

Status Report on Music Services

January 15th 2011

The purpose of this report is to provide the most accurate, up to date information possible within the context of a rapidly changing situation.

The data have been gathered from Local Authorities (LAs) and Music Services. The data are shared to inform planning and to provide a context for decision making at both local and national level.

It is important to note that the data contain estimates and proposals rather than confirmed figures and implemented plans. Definitions of administration, central costs and front line delivery have not been specified or agreed and the percentages are as reported locally by the person completing the return. Offers of 'best practice' are self identified. Where applicable, moderation and external validation are through the Moderated Self Evaluation Programme (MSEP).

Once the outcome of the Henley Review is known, together with the Government's response and details of funding settlements (including total sum, how this will be allocated, to whom, and any conditions for usage), it is recommended that a further, more detailed survey be undertaken in late April/early May 2011 so that the actual situation can be shared early enough to inform local and national plans for 2012 and beyond. This will also provide a valuable baseline from which to evaluate future policies.

Enquiries regarding this report should be addressed to

Richard Hallam MBE, National Music Participation Director, at halla@globalnet.co.uk tel. 07850 634 239

January 15th 2011

Acknowledgement

I particularly wish to acknowledge and thank all those colleagues who have taken the time to respond urgently to this survey at a time when there is so much uncertainty about the future and when they are also fully occupied doing what matters most – continuing to ensure young people receive the best possible music education.

1. **Staffing.** There is a move away from full and part-time contracts to self employment and hourly paid work in order to reduce cost.

Current situation: 2010/2011

- 1.1. 124 LAs and Music Services returned questionnaires, of which 42 (34%) have been issued at risk or Section 188 notices;
- 1.2. 110 (88%) currently have at least one full time employee;
- 1.3. 119 (96%) currently have at least one part time employee, some of whom are hourly paid, others are on part of a full time contract;
- 1.4. 54 (44%) currently engage self employed staff to fulfil various tasks.

2011/2012

- 1.5. 35 plan to make changes for 2011/2012;
- 1.6. 104 (84%), a reduction of 4%, plan to have at least one full time employee;
- 1.7. 108 (87%), a reduction of 9%, plan to have part time employees, some of whom may be hourly paid, others may be on part of a full time contract;
- 1.8. 62 (50%), an increase of 6%, plan to engage self employed staff to fulfil various tasks.

2. **Finance.** More LAs are ceasing to fund Music Services as they are non statutory. Those LAs that are continuing to fund them are reducing their contributions. Nineteen Music Services have three year financial plans provisionally in place, but most are awaiting decisions from central government before confirming their plans for 2011/2012 or beyond.

LA funding: 120 responses.

2.1. current situation 2010/2011:

- 2.1.1. 71 (59%) are currently part funded by the Local Authority bringing £17,337,019 funding;
- 2.1.2. 49 (41%) are currently not funded locally.

2.2. 2011/2012

- 2.2.1. 40 (33%) are planning part funding by the Local Authority bringing £8,773,429 funding (provisional);
- 2.2.2. 53 (44%), an increase of 3% over 2010/2011, will not be funded locally;
- 2.2.3. 27 (23%) do not know.

2.3. 2012/2013

- 2.3.1. 20 (17%) are planning part funding by the Local Authority bringing £4,560,891 funding (provisional);
- 2.3.2. 59 (49%), an increase of 8% over 2010/2011, will not be funded locally;
- 2.3.3. 41 (34%) do not know.

Income. Much of the pressure resulting from the reduction in public funding (local and national) falls on parents and/or schools. Whether parents and schools will have the capacity to make up the shortfall is uncertain, especially in the current economic climate. There could also be a short term challenge in that increases in charges that have not already been announced will not be able to be implemented prior to September 2011, thus only resulting in 66% (two terms') increase in income in the 2011/2012 financial year.

2.4. 2010/2011

- 2.4.1. 106 (88%) reported generating income;
- 2.4.2. Range: 2% to 82%;
- 2.4.3. Average: 49.2% of gross budget.

2.5. 2011/2012

- 2.5.1. 81 (68%) reported planning to increase income.
- 2.5.2. 47 have already planned the level of increase;
- 2.5.3. Range 21% to 85%;
- 2.5.4. Average 54.7% of gross budget.

