active in the music and disability field, particularly using technology to facilitate music-making for disabled people.

NAMHE MEMBERSHIP

Members of NAMHE are reminded that it is the responsibility of the institution to keep the Secretary, Amanda Bayley (A.Bayley@wlv.ac.uk), informed of any changes to departmental contacts (to whom annual subscription requests will be sent). In view of 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 AGM and Annual Conference at the University of Leeds on Tuesday May 13th. If there are any outstanding subscriptions would representatives please ensure that arrangements for payment of these have been made.

NAMHE COMMITTEE PORTFOLIOS 2003
(for information)

Executive

Chair (Stephen Banfield)

- Responsible for directing the business of the committee
- Responsible for the overall direction of the annual conference
- Official representative of the Association to external agencies as appropriate, in collaboration with the Secretary

Secretary (Amanda Bayley)

- Administrator for the Association: constitution, elections, communications with membership (periodic information gathering/disseminating from/to members), committee management
- Representative of the Association to external agencies as appropriate, collaboration with the Chair
- Maintenance of the External Examiner List
- Preparation of delegate materials for the annual conference

Treasurer and Membership Secretary (Mike Russ)

- Membership subscriptions, payments, financial accounts
- Membership database annual update

Committee Members' Portfolios

- Research Assessment Exercise (Stephen Banfield, Darla Crispin)
- Arts and Humanities Research Board (Mark Everist, John Rink)
- Quality Assurance Agency for HE/Learning and Teaching (John Rink, Mike Russ)
- Learning and Teaching Strategies: ILT (John Rink), TLSN (Mike Russ), PALATINE (Mike Russ)
- Pre-HE (QCA, A Level, NMEF) (Nick Fells, Mike Russ, Bruce Wood)
- Information Services, including British Library (Bruce Wood)
- Newsletter (Richard McGregor, Stephen Banfield)
- Copyright (Bruce Wood)

Regional

- DENI (tbc)
- HEFCW (Bruce Wood)
- SHEFC (Nick Fells)

Representatives to other organizations:
SCUDD (Stephen Banfield), UK Council for Graduate Education (Chair), RMA (Darla Crispin), ISM (Amanda Bayley)

EDITORIAL

RICHARD MCGREGOR

Our first Newsletter of 2003 has a number of items which we are sure will be of interest to members. Mark Everist reports on recent deliberations and statistics from AHRB, and we print the full text of the letter written to Vanessa Conte of HEFCE by the NAMHE Chairman, Professor Stephen Banfield in consultation with the Committee, concerning the RAE review. This is followed by correspondence between Professor Nick Cook and Stephen Banfield on aspects of the letter, and since these are germane to discussions of the RAE, the Committee felt that you would like to read them. We are very grateful to Prof. Cook for being so willing to have the correspondence published.

Most colleagues will be aware that NAMHE has a website, now hosted by PALATINE at Lancaster. The Committee has been reviewing this with a view to updating it in the near future. It would really help us to do this if members would take a look at what is currently there and make suggestions as to possible developments. We won't hold you to translating these into actions! Please do have a look at www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine/namhe/ and let us have your ideas.

As I write this it is good to hear that the views of musicians have actually been sought regarding the Government White Paper on 'The Licensing of Music in England and Wales' but so far only performances in churches have been exempted. No doubt you are all familiar with the issues at stake here and have been making your opinions known to local MPs and ministers. If the issue continues to be live when you read this and you haven't done so, please consider writing to your local MP, and, if you haven't already, consider signing the online petition at: www.PetitionOnline.com/2inabar

RAE LETTERS

Letter sent to HEFCE by Stephen Banfield on behalf of the membership

27 November 2002

Vanessa Conte, HEFCE

Dear Ms Conte,

RAE Review: Invitation to contribute

I am responding to this invitation as representative of an interested party, namely music as a discipline in higher education in the UK. I write as Chair of NAMHE, the National Association for Music in Higher Education.

NAMHE has not been able to meet since the invitation was issued and it became clear that a subject response was advisable. But the invitation document has been circulated to the representatives of all 63 music departments that are members and we have received responses from 16 of them, including the 9 represented by the committee, which has debated the issues electronically. More would have been forthcoming were time not so short. I should perhaps add that not all institutions were encouraging or even permitting their departments to receive and debate HEFCE's invitation, which seemed strange if not wrong to us; all the more reason, we felt, to respond ourselves.

