

NAMHE general business

Subscriptions 2006-07

Annual subscriptions have been held at 2005-06 rates as follows:

Individual membership	£30
Small dept membership (3 staff FTEs or less)	£60
Dept membership (4-10 staff FTEs)	£120
Large dept membership (more than 10 staff FTEs)	£200

Subscriptions are payable from 1 October and invoices are being sent out now. Your invoice will be addressed to your NAMHE representative, unless the Administrator has been advised to send it to another contact in your department. Please do what you can to ensure that your invoice is paid promptly. There are still a number of subscriptions outstanding from 2005-06.

Committee Elections

Four members of the Committee complete their term of service at the end of 2006. They are:

Professor Stephen Banfield (Bristol)
Professor Katharine Ellis (RHUL)
Professor Jan Smaczny (Queen's Belfast)
Professor Geoff Smith (Bath Spa)

Stephen completes six years of outstanding service, including two years as Chair. We are very sorry to see him go and thank him for everything he has contributed to NAMHE's work. Katharine, Jan and Geoff are eligible for re-election.

Nomination papers for the four vacancies, each for three years' duration, will be sent out to your NAMHE representative shortly.

The continuing Committee members are:

Professor Mark Everist (Southampton, Chair)
Dr Darla Crispin (RCM)
Dr Nick Fells (Glasgow)
Dr Liz Garnett (Birmingham Conservatoire)
Professor Jonty Harrison (Birmingham)
Professor Richard McGregor (St Martin's, Lancaster)
Dr Linda Merrick (RNCM)
Dr Mike Russ (Huddersfield)

NAMHE CONFERENCE 2007

The 2007 conference will take place at Queen's University Belfast on May 8th 2007. The title for the conference is 'Beyond Graduation'. We look forward to seeing you there.

Postscript

If you are trying to persuade a colleague to stand, you might like to point out that Committee membership seems to help with promotions and titles – three NAMHE Committee members have become Professors in the last year!

And on that note, omitted from the last Newsletter were congratulations to Katharine Ellis who has been appointed Professor of Music at Royal Holloway University of London and Professor of Music at the School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Editorial

I have been associated with committee business in NAMHE on and off from more years than I care to remember – right from the time of the change from NAUMS to NAMSHE and the subsequent re-gendering to NAMHE. It has always been a busy Association but I think it would be fair to say that this year is about as busy as it has ever been. Perhaps email makes communication and consultation that much easier but that notwithstanding it is the sheer scale of it all now which leaves one quite breathless.

There are some very important reports here, not least of which is the report of the Annual Conference 2006 which will, we are certain, be of tremendous use to all in the run-up to the RAE. As always, your comments and observations would be most welcome.

The Committee is delighted to report that the new website is proving very successful: over 500 visitors per month generating over 2000 hits. User statistics also suggest that NAMHE's databases are regularly consulted and that our News section is particularly popular. Thanks to committee member Prof. Geoff Smith of Bath Spa University for overseeing and monitoring the site.

So, as we all settle back to see what the year has to offer, we can take heart that the subject discipline is strong and active, and you can be sure that NAMHE will continue to represent its best interests across as wide a field as possible.

Professor Richard McGregor

Chair's Corner – From the Chair: Prof Mark Everist

A Reflection on Summer Past

It had been hot – so hot that people had been sent to hospital with burns caused by doing nothing more than walking on the sand. Close to dusk, with pelicans swooping over the water off the Delaware beaches, I felt a vague obligation to make use of the 'Beach Access Wireless' that was loudly trumpeted everywhere on the boardwalk. It wasn't quite as sad as it sounds: by some bizarre quirk of scheduling, 1 August 2006 was the beginning of my next term as Head of Music at Southampton as well as the third day of our holiday, and I felt uneasy about the possible repercussions of not taking a surreptitious, albeit virtual, look at the department on my first day.

