

Henley Review of the Funding and Delivery of Music Education – Call for Evidence

Call for Evidence Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is: 1
November 2010.

Your comments should come to us as soon as
possible, and must reach us by that date.

Department for
Education



THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. Please complete it and return it by e-mail to music.review@education.gsi.gov.uk

Information provided in response to this Call for Evidence, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Reason for confidentiality:

Name Virginia Haworth-Galt
Organisation (if applicable) Federation of Music Services
Address: 7 Courthouse Street
Otley
Leeds
West Yorkshire
LS21 3AN

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the Call for Evidence you can contact us on: music.review@education.qsi.gov.uk

Please tick one category that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained school	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent school
<input type="checkbox"/> School Teacher (music or otherwise)	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Music Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Music Teacher / Leader (not school based)	<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary sector music organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Music industry
<input type="checkbox"/> LA Music Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Representative organisation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

If "other" please specify:
The Federation of Music Services is the membership body representing 158 Music Services organisations in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (98% of all Music Services).

Call for Evidence

All of the questions are relevant to both individuals and organisations with an interest in music education. The final comments box could be used to provide details of proven (evaluated) good practice in music education or any other comments that you feel do not fit within the answers to the specific questions. Thank you for taking the time to submit your views.

Questions

1. What is it that works best about the way music education is currently delivered?

Opening Statement

The Federation of Music Services (FMS) believes the best music education provides progression, is standards based and defines musical pathways for children both within schools and within a child's locality utilising an infrastructure of choirs, ensembles, bands and orchestras. The best music education is currently delivered through carefully planned partnerships between instrumental teaching, school teaching and inspirational professional musicians. There is much to celebrate about music education in our country which deserves, and sustains, an international reputation for excellence.

The following have contributed to the successful delivery of music education:

1.1 The Role of Ensembles and a Thriving Musical Heritage

1.1.1 "Our orchestras and ensembles are deeply enriched by the talent that is first recognised and then fostered in our schools by Music Services. Their impact is enormous. Indeed, without the continued commitment of our Music Services it would be hard to imagine how a large number of our orchestras would be able to continue." **Sir Mark Elder, Principle Conductor, Halle Orchestra**

1.1.2 Talent is grown, supported and celebrated within local communities by over 4,000 ensembles, bands, youth and school orchestras;

1.1.3 Music Services are the custodians of thousands of musical instruments. These include instruments which are suitable for young children to learn the basics of music, including notation, and harder to access instruments which are essential for classical ensembles such as French horns and bassoons;

1.1.4 Through the Music Service children and families directly link into our Nation's cultural heritage of music and orchestras – a heritage that we are proud of and believe must be maintained for future generations

1.2 Ring-Fenced Funding

1.2.1 The ring fencing of funding helps to ensure that money is used directly for music education. It is historically proven that when funding for music education is devolved to schools it is not prioritised for music and in fact is often siphoned off to support other budgetary areas. When this strategy was adopted in 1992 (under the Local Management of Schools - LMS) music education in schools went into a steep decline in many areas as funds were allocated elsewhere in schools. This had disastrous results for the music education of children and is one of the factors affecting current parity of provision as some localities have struggled to rebuild an effective music education infrastructure.

1.3 Value for Money

1.3.1 Music Services have a track record in achieving significant return on investment in ring-fenced government funding. In 2011/12 £82.5 million of

Standards Fund investment supported £219 million of music activity with children;

1.3.2 Music opportunities provided jointly by clusters of schools reduces provision costs.

1.4 The Music Education Workforce

1.4.1 The Music Service workforce is comprised of 12,000 trained music teachers who undergo professional development in teaching, leadership and management;

1.4.2 Specialist training and development of School Teachers and others working in music education is provided by Music Services;

1.4.3 A self-evaluation programme provides an assessment mechanism for Music Services, aiming to underpin quality control, service improvement and support.

1.5 School Leadership and Vision

1.5.1 Head Teachers and Governors understand the value of music education in supporting educational development –

1.5.2 “Having embraced music as their specialist area Northampton School for Girls – a totally inclusive/comprehensive secondary school - has used and invested in music as a focus for both itself and its community to a level where the school’s general education strategy has been considered “outstanding” on a year on year basis – it’s an absolute model of what can be achieved where schools value their music departments – excellent classroom teachers/instrumental teachers/accommodation/resources... and all working in partnership with the local Music Service and work-shoppers (this secondary school, somewhat uniquely, has 4 full-time classroom music teachers as well as a host of support from instrumental teachers bought in through the Music Service), plus they help co- host a Saturday Arts Centre with a regular membership of 180+.” **Head of Music and Performing Arts Service, Northamptonshire**

