

SEN11D001

Title: Report of the Music Review Panel
Date: 2 November 2011
Circulation: Senate – 9 November 2011
Agenda: SEN11A001
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

To consider the recommendations of the Review Panel established by the Vice-Chancellor to review the future of the School of Music.

Recommendation

Senate is invited to offer such advice to Council on the recommendations of the Review Panel, as it deems appropriate to assist Council in reaching its conclusions at the Council meeting on 28 November.

Resource Implications

It is expected that costs arising from this process will be manageable.

Given the size of the School, the expectation that musical activities will continue and the number of the staff concerned, any staff costs could be met from funds set aside annually by the University for such purposes.

Risk Implications

Risks facing the University which have led to the Panel's recommendations include the following (risk assessment level in brackets):

- a) Uncertainty in reaching required thresholds for outputs, research income and impact case studies in the forthcoming REF (High)
- b) Need for continued financial subsidy in order to sustain teaching, research and other musical activities (High)
- c) Need for significant additional investment to provide adequate teaching/performance facilities to match competitors (High)
- d) Need for significant additional investment in staffing in order to provide the required a critical mass and leadership for research and teaching, as identified in 2002 review. (High)
- e) Need to utilise squeezed student numbers for lower tariff MUS students, rather than using places for higher demand/higher tariff Schools. (High)
- f) Uncertainty that the requirements of the University's New Academic Model could be met from current staff levels. (Medium)

Risks facing the University if the recommendations are accepted:

- g) Risk that the loss of a School of Music will impact upon the rest of the University (mitigated by the proposed continuation of musical activity at UEA) (Low)

- h) Risk that other Schools may suffer academically from the loss of music studies at UEA (joint courses with Mathematics and Computing have already closed to new intake) (Low)
- i) Risk that musical activity at UEA will not flourish without a School of Music. The Panel has noted that musical life at UEA does not depend solely upon the core academic staff of the School – orchestra and choir membership comes from across UEA Schools and instrumental tuition is provided by Associate Tutors. The recommendation is that the outreach function should be staffed and funded in order to ensure that musical activity will continue to develop at UEA. (Medium)
- j) Risk that current students will be adversely affected by the closure of the School. The recommendation is that the University should draw upon best practice in the Sector in handling departmental closures of this kind and in mentoring students affected. (Medium)

Equality and Diversity

An equality impact statement has been undertaken by the Equality and Diversity Manager. The conclusion reached is that “data on current students for the School of Music does not suggest a major adverse impact for any particular group of students with a protected characteristic, should the decision be taken to close the School”.

In the event that a decision may be taken to close the School, draft impact assessments for course closures have been undertaken. The conclusion reached in assessing the extent to which the withdrawal of courses in MUS has the potential to meet or hinder the policies, values or objectives of the University with regard to equality of opportunity is: “Low potential”.

Timing of Decisions

The recommendation is that the School would close when the current 2011 cohort had finished their studies (2014 or later for intercalating students).

Further Information

Contact: Lisa Williams, Assistant Registrar, Vice-Chancellor’s Office. By email: lisa.williams@uea.ac.uk or on ext 593612 or 592735

Background

INTRODUCTION

In September 2011 a Review Panel was established by the Vice-Chancellor to review the quality of academic activities in teaching and research taking place in the School of Music, its outreach activities and the structures and resources available to support the whole range of activity, in the context of the University's Corporate Plan.

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

A Dean from a Faculty other than HUM (Chair): Prof Ian Harvey
 The Head of the School: Prof John Charmley
 2 Senior Members of the academic staff of a Faculty other than HUM:
 Prof Nigel Norris EDU
 Prof Alastair Mullis LAW
 In attendance: A senior administrator from VCO: Lisa Williams

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference were to review the quality of academic activities in teaching and research, outreach activities, and the structures and resources available to support the whole range of activity, in the context of the University's Corporate Plan and with reference to

national and international standards of excellence, making use of faculty and university performance indicators.