Email was – as one might have hoped – light and frothy. But, seemingly as ever, there was a request for consultation. Dated 28 July, the Arts and Humanities Data Service requested a response to a document by 15 August. I suppose what I should have done was simply what I always do: sent it off to the members of the NAMHE committee for comment, collected views and sent them off to the AHDS (I did actually do this, in fact). But it did bring home in forceful terms the growing dislocation between those who attempt to exercise control over our academic lives (AHRC panel members will know how powerful AHDS can be, for example) and those of us who live them. The ebb and

flow of teaching and research, articulated by semester and vacation, is an essential feature of the way in which we take forward our work in performance, composition and musicology (in all its forms), and to see this so much at odds with the expectations of public bodies was salutary, even as the sun set over the Atlantic coast and my daughter dragged me off to the joys of (ahem....) something called Funland....

But representing the views of the music community in higher education is one of the most important tasks that NAMHE undertakes, and I like to think that we pursue such consultation assiduously. During the last six months, we have responded to various requests in addition to the AHDS: nominations to the AHRC Peer Review College, the Gowers Copyright Inquiry, the AHRC review of funding mechanisms, their Strategic Resource Enhancement Programme, the British Academy Review of programmes, a commentary on the possible future of Conservatoires UK, a letter of support for the new Institute of Musical Research in London, and as I write, we are in the middle of consultation on the changes to the RAE after 2008. Frankly, I should add, this seems a lot for a six-month period. Consultation, however, is only a passive way of representing the views of music in UK HEIs, and I have been greatly cheered by the way in which various public bodies have been at pains to invite initiatives from subject associations (NAMHE) and learned societies (the Royal Musical Association). This has brought such public bodies in for rather more than they bargained for, though, since both NAMHE and the RMA are now part of a much larger informal grouping of subject associations and learned societies across the arts and humanities. On such matters as the AHRC view of the 'European Reference Index for the Humanities' (ERIH), which colleagues will surely remember, I was pleased to act in concert with the Association of Art Historians, the Society of Legal Scholars, as well as organisations representing philosophy, classics, archaeology, and all those other subjects (now, to my horror, I find we are called 'non-STEM' subjects) with whom we make common cause. I think this is important, given the ways in which institutions and HEFCE try to deal with the community in ever-larger groupings, and keeping disciplinary voices heard in this context is one thing that working as a subject association in this context permits. We, of course, keep up with our most recent neighbours; we sent a representative to the conference of the Standing Council on University Drama Departments (they returned the compliment), and the NAMHE committee has invited members of cognate organisations to come and talk to us; we are wiser and better informed as a result.

Our most public event is our annual conference which took place this year at the University of Wolverhampton. Entitled RAE 2008: Strategy, Submission, Survival, it represented the culmination of nearly a year of careful consultation between NAMHE and the chairs of Panel O and UoA 67 for the 2008 RAE. Setting it up and agreeing a report were complex and sometimes tense, but the report figures elsewhere in the Newsletter, and is an important document as NAMHE attempts to ensure that the non-verbal glosses on the RAE criteria are circulated as widely as possible among the subject community.

NAMHE sometimes poke our noses in where some people (VCs, PVCs, public servants) would prefer that we didn't. Two headline examples over the summer will make the point that rapid intervention in public issues can have an effect. In early May, I was approached about the possible closure and redundancies in music at the University of Northampton. Clearly if such mature departments as Exeter and Reading are in the firing line, such much smaller groupings are even more vulnerable. I'm pleased to be able to report that, as a result of NAMHE's intervention with the senior management in the University, redundancy notices were withdrawn, and we were able to help restarting constructive discussions between the music group and management that seemed to have broken down. Matters are far from resolved, but it seems as if NAMHE at least was able to act in enough time to make a difference. More immediately conclusive were our interventions, alongside others, in the reversal of the examining board Edexcel's decision to withdraw its music and music-technology A levels. We worked closely with the head of the Edexcel music board, the Taverner scholar Hugh Benham, and applied pressure to both Edexcel itself and the QCA. The result was gratifyingly startling with a reversal of Edexcel's decision within a matter of weeks. I can't quantify the impact of NAMHE's contribution, but it was certainly judged to be important by the Edexcel chief examiner, who attends our committee meeting on 7 October.