1.6 Unprecedented Period of Investment, Development and Activity

1.6.1 National investment in Widening Opportunities (WO) has led to increased take up of musical instruments with Music Services enabling 2.1 million children at KS2 an opportunity to play an instrument, by 2011. The Sing Up programme has been active in 90% of primary schools and this has led to an expectation that all children should sing;

1.6.2 National investment in instrument funding and in 2009 128,030 musical instruments were bought in England and Wales. The range of instruments purchased has been wide and diverse including accordions, guitars, harps, oboes, ukuleles and violins;

1.6.3 Targeted work, including work funded through Youth Music, supporting excluded children has improved the accessibility of music education as has an increase in the range of out of school and extended school activity and a drive towards more specialist work with children with special educational needs;

1.6.4 The Find Your Talent pilots increased the range of music education opportunities via area partnership working across the arts, culture and heritage sectors.

- 1.6.5 In Harmony has helped raise the profile of music education and its value for supporting disadvantaged communities and raising aspirations;
- 1.6.6 Arts Council RFOs have provided additional music education opportunities as well as opportunities to link music education with other art forms;
- 1.6.7 Partnerships between Music Services and a range of organisations, including high-profile orchestras, have widened the music education offer to children and young people.
- 1.6.8 Academic studies have explored the fundamental cognitive and linguistic value of music education and demonstrated the essential role it can play in underpinning general educational progress and in improving other outcomes including confidence and self-esteem.
- 1.6.9 The value of music education has increasingly been recognised by parents, the public and by government.

And yet – The Music Manifesto and the Review have recognised that we are not providing a universally excellent music education for all our children and there remains a classic postcode lottery. This is because, despite the undeniable investment and the undoubted activity, the music education offer to children has so far failed to be bigger than the sum of its parts. No one has been given the role of overseeing the provision – a suitable metaphor is of many holding a piece of the jigsaw but no one holding the jigsaw box lid. In addition to this at the core of FMS' concern is that learning a musical instrument, a clear expectation of the majority of parents, pupils and teachers, is not central to a current music education and is reduced to a marginal activity.

2. What is it that could / should be working better in the way that music education is currently delivered?

Opening Comments

One Head of Music Service describes how the constraints of teaching music via the current curriculum can result in the equivalent of a PE Teacher attempting to teach a child football by allowing the child to: Touch the ball – watch Match of the Day – study the rules of the of the gamebut not actually play a match!

2.1 The National Curriculum Versus Instrumental Learning

- 2.1.1 The FMS believes that in order to provide the best music education for children the current music curriculum needs revising. Although for some generalist teachers it is complicated and demanding for some children it is un-challenging in its instrumental demands, and does not identify with the general perception of parents that music education should mean *learning to play an instrument and singing*. Some children currently play instruments 'despite' the national curriculum. Current progression routes are not clear and many question how 9 years of a music curriculum, providing approximately 324 hours of music education, produces pupils who may not be able to read or write any music notation or perform at a standard they are proud of.
- 2.1.2 The issue of 'transfer' from KS2 to KS3 is a major concern. The current formal music education structures mean that any skills and enthusiasm for

engagement in music developed by the investment in a child's music education in KS2 may not be capitalised on during the transfer to KS3 and significant momentum and interest is lost;

2.1.3 Most parents view instrumental learning as the main expression of a music education and the 12,000 Music Service Teachers are the major driving force in delivering instrumental learning. However this work is non-statutory and without marriage to its crucial partner – the National Curriculum.

2.1.4 There is a genuine confusion for music educators, schools, parents and pupils over the fitting together of the national curriculum and instrumental teaching. FMS would like to suggest a more effective way to deliver music education in schools to address this (see *Question 3*).

2.2 **Local Organisations Working in Silos**

2.2.1 Although LAMPs (Local Authority Music Plans) have begun to address this, there are no systems in place to ensure a localised overview of the wider music education offer. In any one area a number of music, arts and cultural providers could be each developing and delivering an isolated offer to children. There is no system in place to minimise gaps and overlaps, nothing to encourage sharing of resources, maximising assets and capacity or reducing delivery costs.

2.3 **Leadership of Music Services**

2.3.1 The power and influence of some Music Service Heads and Deputies may be curtailed and restrained by their location within Local Authority structures. There can exist an inherent tension between the leadership role Heads of Service need to undertake to organise and coordinate the delivery of an effective music education offer and the fact that they are placed in a middle management role within a local authority.

2.4 **Teacher Training**

2.4.1 Not all primary school Teachers feel musically competent and this needs to be addressed during initial teacher training and then during employment via specialist skill-sharing with Music Services. Equally, instrumental teachers would benefit from experience of teaching whole classes during undergraduate training. Secondary school Music Teachers would benefit from learning how to work with other music education practitioners and other music professionals to reduce professional isolation and support CPD.

