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Date: Wednesday 25/10/2006
Time: 4:30 pm
Venue: Senate room, South Street Campus

Afternoon tea will be available in the foyer of the Senate Suite from 4pm. Would you kindly remember to wear your name badge?

After the meeting members are invited to have dinner at Club Murdoch.

If you will be unable to remain for dinner, would you please advise the University Secretary, Jeremy Rigg, by phone as soon as possible, so we can finalise catering numbers? His number is 9360 6826.

If any Senate member would like additional information on any agenda item, or has a motion or changes to recommendations which could be included in a supplementary agenda, please contact me as soon as possible via eMail to J.Rigg@murdoch.edu.au

The Chancellor has also requested that, if you intend to speak to a particular item (in particular any item included in Part C of the agenda), please let me know in advance. Where the item is in Part C, would you please also identify the specific item and provide brief details of the aspect(s) in respect of which you intend to speak? This will greatly facilitate the smooth running of the meeting.

JEREMY RIGG
GENERAL COUNSEL &
UNIVERSITY SECRETARY
12/10/2006

AGENDA

1. MEMBERSHIP
   1.1 A list of current Senate members is attached, together with an up to date attendance register.
   1.2 Details of current Senate committees and their members are attached and available at http://senate.murdoch.edu.au/committees/committee05.html

2. APOLOGIES
   2.1 Nil.
   2.2 Any apologies received after circulation of the agenda will be reported to the meeting.
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Section 17A and Division 2 of Schedule 1 of the Murdoch University Act require all members of Senate who have a material personal interest in a matter being considered or about to be considered:
(i) to declare the nature and extent of the interest; and
(ii) not to be present during consideration of the matter, nor vote on it.

PART A - MAJOR ISSUES

4. CENTRE FOR CLINICAL IMMUNOLOGY AND BIOMEDICAL STATISTICS (CCIBS)

The Vice Chancellor will introduce Professor Simon Mallal, Executive Director of CCIBS will provide an update on the work of the Centre and its role in the global fight against HIV and other infectious diseases.

Ms Vicky Dodds, Director of Development, will provide an overview of the capital fundraising campaign to fund the new building for CCIBS on the South St campus.

PART B - OTHER ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

5. VICE CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

The Vice Chancellor will speak to his report to Senate, a copy of which is attached.

6. REPORT OF THE DEPUTY VICE CHANCELLOR (RESEARCH)

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) will speak to his report to Senate. A copy of the report was not available at the time of printing this agenda, and will be circulated to Senate members separately.

7. CHANCELLORS’ CONFERENCE & GOVERNANCE CONFERENCE

The Chancellors’ Conference and the National Conference on University Governance were held in Canberra from October 9 to October 11. The Chancellor and the Deputy Chancellor will report to the Senate meeting on their attendance.

PART C - OTHER ITEMS

The Chancellor will put the following as a single item for noting and for the approval/acceptance of any recommendations contained in them. Members of Senate may request that any of these items be reserved for discussion.

8. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

8.1 Confirmation of the attached minutes of the meeting held on 06/09/2006.

8.2 Note the attached report of action on resolutions passed at the previous meeting.
9. **ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

The minutes of the Academic Council meeting held on 13/09/2006 are attached. Other than in relation to legislative matters, there are no recommendations to Senate.

*Note:* All legislative matters are dealt with under item 12 of the agenda (Legislation Committee).

10. **ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Environmental Committee meeting to be held on 19/10/2006 were not available at the time of printing this agenda and will be circulated to Senate members separately.

11. **HONORARY AWARDS AND CEREMONIAL COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Honorary Awards and Ceremonial Committee meeting held on the 29/09/2006 are attached. There are no recommendations to Senate.

12. **LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**

The Legislation Committee resolved by circular resolution, effective 12/10/06, to adopt the recommendations of Academic Council from its meeting of 13/09/2006.

**LC/10/2006**

To recommend to Senate to amend the following regulations as indicated below [additions in **bold**]:

(i) Bachelor Degree Regulation 1. (1)  
*Insert: Bachelor of Environmental Management (BEnvMan)*  
*Insert: Bachelor of Planning (BPlanning)*

(ii) Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 2. (1)  
*Insert: Master of Arts in Education for Sustainability 48 points*  
*Insert Master of Laws 24 points*

**LC/11/2006**

To recommend to Senate to amend Bachelor Degree Regulation 1.1(1) as outlined attached [deletions struck through].

13. **RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Resources Committee meeting held on 3/10/2006 are attached. The following items contain recommendations to Senate:

**RC/17/2006**

To approve

(i) Authorises the Vice Chancellor or his delegate to conclude contract and other negotiations to outsource residential and associated services to Campus Living Villages on substantially the same terms and conditions detailed to Resources Committee on 27 June 200 and 3 October 2006: and

(ii) Authorises the signing of all contract documentation in relation to the outsourcing of student services, including the associated lease agreements.

**RC/18/2006**

To approve the revised investment policy statement, number 1601 as attached.

**RC/19/2006**

To approve the following payments for the period 16/08/2006 to 25/09/2006 inclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creditors</th>
<th>Debtors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Australian Taxation Office $ 893,356 (PAYG)
Australian Taxation Office $ 855,432 (PAYG)
Australian Taxation Office $ 883,158 (PAYG)
Wesfarmers Energy Pty Ltd $ 510,427 (Reimbursement)
Keywest Constructions Pty Ltd $679,315 (St Ives Stage 6

RC/20/2006 To approve:

(i) subject to (ii), Senate approves the delegation to each of the Vice Chancellor, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate), the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) and the General Counsel, authority to make investments within the parameters of the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents (bolded terms used below refer to the terms as defined in the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents), being:

(a) the transfer of Murdoch IP to Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing no less than 45% of the capital in those companies;

(b) the provision of an In Kind Contribution to the Collaboration in exchange for ordinary shares representing 5% of the capital interest acquired by Westscheme in Investee companies formed in relation to Third Party IP; and

(c) the transfer of the University’s interest in Mixed IP to Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing between 5% and 45% of the capital in those companies, as negotiated with the Investment Manager and the Third Party.

(ii) The Division of Research and Development will provide a report to Senate in each instance an Investee is established. This report will describe the investment and the nature of the technology, and substantive provisions of the relevant shareholders agreement. Further the Division will provide the committee a quarterly report detailing the value of the portfolio of investments obtained through the collaboration.

(iii) That resolutions S22(i) and (ii)/2005, being a standing exemption to the University’s Policy for the Establishment and Operation of Incorporated Entities be rescinded.

RC/21/2006 To recommend that Senate approves the development of the Learning Common in the Library at a total cost not exceeding $3.1M

14. STUDENT AMENITIES FEE

The Student Guild recommends to Senate to amend Schedule A of the Fees Rules reduce the fees for 2007 as follows:

$50 for full time students per semester
$30 for part time students per semester
$15 for external students per semester
$25 for regional full time students per semester
$15 for regional part time students per semester

15. OFFICIAL SEAL

In accordance with resolution S/54/2004, the General Counsel & University Secretary has provided a report detailing the documents to which the official seal has been affixed since the last Senate meeting.
16. **SENATE MEETING DATES 2006**
   The Senate’s meeting dates for 2006 and respective closing dates for agenda items are attached.