This is the time of year when some colleagues on the NAMHE committee come to the end of their tenure, and places fall vacant. Invitations for nominations will shortly be issued, and if you feel a commitment to music in higher education that goes beyond your own institution and have some extra energy to expend (all members of the committee contribute to all the actions we take), I would strongly encourage you to put your hat in the ring. If you would like to discuss nomination, I am always pleased to talk (m.everist@soton.ac.uk).

are at too deep a level of theoretical abstraction. Pankhurst placed emphasis on students experimenting, noting that what gets thrown away is sometimes more instructive than the final product.

Perhaps the most significant paper of the day was given, at the beginning of the afternoon session, by Hugh Benham (Chair of examiners for EdExcel) who outlined his views on the importance of music analysis to work at AS/A2 levels. Much of what Hugh said was reassuring, but he also highlighted a number of issues and concerns for higher education. The sheer breadth of choices within the EdExcel syllabus means that those of us in higher education can no longer depend on students all having a knowledge of concepts previously regarded as core (Bach chorale harmonisation for example). Nor can we assume much familiarity with essay-writing on musical topics: the essay requirement has now declined to just one in two years. The AS/A2 syllabi and the achievement of students at these levels cannot of course be separated from work that goes on earlier in the School curriculum. Hugh highlighted less than joined-up thinking between the various key stages and notably between GCSE and AS/A2. 'Something seems to be going wrong before A level' he observed.

Other variables include the interests and abilities of teachers. Some may be enthusiasts for analysis and for 'classical' music and musicology; others may be much less secure with these disciplines. Those with low levels of musical skill may be reluctant or unable to engage properly with form and harmony. There are ways in which the higher education sector can help our colleagues in schools, notably by providing clearer guidance on the terminology we use when describing for example, the parts of sonata form (and is it 'auxiliary' or 'neighbour note?'). Hugh indicated that he felt that the higher education sector could engage more closely with examiners. He commented that he had tried to engage with Universities in the south of England, asking if they might work with him on syllabus content. He got no reply!

In the final round-table session, Richard McGregor apprised us of the realities of the teacher-training situation where students may come in with musical qualifications below AS/A2, and there was a discussion about the relatively low levels of musical skills that some teachers, particularly those in primary have. In discussion, a strong case was made for the prioritisation of singing.

Stephanie Pitts, joint editor of BJME, had carried out a brief email survey of what analysis means to music students, which confirmed a general insecurity, but also indicated that some students might actually feel uncomfortable about the rather anoraky nature of the discipline.

I briefly presented the results of a little survey I had carried out with first year students at the University of Huddersfield

about what aspects of harmony, counterpoint and analysis they felt comfortable with on entry and were still struggling with well into the year. (Figured bass for example was still found to be problematic and the augmented sixth took them to the real limits of understanding!). I advocated a concentration on principles as much as learning harmony by copying models.

In conclusion, it is clear that those of us in higher education need to accept that the AS/A2 curriculum is extremely diverse and is not intended as a preparation for University entrance. We also need to accept that there is a huge variety in the interests and skills of the teachers and a similar diversity in what they cover with their pupils. There is clearly a strong case for a much closer engagement between the schools, universities and examiners. NAMHE clearly has a role to play in all this. As a first step, we have invited Hugh Benham to talk to us at our October committee meeting and hopefully this will be the starting point towards us becoming more proactive in our relationships with chief examiners, examination boards and syllabus planning committees.

TQEF Project:

'Understanding the transition from school to university music'

This project, which aims to do exactly what its title implies, is a direct result of the SMA study day. It has been set up with the encouragement of the SMA, NAMHE, PALATINE and the University of Huddersfield (it is one of our HEFCE Teaching Quality and Enhancement Fund projects).

Over the next two years we hope to build a better understanding of what is being taught at AS/A2 and how it interfaces with university curricula (particularly the first-year undergraduate). As part of this process we will engage with examination boards and interview staff and students in schools and universities.

Hopefully the project will increase understanding between the two sectors and move us from a situation where staff in universities bemoan the weaknesses of their intake, to one where they feel they are building on strengths and celebrating the breadth of musical experiences their students bring from school.

The project will of course deliver a report and identify good practice; it is also planned to deliver some useful resources such as the guide to terminology Hugh Benham requested.

