



FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Saara Lindahl) Report on International Relations Coordinators (IRC) Working Group (WG) meeting

Krakow, 02 and 03.02.16



- (If it is your first Event WG meeting): How did you feel in the meeting? Did you feel welcomed by the other group members? What it easy to find your place in the group?
- Is it good/necessary to have a student in the event WGs?
- What were the topics that interested you most from the student perspective?
- In which ways do you think that the event your WG is planning will change thanks to the student perspective?
- What would you say was the main input you gave to the meeting? (main ideas)
- Any other reflection, always welcomed!

1) I was very welcomed by all the members. Perhaps due to the enthusiasm of a student's presence it was even suggested that the topic of the next conference theme should be 'students' and the IRC should take a special focus in them. Even though this was not eventually the result, but student representation and involvement could be held as a guideline when planning the next meeting. It was easy for me to get my voice heard.

2) Absolutely! There was a mutual opinion that students ought to be present more actively in the meeting and an actual student representative can insure the student expectations are met. There are anyhow many parts which are not relevant for an active role of a student in the WG meetings, but an attendance is still recommendable, once it is important for the student to get an understanding of the whole conference and of its contents.

3) To make sure that the conference can provide something for students also was the most relevant and interesting part. As topics, everything to do with international careers are relevant, as well as any international cooperation between institutions that affects studying.

4) There will be a special session made by students (also local) in the annual conference.

5)

- my own presence: to have a student there is in itself a statement
- the IRC conference is not intended solely for teachers and administration anymore, but also for students for local students are encouraged to participate in the students session.
- hopefully the threshold to invite and cooperate with students in the future is lowered

6) A lot of the duration of the meeting does not require student participation.

Report written by Saara Lindahl, Student WG representative at the International Relations Coordinators - IRC WG (Helsinki, Finland, 05.08.16)





FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Saara Lindahl) Report on International Relations Coordinators (IRC) Working Group (WG) meeting

Tallinn, 24.05.16



- How did you feel in the meeting? Did you feel welcomed by the other group members? What it easy to find your place in the group?
- Is it good/necessary to have a student in the event WGs?
- What were the topics that interested you most from the student perspective?
- In which ways do you think that the event your WG is planning will change thanks to the student perspective?
- What would you say was the main input you gave to the meeting? (main ideas)
- Any other reflection, always welcomed!

1) Once this was the second meeting, I wasn't a new member and thus less of a focus. I came there after the meeting had started and it took a while before the topic was explained to me (around 30 mins). On the whole I was participating in the discussions as actively as in February, once majority of the topics were not in the right realm for students. I didn't attend the second day of the meeting, but returned to Helsinki the same day I came. I was greeted warmly and felt welcome.

2) It was important for me to update the group concerning the progress and planning of the students' session at the conference (please see the abstract below). Otherwise, not really. One day was sufficient.

3) As I said, the vast majority of the topics had little to do with students and I felt I couldn't give much input in the planning once only the one I was in charge of planning had a student perspective. The other sessions needed the expertise of the international officers and other professionals. Of course, it has been interesting to follow and participate in the making of a conference.

4) For the first time students have an active role and the WG needs to take it into account.

5) As already mentioned, my input this time was limited mainly to the report of my own work and to the discussion with the representative from Krakow.

6) I was reminded several times that whether there are any concerns or difficulties, I can always ask for help. Also, the Krakow representative asked me separately how cooperative their students had been.

Report written by Saara Lindahl, Student WG representative at the International Relations Coordinators - IRC WG (Helsinki, Finland, 10.08.16)



“Exquisite Cadaver” of International Music - Student session at the IRC Meeting in Krakow, 15 to 17 September 2016

Abstract

Internationalisation is all about different perspectives. Therefore, it makes sense that challenges in this field might be solved by looking from different perspectives - also students'. For the first time in the history of the IRC meeting, students have organized a session. The aim is not to primarily present students' concerns and worries, but to work together with the conference participants and propose solutions. Common issues concerning students will be written down on papers which will be rotating among groups who will use them to discuss and picture solutions. Each case will finally unwrap itself like a picture in *exquisite cadaver*.