The review was asked to take into account all relevant factors, especially:

- (i) research, including research grant applications and success rates, internal and external research collaborations, citation performance, the external assessment of possible REF submissions, and/or other output measures appropriate to the discipline, and future research plans;
- (ii) education, including the current range of undergraduate and graduate programmes, the quality of those programmes, student recruitment at all levels and the quality of the student intake, the student experience (including contact hours and feedback, completion rates, degree results, employability), and plans for refreshing the portfolio of programmes;
- (iii) knowledge transfer, including interactions with business, professional practice and public engagement;
- (iv) management and resources, including leadership, finance, human resources and space;
- (v) the financial situation of the School, including the sustainability and sources of all current streams of funding;
- (vi) size and shape, including the academic and financial viability of the School at its present and planned future size;
- (vii) external relations, including international collaborations.

The Review Panel was asked to report on the appropriateness of the School's academic and financial objectives and to assess whether there is a persuasive plan to enable the School to realise those objectives in the post-2012 funding regime.

1. CONDUCT OF THE REVIEW

The Review Panel met as a formal group on three occasions. A number of UEA staff members were interviewed in person by the Panel: Dean HUM, Associate Dean Research HUM, Director of Planning, HUM Faculty Finance Manager, Associate Dean Teaching HUM. (It was agreed that it was not necessary to interview Head of School Prof John Charmley formally, since he was on the Panel and could advise as required throughout the process.)

Written records and performance data were considered in the following areas: Research, Education, Management and Resources, Finance, Planning and Outreach/Engagement. A full list of all documentation considered appears in the Appendix. The Panel had a free hand to request further documentation and analysis as required.

The Chair visited the Music building in person and viewed the new extension and refurbished concert room.

The aim was to examine the data, identify missing data, consider oral testimony and thereby to review the School's trajectory in all performance indicators and to make recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Panel therefore reviewed documentation with a view to understanding:

- 1) the market for music degrees in the UK, and how UEA Music School compared with other music departments nationally;
- 2) whether the School's apparently small size enabled it to cover the curriculum adequately/competitively for both teaching and research;
- 3) whether there are similar sized music schools, which are successful, in terms of teaching, research, financial viability etc.;

- 4) how far the School had addressed perceived shortcomings identified in the previous 2002 Review.

2. DOCUMENTATION

Considered

Documentation as outlined in the Document Summary in the Appendix.

3. BACKGROUND

- 1) Music at UEA started in the 1960s under the direction of UEA's first Director of Music Sir Philip Ledger, with some involvement from Benjamin Britten. As part of the School of Fine Art and Music, in 1973 Music moved to its own building, funded by the Nuffield Foundation and still cited by Arup Acoustics as an important example of their work. It was built to house an annual intake of 12 undergraduates. The UG intake in 2011/12 was 49. MUS is now one of 9 Schools in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities (HUM). It currently has an academic staff of 6.85 FTE (5.25 FTE ATR, 1.6FTE ATS) with additional teaching provided by up to 10 Associate Tutors.
- 2) MUS obtained a 4 rating in RAE 2001, under the old system. In RAE 2008 MUS obtained a GPA of 2.15 (second lowest in HUM). MUS was the only HUM School with no 4* rating. It was assessed as having 40% 3* activity, 40% 2*, 15% 1* and 5% unclassified.
- 3) MUS underwent an external School review in 2002, commissioned by the then Vice-Chancellor Vincent Watts which was carried out by the Heads of Music of the University of Newcastle and University of Wales, Bangor. At that time it was recognised by the Review team that with only 5 academic staff (4 faculty, 1 fixed term), the School of Music was "at the absolute margin of viability". The 2002 review recommended swift expansion to 8 staff in order to offer a reasonable range of key teaching specialisms and to enable the School to function more effectively as a research unit, with sufficient mutual support and cover (eg for study leave) to enable research to flourish.
- 4) Attempts to implement such recommendations have proved difficult. Although new staff have been recruited, almost ten years after the 2002 review an FTE of 8 has still not been achieved, and the attempt to expand the School through the creation of a new teaching programme has not enjoyed the success that had been hoped for. A previous Head of School, Prof David Chadd passed away in 2006 and the School has been without a Chair appointment ever since. Prof John Charmley (Head of School of History) was appointed as Acting Head of School in 2009 and has remained so.
- 5) The 2002 review noted that the undergraduate curriculum had some strengths but also noted its limitations. A new degree in Music and Technology was introduced in 2009 in response to the 2002 recommendations. This degree was designed to expand the number of undergraduates in the School, and thus to provide the resource to fund up to three new colleagues. The School's admissions quota was increased from 25 to 44 in 2009/10 but until 2011 this target remained beyond reach (recruitment of 37 students in both 2009/10 and 2010/11). Thus there has not been sufficient extra resource to fund the additional permanent staff needed. The student number target was reduced to 33 in 2011/12; 49 new students have been recruited. Whether in the new fees climate recruitment to this enhanced number can be sustained is doubtful.
- 6) MUS has for at least thirteen years been in receipt of a subvention from the University to support what would now be broadly termed "engagement" activities i.e Choir, Orchestra, performances and concerts for the wider community. As a result of the 2002 review the annual subvention was