Predictably and sadly, departments that did well in RAE 2001 are broadly happy with the current system and wish to finesse it in certain ways while those with modest or disappointing results want wider-ranging change. This tells us what we already knew from the label 'research inactive': that the RAE has proved petty and divisive, the safeguarding of one's own department— even of one's own individual work— ranking higher in colleagues' thoughts than admiration for or sympathy with another's. This is not what the community of scholarship should be about and is highly regrettable. Add to that the frustrations of reward not following achievement, both because one's own institution has in many cases chosen not to pass the money down and because, as we now learn, commensurate funding is no longer going to follow from the Treasury in any case, and scepticism turning into cynicism becomes rife, as many comments have made clear. In short, if previous RAEs were

taskmasters, RAE 2001 has become a bogey, precisely because with funding and system (therefore grades) currently frozen we cannot simply walk away from it: it would be locking the stable door after the horse has bolted. If this is a strategic ploy, intended to snap historical gradings into place (there is after all a section on this as a possible way forward in the document) without further pump-priming for change, it will prove bitter medicine to many. Fixing a gulf between the haves and the have-nots, as also between centres of excellence and isolated individuals, will be disastrous not just to the collegiality of our subject and our system but to the career structure of the profession. In North America, so often looked to for false comparisons, private funding and tenure systems, not to mention the sheer size of the market, enable a far broader and varied fit between profile and opportunity. Such conditions do not pertain here, especially in a relatively small subject such as music.

The positive aspects of the RAE have perhaps been taken for granted, for I see little if any reference in the responses to the extra money for research over the past decade that has been forthcoming or to the undoubted fact of our increased productivity (as opposed to cultural improvement, which is more debatable). I do believe that British musical research stands in higher international esteem now than in the 1980s or before, and although that is a subjective opinion, my point is that if the RAE is to any extent to be thanked for this its job must continue to act as catalyst through competition, not cultural arbiter—there is no enthusiasm for HEFCE taking upon itself to determine the subject's research importance to UK national endeavour in future exercises, though it might do more to uncover it (see below).

Perhaps I may now summarise some of the responses to individual ideas and questions. Peer review remains the favoured method of assessment. The isolated researcher is not working in a vacuum (see my penultimate paragraph below) and should not be disadvantaged. Greater use of algorithms seems to appeal to creative arts departments and practitioners more than scholarly ones, perhaps in line with audience and community reception as opposed to readership and citation— but these are a minority. Citation measurement is deeply distrusted. Something similar could be said of self-assessment, deemed even more wasteful of paper than peer review, though I must come back to this below. Mixed prospective and retrospective assessment is favoured, together with a long timespan because of the nature of much research production in the arts. There is a general repugnance towards standardisation: in this country music departments have traditionally been very different one from another and we want to keep them that way. We also want to keep them holistic, for while many are happy with research and teaching

being assessed separately most if not all believe that the one discipline informs the other, and to separate them unduly would undermine British traditions of musical scholarship and creativity: this is a highly specific factor not necessarily applicable to other disciplines, let alone other countries. In other words, most music departments want to teach and to profess musicology, performance and composition, and it is the RAE's job to find ways of enabling, not obstructing this through assessment.

I used the word 'profess' rather than 'research'; for perhaps the time has come to ask whether some other word for practice-based activity at the highest professional level within the academy might not be more appropriate than the blanket term under which we have all writhed for the past 30 years or so. I quote Professor Peter Hill, professional pianist and musicologist at the University of Sheffield, than whom no more experienced authority on the subject will be found:

I think it misguided to try to tie the label of 'research' around performers and composers. It seems to me that a new category - e.g. 'creative work' - or some such is needed. Personally I feel very strongly about this, having for all my university career juggled the demands of orthodox research with piano playing. Next May, for example, I have been asked to give a recital of Schoenberg and Beethoven which will be taken by Radio 3. Weeks if not months of work will go into this, but it cuts no ice as 'research'. This seems wrong to me, since this sort of concert work is clearly part and parcel of the contribution I make to the Department as a teacher, and indeed it informs my work as a scholar.