Structure

5 minutes introduction: Saara Lindahl, Mateusz Zubik and hopefully also Ewa Menaszek and Matyldka Sielska will give an introduction about the functioning of the session.

The *Exquisite Cadaver* is composed of **three-parts, 15 minutes each:**

1. Groups with even number of participants are formed around each student. Group members introduce themselves. This is the solo moment for the student. She/he will describe a challenge/concern/problem/idea as a case concerning international studies, career and life she/he has personally faced or has heard from personal experiences of other fellow students. Discussion on the topic will be held in the group, e.g. “Is the case also relevant in other countries or institutions?”. The case can also be specified and narrowed down. It is then written down on a paper and will be the basis of the next parts of the session. After 15 minutes the paper is given to another group.
 2. The new group reads the paper given by the first group. The task of this group is to pretend to live in a dream world where everything is possible and propose the best solution model which would work in a perfect world. Papers are exchanged again, with a new group.
 3. The third group has to think realistically and mirror the solution of the second group to their own institutions. The group would discuss to which extent the solution model is/would be met by their institutions. Is there something that could be done to improve the situation? Exchange of good practices.
- Each group will perform all 3 roles
 - At the end there is a **wrap-up of 10 min** where all the papers are presented.
 - All this papers are then scanned and put online, that they are visible for all the attendees of the conference and hopefully also all students. The papers could have also a nice visual appearance and can be put on display.

FULL SCORE Project

Student Working Group (Saara Lindahl)

Report on International Relations Coordinators (IRC) meeting,

Vienna, 06 June 2017

It was agreed in the meeting that the presentation of the Student Handbook would be moved earlier in the programme plan and more time would be given for some further presentation of the Handbook for those ones interested. It turned out that the situation regarding students will be different in Tbilisi than in Krakow, because students will be back from their holidays (which presented a challenge for student involvement in Krakow).

Therefore, I suggested a special newcomers' session for local students to be included at the beginning of the IRC meeting so that they can know more about the AEC, IRC and the student work in the organization, and to make it easier for them to follow the IRC meeting. After all, students had been interested in the activities in Krakow, but there had been no proper introduction for them. My suggestion caused some discussion and according to the counter proposition, students should be involved in the general newcomers' session. But in the end, students will have their own session that I will keep. There is the ongoing question, which I have been unable to resolve: to which extent students should be treated separately from the rest of the participants in IRC meetings. More isolated treatment can target students and student needs more specifically, but prevents some collaboration between other participants. We also ruled out the possibility for wider student participation in Tbilisi, but the meeting should rather try to target those students, who already have shown some inclination for student representation or international affairs in their institution.

The future role of the IRC WG was one of the topics at the end of the meeting. According to the preliminary proposition, the working group could have members from more varied backgrounds and thus not only include international officers. Also the subject, international cooperation, could be interpreted more widely and be more inclusive. For students, this might provide more possibilities than the current situation, where many of the subjects concern mainly international officers.

This leads me to my main challenge: I often feel my inability to fully take part in many topics. For example, it is challenging for me to suggest key note speakers, and as mentioned previously, many topics during the IRC meetings concern the working realities of international officers. This, I presume, is a difference to the other AEC working groups, like PJP, where students have more personal experience on the topics addressed. On the other hand, there are many areas where I can fully take part into the planning work and hopefully can bring some fresh ideas. And, I wish, I can try to introduce topics, which deal with internationalization and cooperation more widely.

Report written by Saara Lindahl, Student WG representative at the IRC WG
(London, UK, 10/07/2017)

FULL SCORE Project

Student Working Group (Saara Lindahl)

Report on International Relations Coordinators (IRC) meeting

AEC office, Brussels, 03 February 2017

Outline of the meeting:

I arrived late to the meeting due to difficulties in traffic from London, but luckily all the topics where student representation was most important were addressed after my arrival. We went through the feedback from the IRC meeting in Krakow, which had been sent to WG members earlier and addressed the fact that student-lead parts had been a success. I regarded the feedback to be important evidence that students' voice was a needed and welcomed part of future IRC meetings. There were no talks to question this during the WG meeting either, but only the nature of future student involvement in IRC annual meetings was addressed. It was suggested by one member that students would not have an own section during the next IRC meeting in Tbilisi, but would be active in all or at least in many events. I doubted how this could be practically carried out and whether it would lead to the most fruitful outcome. I had planned beforehand my own suggestion for next year's student involvement, which was a presentation to all participants about the handbook, which Student WG was going to publish. It was agreed swiftly by all.