17. **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**
   A copy of relevant articles are attached
**AGENDA ITEM 1.1**

**CURRENT MEMBERS OF SENATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor Geoffrey Bolton</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>24/11/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof John Yovich</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPOINTED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison Gaines</td>
<td>21/07/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Kate O’Brien</td>
<td>20/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Budge</td>
<td>31/05/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry Hunt</td>
<td>26/05/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Aitken</td>
<td>27/08/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CO-OPTED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Iannello</td>
<td>23/05/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley McPherson</td>
<td>23/02/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTED ACADEMIC STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof Stuart Bradley</td>
<td>09/11/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Nick Costa</td>
<td>25/09/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Jim Macbeth</td>
<td>28/10/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTED GENERAL STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip Hocking</td>
<td>21/04/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTED CONVOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janice Bowra</td>
<td>02/12/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Jakobsen</td>
<td>31/12/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTED STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Bradley</td>
<td>31/12/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Georgatos</td>
<td>31/12/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senate Committees 2006-2009

#### Audit & Risk Management Committee
- **Chair**: Judge Kate O’Brien
- **Members**:  
  - Mr Brian Aitken  
  - Ms Janice Bowra  
  - Mr Jamie Ogilvie*  
  - Ms Beverley Schubert*  
  - Gerry Georgatos (observer status only)

#### Chancellor’s Committee
- **Chair**: Chancellor
- **Members**:  
  - Pro Chancellor  
  - Mr Terry Budge  
  - Mr Garry Hunt  
  - Mr Malcolm Macpherson  
  - Judge Kate O’Brien

#### Environmental Committee
- **Chair**: Mr Garry Hunt
- **Members**:  
  - Vice Chancellor  
  - Dr Martin Anda*  
  - Mr Mal Bradley  
  - Prof Nick Costa  
  - Ms Carolyn Jakobsen  
  - Professor Phil Jennings*  
  - Assoc Prof Jim Macbeth  
  - Mr Craig Spence*  
  - Dr Melanie Strawbridge*  
  - Ms Beth Strang*

#### Governance & Nominations Committee
- **Chair**: Chancellor
- **Members**:  
  - Pro Chancellor  
  - Vice Chancellor  
  - Mr Terry Budge  
  - Professor Nick Costa  
  - Mr Gerry Georgatos  
  - Judge Kate O’Brien
Director, HR*
Mr Jeremy Rigg*

Honorary Awards & Ceremonial Committee
Chair Chancellor
Members Pro Chancellor
Vice Chancellor
Professor Nick Costa
Gerry Georgatos
Mr Nathan Giles*
Mr Phillip Hocking
Professor Tom Lyons*
Mr Malcolm Macpherson
Professor Simone Volet*

Legislation Committee
Chair Ms Alison Gaines
Members Vice Chancellor
Ms Janice Bowra
Mr Mal Bradley
Mr Gabriel Moens*
Mr Jeremy Rigg*

Resources Committee
Chair Mr Terry Budge
Members Vice Chancellor
Professor Stuart Bradley
Mr Gerry Georgatos
Mr Phillip Hocking
Mr Garry Hunt
Mr Tony Ianello
Ms Shirley McPherson
Mr Bob Pett#

* Recommended as co-opted, non-member of Senate for term commencing 01/01/2006 and term expiring on 31/12/2008

# Recommended as co-opted, non-member of Senate with term commencing 01/01/2006 and term expiring 31/12/2006
AGENDA ITEM 2

APOLOGIES

There is no separate paper for this item
**SECTION 17A - DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

17A. Disclosure of Interests

Schedule 1 Division 2 has effect.

**DIVISION 2 — DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

2. Disclosure of interests

2.1 A member of the Senate who has a material personal interest in a matter being considered or about to be considered by the Senate must, as soon as possible after the relevant facts have come to the member’s knowledge, disclose the nature and extent of the interest at a meeting of the Senate.

2.2 A disclosure under subclause (1) is to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

3. Voting by interested members

A member of the Senate who has a material personal interest in a matter that is being considered by the Senate

(a) must not vote whether at a meeting or otherwise

(i) on the matter; or

(ii) on a proposed resolution under clause 4 in respect of the matter, whether relating to that member or a different member;

and

(b) must not be present while

(i) the matter; or

(ii) a proposed resolution of the kind referred to in paragraph (a)(ii).

is being considered at a meeting.

4. Clause 3 may be declared inapplicable

Clause 3 does not apply if the Senate has at any time passed a resolution that

(a) specifies the member, the interest and the matter; and

(b) states that the members voting for the resolution are satisfied that the interest should not disqualify the member from considering or voting on the matter.

5. Quorum where clause 3 applies

Despite section 12(6), if a member is disqualified under clause 3 in relation to a matter, a quorum is present during the consideration of the matter if at least 7 members of the Senate are present who are entitled to vote on any motion that may be moved at the meeting in relation to the matter.

6. Minister may declare clauses 3 and 5 inapplicable

(1) The Minister may, on the application of a member of the Senate, by writing declare that clause 3 or 5 or both of them do not apply in relation to a specified matter either generally or in voting on particular resolutions.

(2) The Minister must cause a copy of a declaration made under subclause (1) to be laid before each House of Parliament within 14 sitting days of that House after the declaration is made.
AGENDA ITEM 4

CENTRE FOR CLINICAL IMMUNOLOGY AND BIOMEDICAL STATISTICS

There is no separate paper for this item.
AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL GRANTS

The Minister for Education, Science and Training, the Hon Julie Bishop MP, announced $365 million in Australian Research Council grants, awarded through five schemes:
- Discovery Projects;
- Linkage Projects;
- Discovery Indigenous Researchers Development;
- Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities; and
- Linkage International Project.

Nationally, applications for all schemes were up from 4,498 in 2005 to 4,834 in 2006, with funding decreasing from $370 million to $365 million meaning that success rates went down across the board. Projects funded were also down from 1,214 in 2005 to 1,154 in 2006.

In this round, average funding for Discovery Projects increased by 12 per cent on the previous funding round to $334,267 per project, while average Linkage Projects funding increased by 9 per cent on the previous funding round to $285,745 per project.

The Group of Eight universities this year received 72.1% of total ARC funding - a gain on the 68.5% of overall funding received in 2005. The ATN universities have lost 3.65% (approximately $14 million) of the funding dropping from 10.1% to only 6.45% of the overall funding. By comparison the IRUA universities slipped from 10.2% to 9.5% of the overall funding.

Murdoch received grants under the Discovery Projects, Linkage Projects, and Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities schemes. From a total of 52 applications we were awarded 7 grants, totalling $2.126 million. Details of the successful grants are attached (Attachment A).

UNIVERSITIES AUSTRALIA

The Australian Vice Chancellors Committee decided to accept most of the recommendations of an external report on their organisation. The main changes centre on strengthening the organisation’s advocacy role as the national peak body for higher education. The changes, to be fully implemented by July 2007, include:
- To align with the changed focus, the AVCC will change its name to “Universities Australia”;
- That all universities recognised in Australia shall be eligible for membership;
- Universities to be represented by their CEOs;
- That there is in-principle support for external representation on the Board;
- Acceptance that a “shared view will not be achieved on all issues”; and
- Provision of the secretariat and support for the organisation of University Chancellors.

The structure of Universities Australia would be:
A full-time President who will be the chief executive and will be the main external advocate and spokesperson for Universities Australia;
A Chair of the Plenary and Board who is a current Vice-Chancellor; and
A full-time Chief Operating Officer and a Secretariat to support the CEO and President.

DESI DIRECTIONS

The Minister for Education, Science and Training, Julie Bishop MP, has recently indicated some of the directions she sees for the sector. The first was highlighted in the inaugural Banksia Association Lecture at Murdoch on 3rd October 2006 in which she discussed the need she has perceived for Australia’s universities to develop new private and corporate income streams through philanthropy. A copy of her speech is attached (Attachment B).

The Minister also flagged her intention to pursue further governance reform. Her speech to the National Conference on University Governance on 10th October 2006 (Attachment C) made clear her view that university governing bodies should take a more corporate structure and function. It is pleasing to note, however, that she also sees a role for university academics on corporate boards.

Press coverage of these speeches is included in the Matters for Information section at the end of the Agenda.

AWARDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

- The Kwinana Industries Education Partnership (KIEP) was recognised as the Global Best Practice for Regional Development Partnership by the International Partnership Network at a ceremony in Italy on 4th October 2006. KIEP comprises the Kwinana Industries Council’s 42 member companies, 12 government and private schools, local councils, Murdoch University, Challenger TAFE, the South Coast Regional Chambers of Commerce and employment and service agencies. It is housed at Murdoch’s Rockingham campus. The partnership aims to build strong community and industry links and partnerships at the secondary education level that provide links to further education and training. The strength of the partnership has been its ability to implement programs were innovative, responsive and relevant to students and industry.
- The Bachelor of Science (Chiropractic)/Bachelor of Chiropractic Degree Program has been granted accreditation for two years by the Council on Chiropractic Education Australasia Inc. (CCEA). While there were a number of provisions applied, this is seen to be a good result for a new program. Murdoch also gains status as a Member Institution of CCEA. The Chiropractic staff are to be congratulated on their achievement.
- Professor Andris Stelbovics, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) has been appointed to the RQF working group on modelling as the IRUA representative. The purpose of the working group is to provide guidance on some of the issues to be considered when developing the methodology by which RQF outcomes are translated into block grants. This will be a critical factor in developing the RQF model.
- The first cohort of Nursing students have all been offered jobs for 2007, with some offered more than one position. This augurs well for Nursing at the Peel Campus.
NOTABLE EVENTS

- The Hon Dr Brendan Nelson MP, Minister for Defence, presented an open lecture on behalf of the Asia Research Centre and the Security, Terrorism and Counterterrorism Program’s 2006 Seminar Series on 28th September 2006. Dr Nelson spoke on issues relating to Australian responses to regional instability. The lecture was well attended by Murdoch staff and students and received national press coverage.

