

This statement should be read alongside the statement for Main Panel O and the generic statement.

Absences of the chair and declarations of interest

1. The sub-panel has nominated a permanent deputy chair to act in the absence of the chair or where the chair declares a conflict of interest in an institution's submission. Where both the chair and deputy chair declare a conflict of interest in the same institution, then the sub-panel will nominate one of the remaining members to officiate in that instance.

2. A current register of major interests for all sub-panel members will be collated by the RAE team and held by the panel secretary. Where a sub-panel member declares a number of minor interests in a particular institution, the sub-panel will judge whether this constitutes a major interest. The chair, deputy chair and panel secretary will ensure that declarations of interest by any sub-panel member are identified before meetings. Members will withdraw from the discussion of any submission in which they have declared a current or recent major interest.

UOA descriptor and boundaries

3. The sub-panel recognises the rich diversity of research in music, and welcomes all outputs arising from this research, in whatever genre or medium, that can be demonstrated to meet the definition of research for the RAE at Annex 3, and that have entered the public domain during the publication period. The sub-panel is committed to applying criteria and working methods that reflect the unique character and full breadth of the discipline, and that facilitate the formation of a balanced range of judgements, without privileging any particular form of research output or type of research environment.

4. The UOA encompasses the history, theory, analysis, creation, performance and production of music, in any genre or medium, and the broadest understanding of the subject discipline and its relationship to current practices and cultures. The sub-panel will assess research from all areas of music, which include (but are not confined to):

- composition and creative practice
- performance

- musicology (including historical, critical, empirical, ethnographic, theoretical, analytical and organological approaches)
- scientific approaches to the study of music
- new technology and music
- musical acoustics and audio engineering (where the subject matter is music-related)
- appropriate pedagogic research in any of the areas identified above.

5. The sub-panel recognises that, in many cases, the fields of work described above may be interdisciplinary, and thus have no firm or rigidly definable boundaries. It has taken account of the Quality Assurance Agency's subject benchmarking statement for these fields, and regards the statement as a useful but not limiting guide to its remit. For these reasons, while many submissions will reflect the work of departments, the sub-panel will also assess submissions that do not map neatly onto departmental structures within HEIs, where they properly and informatively reflect the organisation and conduct of research within the institution.

Cross-referral and specialist advice

6. Working within the framework established by the main panel (see paragraphs 10-12 of the main panel statement), the sub-panel will, on a case-by-case basis, determine how specialist advice should best be incorporated into its assessments. The sub-panel will consider all requests for cross-referral, in the context of RAE policy, and will normally take account of such requests. The sub-panel may itself cross-refer work to other sub-panels as appropriate.

Research staff

7. The research outputs of Category A staff should be submitted in RA2, where they will be assessed. The work of Category C staff should also be submitted in RA2, accompanied by a description in RA5c that provides evidence of their research connection with the department (see paragraph 42 below). Where the sub-panel accepts this evidence, the contributions of Category C staff will be assessed on an equal

UOA 67, Music

footing with Category A staff. The contributions of staff in Categories B and D should be described in RA5a.

Research output

8. The sub-panel will neither advantage nor disadvantage any type of research or form of output, whether it be physical or virtual, textual or non-textual, visual or sonic, static or dynamic, digital or analogue. Outputs may include, but are not limited to (in no particular order): books (authored or edited); chapters in books; journal articles; conference contributions; digital and broadcast media; performances; artefacts; recordings; software; music scores; films, videos and other types of media presentation; advisory reports; and the creation of archival or specialist collections to support the research infrastructure. In all cases the research outputs will be assessed against the indicators of excellence and degrees of quality described in Table 2 and paragraphs 15-23 of the main panel statement.

9. The sub-panel will assess all outputs against the absolute standards set out for quality levels (as described in paragraph 17 of the main panel statement) through the indicators of excellence described in Table 2 of the main panel statement.

