1. APOLOGIES

Mr Garry Hunt.

Resolved: Pursuant to Senate standing order 2.2, leave of absence for the remainder of
the Senate’s meetings during 2005 be granted to Mr Garry Hunt.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (MURDOCH UNIVERSITY ACT s17A)

Nil.

Senate resolution S/35/2005, noting the Vice Chancellor’s declaration of interest
regarding the merger proposal from Curtin University of Technology, remains in
effect.

3. SENATE PRIORITIES

Senate noted details of progress against, and developments in respect of, its priorities
for 2005.
4. **VICE CHANCELLOR’S REPORT**

The Vice Chancellor spoke to his written report to Senate. Key issues covered included:

- The availability of funding under the Federal Government’s Workplace Productivity Programme.
- Impending amendments to the *Education Services for Overseas Students Act* which will enable overseas universities and education providers to establish an Australian branch and extend the availability of Australian Government assistance to eligible students of such branches.
- The approval of funding for the laying of a fibre optic cable from Perth to Mandurah, in conjunction with construction of the rail link. Murdoch has been represented in this by the Director of Information Technology.
- Cabinet approval of funding for the Department of Agriculture’s headquarters and Bio-security operations, including discussions with representatives of the Treasury and the Department. Space has been identified on the eastern side of the campus (along Murdoch Drive) where the Department’s needs could be accommodated consistently with the University’s master plan.

**Resolved:** To authorise the Vice Chancellor to negotiate and execute a heads of agreement between the University and the Department of Agriculture, providing for allocation of land and sharing of facilities to enable location of the Department’s headquarters, Bio-security and research functions on the South Street campus.

5. **ANNUAL MANAGEMENT REPORT**

The PVC (Corporate Services) spoke to his written report and a PowerPoint presentation. Key observations included:

- The IT review has been deferred whilst merger discussions have been taking place. However, the consultation process to date has provided valuable information and also obtained a substantial element of support from staff that, hopefully, will facilitate the implementation of strategies that result from the finalisation of the review process.
- Changes to workplace practices consistent with the University’s intention to comply with the HEWRRs.
- The integration of the Office of Corporate & Public Relations within the Division, in particular development of a focus on revenue generation opportunities, e.g. graphic and web design and print shop functions.
- A review of the University’s position under a 10 year forecast. This has been undertaken as part of the Senate priorities for 2005 (i.e. understanding the impact of changing higher education policies) and as a necessary piece of work in considering any merger proposals.
- The forecast is based on a number of assumptions to provide a picture of the University’s position if the expected changes in higher education policy are implemented and the University continues to operate its current business model unchanged. The model is a first step in establishing a baseline position that management can use to assist in developing strategies to create revenue generating opportunities and efficiencies for the University.
The forecast clearly demonstrates that the University’s position is not favourable (assuming that federal funding remains as forecast) over the period unless it makes substantial improvements in respect of its revenue and/or its cost base. The most significant contributor to the forecast decline in financial performance of the University is the difference between the indexation rate applied by the Federal Government to funding and the historical increase in the University’s expenses above the indexation level.

A general discussion followed, including the following points:

- The University is no different from other Australian universities in terms of its long term financial sustainability. On the contrary, there are a number of universities that are already in deficit. Due to the sound financial management of the Vice Chancellor and the executive over the last few years, the University has time, albeit limited, to develop new strategic initiatives and to make operational changes to address these issues.
- As has been anticipated, at some point it may be necessary to consider allocating a part of commercial net income towards supporting high priority initiatives to deliver improved efficiencies and financial sustainability.
- The University is continuing to make ongoing changes to improve the baseline efficiency of many of its systems and process, particularly in the Administration area. New strategies for improving revenue opportunities, efficiencies and other possibilities in the areas of Teaching & Learning and Research & Development are still to be considered.
- Under impending Federal Government reforms, it will be vital that the University is not only efficient, but also visibly successful in its Teaching and Research functions.

Resolved: To note the annual management report and to express the Senate’s appreciation of the endeavours of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Corporate Services).

6. ANNUAL RESEARCH REPORT

The PVC (Research) tabled the [attached written report] and spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. Key observations included:

- The University is reviewing its designated areas of research strength and it is expected, over time, that the list will grow. The existing areas of strength align closely with the University’s involvement in cooperative research centres (CRCs).
- From 2005, all CRCs will be incorporated entities with boards comprised with a majority of non-academic directors, increasing the focus on seeking commercialisation of intellectual property.
- The University’s results across a number of measures show continued growth and we compare favourably against other members of the Intensive Research Universities of Australia group. The University’s results also compare favourably with the GO8 when results are adjusted to take into account the substantial funding advantage of having a medical school.
- The strong level of growth in 2004 is not expected to continue in 2005 as there was one particularly large research grant awarded in 2004.
- The potential impact of the RQF on the University is a continuing concern and the Pro Vice Chancellor is monitoring developments and lobbying Canberra constantly. Of particular concern is the fact that whatever rating is assigned will apply for 5 years with no opportunity to seek any adjustment.
➢ It is also a concern that early indications are that the RQF rating scale favours internationally recognised research, whereas much of the University’s research is aligned with national priorities which may not necessarily receive international recognition.

During the course of discussion followed, it was observed that in order to improve a RQF ranking, it will be necessary to improve relative to all other universities. This sets a high benchmark. The rating that will apply to universities in the lowest level of the RQF rating may be one tenth of that which applies to universities ranked in the highest level. This will have a substantial impact on income.

Resolved: To note the annual research report and to express the Senate's appreciation of the endeavours of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research).

7. AUQA AUDIT UPDATE

The PVC (Academic) provided an update on Murdoch’s preparations for the upcoming AUQA audit, referring to her more detailed briefing paper that accompanied the agenda. In particular she noted that:

➢ Members of Senate have received the University’s portfolio for the Whole of Institution Audit (WOIA), which will serve as a rehearsal for the AUQA audit in 2006.

➢ The WOIA panel are likely to conduct interviews in the week commencing 29/11/2005. Chairs of Senate committees are highly likely to be interviewed by the WOIA panel.

➢ The provisional dates for the AUQA panel to conduct interviews are 8-11 May, 2006.

➢ The Pro Vice Chancellor is available to assist members of Senate in preparing for the WOIA and the AUQA process.

8. CHAIRS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Senate noted the Chancellor’s recommendations regarding Chairs of Senate committees, other than the Audit & Risk Management Committee and the Legislation Committee.

Resolved: To appoint the persons listed below as the Chair of the respective committees listed opposite that person’s name for a three year term commencing on 01/01/2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry Hunt</td>
<td>Environmental Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Governance &amp; Nominations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Honorary Awards &amp; Ceremonial Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Budge</td>
<td>Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. STATUTE CHANGES

Senate noted a report from the General Counsel & University Secretary concerning action consequent upon Senate resolution S/46/2005(i).

Resolved: To ratify amendments to Statute 5-Academic Council in the terms attached (changes marked up).

Secretary’s note In accordance with sub-section 25(1) of the Murdoch University Act, an absolute majority of Senate members voted in favour of the resolution.
10. MINUTES
Senate confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 16/08/2005. It also noted a report of action taken to implement previous resolutions of Senate.

11. ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Senate noted the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Council held on 14/09/2005 and resolved in accordance with the recommendation of the committee as follows:

Resolved: To approve revisions to the ‘Establishment and Management of Centres’ policy in the terms attached (changes marked up).