Nicholas Baragwanath of the Royal Northern College of Music addressed the meeting on the subject of teaching accreditation. He reported that RNCM was developing a customised accreditation route for part-time visiting music teachers and that a pilot would be undertaken from September 2006. The Committee asked to be kept up to date with developments and particularly with the results of the first year pilot.

It was noted that members of the Committee would be representing NAMHE at an SMA Study Day on Music Analysis and Teaching in Lancaster on 25 March; at an AHRC meeting on the ESF European Reference Index for the Humanities on 31 March; and at SCUDD's annual conference in April.

Saturday 3 June 2006 at the University of Birmingham

The Committee noted that 70 NAMHE members had attended Conference, but many institutions had not been represented and no Sub-Panel members had been present. It was agreed that Mark Everist would pursue a follow-up meeting for 2007, to which sister subject associations would be invited.

Katharine Ellis reported that the Infrastructure Sub-Committee had written an open letter to HESA on reporting statistics for Music and the Creative/Performing Arts. This letter had asked questions about HESA's relationship with the National Student Survey, how their statistics were broken down, whether they put statistics into whatever form was requested and, if not, whether there was a policy on how the statistics could be used. HESA had responded to say that they dealt with the statistics and what others did with them was not their concern. The Committee was worried by this attitude. The Sub-Committee is pursuing the issue with individual departments and will publish advice tips via the NAMHE web site.

Mark Everist reported that he had written to the VC of the University of Northampton about the threat to their Music Department, but had as yet received no reply.

Liz Garnett reported on her work creating a database of external examiners. It is planned that this will be updated annually and published on the web site.

It was noted that Committee members would be representing NAMHE at forthcoming AHRC meetings on 14 and 15 June and at a meeting on the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.

The Transition from School to University Music

A Report on the SMA Study Day 'Music Analysis and Teaching' and a new project led by the University of Huddersfield

By Dr Michael Russ

The Society for Music Analysis study day on 'Music Analysis and Teaching' was held in association with PALATINE and the British Journal of Music Education at Lancaster University on Saturday 25th March 2006. This was an interesting and revealing event and one that followed on well from last year's NAMHE conference in that it allowed further discussion of the increasing divergence between the school and university music curricula and emphasised the lack of understanding and communication between the two sectors.

Papers and sessions were presented by school teachers and staff in higher education. In the morning session James Garnett, a Head of Music from Newbury, indicated the range of analytical activity that formed part of AS/A2 and how a number of important aural and analytical skills are taught in the context of, for example, excerpts from film scores (Titanic was the example provided). Aural skills are developed not just by listening to the music itself, but also to the way it is produced and recorded. It was clear that the range of musics considered was vast and that 'classical' music is just one of them. The precise curriculum, in terms of the elements of the syllabus selected, is to some extent at the mercy of the particular teacher's enthusiasms.

Vicky Ward recently completed a PhD at Leeds. She researched the relationship between music performance, music analysis and instrumental teaching (generally pre-HE). Here some interesting insights were gained as to how analysis is often perceived negatively as something that removes enjoyment, and is undervalued by many instrumental teachers. Yet it was found that the best instrumental teachers often use analytical concepts without realising they do so and that there is a direct correlation between the amount of analysis that goes on in a lesson and the expressivity of the playing. More analysis also seemed to go hand-in-hand with less emphasis on technique.

Schenkerian analysis is a useful way to build harmonic and contrapuntal knowledge. Tom Pankhurst, whose user-friendly textbook on Schenkerian analysis is about to appear, provided an interesting insight into his teaching at Liverpool Hope University. He noted that current texts either set students off on a very long-term systematic journey or

Report on NAMHE conference

University of Wolverhampton
2 May 2006

The 2006 conference was entitled 'RAE 2008: Strategy, submission and survival' and comprised an initial presentation by Professors Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel O (Art and Design, History of Art Architecture and Design, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts, Communication Cultural and Media Studies, Music) and Andrew Wathey, chair of the Music sub panel (67), followed by questions and further presentations by Professors Eric Clarke (University of Sheffield), Edward Gregson (Royal Northern College of Music) and Derek Scott (University of Salford). After lunch two separate groups considered issues relating to musicology and analysis, and performance as research. Both 'break out' groups generated questions on which Bruce Brown and Andrew Wathey contributed in general discussion.