10. The sub-panel would normally expect to see four outputs for each submitted researcher. Where there are valid reasons for the submission of fewer than four outputs, there will be no disadvantage. Valid reasons are set out in paragraphs 33-35 of the main panel statement. Where the sub-panel can identify no valid reasons for the 'missing' outputs, then their quality level will be set as Unclassified and incorporated as such into the quality profile.

11. The sub-panel recognises that there may be some highly exceptional cases – for example where a researcher has been engaged in a long-term research project – where the intellectual scale and scope of the research activity represented in one or more of the submitted outputs is considerably greater than the others. The sub-panel will note such highly exceptional cases during its assessment of outputs, taking account

of any relevant information provided in RA5b, and will use its expert judgement to decide whether to recognise such exceptional scale and scope within the outputs quality profile.

12. The sub-panel welcomes the submission of co-authored and collaborative research. It recognises that collaborative research within a department may result in the same output being listed against more than one researcher in the same submission. In such cases, the sub-panel recommends that the statement permitted in the 'Other relevant details' field in RA2 is used to clarify each author's contribution. However, the sub-panel encourages departments to present the widest possible range of research within their submission, in order to provide the sub-panel with a full understanding of the research environment's breadth and richness.

13. In undertaking its detailed examination of the research outputs, sub-panel members will draw upon the evidence made available to them in order to form expert judgements on the quality of the research submitted. 'Evidence' is taken to mean that which makes manifest the research content and imperatives of the submission. Researchers should accordingly submit such evidence as they deem necessary to enable sub-panel members to assess it within the following guidelines:

- a. **Research output:** this may be submitted alone where it is deemed to constitute sufficient evidence of the research in itself.
- b. **Statement:** it is *recommended* that a statement of up to 300 words is submitted in the 'Other relevant details' field of RA2, in cases where the research imperatives and the research significance of an output (such as: an artefact, curation, digital format, installation, performance or event, screening, tape, textbook, translation or video) might further be made evident by a descriptive complement. The statement might include: a brief description of the project and its stage of development; a rationale outlining questions addressed; a summary of approaches/strategies undertaken in the

work; a digest of further evidence (if any) to be found in sub-paragraph 13c below. As previously indicated, the 300-word statement should also be used to clarify the relative contributions of researchers working on a collaborative research project. The sub-panel will ignore any evaluative commentary on the perceived quality of the research.

- c. **Portfolio:** additional scholarly materials deemed to assist the sub-panel may be identified under the 'Other relevant details' field in RA2, and be made available on request in either digital and/or physical form. This may be of particular use to the sub-panel in cases where the research output is no longer available, or is one in a series of interconnected outputs. The portfolio might include complementary writings about the processes and outcomes of the work and/or other documentary materials (such as DVDs, tapes, photographs, sketchbooks, web-sites, interviews or programme notes). The material should be presented to best assist members in accessing the research and/or scholarly dimensions of the work.
14. To build a quality profile for research outputs the sub-panel will:
- assess outputs against the three indicators of excellence (significance, originality, and rigour), identifying each with a quality level (see paragraphs 15-22 of the main panel statement)
 - weight all outputs equally unless, exceptionally, an output has been judged to be of a considerably greater scale and scope
 - use the outputs examined in detail to compile a percentage profile that represents the quality of all outputs in each submission
 - take account of all the information provided in RA5b, as set out in paragraph 33-35 of the main panel statement
 - agree a quality profile in 5% bands so that it constitutes 70% of the overall quality profile.

Research environment

15. In assessing the research environment the sub-panel recognises there are no absolute standards applicable to all submissions. It will take account of variables such as the numbers of research-active staff submitted, their relative career stages and their levels of experience, along with relevant information in RA5b.

