



ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the four hundred and ninety-eighth meeting of the Academic Board held in the Chamber, John Scott Meeting House, La Trobe University, Melbourne Campus on Wednesday 13 September 2017 at 9.30am.

Present: Professor Christine Bigby (Chair), Professor Paula Baron (Deputy Chair), Ms Nishtha Aggarwal, Dr Julie Andrews, Professor Tony Baker, Dr Josie Barbaro, Dr Ishaq Bhatti, Dr Irene Blackberry, Dr Narelle Brack, Dr Jacob Chandler, Professor Michael Clarke, Professor Leigh Drake, Professor Grant Drummond, Dr Jason Dutton, Dr Warwick Frost, Dr Anthony Gendall, Dr Daniel Grant, Dr Peter Green, Professor Jane Hamilton, Dr Emma Henderson, Dr Darren Henry, Professor Stephen Kent, Professor Kerri-Lee Krause, Dr Prem Kurup, Professor Roger Lumley, Ms Virginia Mansel Lees, Professor Anthony McGrew (*Acting Vice-Chancellor*), Professor Lisa McKenna, Dr Carol McKinstry (*via videoconference*), Mrs Susan Nalder (*via videoconference*), Professor Mary Anne Noone, Professor Keith Nugent, Dr Jodi Oakman, Dr Jenni Oates (*vice Professor Chris Pakes*), Mr Matthew Oates, Ms Jennifer Peasley, Dr Greg Powell, Dr Luke Prendergast, Professor Wenny Rahayu, Mr Matthew Riddle (*vice Professor Betty Leask*), Professor Brian Smith, Dr Evelien Spelten, Mr Robert Stephenson (*via videoconference*), Dr Gwenda Tavan, Dr Colleen Thomas, Dr Suzanne Vassallo, Professor James Walker and Professor Lawrie Zion.

Secretariat: Angela Cowburn, Senior Executive Officer, Governance and Policy Services.

In Attendance: Mr Mark Engel, Dr Richard Frampton, Professor Richard Gray, Ms Robyn Harris, Professor Katie Holmes, Professor Patrick Humbert, Professor Teresa Iacono (*via videoconference*), Mr Greg Jamieson, Dr Simon Kerr (*vice Dr MaryAnne Aitken*), Dr Mark Kvensakul, Professor Nicki Lee, Professor Birgit Loch, Ms Natalie MacDonald, Professor Chris Mackie, Professor Meg Morris, Dr Paul Ramage, Professor Mark Rose and Professor Magnus Tideman.

PART A – PROCEDURAL MATTERS

	ACTION
<p>(i) Apologies & Membership</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor John Dewar (Vice-Chancellor), Dr Joanna Barbousas, Dr Deborah Gleeson, Professor Russell Hoyer, Professor Betty Leask, Professor Sue Martin, Professor Paul Mather, Dr Deborah Neal, Professor Chris Pakes, Professor Robert Pike, Mr Kelly Smith, Professor Richard Speed, Professor Gillian Sullivan Mort and Dr Guinever Threlkeld.</p>	
<p>(ii) Approval of Agenda</p> <p>The Board resolved to approve the Agenda, as circulated.</p>	
<p>(iii) Outstanding Matters</p> <p>The Board received and noted report AB17/89, which included the following attachments:</p>	

- Attachment A: memo from the La Trobe Business School regarding the course redesign process – 2018 undergraduate programs.
 - Attachment B: Third Party Teaching Approvals and Management.
- Both in response to queries that were raised at the August 2017 meeting.

(iv) Matters Approved on Behalf of Academic Board

The Board received, noted and ratified report AB17/90, a summary of matters which had been approved by the Chair or Deputy Chair on behalf of the Board since the last meeting:

- (a) Coursework Committee
A proposal from the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce, as referred by the Coursework Committee, for a major course revision of the Bachelor of Commerce (LBCOM), as detailed in Attachment A to AB17/90.
- (b) School of Humanities and Social Sciences Review: Academic Board nominee, as detailed in Attachment B to AB17/90.

(v) Report of the Chair

The Chair provided a brief verbal update on the following items:

- (a) A call for nominations for Chair and Deputy Chair, Academic Board, had been circulated to the professoriate with a closing date of Monday 2 October at 12 noon.
- (b) A call for nominations for the newly created positions on Academic Board would be circulated soon, with an election to be held in October.
- (c) A call for Expressions of Interest in taking part in the School of Psychology and Public Health Review as an Academic Board nominated 'Senior La Trobe academic' panel member had been circulated.
- (d) A Course Management Reform Program Update (AB17/99) had been provided for Board members information. The Chair thanked Professor Mary Anne Noone, as Chair of the Coursework Committee, and the Committee for the effort, including additional meetings, to ensure that this work gets done.
- (e) Three Emeritus Professor nominations provided for approval: Professor Betty Leask; Professor Leigh Drake; and Professor Geoffrey Durden.

(vi) Report of the Vice-Chancellor

The Board received and noted circulated paper AB17/91, the Report of the Vice-Chancellor, which can be located at the following link:

<https://unite.latrobe.edu.au/sites/sc/sgc/abc/abmeeting2017/Paper/6/91-VCsReport-September2017.pdf>.

The *Acting* Vice-Chancellor also provided a brief verbal update on the following issues:

- (a) ARWU achievement.
- (b) Debate regarding the Higher Education Reform legislation commenced yesterday. The Government are hopeful that it should be resolved by the end of the week.