- The 2006 Sir Walter Murdoch Lecture was presented by Nobel Prize Laureate Professor Peter Doherty AC, FAA, FRS on 20th September 2006. He spoke on the topic: “Science and the Public Intellectual”. Established in 1974 to mark the centenary of the birth of the University’s namesake, Sir Walter Murdoch, the Lecture presents an opportunity for Murdoch to host speakers of international standing. This year’s Lecture was attended by Senators, members of the Murdoch community and external stakeholders.

- Murdoch held a Multicultural Week Festival from 3rd October to 7th October 2006. The week commenced with an Anti-racism Public Lecture featuring The Hon David Malcolm AC and Nyoongar Leader, Ms Irene Stainton. Other events included a Multicultural Festival Day on Bush Court and a Guild sponsored International Soccer Tournament.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

- A student exchange agreement has recently been signed by Professor Gary Martin and Professor Wulf Fischer, Founding Rector of Fachhochschule Bonn-Rhein-Sieg, Germany. The agreement commenced on 11 September 2006 for 3 years, with automatic renewal for another 3 years. The exchange provides up to two semester-long places or one year-long place annually.

- The University has entered a Memorandum of Understanding with Banasthali Vidyapith, India. The agreement was signed by Professor Gary Martin and Professor Aditya Shastri, Director of Banasthali. Signatories were Professor Gary Martin The agreement came into force on 17th July 2006 and is for a five year term. Areas of cooperation will include collaborative teaching, research, seminars, exchange of students, staff and scholars, sponsoring seminars and workshops. Specific agreements will be developed mutually for any specific projects.

- A new offshore course agreement has recently been signed with Auckland Wise Institute (AWI) in New Zealand for the delivery of Murdoch’s Bachelor of Commerce with majors in Management, Marketing Management and Human Resources Management. The date of course commencement is to be confirmed.

- A delegation from Shenyang Institute of Engineering, China visited Murdoch from 20 to 22 September 2006. Members of the party were Mr Zhang Tielian, President, Mr Han Wei, Vice-President, International Affairs and Ms Lou Yuying, Acting-Director, International Affairs. Meetings were held with members of Senior Executive and colleagues from Science & Engineering and the Division of Arts, as well as Kingston College and Challenger TAFE. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed for a five year term, commencing from 22nd September 2006. Areas of cooperation will include activities such as collaborative teaching, research, seminars, exchange of students, staff and scholars, sponsoring seminars and workshops. Specific agreements will be developed mutually for any specific projects.
Discovery Project Grants

The role of extracurricular activity participation in promoting healthy development of Australian youth
Professor B Barber; Professor J Eccles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$55,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary
Organized extracurricular activities such as sport and art have the potential for promoting healthy development and reducing the risks faced by teenagers. However, current research evidence, often based on middle-class youth in the US, is inadequate for making policy recommendations for improvement to the after-school lives of Australian youth. This study will offer insight into the importance of making a diverse selection of organized activities available to Australian teenagers, and will improve our understanding of which aspects of participation are most likely to enhance their social and educational opportunities.

Matter-antimatter interactions - Australian Professorial Fellowship
Professor I Bray

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$77,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$77,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$77,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$77,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$77,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary
Much of the light that we see is either due to or is influenced by collisions between particles on the atomic scale. The understanding of astronomical observations, the Sun, or our atmosphere is underpinned by the knowledge of atomic collisions. They are also critical in the development of fusion, lasers and lighting sources generally. Interactions with antimatter have additional applications in the medical and material sciences. For example, positron collisions with matter are used in Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scans and in surface analysis.

Ancient DNA as a tool to study Australia’s paleome: exploring climatic change, past biodiversity, extinctions and long-term survival of DNA.
Dr M Bunce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary
Restoration of Australian ecosystems can only occur if we know what plants, animals and insects used to live in the area before ‘pest’ species were introduced. This project will use ancient DNA obtained from ‘poo’ and cave sediments, that is thousands of years old, to discover what species used to live where and when. The ancient DNA profiles of past ecosystems will allow us to make better decisions when trying to establish sustainable and ‘natural’ mainland and island sanctuaries. Ancient DNA is well preserved in some dry environments; this project will assess DNA preservation from sites all across Australia and use the DNA sequences to discover information about extinct animals and how past climate changes affected the native biota.
Molecular dissection of resistance to subterranean clover mottle virus using *Medicago truncatula*
Professor MG Jones; Dr R Jones

2007 : $100,000
2008 : $100,000
2009 : $100,000

**Project Summary**
Plant virus diseases cause economic losses in most crop plants. Grain and pasture legumes are an important component of Australian agricultural cropping systems, and provide human food and animal feed: they also contribute to higher yields of crops like cereals when grown in rotation, by providing nitrogen and a disease break. In this project, the 'model' legume, *Medicago truncatula* ('Barrel Medic') will be used to identify a new virus resistance gene. The knowledge gained will be used to improve resistance to viruses in crop legumes, so reducing losses and aiding sustainability of production. This will support rural communities and the national economy.

**Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities Proposals**

**High throughput orthogonal mass spectrometer for biotechnology research in WA**
Prof MG Jones; Prof R Appels; Prof DJ Hampson; Dr RP Tiwari; Dr DM Groth; Dr GW O'Hara; Dr C Li; A/Prof GE Hardy; Dr W Ma; A/Prof RD Trengove; Dr GI Dwyer; Prof GE Wilcox; Dr M Francki; Dr RJ Lipscombe

2007 : $189,000
Partner Organisations & Collaborating Organisations: Murdoch University, The Department of Agriculture and Food WA, Saturn Biotech Pty, and Curtin University of Technology

**Project Summary**
The new 'orthogonal' mass spectrometer will be housed at the WA State Agricultural Biotechnology Centre at Murdoch University (SABC). The SABC is a multi-user university centre that provides equal access for researchers from all universities, state government and industry to major facilities. The equipment will provide a competitive advantage to researchers undertaking fundamental and applied projects that underpin new developments in plant and animal agriculture. Outcomes include: development of new molecular markers to speed crop improvement and quality, animal genetic improvement and health, and support for new biotechnology companies. This will benefit the community through more productive, competitive and sustainable agriculture.
Linkage Project Grants

Balancing Water Quality and Ecosystem Health with Water Yield -- Ecosystem Response to Thinning in Wungong Catchment
A/Prof RW Bell; Prof RJ Hobbs; Em/Prof AJ McComb
2007 : $ 130,000
2008 : $ 140,000
2009 : $ 110,000
2010 : $ 60,000

APA(I) Award(s): 1
Collaborating/Partner Organisation(s): Murdoch University, Water Corporation

Project Summary
Reduced rainfall in past decades and future climate uncertainty have added a sense of urgency in Australia to search for new water resources to sustain a growing economy and population. A forest thinning trial is planned in the Wungong Catchment, Western Australia, to substantially increase water yield. Thinning is attractive as a low-cost option, and is potentially suitable for other catchments. However the potential environmental and ecological impacts, which are major community concerns, must be investigated. This project will assess the levels of impact, associated ecosystem responses and the capacity of catchment ecosystems to sustain such management intervention.

The nature, diversity and potential impact of infectious agents in Western Australian threatened mammals.
Prof RC Thompson; Dr AJ Lymbery; Dr A Smith; Dr P Clark; Dr PB Spencer; Mr KD Morris; Dr AF Wayne
2007 : $ 153,118
2008 : $ 145,118
2009 : $ 137,118

APA(I) Award(s): 1
APDI: Dr A Smith
Collaborating/Partner Organisation(s): Murdoch University, Department of Conservation and Land Management

Project Summary
This project will generate new information on parasitic diseases, which will contribute to the management of terrestrial ecosystems by government agencies such as the Western Australian Department of Conservation and Land Management, and private concerns, such as the Australian Wildlife Conservancy. The project will also assist in the formation of appropriate responses to exotic disease incursions, by increasing understanding of the spread of parasitic infections between native, feral and domesticated animal species.
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I am delighted to be at Murdoch University for the inaugural lecture of the Banksia Association.