Administration; Management; Front line delivery. 104 LAs and Music Services responded to a question about relative expenditure on administration; management and other central costs; and front line delivery. Great caution must be exercised in making judgements concerning administration and other central costs as different respondents have not necessarily included exactly the same information under each heading. A number of Music Services still receive 'in kind' support from their LA. There could also be some variance in how front line delivery has been calculated locally. In addition, where funding has been devolved to schools and where self employed teachers provide all or part of the service, the 'centre' may be little more than an agency, thus resulting in a smaller overall budget (i.e. not including fees for instrumental tuition) and relatively higher percentage costs for administration and management.

2.6. Administration:

- 2.6.1. 47 (44%) report 5% or less for administration. A further 32 (31%) report less than 8%. Sixteen (15%) services report administration at 10% or more.
- 2.6.2. Range: 0.1% to 25%.
- 2.6.3. Average: 6.5% of gross budget.

2.7. Management and other central costs (some of these are still 'in kind' from the LA and are not included):

- 2.7.1. Range: 4% to 42%
- 2.7.2. Average: 16.8% of gross budget.

2.8. Front line delivery:

- 2.8.1. 46 services (43%) report front line delivery at 80% or more. A further 38 (37%) are between 70% and 79%. Ten (9.6%) services report less than 60% of their budget being directly spent on front line services.
- 2.8.2. Range: 45.5% to 93%
- 2.8.3. Average: 76.5%

3. Wider Opportunities

- 3.1. In 2008 LAs were funded to increase participation and raise standards of pupil achievement in music by:
 - providing opportunities for Key Stage 2 (KS2) pupils to learn a musical instrument and/ or to receive specialist vocal tuition; and
 - maintaining and extending the broadest possible access to music education provision.
- 3.2. Further guidance stated that these programmes should provide worthwhile opportunities which all young people enjoy. Common factors from the pilot programmes were identified:
 1. All pupils have a meaningful experience of learning to play an instrument – normally this would last a year.
 2. All pupils enjoy making music in their peer groups – normally as a whole class.
 3. The skills of class teachers and specialist instrumental teachers are maximised by ensuring they work closely and learn from each other – ensuring greater sustainability.
 4. Programmes are developed as an integral part of the pupils' whole musical experience, building on previous work and extending beyond the programme – ensuring continuity for pupils.
 5. Programmes are based on well planned progressive experiences that clearly complement national curriculum requirements and ensure pupils know how well they are doing and what they need to do to improve further.
 6. Programmes contain appropriate strategies for supporting pupils who initially do not have the encouragement or support from their parents/carers, or who need additional support for other reasons.

- 3.3 LAs were charged with ensuring the quality and value for money of the provision purchased and for ensuring that Key Stage 2 was given priority.
- 3.4 No instruments were specified. (Pilot programmes had trialled instruments such as the harmonica alongside more traditional instruments).
- 3.5 Reports by the National Music Participation Director and the research project ‘Wow, it’s music next!’¹ together with LAs and Music Services own evaluations of their programmes resulted in local adjustments in 2009 and 2010. A wide range of opportunities have emerged taking account of the knowledge and skills of local providers and in response to the needs of schools and their pupils. There is some evidence that points 3, 4, 5 and 6 above have not been sufficiently implemented:
- 3.5.1 The skills of class teachers and specialist instrumental teachers are not always maximised by ensuring they work closely and learn from each other – ensuring greater sustainability.
- 3.5.2 Programmes have not always been developed as an integral part of the pupils’ whole musical experience, building on previous work and extending beyond the programme – ensuring continuity for pupils.
- 3.5.3 Well planned progressive experiences do not always clearly complement national curriculum requirements and ensure pupils know how well they are doing and what they need to do to improve further.
- 3.5.4 Programmes do not always contain appropriate strategies for supporting pupils who initially do not have the encouragement or support from their parents/carers, or who need additional support for other reasons.
- 3.6 Despite the guidance in 3.1 and 3.2 above and in 3.11 and 3.12 below, some expectations and assumptions need to be challenged, particularly with regard to the purpose of the programme; the efficacy of teaching in large groups; identifying which children need to receive regular weekly tuition in small groups; and the role of ensembles from the earliest stages of learning. As Bamford and Glinkowski report:

(my highlights)

*The research revealed that there was a wide spectrum of expectations and aspirations attached to the WO programme concerning whether, on the one hand, it should be aiming to achieve excellent standards in instrumental learning, or whether, on the other, its primary purpose was to provide children with an enjoyable general introduction to musical education via an instrument-based learning programme. **The two ends of the spectrum are not necessarily mutually exclusive**, but it appeared that **each music service** (and indeed **each individual involved in the programme, from the music tutors to the school head teachers**) held **a different sense of what might be possible and realistic to achieve in terms of this spectrum of possibilities.***

¹ Bamford and Glinkowski 2010.

