Management Committee Meeting

22nd April 10am, West Road Board Room

Present: Ben Glassberg (President) (BG); Giverny McAndry (Vice President) (GM); Karys Orman (KO); Quintin Beer (QB); Patrick Flynn (PF); Chris Lawrence (CL); Ian Howard (IH); Martin Richardson (MR); Jenny Reavell (JR); Lucy Morris (LM); Jo Whitehead (JW); Vicky Simons (VS); Ian Christians (IC); Nick Shaw (NS).

1. Apologies
   1. Chloe Davidson (CD); JR leaving at 11am.
2. Approval of Minutes
   1. No minutes to approve because has been away.
3. Matters arising
   1. Final version of Ensemble plans
      1. CUCO (GT) – N/A
      2. CUMSSO (VS)
         1. Largely the same: rehearsal schedule change not as drastic as it sounds, instrumentation has been added
         2. Elections next week; handover already exchanged hands
         3. Is committee large enough to make light work?
            1. General members who may want to help out is a possibility as unnamed roles
            2. Fixing is not (should not) be an issue.
            3. CD is integral for running of CUMSSO; cannot lose her!
            4. Not having a principle conductor for this year and reviewing it at the end of the year. Interim period. Not really planning for the next few years in case a principle conductor is appointed.
            5. CL: Appointing principle conductor(s) difficult due to forward planning for the professional
            6. IC: London agents for conductors – well-known conductors not as keen as young/inspirational conductors. Could integrate conductors’ details into CUMS database?
      3. CUMSCO (PF)
         1. Future progression plans are new:
            1. CUCO player should be leader and anchor. Leadership skills priority over ability; this position and its nature should be advertised during recruitment process.
            2. Rehearsal schedule changes from CUMSSO means limitations to strings may not apply.
            3. Currently appointing new president.
      4. CUWO (IH)
         1. Fill out the gaps and aim for optimal instrumentation; it was agreed that CUWO should aim for this, otherwise there would be no point bothering(!)
         2. Aims to create more enjoyable programmes to increase revenue from tickets.
         3. Varsity Concert this year clashed with other engagements (brass band, CUJO, etc); it was agreed that in such instances the ensemble and/or music society presidents should negotiate as events are often more flexible than assumed.
         4. Trinity College might not give the chapel for free. NS says to budget for the cost just in case.
         5. ‘Cam the Man with a Van’ may be used for transportation for percussion, £20 cost each way!
      5. CULC (BG)
         1. Donations procedure should be more official and rigorous
         2. Some extensive costs – high costs for those without high donations. Balancing risk of exciting programmes with audience appreciation...
         3. CUCO-esque concerts are out of place in CULC; perhaps one per year could be an exception. CULC should fill chamber concert void, venue and platform for pieces and ensembles which do not fit into bigger events.
      6. CUPE (MM) – N/A
      7. CUMS Chorus (MR)
         1. Stephen Cleobury is stepping down in 2 years time; moving in the same way until this time with programmes in place, but undertaking a wide strategic review for future.
         2. Financially perceived as a drain on resources (may not be true); fundraising in their own right (outside of CUMS umbrella) needs to be a new focus; KO very important for this.
         3. Next season: look at ticket pricing carefully. Under-pricing for the Bach and Verdi Requiem to be rectified to create greater revenue.
         4. Venue: West Road least popular.
         5. Potential name change to Cambridge University Symphony Chorus? New name defines the repertoire.
         6. A Student President position may not work so well here, but may come out of current membership and a team to encourage things like outreach, etc.
      8. NS highlighted the lack of budget in each ensemble plan.
         1. It was agreed that a ‘handover document’ containing ensemble logistics should be created for incoming committees and circulated after their appointment; elections in Lent, shadow over Easter and start in October fresh. This should be applicable to all CUMS ensembles.
         2. It was agreed that budgets should be given to NS by end of May latest, and great care should be taken to include everything.
      9. PF suggested introducing a database for CUMS similar to that of the Union Society. Useful for programming purposes (documenting length, popularity, history within CUMS across all ensembles).
      10. CL suggested that CUMS President should be instrumental in giving advice to ensemble presidents regarding conductors.
