Report of 'Polifonia' Steering Group Meeting
19 June 2010, Vilnius

Participants
- Johannes Johansson, Royal College of Music Stockholm (Chair steering group)
- Christopher Caine, Trinity College (Chair Accreditation WG)
- Kaarlo Hilden, Helsinki Metropolia University of Applied Sciences (Chair INVITE WG)
- Helena Gaunt, Guildhall School for Music and Drama, London (Chair Research WG)
- Jacques Moreau, Cefedem Rhônes-Alpes Lyon (Co-chair Bologna WG)
- Ester Tomasi-Fumics, Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst (Co-chair Bologna WG)
- Polifonia team

Apologies
- Marc-Olivier Dupin (External Evaluator)
- Pascale de Groote – CPD for directors WG (Koninklijk Conservatorium - Artesis Hogeschool Antwerpen)

1.   Welcome by chair Johannes Johansson
Johannes welcomes the chairs of the 'Polifonia' working groups to the steering group meeting during the joint working groups meeting in Vilnius, Lithuania.

2.   Report meeting 29 January 2010, Utrecht
The report of the previous meeting on 29 January 2010 is approved without any comments.

3.   Reports on the activities of the working groups by working group chairs
As the chairs of the working groups reported on their groups' work in the joint session before the steering group meeting, Johannes suggests that this agenda point should include points or comments that were not made in the previous session.

Martin adds that from the point-of-view of the project management, the groups need to finalize all their products over the next couple of weeks. The final report of the 'Polifonia' cycle will be due December 1st. The framework of the report will be the same as the interim report, and all activities done until the interim report are already prepared. The 'Polifonia' team will work on the documents of the second half and believe that it will be ready by December 1st.

4.   Group discussion on the project
Kaarlo brings up a challenge he has faced during the project. He explains that the INVITE Working Group had difficulties regarding procedure as well as content, but they have managed to get over these challenges.

Eleonoor wonders whether the project management should be more prepared to deal with different types of tasks. Johannes emphasizes that it will rarely be without complications as the groups will consist of members with different backgrounds including language, terminology and expression.

Helena adds that some of the working forms used in the Innovative Conservatoire seminars for teachers could be helpful for facilitating work in such groups.

Helena also brings up a challenge she has faced as chair of the Research Working Group. She says that what the group will produce will be fine, but they had to go through some difficult conversations to get there. She also feels there has been political manoeuvring behind the scenes, where the group has not been consulted. More concretely she refers to the Research thematic day during the AEC Annual Congress and the EPARM (European Platform for Artistic Research in Music) initiative for the upcoming 'Polifonia' cycle.

Martin explains that the AEC Congress was not intended to be a behind-the-scenes preparation, but it was more of a lack of dialogue and connection and that the project management will try to make sure that this type of miscommunication does not happen again. On the other hand, the EPARM initiative will be open to everyone so there is no need for the working group to feel excluded.

Johannes adds that quite a few things go on at the same time, meaning the current 'Polifonia' project and the planning of the upcoming cycle. The fact that the next 'Polifonia' cycle plans to focus on artistic research only is a complicated process. Martin explains that the Third Cycle Working Group in the first 'Polifonia' was too heavily influenced by artistic research and only focused on 3rd cycle, so in the second cycle, the Research Working Group was formed. Now the wish for more student involvement has lead to EPARM. He adds that the AEC does not have a clear research ideology at the moment as there is an enormous diversity within the membership. However, practise based research is in need of support at this time, which is another reason to go ahead with the EPARM initiative. Johannes emphasizes that EPARM does not bring a definition of research; it is just an example of a type of research which needs more development.

Linda brings up the terminology of the handbooks; whether all groups should use the same terminology and whether it should be "conservatoires" or "higher music education institutions". It is decided that conservatoires can be used as long as in the beginning of the handbooks there is a definition of what the group means with the word "conservatoire". Ester adds that the Tuning brochure defined the word and this could be used in the handbooks.

Ester asks if we still have the feedback questionnaire which was produced in the first cycle of 'Polifonia', which was sent to the working group members. She thinks that it would be a good idea to have something similar for the current cycle, which can be sent to all working group members at the end of the project.

5. Polifonia 2010-2013 (if necessary)
Helena brings up the issue of the responsibility of the working group members to come to the meetings. Either a code of conduct needs to be prepared for the new cycle of 'Polifonia' or the project management needs to clarify to the working group members the amount of work and travel expected from them. The Research Working Group had some trouble with attendance to the meetings, especially during the Novi Sad meeting in February 2010, and it would be good to avoid this in the next cycle.

6. Next steps
▪ The 'Polifonia' team gives an update on what will happen in the upcoming months until the end of the project. Over the summer, once the titles of the handbooks are finalized, the last 'Polifonia' newsletter will be drafted and printed.
▪ At the moment the project management is finalizing the contracts and staff hour declarations for the second period of the project. The steering group is urged to send necessary information as soon as possible.
▪ Linda informs the steering group that the budget is well on track at the moment. There is a decent amount saved while making sure that the project can print and translate all that is needed.

7. Suggestions for the next steering group meeting: 27 September 2010, Utrecht

Linda explains that this agenda point is for the preparation of the final steering group meeting which will take place in Utrecht in September. The following three points will be on the agenda for this meeting.

- A strategy for the promotion of materials produced in this cycle,
- Research into internet tools for working groups to use for the next cycle by the 'Polifonia' team,
- Suggestions of the current working group chairs for the chairs of next 'Polifonia' cycle.

Eleonoor brings up the role of the AEC team within the working groups, she feels that it is not clear what is expected of the team, how much the team can be proactive within the group. She asks the steering group for feedback. Martin and the chairs agree that this is depending on the working group and the knowledge of the team. It is also agreed that in the first meeting with the chairs of the next 'Polifonia' cycle, this should be discussed upfront to make sure the role is clear.

For the final steering group meeting on September 27th, it is decided that the meeting can start at 12 and end at a time which allows the chairs to travel home on that day.

Report written by Şirin Tuğbay

To-Do List:

Polifonia Team:

- Prepare a draft strategy for the promotion of materials produced in this cycle,
- Research into internet tools for the next cycle (google docs, other sharing and communication tools)
- Collect pre-college entrance requirements for the HUMART project
- Collect updated/corrected country overviews for the national descriptions
- Collect examples of how AEC Learning Outcomes and Polifonia/Dublin descriptors have been used in all European countries

Steering Group:

- Prepare a very brief document with suggestions for the chairs of the next 'Polifonia' cycle.