When it comes to the rest of the meeting, I don't recall any other occasions where the student voice was specifically needed. I tried to be an active member of the meeting to the best of my abilities.

Overall take on the reception of student voice after the first year:

Now, after my first one full year, I have tried to perceive the stance on student involvement the other WG members have taken. Overall I can say they have been very flexible and positive, if quite passive on the issue. I have tried to bring a clear role for a student in IRC WG myself, which means specific student-lead events in the IRC annual meetings. Perhaps because of the lack of strong opinions from any of the other WG members on the nature of student involvement, the rest of the WG seems to expect me to take responsibility on student issues more than wanting to deal them mutually together. My suggestions have always been accepted quite effortlessly, or that at least has been my impression. However, this does not mean lack of interest or faith and the yearlong collaboration has been enjoyable.



What the student involvement has been able to achieve in one year?

If we don't think that student involvement has a self-value in itself, there has been many developments ensued by the involvement. Here are the two key achievements, as I see them:

- Students are now seen and proven as possible collaborators in international cooperation. I got a lot of feedback in Krakow from both IRCs and students of how the event had been an eye-opener and enabled them to see current challenges from each other's point of views. They also thanked for the chance to try to solve and discuss the difficulties together.
- Involvement of local students in Krakow inspired several students to pursue more active roles in their institution.

Report written by Saara Lindahl, Student WG representative at the IRC WG

(London, UK, 10/04/2017)



FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Sylvain Devaux) Report on Pop and Jazz (PJP) Working Group (WG) meeting

Brussels, 12-13.10.15

11:00 - 17:00



The meeting took place on that day in the AEC office in Brussels, from 10am to 17pm. I found the time frame adequate and enough to discuss the various topics. That was the first time I attended such a meeting with members of an already constituted AEC Working Group. Overall, it was truly a valuable experience for me, especially since the group concerned belongs to a different professional environment than mine and it is very much interesting for me to discuss and tackle with the concerns, interests and issues of the musical sector from another perspective. I realized that actually, regardless of the discrepancies that exist between the more classical/contemporary music environment and the Pop and Jazz one, these share a lot of similar concerns. When it comes to addressing those and in spite of the fact that the “solutions” or outcomes could vary from a sector to another, I would find highly valuable to enable discussions between people from different sectors. I found the discussions truly relevant.

The members of the PJP WG are really respectful towards each other. The group features a great balance and complementarity among its members in terms of expertise, mind-sets and personalities. I have been very well welcomed and very quickly I felt free to share my thoughts and ideas. I never felt I was judged in any way. I really appreciated to feel on equal footing with the others, and I learned a lot from the other members.

I took part in the preparation of the upcoming PJP Platform in Rotterdam at the general level (participating in the overall reflections on schedule, time frame, organization...), but I also provided some inputs as topics. I submitted “Changing student mind-sets” as one of them for the World Café as well as “Cross-disciplinary projects: reaching new audience and funding opportunities”. I will prepare and hold these two sessions of discussions during the event, which will undoubtedly be a great experience. As there is going to be about twenty students coming from all around the Nederland to join in (an open call has been sent out throughout the country), I will also go there one day earlier in order to meet them before the event starts, so that we could prepare the student’s involvement within the event.

Difficulties and questions:

It was clear neither for me, nor for the group, which role I had to take and how much I’m supposed to be involved in the group’s activities. Should the student representative in an AEC WG have specific tasks? The question remains and I didn’t really find yet a satisfying answer...