2.5 **Top Down Approach**

2.5.1 The top down approach of some national organisations and initiatives has meant that programmes have not always adapted to local need. In the absence of an organisation or agency empowered to take an overview of local provision (the lid of the jigsaw box), and to assess what is needed to support pupils progression these types of interventions can fail to add capacity and value to existing local provision.

3. What would be the ideal way to ensure that every child learns a musical instrument and learns to sing?

Opening Comments

“A music education should be real; placed in a real cultural context and for a real purpose. Music education should reflect musicThe National Curriculum provides a uniform programme of study that embodies an age related model of progression but there are many other forms of music making that children encounter e.g. bands, learning to play an instrument. In fact the most exciting parts of music making are often those other parts. Not all children get the same opportunities and the main difference hinges on whether you play an instrument or not. A defining feature of a musician is whether you can play a musical instrument. **I would argue that musical identity in school is not shaped by the curriculum but by the defining activities of a professional musician – namely playing an instrument.** Further work (Macdonald, Hargreaves and Miell 2002) shows that identification with music in school declines with age (transition and changing schools are two key examples) but does not change and even strengthens with age as children engage with musical activity out of school. Playing an instrument therefore has a natural place at the centre of a music curriculum.”

Maureen Hanke, Chair of FMS

3.1 FMS recommends that learning to play musical instruments and singing is brought to the core of the music curriculum

- 3.1.1 All children should learn to play a musical instrument as part of the national curriculum with progression pathways and assessment to support excellence;
- 3.1.2 Singing should not be considered in isolation because it is part of music.
- 3.1.3 The work of Music Services needs to be central to the National Curriculum, not marginal;
- 3.1.4 A generic pedagogy is developed which is effective in delivering instrumental tuition as part of the curriculum, combining the vocational and academic dimensions of music.

3.2 Ongoing Delivery of Music Service Core Offer to Children

- 3.2.1 **Progression – providing musical pathways:** driving attainment through structured and disciplined teaching; encouraging achievement through assessment and examinations; supporting continuity through playing throughout primary and secondary school life; building confidence through performance; providing substantial educational challenge;
- 3.2.2 **Quality Standards – in training, in teaching and in musical results:** 12,000 trained teachers working with schools and pupils; Music Services undergoing rigorous review and assessment to support service improvement; FMS provision of CPD to leaders, managers and teachers;
- 3.2.3 **Supporting Schools and Local Communities – a unique relationship with schools and with communities;** working closely with schools to raise standards and achieve measurable results; driving improved provision to schools and pupils; helping schools and communities by brokering and creating partnerships with other music and arts providers.

3.3 Progression Pathways – Vertical and Horizontal Learning

- 3.3.1 Music education has to recognise and address the needs of all children, including the fast learner and those who are challenged;
- 3.3.2 Core provision will support most children and additional resources / different responses will be needed to support the differing needs of the fast learner and the challenged learner;
- 3.3.3 Ideally music education needs to allow for vertical groupings (based on ability and interest not age) and to allow for working with outside specialists to provide ensembles matching the abilities of learners;
- 3.3.4 Progression also includes active signposting to national organisations such as the National Youth Orchestra and participating in the work of Music for Youth;
- 3.3.5 Children should work towards assessment and attainment (for example the ABRSM Music Medals could provide a way to recognise achievement in a curriculum with instrumental learning at its core), but ‘teaching to exams’ should be avoided.

3.4 Digital Learning

- 3.4.1 To support the revised music curriculum and pedagogy the role of digital learning should be considered as an effective way of supporting pupils to continue their learning in other spaces, including at home. A digital strategy will allow teachers to assess individual pupils’ progress and activity and aid transition.

4. If we had a blank sheet of paper, what would be your view of the ideal funding and delivery structure for music education?

Opening Comments

The Music Service relationship with the child embodies the concept of localism, working as they do with schools, families and wider communities. Other parties may argue for a regional approach but the FMS don’t believe it is necessary, or cost effective. Nothing is more important than delivering an effective music education through schools for pupils, reflecting the needs of that locality.

In many areas Music Services are increasingly the drivers of partnerships, working with other arts and cultural organisations as well as with community music organisations and community musicians. This is because a Music Service sits at the interface between the education world and the arts world and increasingly recognises that local cultural organisations such as RFOs and arts venues have a strategic contribution to make and should be part of the partnership supporting the music and cultural education offer.

To deliver national music education priorities, based on standards and attainment, key local partnerships are needed between schools (funded to deliver music and cultural education as part of their curriculum) and their Music Service (accessing ring-fenced funding for music education).