There has been a fair measure of dissatisfaction within the profession about the criteria and results of practice-based research in RAE 2001, so it is easy to see why the issue needs extensive revisiting— or, as I am suggesting, properly visiting for the first time— long before any further assessment. We look to HEFCE to host such visitation and should be delighted to co-operate as a subject association, bearing in mind that while many of its issues also apply to drama, dance and/or the plastic arts, others, including, I think, the size and overall scope of our subject, take us beyond them.

I should like to end on a constructive note. There is no reason why the *assessment* of research should not also entail the *celebration* of it, which the RAE could take upon itself at minimal extra cost. I give two simple, precise and typical examples. One is from my own field, the study of music in Britain and British music of the past 200 years. This has made massive strides forward in the last decade from within our

REQUEST

from Pam Thompson
(one of this year's conference speakers)

International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres UK & Ireland Branch
c/o Royal College of Music Library
Prince Consort Road
London SW7 2BS

14 February 2003
Dear Colleague,

New Plan for Music Libraries

I am preparing a new plan for music libraries in the UK and Ireland (to be published April 2003) following on from the Research Support Libraries Programme "Ensemble" project. The Ensemble consortium produced over 180,000 new catalogue records for printed music and hopes to continue its work in the coming year to provide better online access to music resources. It is estimated that over a million music titles in the major academic libraries do not yet have an electronic catalogue record.

As it is vital that we take into account the views of the academic music community in our research, it would be appreciated if you would complete and return to me the attached short questionnaire, adding any comments you may wish to make. The questionnaire can be returned by e-mail to: musicclip2@aol.com.

Many thanks for your help.

Yours sincerely,

Pamela Thompson, Chief Librarian
Royal College of Music for IAML (UK & Irl)

BIOGRAPHIES OF NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Amanda Bayley

Amanda Bayley is Reader in Music at the University of Wolverhampton and is Events Officer for the Society for Music Analysis. She graduated from Dartington College of Arts then undertook postgraduate studies at the University of Surrey. She completed her Ph.D. at the University of Reading in 1996 on 'Bartók Performance Studies'. She is editor of *The Cambridge Companion to Bartók* (CUP, 2001) and has also published on twentieth-century string quartets. Her current research interests include

QUESTIONNAIRE

TO ACADEMICS IN MUSIC DEPARTMENTS
IN THE UK AND IRELAND

- 1 Were you aware of Ensemble's work?
- 2 Have you noticed any improvements in online information on printed music in recent years?
- 3 Do you find online catalogues for music and recordings satisfactory for searching?
- 4 Are there any impediments to your work in music libraries and, if so, what are the most significant?
- 5 Does your institution have a designated music librarian?
- 6 Do you use public/other music libraries as well as academic libraries and, if so, which?
- 7 Do you know or have you used "Encore!", the online union catalogue of performance sets in music libraries (accessible via the IAML website (www.iaml-uk-irl.org)?)
- 8 Please make any comments you wish on using music libraries or archives for research, teaching or performance and add any observations on improvements you would like to see.

Many thanks!

twentieth-century music, performance studies and ethnomusicology. Research undertaken as an Edison Fellow at the British Library National Sound Archive focuses on the performance analysis of Bartók's String Quartets.

Darla Crispin

Canadian pianist Darla Crispin came to the U.K. as a Queen Elizabeth II Centennial Scholar, studying with Edith Vogel at the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and gaining the School's Concert Recital Diploma in 1988. She soon became a member of its Academic Studies department, with particular responsibility for co-ordinating postgraduate studies. She took up the position of Head of Postgraduate Programmes at the Royal College of Music in

Profs Robert Pascall

(University of Wales, Bangor) and

Graham Barber

(University of Leeds)

Prof Alan Pearman

(Pro Vice Chancellor, University of Leeds; Professor of Management Decision Analysis in the University of Leeds Business School)

John Stephens

(Educational Consultant, Youth Music)

Prof George Caird

(Principal, Birmingham Conservatoire; chair, Music Education Council)

Paid up members of NAMHE are entitled to send two representatives free of charge. Additional representatives can attend on payment of £10 per person. Along with this Newsletter you will receive a complete conference programme and a booking form. Please return these as soon as possible, or by 14th April at the latest, to Dr Amanda Bayley at the Department of Music, University of Wolverhampton, Walsall Campus, Gorway Road, Walsall, WS1 3BD.