12. CHANCELLOR’S COMMITTEE
Senate noted the minutes of the meetings of:

➢ the Chancellor’s Committee held on 13/09/2005 and 28/09/2005; and

There were no recommendations requiring a Senate resolution. Discussions in relation to the merger feasibility study and the role of the Guild President in reference to Senate were held in camera and are dealt with below.

13. GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
Senate noted the minutes of the decision (by circular resolution) of the Governance & Nominations Committee dated 24/08/2005 and resolved in accordance with the recommendation of the committee as follows:

Resolved: (i) To co-opt Ms Dawn Casey as a member of Senate for a 3 year term commencing on 01/01/2006, to replace Bob Pett whose third term expires on 31/12/2005.

(ii) To authorise the General Counsel & University Secretary to amend and reissue the Statement of Governance Principles in the terms attached to the minutes of the Governance & Nominations Committee dated 24/08/2005.

14. HONORARY AWARDS & CEREMONIAL COMMITTEE
Senate noted the minutes of the meeting of the Honorary Awards & Ceremonial Committee held on 16/09/2005. There were no recommendations requiring a Senate resolution.

16. RESOURCES COMMITTEE (PAPERS & DISCUSSION COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE)
Senate noted the minutes of the meeting of the Resources Committee held on 20/09/2005 and, noting that formal proposals in relation to the Lakeview Apartments complex and student accommodation generally are yet to be referred to Senate for review and determination, resolved in accordance with the recommendation of the committee as follows:

Resolved: (i) To authorise management to enter into negotiations with St Ives on the development of a high care facility, and to commence feasibility studies and the design of an expansion of the St Ives Village.
(ii) To approve the attached list of payments for the period 22/07/2005 to 09/09/2005.

(iii) To approve a $2M budget allocation for the continuation of the asbestos removal programme at the end of 2005.

(iv) To approve, subject to the attached conditions, the University subscribing for shares in a proposed incorporated joint venture vehicle to commercial intellectual property.

17. CURTIN-MURDOCH MERGER FEASIBILITY STUDY (PAPERS & DISCUSSION COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE)

Senate noted the minutes of the meetings of the expanded Chancellor's (Merger) Committee held on 13/09/2005, 26/09/2005 and 28/09/2005. The Chancellor also provided a verbal update in relation to the status of discussions with the Chancellor of Curtin University of Technology.

Resolved: To authorise the expanded Chancellor’s (Merger) Committee to act on its behalf in negotiations with the Curtin Council Merger Steering Committee to progress the merger feasibility study on the basis of:

- the resolution of the Council of Curtin University of Technology dated 22/06/2005;
- the resolution of the Senate dated 28/06/2005; and
- the deed of confidentiality between the parties and executed by Curtin University of Technology on 23/06/2005.

Senate noted also that the WA Minister for Education has appointed a consultant to advise on possible criteria for assessing public benefit in the context of any merger.

Resolved: To authorise the expanded Chancellor’s (Merger) Committee, in tandem with the Vice Chancellor and the Senior Executive, to liaise with the Federal or State Governments as necessary on any matters relating to, or arising out of, the merger negotiations.

Secretary’s note Mr Daniel Narbett dissenting.

A discussion then ensued in relation to the role of the Guild President in relation to Senate generally, and its consideration of the merger feasibility study in particular. A motion that the Guild President be invited to participate in all meetings of Senate which considered any merger, subject to signing a confidentiality agreement, was not passed. Key points canvassed included:

- It was asserted that the effect of sub-section 20(2) of the Murdoch University Act is that the Guild President must have a role in Senate’s deliberations. A copy of correspondence from the Office of the Minister for Education, Science & Training dated 17/05/2005 was tabled indicating that the Senate could grant the Guild President attendance or speaking rights should it wish to. Any concerns about confidentiality could be addressed by the Guild President signing a confidentiality agreement.

- It would create an untenable conflict of interest for the Guild President to be constrained by the requirements of a confidentiality deed whilst having the obligation to be the conduit for information passing between Senate and students.

- Some formal recognition should be given in terms of the Guild President’s role.
There are numerous measures in place to facilitate consultation and communication with the Guild and students in relation to the merger feasibility study, including general briefing sessions, website ‘Frequently Asked Questions’, an online feedback facility and a direct briefing between the University’s members of the merger feasibility team, on the one hand, and the Guild President and Mr Daniel Narbett on the other. There have also been meetings with the Vice Chancellor, the merger feasibility group and the Guild President.

Resolved: Noting that the PVC (Corporate Services) and the Chancellor will each confer with the Guild President and the two elected student Senators, to request the Governance & Nominations Committee to consider and make recommendations to Senate on the future role for the Guild President in light of the National Governance Principles, the attached letter from the Minister and the terms of the Murdoch University Act.

18. SENATE MEETING DATES 2006

Resolved: To approve the following meeting dates for 2006, all of which are on a Wednesday:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Deadline for agenda papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/02/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 09/02/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/2006 (Peel campus)</td>
<td>Thursday, 23/03/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 20/04/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 25/05/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 29/06/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 24/08/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/2006</td>
<td>Thursday, 12/10/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. OFFICIAL SEAL

Senate noted the attached report provided in accordance with resolution S/54/2004.

Signed as a true record of the meeting of the Senate held on 11/10/2005.

---

Emeritus Professor Geoffrey Bolton – Chair

Dated: November, 2005
Executive Summary

Murdoch University has continued its commitment to high quality and interdisciplinary research in its Strategic Plan 2003-07, by seeking to build on its record of research excellence in fulfilment of its major research goal:

*To contribute to the knowledge, wellbeing and sustainability of contemporary society by conducting high quality multidisciplinary research and development.*

The key strategies to achieve the goal are:

- To focus research into areas of recognised and growing strength
- To strengthen postgraduate research
- To extend existing research relationships, and foster new ones, with external partners.
- To exploit Murdoch University’s existing and potential intellectual property, technology transfer, and commercialisation.

This report highlights the successes of Murdoch’s research over the past year measured against these key strategies. Significant points to emerge may be summarised as follows:

- Murdoch has again increased its share of the Research Block Grants. These are allocated by formulae based on research grant income, research completions, research load and publications.
- Data presented show that key performance indicators for the strategies are highly positive and demonstrate Murdoch’s continuing improved research performance.
- Murdoch’s research training and support for higher degree students is rated highly nationally.
- The potential for commercialisation of intellectual property generated by research at Murdoch University has been greatly enhanced through the performance Murdoch Westscheme Enterprise Partnership and MurdochLink Pty Ltd.
- Murdoch University was a new entry in 2004 for a listing of the world’s top 500 research institutions released by Shanghai Jiao Tong University.
- A new Research Quality Framework Process will replace the existing Research Block Grant Scheme in 2007. Murdoch University is positioning itself to optimise its Block Grant in the new framework.
STRUCTURE OF RESEARCH REPORT

1. Strategic Plan 2003-2007: Research goal and key strategies
2. Key environmental factors
3. Key strategies
4. Key performance indicators
5. Outlook for the future

1. STRATEGIC PLAN 2003-2007: RESEARCH

To contribute to the knowledge, wellbeing and sustainability of society by conducting high quality multidisciplinary research and development.