FMS presents a powerful vision for localism, serving schools and ensuring an excellent and progressive music education for all children;

4.1 Funding Structure

- 4.1.1 The most effective financial model will support localism and see ring-fenced funding distributed on a formula basis to provision and not subject to a bidding process;
- 4.1.2 FMS believes that local partnerships based around schools provide the best way to ensure funding is used effectively and meets the needs of schools. Many Music Services have close relationships with schools to decide the local priorities and to develop provision. We propose exploring a model where this relationship is formalised with a 'Local Board' of representative schools having the strategic responsibility for music education in an area. It is envisioned that schools would constitute approximately 50% of a Local Board.
- 4.1.3 The Local Authority will also be a key member of the 'Local Board'. Many LAs provide funding for music services and see them as an integral part of their local plans and ambitions for their communities for education, culture and wider priorities such as regeneration and social cohesion. However, the structure of the Board should be designed to mitigate against LAs dominating against school needs and against music providers locally;
- 4.1.4 The third partner will be local arts and cultural organisations with a strategic contribution to make to serving schools and the local community.
- 4.1.5 The concept of 'Local Boards' needs detailed, fast and effective modelling. For example, a local authority area would be the natural size for a local partnership board but opportunities for economies of scale for local boards working together need to be explored. FMS has been engaged in business modelling work with Ernst and Young and they are willing to work with FMS and the Department for Education to explore adequate financial modelling of this concept;

4.2 Delivery Structure

- 4.2.1 Music Services need to become a 'junction box' within a local area, they will lead on delivery and provide strategic management and leadership working to ensure that an effective music education is delivered for all children and to negate the current problem of gaps and overlaps and poor use of resources; LAMPs can become enhanced planning documents and will assist in the planning for local governance, shared development and leadership and co-ordination;
- 4.2.2 By following the strategic direction defined by their Local Board, Music Services will be empowered to co-ordinate local provision and engage with all relevant music education and arts and cultural providers. The music education offer in a locality will clearly be greater than the sum of its parts. The capacity of that offer will be greatly increased as will the longevity of the offer, the financial value of the offer and the depth and richness of it.
- 4.2.3 Because of Music Services unique relationship with schools and position as educationalists they will ensure that all delivery is linked to clear, ambitious, challenging educational outcomes supporting the delivery of progressive pathways for all children within the locality.
- 4.2.4 This model can also coordinate the wider arts and cultural education provision in an area with little additional resources.

4.2.5 FMS is exploring the concept of a 'Super Head'. This would be an existing senior Head of Service who is charged to provide enhanced leadership to oversee clusters of Music Services (similar to the Executive Head Teacher role). The 'Super Head' would work at senior officer level in local authorities and with larger regional and national arts organisations for the benefit of the local provision. This model does not increase cost but does increase capacity, addressing the weakness defined in point 2.3.1 in our response to question 2.

4.2.6 Strategic planning will allow for the provision of a local music education offer which demonstrates cost efficiencies, economies of scale and overall value for money. Music Services are already exploring cross service working and savings based on shared back office costs.

4.3 National Support

4.3.1 Music education at a local level needs to work within a national framework for workforce training and development; shared communication and networking; quality assurance and service improvement; supporting innovation and the development of key national relationships designed to enhance local delivery.

4.3.2 FMS would like to be actively engaged in the development and delivery of national support mechanisms and procedures. We have a track record of providing cost effective strategic music education initiatives (currently delivered for less than 1% of the Music Standards Grant Fund) including:

- Quality Assurance (Self Evaluation and MSEP programme)
- Curriculum Development (Impact Assessment of Wider Opportunities, A Common Approach)
- Business Development (with Ernst and Young)
- Leadership Development (FMS Leadership Training programme, Communications and Advocacy with Think Again)
- Workforce Development (FMS Standards for Instrumental Music Teachers and Leaders)

5. Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

5.1 **FMS would encourage the fast trialling of ideas and would like to work with government to develop any plans and recommendations made as a result of the Review, including:**

5.1.1 A new music curriculum model as part of the wider review of the National Curriculum due to report by September 2012;

5.1.2 A framework for terms of reference for local boards to provide the strategic direction of local music and cultural education;

5.1.3 Building on the work done with Ernst and Young to explore financial models for localism, how the pupil premium might be used and devising a fair funding formula to replace the current postcode lottery;

5.1.4 Building on the work of the MSEP programme developing independent quality assurance processes to ensure effective use of public funds and to explore a role for 'Super Heads' to oversee and support local services.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks but smaller scale consultations (such as this one) can run to shorter timescales.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

Thank you for taking time to respond to this Call for Evidence.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be e-mailed by 1 November to music.review@education.gsi.gov.uk