Even if the people regarded my presence within the group as valuable, they tend to forget to include me systematically in the email discussions during the first few weeks that follow (for instance, when it came to picking up a date for the next skype Meeting, I was out of the discussion). Yet, this point got better after some time.

Report written by Sylvain Devaux, Student WG representative at the PJP - Pop and Jazz WG (Paris, France, 30.07.16)





FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Sylvain Devaux) Report on Pop and Jazz (PJP) Working Group (WG) meeting

Brussels, 04-05.05.16

11:00 - 17:00



Following the PJP Event in Rotterdam, the PJP Working group gathers in Brussels to debrief and envisage the next Working Group's assignments. The main aims of this meeting were to discuss, schedule and assign the tasks in order to prepare the PJP Bulletin, which aims at providing the community with a summary and some feedbacks from the past event (Cf. PJP WG Meeting report for more details). In general, I definitely felt like any other member, part of the group, and I appreciated it a lot.

I have been assigned to write a report on the discussions that took place at the table I was hosting during the World Cafe session.. Thus, I wrote for the Bulletin an article in the form of a short story in order to share the content of these discussions. I rephrased and reorganised as well the final student's statement made by all the students who attended the Rotterdam Event, again for the Bulletin.

I realise how much, by taking part in the preparation of the event and by sharing reflexions with the others, being in this group nourishes and questions a lot my own ideas and approaches of music making, thinking them from another view point. Also, I apprehend much more the complexity of such subjects as music teaching and learning, and understand how important it is to share and discuss with others about it. I appreciate being in touch with such a community.

Difficulties and questions:

Even though I assume that I took a satisfying and active role within the group, I am still wondering what kind of role I have to play and how far I should engaged in my PJP WG's membership. Within this group, do I have to assume a similar role to the others, or should I be more focused on student's aspects (communication tasks with the students of the Pop&Jazz fields, preparing more student-concerned topics, making sure students are represented, have their voice heard and that they take active roles within the event...?). Especially since the Student Working Group demands already a great deal of work, It would probably be worth clarifying and defining this point?

From an individual perspective, I have the feeling that a student more in the field of the Pop or Jazz sectors would benefit more than me from being within this group since he/she could share more adequate experiences and would make the most of all the knowledge and know-how of the musicians in the group as well as getting concrete and helpful advices.

Report written by Sylvain Devaux, Student WG representative at the PJP - Pop and Jazz WG (Paris, France, 30.07.16)

FULL SCORE Project

Student Working Group (Sylvain Devaux)

Report on Pop & Jazz (PJP) WG meeting,

AEC office, Brussels, 3rd and 4th October 2016

My presence in the group is fully accepted, I contribute as any other member. The discussions and reflections led by this group of people are deeply instructive and interesting. Although, some topics discussed in this meeting, such as the collaboration of the Aec with other associations or networks (EJN, EASJ...), seem a bit far away from student's concerns. That's why I felt a bit useless in the discussions, not really being able to make any valuable contribution.

At the same time and with a bit of reflection afterwards, I realize that I got nevertheless a deeper insight into how the AEC works, what types of relation it has, how is the process of discussions and concretization of collaborative work and partnerships. As always, there is something to learn, and the PJP group is immensely rich with that regard. The agenda of the meeting was quite heavy. There was a fair amount of work to be done, lots of topics to tackle in so little time! I felt that there were too many subjects to deal with.

The WG members are really busy and I found it hard to tackle the "student subject" there. What I mean is that, as a student representative, I assume that one of my mission here is to foster a particular focus on the students and their concerns, so as to ensure a better involvement in the platform as well as, in a more general manner, to make sure that the Conservatoires, members of the AEC, take more into account the "student's voice". It was difficult for me to broad a consistent discussion around that, since the preparation of the London Congress and the emerging collaborations with EJN and EASJ seem to take most of the time we had.

At last, I start feeling that I would like to have among my daily activities one that could ensure a concrete and practical "follow-up" of what I learn and gain here in terms of knowledge. I would like to make use of all the reflections on teaching, learning and education and put them into a professional and practical activity from now on.