Australian society values the contribution of our higher education sector and has high expectations for our Universities.

There is an expectation that Australian Universities will provide a high quality education for their students and equip them with the skills that employers will be seeking for the jobs of the 21st Century.

Our universities are expected to carry out research that is both high quality and relevant and Universities must create new knowledge to underpin our nation's innovation and competitiveness.

We expect our Universities to be accessible no matter the socio economic background of the students. And we expect our Universities to be accountable for their performance and to the taxpayers who sustain them and to be transparent in their operations.

Our universities must be internationally competitive.

Currently, there is a high reliance on the Australian Government for funding, both directly and through our management of student loans schemes – accounting for almost 60% of total funding.

And of the total public funding for Universities 98% comes from the Commonwealth.

I am not be suggesting that there be any reduction in our commitment to the sector, but I believe there are additional streams of funding which - historically - have been overlooked.

And that is what I want to talk about today.

But first let me put my views in context.

Today, Australia's universities have access to higher levels of revenue than ever before. In 2004, total revenue available to higher education institutions from all sources was $13 billion – an increase of more than $5 billion or a 65% increase on 1996 funding levels.

As a result of Backing Australia's Future and related initiatives, the Australian Government will direct more than $7.8 billion to the sector this calendar year – up from $5.3 billion in 1996.

Overall these reforms will result in the sector being $11 billion better off over the next decade.

Recent figures show that our Universities are financially viable, collectively holding over $7 billion in cash reserves and investments.

Australia’s funding of universities is often compared unfavourably to countries such as Finland and Sweden, where virtually all funding comes from the public sector and students pay minimal or no contribution - although this is changing. However, proponents of this type of model fail to mention government taxation rates in Finland and Sweden.
Government income tax rates in Finland increase to 38% for all income above $50,000. Add local government income taxes of 15% to 20% of income. Plus a 2% religious tax, a property tax of 4% and a GST of 22%, and you see the size of the public purse available to the Fins government!

Sweden’s personal income taxes are the highest in the world. The combination of state and local income taxes mean Swedes pay 42% up to $68,000 and 56% on income above that. They also pay a GST of 25%.

Thus, when comparisons are made, the Commonwealth spend is a fair contribution to the needs of the higher education sector in this country.

But are we overlooking obvious sources of additional funding?

If the Commonwealth contribution represents 98% of all public funding to the higher education sector in this country, then there is a striking anomaly.

Universities are creatures of our States, set up under State legislation, they are accredited, registered, audited, governed by the States. The States even nominate their representative for Councils and Senates. So where is their financial contribution? Just 2%? And that figure is debatable.

Let me give you an example, in 2005 the State and Territory Governments provided around $230 million in State grants to universities across Australia.

What is not as widely known or appreciated is that while States contributed $230 million, they took out more than $377 million in payroll tax. State and Territory Government in fact profited from their universities in 2005 to the tune of $147 million.

In other comparable federations, State Governments acknowledge the benefits to their communities of their Universities and contribute accordingly. So there’s an obvious untapped source.

Another is the alumni. I have heard it said that because Australian students now pay tuition fees we cannot expect them to make any other contribution to their alma mater at any other time throughout their lives!

Australia has one of the fairest higher education systems in the world, recognised as such internationally, where virtually every eligible person who wants to undertake university studies is able to do so in a Government-subsidised place.

In 2005, over 90% of eligible year 12 students were offered a place at a University, in their home state.

We have a record number of students at our universities, almost 1 million students, an increase of nearly 40% since 1996. And about 96% of all Australian undergraduates are in a Government subsidised place.

HECS was introduced by the ALP in 1989 to ensure that students made a fair contribution to the cost to the taxpayer of their studies, given the potential lifetime earnings for a graduate.

Today for every $1 a student contributes to their education the Australian Government contributes $3. Students pay 25% of the cost of their fees, the taxpayer picks up 75%.

Since 1989, almost 2 million people have been able to access higher education opportunities through Australian Government funded loans (HECS and HELP). There are no upfront fees and they are income contingent.
Today students only begin to repay the debt when their income exceeds $38,149 per annum.

To date, around 780,000 (41%) of people have repaid their debt. The average outstanding debt is around $10,500.

So let’s focus on the potential of greater private and corporate philanthropy in our Universities.

The higher education sector needs to consider seriously ways that it can increasingly engage both the corporate sector and its own alumni to optimise the resources, commitment and experience these valuable partnerships can provide.

It is well known that universities in the United States enjoy substantial philanthropic support, with a significant amount generated through their alumni networks. However, it is a mistake to assume that it is a cultural quirk or somehow tied to their tax system.

University philanthropy has not happened by accident in the US. Their universities and colleges have developed a highly professional approach to engaging their alumni for the purposes of fund raising. Many institutions have large departments devoted to liaising with alumni and working to actively promote philanthropy.

And the results are astounding, with donations to US universities reaching a record A$32.6 billion in 2005.

Harvard University was most successful in raising A$722 million. Overall, donations from alumni accounted for 28% of US university philanthropy, non-alumni individuals donated 21%, corporations 18% and charitable foundations 25%. Philanthropy accounts for about 20% of total funding to some individual US universities and almost 15% across the sector.

This contrasts with Australia, where the sector currently receives less than 2% of its income from philanthropic sources. We do not compare well with leading nations in the field of philanthropic support or in terms of alumni engagement.

However, this is not a societal issue as Australians are among the most generous people on earth when it comes to donating to worthy causes.

The taxation system is not an impediment - with the ability to fully claim such donations.

In one sense, it is cultural, in that while there is a culture of giving in Australia, there is not a culture of asking by the university sector.

I can cite my own experience and it is typical of others. In 1996 I attended HBS for the Advanced Senior Management Programme. At graduation, I was provided with a lifetime e-mail address to keep in touch with classmates and lecturers; I receive a class newsletter published regularly with other class news; I am invited to annual reunions of my class, as well as all the HBS lecture series held in Boston or in Asia, or elsewhere; there are opportunities to meet with Harvard professors visiting Australia; I am a member of the Harvard Club of Australia and attend dinners in Sydney and in Perth and mix with other Harvard alumni.

And from this constant contact, Harvard promotes itself, its courses and ensures a continuing supply of fee paying students from Australia. I read this morning that John Worsfold is to attend a Harvard or Stamford course – encouraged by their alumni here in Australia.

And many feel an obligation to give back what Harvard has given to them. This pattern is replicated in countries around the world.
Compare my Australian experience. In the 1970s I attended Adelaide Law School in Adelaide. After graduating I heard nothing more. No communication over the last 28 years, until earlier this year when it was published in the press that I was an Adelaide Law Graduate and the V-C sent me a warm note saying what a lovely surprise it was to learn that one of their graduates was the Federal Education Minister!

This was the norm, not the exception.

I think of my classmates, who, like me, became partners in major law firms, or went on to be CEOs in major businesses. Have they been contacted?

To my observation, by and large, there has been little effort given by Australian Universities to developing and maintaining links with alumni over an extended period.

The graduate data bases maintained by US institutions contain a wealth of information. The Australian higher education sector cannot afford to ignore the valuable networks of their alumni, and the potential to tap philanthropic sources of funding.

Our higher education sector, assisted and encouraged by the Australian Government, needs to develop a much more significant culture of philanthropy in Australia.

The challenge is to create a higher education sector that is engaged with the community, and more importantly with its network of graduates.

There are almost 3 million Australians aged 25-64 with a university degree, many of these people are working in the corporate sector, many are leaders in their field or running small and medium enterprises.

Graduates dominate the ranks of the professions.

Gross lifetime earnings of a graduate are currently estimated to be around $700,000 more for males and almost $500,000 more for females, compared with non-graduates.

The role of philanthropy is to support the development of excellence and not to provide basic maintenance or core funding. Philanthropy has the advantage of coming without too much red-tape attached – unlike public funding, which is necessarily accompanied by stringent accountability measures.

Ideally, a greater focus on philanthropy would enable universities to undertake activities that they would otherwise have to decline, to take risks that they would otherwise have to avoid.