The conference was hosted by the University of Wolverhampton, and included a cordial welcome from the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Caroline Gipps, and was well attended by representatives from nearly all of NAMHE's member institutions.

Opening Presentation

A number of points were made which will be of interest to NAMHE members starting with Bruce Brown noting that though research assessment may be moving towards a more metrics-based methodology, his assumption was that RAE 2008 would go ahead as currently planned; he also speculated that there may be a metrics exercise shadowing RAE 2008 and also posed the question — is it possible for metrics to measure quality as well as volume, and what might they be?

The following points arose during Bruce Brown's part of the opening presentation (they are described in more detail in the Main Panel O Criteria and Working Methods pp 65-73):

- He expressed the personal view that teaching and research should be partners in the HE experience with research helping to stimulate a vital spirit of enquiry that unites both teachers and students;
- there is sufficient latitude in the sub panels' working methods and criteria for submissions for the sub panels to be responsive to a range of descriptions of types of research, their varied

forms of output and different types of research environment (whether big or small);

- in assessing whether an output meets the standard required to be 4*, the panel will take account of the three main indicators of significance, originality and rigour. These need not each be exhibited in equal measure, and in all cases the panel will test their judgement against the definition of the quality levels – i.e. it is world leading because it 'has been or is likely to be and essential point of reference for work being undertaken across its field and influential upon that work'

- research income may be a matter of volume and/or esteem; in the latter case the toughness of the competition for funds would be taken into account (for example, if a relatively modest grant of £12K for a PhD studentship were gained against fierce competition, this would be viewed favourably in terms of the esteem generated by such success);
- the RA5 text would be the starting point for the panel, thus their preliminary overview based on the RA5 was very important in helping the sub-panel to contextualise the submission as a whole and to set the agenda for the assessment (e.g. it may help to identify specialist advice needed for the assessment);
- the normal expectation for category A staff is that they will submit four outputs (exceptions result from, for example, illness, maternity leave [involvement in senior management responsibility does not count as grounds for exemption!]; full details p. 22 para. 33 of the criteria). Part-time working is a legitimate reason for submitting fewer than four outputs. In all cases the reasons for submitting fewer than four outputs should be explained in RA5b.
- if there is good reason for the submission of less than four outputs then this will have no effect on the quality profile, either positive or negative — should there be no good reason evident for the submission of less than four outputs then the 'missing' outputs will be registered as unclassified and so be included in the quality profile;

- each research output submitted may be accompanied by a 300-word commentary which could include links to a range of further information where the research imperatives and the research significance of the output might further be made evident, although this is not mandatory; also, a scholarly portfolio can support work, for example a dramatic performance that may be ephemeral or is one of a number of connected outputs (pp 66 para 13 of the criteria);
- esteem indicators will not be entered as a profile that is spread over the quality levels but as one 10% at a single quality level and so retain a moderating influence on the quality profile overall;
- category C staff includes bona fide independent researchers connected to the submission but will not, for example, be employed by the institution but, say, be an independent performer funded by an Arts Council research grant where funding goes directly to the researcher and not through the institution;
- Bruce Brown offered the view that in RAE2008 it may be important to not only produce good research, but to tell it just as it is, and to avoid gamesmanship.

Andrew Wathey added a few points of emphasis as follows:

- the music sub panel is clear that it will not be privileging one type of output over another;
- all outputs will be assessed against the published indicators of quality and no particular form of research would be privileged over another;
- the fact of publication in (e.g.) a world-leading journal will not replace the panel's judgement, which would be applied in the same way whether an output is published in a world-leading journal or a very different kind of journal, conference proceedings, website, etc., ;
- the panel anticipates that submissions will be made across a very broad range of types outputs (software, performances, compositions etc.);
- the research environment should ensure development; a structure that locks a department into a fixed state of development would not meet this expectation;
- the panel would examine what is being done to develop future researchers and what is in place for those yet to come;

A digest of the questions raised from the floor and their subsequent discussion

There was a request for more information concerning electronic publication. — the sub-panel's criteria make clear it will have no preference for any particular medium, all forms of output will be treated equally and electronic submissions will be on a 'level playing field' with any other mode of publication.

