

ACADEMIC BOARD

Report title REPORT OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE JUNE 2011

Prepared by Peter Janssen, Acting Director, Research Services

Reviewed by Professor Tim Brown, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

Date 1 June 2011

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I.1 Background

The Research and Graduate Studies Committee is a Policy Committee of Academic Board. It meets approximately 10 times a year and provides a report to Academic Board on key items resolved and discussed. This Report deals with matters considered at the Committee's meeting held on 27 May 2011. The Report supplements reports from time to time by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) to the Academic Board.

I.2 Summary

Items considered by the Committee at this meeting included:

- (a) Policy and Procedures:
 - Draft Research Data Retention and Disposal Procedures
- (b) Research Excellence for La Trobe (Framework)
- (c) Excellence in Research Australia: IRU request for 'frequently asked questions'
- (d) Recognition of workload under the Workload Management System: report on WMS Steering Committee
- (e) Review of the Centre for Dialogue: consideration of Review Report
- (f) Review of the Centre for Bionic Ear and Neurosensory Research: appointment of Review Panel
- (g) Reports of Sub-Committees and Working Parties:
 - Animal Ethics Committee: 14 April 2011
 - Genetic Manipulation Supervisory Committee: 17 November 2010
- (h) Membership of the Genetic Manipulation Supervisory Committee: appointment of Cat. I member
- (i) Membership of the Animal Ethics Committee: appointment of Cat. C and Cat. D members

I.3 Issues (including any financial, legal or compliance issues)

Not applicable.

I.4 RECOMMENDATION

Academic Board is invited:

- (a) *To consider and endorse recommendations arising from the Review of the Centre for Dialogue, as detailed in Attachment A, noting that several recommendations will require referral to the Planning and Resources Committee as they concern matters of financial planning, budgeting and accountability.*

(b) To receive and **note** the Report of Research and Graduate Studies Committee from its meeting held on 27 May 2011.

2. LIST OF DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

Attachment A: Review of the Centre for Dialogue: recommendations

ATTACHMENT A: Review of the Centre for Dialogue

Review Panel

The Review was conducted in February, 2011 by a panel consisting of two academic staff from La Trobe University, two external experts and chaired a member of RGSC.

Membership

Review Panel Chair

Professor Gavin Jack (Chair), Professor of Management, Graduate School of Management.

Review Panel members

Dr James Jupp, Director of Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, Australian National University; Professor James Walter, School of Political & Social Inquiry, Monash University; Professor Norie Neumark, Professor of Media Studies, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences; Professor David Frankel, Professor of Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences.

Secretariat

Ms Philippa Thomas, Executive Officer to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Terms of Reference

The guidelines for the establishment and operation of research centres and institutes require the Research and Graduate Studies Committee to conduct an academic review of each centre/institute every five to six years by a panel containing two members external to the University with expertise in the area(s) of research of the Centre, chaired by a member of the RGSC chosen by RGSC and containing two internal members nominated by the DVC/Dean following consultation with the Director. According to the Research Plan 2009 – 2012, the review of the Centre for Dialogue was scheduled for May, 2010. Due to scheduling difficulties the Review was postponed until February, 2011. All centre and institute reviews are subject to the same general terms of reference as follows:

1. Review the academic activities of the Centre and report on whether these are in accord with the stated aims and objectives for the Centre.
2. Report on the quality of publications and any other research outputs.
3. Review the projected programme of activities for the next five years and comment on its quality, feasibility and the extent to which it is aligned with University and Faculty plans.
4. Recommend to the Research and Graduate Studies Committee on whether the Centre/Institute be permitted to operate for a further period of up to five years, including any recommended changes in the mode of operation and academic objectives.

Reporting

Following the review of a University (respectively, Faculty) Centre, the RGSC (respectively, Faculty Board) shall make a recommendation to the Academic Board (respectively, RGSC) on a further period, up to six years, of University Centre status.

Documentation

The Review Panel was supplied with a number of documents from the Director, Centre for Dialogue, Professor Joe Camilleri. The documents included: Report on the Activities of the Centre for Dialogue (2006 – 2010); Written Submission to the Review Panel; Strategic Plan 2009 – 2013; Funding Strategy Plan 2010 – 2014; Centre for Dialogue Constitution; Annual Reports 2007 – 2010; *Connections* Newsletters. Thirty eight written submissions were also considered.

Timeline and Deliberations

The Review Panel received a range of documents related to the work of the Centre for Dialogue on 15 February, 2011. Written submissions were invited from both internal and external stakeholders until 15 February after which time they were collated and circulated to the Review Panel. The Review Panel met at the Melbourne (Bundoora) campus of La Trobe University on 22 and 23 February 2011.

