Consultation on recurrent funding for 2021-22

Introduction

We would like to collect your name and email address so that we can contact you in the event that we need to clarify any of your responses. This information will not be published. Please note that, if you choose to provide us with personal information as part of your consultation response, you will need to consent to us processing your data in line with the privacy notice outlined above.

I consent to the OfS processing my personal data in line with the privacy notice outlined above.

Contact details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Oliver Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Oliver.Morris@ukmusic.org">Oliver.Morris@ukmusic.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what capacity are you responding to the survey?

To provide an official response on behalf of a higher education provider, organisation or representative group

Information about your organisation

| Name of higher education provider or representative group | UK Music                        |

Unless you indicate that you would prefer your response to be confidential, we may quote sections of your response when we publish a summary of responses to this consultation on the OfS website (and in alternative formats on request). This may include a list of the providers and organisations that respond, but will not include personal data such as individual names, email addresses or other contact details. Individuals and organisations will not be identifiable in our consultation response. We will not publish individual responses.

Are you happy for passages from your responses to be published on the OfS website?

Yes, I am happy for my responses to be published.

Funding for high-cost subjects
Question 1: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to distribute a greater proportion of the OfS recurrent grant through the main high-cost subject funding method? (See paragraphs 15 to 36.)

Strongly disagree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.

UK Music feel that these measures would do damage to the already strained music education sector and would ultimately threaten the music industry’s talent pipeline. Music is a foundation for society, communities and individuals and something that has provided comfort and strength during the most trying times. Its value in life is immeasurable and its value in economic terms is undeniable. In 2019 (pre-Covid) music was worth £5.8 billion to the UK economy and employed 197,168 full-time equivalents in a world-renowned industry so vital to the UK’s soft power and standing in the world.
Question 2: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to split price group C1 in order to implement a reduction of 50 per cent to the high-cost subject funding allocated to subjects in the performing arts; creative arts; media studies and archaeology? (See paragraphs 15 to 26.)

Strongly disagree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.

Music is a key national asset and one that generated £5.8 billion for the economy in 2019. Up 11% from 2018. It is also vital for the UK’s standing in the world through the soft power it generates. It is of benefit to society, communities and individuals nurturing wellbeing, allowing expression and providing employment. As a sector it relies upon a huge range of individuals with a wide breadth of skills – from technical to business and performance to legal and many many more. We are concerned that not only will such cuts impact the artists that the UK is so renowned for but also the whole industry that supports them from labels and publishers to managers and collecting societies and producers to those involved in live events and everyone else in between. UK Music’s annual report Music By Numbers clearly shows that the music industry supports almost 200,000 f4 equivalent jobs.

The Creative Industries as a whole contributed over £111 billion to the economy in 2018 rising to £16 billion in 2019 and includes a high proportion of freelancers and SMEs who are driving innovation, so vital for a thriving and buoyant economy. For example 55% of creative firms stated they conducted R&D in the last year. The critical analysis skills, confidence and understanding of the music industry learnt during their study is one reason why graduates are so valued by employers and successful as freelancers. Indeed as the PRS Foundation highlighted to us:

"Graduates who study creative/arts subjects not only have specialised skills in areas such as music management, finance, law, production, sound design, music theory and practice but are also renowned for their soft skills, which are not just important for employers but for wider society. LinkedIn’s research on the most sought-after job skills by employers for 2019 found that the three most-wanted soft skills were creativity, persuasion and collaboration. Cuts significantly increase the risk of employers missing out on crucial ways to understand and improve sectors, society and ourselves – including enhancing personal wellbeing, sparking innovation and helping create tolerance, among other values."

UK Music supports the Music Academic Partnership (MAP) network which consists predominantly of HE institutions. We see the work they are doing as vital to the success of the music industry. The network helps UK Music in our regional music industry outreach and national careers work. It also demonstrates clearly to UK Music the value of such providers to not only the learners and creative professionals of the future but also to the local and regional economies. Many institutions not only service local applicants from challenging backgrounds who may not be able to relocate to university but also engage actively as a vital part of the local economy helping build resilience and nurture community. We feel strongly that they must not suffer such a cut – especially when it would seem to undermine the ‘levelling up agenda’ so central to the Government’s strategy.