Many aspects of the Australian natural and social environment are unique and therefore require unique solutions. Murdoch University will conduct research in areas that are aligned with national, State and community priorities. The University will continue to build on its record of research excellence through focused, innovative and enterprising approaches.

Maintenance of a productive research culture requires a pool of talented postgraduate research students. Murdoch University will ensure they have quality supervision, clearly defined projects, sufficient resources and opportunities for developing generic skills.

Long-term and enduring partnerships will be built between Murdoch University researchers and other complementary national and international government agencies, universities, industrial and commercial partners and venture capital companies. Murdoch University will support researchers to generate intellectual property that has potential commercial value and, where appropriate, to assist in successful technology transfer and commercialisation.

Key Strategies
- To focus research into areas of recognised and growing research strength
- To strengthen postgraduate research
- To extend existing research relationships, and foster new ones, with external partners
- To exploit Murdoch University’s existing and potential intellectual property, technology transfer, and commercialisation

2. KEY ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

2.1 The research block grant funding system

In December 1999 the Government issued a White Paper on research and research training, Knowledge and Innovation. The White Paper, having established the broad framework for research and research training in higher education, was followed by the release of a major Innovation Action Plan, Backing Australia’s Ability (BAA1). This increased funding for research and development generally by $2.9 billion over five years and in the higher education sector specifically by $1.47 billion. It included funding for a doubling of ARC competitive grants, increased project-specific and systematic infrastructure grants. BAA1 funding was due to finish in 2005-06.

In response to a series of reviews conducted in 2003 on Australia’s research needs, the Government followed up with Backing Australia’s Ability – Building Our Future through Science and Innovation (BAA2), which was launched on 6 May 2004. The new package totalling $5.3 billion will run for seven years from 2004-05 to 2010-11. Both of these
packages provide research funding via the universities’ block operating grants through a performance driven competitive system of research funding that rewards performance against four major indices: research income, higher degrees research completions, research publications and higher degree research student load. These indices form the basis of the three primary block grant operating schemes: (1) the Research Training Scheme (RTS); (2) the Institutional Grants Scheme (IGS); and (3) the Research Infrastructure Block Grant (RIBG). It is in the universities’ interests to maximise their research income by improving their performance relative to these drivers. Therefore our key performance indicators are designed to measure these indices. The most significant indices contributing to the allocations are those arising from research income and higher degree completions.

Disappointingly Backing Australia’s Ability – Building Our Future through Science and Innovation fails to provide any additional funding for the RTS or the IGS. An AVCC paper analysing BAA2 concludes that the funding for research will be inadequate compared to the OECD commitments for substantial increase in research funding over the same period. The analysis may be found at http://www.avcc.edu.au/news/public_statements/publications/AVCC-Response-to-BAA2.pdf

2.2 Research Quality Framework

Attention should also be drawn to an announcement by the Prime Minister in May 2004 that the Australian Government would establish Quality and Accessibility Frameworks for Publicly Funded Research as part of the Backing Australia’s Ability – Building our Future through Science and Innovation. The aim of the Research Quality Framework (RQF) initiative is to develop the basis for an improved assessment of the quality and impact of publicly funded research and an effective process to achieve this. Subsequently the intention is to use these measures to develop a new research block fund to replace the existing IGS and RTS schemes. The new measures will be developed by the end of 2005 in consultation with the universities. At present it is anticipated that a national RQF scheme will be adopted in 2007.

2.3 Priority Areas for Research

BAA2 represents a commitment to pursue excellence in research, science and technology, through three key themes:

• the generation of new ideas (research and development);
• the commercial application of ideas; and
• developing and retaining skills.

The National Research Priorities, developed as part of BAA1, will continue to focus the research effort on these challenges. The four priorities are:

• An Environmentally Sustainable Australia;
• Promoting and Maintaining Good Health;
• Frontier Technologies for Building and Transforming Australian Industries; and
• Safeguarding Australia.

As preference is given in the competitive grants funding for projects that fall within these areas, Murdoch’s research strategy is to ensure that there is considerable overlap between our Areas of Research Strength and the National Research Priorities.

The concentration on science and technology as priority areas, while understandable, has lead to considerable disquiet in the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences sector of the Australian universities. These areas have been traditionally major areas of research and scholarship
throughout the system and continue to be at Murdoch University. At Murdoch these disciplines are responsible for a majority of our higher-degree research completions and therefore contribute significantly to our RTS block grant income. Lobbying by these disciplines across the sector, lead in June 2004 to the announcement by the Government that it would provide funding of $1 million for a Council of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS). The Council will help strengthen the role of the humanities, arts and social sciences in Australia, and provide a forum within which academics, students and the broader community can develop more effective ways of engaging constructively with policy-makers.

2.4 Succession Planning

A comprehensive study of the Murdoch research community was carried out by Professor Val Alder, Executive Research Strategist, in the first half of 2003 and reported to the Senate last year. It revealed two particularly significant features, firstly that most of the income generated for our 2003 research block grants RTS and IGS are due to a small subset of the Murdoch research community. The second important observation was that this performance is due to an increasingly aging cohort of research leaders. To mitigate the potential loss of research income a succession planning process was implemented in 2003 and is designed to run for a further four years.

2.5 Agricultural Research

In 2004 a business plan was submitted by the Department of Agriculture WA to the state government for relocation of the department’s headquarters and the formation of an integrated research alliance with Curtin University, Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia. The proposed Institute\(^1\) is designed to perform the research required by the State Department of Agriculture. It will bring together the major agricultural researchers in the State and will comprise a series of centres of excellence and will be staffed by researchers from the universities and Department of Agriculture. The partners will provide a range of facilities, both new and existing. A Steering Committee evaluated the relevant research strengths at each university and the overlaps with the researchers from the Department. Because of Murdoch’s considerable research concentration in veterinary and plant agriculture and biotechnology, it will benefit in a significant way. The ensuing formation of the new centres following from a successful conclusion to the planning process should provide enormous long-term benefits to the research capability of Murdoch University. It will provide critical-mass research teams working at Murdoch that will lead to enhanced opportunities for agricultural research. Relocation of several hundred researchers from the Department of Agriculture to Murdoch is proposed. The proposed relocations and integration will take at least five years as new research facilities will need to be built using state government funding. Increased funding streams from the Federal Government agencies, enhanced opportunities for research training of higher-degree research students and formation of national international collaborations will follow. Overall the formation of ARWA will lead to the largest Integrated Agricultural Research Facility in the Southern hemisphere and one of the five largest centres of its type in the world.

3. KEY STRATEGIES

An overview of the key strategies guiding Murdoch’s research effort follows. A detailed analysis of the strategies and the major research groupings into areas of research strength and quantitative information about them is contained in the Murdoch University Research and Research Training Management Plan 2005.

---

\(^1\) The name of the institute was confirmed as Agriculture Research Western Australia (ARWA) in 2005
3.1 Focusing research into areas of recognised and growing strength

Examples of successful research at Murdoch span a continuum from individual or small group projects to large focussed groups working in Research Centres. Murdoch has more than 30 specialist Research Centres representing a diverse range of research expertise. However, it was recognised that its limited strategic resources cannot be spread evenly. This was encapsulated in the 1999 University Senate resolution “That the University should focus its research effort into areas where it can achieve leadership and a sufficient concentration of resources, including staff, to support a long term research program containing areas of national and international significance”. This resolution was enacted in 2000 with the development of designated Areas of Research Strength (“ARS”) and has continued to guide the management of research and research training at Murdoch. The process has been further refined with the launch in March 2004 of the Academy for Advanced Studies for internationally recognised researchers and small research groups who do not ‘fit’ into the ARS, and the introduction of mechanisms to direct more support to designated areas of research strength. Further work is being done to articulate the role of the Academy and to widen its membership to include representation from the ARS.