16. Institutions should provide information in RA5a concerning both the research environment and indicators of esteem, working to the maximum word lengths stipulated in Annex 6. To assist the work of the sub-panel, institutions are requested to structure the research environment element of RA5a to demonstrate how the research environment meets the indicators of excellence given for it, ie, strategy, people, and structure. Examples of the kind of information that could be included under each heading are given below. The examples given are purely indicative and may not apply for all departments; institutions are not required to provide information under every example given.

Strategy

The research strategy and its operation

17. Examples may include, but are not limited to:
- the research strategy during the assessment period 2001 to 2007, identifying any key issues as described in a submission to the 2001 RAE, if applicable
 - an outline of the research strategy envisaged from 2007 onwards. This statement may also mention new and developing initiatives that are not yet producing immediate outcomes; or which may not yet be performing at a national or international level, but which are nevertheless of strategic importance to the submitting institution.

Sustainability of the research environment

18. Examples may include, but are not limited to:
- evidence of long-term planning for promoting research and sustaining an active

UOA 67, Music

and vital research culture, including evidence of institutional commitment to the department/discipline

- mechanisms for developing the research culture, eg, publications, journals, newsletters, online reviews, and symposia.

Research grant applications and other forms of research income

19. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- procedures and support for research grant applications
- the diversity of sources of research income, including any research income not cited in RA4 (eg, Arts Council awards made directly to individual researchers)
- numbers of successful grant applications
- numbers of completed projects
- the leadership, supervision, dissemination, evaluation and successful delivery of funded research projects.

People

Support and training for research staff

20. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- arrangements for developing and supporting staff in their research, including how this support sits with their non-research duties
- arrangements for developing the research of colleagues new to research and for integrating them into a wider supportive research culture
- recruitment or secondment of research staff to business or industry
- recruitment or secondment of research staff to museums or public bodies
- details of the contributions made by staff in Categories B and D during the census period, and/or details of how their departure has affected the strength, coherence and research culture of the department
- details of the role and contribution of staff recruited within a year of the census date.

Support and training for associates, fellows and research students

21. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- structures in place to support research associates, fellows and students and to help them complete their projects and theses
- funding support
- graduate research seminars
- schemes for training research supervisors and for quality assurance
- the integration of research associates, fellows and students within the research environment of the department.

Other research activities

22. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- the achievements of research staff during the assessment period
- research outcomes not already referred to in RA2 or elsewhere
- membership of Research Council panels or other peer review bodies
- research projects not completed within the publication period
- joint projects or publications with practitioners in business or industry
- joint projects or publications with museums and public bodies.

Structure

The intellectual infrastructure

23. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- the department, and the researchers working within it
- distinctive research fields that characterise the research environment
- the scholarly infrastructure supporting research, eg, significant collections or archives (their development and use)
- means for promoting and sustaining the intellectual infrastructure

- joint research programmes or projects with industry or business practitioners
- associated fellowships or studentships with other universities, business, industry, museums or public bodies.

The wider context of the research infrastructure

24. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- information on the local, regional, national and international research contexts or communities within which the research takes place
- relationships with research users (including business, industry, museums and public bodies) or Knowledge Transfer Partnerships
- the creation of research centres, partnerships, affiliations, performances, exhibitions, conferences or symposia
- arrangements for supporting interdisciplinary or collaborative research.
- account taken of government policy, initiatives and objectives
- other UOAs to which related work has been submitted, and any difficulties of fit between the departmental structure and the UOA framework.

The operational infrastructure

25. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- quality assurance mechanisms and their use
- facilities for research staff and research students
- the supporting administrative and technical facilities
- advanced equipment or IT resources that support the research
- resources or facilities gained through collaboration with organisations external to the university.

Research students and research studentships

26. Research student numbers and studentships will be assessed as part of the research environment. Externally-funded studentships awarded through rigorous competition, or by prestigious bodies including those from industry, will also be considered as esteem indicators. In undertaking its assessment, the sub-panel will take into account relevant standard analyses provided by the RAE team (as listed in Annex 7), including data on registrations and numbers of completions, and students per research-active staff.

