

Music

SESSION 1 – THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH OUTPUTS FOR THE DISCIPLINES WITHIN PANEL 13

Examples of types of outputs likely for Music

- creative work – including composition, performance, recording
- publications - standard formats
- music publication - music recordings & sound production
- software development, creating music technology, "instrument building"
- scholarship of teaching

Peer Review processes:

- blind review is the norm in other disciplines but is this a good proxy for quality?
- Peer Review Processes for creative arts areas include
 - selection panels
 - curatorial processes
 - commissioning processpart or all of these processes are often in the public domain, as is the output itself
- Self-publication - can peer review be included? - peer reviewing often come after the publication, not before.

Groupings of researchers:

- Need to include as many staff as possible into this RQF/consultation process - overcoming resistance from 'creators'
- Need to include collaborations/ groupings/single researchers as part of groups

Special needs of creative arts / music researchers:

- Need to emphasize exegesis way of thinking within submissions
- Address knowledge transfer - demonstration of impact
- Mixture of disciplines/expertises, with sharing of RFCD codes in one person's / group's / output(s)
- Documentation may need to be retrospective
- Need to decide which outputs to include, ie those for which documentation is available
- Composers who may self-publish - retrospective issues?

Other issues:

- Traditional form of review is well established

Quality (ie within the field / academia):

- Drawing the line between quality & impact. Quality is 'impact' (peer esteem in field) on your peers - impact relates to broader community.
- How do you find evidence of quality?
- Quality/citation rates in relation to web based publications
- Need to construct different methods of peer review.
- Issues around self-publishing - difficult to deal with quality
- Is commercial publication a proxy for quality?
- not performance venues - not proxy for quality - What can be used as indicators for quality?
- need to have context statement - importance of exegesis statement
- Quality – demonstrated by internal peer assessment
- issues arising from internet/web based publication

Session 2 Music

Context statement

- Various forms of external funding
 - Inclusive
 - Competitive?
 - Peer review?
 - Descriptions required but bear in mind who reads the context statement
 - Direct industry investment for projects
 - ♣ Is this consultancy?
 - Locality not a hierarchy but indicates level of community engagement
- Peer/academic esteem
 - Citations
 - ♣ Traditional outputs like papers
 - ♣ Composer's work
 - ♣ Scholarly literature
 - ♣ Frequency of performance/broadcast – repeat presentations of the work
 - ♣ Google analytics – web 2.0 technology
 - ♣ Original scholarly/creative work becomes a resource for further scholarly or creative work
 - Reviews
 - Membership of Academies
 - Editorial service on international/Australian research journals
 - Industry or academic selection panels for external organisations/reviews/juries/adjudication
 - Examining RHD theses
 - Academic expert/reviewer of other institutions/organizations proposals for infrastructure or curriculum development
 - Expert media comment
 - Advice or input to policy for government/industry
 - Input to the broad arts industry network
 - Invitations as keynote speakers/performers/composers/artists in residence
 - Regional communities rely on the community engagement from the cultural resource of the university
 - Prizes and awards
- RHD outcomes
 - Graduate destinations
 - ♣ Impact on community/industry/academia
 - Ability for our RHD students to impact/leverage on their field
 - The thesis is not a recognized research output – only publication from the thesis
 - Completions and enrolments

- Institutions' standing in the field
 - Constitution of the group
 - Group may be higher in reputation than the institution
 - Ability to attract leading researchers as keynote speakers/artists in residence/performers/research students
- Strategy of the Group
 - Ability to do capacity building within the Group and beyond
 - Ability to sustain further research outcomes and encourage emerging researchers
 - Level of collaboration as evidenced by interaction with external stakeholders
 - Ability to show cross-disciplinary work
 -
- VENUES ARE NOT A TRUSTWORTHY MEASUREMENT FOR QUALITY
 - Economic drivers come into play
 - Can we tease out 'venues' discussion?
 - What is the role of the promoters?
 - Is there a peer review process to get into a venue?
 - Use of institutional venues
 - ♣ Often the institutional venue is a major venue in a community
 - A lot of music actually not designed to be performed in venues
 - ♣ This is an old model
 - ♣ Does not acknowledge new ways of performance and dissemination of research outputs and scholarly work.

Session 3 Music Impact Statement

- Measurements/magnitude and proof
 - Audiences
 - ♣ How do you measure audience impact?
 - Downloads
 - Web-based outputs
 - ♣ Fast changes
 - ♣ Needs standards
 - ♣ MPEG – 7 format can provide tracking of evidence
 - CD sales
 - Quantitative measures of uptake
 - Re-use in other media/contexts
 - ♣ This may happen outside of time-frames of RQF
 - Citation
 - Adoption in policy/curriculum/education policy and practice
 - Patents/start-up companies
 - CHASS No. 2 2005, December
 - Media coverage
 - Expert opinion
 - Translation of scholarship beyond academia
 - ♣ Workshops in community
 - ♣ Social relationships set up through work
 - ♣ Service to community
 - Industry prizes and awards (ARIA, APRA)
 -
- End-users and proof of benefit/level of adoption
 - Who are the end users/users?
 - ♣ Audiences/consumers/stake-holders
 - ♣ Networks need to be acknowledged for their complexity and multi-dimensions
 - ♣ Tertiary sector and all the students
 - ♣ Teaching staff work with u/g students
 - Studio-based teaching
 - Research-led teaching
 - Creative team work

- ♣ Creation of IP
 - ♣ Who are the end users of traditional paper-based research outputs and how is it measured?
- User – is this the more correct term?
- End user – goes to the end & stops?
 - ♣ Qualified end users – who are they?
 - ♣ Have they taken up research outputs in unchanged formats?
 - ♣ They could take up research outputs and then change it for their next purpose.
 - ♣ Difficult to prove quality of original research outcome even if end-user makes changes to the research output.
- Identifiable social, economic, environment and culture impact
 - Statistics – see above
 - Music therapy
 - ♣ Patients in hospitals
 - ♣ Working with families
 - Music education
 - ♣ Play for Life
 - ♣ Development of public school education policy and curriculum
 - Musicology
 - Cultural impact
 - ♣ Humanitarian work
 - ♣ Refugee communities
 - ♣ Development of identity/national identity
 - ♣ Working with other cultures
 - ♣ Drug/alcohol rehabilitation using music projects
 - ♣ Endangered languages/ cultural/heritage
 - “Paradisec”
 - conservation and repatriation of music
 - discovering missing music
 - ♣ Documentation of cultural heritage
 - ♣
- Impact on scholarly/curriculum development
- Research will have to meet minimum level of quality before being assessed for impact.
 - Impact of the grouping is more important than the individual contribution
- Impact can include longer time-frame
- The way research output is taken up can be a very convoluted path and therefore hard to prove the level of impact.
- Quality putting up things within 6 year time-frame. Can impact include ‘other’ research outputs as part of the group’s work?
- Impact

- Level of engagement