*A significant number of music services' tutors commented that **the standard of instrumental learning** (skill and knowledge development) achieved by WO pupils **was, in some cases, comparable to that achieved by children of a similar age who followed small group or individual lessons.***

3.7 The data below is complicated by these factors and further discussion is required before these data can be used usefully to inform future policy and decisions.

3.8 121 returns included data relating to Wider Opportunities programmes.

3.8.1 93 (76.9%) stated that their programmes were working very well and that they would recommend them to other services.

3.8.2 5 (4.1%) stated that their programmes were working satisfactorily.

3.8.3 14 (11.6%) stated that their some of their programmes were working very well whilst others were working less well – a mixed picture.

3.8.4 2 (1.6%) felt that their programmes were not working well.

3.8.5 7 (5.8%) did not grade their programmes.

Instruments offered

3.9 Thirty nine instruments are taught singly to the whole class. Ninety nine services teach these and other instruments in a range of combinations.

3.10 The musical or educational rationales that underpin decisions about which instrument are offered are not always clear.

3.10.1 In some programmes the approach is linked to families of instruments, ensembles, class orchestra or a musical style.

3.10.2 In some programmes the links to the requirements of the statutory national curriculum are so close that it is difficult to see what is additionally being provided. There is therefore the danger that this funding, which should *complement and enhance* the statutory requirements, for which schools are funded directly, simply allows schools to redirect their own funding for music to other areas. This is of particular concern in the present economic climate as double funding cannot be countenanced. (See Annex 1 for a complete list of instruments).

Length of programme

3.11 As mentioned above (3.2 (1)) the length of tuition programme should be of sufficient duration. This is normally a year but will depend on many factors, including the previous music education experience of the pupils; local traditions; and the value attributed to playing an instrument in the home. Longer or shorter programmes may be entirely appropriate. (See Ofsted Making More of Music (2009) paragraph 193). Flexibility in devising programmes and the strategic and effective use of available funds are therefore essential.

- 3.12 Neither is the programme intended to be just a ‘taster’ session. Both the original guidance (p4) and the revised guidance (p5) deal effectively with this point²:
(my highlights)

Programmes in all Wider Opportunities schools were made up of three basic elements, which might be offered simultaneously or one after another, depending on the school and Music Service involved. These three common elements were:

*Taster activities: experiences designed to **engage, educate and inspire** so that children can make an **informed choice** about which instruments they might like to take up.*

*Foundation activities: **‘general musicianship’** experiences designed to help children learn more about pitch and rhythm, and about how to translate sound into symbol and symbol into sound. In the pilots, these were very practical, hands-on sessions that prepared children for learning a particular instrument.*

*Tuition: there is the opportunity to go on and learn a musical instrument, generally in a **whole-class setting**. This included ensemble playing, composition and performance, and specialist tuition in both small and in larger groups. Ofsted recommended that, wherever possible, **the tuition phase should last for at least one year.***

- 3.13 The average length of programme is 29 weeks, but the range is from as little as 4 weeks to 39 weeks (including planning and professional development requirements).

Finances

- 3.14 The questionnaire also requested information relating to the financial amounts that schools contribute to the programme.
- 3.14.1 36 reported that their schools were not expected to contribute to the programme. (All of the Standards Fund is assumed to be held centrally in these LAs).
- 3.14.2 12 reported an average annual contribution to the Music Service of £98,940
- 3.14.3 75 reported amounts per class or per school with an average annual contribution of £986. Range: £100 to £2,850
- 3.14.4 It is assumed that some of the Standards Fund is devolved to schools in 3.15.2 and 3.15.3, more data are required to assess how much schools are contributing from their own budgets towards these programmes.

Forward Plans

- 3.15 Some LAs and Music Services describe programmes that run over several years with a sliding scale of charges.