Research income

27. The assessment will be focused on outcomes rather than income, and will recognise that the levels of income required to assist research sustainability are relative to the scale and size of a department and the nature of the research. Research income will be assessed as part of the research environment. Grants awarded through rigorous competition, or by prestigious bodies including those from industry, will also be considered as esteem indicators. In undertaking its assessment, the sub-panel will take account of the total number of grants relative to the size of the department, along with the range and level of external income available to its researchers. Where relevant, the sub-panel will also take into account the standard analyses provided by the RAE team.

Formulating a quality profile for research environment

28. In exercising its expert judgement to build a quality profile for the research environment, the sub-panel will:

- a. Identify each of the three indicators of excellence (strategy, people and structure) with a quality level (see Table 2 and paragraphs 15-23 of the main panel statement). In undertaking its assessment, the sub-panel will take account of all the information provided on the research environment in RA5a, as well as the data on

UOA 67, Music

student numbers and studentships in RA3a and RA3b, and the data on research income in RA4.

- b. Allocate each of the three quality levels with 25% of the quality profile.
- c. Allocate a further 25% to represent the sub-panel's overall assessment of the research environment, with the qualification that this could be moderated in either direction to take account of particular aspects of the environment, as described in the submission.
- d. The profile for the research environment will then constitute 20% of the overall quality profile.

Esteem indicators

29. In assessing esteem indicators the sub-panel recognises that there are no absolute standards applicable to all departments. It will take into account variables such as the numbers of research-active staff submitted, their relative career stages and their levels of experience, along with relevant information in RA5b.

30. To assist the work of the sub-panel, institutions are requested to structure the esteem element of RA5a to provide examples of esteem against the three indicators of excellence given for it: recognition, influence, and benefit. Institutions should look to provide a range of indicators representative of the department as a whole, and are not required to provide separate lists for each individual researcher under each category:

- a. **Recognition:** examples may include but are not restricted to: honours, prizes, visiting fellowships or appointments; commissions; performances at major festivals; residencies; invitations to deliver external lectures, lecture series, addresses to major conferences, or to chair major conference sessions; and consultancies with business, industry, and public bodies.
- b. **Influence:** examples may include but are not restricted to: membership of Research Council committees, university or industry

advisory panels, or national research strategy or review boards; service on competition juries; directorships or membership of programme committees for major festivals and other prestigious events; non-executive positions on the board of a collaborating company; leading positions in professional and subject associations; editorial positions; refereeing academic publications or research proposals; and consultancies.

- c. **Benefit:** examples may include but are not restricted to: the establishment of externally funded endowments for research fellows, students or projects, including business or industry sponsorship; access to, or receipt of, archives and other research resources; numbers of externally funded studentships or fellowships won for the department in open competition; major externally funded projects won in open competition; and other competitively won external research income.

Formulating a quality profile for research esteem

31. Esteem will be identified with a single quality level representing 10% of the overall quality profile. This will be determined by assessing its three indicators of excellence (recognition, influence and benefit), as described in Table 2 and paragraphs 15-23 of the main panel statement. In undertaking its assessment, the sub-panel will take account of all the information provided on esteem in RA5a, as well as the data on externally-funded studentships in RA3b.

Applied and other types of research

32. Definitions of differing types of research, which are recognised and supported by the sub-panel, are given in the statement for Main Panel O, paragraphs 24-29.

33. The sub-panel welcomes all types of research for assessment whether produced through writing, making, composing, or performing. Without privileging one type of research over any other, the sub-panel will judge how such research embodies new knowledge, or enhances understanding/appreciation, or enriches the

intellectual/creative infrastructure in which such research is conducted.

34. The sub-panel recognises that types of research described in the definition of research for the RAE (ie, scholarly research, basic research, strategic research, practice-based research and applied research) are suffused by the distinctive practices of research in music. It also recognises that these types of research may not always be discrete or separable in research in music, and further that they may often be integrated within a research project and its outputs.