increased from £85,230 to £104,493. This was in respect of its activities in encouraging, supervising and providing for campus music activities. In 2011/12 the level of subvention is £159,991 (set to increase to £165,006 in 2013/14). Under the previous financial regime and following the 2002 review, MUS was also supported via a reduced space charge in recognition of the wider UEA usage of the Concert room and Practice Rooms, and the administrative support was upgraded.

4. RESEARCH

- 1) The Panel considered the School's contribution to the 2008 HUM Strategy document. This highlighted "a re-energised bidding culture in the School". Unfortunately there appeared to be no evidence of this since then. Only one grant bid had been placed since 2008 (it was unsuccessful) and no grant income had been obtained. By contrast, in the prior RAE period there was external research grant funding from the British Academy, ACE, EPSRC, British Council and AHRB (much emanating from David Chadd's work). In research terms the School's 2008 Strategy document highlighted a reputation in the fields of technologically-informed music practice, electro-acoustic composition, musicology, digital archiving and music practice at the emerging interface between electronic music performance, improvisation and composition. The 2008 RAE sub-Panel noted that "Despite claims that 'music as practice' is a characteristic of this department with electro-acoustic composition highlighted as a key research activity, the bulk of submitted outputs are textual materials in books and journals, with a spread of historical periods from the 19th century to the present day."
- 2) The 2008 RAE outcome for MUS was disappointing overall in comparison to other Schools in HUM or Music schools nationally. MUS achieved a GPA of 2.15 (second lowest in HUM) and was the only HUM School with no identified 4* activity. MUS was assessed as having 0% 4* activity, 40% 3* activity, 40% 2*, 15% 1* and 5% unclassified. The absence of 4* activity is unusual amongst close competitor institutions in Music (Bath Spa (10/20/50/20), Bristol (10/75/10/5), Nottingham (25/60/15/0), Sheffield (45/35/20/0), Southampton (50/30/15/5), Surrey (15/60/20/5) and York (50/25/20/5) who all achieved some 4* research (percentage at 4*/3*/2*/1* listed in brackets after each institution). The Review Panel inferred from this that the 2008 RAE sub-Panel had not been reticent about awarding 4* scores for outputs.
- 3) Nevertheless the RAE sub-Panel's comments included some positive comments on the School's research and an appreciation of the difficult staffing circumstances during the 2001-2008 period, particularly with the death of the Head of School in 2006. It was "...noted with regret the death of a key researcher...there is evidence that staffing issues have impacted negatively on outputs...the sub-Panel considers there is a clear and convincing strategy in place to move forward to the next assessment period." They also noted that there were examples of outputs which were internationally excellent (ie 3*) across the range of work submitted. They noted a distinctive and coherent strategy yielding levels of per-FTE research income and research student numbers which were at the top end of the distribution for this UOA, in the 2001-2008 period.
- 4) Since then, however, the trajectory has been downwards. The Panel learnt that in early 2010 it was apparent that MUS would have no submission prepared in time for the University's Interim REF. In order to establish whether a REF submission of sufficient quality could be drawn together, the School was given a special dispensation by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research of nine months for further work to be undertaken and for planned outputs to be written up. To support this endeavour, one staff member was awarded a full year's study leave and another staff member awarded one semester's study leave. The

extended Interim REF deadline for submission was not met and it was not until September 2011 that a submission was finally completed.