The ARS are largely multidisciplinary and fit the focus areas of sustainability of contemporary society enunciated in the primary research goal of the University. Today Murdoch supports six Areas of Research Strength and two areas of emerging research strength.

The Areas of Research Strength are:
- Agricultural and Veterinary Biotechnology and Bioinformatics
- Contemporary Asia
- Ecosystem Management and Restoration
- Hydrometallurgy
- Social Change and Social Equity
- Technologies and Policies for Sustainable Development

Emerging Areas of Research Strength are:
- Interactive Media
- Learning, Leadership and Policy

They provide a focal point for Murdoch’s research and research training activities and incorporate researchers who are also prominent in most of the research centres in the University. Together they are responsible for attracting 60% of the University's reportable research income.

In recognition of the potentially looming problem of retirement of research leaders, a succession planning process was introduced in 2003. Management of the risk of loss of key researchers in the next five years has been tackled by identifying which key researchers need to be replaced immediately or in the medium term. A funding scheme, to meet the costs associated with maintaining our key research leadership was approved as a strategic allocation in the R&D budget and was made possible through the projected growth of the Murdoch research allocations of RTS, IGS and RIBG from the positive trend of the key performance indicators for research.

Three key elements of the fund are that provisions be made for (1) replacement of strategic senior appointments at the professorial level to ensure continuity of leadership in Areas of Research Strength; (2) encouragement of young postdoctoral researchers with research leadership potential from within the University and attracting talented researchers from other
institutions; (3) provision of short term gap funding for highly capable researchers who have narrowly missed out on grants awarded in competitive funding rounds. The SRF can also be used strategically to match offers from other institutions to our younger research leaders.

An initial $500,000 allocation was made to the scheme in 2004. Six key appointments have been made in the first two categories as follows:
(1) Professor Richard Oliver, Professor Neil Loneragan
(2) Dr Treena Burgess, Dr Dmitry Fursa, Dr David Morgan, and Dr Steven Bellman

Risk management of our key researchers is an ongoing issue for the future. Monitoring of our research leaders and their future plans for category (1) is a continuing process in 2005. A new round of applications for research leadership fellows, category (2) was called for in November 2004 for appointment in 2005. To fund the commitments through 2005 an allocation of $750,000 was provided for in the R&D budget.

3.2 Strengthening Postgraduate Research

The administration of research training and research student completions is managed through the Graduate Centre, under the direction of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The multi-disciplinary nature of Murdoch’s undergraduate and postgraduate programs has made Murdoch particularly attractive to mature aged students, many of whom have considerable experience in the workforce. Demand for places from well-qualified applicants continues to be high. The ability of the students to accept entry into a program of study is limited by the availability of scholarships. Recognising this the University has strategies to assist students to obtain financial support, which include providing additional, partial or fully funded scholarships from internal and external sources.

Improved processes for monitoring progress of students implemented in 2003 were further refined in 2004. The commitment to, and success in, improving the quality of higher degree research training and research infrastructure for postgraduate students is monitored by surveys and more recently by benchmarking studies. Benchmarking of research degree policies and processes against other universities was introduced in 2004. A recent study found that at the doctoral level, Murdoch’s research degree processes met all, or all but one of the benchmarks in 7 out of 8 categories. Murdoch was one of only 4 universities of 24 to achieve the highest ranking (the others were the University of Melbourne, Monash University and James Cook University).

As part of its strategy to promote new international research collaborations including those offered by research training, the R&D Board acted on a report commissioned by the R&D Division to investigate the cost/benefit of increasing our international postgraduate student load. The report confirmed a significant net benefit from training international students. The recommendations of the final report are being implemented in 2005 and will provide partial financial support for training an additional twenty international students in 2005.

3.3 Extending existing research relationships, and fostering new ones, with external partners

Federal and State Government funding initiatives have enhanced Murdoch University’s commitment to partnerships with other institutions and industry, in particular Cooperative Research Centres, WA State Government Centres of Excellence and the Australian Research

---

2 The following candidates were successful in being awarded research leadership fellowships for 2005: Dr Eric Konigsberger, Dr Kanishka Jayasuriya and Dr David Nolan.
Council Linkage Program. Murdoch’s success in increasing its participation in Round 9 of the Cooperative Research Centres (CRC) Program involved core partnership in three new CRC’s, refunding of one CRC and supplementary funding for two other CRC’s. By the end of 2005 Murdoch will be a core partner in eight CRC’s and a supporting partner in a further four.

**Round 9 CRC successful outcomes for Murdoch University**

| New CRC: | CRC for an Internationally Competitive Pork Industry  
| Developing from existing CRC: | CRC for National Plant Biosecurity  
| | CRC for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (being developed from an existing CRC in which Murdoch was previously not involved).  
| Supplementary funding for existing CRC: | AJ Parker CRC for Integrated Hydrometallurgy Solutions  
| | Australasian CRC for interaction design  
| | CRC for molecular plant breeding  

The Research and Development Board allocates leveraged funding in a strategic manner for these ventures. The details of funding programs in BAA2 indicate that further development of collaborations and enhanced use of national facilities will be a priority to access new funds.

**3.4 Intellectual property, technology transfer, and commercialisation**

Murdoch University through its R&D Division now has an improved systematic and focussed approach to the identification, management, protection and commercialisation of the intellectual property of its researchers. Its Industry Liaison office (ILO) has been successful in forming linkages with industry and venture capital partners. With the creation of Legal and Governance, Murdoch Link and the joint venture investment fund, the Murdoch Westscheme Enterprise Partnership (MWEP), ILO has the opportunity to fulfil a more focussed role in meeting its core objectives, which are to:

- a. Identify, managing and protect the University’s IP
- b. Implement /develop educational policies and processes
- c. Foster a more entrepreneurial, innovative and commercial focus amongst researchers.
- d. Foster and facilitate effective research and development partnerships with industry and investors.

MWEP and MurdochLink target specialised areas; MWEP is constrained in pursuing only those projects that meet strict criteria relating to potential market size and commercial returns, and MurdochLink targets consultancies. ILO interfaces with these bodies and provides commercial and administrative support to them. It continues to represent the university in its day-to-day interaction with various external parties and provides support to researchers in identifying, protecting and commercialising emerging IP. In addition it pursues commercialisation opportunities either not taken up by MWEP or not offered to MWEP.

In 2004 MWEP financed a number of exciting and innovative research projects, originating from Murdoch. These include projects that involve the identification of biocidal compounds and Giardia diagnostic tests. Ongoing projects include a novel plant breeding process that will deliver a natural alternative to the world’s largest crop fungal pathogens as well as a multidisciplinary project involving the development of a new herbicide based extracts from an exotic plant leaf and a native seed.
The University’s commercial consulting company MurdochLink Pty Ltd was established in January 2004 to manage the University’s consulting and contract research activities. This will help limit the University’s exposure to risk, regulate consultancy activity and enable University staff to build on their strengths and expertise. This also enhances the reputation of the University and its staff and provides them with a source of additional income. A General Manager, Mr Tim Morrison, was appointed in January 2004. In 2004 forty projects were awarded to Murdoch Link. A total amount of $1,035,406 in grant and contract funding has been generated by the Company in its first year of operation exceeding the budget forecast. For 2005 our most recent projection is for the company to exceed 3 million dollars in projects.

4. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The University’s research performance is assessed by a set of nationally accepted key performance indicators. It is of particular interest to present comparisons with the group of six Innovative Research Universities (the IRU group) who have agreed to cooperate in research collaborations and research benchmarking. The group comprises Flinders University, Griffith University, La Trobe University, Macquarie University, Murdoch University and the University of Newcastle.

4.1 Research income

Murdoch’s research income has risen steadily in the past 5 years. In 2004 Murdoch University had Operating Revenues of $109.07 million and Consolidated Revenues from all sources of $188.58 million. In the competitive research funding system introduced in 2002 that links research funding directly to research performance, Murdoch has consolidated the strong position as one of Australia’s top performing research universities on a per capita basis. Research income increased by 23% from $29.18m to $35.97m between 2003 and 2004 and has more than doubled in the five years since 2000 (See Figure 1). This will have a strong positive effect on the research block grant in 2006 to 2007. The target of $40 million by 2007 in the Strategic Plan 2003-2007 is achievable based on the present trend.

![Murdoch DEST Reportable Research Income 2000-2004](image)

**Figure 1. Research Grants and Income 2000-2004**
Murdoch’s performance in ARC linkage grants which is a measure of its engagement of research relevant to the needs of industry partners has demonstrated an excellent growth trend as indicated in Figure 2. The exceptional performance of 2003 was not sustained in 2004 but the trend line is positive.

![Figure 2: ARC Linkage Grants to Murdoch: 2000 – 2004](image_url)

Research income performance with other universities may be assessed with the advent of the new government research funding system in 2002. The RTS, IGS and RIBG form a readily identifiable block grant for research ($RG = \$RTS+\$IGS+\$RIBG$) that may be compared to the operating grant. The higher the percentage the more “research oriented” the university is. Murdoch is a research-intensive university and therefore this is a useful measure for comparison with other universities. In 2003 Murdoch’s RG/OG amounted to 21.60% which placed Murdoch 12th nationally out of 40 institutions, which represents a one place improvement in the national rankings over the previous year.

Murdoch ranked 12th nationally on its research block grant as a percentage of its operating grant and second amongst the IRU with our block grant being worth 22.67% of our operating grant. This is an increase of 1 place nationally and amongst the IRU. Murdoch’s performance in relation to the Innovative Research Universities group is shown in Figure 3.
Another key performance indicator, total research income per ten full-time-equivalent researchers, is given in Figure 4. Murdoch is ranked first amongst the IRU group. Murdoch achieved a 17% increase in research income over the previous year and ranked 6th Nationally for Research Income per 10 research staff.

4.2 Research Training

In 2004 Murdoch University had 835 higher degree research students (578 EFTSU), which is 6.4% of total student enrolments compared to 6.1% in 2003. A measure of the research focus of our staff is that Murdoch University ranks 4th nationally (unweighted load) in the number of research students supervised per 10 staff FTE. Figure 2 provides a comparison of this indicator with the numbers of the IRU group of universities.
Murdoch’s postgraduate student completion rate per 10 FTE staff (Figure 6) ranks 11th nationally (up two places from last year) - Murdoch remains at the top of the IRU group.

As research scholarships are funded for three years and the RTS places for no more than 4 years, it is important to reduce Murdoch’s completion time shown in Figure 7. The year 2004 saw the average Doctorate Completion time dip down to a highly satisfactory 43.33 months after a high in 2002 and 2003, due mainly to a number of long-term PhD students finally completing and skewing the data. In 2004 the Murdoch Graduate Centre undertook its biannual survey of Postgraduate Research Student Opinion. Responses from the survey were very positive, as in surveys from previous years. Murdoch scores consistently high, in 2004 scoring between 75%-91%, in the survey categories: School/Division Environment, Support
for Research Activities, Professional Development and Intellectual Freedom. The Graduate Careers Council of Australia ranked Murdoch’s research students are the most satisfied in Australia in a benchmarking study with Murdoch ranked by it research students as

- first for overall satisfaction
- first for thesis examination
- first for goals and expectations being met
- second for skill development
- third for supervision.

Figure 7: Average time to completion for Murdoch Postgraduate Research Students

Murdoch’s performance in terms of weighted publications research output, including books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, and refereed proceedings, per 10 staff FTE is rated at 16th out of 42 nationally. Murdoch improved its ranking from the previous year by 1 place to be 2\textsuperscript{nd} out of 6 in the IRU group.

4.3 Publications

Figure 8: 2003 Weighted Publications per 10 Research Staff FTE for IRU group
It should be pointed out that research publications are weighted at a marginal level and have very little influence on the block grant under the present block grants scheme. However they are a useful measure to indicate that quality research outputs are being delivered. They will play a much more important role in the emerging Research Quality Framework and our present strategies for maximising the research block grant will need to be reset as the details of the changes emerge.

4.4 Intellectual property, technology transfer, and commercialisation

The Division of R&D is in the process of developing formal key performance indicators for assessing the performance of the following commercial activities of Murdoch University: License income royalties, equity value, contracts for research and number of spin out companies.

5. OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The research environment is becoming increasingly competitive. Many of our competitor universities are also improving their research performance and we only stand to improve our position relative to them if our research grant income, research completions and publications increase at a greater rate than theirs. We must also face the disappointing fact that the block grants for RTS and IGS are fixed and have no inbuilt indexation for the future. In this climate, nurturing of research and growing it across our considerable range of quality research areas continues to be challenging.

In this competitive environment it is very pleasing to be able to report that Murdoch University has been listed for the first time in 2004 in the highly regarded Shanghai Jiao Tong University Index which places Murdoch University in the top 500 research universities in the world. Altogether 14 Australian universities were listed - the Group of Eight universities, five of the six IRU Australia members and the University of Tasmania. Media coverage of the listing’s release acknowledged that there are two "research intensive" groupings of Australian universities. The complete list is available at: http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ra/2004/2004Main.htm. In the 2005 listing Murdoch has improved it’s ranking by 14 places.

Over the next few years Murdoch is well placed to strengthen its research in the areas of agricultural science with the relocation of the Department of Agriculture and the integration of a considerable number of its researchers to the Murdoch campus. These research activities fit well with Murdoch’s research mission as well as with state and federal research priorities.

Medical research also continues its strong growth in research income. Of particular note is the considerable success of Professor Simon Mallal and Professor Ian James in securing a 12.6 million dollar funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for their Centre for Clinical Immunology and Biomedical Statistics. Accompanying such rapid growth in research is the necessity for planning of new physical research infrastructure. One of the challenges for the University will be to find ways of allocating research block grant returns from this funding in order to provide infrastructure to our best researchers.