35. The sub-panel recognises that, in music, a large proportion of submissions will contain a practice-based element. The outputs of practice-based research will be given exactly the same weight as all other outputs; the quality indicators of significance, originality and rigour will be applied appropriately in the sub-panel's assessment. A very wide range of outputs of practice-based research are expected and welcomed by the sub-panel, provided they meet the definition of research for the RAE. Examples of such outputs in music may include, but are not limited to: composition, performances of any repertoire or kind; improvisation; mixed media installation, web-sites; sound design; and exhibitions or other events.

36. Outputs of pedagogic research in higher education concerning music are welcomed by the sub-panel, where they meet the definition for such research as set out in paragraphs 59 and 60 of the generic statement and in Annex 3.

37. Outputs of scholarly research in music are also welcomed by the sub-panel and might include, but are not limited to: dictionaries or encyclopaedias, or entries in these; databases, catalogues or archives, or contributions to these; scholarly editions and translations.

Interdisciplinary research

38. The sub-panel recognises that, since RAE2001, interdisciplinary research has continued to advance within the arts, humanities and social sciences, as well as with other disciplines beyond this domain. Research Council

support for interdisciplinary work between, for example, design and business or engineering, has been further accompanied by support for interdisciplinary initiatives between, for example, the creative arts and natural and physical sciences.

39. In this light, the sub-panel anticipates receiving interdisciplinary work to assess. It recognises that the descriptors of the research covered by other sub-panels are inherently interdisciplinary, often having no firm or rigidly definable boundaries.

40. It is expected that the assessment criteria of the sub-panel which receives the submission will be flexible enough to accommodate interdisciplinary work, and these criteria will be shared with other sub-panels to facilitate its assessment. Within Main Panel O, the working methods shared by sub-panels will further enable the configuration of assessment teams with the range of expertise appropriate to such research.

Individual staff circumstances

41. Where, for valid reasons, the work of a researcher has been limited or circumstances have significantly affected the nature of their contribution to a submission, this will be taken into account in the assessment. Valid reasons are outlined in paragraph 39 of the generic statement and, for the sub-panels in Main Panel O, in paragraphs 33-35 of the main panel statement. In all such cases, institutions should use RA5b to describe the individual circumstances of staff.

42. For each member of Category C staff submitted, institutions are asked to provide evidence in RA5c of a close relationship with the submitting department, beyond that of passing engagement or token association. Evidence may include, for example, supervision of research students, co-authorship with established Category A staff, involvement in collaborative departmental research projects, departmental support for their research, or other contributions to the research environment. If the sub-panel is not satisfied with the evidence provided, the Category C staff concerned will be discounted from the assessment.

UOA 67, Music

Working methods

43. In order to exercise their expert judgements on research quality, the sub-panel will use the assessment criteria previously described. This will be done through a four-stage assessment process incorporating the following:

- a preliminary overview
- detailed assessment
- a final review
- an agreed profile for recommendation to the main panel.

Preliminary overview

44. In preparing the ground for a balanced and fair assessment, sub-panel members will each bring their expert knowledge to bear on a holistic preliminary overview of the information provided in RA0-RA5 of each submission. At this stage RA5 will help panel members both to assimilate the full context of the research submitted and help identify those outputs listed in RA2 to be examined in detail. The purpose of the preliminary overview will be to engage fully all members of the sub-panel in each submission. It will also help to prepare the agenda and arrangements for assessment, as well as ensuring equity and fairness in the process.

- a. Prior to the first assessment meeting all sub-panel members will have considered all submissions, and will come prepared to discuss the way in which the practical arrangements for assessment can best be configured.
- b. Prior to the first assessment meeting, the sub-panel chair and panel secretary will have provisionally identified the members to be primarily responsible for each submission (one will be appointed to lead and co-ordinate the assessment). These recommendations will be circulated before this first meeting, and confirmed or amended after the preliminary overview.
- c. In undertaking the overview, the sub-panel will identify issues for more detailed examination, any further specialist expertise

needed to undertake this examination (including, for example, other members of the sub-panel, members of other sub-panels, or independent experts not on any sub-panel), and decide how the workload will be distributed.