Could a work which had been accepted for publication in, for example, October 2007 but which would not appear for a year be accepted as an RAE submission if placed on, for example, a personal website? — again, research outputs are defined in the criteria as "any form of publicly available, assessable output embodying research as defined for the RAE". The form of some outputs may be such that they are only available in digital form and others may be deemed most appropriate in such form.

How might a journal editor best advise an author in the case of an article that has been accepted, copy edited and is present on a publisher's website? Also, what of a piece of work that has been accepted, but may not be copy edited? Could this be placed on a personal website if the publisher agrees? — Yes.

Should the 300-word statement explain why a piece of academic work has not appeared in a conventional form? — not necessarily, this is a matter of judgment and the sub-panel's criteria provides full details on the 300 word statement and how it can help elucidate the research output (p. 66 para. 13-14).

Concerning the status of ephemeral work: might software developed during a project be counted in some way? Could a supporting portfolio include an article about this software? — Yes, and the portfolio has been included to ensure that scholarly and other materials essential to an understanding of the research can be available

Does any moderation take place beyond the sub panel so that there is an opportunity for 'added value' before the main decision? — Strictly speaking the final decision rests with the main panel, which must confirm the recommendations of the sub-panel. The main panel may look, for example, at a number of factors (e.g. a high number of missing outputs) and ask that the sub-panel reflect on their assessment in the light of such issues.

Concerning interdisciplinary outputs; will these be put before the main panel or 'sliced up' between sub panels (e.g. Music and Drama)? — The research submission as it is provided will be submitted to a 'home' sub-panel that will be responsible for making the assessment. Cross-

be much more straightforward (read bibliometric) than the RAE. He was also critical of the way in which the AHRC had handled this business, and when I explained that this was being presented by the AHRC as 'something from the EU and nothing to do with us', he quietly explained that 'Europe – c'est nous.....'; in other words that the project is nothing more than the total of what member organisations come up with. I'm afraid that I didn't have much of a reply to this. Klein was clearly dissatisfied with the way in which the AHRC had handled this entire project.

When I arrived, the list had already begun to take on a plausible form that it never had before: the suggestions that had been made in both the UK letters (using the RILM listings and noting if the journal was present in the JSTOR listing) had been taken account of, and listing in the Thomson-ISI AHCI had also been noted. We spent most of the morning going through the list of titles, excising those that were clearly below the threshold for admission to the list, cleaning up some erroneous titles, and identifying gaps in knowledge where further work was required (quite a lot of this). I came away with titles in the followings subject areas to work further on, in other words to consult further:

- Music and Psychology (Eric Clarke)
- Ethnomusicology (Jonathan Stock)
- Music Education (Richard McGregor)
- Music Therapy (suggestions please?)
- The Irish list (Jan Smaczny)

We then looked at all the additions that colleagues had brought to the meeting, discussed them and added them to the list. We used these thereafter as a basis for practicing classification. The most problematic areas of classification immediately appeared between categories B and C. The C category is largely reserved for journals with a local or regional interest (defined geographically), but we found very few journals that fitted in this category (Musik in Baden-Württemberg was much cited.....), but we did find a number of journals that served a relatively small community – the Hindemith-Jahrbuch, for example, or the Journal of Schenker Studies – that could be scattered all over the world. This was a point well taken by the ERIH team, and could mean – if our concept of a 'virtual local community' was substituted for a concept of local or regional geography, that a lot of the journals heading for a B categorisation, and not just in music, would move into the C category.

We then moved on to a third pass through the list categorising those journals that we had not already identified for further work. The important thing here was identifying A journals, with the ranking largely being based

on whether it was essential reading for all in the field, or if it was a specialist journal that added value to the field as a whole. When I left the meeting, we had only taken a single run through this, and I suspect that the dozen or so journals graded A had probably gone up to around 20 by the end of the evening (I shall be watching this very carefully during the email exchanges that will be happening over the next few weeks).

There is much to do with the journals requiring further work over the next couple of weeks; my workload is outlined above, others have been tasked with trawling some of the underrepresented countries (Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Russia, Slovenia and Croatia).