Report written by Sylvain Devaux, Student WG representative at the PJP WG
(Paris, France, 06/12/2016)



FULL SCORE Project
Student Working Group (Ruth Fraser)
Early Music Platform (EMP) Working
Group (WG) meeting
Brussels, 04.03.16
11:00 - 17:00



Our first point of call after introduction was to discuss the previous meeting in Prague:

- Participants thought it was important to have the point of view from students
- They thought it was interesting to focus on the relationship between school and festivals
- The thought was raised as to what practical applications can be in place after such lively meetings
- They discussed how we can help to build up the Early Music scene in Eastern Europe; asking if they have strengths that we don't have and how they can learn from the mistakes we made in the 1980s.
- They wished there to be more involvement and connections between the showcase musicians and the delegates; not to have them just play and leave

There was a brief discussion on the role of musicians in society; balancing the leaning of an instrument, focusing on historically informed practice (HIP) and also being prepared for the market.

Most participants thought it would be better to rename Early Music studies ad courses to HIP.

We discussed the motivation of students, that they should not just be listening to CD's and YouTube for inspiration but actively researching like they used to. The EM revival was driven by critical minds who are now all teaching what they found rather than inspiring their students to find out for themselves. Students are now tending to imitate success.

Participants thought that students are very good with finding their own way in the industry, often more so than teachers but there was a difference in opinion between departments for their visions on students pathways; some opting for a more open vision for EM and others wanting to instil fixed views about EM. Everyone agreed that the curricula is changing gradually to become more accessible and open - dealing with students individually rather than as a whole block. However this also brought up the question: should students adapt to the school or the school to the student?

Participants thought that ESMUC should be present at the meeting.

Theme ideas for the conference in The Hague 2017:



What are the main ingredients for an EM Curriculum?

- Main subject (instrument)
- Depends on the instrument (not all courses are applicable for every EM instrument)
- Improvisation
- Understanding of Polyphony and Basso Continuo
- Counterpoint
- Introductory course of EM language into Classical music

- What do they want?
 - they want to have modern formation as BA and specialisation as MA
 - they want to know the style and be able to play EM

It generally was felt that a non-specific Bachelor programme containing elements of EM was preferable leading students to specialise in the Masters. There could be a split in the BA with students taking special courses in EM but not necessarily a whole separate degree.

A question was raised: Is the point of this curriculum discussion to come up with an ideal curriculum? If we create this then we will also engender a generation of generic students.

Report written by Ruth Fraser, Student WG representative at the Early Music Platform - EMP WG (The Hague, the Netherlands 11.07.16)

FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Isabel González) Report on Congress Committee meeting Brussels. 01-04-2016 10:00 - 17:00



I think that students' perspective in events WGs can be really inspiring and positive in order to find new solutions and more innovative ways for every event, besides of identifying lacks and necessities that were not so evident previously, giving the opportunity to re-design contains and programmes.

Obviously, the Students' voice and diversity were the topics that interested me the most. Two topics that are, in fact, two real AEC challenges where there's lot of work left for doing, and where AEC can really find great benefits in short and long terms.

After my experience in this WG meeting, I could really notice that there's a lack of awareness about the importance of seeing a sector of current students as future builders of HME and AEC community, besides of the necessity of fostering a collective AEC identity; developing even more the regional meetings and attending for equal the needs of the different realities to break culture barriers and prejudices.

It's for that I propose that students voice session must be a general session in Annual Congress to bring ***When Past and Future meet at Present*** in order to create a dialogue between generations...what do new generations have to tell to older ones about HME according to their experience? At the same time, I propose to include a student in every regional meeting as audience in order to write report and increasing their awareness about HME politics and work-decisions making that their institutions work for implementing or discussing about. This way we make them empathy with HME problematics from their own reality with AEC.