- 5) The research performance of the School in this REF period has unfortunately in several respects appeared unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the additional time allocated to MUS to enable it to put together a REF submission, the Panel heard evidence from the Associate Dean Research and Dean HUM to the effect that they were not confident that the extended period had actually resulted in a clear, credible REF submission being produced. It was still not clear how many REF-submittable outputs had been produced during the census period. The Panel noted that there was still some lack of clarity as to whether compositions proposed for submission would count for REF purposes (the Panel understood that there was a requirement for REF to show that compositions were underpinned by research, rather than being simply a creative product, and this was still not fully established in the MUS submission). The Associate Dean Research indicated that she was not confident that the Interim REF, once submitted, would show any improvements in research from the 2008 RAE submission; indeed there was concern that the submission would be weaker than before.

- 6) The Panel noted that the current expectation of the Head of School and the Associate Dean for Research HUM was that out of 6 Category A academic staff (5.25 FTE) in MUS only 3 or 4 staff would have 4 outputs of the required quality by the REF census deadline. The Interim REF Assessor has reported to the Executive Team on a delayed schedule (due to delayed submission) on the quality of those outputs already prepared. The prospects for a full submission of the required quality in time for the main REF are poor.

It was noted that whilst there were potentially some REF impact case-studies which could be developed for MUS, the Associate Dean was concerned that most of the impact had not taken place within the REF counting period.

- 7) The Panel noted the concern expressed by the Associate Dean for Research HUM that the School seemed to be failing to engage with the REF process in the way other Schools in HUM were doing. The Panel heard that key individuals had not attended some relevant research meetings. The old HUM Research Office had, the AD reported, provided considerable help to the School.
- 8) The Review Panel's overall conclusion is that the School's ambitious research strategy in 2007/8 has not been fully implemented and as a result the School has not delivered the hoped-for results by 2011. Moreover, the Panel could not find any evidence that a significant positive change in the School's research performance was likely and as a consequence the outlook for the School in the harsher financial climate for universities under the new fee regime appears to the Panel to be bleak.
- 9) In the Review Panel's view it was a reasonable assumption on the basis of all the evidence so far, that MUS would not fare any better in the REF than in RAE2008. The £90K HEFCE R income secured then was therefore likely to be reduced and with no concomitant increase in grant income likely to plug the gap. On the basis of all the evidence reviewed by the Panel, it was clear that a research culture in the School of Music was not sustainable in its current form.
- 10) Overall the Research picture was one of uncertainty in reaching the required thresholds for outputs, no current grant spend, no realistic prospect of grant spend in the near future and little research upon which to generate impact case studies within the required time-frame. The research culture appeared under-developed, with little or no evidence of collaboration between academic staff in MUS and academics in the rest of HUM or other areas of the University. The

Panel noted a lack of effective research leadership in the School. Attempts to enlarge the research base of the School since 2002 had not been successful over the long term.

5. EDUCATION

Noted:

- 1) MUS currently runs two undergraduate courses – W300 BA(Hons) Music and W350 BA(Hons) Music with Technology, a new course introduced in 2009. Previous courses in Maths and Music and Maths and Computing were closed to new entrants in 2010. MUS was oversubscribed in 2011 exceeding its target of 33 by 16. There are currently 25 new students on W300 Music and 24 on W350 Music with Technology.
- 2) MUS has in the past taught some PGT students on an MMus in Performance and Conducting, but these have tended to be bespoke programmes catering for very small numbers (an intake of 3 PGT students in 2011/12 against a target of 4). There have also been a number of Masters by Research and PGR students (currently an intake of 4 PGR students against a target of 4).
- 3) A significant increase in tariff of new entrants was noted between 2006/7 and 2011/12, partly accounted for by changes in methodology but also indicative of some notable improvement in the qualifications of students attracted. Applications and accepts for W300 have both increased for 2011 entry. Tariff rose from 279 in 2006/7 to 405 in 2011/12, in part because of favourable changes by UCAS to the music awards included in the tariff calculation. However, the School's tariff remained below the HUM average of 426 and it was noted that the proportion of AAB students in the 2011 intake remained very low (18%) in comparison with the overall UEA figure of 38% and HUM average of 50%. There had, moreover, been inconsistency in its recruitment over the last five years despite a relatively healthy national market. Volatility in conversion of applications to accepts for Music was also noted. The Planning Office analysis suggested that this might be due to the comparatively low entry requirements for the course (BBB in 2012 compared to Bristol AAB-BBB, Nottingham ABB, Southampton ABB, York ABB, Bath Spa 220-280, Surrey AAB-ABB). Additionally it was noted that UEA Music was at risk of being held as an insurance offer. In the Panel's view, in the current fees climate the ability of a School to attract AAB+ students was critical, these being the only students that can be recruited without restriction.
- 4) In an analysis of Subject Level Position in the Good University Guide 2012, it is notable that MUS was one of the UEA subjects which had risen (along with Sociology, Communication and Media Studies and Biological Sciences), gaining ten places from a ranking of 38th to 28th out of 72 institutions. The active indicators at subject level are National Student Survey and entry standards (both of which showed an improvement for MUS) plus Research quality and graduate employment prospects (which had largely remained static or fallen slightly). The Planning Office noted that at subject level there was considerable volatility year on year. In the Panel's view the improvements in entry standards have had an impact on league table performance for MUS, albeit from a low level.
- 5) The Panel were informed that there were nonetheless some serious problems in the School's Learning and Teaching strategy and delivery. The Panel interviewed the outgoing Associate Dean Teaching and noted his view that teaching in MUS was based less around an organised curriculum, than on a selection of modules reflecting the staff's personal interests, past and present. It was reported that the limited number of modules available meant that some Year 2 modules were offered in Year 3. These matters were, however, not raised in the one External Examiner's report available to the Panel. In the

Panel's view, given the difficulties faced by such a small number of staff, it was to their credit that they had managed to deliver the quality of education that they had and to provide the improvements noted.

- 6) Nevertheless, having considered carefully the existing curriculum, the Panel's view was that much work would need to be undertaken in the light of the University's New Academic Model requirements regarding overall course coherence and progression between levels. The Panel noted that a root and branch review of courses within MUS would be needed. Clear leadership in teaching would be required, yet a new lecturer on probation had had to take on the role of Director of Teaching.
- 7) The view of the ADT was noted in the following areas: the introduction of a new course in Music and Technology had clearly stretched the School in terms of its ability to deliver its teaching. The School was dependent upon a number of Associate Tutors to deliver core teaching. There were management issues within the School surrounding compliance with UEA teaching processes, such as meeting deadlines for teaching administration. This required constant vigilance on the part of the ADT and Faculty staff; it was unclear how far this situation was sustainable.

6. MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES

- 1) Accumulating concerns about the relative lack of effective leadership within the School, after the death of David Chadd in 2006, led the previous Dean HUM to invite the Head of History, Prof John Charmley, to take over as Head of School, in addition to his other roles. It is understood that due to the low number of students in MUS during this period (UG intakes of 21, 22 and 32 in 2006/7/8), investment in a new Chair was not deemed financially viable at that juncture.
- 2) The MUS building has been a cause of concern over a long period and would require investment to make it match competitors and appeal to students. The 2008 MUS Strategy document reported that: "The School was built to provide accommodation for half the current number of students. While the current situation has been manageable, the School cannot offer the facilities of its competitor institutions, nor does it have room within the building to expand its activities substantially. The University Architect has drawn up plans to construct a new recital hall and additional studio, teaching and office space by covering the adjoining amphitheatre."