A further challenge that will confront Murdoch is the Research Quality Framework and the impact it will have. There is considerable speculation in the sector that the new framework as developing will have the effect of moving research block funding away from the new-generation universities, including Murdoch to the sandstones. As loosely proposed, the funding will go to research clusters within each university that can demonstrate international recognition for their research at a very high level. Murdoch University has already pointed out in its submissions to DEST that our mission is to engage with research that fits in with
national priorities as evidenced for example, by our strong performance in CRCs and ARC linkage grants. Thus far there is considerable lack of clarity how these priorities can sit comfortably with the requirement of globally recognised research. In order to be able to plan effectively for the advent of the RQF framework to be introduced in 2007-8, Murdoch R&D Division and the R&D Board will be carrying out detailed modelling and will participate in trial assessments throughout 2005. The information derived from these assessments will be used to form our strategies for maximising our block grant income under the new framework.

The history of the similar research assessment exercise in the United Kingdom suggests that there will considerable incentives placed in the path of outstanding researchers to change institution. Murdoch already has recognised the need for maintaining continuity and capability in its leading research areas by implementing a succession plan for the next few years. With the additional pressures and increased risk for retaining its key researchers this plan will need to be widened and enhanced to meet the new scenario.
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ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

PREAMBLE

To extend knowledge, stimulate learning and promote understanding for the benefit of the community, Murdoch University encourages the establishment and development of Research, Professional and Teaching Centres. In order to enhance its reputation for research output and research training and build strategic relationships with other academic institutions, government and the private sector, the University recognises that Centres in areas of existing and potential research strength must be identified, fostered and encouraged to work co-operatively.

The principles outlined in this policy apply to all Centres established within the University or in which the University participates. The policy provides for consistency of application and accountability towards the effective and efficient management of Centres at Murdoch University.

PRINCIPLES / OBJECTIVES

To provide a policy for the establishment and management of Centres at Murdoch University.

INTRODUCTION

1. Murdoch University encourages the establishment and development of Research, Professional and Teaching Centres. In order to enhance its reputation for research output and research training and build strategic relationships with other academic institutions, government and the private sector, the University recognises that Centres in areas of existing and potential research strength must be identified, fostered and encouraged to work co-operatively.

The principles outlined in this policy apply to all Centres established within the University or in which the University participates, including major centres established with significant external funding such as Co-operative Research Centres, State Government Centres of Excellence, ARC Special Research Centres and ARC Key Centres of Teaching and Research. It is recognised that the establishment of such Centres is subject to criteria specified by the funding agencies, and that any conflict may need to be resolved outside this policy.

In considering proposals to establish Centres, the University will take into account Clauses 4 to 11 of this policy, as well as the following:

1. the University’s strategic plans, and in particular the Operational Research Management Plan;
2. the implications of any requirements prescribed by the funding body, in relation to the University’s policies and procedures;
3. the possible need for matching or supporting funds from the University’s Research Applications Fund, or from other central funds.
CLASSIFICATION OF CENTRES

2. A Centre shall be defined as an administrative entity within the University which has responsibility for undertaking or facilitating research, consultancy, professional and/or teaching in a specified area or for other activities as envisaged in Clause 9 of this policy, and which may have responsibility for generating income. A Centre may be established in association with another university or other institution. Subject to satisfactory reporting as outlined in Clause 17 of this policy, Centres will be established for a fixed term of five years, except where there is agreement from the Vice-Chancellor that the centre will be established for a different period of time.

3. Centres may be classified as either University, Inter-divisional, Divisional or School Centres. University Centres are those established as a result of a successful application to an external funding agency (eg Co-operative Research Centres, Centres of Excellence etc); a formal agreement to collaborate with other institutions, or include substantial external participation and support. Centres which are largely internal to the university, for all they may be successful in attracting external grants and consultancies may be classified as either Inter-divisional, Divisional or School Centres. Centres will be classified as Inter-Divisional Centres if, in accordance with Clause 4 of this policy, it can be demonstrated that they are interdisciplinary and collaborative across Divisions. Centres that are predominantly located within one Division but across Schools will be classified as Divisional Centres and those that operate primarily from within one School will be classified as School Centres.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRES

4. Centres may be established under the following circumstances:

4.1 University Centres will usually be established as a result of Murdoch's participation in a successful application to a Commonwealth or State Government agency, or as a result of an agreement between the University and industry, or the University and other institutions. With respect to such centres, a Memorandum of Understanding or some such contract will detail the nature of the university's involvement, as allowed by Clause 5 of this policy. In accordance with Legal Policy LP2/2004, all staff must obtain a legal sign-off for all agreements or MOUs relating to a centre.

A proposal for the University to participate in an external application to establish a centre shall be undertaken only with the approval of the Vice Chancellor on the advice of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research). In agreeing to become a party to such proposals, the following shall be considered:

- A demonstrated synergy between Murdoch’s research interests and strengths and the proposal.
- The expected return to the university in relation to expected investment and any leveraging contribution.
- The likelihood of the application being successful.
- The nature of the University's involvement in the prospective centre (eg as host, as a node of a CRC).
- That any major operational issues have been resolved.
- A satisfactory management and review process.

The PVC(R) must seek the agreement of the relevant Executive Deans before advising the Vice Chancellor to sign-off on any such application.

Centres which are established as a result of such arrangements may, when the funding ceases, reapply for re-classification as an Inter-divisional or Divisional Centre.
4.2 Inter-divisional Centres may be established if it can be clearly demonstrated that they are:

- Collaborative between Divisions within Murdoch;
- Interdisciplinary; and
- Value-adding, in that they contribute to the University in a manner not feasible within current organisational structures and research arrangements.

4.3 Divisional Centres may be established if it can be demonstrated that they will:

- Benefit the research, teaching or professional activities of a group of staff within one Division that is working in a field of common interest;
- Assist in the development of an emergent area of research, teaching or professional strength;
- Provide clear advantages in attracting support from external agencies, or
- Enhance the teaching-research nexus.

4.4 School Centres may be established if it can be demonstrated that they will:

- Benefit the research, teaching or professional activities of a group of staff within one School that is working in a field of common interest;
- Assist in the development of an emergent area of research, teaching or professional strength;
- Provide clear advantages in attracting support from external agencies, or
- Enhance the teaching-research nexus.

5. This policy shall apply to all Centres established within the University except that in the light of funding or other arrangements with external agencies, the Senate, on the advice of the Vice Chancellor and on such terms and conditions as the Senate considers appropriate, may establish Centres which do not conform to the policy in all respects.

6. All Centres shall be based within one or more Divisions of the University for administrative purposes. Schools are within Divisions for administrative purposes, and therefore School centers will report, through their school, to the respective Division. Where proposed Centres (University or Inter-divisional) involve more than one Division, a Memorandum of Understanding is to be signed by the Executive Deans of all the Divisions participating in establishment of the Centre. For the case where such Centres are primarily involved in research, the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) will be responsible for negotiating with Executive Deans the Memorandum of Understanding. Where such Centres are intended to conduct professional and teaching activities, the President of Academic Council will be responsible for negotiating Memoranda of Understanding with the Executive Deans of participating Divisions. The Memorandum of Understanding will endorse the Executive Dean of each Division involved will sign a note confirming acceptance of the proposed institutional location, management, funding and reporting arrangements for the Centre and arrangements for calculating and allocating income generated by the Centre’s research or other activities. Comment: Please note that it is a legal nonsense to talk of an MOU between Divisions. At best, there can be a notation or file note signed by the Executive Deans confirming acceptance of the relevant conditions that will apply.