During the meeting, I felt a general sluggishness and, also distracted atmosphere by phones or mailing; and a lack of effective and efficient work meeting due to Agenda structure and organisation. Agenda was not clear enough and not good enough organised in order to concrete or enumerate clearly the problems at different scales with their respective solutions. At the same time I missed a bigger reflection in order to identify participants' demands in the possible meaning of results of participants' questionnaires... and suggestions are important, but not real big solutions in order to develop the Congress as the political event it is. At the same time, Congress was compared to an event such as the Pop and Jazz Platform and I think it is dangerous to make these comparisons because the role of these two events are completely different in AEC. In conclusion, I think that there's a lack of structure organisation and previous preparation, a distracted determination to persuade clear big challenges through this event, and a lack of synergy that could also be affected for the dates where meeting took place in Brussels (just after the terrorist attacks).

Report written by Isabel González, Student WG representative at the AEC Congress Committee (Murcia, Spain, 10/05/2016)

FULL SCORE Project

Student Working Group (Isabel González Delgado)

Report on Congress Committee meeting,

Academy of Music, Zagreb, 29 June 2017

The reason why I did not write any feedback from the first Congress Committee meeting was that I did not feel I had anything to say. It was a quite fast, energetic and efficient meeting - A feeling we all shared afterwards. Concerning my second congress committee meeting which took place in Zagreb, I must say I was quite motivated. Things went fast again and we all agreed in modifications and some important perspectives concerning topics for the congress programme and ways to shape them. In addition, I felt useful in order to make understand the rest of the group some necessary perspectives from the student point of view.

My only one concern from student perspective was the opinion of some Congress Committee members about the students' sessions in the Congress. Someway, they tend to think that our job in the congress is something aside from the directors, separating in 2 sides: "the student stuff" and the "management stuff". I am not going to hide I felt a little bit disappointed and, and is something I feel the Student WG should discuss with the AEC office in our meeting in September, when discussing the role of the WG in the SMS project.

1º: The concern about Education is a concern that whatever person can feel independently of its age and its status. If we are talking about HME enhancement, we are talking about a common goal. The difference of this common goal between students and directors is the perspective. It is for that reason why partnership is necessary. Heads concerns attend a more pragmatic perspective since they have concerns from organisation and business view, while students' perspective is free from these concerns, **keeping a whole concern about the real values of the cause and its consequences.** I am not saying that directors do not care, but it is obvious that management concerns necessary take a big amount of their time.

2º It is true this is not a job for whatever student and it is for that reason why it is maybe more difficult to find the proper voices. Moreover, it is always a long term project. Students need also a time to train itself in this work of HME enhancement. Nevertheless, my experience is a proof. AEC is a place for students because it is an opportunity to get to know the network that really works for an enhancement. It is the perfect place to receive the training. If I would not have had the opportunity to work in AEC we would not have had the first HM student union at national level in Spain which is working with Ministry to solve the problems that heads of institutions are unable to solve because they cannot find common perspectives or they are not able to work together. **Maybe it is not a direct benefit for AEC as organisation, but it is a direct benefit and contribution to AEC mission and goals.**

Another concern it is about my role into congress committee since it is the event where whole student working group attend. Someway, it is necessary to find the agreement with the rest of SWG for titles and contain of sessions. That's something difficult to deal with for me since I use to have a different criteria and that does not make me feel completely free in order to work or contribute in congress committee.

Report written by Isabel González, Student WG representative at the AEC Congress Committee

(Murcia, Spain, 10/07/2017)



FULL SCORE Project

Student Working Group (Angelina Konstantinou)

Report on European Platform for Artistic Research in Music (EPARM) meeting 2017

20 - 22 April 2017 | Royal Conservatoire Antwerp

How did you feel in the meeting? Did you feel welcomed by the other group members? What it easy to find your place in the group?

In general I felt quite ok. They asked me something that I didn't have the chance to answer because I was noting down something they said but in spite of this, everything was fine.

Is it good/necessary to have a student in the event WGs?

Of course it is. Students need the experience and the AEC needs to be influenced by the innovative ideas that young artists' mind-set have.

What were the topics that interested you most from the student perspective?