Just as philanthropy has enabled the pursuit of excellence within the private school sector and research sector, notably the medical research sector, so too can it enable the pursuit of excellence in the uni sector.

Philanthropy can endow chairs with competitive remuneration needed to attract high quality academics. It can be used to offer merit-based scholarships to ensure that the best students, both domestic and international, are engaged and supported.

Philanthropy is also an enabler of diversity. It allows universities to experiment with innovative means of teaching, new courses and the application of emerging technologies.

There is great potential for philanthropy as a means for universities to promote equity, to drive better outcomes for Indigenous students and those coming from families and communities that do not have a tradition of going to university.
An outstanding example of this kind of philanthropy is the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The two simple values that lie at the core of the Foundation’s work are:

- all lives—no matter where they are being led—have equal value; and
- to whom much has been given, much is expected.

Murdoch University is to be congratulated for securing a research grant of $12.6 million from the Gates Foundation, in recognition of the leading edge work being undertaken by the Centre for Clinical Immunology and Biomedical Statistics in the field of HIV medicine.

Recently British Prime Minister Tony Blair said it was unsustainable for taxpayers to bear the full cost of higher education in light of the huge and growing demand for university graduates. He also used the US example to urge UK universities to build similar programs and to engage support from industry and business foundations.

Apart from benefiting the bottom line, philanthropy has provided many of the leading United States universities with the flexibility to take risks and has enabled an independence from government. Something which Australian universities can only envy.

Critical elements of a philanthropic culture are already in place in Australia. In 2004, for example, more than 13 million Australians, or around 87%, of adult population made a donation of some sort - average was $424 per person.

The giving of money, goods and services to non-profit organisations by business and individuals is estimated to total around $11 billion annually.

Of this, health non-profit organisations, including medical research organisations, received about one in six of the total value of donations by individuals, one in ten of all hours volunteered and almost one in five of the total value of business giving.

By contrast, the education non-profit organisations receive about one in twenty dollars of all donations from individuals and business – which is directed to schools and parents’ groups.

A number of reviews into Australian higher education institutions have already suggested that universities should look to increasing their philanthropic effort to provide an additional revenue stream.

In response to these reviews, some Australian universities have developed strong communication strategies and alumni networks to enhance their fund raising activities, but this is uneven across the sector and the maturity of institutional approaches varies widely.

Murdoch University stands out as having had considerable success in securing both corporate and individual philanthropy. In addition to the funding from the Gates Foundation the university has:

1. established the Murdoch University Veterinary Trust, which has raised $1.6m to support the work of the Vet School;
2. campaigned to raise $2.5m for the Law Library and new Law Building;
3. established the Murdoch University Foundation to encourage and facilitate fundraising as well as other initiatives.

I note that much of the success in these areas is due to the hard work of the Vice Chancellor including his decision to invest in the establishment of an Office of Development with resources to support University staff in fundraising activities.

So, where to from here?
I have asked my Business, Industry and Higher Education Collaboration Council - headed by David Murray - to advise me on strategies to develop a culture of philanthropy towards and from within Australian universities, including strategies for business and government to encourage alumni philanthropy.

The Council will conduct research and analysis that will assist in the building of a culture of philanthropy. Specifically, the consultancy will:

- identify how universities currently engage with potential donors, including alumni;
- review and identify best practice nationally and internationally;
- develop a set of national best practice guidelines; and
- identify practical, cost effective options that will assist universities to become more strategic in their fundraising.

The Council will consult with key stakeholders including universities, business, state governments, university development professional offices and peak philanthropic bodies to review and identify best practice nationally and internationally. I have allocated $200,000 to support the council’s work.

Another avenue I am exploring is to increase philanthropy through the existing taxation mechanisms and I recently met with Mr David Gonski, Chair of the Tax and Philanthropy Working Group of the Prime Minister’s Community Business Partnership. He has provided me with some ideas, which I am working on.

Together, we can create a higher education sector which has the hallmarks of excellence and responsiveness, one that satisfies the needs of present and future Australians, and one that meets the many and varied challenges of a rapidly changing world.

And finally, I commend the work of the Murdoch Banksia Association, which serves as an inspiration to institutions throughout the higher education sector and beyond.

The work of the Murdoch Banksia Association is all about sustaining connections between people and institutions. It is about conserving rather than neglecting human resources.

At Harvard Business School I learned the truth of an old saying: “look after your people and the bottom line will look after itself”.

This applies not only in business, but also in universities.
Thank you Professor Schreuder.

I am pleased to open this conference and to share my thoughts on where we – the Australian Government and our universities – have made progress in achieving more effective university governance. I will also talk about how we can advance our efforts in the future.

Let me start with the University Governance Professional Development Program, which is a key contributor to our efforts. Established with funding of $200,000 from the Australian Government, the program organised this annual conference, and also supports a number of initiatives helping universities to develop “best practice” in their governance arrangements. The program's ongoing operations are funded through subscriptions and training fees.

I am pleased to learn that 26 universities are now members of the program, up from 18 a few months ago and I hope other universities will join in the near future so there can be greater sharing of practices and ideas.

In 2002 when the Australian Government undertook its major review of the sector, Higher Education at the Crossroads, there was no or little evidence of a culture of good governance.

During the Crossroads consultations, consistent concerns were raised about the effectiveness of universities’ governing bodies, and whether the centuries-old collegial model of governance was adequate, let alone good practice.

One concern was whether governing body members had the skills needed to oversee modern Australian universities, some of which now had annual budgets of around a billion dollars. Collectively our universities have cash reserves and investments of over $7 billion. Higher education finance is a sophisticated enterprise.

A second concern was that intractable differences often arose between Council members who represented different constituencies within the university, leading to a third issue of the unwieldy size of some governing bodies – up to 35 members in one case, and in the high 20’s in several others.

Fourth, there were doubts about the ability of governing bodies to effectively monitor universities’ commercial operations.

The Australian Government moved to address the concerns identified in the Crossroads report and introduced the National Governance Protocols.

All universities have either complied with the Protocols, or should have completed promised action to comply within the allowable transition period, which has just ended. But what impact have the Protocols had on university governance, and what more needs to be done?

It concerns me that there is a feeling that the protocols are now behind us, and there appears to be a culture of complacency creeping into the governance of universities. A large proportion of the community of university governance practitioners across Australia appear to believe they have done their job.

I am concerned there is a belief that meeting the bare minimum requirements of the National Governance Protocols is enough. It's not enough! The protocols were established to help kick start universities in the right direction. They were established to provide an incentive for universities to significantly improve their governance - not for universities to only meet
minimum expectations. It was not an invitation to accept the lowest common denominator.
Good governance makes good business sense.

It concerns me also that this complacency is reflected in the poor uptake of opportunities for professional development. So far this year, only six universities have undertaken the professional development workshops through the University Governance Professional Development Programme. It concerns me that another course has had to be cancelled due to lack of interest, and the website established to facilitate the national exchange of ideas, papers and policy templates has remained largely unused.

There are some encouraging signs though. A handful of universities have gone well beyond the minimum requirements of the Protocols, and demonstrated a commitment to achieving “best practice”.

These may not be the universities that many would expect – such as some of our most prestigious – but they are universities that have enthusiastically embraced an active culture of commitment to improved university governance.

These universities are appointing people with first-class financial skills to their councils. These are not just people with generalist management experience, but people with direct responsibility for handling large budgets within their own organisations – chief financial officers and the like – and who would quickly tell from a university’s budgetary papers whether dangers are looming. They are the kind of “financial experts” the National Governance Protocols were hoping would come onto councils.

The universities that have embraced a culture of good governance contrast markedly with other universities which have taken a minimalist approach to good governance.

For example, the Protocols seek to promote renewal of council membership, to achieve a balance between experienced members and new members who may bring fresh ideas. The protocols limit service to 12 years, unless the governing body agrees to grant a specific exemption. Some universities have granted extensions to many governing body members at once. This is not the way to achieve balance.

Similarly, there is a Protocol requiring universities to have grievance procedures, and to publish them. This Protocol aims to make such procedures transparent. Many universities do have robust procedures which can easily be located on web sites, for example. Other universities comply with the Protocol because the procedures exist and are available, albeit hard to find – but they do not appear to be fully committed to transparency.

Against this background, let me share some thoughts about what constitutes best practice and what could be done.