This was part of an ambitious scheme originally drawn up in 2006 to construct a new concert hall and various ancillary rooms in the space currently occupied by the outdoor amphitheatre adjacent to the main entrance to Music. This proposed extension at 3 levels was costed at approx £4.5million in 2006. In the absence of a convincing business case, this extension was never built.

- 3) The current situation appears little better. The Sept 2010 Module Monitoring report by the Director of Teaching notes that "Facilities remain a major issue in respect of both recruitment and student satisfaction. While computing facilities have been much enhanced, they remain barely sufficient. Purpose-built studios are now the norm in music departments, and while the current situation stimulates ingenuity...there are important learning opportunities we are unable to provide. An additional seminar room has been a welcome addition (the first since the School was built 40 years ago) but there is a conspicuous lack of appropriate large teaching and performance space and practice facilities are now insufficient."
- 4) The Panel requested a report from the Director of Estates on the MUS facilities and noted that there had been a recent limited extension of the building ("phase 1 MUS extension") which had improved the external fabric and provided a new

practice room and corridor. Anticipated capital expenditure on the building's maintenance in the next 5 years was likely to be in the region of £100K. There was planning permission for additional extension work ("phase 2 MUS extension") which would allow physical connection via a new staircase to the current Careers building and provide a limited amount of additional space, but it was unlikely that this would meet all the needs of an expanded School of Music. Estimated capital cost of this limited extension would be £350K; further expansion would obviously increase this amount.

- 5) In terms of attracting students, according to a survey of offer holders who declined a place at UEA for 2010 entry, those who had declined a course in MUS were significantly more likely than average to say that course facilities had been their main reason for declining.
- 6) The Panel also considered web pages showing facilities at other Music departments nationally and the impression gained was one of the UEA MUS School being rather limited. This was in part to be expected given, as noted in the background section, that the building had originally been intended to house an intake of only 12 undergraduates. The Panel noted that a constant feature of internal reports by the School (eg the 2007 new course proposal) was reference to under-investment in Music facilities at UEA. "In an increasingly facility-critical market, the School of Music has weathered prolonged under-investment. It has maintained its reputation...despite its facilities and staffing comparing unfavourably with even regional institutions such as West Suffolk College, Colchester institute and Anglia Ruskin. There are no top-flight universities without state-of-the-art studio and performance facilities and dedicated technical support".
- 7) The Panel interviewed the Dean of HUM and noted his view that MUS suffered from being small, with no senior staff able to fill senior management positions and that the School had old-fashioned facilities compared to its competitors
- 8) The Panel noted Dean HUM's view that in order to revamp the School, a new Professorial appointment would be needed to provide leadership/management, supported by approximately four additional staff at Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Reader levels to provide the appropriate weight and size to the School. This is clearly a substantial investment with no prospect of matching research and tuition income.
- 9) In the view of the Panel, the School had received supplementary support from the University for the last ten years and had received leadership via the Head of another School, for whose time MUS was not charged. However, the structure of the School, with no Chair of Music and comprising only Lecturer/Senior Lecturer staff meant there was a lack of the specialist leadership necessary to meet the challenges of the new fee regime. MUS would require a level of investment in staff and facilities for which there was not the resource. In the Panel's view and based upon all the evidence they had reviewed, the School was not a good prospect for the investment of further University resource.

7. FINANCE AND PLANNING

The Panel requested and considered;

- 1) Current Financial Plan for MUS;
- 2) financial modelling of MUS, particularly financial projections after apportionment;
- 3) an analysis of what would happen financially if there was to be an increase/reduction in student numbers;

- 4) an analysis of what would happen when the HEFCE income line is removed entirely in 2014/15 and what happened to income overall in the new funding regime;
- 5) an analysis of what happened in the above scenarios when the c. £150k subvention is removed. In particular, what would be the break-even student number for MUS, with and without the University's subvention.