PART B – MATTERS FOR APPROVAL

498.1 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 August 2017 [AB17/87(M)] were confirmed.

498.2 Items for Approval not requiring discussion

498.2.1 Award of Degrees and Diplomas

The Board received circulated report AB17/92 and **resolved to approve** the conferring of awards *in absentia*, the conferral of awards and award of higher degrees, as detailed therein.

AEGTO
GRS

498.2.2 Proposed Academic Board Meeting Dates 2018

The Board **resolved to approve** the meeting dates for 2018, as detailed in AB17/93:

EO

Meetings of the Academic Board in 2018 will be held at 9.30am on the following dates, all of which fall on a Wednesday:

14 February	8 August
14 March	12 September
9 May	10 October
13 June	14 November

498.2.3 Academic Board Regulations: minor revisions

The Board received report AB17/94 and **resolved to endorse**, for referral to Council, the revised Academic Board Regulations 2017, as detailed in Attachment A.

EO
Legal
Services

498.3 Standing Committees of Academic Board

498.3.1 Report of Academic Quality Committee: 16 August 2017

The Board received report AB17/95 and noted that the Academic Quality Committee had considered the following items at a meeting held on 16 August 2017:

EO(AQC)

- (a) Standards (TEQSA) Alignment Program Report.
- (b) Policy Compliance Reports:
 - Gender Equity Policy.
 - Transgender Policy.
 - Research Data Management Policy.
- (c) School Reviews.
- (d) Report on Third Party Teaching Arrangements:
 - Bendigo Kangan Institute.
 - East China Normal University.
- (e) Annual Review Report from the Academic Quality Committee.
- (f) TEQSA Renewal of Registration.

498.3.2 Report of Education Committee: 16 August 2017

The Board received report AB17/96 and noted that the Education Committee had considered the following items at a meeting held on 16 August 2017:

- (a) Essentials Policy.
- (b) University Appeals Committee Working Group Report.
- (c) Strategic Discussion on Learning and Teaching Quality, based on SES and related data.
- (d) Data Requirements and Availability.

The Board **resolved to approve** the Essentials Policy, as detailed in Attachment One to AB17/96.

EO(EC)
Policy Adv

The Board also noted the progress of the University Appeals Committee Working Group, as detailed in AB17/96.

498.3.3 Report of Coursework Committee: 17 August 2017

The Board received report AB17/97, and noted that the Coursework Committee had considered the following items at a meeting held on 17 August 2017:

- (a) Matters Arising from the Minutes.
- (b) Course Submissions from the College of Science, Health and Engineering.
- (c) Course Submissions from the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce.
- (d) Academic Course Reviews.
- (e) Additional Meetings for September.

The Board **resolved to approve** the following course proposals, as detailed in Attachment A to AB17/97:

(a) *New Courses*

College of Science, Health and Engineering

- Master of Engineering (Manufacturing) SMENM, SMENMB
- Master of Engineering (Civil) SMENC, SMENCB
- Master of Engineering (Electronics) SMENE, SMENEB

(b) *Course Revisions*

College of Science, Health and Engineering

- Bachelor of Psychological Science SBPS
- Bachelor of Applied Science and Master of Orthoptics HZVSO
- Master of Orthoptics HMORT

College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce

- Bachelor of Criminology/Bachelor of Psychological Science LBCPY
- Bachelor of Arts ABA

(c) *Course Closures and Suspensions*

College of Science, Health and Engineering

- Bachelor of Science and Master of Teaching (Secondary) SZSTS
- Diploma in Health Sciences HDHS, HDHSM, HDHSS, HDHSW
- Bachelor of Speech Pathology (Complementary) HBSPX
- Graduate Certificate in Narrative Therapy HCNT
- Graduate Certificate in Oral Health (HCOH)
- Graduate Certificate in Professional Practice Development HCPPB
- Doctor of Psychology in Counselling Psychology HDPCP
- Graduate Certificate in Child and Family Practice HGCCFP
- Graduate Diploma in Counselling HGCOUN
- Graduate Diploma in Child and Family Practice Leadership HGDCFP

EO(CC)
GenMgrs
DD SAdmin
APVC(CW)

- Master of Counselling HMCOUN
- Master of Counselling Psychology HMCP
- Master of Health Sciences HMHSB
- Master of Professional Practice Development HMPPB
- Master of Health Administration HSMHBJ
- Master of Sign Language (Linguistics) HMSLL
- Return to Practice (Division 1) H RTP
- Master of Paramedic Practice HMPB, HMPM, HMPS, HMPW
- Bachelor of Public Health with Honours RHPH
- Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours) SHPM
- Mathematics Bridging Course SMBC

The Coursework Committee also requested that the Academic Board investigate the following matters with regard to Academic Course Reviews:

- Why there are lengthy delays in the provision of data to Schools required for the Course Review process?
- How this delay can be resolved to ensure it does not happen again in future years, including 2018.
- Ways to raise the profile of Academic Course Reviews to ensure they are recognised as an important quality measure.

The Board requested that the Executive Director, Education Partnerships and Quality, provide a detailed briefing report to the next meeting.