A fundamental criterion in my view is that all governing body members should be fully committed to their duties. They must have enough time to attend the meetings, read documentation, attend appropriate induction and training sessions, and represent the university when required. Nor should people be appointed to councils solely as a reward for generous donations or just because of extensive networks. Membership of the governing body should involve dedicated hard work.

The Corporations Act has what is known as the “business judgement rule” which requires directors of a company to inform themselves about matters upon which they are to make judgements. It would be appropriate for governing body members to have a similar duty.
Members of the governing body need appropriate skills and background knowledge. There is scope to be more explicit in the Governance Protocols about the qualifications and experience requirements for the members who must have financial expertise.

If universities need to pay governing body members to attract people with the necessary skills and commitment, then this is something all universities should consider.

Elected members must make decisions in the best interests of the university as a whole, rather than representing the interests of a particular constituency. This is not a simple issue, because elected members can bring important perspectives to the governing body’s deliberations, and the views of their electors and the overall best interests of the university are not necessarily incompatible. But elected members must put the university’s overall interests first.

It is worth considering whether it would be preferable to have a smaller governing body with advisory bodies comprising those representing specific interest groups.

It is intolerable to have an instance where one university has to withhold confidential documents from its council members because it expected them to be leaked to the media. (I say this as a member of Cabinet!) Universities’ enabling legislation should impose on governing body members the duty to maintain confidentiality and prohibit improper use of information.

Council meetings must be a challenging time for senior executive staff – for them to know that they must be thoroughly prepared for the meeting and have the facts ready. In particular, the Chief Financial Officer should expect a tough grilling about the university budget! Of course, the governing body should not conduct fishing expeditions or interrogations, but if there are real problems it should be aware of them. No-one should ever see the governing body as a rubber stamp.

While on the subject of university finances, governing bodies might need to take a more proactive role in looking at the management of assets.

My department’s Institution Assessment Framework data has suggested that some universities may not be making enough provision for maintenance, and that in time they may face significant costs to bring their facilities up to a satisfactory standard. The National Governance Protocols could be strengthened to require the governing body to approve a strategic asset management plan.

Delegations of governing body responsibilities should be granted with care. Governing bodies are still accountable for delegated matters and should require some form of report on the exercise of the delegation. Governing bodies should not be able to delegate responsibility for decisions that have the potential to affect the financial viability of the university.

Governing bodies need information. They must have statistical data and performance indicators so that they know how their university is faring. I think that the Annual Report approved by the governing body should report on performance indicators set by the governing body. The governing body should be required to consider performance and comparative performance data produced by my department. Enormous effort goes into supplying data by institutions and I would like to see it better utilised.

Governing bodies may need upgraded Secretariats, to provide this information and advice on responsibilities and legal issues. I suggest it should be mandatory that there be a council secretary or similar officer separate to the Vice-Chancellor or Chief Executive Officer.

I would like to see service beyond about 8 years become rare. Whatever the skills and benefits long-serving members have delivered, there comes a time to move on and make room for fresh ideas. Membership shouldn’t just roll over year after year because of entrenched expectation.
Maintaining a dynamic vitality, a creative tension is important in any governing body.

There is a need for further improvements in the oversight of controlled entities. It is not good when an Auditor-General comments that a university’s finance department “identified two new controlled entities during the 2005 financial reporting process that it had not previously been aware of.” Governing bodies need to be rigorous in providing this oversight, as the National Governance Protocols require.

With regard to the size of governing bodies, I don’t think the limit of 22 in the National Governance Protocols has gone far enough. Good practice models suggest that 10 to 15 members is the ideal size for such a body – large enough to benefit from a diversity of viewpoints, while small enough to facilitate effective decision making.

My inclination is to have a limit of 14 that must continue to have a majority of external independent members who are neither enrolled as a student nor employed by the higher education provider. Specialists can be invited for particular information or additional perspectives on issues.

In recent months I have spoken of the need for greater diversity in the university sector in Australia. Some commentators have suggested that I am overlooking a great deal of diversity that already exists. I do recognise that there is a level of diversity, but there is a need for more.

By focussing on the things they do really well, and putting more of their resources into their strengths, universities will provide higher quality outcomes and improve their standing in an increasingly competitive international environment. Being just average in most things will not be good enough in the medium and longer term.

Governing bodies should lead their universities in setting their directions in this regard. It would be a valuable enhancement of the National Governance Protocols to require the governing body to take the distinctive role of the institution into account in approving the mission and strategic direction, annual budget and business plan. What is distinctive about my university’s course offerings, mode of delivery, mission, what do we do best? What will make my university competitive?

I am watching developments in relation to university governance with great interest, and I may need to change the Protocols to deliver the reforms they were designed to bring about. But I do not see the Protocols as the only driver.

University Chancellors are taking a much more proactive role than in previous years – they are engaging more systematically with their universities, and with other Chancellors. Their statements and activities in relation to their universities are being much more frequently reported in the media, and they are leaders rather than figureheads. Chancellors have a vital, if not lead role to play in enhancing the philanthropic and alumni efforts of our universities.

What the Australian Government is seeking to bring about is a change of culture within university governing bodies. While there has been much movement in the right direction, cultural change cannot be expected to occur overnight because it involves shifting attitudes, and attitudes can be notoriously hard to shift.

There’s no shortage of advice in this portfolio, and I am often reminded of the reporting demands placed on universities by the Government.
There will always be accountability requirements – with more than $7.8 billion of taxpayers’ money paid by the Australian Government to the higher education sector each year, that is only fair. But if the Government can be confident that universities are responding to the diverse educational and research needs of the nation, there is less need to prescribe requirements to universities. A high standard of governance is a key component of this quality assurance.

Federal, state and territory education ministers have agreed to a review of the impact of the National Governance Protocols and the scope for their enhancement. The review is to report to ministers in 2007.

I will be raising with state and territory ministers a number of the issues I have mentioned today, to be considered for inclusion in a revised set of Protocols. At the same time I will of course welcome the ideas of people on governing bodies or within the universities. Certain changes will be needed, but I would also like to consider constructive suggestions from those who are committed to the improvement of university governance.

The Australian Government’s role in the governance of universities
I would have hoped that as billion dollar enterprises that are now educating a record number of students – almost one million students - universities would have had governance best practice as an important organisational goal.

The Crossroads review showed otherwise - that university governance practices were dangerously unwieldy and inappropriate, and so the National Governance Protocols became a necessity.

The Australian Government has provided an opportunity for universities to improve their governance – an incentive to seek best practice. For some universities, this has proven an invaluable contribution to their strategic management. For others, there is still a long way to go.

I trust that in the course of this conference, you will consider a range of opportunities for enhancing governance arrangements within your universities, and learn from each other’s experiences and initiatives.

Thank you
REPORT OF THE DEPUTY VICE CHANCELLOR (RESEARCH)

This item will be distributed separately.
CHANCELLOR’S CONFERENCE & GOVERNANCE CONFERENCE

There is no separate paper for this item.
CHANCELLOR’S CONFERENCE & GOVERNANCE CONFERENCE

There is no separate paper for this item.
Date of meeting: Wednesday, 06/09/2006

Present: Em. Prof. Geoffrey Bolton (Chair)

Prof. John Yovich (Vice Chancellor)  Ms Alison Gaines
Mr Brian Aitken  Mr Gerry Georgatos
Ms Janice Bowra  Mr Garry Hunt
Prof. Stuart Bradley  Mr Tony Ianello
Mr Terry Budge  Assoc. Prof. Jim Macbeth
Prof. Nick Costa  Ms Shirley McPherson

Secretary: Jeremy Rigg

Observers
Prof. Yianni Attikiouzel
Mr Brett Blacker
Mr Ian Callahan (DVC – Corporate)
Ms Stefanie Dobro
Mr Reece Harley
Mr Lloyd Johnson
Prof. Gary Martin (DVC – Enterprise & International)
Prof. Jan Thomas (DVC – Academic)
Prof. Arnold Depickere

Apologies
Prof. Michael Borowitzka (President, Academic Council), Mr Mal Bradley, Assoc. Prof. Michael Campion, Mr Philip Hocking, Ms Carolyn Jakobsen, Mr Malcolm Macpherson, Judge Kate O’Brien, Prof. Jim Reynoldson, Prof Andris Stelbovics (DVC – Research).