Reducing funding to a vital part of the music talent pipeline during such difficult times and following years of pressures put upon the rest of the music talent pipeline will be a challenge for the sector and we fear would lead to a loss of some university departments. These institutions offer industry knowledge, opportunities to develop professional practice and very importantly resources to students that are often unattainable when learning your craft in other contexts especially for students from a socio-economically franchises background or geographically isolated area. The music production educational provider JAMES offers an example of such an employment outcome. A student from UK Music MAP partner UClan gained employment partly due to their experience using the Genesys Black console that was available to students at the university. The student is now a product specialist working on Genesys Consoles and outboard units.

The financial cuts are worrying enough, but equally concerning is some of the narrative within the consultation document. For instance, it implies these courses are ‘not among [the government’s] strategic priorities’ (although they make ‘a particularly important contribution to access and participation’ and ‘play an important role in supporting important parts of the UK employment sectors, economy and cultural life’) (pp. 17-18). It also pits STEM subjects against others by saying STEM is ‘more relevant ... to the Government’s ‘Plan for Growth’ (p.19). These are not only concerning in terms of implications for one of the areas of the economy that was most buoyant (pre-Covid) but also confusingly contradictory. Subjects threatened by this consultation have an important role to play in access and participation yet as the consultation document itself states the cuts will directly impact courses that ‘have the highest proportion of any broad subject group to have a reported disability’ (p.18). This must therefore have potentially disastrous implications for courses in the most fragile communities that cater to some of the most in-need students.

In the Government’s own Build Back Better: Our Plan for Growth the creative industries are cited as one of the sectors that are leading innovation and with high growth (p.20) and the UK is lauded as having world class knowledge and research with a high percentage of adults with tertiary education. This proposal could undermine this progress.

The move to cut funding for music also seems to go against the Government’s own messaging around its support for music education and its importance at secondary level. Earlier this year the DfE published the new Model Music Curriculum for schools. Minister Nick Gibb said:

"After the most difficult of years, it's time for a musical renaissance across England’s schools and I hope this will inspire a new generation of musicians."

One of UK Music’s MAP university partners rightly asks:

"Where will Nick Gibb’s ‘new generation of musicians’ study their craft? How will the next generation of
Question 2: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to split price group C1 in order to implement a reduction of 50 per cent to the high-cost subject funding allocated to subjects in the performing arts; creative arts; media studies and archaeology? (See paragraphs 15 to 26.)

British musicians be able to generate significant amounts of money for the UK economy, if they cannot study music at HE level?"

A UK Music member The FAC also rightly raises their concerns:
"As a trade organisation which represents the UK artists, we are devastated to hear of such proposal of reducing High-cost subject funding; performing arts; creative arts; media studies by 49% in the 2021-22 academic year." Artists and creators as a whole contribute massively to the UK economy, culture and people's lives in so many different ways, including their health and wellbeing. The Government have to invest more and certainly not less in the future of our talent pipeline. Even to those students who might not pursue their careers in the music industry, the music education is crucial for their personal development and mental health."

And another UK Music member The Ivors Academy highlights the benefits of having a music degree when moving into the music industry as well as providing an example of the benefits in the context of their area of expertise:
"Knowledge of the history of music provides familiarity with the context and sector-specific requirements of jobs in the music industry. Particularly, working for membership organisations entails dealing with members' day-to-day issues. It is an extraordinary advantage to go into the job knowing what those issues are and speaking the same language as your members."

We are very concerned that such easy distinctions are drawn in the proposal between subjects deemed valuable and those that are not. Creativity and creative skills feed into the whole economy and research from the University of Sussex found that organisations combining arts and science skills are 10% more productive and have 6% higher employment growth. Research also reveals that creativity as a skill is in high demand by employers in growth industries across the economy, not only those in our world-leading sector.

Question 3: Notwithstanding your answer to question 2, if we were to split price group C1 as proposed, to what extent do you agree with our approach to implementing this? (See paragraphs 27 to 28 and Annex B.)

**Strongly disagree**

**Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.**

Whilst we must reiterate our opposition to the proposal we would also suggest the methodology to implement the proposal is flawed. The consultation document lists the benefits (paras 22-23) of subjects such as music yet still considers them a lower priority. The proposal also crudely distinguishes between STEM and non-STEM subjects whereas in reality many creative subjects have STEM at their core.

Question 4: To what extent do you agree with our approach to counting students from the Crown Dependencies in our funding allocations for 2021-22? (See paragraphs 34 and 35.)