7. All members of Centres shall be members of the staff of Divisions of this University or other institutions participating in the Centre, or adjunct appointments to the Centre, unless the Vice Chancellor decides otherwise.

8. A proposal for an Inter-divisional or Divisional Centre whose primary purpose is research shall be submitted initially to the Boards of the Divisions, via their Research Committee, in which the
Centre is intended to be based. A proposal for a School Centre should be submitted to the School Committee, endorsed by the Head of School, then forwarded to the Board of the Division. If endorsed by the Boards, on the recommendation of their Research Committee, the proposal shall be forwarded to CCARS for assessment against this policy and, if approved, referral to the Research and Development Board, in the case of Research Centres, or in other cases, Academic Council, which may recommend to the Vice Chancellor that the Centre be established.

9. Where the Vice Chancellor has agreed to the establishment of a Centre whose primary purpose is to conduct research, or when an application to an external funding agency has been successful, the Research and Development Board shall ask Academic Council to formally note the establishment of the Centre (and by virtue of its resolution to notify Senate).

10. A proposal for a Centre whose primary purpose is teaching, consultancy, professional development, or other activities which may provide a service to the community (including but not primarily research), or a combination of these, shall be submitted to the Academic Council by the Board of the Division in which the Centre is intended to be based. A proposal for a School Centre whose primary purpose is teaching, consultancy, professional development, or other activities which may provide a service to the community (including but not primarily research), or a combination of these, shall be submitted to the School Committee for approval before submission to the Board of the Division in which the School Centre is intended to be based. The Council may recommend to the Vice Chancellor that the Centre be established and that it be classified as a 'Professional Centre'.

11. All submissions shall contain a plan, including the following information:

11.1 Centre’s goals and objectives

Operational targets for years one, two and five of its operation

Performance indicators for future reporting and evaluation

Description of how the Centre relates to the University’s Operational Research Management Training plan

Details of how the proposed Centre conforms with Clause 3 of the Policy for the Establishment and Management of Centres.

A Risk Management Plan using the template in Annexure A that contains Risk Consequence and Likelihood tables and an education document on how to apply the risk management methodology. If this plan identifies any Extreme or High residual risks, the submission should not proceed until processes or strategies are put in place to reduce these risks to Moderate or Low levels.

Comment This needs further adjustment as a Centre, the primary purpose of which is to conduct consultancy work will breach the Senate’s Consultancy Policy. There needs to be a process built in for such proposals to be vetted by MurdochLINK in accordance with the Consultancy Policy – this adjustment is in the below paragraph.

Individual consultancy proposals for Research Centres must comply with the Senate’s consultancy policy and be accordingly vetted and approved by Murdoch Link.

11.2 Key personnel

Names, addresses
Proportion of time committed to the Centre

Roles and responsibilities

Details of how the centre will manage legal and constitutional issues relating to the participation of staff from outside the University

11.3 Infrastructure

Location of the Centre, together with details of how the accommodation needs of the centre will be met, by whom and at whose cost.

Equipment, infrastructure and other requirements, and details of how these will be supplied, by whom and at whose costs

11.4 Organisation

Management structure of the Centre

Roles, responsibilities (including any issues relating to legal liability), composition and period of membership of advisory committees and Boards of management

Details of how the accounting and administrative processes of the Centre will be managed

If it is proposed to have the Centre incorporated, this should first be approved by Senate in accordance with the University’s Policy for the Establishment and Operation of Incorporated Entities.

11.5 A statement on how the proposed Centre might impact on other Schools or Centres in the University

11.6 Resources and income (attach copies of agreements)

Details of resourcing arrangements between the Centre and participating Divisions, Schools, the Research and Development Board and external collaborators

Agreements relating to the sharing or allocation of income from Centre activities

Details of all agreements relating with external agencies, including agreements on intellectual property issues and “in kind” contributions.

Estimated income and expenditure for the first three years of operation, together with documentation of confirmed income.

12. In evaluating proposals to establish a Centre, consideration will be given to whether the proposal adheres to Clauses 4 to 11 of this policy.

13. In cases where the primary purpose of the entity is to conduct research, the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) will decide whether a term other than "Centre" be used to describe the entity if this is considered appropriate under the terms of a grant from an external funding agency or following recommendations from external participants. In cases where the primary purpose of the entity is teaching, consultancy, professional development or other activities, Academic Council will decide whether a term other than "Centre" be used to describe the entity if this is considered appropriate under the terms of a grant from an external funding agency or following recommendations from external participants.
14. As soon as practicable after approval has been granted to establish a centre, the secretary of the Research & Development Board or the Academic Council, as the case may be, will provide details of the centre to the General Counsel & University Secretary so that the University’s “Entities Register” can be updated.

MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

14.15. The Director of each Centre shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor, on the advice of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) (if a research Centre) or the President of Academic Council (if a professional or teaching Centre) and the Executive Dean(s) of the Division(s) participating in the Centre. The Executive Dean will take advice from the Head of School in the case of a School centre. However, in the case of a University Centre, if there is a contractual agreement with the University which includes a process for appointing the Director, that process shall be followed instead.

Where the Director of a University Centre is not located at Murdoch, the Vice Chancellor with the relevant advice from the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) or the President of Academic Council, will appoint a Murdoch staff member as a Deputy Director.

The Deputy Director of a University Centre, or the Director of an Inter-Divisional, Divisional or School Centre will be:

(a) a member of the full time academic staff of Murdoch University at the level of Senior Lecturer or above;

(b) appointed for a term not exceeding three years and shall be eligible for reappointment;

(c) responsible to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) in the case of University or Inter-divisional research Centres, Academic Council, in the case of University or Inter-divisional professional and teaching Centres, Executive Deans of the Divisions participating in the Centre in the case of Divisional Centres, and the Head of School in the case of a school Centre, on all matters relating to the Centre.

15.16. Unless otherwise prescribed by contractual or other formal arrangements with another institution to which the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) / President of Academic Council or Vice Chancellor has agreed, each Centre will have an advisory committee and/or a Board of management whose membership, role and responsibility will be approved by the Vice Chancellor. An advisory committee will provide advice to the Centre on how it might best meet its goals and objectives and improve or expand. A Board of management will, in consultation with the Centre Director, develop Centre policies, advise the Director of the Centre on strategies to achieve the Centre’s goals and objectives, and have responsibility for monitoring the progress of the Centre.

Members of advisory committees and Boards of management shall hold office for three years and shall be eligible for re-appointment.

The Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) or nominated delegate and the Director of the Centre will be represented on the advisory committees or Boards of management of all University Research Centres. The President of Academic Council or nominated delegate and the Director of the Centre will be represented on the advisory committees or Boards of management of all University Professional or Teaching Centres. Executive Deans of the participating Divisions or nominated delegate and the Director of the Centre will be represented on the advisory committees or Boards of management of all Divisional Centres. The Head of School shall be on the advisory committees or Boards of Management of a School Centre.
16.17. Management and advisory committees and Boards may co-opt up to three members for a period not exceeding three years. A casual vacancy of more than six months to a position on a Board or an advisory committee may be filled by a new appointment. The person newly appointed shall serve for the balance of the term vacated. Each year of office shall commence on the first day of second semester in any academic year and expire on the day before the commencement of the second semester in the next academic year.