ED(EP&Q)

498.3.4 Report of Research and Graduate Studies Committee: 18 August 2017

The Board received report AB17/98, and noted that the Research and Graduate Studies Committee had considered the following items at a meeting held on 18 August 2017:

- (a) Research Performance Report - July.
- (b) La Trobe's Intellectual Property Policy.
- (c) Research Centres
- (d) Proposed HDR Pathways.
- (e) Engagement and Impact Assessment Pilot Results.
- (f) RTP Scholarship Policy.
- (g) Ethics Discussion.
- (h) Animal Ethics Committee
- (i) Board of Graduate Research Report.
- (j) Annual Reports from Research Centres and Institutes.

The Board **resolved to approve** the:

- establishment of the Centre for Livestock Interactions with Pathogens, as detailed in Attachment 1 to AB17/98.
- establishment of the Living with Disability Research Centre, as detailed in Attachment 2 to AB17/98. It was noted that the Living with Disability Research Centre had previously been formally established by the Faculty of Health Sciences.
- Graduate Research Supervision Policy and Procedure, as detailed in Attachment 3 to AB17/98.
- Graduate Research Examinations Policy and Procedure, as detailed in Attachment 4 to AB17/98.

EO(RGSC)
EO(DVCR)
Policy Adv
DeanGS

498.4 Other Matters		
498.4.1	Course Management Reform Program Update	
	The Board received and noted AB17/99, an update on the Course Management Reform program progress, including establishment of two project streams to advance improvements ('process and practice' stream and 'technology and systems' stream).	Dir,CMR
498.4.2	Emeritus Professor Nominations	
	(a) Professor Betty Leask	
	The Board resolved to approve the proposal from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), as endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor, to confer the title of Emeritus Professor on Professor Betty Leask, as detailed in AB17/100.	EO OVC
	(b) Professor Leigh Drake	
	The Board resolved to approve the proposal from the Head of the La Trobe Business School, as endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor, to confer the title of Emeritus Professor on Professor Leigh Drake, as detailed in AB17/101.	EO OVC
	(c) Professor Geoffrey Durden	
	The Board resolved to approve the proposal from the Head of the La Trobe Business School, as endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor, to confer the title of Emeritus Professor on Professor Geoffrey Durden, as detailed in AB17/102.	EO OVC
498.4.3	Award of Honorary Degree: Olivia Newton-John	
	The Board resolved to approve the award of an honorary degree (DLitt) to Olivia Newton-John, as referred by the Vice-Chancellor and detailed in AB17/103.	OVC AAO MgrGC&E
PART C – MATTERS FOR INFORMATION		
498.5 Matters for Information		
498.5.1	Report of the Academic Promotions Committee: August 2017	
	The Board received the Report of the Academic Promotions Committee: August 2017 and noted that the persons named therein had been promoted, as detailed in report AB17/104.	EO(APC)
PART D – DISCUSSION		
498.6 Strategic Plan Refresh		
	The Board received and noted the draft La Trobe University Strategic Plan 2018-2022, as detailed in AB17/105, and the 2018 Annual Priorities and draft KPI and MPI, as detailed in circulated paper AB17/105a.	

The Chair introduced the panel members: Dr Irene Blackberry, Dr Jason Dutton, Dr Carol McKinstry, Professor Katie Holmes and Dr Jacob Chandler; and provided a brief introduction and reflection on where the Plan had moved to since the Board had last discussed it at the May meeting.

A summary based on the transcript of the discussion is attached as an addendum.

The meeting closed at 11.00am.

498.7 Next Meeting

9.30am
Wednesday 11 October 2017
Chamber
John Scott Meeting House
Melbourne Campus

Chair: _____

Date: _____

Academic Board Panel Discussion on Draft Strategic Plan. 13 September 2017.

At the Academic Board meeting on 13 September 2017, members of the Board who had participated in the discussion panel about the first draft of the University strategic plan were invited to comment on the second draft of the plan. This is an edited transcript of their comments and those of other Academic Board members about the draft plan.

Dr Carol McKinstry. I was really pleased to see the revisions especially those related to the “One University Many Campuses” section and that the plan focussed on all metro and regional campuses, considering the composition of campuses of all those across Victoria but also in Sydney. The concept of making our courses more attractive and relevant to Indigenous students, I think, is also important and that is for all campuses not just regional ones. Important that we are also addressing the “brain drain” from regional communities. One part of “One University Many Campuses” that is essential is the need to contextualise our system so we do not just have a one-size-fits-all for all campuses because they are different. So the nuances in the different campuses need to be taken into account. An example of that perhaps is around perception and need to make changes in some centralised systems. For example, we need to ensure that in our systems we can make more early offers particularly for the non year 12 students for the courses beginning in January that do not follow the usual university year and especially for courses on regional campuses.

I’d just like to highlight the importance of regional advisory boards, but with one mention that they need to have diversity so not just those from education and business but having a broader diversity of gender and backgrounds. There needs to be a recognition that teaching varies on the various campuses as well so one-size-fits-all does not work because there are different needs on campuses, there is different staffing compositions and different student needs so we need to be aware of that. An example of this would be perhaps tinkering with the CIM system where one’s subjects has to fit in with the predetermined teaching periods rather than the actual teaching period. This impacts a whole range of things including our student feedback system so more flexible systems is the key.