Meeting commenced at: 4:35 pm

1. MEMBERSHIP & ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1.1 The Senate wishes to thank Mr Malcolm Macpherson, whose term expires on 10/09/2006, for his excellent contribution to Senate over the past nine years.

1.2 The Chancellor informed Senate of the passing of Dr Michael Booth, senior lecturer in Psychology and Philosophy of Science at ISTP. Dr Booth was a valued teacher and great colleague and Senate extends its sympathy and condolences to his family.

Resolved: S/33/2006 (i) To express to Mr Malcolm Macpherson Senate’s great appreciation of his efforts as a member of Senate.

(ii) To express Senate’s condolences to the family of Dr Michael Booth.

2. APOLOGIES

2.1 Mr Mal Bradley, Mr Philip Hocking, Ms Carolyn Jakobsen, Mr Malcolm Macpherson, Judge Kate O’Brien.

2.2 Mr Mal Bradley sought leave of absence for this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting to be held 29/11/06 due to work commitments.
Resolved: To grant leave of absence during the months of September and November 2006 to Mr Mal Bradley, pursuant to Senate standing order 2.2.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
None.

4. AUQA AUDIT REPORT
The Vice Chancellor updated Senate on the AUQA Audit report which was released on 05/09/2006. The report reflected positively on Murdoch’s self review and internal quality processes, as well as Prof Jan Thomas, who steered the exercise.

The report was well received by the media and the various items highlighted in the report will be followed up by an implementation committee.

5. SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR 2006
The Chancellor requested all Senate members note the remaining Senate Committee meetings for 2006, and encouraged attendance to ensure all meetings are quorate.

6. VICE CHANCELLOR’S REPORT
The Vice Chancellor spoke to his report to Senate. Key items included:

- The new enterprise bargaining agreements were approved by staff in the recent ballot. The University, staff and the unions have all worked well together to achieve this excellent result;
- Arrangements for the allocation of the various Commonwealth funding pools continue to be in a state of flux. The University’s role in the Innovative Research Universities Australia (IRUA) group has been invaluable, supporting effective and prompt responses to Federal Government requests and initiatives;
- The launch of the WA Biotechnology Industry Development Strategy at the on-campus State Agricultural Biotechnology Centre on 10/08/2006 was an excellent opportunity for the University. The State will be distributing a significant amount of research funding over the next four years and the University has made a submission regarding this.
- Minister McTiernan recently launched of the Draft Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan. The plan is open for comment over the next 2 months. The infusion of residential space and activity into the Murdoch area will be a good result overall for the University.
- The University maintained its 5 star teaching rating, as marked by the Good Universities Guide, making it 11 out of 12 years. The University also achieved 5 stars for research intensivity.

It was moved that Senate approve the recommendations made at the conclusion of the Vice Chancellor’s report.

Resolved: (i) To approve the re-appointment of Ms Karen Brown, Mr Terry Budge and Mr Richard Alder as trustees of the Murdoch University Foundation for a further term of three years expiring on 05/09/2009.
(ii) To appoint Emeritus Professor Kat Longley as a trustee of the Murdoch University Foundation for a term of three years expiring on 05/09/2009.

7. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES
   7.1 Senate confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 12/07/2006.
   7.2 Senate noted the report of action on resolutions passed at the previous meeting.

8. ACADEMIC COUNCIL
   Senate noted the minutes of the Academic Council meeting held on 19/07/2006. There were no recommendations to Senate.

9. AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
   The minutes of the Audit and Risk Management Committee meeting held on 28/08/2006 were not distributed at Senate and will be distributed to Senate members week commencing 11/09/2006. There were no recommendations to Senate.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE
   Senate noted the minutes of the Environmental Committee meeting held on 17/08/2006. There were no recommendations to Senate.

11. HONORARY AWARDS AND CEREMONIAL COMMITTEE
   Senate noted the minutes of the Honorary Awards and Ceremonial Committee meeting held on 10/08/2006. There were no recommendations to Senate.

12. LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
   Senate noted the minutes of the Legislation Committee meeting held on 01/09/2006.
   and resolved the following:

   **Resolved:**
   S/36/2006
   To approve the amendments to the following legislation:

   (i) Certificate Regulation 1(d) *(mark ups attached)*
   (ii) Diploma Regulation 1(1)(c) *(mark ups attached)*
   (iii) Bachelor Degree Regulations 18.(2), 25 and 28 *(mark ups attached)*
   (iv) Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 1.(1) and 2.(1) *(mark ups attached)*
   (v) Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 24 (3) and (4) *(mark ups attached)*

   **Resolved:**
   S/37/2006
   To approve the amendments to the Election Regulations *(mark ups attached)*

   **Resolved:**
   S/38/2006
   To approve the amendments to the Post Graduate Research Degrees Regulations *(mark ups attached)*

   **Resolved:**
   S/39/2006
   To approve the amendments to Statute No 18 - Intellectual Property *(mark ups attached)*

   Secretary's
   In accordance with section 25 of the *Murdoch University Act*, an absolute majority of Senate must ratify the amendment to this Statute. Items 7 to 15 were put to Senate for a vote and
Note: absolute majority was received, with the twelve members present passing the resolutions unanimously.

Resolved: To approve the amendments to the Intellectual Property Regulations (mark ups attached)
S/40/2006

13. RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Senate noted the minutes of the Resources Committee meeting held on 22/08/2006 and resolved the following:

Resolved: To approve the write-off of $42,953.02 as at 30 June 2006.
S/41/2006

Resolved: To approve the write-off of $11,921.72 representing obsolete text books and stationery as at 31 July 2006.
S/42/2006

Resolved: To approve the attached payments for the period 17/05/2006 to 20/06/2006 inclusive.
S/43/2006

14. OFFICIAL SEAL

Senate noted the official seal register.

15. GUILD OF STUDENTS PRESENTATION

The Guild President spoke to Senate about the changes and current programmes adopted by the Guild of Students in 2006. Key issues raised by the President were:

> Student poverty;
> Loss of revenue as a result of voluntary student unionism (VSU); and
> The new financial and management programmes implemented by the Guild.

The Senate members were most impressed by the hard work and enthusiasm of the President and his team and warmly congratulated him on his achievements in 2006. In particular, the Guild’s sound financial management, the undertaking of social equity initiatives (such as the donations of used computers to African countries) and focus on student amenities was supported.

16. CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - STUDENT ACCOMODATION

All observers left the Senate room

Senate dealt with this item in camera. See the separate, confidential minute of this item.

Meeting concluded at: 6:10pm

Signed as a true record of the meeting of the Senate held on 06/09/2006.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR GEOFFREY BOLTON - CHAIR

Dated: October, 2006
Date: Wednesday, 13 September 2006

Present: Professor Michael Borowitzka (Chair)
Prof John Yovich (Vice Chancellor)

Ms Bee Lay Addis
Prof Yianni Attikiouzel
Assoc Prof Parisa Bahri
Dr Robert Bennett
Mr Malcolm Bradley
Prof Stuart Bradley
Ms Melanie Burkhardt
Prof Arnold Depickere
Mr Gerry Georgatos
Ms Deborah Hamblin
Mr David Holloway
Dr Cassandra James

Dr Judy MacCallum
Mrs Carolyn Jones
Assoc Prof Dora Marinova
Dr Rhonda Marriott
Assoc Prof John Pluske
Prof Jim Reynoldsor
Ms Katy Stanlake
Prof Andris Stelbovics
Dr Anne Surma
Prof Jan Thomas
Prof Iain Walker

Apologies: Prof Gary Martin, Dr Rajasundram Sathiendrakumar, Mr Matt Vapor

Secretary: Mr Jeremy Rigg

Official Attendee: Assoc Prof David Macey, Mr Darren Munday

MEMBERSHIP

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the President welcomed the new members to their first meeting of Council: Dr Cassandra James, Dr Judy MacCallum, Prof Stuart Bradley and Dr Robert Bennett. The President acknowledged the re-election of Deputy Chair, Assoc Prof Parisa Bahri. The President noted that Secretary to Council, Ms Gerry Dunne had resigned from the University, and that Mr Jeremy Rigg, General Counsel and University Secretary, would be Acting Secretary for this meeting.

1. DECISION BY CIRCULATION

In accordance with Standing Order 10 of the Standing Orders for Academic Council and Subordinate Bodies, and as foreshadowed in Council’s 19 July 2006 meeting minutes the proposed membership for the Measurement of Excellence in Learning & Teaching Working Party and for the Recognition of Excellence in Teaching Working Party were considered by circulation. An absolute majority of members supported the recommendations, with the decision effective Monday, 21 August 2006.