In conclusion, we were undoubtedly correct in deciding to be part of this exercise and make it work; there is no doubt that it will be completed, and we need to be sure that the music component is as good as it needs to be. The remaining question, to my mind, is the extent to which the ESF can be sure of keeping its promise to object vigorously to using this index as any sort of bibliometric measure. When the project is finished in October 2006, how can we be sure that there will be anyone to stop VC 'x' closing department 'y' because there have been no publications in A-Graded journals for two years?

Committee meeting Summaries

Alison Marlow - Administrator

Saturday 4 March at the University of Birmingham

As usual, the March meeting concentrated on plans for the Annual Conference, which this year included a discussion of a preparatory meeting with the RAE 'O' Panel and Sub-Panel Chairs. This discussion helped to finalise the form that Conference would take.

The Committee discussed the possibility of focusing the 2007 Conference on the implications of and strategies for dealing with fee paying undergraduates in music departments. A decision will be taken at the October meeting.

referral can be requested but is not an automatic right (see p.65 para. 6 of the criteria). Sub-panels may also enlist specialist advice to assist their assessment of a submission (described in p. 19 para. 10-12 of the criteria).

What about two individuals who might submit an output to two different panels? — It depends how the output is described; two researchers can submit to two different panels and use the 300-word statement to explain the situation. Where a single output has a number of authors it can be submitted as many times as it has authors though it may also be relevant to submit a range of outputs that demonstrate the richness and diversity of the research environment.

What about world leading outputs that are not widely accessible, for example an article or book on Welsh music published in Welsh? — An output does not have to be universally accessible to be world leading, i.e. the issue is quality not geography; (table 2 on p. 20 of the criteria) the criteria for assessment are ‘significance, originality, rigour’; this could certainly be applied to an output in Welsh about Welsh music, e.g. is it an essential point of reference in its field and been influential upon that field?

Might the output being in Welsh reduce its impact? — No. It is not the size of the field but the influence within that field through the significance, originality and rigour of the research that matters.

Concerning clarification on intellectual sustainability: structure at a material level may not guarantee intellectual sustainability; for example, how does anyone know that a project founded in 2008 will have intellectual vigour in 2010? — This distinction arose in order to indicate that not just resources (e.g. equipment or a building) could define sustainability; there could well be further discussion regarding the definition of intellectual sustainability; it might be defined as ‘responsiveness and capacity for development’; it might also be defined as a ‘sense of creative and intellectual environment’ as well as equipment or the presence of research groups; where ‘new blood’ is invested in there must be a strategy for developing these researchers and for how the continuity of the environment in which they work is managed. Also, intellectual sustainability does not necessarily mean doing more of the same research; there may be instances where fundamental innovations have altered the course of the research and so ensured its sustainability.

Could part-time staff be submitted by two institutions (e.g. UCE Birmingham Conservatoire and RAM)? — So long as the individual does not add up to more than one FTE they can be submitted.

Ensemble performances can contain exciting and innovative features which could be returned; how would the panel view a performance, e.g. by the London Sinfonietta, in which only one performer was to be submitted? — It can be assessed if the significance, originality and rigour of the performance is evident and the contribution of the individual to these indicators of excellence is clearly and convincingly described.

Is 1 January 2001 an absolute cut off? What would happen in the case of a journal dated 2000 that did not appear until late in 2001? — Yes, it is a cut-off. See Guidance on submissions, para. 100: “If the date of imprint differs from the date of actual publication, and one of these dates lies outside the publication period, the variance must be noted...institutions may be required to provide evidence...such as a letter from a publisher.” The date at which it became publicly available is the key issue. In this context, attention was drawn to the earlier discussion of outputs put in the public domain in digital form.

See paragraph 100; the crucial thing seems to be the date by which an output is publicly available. — An output is submissible when it is publicly available; the printed publication date will very usually, though perhaps not always, be that at which the publication was first made available; the panels would react badly to attempts at gamesmanship.

Concerning gamesmanship, is there anything to prevent an institution from employing people two months before the census date? — No, there is nothing to stop them, though contract dates will be evident from RA1 and 0 and will be one factor amongst many in informing the sub-panel’s assessment of the overall quality of a submission. Also the contribution to the research environment of someone who had only recently arrived might be limited.