17.18. The Director of a Centre required by an external body to produce an annual report will provide the Division of Research and Development with a copy of that report. In all other cases, the Director of a Centre must submit a draft annual report to the Centre's advisory committee or Board of management for their consideration and comment. The Director of University Research Centres will present the final version of the Centre's annual report to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) and the Research and Development Board, and Directors of University Professional or Teaching Centres will present the Centre's annual report to the President of Academic Council. Directors of Divisional Centres will submit the Centre's annual report to the Executive Deans and Research Committees of the participating Divisions. Directors of School Centres shall submit the report to the School Committee and Head of School. The report must chart the progress of the Centre against the objectives, targets and performance indicators and compliance with both the funding agreement, risk management measures and relevant legislative requirements specified in the proposal to establish the Centre in accordance with Clause 11. The Report, once finalized, shall be placed on the Centre's website.

18.1 In addition, in the fourth year of the Centre's operation, or earlier with the approval of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) or President of Academic Council, as appropriate, the Director of the Centre must include in the annual report a statement indicating either:

(a) That the Centre will be discontinued at the end of its fifth year of operation.

(b) A statement of intent to submit a proposal for continuation of the Centre.

Where a Centre has been established as a result of a successful application to an external funding agency or through agreement with external partners, and the reporting and review cycle differs from that set out here, the report on continuation/ discontinuation can be made in association with the external agency's review process or the Memorandum of Understanding, with the written approval of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) or President of Academic Council as appropriate.

18.2 In the event that a Centre is to be discontinued, in the final year of its operation the Centre must provide a report containing the following information:

a. A summary of the Centre's key achievements
b. A statement of any impediments that were encountered
c. A statement indicating how all assets of the Centre will be disposed of at termination of the Centre, including how income from assets such as intellectual property will be disposed of, and what arrangements will be made for the redeployment of Centre staff
d. disclosure of any existing liabilities, contracts, entitlements or any other matters that should be disclosed, at termination of the Centre.

The Centre will be discontinued at the end of its approved period of operation and the Executive Deans of participating Divisions, Director of the Centre, external participants and members of management and advisory Boards and committees will be notified.
Review of Centres

18.19. If a Centre wishes to continue operating beyond the fixed term of five years, in the final year of that term, or earlier with the approval of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) or President of Academic Council, as appropriate, it must submit a proposal to continue for a further five years. The proposal must comply with the requirements of Clause 11 of this Policy. The Centre must also undergo a formal review. Criteria for continuation shall include an assessment of the Centre’s performance over the past four years against the goals, objectives, targets and indicators specified in the proposal to establish the Centre, and an evaluation of the Centre’s new proposal for continuation against the principles and criteria outlined in this Policy for the Establishment and Management of Centres.

School Centres shall be reviewed in conjunction with their School review.

All Centres must review their risk management plan in consultation with the Director, Office of Internal Audit and Risk Management on an annual basis. If this annual review identifies any Extreme or High residual risks, processes or strategies are to be put in place to reduce these risks to Moderate or Low levels in a timely manner.

19.20. When a Centre indicates that it wishes to undergo a review to continue operation for a further five years, the Research and Development Board or Academic Council, as appropriate, shall appoint a review committee, except in the case of School Centres who shall be reviewed in conjunction with their school review. The review committee will comprise three people who are independent of the management and activities of the Centre. The Chair of the review committee will be an external person who has knowledge of the fields in which the Centre has operated. All major external participants in the Centre must be consulted on the timing and aims of the review, and consulted during the review process.

In the case of Research Centres, the Research and Development Board may exercise discretion on the level of peer evaluation involved to take account of the size and nature of the Research Centre. As an alternative to the review process set out in this Policy, the Board may authorise a review by its Committee for the Review of Centres and Areas of Research Strength (CRCARS) or by an Expert Visitor to the University. The procedures for the review of Research Centres are expanded upon in the Protocol for the Review of Research Centres approved by the Research and Development Board (Res: RDB 59/02).

The costs of the review of a Centre normally will be borne by the Centre. However, a case may be made by University Centres to apply to the Research and Development Board, Divisional Centres may apply to their Division, and School Centres may apply to their School for assistance in funding their review.

20.21. The review committee will assess the activities of the Centre and proposal to continue the Centre for a further five years in light of the criteria outlined in the Policy for the Establishment and Management of Centres. It will provide a report that includes an executive summary of no more than two pages, and assessments of the Centre’s past performance and its proposal to continue. The report will recommend that the Centre either continue or be disestablished. In cases where the review committee recommends that the Centre continue, it should provide recommendations on how the Centre might modify its activities and its proposal to best achieve its objectives.

The review committee shall seek the views of the Director of the Centre on its preliminary report. The Director of the Centre will be required to write a reply to the review committee’s report, responding to its recommendations. In cases where the review committee recommends that the Centre modify its activities and its proposal, the Director of the Centre should indicate which of the recommendations made by the review committee will be incorporated into the proposal to continue the Centre for a further five years, and how this will be achieved.
Ms Barbara Whelan
Murdoch Guild
South St
MURDOCH WA 6150

17 MAY 2005

Dear Ms Whelan

Thank you for your email of 19 April to the Hon Dr Brendan Nelson MP, Minister for Education, Science and Training, concerning the representation of the Guild President on the Senate of Murdoch University. The Minister has asked me to reply on his behalf.

National Governance Protocol 3 requires that *ex officio* members on a university governing body be limited to the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and the Chair of the Academic Board.

There is nothing in the Protocols that would preclude the Senate from granting the Guild President attendance or speaking rights should it so wish.

Yours sincerely

Zoe McKenzie
Senior Adviser
Legislation relating to the role of the Guild President in Senate

The Murdoch University Act

20. (2) The Guild shall be an organised association of students for the furthering of the common interests of its members, and shall be the recognised means of communication between students and the Senate, in accordance with any Statutes that the Senate makes.

Statute 17. Guild of Students

2. (2). The Guild shall be the recognised means of communication between the student body and the Senate.

Guild Regulations

11. Subject to any direction by the Secretariat, it shall be the duty of the President of the Guild to:
   a) Be the official spokesperson of the Guild and to be the main instrument of formal liaison between the Guild and the student body, the University and the general public.
### Senate Resolution S/54/2004

**Report of Documents to Which the Official Seal Has Been Applied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other party</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2005</td>
<td>Comprehensive Education Centre P/L, Murdoch College and Murdoch Properties</td>
<td>Settlement deed variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2005</td>
<td>Parker Centre Limited</td>
<td>Approval to Change Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2005</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Australia and various</td>
<td>Deed of Transfer of Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2005</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Australia and various</td>
<td>Deed to terminate an agreement in relation of AJ Parker CRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2005</td>
<td>Parker CRC for Integrated Hydrometallurgy Solutions</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/08/2005</td>
<td>Minister for Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>Amendment to <em>Statute No. 8 - Interpretation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/08/2005</td>
<td>Minister for Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>Amendment to <em>Statute No. 23 - Student Discipline</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/08/2005</td>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td>Deed of Variation and acknowledgement #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/08/2005</td>
<td>State of WA</td>
<td>Licence agreement - electronic copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/2005</td>
<td>Beijing Union University</td>
<td>Agreement for the delivery of Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2005</td>
<td>DEST</td>
<td>National Governance Protocols compliance certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>