The Conference will, as usual, be preceded at 10.00am by the AGM. Please make every effort to attend this short business meeting so that we can keep you informed and also so that we can continue to represent the views and wishes of the membership.

A REQUEST
from Professor Roger Bray

From: Roger Bray at PALATINE [palatine@lancaster.ac.uk]
Sent: 12 February 2003 16:03
To: Key Contacts
Subject: IMPORTANT CONSULTATION
To: key contacts; please also forward this to your colleagues.

As you will probably have noticed, there has been a recent burst of high-level activity to do with learning and teaching matters: specific developments are proposed in the Government's White Paper (www.dfes.gov.uk/highereducation/hestrategy/), more immediate developments are indicated in the HEFCE grant letter (www.hefce.ac.uk/news/hefce/2003/grant03.htm), and there has been a Report of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Committee jointly to HEFCE, UUK and SCOP (www.hefce.ac.uk/Learning/TQEC). A HEFCE Strategy Paper is expected very soon, which may add further to this. Although some of these issues are specifically for the English university system, there are related

developments in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and so colleagues in those countries may wish to comment on developments in England.

Briefly, the chief proposals are as follows:

- establishment of a 'teaching quality academy, to be responsible for supporting teaching enhancement. Final details of its responsibilities are not by any means settled, but it is proposed that it take over the ILTHE (members are being consulted separately on this), the LTSN, and responsibility for various enhancement functions, such as National Teaching Fellowships; creation of 70 'centres of excellence', each being awarded a grant of 500k per year for five years. We understand that the way these may operate is even less settled, and therefore there may be a way of influencing how they will work.

The organisational position of PALATINE and the LTSN Centres in all this is not finally settled, but there is some suggestion that they will move into the new 'academy' lock stock and barrel, at least at first.

We at PALATINE shall continue to act as honest brokers in all this, a role we would seek to maintain whatever the outcome. If we do have a chance of commenting to HEFCE we want to be sure that we have a picture of people's views, and so we invite you to comment on:

- the 'academy': how should it run?
- the 'centres of excellence': how should they operate?
- PALATINE: our role in the discussions and our role in the future (and changes you would like to see in the way we operate).

The subject associations, SCODHE, SCUDD and NAMHE, which are strongly represented on our Management Committee, will also welcome comments, but we have put in place this, our own, method of receiving personal views in addition.

Professor Roger Bray
Director, PALATINE
Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)
Centre for the Performing Arts

Please send your comments by email or in the post to:
PALATINE (Performing Arts Learning and Teaching Innovation Network)
The Great Hall
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YW
United Kingdom

Email: palatine@lancaster.ac.uk
Website: www.lancs.ac.uk/Palatine

universities and therefore thanks at least partly to RAE incentives; our national music accordingly rates more highly abroad than hitherto and attracts overseas researchers. But the research, often of an interdisciplinary nature, is clumped in a number of our university departments, Leeds, Durham, Birmingham and Goldsmiths' to name but four, with varying RAE grades and without (as far as I am aware) official collaboration between them, though scholarly communication is everything it need be, cradling indeed the lone researcher in still other departments. The RAE has no mechanism for recognising and publicising this aggregated achievement. Exactly the same could be said of electroacoustic composition, which pulls together at the national level to Britain's redounding credit but across a network of variously-graded campuses. If only the full picture of our research excellence in music in this country could be painted by the RAE, the result itself would cease to be a sterile algorithm and become a living force.

How can HEFCE achieve this? One suggestion has been by a *standing* research panel of the unit of assessment, shifting the balance away from institutional straitjacketing towards subject-sensitive measures and responsibilities on both sides. This seems an excellent idea and need not conflict with interdisciplinary concerns (behind which institutional expediencies too often hide). Especially if bodies such as NAMHE and the BBC (an old hand at assessment of new music and performance) were represented on it, it could mop up most if not all of the remaining concerns of our respondents, which include the following desiderata:

- rolling review (more like QA)
- differentiated review of the various sub-disciplines so distinctive in music
- sensitivity towards the monotronics (conservatoires)
- the development of criteria for excellence by practitioners themselves in composition and performance
- recognition of the transient and local nature of some artwork
- a closing of the loop of accountability, feedback and appeal, especially where the sustainability of previous investment is an issue (colleagues feel strongly that accountability should run to penalty clauses and that an appeals procedure should be instituted).