**Tend to agree**

**London weighting**

Question 5: To what extent do you agree with the proposed approach to remove the targeted allocation for students attending courses in London? (See paragraphs 37 to 48.)

**Strongly disagree**

**Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.**

London has far higher living costs than other areas of the country and whilst we would not want to privilege London in any way that might put other areas or HEIs at unfair disadvantage the challenges facing students wishing to attend a London HEI must be recognised.
Question 6: To what extent do you agree with the proposed approach to remove London weighting from the formula-based student premium allocations? (See paragraphs 37 to 48.)

Strongly disagree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.
This will have negative impacts upon institutions that service some of the most deprived communities and will disproportionately impact them. There is also a significantly greater proportion of – as the consultation document itself states – ‘students from black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds studying at providers in London than in other regions’ (p.27) thus harming the diversity agenda. The London Higher report The Impact of Removing the London Weighting gives a full account of the issues.

Funding to widen access and support successful student outcomes

Question 7: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to provide £40 million to support Uni Connect activities in 2021-22? (See paragraphs 59 to 63.)

Strongly disagree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.
This amount represents a reduction in the scheme.

Question 8: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to distribute an additional £5 million through the existing student premiums in the proportions show in paragraph 65, and to earmark this £5 million to be spent on student hardship?

Strongly agree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.
Any additional funding for disadvantaged students is welcome.

Question 9: To what extent do you agree with the proposals to distribute £15 million to address student transition and mental health, through a combination of competition and a new formula-based student premium? (See paragraphs 67 to 71.)

Strongly agree

Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.
Vital issues and we welcome any additional funding.

Other recurrent budget proposals

Question 10: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the rate of funding for the nursing, midwifery and allied health supplement, which will increase the total budget to £27 million? (See paragraphs 74 to 75.)

Strongly agree
Question 11: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the rate of funding for overseas study programmes, but base the allocation on the higher of relevant student numbers in either 2019-20 or 2020-21? (See paragraphs 76 to 78.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide an explanation for your answer. If you believe our approach should differ, please explain how and the reason for your view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the Turing scheme still falls short of the benefits of being a part of the Erasmus+ scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 12: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to maintain in cash terms the budgets for other targeted allocations as proposed in paragraph 79?

| Don't know / prefer not to say |

Modelling the impact on providers

Question 13: Do you have any comments about any unintended consequences of these proposals, for example, for particular types of provider or for particular types of students?

We would like to reiterate that any funding reduction will negatively impact many institutions delivering a broad range of music and music-associated courses. This will be especially troublesome for institutions who traditionally serve disadvantaged communities and it should be seen to be a move that would have potentially negative impact on students from diverse backgrounds whose educational career has likely been less traditional. It is also stated explicitly that the cut would impact disabled students disproportionately.

Equalities impact assessment

Question 14: Do you have any comments about the potential impact of these proposals on individuals on the basis of their protected characteristics? Protected characteristics are defined in Part 11 of the Equality Act as: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation. See: www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/part/11/chapter/1.

The proposals would impact individuals in a number of ways. Firstly as noted earlier the impact in London would be felt by the higher number of - as the consultation document itself states – ‘students from black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds studying at providers in London than in other regions’ (p.27)

As it is also stated in the consultation document that learners from the above groups are also less likely to study these subjects then to make it more difficult to access such courses would seem a serious error of judgement. This same argument can be made for mature students. Also, as noted earlier, the proposals would impact those individuals with disabilities as ‘[S]tudents studying design, and creative and performing arts have the highest proportion of any broad subject group to have a reported disability, with particularly high proportions in relation to cognitive or learning difficulties and mental health conditions’ (para. 22a).

Terms and conditions of grant for 2021-22

Question 15: To what extent do you agree with the proposed changes to terms and conditions of grant for 2021-22? (See paragraph 97.)

| Don't know / prefer not to say |
Question 16: Do you have any other comments on the proposals in this consultation?

We see the proposal as a potentially very destructive move for our own music talent pipeline and one that would undoubtedly harm both HEIs and the Creative Industries. We are also concerned that still – despite much evidence of the societal, economic and cultural benefits - the Creative Industries are somehow regarded as of having less value than other areas. Quite apart from the fact that in reality many ‘creative’ subjects contain huge amounts of technical knowledge and professional judgement it is disingenuous to continue to present some options as being ‘better’ routes for people to pursue in their lives.