It’s good to recognise there are still some workforce shortages so that the course offerings on various regional and virtual campuses is important. For instance, Agri Business is an area that has workforce shortages, so linking courses and industry is also very important. All campuses

really recognised the importance of establishing these linkages not just for student employability but for a whole range of things such as research. And also establishing opportunities for partnering with global organisations for research. I think it was Katie that mentioned last time about the opportunities, particularly the regional campuses have for more unique research opportunities. These are probably the really important things that I wanted to draw out. I went over the 2018 priorities but I won't go into those, just I felt there's probably some areas that need tinkering around that regarding graduate research student experience and again not a one size fits all for every campus.

Dr Jake Chandler. Last time I talked a bit about the issue of faculty having international experience and international collaborations and outlined the reasons why I think these are important issues. I noted a few indicators relating to international research collaboration. This is an area where we track very, very poorly indeed. I also noted that, in the original document, neither of these issues had been flagged out substantially. Looking at the new document, I think it has improved, at least with respect to Research Excellence (see the header on page 10, point 6) which outlines a few prospective measures to be taken. This document also now includes some MPIs and I suppose that is where the action is. Looking at these, I see that the issues of interest are translated into just one indicator which is, I think, 3.3, 'international co-authored publications' in the research section. What I want to do today is to make a suggestion for an additional MPI, namely an MPI pertaining to international experience among faculty members, which could be naturally situated in the Operational Excellence category in the Workforce Profile rubric, which already includes two indicators pertaining to diversity.

I'm quite happy to make a more substantial case for this and cite some of the literature but for now I just wanted to note that this is not an unusual performance indicator to include in a plan. The University of Melbourne, in their 2011–2014 plan, cites as an explicit goal an increase in the percentage of staff with international qualifications by 5%. That's in their plan. UQ, in a plan dating from a similar period, makes a similar kind of suggestion as well. And it's not just important to Australian or elite universities. For example, the University of Dundee includes a PI pertaining to the proportion of academic staff from overseas or coming from an overseas position. Obviously there's room to discuss how this kind of PI ought to be formulated because it relates really much more to experience than to being an 'international person'. Australians

who've picked up posts abroad ought to qualify. That's in my opinion. I just wanted to put it out there.

There are also another number of related indicators that could be considered. There is the issue of the proportion of international applicants for local positions and increasing the international experience of the staff who are already at the university. There's the issue of tracking the amount of time spent abroad on sabbaticals, which some universities do, and mention in their strategic plans. Just to finish, I wanted to mention that while I think this is an important dimension of growth, I think it is also a dimension along which it is quite easy to grow and there are some very obvious and cheap measures that could be put to the task. So just pointing to some actual university plans, Nottingham Trent in the UK says that it will revise its selection criteria for academic staff to make international qualifications and or experience an important desirable criterion. The University of Bergen commits itself to the following: 'as a rule, all academic positions will be advertised internationally'. There are also measures that pertain to fixed-term positions. So, for instance, the University of Cologne has a target associated with increasing the number of international visiting professors. Anyway, that's all I have to say, I just thought it'd be a suggestion to put on the table.

Professor Christine Bigby. I just wonder whether at the end you might like to comment on the article that was in the *The Australian* this morning about the ACU and the significant number of very highly paid part-time professors they had on their books who are international and actually are resident overseas, who don't do any teaching but have been hired, so it is alleged, so that their research can count towards the ARC Excellence in Research Assessment (ERA). This may mean there is a backlash against internationalisation.

Dr Jason Dutton. Last time I talked to you about including targets to improve our national reputation . There are some specific targets in here that I like and I would like to talk to those. What I really think is some of them are probably a little ambitious for the next five years. A number of the targets, and there's talk of being top in Victoria, top 12 in Australia, I think, in the next five years to turn the ship around in some of these areas will be very difficult. What I would suggest is that by 2022, La Trobe will be top three in Victoria across the board with anything we can measure. If we can pip Melbourne and Monash at something, that's great, but what it really means is we need to catch-up to beat Deakin to get to where we want to be and I'll just give some examples for that.

In research, right now, Deakin is well ahead of us in paper citations and probably, more importantly, to take account of the differing sizes of the university citations per paper. They are publishing more about their papers and the gulf is widening so that Deakin is going farther ahead of us every year in this area. And I think if we can manage to catch them in the next five years, the world rankings and the goal to getting to the top 250 or 200 will follow naturally if we are able to improve enough to catch Deakin. And, as a measure, I think that aiming to be top three in Victoria is better than using the number in the world ranking because there is too much we can't control in the world rankings. For example, if all three of our highly cited people fall under the bar next time by a single citation each, we'll plummet 150 numbers in the AWRU or whichever one it is ranking. We are not really a worst university if we fall by one citation but that is what the numbers would show and that's something we cannot control. If we can get to Deakin's level of productivity, we will naturally climb.

In terms of teaching, the student experience and student employability goals, with a target to top Victoria, top 12 in Australia. Of course, we all know for student experience, we are currently either dead last or next to dead last depending on which ranking you look at. I think to turn that ship around in the next five years would be very, very difficult to go from last in Australia to top in Victoria. So, again, aiming to be top three in Victoria, so to beat Deakin in that is a more measurable goal. For teaching, in particular, this is going to be hard. You will have to make major changes in how you value your teaching quality at this university. I can only speak personally but since I've been here in 2011, the powers that be, the people higher on the pyramid have always been interested in my research and asked a whole lot about how my research is going and how much money, how many publications, how many citations?