We urge you to consider this suggestion, at least for music.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Banfield
Elgar Professor of Music
The University of Birmingham

2 December 2002

Dear Stephen,

I was interested to see the letter you wrote on behalf of NAMHE to Vanessa Conte on 27 November as part of the RAE consultation exercise, and it looks as if institutions have expressed a variety of views! I realize that the point of your letter is to express the views of the NAMHE membership and not your own, so I hope you won't mind if I try to clear up a misunderstanding and make a comment.

The misunderstanding has to do with this passage:

There has been a fair measure of dissatisfaction within the profession about the criteria and results of practice-based research in RAE 2001, so it is easy to see why the issue needs extensive revisiting – or, as I am suggesting, properly visiting for the first time – long before any further assessment.

There are two issues here:

- (1) As you will remember, the 2001 Criteria were subject to consultation in the subject community; many institutions commented on them, the majority of the comments were supportive, and those that weren't were considered and in some cases acted upon. It's true that the grades resulting from the application of those criteria weren't welcomed by those institutions that didn't do well, but that is quite another matter.
- (2) The 2001 panel may or may not have got the assessment of practice-based research right (you'll recall that our overview report suggested that there should be 'further debate on the nature and assessment of practice-based research in advance of any future RAE'), but to suggest that it didn't 'properly visit' the issue is not justified. First, the panel for the first time included two performers to ensure 'the development of criteria for excellence by practitioners themselves' (to borrow your words). Second, the Criteria were considerably more detailed concerning practice-based research than the 1996 ones (though the principles were basically the same). Third, though you'll have to take my word for this, the panel spent a great deal of time discussing the issue, with working papers and other correspondence on the subject. Fourth, I liaised closely with the panel chairs of other UoAs assessing practice-based research, including a meeting specifically to make our Criteria for its assessment as consistent as possible.

The comment has to do with Peter Hill's call, which you quoted, for practice-based research to be separated in future from research proper and assessed as 'creative practice', and I take it from your letter that there is widespread support for this. This is obviously

tempting as a way of avoiding all sorts of problems of assessment (it's basically the old idea of research equivalence). But we need to remember that what we're talking about here is not a scheme for assessing the quality of work done by HEI staff generally, but for distributing governmental research funding. As I see it, the research equivalence argument is liable to play into the hands of those (such as the Treasury, which we are told is driving this consultation) who would be quite happy to see practice excluded from research funding on the grounds that it isn't research – and I wouldn't bet on the chances of a new governmental fund for creative practice being set up! The purpose of the position taken by the 1996 and 2001 panels was precisely to make research funding available across the various strands of what we all see as an integrated discipline (which is of course the AHRB's position, too).

In short, I can readily understand people's feelings, but we shouldn't forget the political realities of the situation.

With best wishes,

Nick

Nicholas Cook
Research Professor of Music,
University of Southampton

19 December 2002

Dear Nick,

It was rude of me not to have acknowledged your message about my HEFCE letter. I'm sorry – it's just that the end of term has been awful.

It was a helpful response, and I wonder whether my committee colleagues might want to see it printed in the next NAMHE Newsletter, alongside my HEFCE letter which I think they want to reprint. I'll ask them when we next meet, and depending on what they say, you can then give or withhold your permission.

I sent it round the committee for comments, and what came back was very much what I myself would wish to say in reply, namely, that we have every confidence in the 2001 panel having done its job properly where 'practice-as-research' was concerned: you moulded (with broad input) the Criteria and did them justice. But there is practice and there is research to the top professional level in our universities, and the two don't always have to go together just because that is (through the RAE) HEFCE's convenient and hitherto only way of dealing with both. That is what I meant by calling for an *ab initio* debate about the types of activity in (or at least benefiting) music departments and monotronics

that are not teaching and are not administration, and that is what Peter Hill was pointing out. Who funds what, and indeed whether everything needs public funding, is an issue that can only properly be debated when we draw a deep breath and look at it all afresh, which you certainly weren't able to do in the RAE job you inherited, but which the current review window is surely supposed to encourage.

But we take your point about the *Realpolitik* of it all and appreciate your timely warning to us not to start unpicking things naively at the risk of losing secured funding and status.