Interviews were conducted with a range of people from across the University who have connections with the activities of the Centre. Interviewees included: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor Tim Brown; Director Centre for Dialogue, Professor Joe Camilleri; Deputy Director, Dr Michalis Michael; Professor Tim Murray, Executive Dean Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (FHUSS); Professor Robert Manne, Politics & International Relations Program, FHUSS; Professor Dennis Altman, Director Institute for Human Security; Hon. Steve Bracks, Chair Advisory Board of the Centre for Dialogue; Professor Judith Brett, Head of School of Social Sciences, FHUSS; Professor Malcolm Rimmer, Head of Regional School of Business; Professor Nick Bisley, Program Convenor, Politics & International Relations Program, FHUSS.

A number of staff directly associated with the Centre for Dialogue was also interviewed, including: Tracy Lee, Research Office Executive, Institute for Human Security; Charlotte Setijadi-Dunn, Research Assistant; Christine Siokou, Administration Officer; Aran Martin, part-time Project Officer; Nicholas Taylor Middle East Community Dialogue Program; Dr Luca Aneceschi, Research Associate; Dr Ben Isakhan, Research Associate; Larry Marshall, Project Manager, Young Muslim Leadership Training Program; Dr Stephen James, Honorary Research Associate and Editor Journal – *Global Change, Peace and Security*.

Recommendations from RGSC

Academic Board **record** the thanks of to

- the Director and members of the Centre for Dialogue for their work putting together the documents for this Review
- the interviewees for taking time to talk with them face-to-face and all those who made written submissions.

It is **recommended** that Academic Board accept the following recommendations of Research and Graduate Studies Committee following consideration of the Report of the Review of the Centre for Dialogue:

R1: The aims of the Centre as stated in the Constitution should be clarified, consolidated and updated to reflect better and in sharper relief the focus and activities of the Centre.

R2: The Centre should consider the development of a coherent strategy to ensure that its activities and outcomes are consistently promoted at the levels outlined in the second aim, notably at the national level.

R3: The Centre should consider focusing on values and values education within schools and institutions of higher and continuing education in fulfilling its mission “to promote better understanding of globalisation and governance issues in the context of cultural and religious diversity in primary and secondary schools, and in institutions of higher and continuing education.”

R4: There is scope to integrate aims five, six and seven of the Constitution, namely:

- “To conduct international networking, exchanges and co-operative projects, on civilisational dialogue, with the emphasis on Asia-Pacific perspectives;
- Develop agreements with universities, research centres and institutions around the world for the exchange of information, the exchange of appropriate students and staff for study and research purposes (with the provision of scholarships) for the promotion of collaborative research, the exchange of distinguished academic visitors, organizing programs of lectures by distinguished visiting scholars, around the general theme of inter-cultural/inter-civilisational dialogue;
- To foster interaction and dialogue between scholars, research institutes, think-tanks, religious leaders, and representatives of a number of important constituencies, including government, industry, international organisations (eg. UNESCO and other UN agencies).”

R5: The quality of the projected programme could be improved with greater strategic focus, a better understanding of the Centre’s key strengths and the narrowing down of its range of activities.

R6: The Panel recommends that the Centre, as its *primary* academic goal, re-focus its strategic vision, plan and operations around community engagement and development along with focused research designed to improve related outcomes.

R7: Future Funding Strategy documents should be more concise and clearly written.

R8: The Centre must develop a detailed, written succession plan immediately.

R9: In its strategic planning and documentation, the Centre should reflect a more explicit engagement and alignment with the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and La Trobe plans, especially in the domain of research and community outreach. The Centre should also seize the opportunities provided by Objective 2, Action 3 in *Vision 2015*, namely, “develop knowledge exchange programs with industry and professional partners to support development in north Melbourne, Bendigo, Wodonga, Mildura and Shepparton”.

R10: The Centre for Dialogue should be allowed to operate until the end of 2013 with some significant changes to its academic objectives and modes of operation.

R11: Traditional and applied research by members of the Centre can continue to be carried out through affiliation of the Centre with the Institute for Human Security.

R12: The Constitution of the Centre should be amended through appropriate channels in light of the recommendations above and consideration of the University template for constitutions of Research Centres.

R13: The activities of the Centre should be reviewed once more at the end of 2013 to consider how effectively it has transitioned following the decisions made by Academic Board and Planning and Resources Committee in the context of the Review Report.

It is **recommended** that Academic Board pass to Planning and Resources Committee the following recommendations of the Review of the Centre for Dialogue to consider in light of the Report and the Minutes of this meeting of Academic Board:

R14: In addition to greater strategic clarity, the feasibility of the projected program would be enhanced by clearer funding sources to support narrower objectives, necessary succession planning and a clarification of the relationship with the School of Social Sciences and other University units and structures.

R15: Redefining the central objective of the Centre for Dialogue necessitates re-consideration of the appropriate University portfolio that would provide accountability and reporting lines, central funding and support for the Centre’s community engagement objectives and appropriate housing for members of the Centre. The Centre would become formally separated from the School of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in terms of resources, reporting, accountability and funding expectations.

R16: The School of Social Sciences should be offered a fractional or full replacement (depending on subsequent discussions) for the Director’s salary to compensate for lost resource.

R17: The Director of the Centre needs to ensure that full details of present and future funding opportunities are shared with the Deputy Director.