² Instrumental and Vocal Tuition at KS2 (2006); Instrumental and Vocal Tuition at KS2 (Revised Guidance 2007)

3.16 Other LAs and Music Services appear to have not given sufficient priority in their planning to the intentions underpinning the programme. Some schools are offered a free opportunity one year with no provision available for the next cohort in the following year. Whilst the reasons for adopting these approaches are understood, they demonstrate a lack of understanding of the longer term strategies that are required. Helping head teachers to establish or build on a musical tradition in their schools, communities and the local area, including the local secondary school(s), is part of the strategic vision that needs to be addressed by LAs and Music Services in partnership with their schools and other contributors to music education.

4 Best Practice

4.1 LAs and Music services were requested to list any particular aspects of their service which they consider to be 'best practice' and which they would be prepared to share with other services.

4.2 The White paper, the Importance of Teaching, (Nov 2010), announced the end of the School Improvement Partner (SIP) but referred to an increase in the number of National and Local Leaders of Education – head teachers of excellent schools committed to supporting other schools – and the intention to develop Teaching Schools to make sure that every school has access to highly effective professional development support, thus making it easier for schools to learn from one another. A similar philosophy can apply to music services. Annex 2 provides a simplified list of those areas that colleagues have self-identified as their own best practice. LAs and Music Services that wish to add to their own offers, in the light of these examples are encouraged to email me at halla@globalnet.co.uk and I will update the spreadsheet.

Richard J Hallam MBE
National Music Participation Director

15th January 2011

Annex 1 Wider Opportunities

Instruments offered alone

| Instrument | Number of services |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Bassoon and/or mini bassoon | 6 |
| Chalumeau | 3 |
| Clarinet | 42 |
| Fife | 13 |
| Flute | 33 |
| Oboe | 6 |
| Ocarina | 6 |
| Recorder | 54 |
| Saxophone | 7 |
| Tin whistle/folk whistle | 6 |
| | |
| Baritone/Euphonium | 12 |
| Cornet/Trumpet | 23 |
| French horn | 5 |
| Pocket trumpet | 2 |
| Tenor horn | 10 |
| Trombone | 14 |
| | |
| Cello | 21 |
| Double Bass | 6 |
| Viola | 10 |
| Violin | 46 |
| | |
| Guitar | 65 |
| Ukulele | 32 |
| | |
| Accordion | 1 |
| Chanter | 1 |
| Harmonica/Melodica | 4 |
| Melodeon | 1 |
| | |
| Keyboard | 26 |
| | |
| Gamelan | 3 |
| | |
| Djembe (African drums) | 38 |
| Dohl drum | 1 |
| Marching drum | 4 |
| Steel pans | 19 |
| Tabla | 3 |
| Taiko drum | 6 |
| | |

| Instrument | Number of services |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Glockenspiel | 2 |
| Hand chimes | 1 |
| Xylophone | 2 |
| | |
| Samba | 39 |
| | |
| Vocal | 52 |
| | |

Instruments taught alongside others.

| Instrument | Number of times cited |
|---|------------------------------|
| Mixed band | 26 |
| | |
| Brass | 69 |
| Percussion (including world percussion) | 69 |
| Strings | 61 |
| Woodwind | 21 |
| | |
| Clarinet | 30 |
| Double reed | 42 |
| Fife | 5 |
| Flute | 21 |
| Ocarina | 2 |
| Recorder | 19 |
| Saxophone | 10 |
| Whistle | 3 |
| | |
| Baritone/euphonium | 10 |
| Cornet/trumpet | 24 |
| Horn | 9 |
| Pocket trumpet | 1 |
| Trombone | 13 |
| Tuba | 4 |
| | |
| Cello | 22 |
| Double bass | 4 |
| Viola | 11 |
| Violin | 26 |
| | |
| Endangered species | 1 |
| | |
| Guitar | 12 |
| Sitar | 1 |
| Ukulele | 9 |
| | |

| Instrument | Number of times cited |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Keyboard | 7 |
| | |
| Gamelan | 2 |
| | |
| African music/Djembe | 21 |
| Dohl | 1 |
| Steel pan | 9 |
| | |
| Glockenspiel | 2 |
| Xylophone | 2 |
| | |
| Class orchestra/Orff orchestra | 3 |
| | |
| Samba | 15 |
| | |
| Dance | 1 |
| Eastern European music | 1 |
| Folk music | 3 |
| Indian music | 2 |
| Irish music | 1 |
| Jazz music | 1 |
| Medieval music | 1 |
| Rock music | 6 |
| Sound pod | 4 |
| Traditional music | 1 |
| | |
| Dalcroze | 2 |
| General musicianship | 1 |
| Music Therapy | 1 |
| Special school/PRU programmes | 5 |
| | |
| Vocal | 14 |
| | |
| Miscellaneous (not specified) | 3 |
| | |