Best wishes,

Stephen

20 December 2002

Dear Stephen,

Thanks very much for this reply. Of course I understand and sympathize with what you are talking about in terms of the relationship between practice and research! As you realize, my concern is whether asking these fundamental questions within the context of a review of research assessment/funding creates a risk of blowing the whole practice-based research thing out of the water; it would be different if it were a more fundamental review of who pays for what, as you put it. Anyhow time will tell!

Thanks again and have a good Christmas,

Nick

23 December 2002

Dear Stephen,

Just an afterthought to my previous reply, although not directly related to the HEFCE consultation: as you know, and assuming that research assessment continues more or less as currently defined, I think it would be a good idea for the sector to come to an agreed view on practice-based research in advance of any future RAE; I feel that NAMHE is the obvious group to coordinate this; and I hope it goes without saying that I'd be happy to contribute in any way I can (as I'm sure other RAE panellists would).

Have a good Christmas,

Nick

2 January 2003

Thanks, Nick; I'll lay the issue (and our correspondence) before the NAMHE committee the week after next. It would have to be one of our annual conferences, I guess, but not this year; we need a rest from the topic. (But we shouldn't wait too long either).

As ever

Stephen

AHRB
a Report by Mark Everist

One of the most significant changes in the AHRB's 'Review of the Postgraduate Programmes' is that funding for master's programmes will be extended to include both composition and musicology, and this change will be implemented for applications for programmes beginning in 2003 (in other words for those students currently applying; the Guide for these applicants has already been published); many will feel that this is a welcome addition to the suite of awards made by the AHRB in that it brings composition, performance and musicology into a clear alignment. Many of the statistical data presented in the report are of great interest, especially those relating to the distribution of awards among institutions (75% of awards in 1999 went to 18 institutions only [section 20] and it is possible to read a certain regret into this part of the review), and success rates for different schemes (since 1993, 20-37% for master's programmes and 27-36% for doctoral programmes during the same period).

Turning to the research programmes, much can be learned from the documents published by the AHRB itself. All applications are considered by one of eight research panels, unless its interdisciplinary nature requires reference to more than one panel. Panel 7 is entitled 'Music and Performing Arts' and is the panel to which most music applications go. For the year 2001-2002, here are the success rates for the schemes across all panels:

- Research Grants: 20%
- Research Leave: 50%
- Resource Enhancement: 18%
- Innovation Awards: 20%
- Fellowships in the Creative and Performing Arts: 35%
- Small Grants in the Creative and Performing Arts (under £5k): 70%
- The figures for the research grants and resource

enhancement scheme directly relate to the size of the awards made (from £5,000 - £500,000), and a regular feature of these schemes is a rating of A+ but no possibility of funding the project (although the rating scheme is likely to change a little in the future, the basic pattern is A+, A, A-, B – which encourages resubmission – and R[eject]). The research leave scheme has a high level of success, reflecting the AHRB's contribution to this part of its provision and also the much smaller value of awards. But for our subject discipline, the two schemes that are aimed at creative and performing arts, the fellowships and small grants, have higher levels of success, at least in part as a result of the lower number of applications than for other schemes. It is very much the view of Panel 7 that these schemes would benefit from wider publicity in order to attract a larger number of bids – especially to the Small Grants in the Creative and Performing Arts. I would be very interested to receive comments on this particular issue (and any other) at m.everist@soton.ac.uk.

Finally, it has now been formally announced that the Arts and Humanities Research Board is to become a fully-fledged research council under the auspices of the Office of Science and Technology. The effect on the funding patterns is likely to be slender in the first instance, although it is anticipated that the AHRB will benefit from bidding to the 2004 spending review through OST. The broad portfolio of existing schemes is likely to remain. Unless the AHRB/C sees fit to change them on the basis of subject feedback, but there will be some additional funding streams as a result of council status, and that will lead to some new schemes.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE and AGM

This year's NAMHE conference will take place in the Music Department, University of Leeds, on Tuesday 13 May 2003. The theme for the conference is 'Securing and Exploiting Resources' and we have been fortunate in securing the participation of a large number of speakers who will address the topics 'Taking command of new sources and resources' and 'What and where next?' with an opportunity between for discussion and debate.

The speakers are:

- Pam Thompson**
(Chief Librarian, Royal College of Music)
- Prof Mark Everist**
(University of Southampton)