4. Review job descriptions for CUMS P & VP (BG)
   1. Appoint at the end of Lent, shadow over Easter. Tenure to be for the academic year.
   2. He/she should be added for the next application.
5. Review of current budget (NS)
   1. £16-18k total loss for CUMS (size of the loss is the issue; manageable loss is around £16k on concerts and £10k loss), this is too much.
   2. Bills come through incredibly late; costs need to be transferred to NS as they happen.
   3. IC: would not accept this principle. Musicians are not being paid, so a much smaller loss should be aimed for. Suggested a project to see what changes can be made to the situation. Target not to break even have a loss on concerts. JR suggested that from a charitable perspective careful custodianship of the funds we already have in order to provide a good service of creating music is important because CUMS is a charity.
   4. Cumulative negative situation; one ensemble goes off-piste and it all add up; the culture of loss is not acceptable.
   5. Action: NS to circulate total budget for CUMS and estimates in near future.
   6. It was agreed that artists do not have the authority to spend outside of the budget they have provided without prior permission from NS and JW; it was also agreed that these permissions must be sent to BG as well as NS in order to judge musical importance as well as financial worth.
   7. Younger professionals more suitable for multiple soloist jobs within one project; for one soloist, a higher quality is expected.
   8. Very worth searching locally for odd jobs – mention them in the programme or offer them an advert.
   9. Annual write-off for instrument collection is £10k over a 10 year period.
6. Review Current Programme (BG/CL)
   1. CUCO is the gap. 2.5 concerts of missing information
      1. Possible French Programme/Peter Stark/Soloist (Rees?)
      2. IC: January concert Brahms Requiem and Dvorak 8th
      3. IC: Carlos Iscaray May concert conductor?
         1. Strategically using him for CUCO might not be wise as he has relationships with CUMSO. Perhaps double book him.
         2. CL: CUMS should have a general relationship with conductors – conductors should not be attached to particular ensembles.
         3. Different conductor would give wider portfolio of contacts.
         4. February concert: Christopher Seaman, alumnus. Masterclass dimension? Stephen Kovacevich might play Mozart concerto. Might not self-direct.
      4. Last week of May deadline to solidify these choices and their budgets.
   2. CUMSSO
      1. Peter Donohoe concert programme not finalised
      2. 20th century concert not been nailed down. Expense due to 20th century programme.
      3. Joel’s Concert change noted – Prokoviev, Rachmaninov, Tchaikovsky
   3. CUMS Chorus Britten War Requiem in Ely – CUMS budgetary implications – Jo knows the answer. Needs to be written down and sent to NS.
   4. CUMSCO
      1. All good! Suitable and popular.
   5. Joint concert
      1. All good!
   6. CUWO
      1. Varsity Concert – want to get it in the brochure, fix the date soon and announce date.
   7. 17th January soloists for Brahms Requiem – leaving CUMS to find them. BG to contact Caroline so she will find soloist; find home-grown soloist.
   8. CUMS Chorus
      1. All good! Mahler 2 for organ. Chamber version!?
   9. CUPE: CUWO needs to know, but it is not sure yet.
      1. CUPE does not need a separate budget because they are nearly always playing as part of another concert.
7. Proposals for London Concerts
   1. BG proposed the expansion of the CUMS brand; yearly fundraising concerts on small scale.
   2. Fundraising and orchestral concerts in London
      1. Two fundraising concerts
      2. One orchestral concert – big orchestral work and a smaller work
         1. Oxford and Cambridge Club are keen
         2. Smaller independent venues could be used
      3. Orchestral concerts: CUCO plays at Kings Place annually (repeat concert) IC mentioned his connection with the London Chamber Music Society, who want a repeat of the Howard Shelley concert on the Sunday following the Saturday November concert. Good opportunity to be imbedded every year. They do the marketing and have a regular audience, though the venue can only fit 32-34 musicians on the stage.