What might be the consequences? — It will be inevitable that some institutions may employ people in October 2007 and there is nothing to stop them concentrating investment. The presence of short-term contracts for example, around the census date, arranged for high profile researchers, perhaps from abroad, may or may not cause a sub-panel to reflect upon issues such as the research environment’s stability and sustainability, or look for particular innovations that have attracted such recruits.

What about the overlap of items? For example, a chapter that duplicates an article – it is after all in the nature of scholarship to overlap. — If the substance and form is different in these outputs they will be accepted as part of the research’s developmental process. Multiple counting of substantially the same research outputs however

should be avoided. Contribution from chair: the 300 words might help to explain the nature of the overlap and how this adds to the research’s development (see para. 29 of the generic statement).

Concerning early career researchers – would a junior research fellow who has moved into a lectureship count as an early career researcher? — Where there is doubt in such cases the RAE team would consider the status of A or A* staff [in relation to a situation such as this]. The number of outputs submitted for an early career researcher is set out in the guidance; the panel must make a judgement concerning how the submission of a number of outputs smaller than four is arrived at. Also, there might be a situation where someone has, after a long career spent exclusively as a teacher outside HE, recently started a research career — in this instance, provided it could be documented, they might be described as early career researchers. However, if they previously had a contract which rendered them eligible to be submitted as Cat A (i.e. on the payroll of an HEI, primary role teaching and/or research), then the beginning of that contract is when they first become eligible as an early career researcher.

If someone comes from another country, where research imperatives and culture might be different, to a UK institution, should they be seen as an early career researcher? — There may be a case where people have worked outside the HE sector who had also published – in such a case the panel would have to make an appropriate judgement. It is impossible to legislate for all circumstances – a judgement must be made, but it is not the sub-panel’s intention to create disadvantages from such instances where there may be doubt. Overall, they will be looking to find excellent research wherever and however it is produced.

When two authors are collaborating (which may indicate the richness of an Environment), for example, on a music theory book, might they be penalised for submitting the same item? — No. It is important that those who prepare the submission take care to make such instances clear in helping the sub-panel to form a fair and objective judgment.

The committee’s grateful thanks to Professor Jan Smaczny for preparing the bulk of this report which has been seen and approved for publication by the Professors Brown and Wathey.

Reports

**ERIH Music Expert Panel meeting,
11 June 2006, Mainz. (09.00 to 18.30)**

**Report by Mark Everist to NAMHE, RMA,
Dr William Drabkin.**

Present: Paivi McIntosh (ESF), Laurenz Lütteken (Zurich), Rudiger Klein (ERIH), Christian Meyer (Strasbourg; chair); Laszlo Dobszay (Budapest); Mark Everist (Southampton).

I attended this meeting in place of the official representative from the UK on the panel, Dr Bill Drabkin. In large part I was simply discharging my obligation as an alternate, and I largely did what I was told to. But given that the co-ordinator of the project, Paivi McIntosh, and one of its directors, Rudiger Klein, knew that I was the chair of NAMHE and had written one of the two reports that the project had received from the AHRC, this was obviously an excellent moment to make a few very important points. I was firm but polite, and was surprised about how well informed Klein in particular was about what is at stake in the UK in terms of research assessment, possible consequences of adverse performance, and so on. I made all the usual points, referring directly to the two letters that had been written by the RMA and by NAMHE; in turn, Klein mentioned discussions with NAMHE’s Darla Crispin and Katharine Ellis that he had at the meeting in Bristol at the end of March.

It was quite clear to me at the end of this discussion that the project is well aware of the dangers that the project poses to arts and humanities in the UK, and is proposing to make statements about the use to which the journals list will be put. I made the point – strongly – that they could recommend what they wanted, but that HEFCE, the AHRC (under pressure from other RCs) to say nothing of HEIs could do with a document in the public domains exactly what they liked. However Laurenz Lütteken (Universität Zurich) drew our attention to the fact that his department is under assessment from an institution using a list of journals that makes the early stages of the ERIH project seem like a model of completeness and accuracy. He made the point forcefully that a well-assembled list of journals such as ERIH would be a welcome change in the environment in which he and his colleagues worked.

Klein made the point that other EU countries would be introducing systems of research assessment that would