In five or six years, not once have I been asked if I'm a competent teacher. So as a new staff member over the past few years, it's pretty easy to get the message of what is important and I worry that is why our teaching quality or student satisfaction has fallen off. And in terms of how to improve that, at least in the sciences in my experience, is what the students really want to improve their experience is staff time. Our time is expensive and if we give the students more time something else has to give. What? I'm not sure, that's above my pay grade, hopefully paperwork or admin or something but, in general, to get our teaching ship turned around, to get in the top three in Victoria, top 12 in Australia, how we value teaching quality, I think, really has to change.

Professor Katie Holmes. I'm offering my comments in the spirit of frankness and I'm going to make some general comments and then some more specific ones in relation to the issue that I raised last time. I made the mistake of reading this draft having watched an episode of *Utopia*. It was not a good idea. And in particular I found in the documents too much language of consultants, too much vagueness and in that a lack of specificity. What I didn't find in the plan is an understanding of the university as a place of ideas, of leading in knowledge and thinking and pushing the boundaries and challenging the status quo and encouraging our students to do that as well or even suggesting that we would encourage students to think outside the square. I don't see the radical, challenging place – and that's a quote – that the plan claims the university once was. I don't see anything bold despite the claim to be “willing to innovate and disrupt the normal way of doing things.”

I do get a sense of a corporate enterprise and one which wants to equip the students for careers but we are not even seeking to inspire them according to the document. We want them to be “adaptive future leaders and agents of change” but what are we offering that is different from any other university? That is not actually in the document. How does what we stand for change the student experience? How do our values and our “inclusiveness, equity and social justice” help prepare them for the world? I think that these things do in very important ways but that's not spelled out in the document. So what I am suggesting is that there is a complete lack of connect between what the document suggests the university stands for and what we say we are offering our students and making the link between why what we stand for actually can equip them for the world as they will find it.

In my previous comments I discussed the regions and the lack of recognition in the document about the possibilities that the regions provided for research and research partnerships. I am really pleased to see that there is much more discussion of this in the document, as Carol has already pointed out, and I actually think the discussion about the regions in the document is one of its strongest areas. There is particular mention of the cultural events and the place based programs that the university can offer and engage with. And also importantly the opportunity to influence debate around the national conversation of the future of regional Australia. Again, that's another quote from the document and I think that is really important. We are really well placed to do that and it's an opportunity that we need to run with.

And I'm also very pleased to see that there are some specific industries that are named that we can connect and partner with as we are already doing and these are actually listed. There is a comment on page 12, however, that "our regional campuses provide a path through higher education for those not able or willing to leave home." I think this sounds like a really second-rate path. It's not one to inspire students. How about we reword something like "for those who choose the benefits of a regional-based education over an urban one".

The agenda that is outlined in the research excellence objective, I think, is rather vague and "the critical areas of importance" in which we are going to make focussed investments are left unstated and nor are "the big challenges of our time" named. So there is kind of just a vagueness around all those actual targets that I think is a real problem. I think it is admirable that the gender equity and diversity is embedded within the plan and mentioned in the research section but it should not only be there. At the very back of the growth section, resource growth, there is a mention of research consultancy through a dedicated commercial arm of the university. Again, this is very vague and it's not clear how this ties in with the research aims of the document even if the two are related.

And in a final comment; in a personal submission about the first document that I made to the writing group, I encouraged the authors to take seriously the challenge that climate change presents to our students and our communities. I think it is very disappointing that this has no mention at all within the latest plan. It is silent on this most pressing of issues and on any role that the university might take in this regard. Dr Simon Kerr from the Research Office has actually prepared a submission to the committee about this silence that I have put my name to and would encourage others to and I quote that he is "encouraging the university to be a leading climate conscious university."

In order to fulfil its stated mission and vision, the university must exercise leadership in embedding the challenge of climate change as one of its major drivers in research and teaching into the future. I think this is an opportunity for us to be bold, to make a stance and I think it is one that we should embrace.

Dr Irene Blackberry. I just want to echo what Katie has said. I did mention the importance of understanding that the world is changing, the world is changing quite fast, and I think this been taken out off the document now – previously I did mention about climate change and I did

mention about the importance of understanding of the environment where we live and the rapid change of the demographics which, again, is still not being reflected in the document. I am quite pleased to see that the document has shifted from being Bundoora-centric, technology-centric to more acknowledgement of the strength of the regional campuses and I applaud the authors for accepting some of the feedback that we have given previously.

Before I talk a bit more, I'm just wondering about the people in this room, I see you all as the movers and shakers in terms of research at Latrobe. How many of you actually have visited the regional campuses or have done some work with the researchers or staff in the regional area? So about less than half? I think we need to start somewhere and we do need to start from within.

What I want to talk about now is mainly staff development, particularly research staff and that includes all of you here. To achieve success, Latrobe's ability to achieve the vision and mission currently stated in the draft really depends on the staff performance as well as the research culture. I am very pleased that the word research culture itself has got into the document and we do need to think a bit more about what is the research culture that we are trying to cultivate at Latrobe.

So the four RFAs have done very well in connecting staff from multiple campuses to work together. However there remains a need to force much more interdisciplinary research collaboration drawing upon the current staff strengths as well as track records. So all of you in this room can do a lot more for LaTrobe by engaging with other staff from other campuses and even from other departments. So I would like you to have a think a bit more around that.