As a student and a young performer who tries to figure out how to perform a piece since I still lack the experience, I loved Parallel session IIA "Schubert Revised" by Frank Havroy and Gunnar Flagstad! They gave a live mini concert while on the projector the audience could see what they were thinking. At a point they said that themselves are still trying to figure out what do they consider as aesthetically well-"targeted" on the music and they also did a collage of videos of the same piece from different eras. It was funny, brief and full of rhetorical questions as food for thought. I believe that their approach should be strongly encouraged for meetings that their content is guided to performing arts. (*I've been told by many people that parallel session VIC by Shaya Feldman was similar to that and everybody enjoyed it as well)

In which ways do you think that the event your WG is planning will change thanks to the student perspective?

In my view, this is not going to happen soon. I know that they would like bringing more students to attend the meeting because they believe that their opinion and influence is important but I feel that changing thanks to the student perspective, abstains.

What would you say was the main input you gave to the meeting? (main ideas)

I discussed with some members of the WG the fact of the limited student participation. We agreed that would be interesting finding a way to attract more young artists.

GENERAL NOTES:



This year's topics addressed by the meeting were better than last year. I really enjoyed this meeting. Most of the parallel sessions were interesting. The idea of a 15' break in between turns up pretty smart since it gives some time to the audience to absorb the given information and relax before entering the next session.

There were many technical issues that were interrupting the sessions' flow. There was a speaker in parallel session IIIA (whose by the way this meeting was his very first) that couldn't start his presentation on the board due to these issues and as a result he didn't do a good job (he ran out of time and he was keep losing his words).

Report written by Angelina Konstantinou, Student WG representative at the EPARM WG

(Vicenza, Italy 12/07/2017)





FULL SCORE Project Student Working Group (Angelina Konstantinou) Report on European Platform for Artistic Research in Music 2016 *Vicenza. 20 to 22-04-2016*



How did you feel in the meeting? Did you feel welcomed by the other group members? What it easy to find your place in the group?

As my first time in an AEC meeting, I was a bit anxious but the groups' members were very friendly, kind and helpful with me, making me feel welcomed and relax. I did not have any special place in the group; I was just watching their presentations and conversations that followed them, as other participants did.

Is it good/necessary to have a student in the event WGs?

I strongly believe that the student representation in the AEC WG events is necessary. We are making with our presence clear that we care about what is discussed, as well as decided. It is highly important to give our perspective as students, because in many cases we are getting affected. Furthermore, a student knows what feels that lacks/confuses/difficult him; professors that compose AEC's WG have the experience and the methods so collaboration between them could be very useful and efficient for everyone.

What were the topics that interested you most from the student perspective?

Although I felt that the topics were a little too philosophical and general, I found prf. H. Frisk's Breakout Group Discussion Questions on Methodology interesting. The idea of Artistic Research develop its own methods is something that could be a very useful guide for students, especially newly introduced. Participants discussed that research varies from university to university. Some pay a lot of attention to how you are researching, what methods do you use and most important, WHY they (students) are doing this and some other universities do not even have a subject that exclusively deals with Research. A participant aptly said that "students usually believe that in order to write a book you just need to read 100 others." I think a divergence that has to be "equilibrated" shown and the WG saw it.

In which ways do you think that the event your WG is planning will change thanks to the student perspective?

I don't believe that anything will change, at least not in the near future. As I said, the conversations were too general, which made taking a decision impossible. Participants were debatable but up to a point and that's very reasonable -no one wants not to "defend" their institution. Every single one has its own norm which considers the best.

General remarks:

I am very happy joined the event of EPARM WG. I think it helped not only me, but also many other participants, realize the “fluidity” of what is considered as Art, Artistic, Scientific or not, as well as the difficulty of taking determinant decisions on the methods that will certify the quality of the context.

Nevertheless, having read all these documents of the EPARM WG, I expected more specific and probably practical topics that would follow to more targeted conversations, like the idea of creating an AEC magazine/library etc...which are written in the EPARM's documents. Since that was my very first AEC meeting, I don't know how usually things lead but surely important things that had to come into view did, and that's very optimistic!

Report written by Angelina Konstantinou, Student WG representative at the EPARM - European Platform for Artistic Research in Music WG (Kerkira, Greece, 28/04/2016)