The Panel noted

- 1) The main sources of finance in MUS were Home/EU student income, the University's subvention and a small amount of research income. There was no indication that the financial situation was set to improve. As already noted, QR research income could well reduce post-REF. Moreover, under the new fee regime a slight drop in income was forecast next year, even with the additional 16 students recruited in 2011.
- 2) It was noted that the University's c.£150K subvention to MUS had been originally awarded (over ten years ago) to promote the equivalent of "enterprise and engagement" activities in MUS but had been used in significant part as core subsidy for some time. The Panel viewed this as contrary to normal UEA practice and undesirable over such a long period.
- 3) Without the annual subvention the School would be in deficit, and remain so for the foreseeable future. The size of this deficit was set to increase from 2014/15 when it was anticipated that student numbers would, at best, return to 33 with significant risk that the Government's new core-and-margin policies might force it lower. To illustrate this point, if the planned annual subvention (set to rise to £165K) were to be removed in 2014/15, the deficit would be £165K and this was considered likely to be an underestimate. It was clear that the School depended critically upon the UEA subvention in order to balance the books, and that this subvention was being used for core running costs rather than solely for engagement activities.
- 4) Without the subvention, the analysis provided for the Panel by Finance showed that the break-even student number would need to be 41, rather than the Student Number Control of 33 awarded to MUS currently, so a permanent transfer of at least 8 student places from elsewhere at UEA would be required. The Government's new core and margin policies are making it very difficult for the Faculty to allocate additional places to School's recruiting few AAB candidates. To do so for Music becomes all the harder from September 2012 and the onset of the new fee regime, when Music will cease to receive Hefce funding for new students on both undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes
- 5) The Panel also considered the reverse scenario whereby the MUS Student Number Control target of 33 could potentially be redistributed to other areas at UEA. The analysis by the Planning Office showed that the weighted average of 33 students redistributed throughout UEA would have very little impact on UEA's *overall* league table performance, either positively or negatively, if simply salami-sliced across all Schools.
- 6) However the Panel noted that targeted use of these numbers could have considerable impact in making possible urgently needed growth in other HUM Schools. For example an extra 33 well-qualified students into LCS could have beneficial institutional impact in terms of critical mass, league tables and finances. Equally, it could make institutional sense to add the number to the higher demand/higher tariff Schools such as LDC, HIS, PHA or LAW or to redistribute them across all HUM schools where demand was stronger. The Panel noted the wide gap between LDC, which had shown potential to recruit 85% at AAB and above, and MUS where the equivalent figure is 16%. Moreover any released student numbers could be used to protect HUM's other Schools from the impact of

the new core and margin mechanism, which from 2012 will reduce the number of places available at UEA for students with qualifications below AAB.