The other thing is about the funding mechanisms and support to enable exchanges of staff. LaTrobe staff from regional campuses come to Bundoora and vice-versa. It is important for us not to see the regional campuses as second-class, like we will go there if we really need to go there. Sometimes Bundoora staff take things for granted. When you can come here to work it may only taken an hour, much less time and cost than coming from a regional campus. To come from where I live in Albury Wodonga, there is no funding mechanism for me to do that. Another example was with the recent research showcase organised by Marketing, I had invited some key industry partners to come here and the message I got from the marketing people was 'we don't offer any funding for regional staff' so it is very disappointing in a way despite the strategic plan,

the guidelines, the policy all clearly stating that there will be support for regional staff to come here. So I just want to bring your attention to that.

Most of the staff on the regional campuses, particularly if they don't have management roles, whether they are teaching or teaching and research, they do need to have some support, they do need to connect to other people as well and that's how we can grow as a university. I'm aware that we are in the digital era, we can connect through zoom or video conferencing we are doing now. Nevertheless, it is important to build that trusted relationship and to do so we still need to have face-to-face contact, even in this technological, digital era.

For me, myself, I gain a lot of experience being here with you [at Academic Board in Bundoora] having that time to interact, to learn, as well as to collaborate and establishing new relationships. What I would like to see from the strategic plan document is the implementation for the staff, so how the staff can be supported to enable them to grow and connect? Part of the vision is connection. We need to connect with ourselves here within La Trobe. I take your point, Jacob, about the international side of it but I think even within La Trobe, there's a lot of opportunity to grow.

The other part that I would argue is that we put a lot of emphasis about students' employability about being career-ready but I would argue that it is as important to actually prepare the staff for the future. The world is changing and so the staff themselves need to change. We need to be all-rounders, we need to be able to do pretty much everything and there seems to be a lack of support from LaTrobe to enable us to do so. For example, having industry experience is as critical for staff as it is for students. So I would argue that we do need to create this environment where the staff can also access some industry experience. We have seen a lot of success within the School of Nursing, for instance, having clinical placements, and clinical academics within the hospitals, so I think that is something that we need to grow not just within Nursing or Allied Health, I think we need to grow that a bit more broadly in the regional campuses as well as other areas, other departments as well.

I think, just to close off, I'm pleased to see that the latest version of the strategic plan is a bit more directive compared to the previous one. It offers great acknowledgement of the research successes that we have contributed to, La Trobe as a whole from the regional campuses point of view, but I haven't seen any update on the La Trobe regional research plan since late last year so

I'm looking forward to reading that. I do agree with Katie, that there's still something missing or lacking in terms of the La Trobe identity in the document. What will La Trobe University be known for by 2022? And I did mention previously as well that each of the campuses needs to have its own strength to make it work so that we can offer a laboratory - you need to be known for something. You can't just be innovative but innovative in what for example?

Professor Grant Drummond from the Department of Physiology and Oncology. I had a question about the citations per paper. Can you elaborate a little bit more on which fields of research are being funded?

Dr Jason Dutton. So that's Deakin as a whole. My feeling is that we are both comprehensive universities so within the area of the science management, we cover broadly the same fields as Deakin, both comprehensive universities across the board. I think my numbers, they're 2012 to 2016 papers are on 8.9 cites per paper. La Trobe's on about 5.8. That's a big difference and I don't think given the portfolios of the two universities that is due to differing types of research going on, just that theirs is naturally more highly cited than ours. If I'm wrong about that, I'm wrong, but given that we're both comprehensive universities, I think that difference is outside the difference you'd expect based on disciplinary differences.

Dr Warwick Frost from the School of Business. A couple of years ago we collected the data on staff engagement and I can see that was very much linked to the data we also collect on the student experience. And the data on staff engagement was abysmal. The message we should have got from that is that a lot of staff feel disengaged. The people I work with, we looked at the strategic plan, we had a few discussions and so forth, very informal, and practically everybody said, "This just doesn't speak to us. This has got nothing to do with what we do." And that, I think, is a really key message I would like to get across. Somebody talked about we are movers and shakers and so forth and we should be decision-makers. I'm sorry, I'm not a decision-maker. I don't get involved in decision-making and, like a lot of my colleagues, we feel very excluded. And I think that has got to be taken onboard, we are excluded from a lot of the decision-making about teaching. In research, the RFA's have been good but our School has now decided that grants are only for Early Career Researchers (ECR) and if you haven't got an ECR in your area, you are not going to get a grant. Well, again, we just throw our hands up and say, "We're excluded." I think that is a key message.

The strategic plan can be changed but for a lot of staff unless there is a change in culture throughout the university, right down through the Schools and the Departments where staff are taken onboard and listened to the strategic plan doesn't really take us anywhere.

Academic staff member from the Law School. I had great hopes for the new draft of the plan especially when I saw the first terrible title they came up with had gone, and I think that's definitely a big step forward from the first draft. But my concern is I think a strategic plan should be both inspirational and aspirational and I think that both of those things require that it be achievable. My concern, reading through the whole document, is whether or not there is a literal integral plan. I don't think, in five years, that we can actually become the top university in all of those areas and, to me, that means if this is in the document, that we are being set up to fail and I don't think that that is either inspirational or properly aspirational. So I am very concerned about that because we are the ones who had to carry this out and I just don't know that it can be done in five years so that is a concern that I have.