Detailed assessment

45. The assessment teams confirmed by the sub-panel (calling upon any additional expertise that has been agreed) will undertake a detailed examination of all components of the submission, along with a selection of the cited outputs, in order to explore the sub-panel's preliminary overview and to probe any issues it has raised. In examining the research submission and its outputs, sub-panel members will do so in sufficient detail so as to form reliable expert judgements on the quality of research.

46. In conducting its preliminary overview, the sub-panel will consider all of the information provided in RA2. Sub-panel members will use this information, together with their expert judgement, to select a proportion and range of outputs for detailed examination which they believe is representative of the quality of all outputs presented in a submission. The detailed examination of research outputs will be based entirely upon the members' direct engagement with those outputs cited in the submission, and related evidence where it has been identified (in accordance with paragraph 13). In particular:

- a. The research outputs to be examined in detail will include:
 - at least two outputs authored by each staff member submitted as Category A or C (or one output in cases where only one output has been submitted)
 - outputs that on initial scrutiny are deemed to be of the highest quality level
 - a selection made in light of issues identified in the preliminary overview
 - a further selection taken to assist the sub-panel's full understanding of the research environment as described in RA5.

UOA 67, Music

- b. The selection and proportion of research outputs to be examined in detail will be as needed to establish a reliable quality profile for all research outputs listed in a submission. This will never be less than 50% of the outputs listed in each research submission and will be substantially more than this (up to 100%) if required to establish a robust and reliable quality profile for all of the outputs listed in a submission. Generally, across the unit of assessment, the sub-panel anticipates that it will wish to examine virtually all outputs in detail. The sub-panel will ensure breadth and consistency of judgement through the practice of outputs being examined by at least two members and, in some cases, through additional expertise.
- c. The members will present the sub-panel with their recommendations for quality profiles in each component of the submission, along with supporting reasons. Then, with full information before it, the sub-panel will apply its collective judgement and expertise to forming an overall quality profile for recommendation.
- d. The sub-panel will seek to achieve consensus on the recommended profiles through debate. It will then either:
- pass a recommended profile on to the main panel for confirmation
 - ask the main panel to advise on ways of achieving consensus if the sub-panel is unable to agree
 - request its members, or members of another sub-panel, to review some aspect of a submission before a recommendation can be made.

Final review

47. The sub-panel will scrutinise all the work undertaken by its members, considering their comparative judgements and recommendations, in order to reach a consensus on the quality profiles. In particular:

- a. The sub-panel will receive and review summary data concerning the members' detailed examination that will include, for example: the percentage of outputs examined in detail; the relative proportions of Category A and C staff in a submission; the contributions of early career researchers; and instances where valid reasons have been given for the submission of fewer than four outputs.
- b. The sub-panel will be informed of any aspect of the assessment where the members have:
- been unable to agree any part of that assessment
 - been required to undertake an examination of specific issues
 - identified further issues in the course of the assessment
 - worked with members of other sub-panels, or independent advisers, on the assessment of outputs.

Agreed profile

48. In seeking to confirm the sub-panel's recommended profiles, the main panel will automatically review any submissions where:

- a. The chair and deputy chair have declared an interest in a single submission.
- b. The sub-panel has been unable to achieve consensus (see paragraph 9 of the Main Panel O statement).

49. Otherwise the main panel will:

- a. Review the summary data resulting from the sub-panel's assessment of each submission.
- b. Consider the quality profiles recommended for each component of the submission along with the overall quality profile.
- c. Seek advice from research users and international experts who are members of the main panel.
- d. Either confirm the recommendation, or exceptionally, request the sub-panel to review specific issues that have arisen from the data provided.