8. ENTERPRISE AND ENGAGEMENT/OUTREACH

- 1) The Panel noted that the School currently hosts:
 - an extensive programme of concerts by UEA orchestras, choirs and ensembles; attendance at the orchestra and choir concerts average approximately 400 per performance;
 - the Sonic Arts series of electro-acoustic, experimental and improvised music;
 - a series of concerts by visiting chamber groups, soloists, early music and jazz artists;
 - performances by students, including a monthly series at the Assembly House;
 - concerts by resident ensembles – currently the Allegri String quartet and Chamber Orchestra Anglia.
- 2) In terms of benefits to the wider UEA community, instrumental and vocal tuition is provided by freelance teachers (mainly professional performers, rather than the School's academic staff). Tuition is provided as part of their course of study for MUS students, other UEA students can pay directly for such tuition.
- 3) The Friends of UEA Music, an organisation which supports the School and organises fundraising events, plays a significant role in this flourishing picture.
- 4) The Panel was impressed by the range of musical activity at the University. However, it was clear to the Panel that the musical life of the University does not depend solely upon the core academic staff of the School. By way of example, of the 70 players currently in the orchestra, 21 are current Music students and 7 are ex-Music students (graduated from 2-10 years ago). Thus only one-third are students from MUS. The rest are mainly other students/staff from UEA and occasionally members from the wider community are sought if a particular instrument is not represented.
- 5) The Panel noted that a member of academic staff had been given responsibility, as outreach coordinator, to consolidate and develop the current programme of musical activity at UEA and the relationship with Chamber Orchestra Anglia. Chamber Orchestra Anglia was founded ten years ago (from an initiative within the University) to house a fully professional, top quality orchestra in Norwich and in association with UEA, so that young musicians would have regular access to high-quality performances, be taught by top professionals and consequently raise their aspiration. Four years ago COA was made orchestra-in-residence at UEA. Some of COA's principal players give masterclasses from time to time and the orchestra has presented a number of concerts in collaboration with various members of Schools outside Music e.g. Mathematics, Genetics, Drama, Creative Writing.
- 6) The Panel saw considerable value to UEA students in the outreach function continuing, perhaps located within the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, alongside the Events function.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The external review in 2002 noted that the School of Music was “at the absolute margin of viability.” Since that time, in the view of the Panel, there has been insufficient improvement to warrant continued subsidy of or enhanced investment in the School of Music.
- 2) After careful consideration of all the factors involved, including the research profile, the unanimous recommendation of the Review Panel is that UEA should not continue to teach music at UG, PGT or PGR level, once the current 2011 cohort have completed their degrees. In its present form, by virtue of its small size, outdated facilities and lack of senior leadership, the School faced what were felt to be insuperable challenges.
- 3) In the event that a decision to close the School is made, every effort should be made to ensure that the current cohort of students are supported throughout their degrees, and are able to complete their studies without detriment. The University should draw upon best practice in the Sector in handling departmental closures of this kind and in mentoring the students affected.
- 4) The Panel further recommends that the flourishing musical activity and outreach/engagement at UEA should continue, supported by a subsidy from the University.

October 2011

APPENDIX – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY PANEL FOR MUSIC REVIEW 2011

RESEARCH

Research applications and awards for HUM since 2005/6 to present
RAE2008 Submission for MUS
RAE2008 Panel comments for MUS
RAE2008 GPA scores for HUM
Explanation re: lack of citation data for HUM Schools
Comparator RAE data for other institutions in Music UOA67
Individual research plans 2011 for MUS staff
Draft Impact document 2011 for MUS
Interim REF Assessor's Report 2011

EDUCATION

Course brochure
External Examiners' Report 2010-11
Module Monitoring/Course Update 2009-10 (report from Director of Teaching)
UG, PGT and PGR Target vs Registration 2005/6 – 2011/12
UG and PGT Applications 2006-2011
Admissions data analysis
Details of competitor institutions listed for W3 Music on UCAS forms 2010 and 2011
Student number census 2011
Student number analysis
PGR completion rates
Tariff summary MUS 2006/7 – 2011/12
Tariff summary UEA 2006/7 – 2011/12
Tariff summary comparator data for other institutions
AAB analysis by UEA School 2007/8 – 2011/12
Contact hours information
NSS 2006 – 2011 for UEA/MUS
NSS comparator data for other institutions
Good University Guide analysis
League tables analysis
UEA First Destinations survey data plus Employment data from Careers Service
Web search on teaching facilities at other Universities' music departments

OUTREACH

Music events webpages on UEA Symphony orchestra and choir, Music at One, Chamber Choir, Sonic Arts, Allegri Quartet, other UEA concerts
Chamber Orchestra Anglia information
Additional background information from Concerts assistant and Director of Music

MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES

Staffing details from HR
Estates report on MUS building and building plans
Estates floor plans and accompanying notes

APPENDIX – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY PANEL FOR MUSIC REVIEW 2011

FINANCE

Income and Expenditure 2008/9-2010/11

MUS Financial Plan 2011/12

Financial modelling on different student numbers and future fees scenarios

Load transfer details

Financial subvention details/background

HISTORIC AND FUTURE PLANS

Report of Music Review July 2002 and HSS Deans response Sept 2002

Green paper Response 2006

Music Technology proposal 2007

MUS Strategy paper 2008

MUS Away Day Strategy paper 2011