After the meeting in May when we had the excellent panel session, I was hoping that this new draft would have a stronger sense of who we are at the university. I think, again of an aspirational, inspirational document. And I still don't see it. I still don't see the message in this document that says these are our core values, this is what we are trying to give back to the community, this is our role as a university. To me, this document doesn't see those things so I think there's still work to be done.

Dr Greg Powell from the School of Education. I have already put in a submission about this draft document so it was really interesting to hear the panel's overview which I personally will take onboard as well. I think one of our biggest issues at this university is the systems, the ICT systems, that don't talk to each other. I've talked about this a lot. I have been here 11 years and when I first came here it was terrible, and I couldn't believe it, throughout the university. Our systems have improved. A lot of work has been happening behind the scenes, I am aware of that, but we have so many systems that we need to log into and then log out of and log back into. We need a strategic system that might cost the university between \$5 million and \$10 million to develop. I know the Children's Hospital is developing an iPad system for all their staff and that is going to be at a starting rate of \$50 million and it's already commenced. I think part of the frustrations that academics like myself experience trying to achieve the best outcomes for our

students and our colleagues are because of the systems. I don't think this draft document takes enough of that to have a future vision for where we're actually heading as well. Thank you.

Professor Mike Clarke, Head of the School of Life Sciences. I just want to take our attention to operationalising this. We have got a MPI table that has also got to be incorporated as part of the business plan process currently happening. As a Head of School, as one of my colleagues has said, we are going to be required to implement this plan and I think there are a number of disconnects in the language and in the targets. If I take the Enabler of revenue growth which is 7.5%, I have got no idea of this at the School level. If that is ambitious or tame, because it is not expressed in language that means anything to my budget. And the figure for the growth of teaching revenues, we are going to need help to understand. So it's really hard to endorse a document and say you are dreaming or, no, that's a piece of cake because it is not actually expressed in language we can understand. I think that is a fundamental communication challenge here. When I look at the MPI's for the operational excellence pillar, which my colleague from Education has highlighted. Here there are a pain point for lots of us, they are much less specific than the educational or research goals and I would like to see the targets there and the operational excellence sharpened. So we are all in this together and we all know what we are all trying to achieve.

Professor Christine Bigby I'd just like to make a comment, too. I think part of what Katie has said and other people are also raising is the lack of a story that is really clear and coming through strongly about what this university stands for, what our research looks like, why our teaching is different. I was interviewed yesterday by a young woman, Dr Giselle Roberts, who refers to herself as a story teller – actually she is the communications person working for LIMs and has been there since the beginning. Her role is translating their research into plain English so it can be communicated to everybody else – now she is the also interviewing staff and compiling the new SHE College newsletter. And she is a historian by discipline but has a very passionate sense that this university needs to have more stories told about what we do to convey that information in a meaningful way that connects with others. I think we need to compile and collect stories from across the university from each of us in terms of our research so that it's understandable to each other and to the outside world. My sense is that is what's lacking in this document. There is no heart or story about La Trobe in all its many facets – even we ourselves do not know the stories of each others research or teaching innovations. We actually don't know what each other are

doing so it's very hard to make those connections that Eileen was talking about, and those connections are at the heart of culture and changing it.

Professor Katie Holmes. I just want to say that, in a sense, the story that the plan initially starts to tell is one about the radical past and how bold and innovative and cutting edge the university was. And the point I was trying to make is then that it is just lost. There is no sense in which we are prepared to carry through that sense of being bold and committed to something and hence the disconnect because, in a sense, at the moment, we can't tell that story. We can't tell that story as one that has consistently followed through. Some would say that the radical, bold thinking of the founding days was amongst a small group of people at the time anyway but that's another point. So I think that you're absolutely right, that's what's lacking, it's that sense of vision and still who we really are and who we want to be.

Professor Kerri-Lee Krause. Thanks to the panel, that's been really helpful to me. I did come in part-way through this conversation. As an organisation I do think it is part of us telling the story of who we are so I do appreciate that analogy. I was talking with Keith yesterday about the fact that my observation of La Trobe, now that I'm in my ninth week, is that it appears that we are very good at setting a goal and going after it and really focussing on a goal. I observed the significant growth and improvements that have been made in the research area. I think that the direction was given that we would really improve and intensify our research performance and, as a university, we've done that extremely well.

Now we need to do the equivalent in the teaching and student experience side of things. And I think the point I was making in the strategic plan is it is not either/or. I have been listening to the discussion from the panel and the comments that are being made. Certainly I think we can be bold and need to express how we do that. I think there are some bread and butter things that are perhaps somewhat boring but nevertheless critically important that need to be attended to. And so that brings me back to something I've been talking a bit about when I talk with staff and students and that is the need to be doing both and being 'ambidextrous' if you like.

One of the things that I'm interested in is focussing on the quality of the student experience, employability and, at the same time, our operational excellence and our research excellence. How do we manage to do all of those things at once and that means that we need to be particularly good at setting goals and targets but if I just take the research and the education side

of things, I think there is a particular challenge we have as an organisation about how we continue to strengthen our research performance and engagement and I now bring alongside that an equal focus on learning and teaching, quality of the student experience and that's something that I would like to bring back to Academic Board as we continue this discussion. I think it's missing in many of the conversations I hear, that recognition that we need to be ambidextrous and doing both. I think that also means that we don't all do the same thing all the time. We have got to figure out, as a workforce, how we will we make sure that we support academic staff and our professional staff. I think we need to determining how staff build their careers and where the focus might lie at a particular point in a career so that we are intentional. There are some people who doing both very well, research and learning and teaching, but not everyone necessarily needs to do that and we need to make sure we build those career paths for those who want to focus.