      4. CUMSSO performs at Cadogan Hall every other year; combination Cadogan Hall
      5. Potential Collaboration with Oxford Music Society.
      6. VS noted that doing concerts outside of term poses problems and raised concerns with putting on too many concerts without taking anything away. NS noted that cost of the London concerts have needed financial help and are very stressful on CD. CL expressed concern that we over-value the worth of appearing in London, and should confine to just one orchestral concert, working closely with CUDAR. MR said that CUMS Chorus wants to spread its wings and would love to collaborate with other CUMS ensembles; there is potential for reciprocal concert when the Bach Choir comes up to Cambridge for a concert. LM sees London as an opportunity for outreach, advertise among London colleges. Questions were raised as to whether responsibility lies with CUMS or individual ensembles for outreach. Action: GM to construct meeting with Joe Shaw (CaMEO officer) about potential work.
      7. Create links with different venues – slotting into existing venues and series and effectively engaging with them, but promoting from ground-up for a one-off at Cadogan Hall is a different ball game.
   3. Need for fundraiser/Artistic Director
      1. Builds connections with conductors and agents and fundraising where the Student President cannot look after future interest of CUMS.
      2. Some degree of continuity and support but does not take over; advisory role and doing jobs that they cannot do.
      3. Discussion regarding the balance between the two roles: it was agreed that fundraising was the priority, and that solid commitment was necessary to avoid difficult situations. A professional fundraiser, having unique but transferable skills, would be advantageous.
      4. The formality of the position was debated. CL was certain it should be a formal agreement to avoid commitment issues.
      5. The importance of emotional connection and artistic involvement in CUMS was also discussed, as well as involvement in London concerts. It was largely agreed that artistic sensitivity is necessary, and there may not be such thing as an effective fundraiser who is also totally independent.
      6. BG and CL suggested that Justin Lee, who runs Cambridge Music Festival, is interested in helping CUMS but that nothing set in stone.
      7. LM suggested an annual telephone campaign event. Difficulties in this include: gaining support of CUDAR; tracking down alumni.
      8. It was agreed that an artistic director was not necessary and that CUMS does well as is.
      9. It was mentioned that significant potential for marketing has not had the dedication that it needs, and this is different to fundraising itself. Student President has taken over some of these jobs.
      10. NS £40-45k pro rata for two days. Some donors have said they will up their donations for the next five years while they appoint. Offer percentages of money raised? Complicated. Three year trajectory in the first instance. Perhaps an informal agreement could be made where he helps CUMS for a year.
      11. No other ensemble other than CUMS Chorus is asked to gain sponsorship, though they should also contribute.
      12. Should not just hire from our contacts.
      13. Action: BG to draw up a draft document of what we do and don’t want and highlight grey areas. Send to committee for thoughts.
8. AOB
   1. NME Proposal
      1. Another element of music making to CUMS; makes us more attractive.
      2. Concerns were raised regarding the notion that anything that is university-level music making falls under CUMS – this is dangerous until we are better supported; do we have the ability to take on more?
      3. Expanding while we have a shortage of players for current ensembles is counterintuitive.
      4. Means CUMS are supporting faculty-led ensembles.
         1. This could lead to negotiation regarding rehearsal charges.
         2. It was noted that CUMS has been giving instrument hire for free for two years.
      5. Perhaps there is a middle road where we offer everything except the grant – publicity, CUMS accreditation as an Associate Member.
      6. It was agreed that a more concrete definition of full members of CUMS and associate members should be formed; relationship should be mutually beneficial.
      7. Action: Jo to draw up balance sheet.
   2. May Week Festival (LM)
      1. Five concerts (first is May Week concert; 2-4 open to application; last is a last-night-of-the-proms style) for 2015 May Week, run by an elected individual committee.
      2. Subject to funding and rehearsal; concerns about May Week saturation
      3. Action: LM to draw up a paper.
   3. Wine for after concert parties
      1. £1.20 including corkage. IC still happy to provide wine.
      2. Each budget will include an estimate of party costs based on number of performers.
   4. CUMS Rehearsal Calendar (VS)
      1. Similar to point 3.ix, a proposal was put forward to make available a centrally available online calendar to help avoid rehearsal clashes and to encourage logistical cooperation and transparency between all the CUMS ensembles. It was agreed that this was a good idea, and that further research should be done into assessing the most suitable platform for this.

The meeting ended at 1216.