Annex 2 Best Practice

| Best practice area | Number of offers |
|---|------------------|
| Early years | 11 |
| National Curriculum | 17 |
| | |
| Wider Opportunities (including impact assessment and/or ensembles) | 46 |
| | |
| Music Service Curriculum | 17 |
| Woodwind | 1 |
| Double reed | 1 |
| Guitar | 2 |
| Recorder | 1 |
| Percussion workshops | 1 |
| | |
| Gifted and Talented | 3 |
| Special Educational Needs | 13 |
| | |
| Transition | 5 |
| | |
| Music therapy | 1 |
| | |
| Vulnerable groups | 3 |
| | |
| A level/Music technology | 3 |
| | |
| Contemporary/rock | 9 |
| Jazz | 2 |
| World music | 2 |
| | |
| Kodaly | 1 |
| | |
| Vocal provision | 17 |
| | |
| Cross Arts programmes | 6 |
| | |
| Area ensembles/music centres | 26 |
| Music theatre | 1 |
| | |
| Massed events | 9 |
| | |
| Tours | 1 |
| | |
| Links with schools | 8 |
| Links with FE/HE | 1 |

| Best practice area | Number of offers |
|--|-------------------------|
| Consultation | 3 |
| Partnership working | 27 |
| | |
| Young ambassadors/apprentices | 3 |
| | |
| Recording technology | 2 |
| | |
| Website technology | 3 |
| | |
| Community work | 1 |
| Intergenerational work | 1 |
| Adult provision | 5 |
| | |
| Continuing Professional Development | 18 |
| Performance management (including Quality assurance) | 13 |
| | |
| Finance | 6 |
| Leadership and management | 15 |
| Pay and conditions | 6 |
| Public relations | 5 |
| | |

Annex 3 Questionnaire

January 2011 music service questionnaire

Please complete as many of the questions as possible and return this form as soon as possible and no later than Friday January 14th to halla@globalnet.co.uk

Name of Music Service:

Name of person completing this form:

Position:

Contact email and phone:

1 STAFFING

1.1 How are your music service teachers currently (2010/2011) engaged? (Complete all that apply)

- | | | |
|----------------------|-----|----|
| • Full time contract | yes | no |
| • Part time contract | yes | no |
| • Self employed | yes | no |

1.2 Are there plans to change these arrangements for 2011/2012 and beyond? yes no

If yes, indicate below the changes you envisage

- | | | |
|----------------------|-----|----|
| • Full time contract | yes | no |
| • Part time contract | yes | no |
| • Self employed | yes | no |

1.3 Have Section 188 notices been issued? yes no

Comment:

2 FINANCE

2.1 Please give details below of the **Local Authority contribution** to your Music Service and any plans/proposals for the next two years (if known).

| | 2010/2011 | 2011/2012 | 2012/2013 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| LA contribution | £ | £ | £ |

2.2 What **percentage** of your **current** (2010/2011) overall budget comes from **any source other than LA or the Music Grant**?

2.3 Do you have **plans in place to increase other income** in 2011/2012? yes no

If yes, what is your new target? (As a percentage of your overall budget).

2.4 What **percentage** of your overall budget is spent on **administration**?

2.5 What **percentage** of your overall budget is spent on **other central costs, management and quality assurance**?

2.6 What **percentage** of your overall budget is spent on **front line delivery**?

2.7 Please give details of any other costs you have not included in the above. (As a percentage of the overall budget).

Comment:

3 WIDER OPPORTUNITIES

3.1 Please list the range of instruments offered through your Wider Opportunities programme(s); length of those programmes; and whether the schools currently contribute towards the costs.

| Wider Opportunities instrument(s) offered | Length of programme (weeks) | Contribution by school (£s) |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3.2 How well do you feel your Wider Opps programme is working?

Very well (would recommend it to others) Satisfactory Mixed Not very well

Comment:

4 BEST PRACTICE ISSUES

Please list any particular aspects of your service of which you consider to be best practice and which you would be prepared to share with other services.