So I think there is some recalibrating to be done in the strategic plan and this process provides us all a really good opportunity to do that. And I just note that comment in relation to the earlier comment about people asking about research performance, Jason, and not much asking about the quality of teaching so I'll come back to that. That actually resonates with my observations so far. I think there is work to be done. It doesn't mean there isn't good work happening around the organisation. Just to the point about the achievability in five years. I think we do need to be aspirational, absolutely, but I think with that very clear focus on the bread and butter priority, it is possible to turn around. Whether we are top in Victoria, time will tell but we are already doing some very focussed work on how we make sure our data is used in the service of improvements and enhancement at subject and course level. And I would like to also see the conversation shift a little bit more to not just improving but enhancing, in other words, a strengths-based approach to being ambidextrous in our education and in our research.

Professor Maryanne Noone. School of Law. Just a minor point in picking up the consultancy-speak, if you like, of perhaps how the document doesn't spell out exactly what we are doing at the moment. If we go to the management performance indicators and item 2.7, it is talking about employer satisfaction. We have got a number of companies offering real scholarships and internships. I think partnerships has been an active part of the university's endeavours over many years including lots of not-for-profits, lots of hospitals, lots of other organisations so clearly we

are not just measuring it by the number of companies but by the other many organisations that we have placements with.

Professor Christine Bigby. I agree the language needs to reflect the diversity of partnerships across the University. I think, too, one of the issues is that we are using indicators that we have to at the national and international level but as academics, many of us would say some of these indicators are inherently flawed. Relying solely on student satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of teaching is incredibly problematic. In research, relying on the AWRU index and citations for example have no relevance whatsoever to indicators of the quality of research in the Humanities. I think it would be really useful to try, at the implementation level to develop some more credible indicators that we have more confidence in and which would actually make more sense to people in different places at the university.

I would just like to ask each member of the panel to say a few words - things they haven't been able to say or comments on what other people have said if there's nobody else from the floor.

Dr Carol McKinstry. I think it's been a really good discussion this morning and I would also like to reiterate that I think the equilibrium has started to move back from the focus on research outputs and back towards teaching quality, where there were very ambitious targets as part of the last strategic plan. And I suppose it is coming back to the equilibrium that we actually value all areas of the university although leadership hasn't actually been mentioned either and I think that's often a very vague area as well in the strategic plan. I like the idea of a strengths based approach, building on strengths, overcoming weaknesses and I think that is very well suited, particularly to regional campuses whether it be teaching, whether it be research but it is possible to do both and achieve at both.

Dr Jake Chandler. I just had one thing that I was puzzling over yesterday because I was looking at essentially the MPIs in the previous document and I was wondering to what extent they are replicated here, whether some have dropped and if so why.

Professor Keith Nugent. I don't think I can answer you in detail. The concept of MPIs was really about how do we build into what we need to do to deliver the overall plan in terms of the strategic document. We didn't have the concept of the MPIs last time, we had a lot of KPIs that we were seeking to achieve. The intent with this document is to have relatively few overarching

KPIs and we will need help to flesh the MPI's. I think the strategy has really developed a concept of what the overall KPIs are. We can then talk about the KPIs and MPI's. Does that help?

Dr Jake Chandler. Yes. I was reading the previous list of goals as the equivalent to MPI's. Of course, they're always imperfect and Chris has talked about it in terms of the use of citations in humanities. How do we measure that effectively in a simple way. People have struggled with that a lot and we have to solve that problem, we need to be aware while nothing is perfect in this area but we can get as close as we can.

Dr Jason Dutton. I'll just close by saying in terms of being an employer of choice and staff engagement and what not, as senior leadership implements all of this stuff, when any move is made the question should always be asked 'does it make this university a better place to work at?' and if the answer's no, that's probably not such a good idea. If the answer is yes, that is a good thing because it is our staff that will implement everything that makes the students feel better and improves the research. I'll just say that any move that gets made should always be to make it a nicer place to be at.

Professor Katie Holmes. I do want to take up that issue of staff engagement that Warwick has also raised. I think it's really crucial. It is actually mentioned in the document under the core objectives for outstanding student experience, that the outstanding staff experience is obviously a precondition for student experience. There is a comment here under contemporary academic programs, 'we will continually update our courses to keep them interesting, relevant and convenient for students'. I have problems with that word convenient, maybe accessible is a better word but I think we have to strive to do something much more than make our courses interesting and convenient and I think inspiring staff is a really good place to start with a strategic plan and thinking boldly and ambitiously is really crucial if we want to harness staff's energy and time and commitment.

Professor Christine Bigby. If you notice at the end of that paragraph about academic programs, there is another sentence that talks about our courses using leading-edge research. I think that should actually be much nearer the front.

Dr Irene Blackberry I just wanted to say I think the staff are very important in this whole thing so I think a lot of the strategic document, the emphasis is about the students and about the

performance but I think the workforce, we themselves who will make for success, I think a lot of the emphasis and the work needs to be done in that area as well.