Resolved: AC/113/2006
(i) to approve the following membership for the Measurement of Excellence in Learning & Teaching Working Party to report, at the latest, by the March 2007 meeting:

Dr Rick Cummings (Chair)
Ms Christina Ballantyne  
Dr Robert Bennett  
Dr Pyara Dhillon  
Mrs Carolyn Jones  
Ms Hilary MacDougall  
Assoc. Prof. Dora Marinova  
Prof Jan Thomas (ex officio)  
Guild President or nominee

(ii) to approve the following membership for the Recognition of Excellence in Teaching Working Party to report, at the latest, by the March 2007 meeting:

Prof Michael Borowitzka (Chair)  
Dr Nancy Ault  
Dr Martin Cake  
Dr Judith MacCallum  
Prof Gabriel Moens  
Dr Angus Morrison-Saunders  
Prof Jan Thomas (ex officio)  
Dr Jennifer Weir

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2006 were confirmed.

3. 2005 SPAQ PRESENTATION – EXECUTIVE DEAN, DIVISION OF ARTS

Professor Arnold Depickere spoke to the Division’s 2005 SPAQ Report. There were no questions on notice regarding the written report. Key points included:

- Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) was not included in the report due to staff and management changes at the school during the relevant period. An update to the SPAQ report including SSH will be provided in due course.
- There has been a downturn in the IT industry over recent years, which is reflected in decreasing trends in GDS and Course Load indicators for IT. On the plus side, CEQ satisfaction scores and first preferences intake for IT are the highest in WA.
- Law is entering a period of unprecedented competition in WA. The school is seeking to address this challenge with a focus on enhancing its postgraduate and professional education offerings, and forging new links internationally.
- Business continues to have strong links internationally, and has improved on CEQ scores and first preferences.
- MCC also has strong international links, but there are decreasing trends in CEQ and GDS that need to be addressed, in part by forging stronger links with industry.
- ISTP continues to score highly on student satisfaction scores, and has improved its research completion rates and times.

Prof Depickere thanked the Divisional Heads of School for their assistance with the report.

A query was raised in relation to the report information on revitalisation of courses from the Division of Arts. Prof Depickere understood that this information had been
provided to Council. The President advised that this will be included on the agenda for the next Council meeting.

4. **2005 SPAQ PRESENTATION – EXECUTIVE DEAN, DIVISION OF HEALTH SCIENCES**

Professor Jim Reynoldson spoke to the Division’s 2005 SPAQ Report. There were no questions on notice regarding the written report. Key points included:

- There has been a 46% growth in student load since 2001, largely from the new schools of Chiropractic, Nursing and Pharmacy.
- Chiropractic, Vet and Nursing attract a high number of mature age students, which can present a problem in meeting load targets given the credits and exemptions that are granted.
- Trends in student progress rate and drop out rate for the Division are improving as against University wide trends.
- The figures for student to staff ratios are generally stable, but there are anomalies for the new schools given the investment and development involved.
- GDS data shows an increase in the percentage of students moving to further study.
- The research degree data is difficult to interpret, with a “lumpy” distribution of student entries, but it appears that there is capacity to increase numbers.
- Significant work has been done in relation to new and improved facilities, including a model dispensary for Pharmacy, the Chiropractic clinic, a CT scanner for Vet, and further work is underway for Stage 2 of the Peel campus for Nursing.

Given the increased numbers of mature age students, there was some discussion as to whether a shift in the entry criteria for Vet from TES based entry to entry based on completion of a year of tertiary studies should be considered. There was also a suggestion that the CEQ data for the Vet school should be examined more closely, given the significance of this school.

Prof Reynoldson acknowledged the assistance of the Divisional Heads of School, administrative staff with the Division, Office of Policy & Planning and the Teaching and Learning Centre in preparing his report.

5. **REPORT ON THE POSTGRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT**

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) spoke to the report on the PPE project. Key points included:

- It is recognised that there are issues with demand and retention in the University’s postgraduate offerings, and this is an area that needs a strategic focus if we are to remain competitive.
- There are three main focus areas for the project, being the improvement of current postgraduate offerings, the introduction of concurrent undergrad and postgrad awards, and development of professional short courses.
- Concurrent awards would be offered to high achieving students interested in undertaking postgraduate units during summer or winter terms.
It is apparent that some students do not feel that their needs as postgrads are adequately considered. Steps proposed to address this include:

- revising course structures to limit or remove the use of double coded units.
- clarifying the prerequisites for postgrad units to create a greater distinction between undergrad and postgrad courses.
- developing regulations and policies that are specific to postgrad courses.

A new Director, Postgraduate and Professional Education has been appointed, and this will assist by enabling a centralised approach to be taken to these issues.

A number of queries were raised in relation to the introduction of concurrent awards, in relation to the impact upon staff and existing postgraduate students. The DVC(A) clarified that the overriding objective is to maintain a high quality offering that students and staff want to be involved in. The postgrad award offered may or may not be within the undergrad discipline, depending on the needs of the students and school. Selected staff will be invited to participate in the units over the additional terms, and it is not intended to be rolled out as a large scale initiative. Students will only be able to graduate with the postgrad award upon completion of the undergrad award.

There was general discussion in relation to double coded units, and it was noted that in some circumstances, there may be some benefits in having units with a mix of postgraduate and undergraduate students (such as mentoring of undergraduate students, and exposing postgraduate students to different ideas or competencies).

Council members are asked to provide feedback as requested throughout the report, in order for recommendations to be brought back to Council for approval at the next meeting on 1 November 2006.

The DVC(A) thanked Ms Tamara Martin for her assistance with this project.

6. REPORT ON THE EQUITY QUALITY ASSISTED LEARNING (EQAL) PLAN

Ms Helen Makeham, Disability Liaison Officer, tabled a paper on the Equity Quality Assisted Learning (EQAL) plan to Council, as well as the 2006 Disability Access Plan and the 2006-2001 Strategic Implementation Plan for Disability Access and Inclusion. Ms Makeham spoke to the EQAL paper. Key points included:

- There are now over 700 students registered with a disability that may affect their studies. There is an increasing number of students with psychiatric disorders or learning difficulties, as well as increased numbers with more than one condition affecting their studies.
- It is hoped that the introduction of EQAL plans will enhance communication across the University divisions on access issues, and act as a “passport” for students to provide access in a range of areas.
- A sample EQAL plan and flowchart for the process of developing EQAL plans is provided in the appendices to the paper tabled at Council.

Council members were requested to provide feedback on the EQAL paper on or before close of business on 29 September.

Secretary’s note: Due to an oversight within the Secretariat, Ms Makeham’s slides were not available for presentation at the meeting but were circulated to Council members on 14/09/2006.
7. REPORT ON 2007 ON-LINE TUTORIAL ENROLMENTS

Mr Darren Munday, Director, Central Student Administration, spoke to the report on 2007 on-line tutorial enrolments. Key points included:

- The pilot program of on-line enrolment in Foundation Units that has operated in 2006 to date had received very positive feedback, and it is intended to roll out the system University wide for 2007.
- The recommendations within the report are proposed as rules for the system to ensure its consistent operation.
- Instruction manuals will be developed to enable staff to access the system to change enrolment details. Students will be automatically notified of changes by e-mail.

A query was raised about the fairness of the system operating on a “first in, first served” basis, as opposed to the “preferential” system used manually. It was noted that Unit Coordinators will be able to make changes manually, and will have the discretion to deal with particular student needs.

Council resolved to adopt the recommendations in the report, with one minor change of wording in the first recommendation.

Resolved: To adopt recommendations of Central Student Administration that:

AC/114/2006
(i) the Callista Attend system be adopted for the selection of all tutorials, workshops and laboratories by students for all units;
(ii) the Callista Attend activity enrolment limits be set as follows:
    Tutorials – 15,
    Laboratories – Room capacity,
    Workshops – Room capacity;
(iii) the Callista Attend availability for standard Semester 1 units be set as follows:
    Part II units – Enrolment available from mid-January 2007,
    Part I units – Enrolment available from commencement of Orientation week

8. TRENDS IN ACADEMIC ORGANISATIONAL UNIT REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT AND ACTION PLAN

The President advised that this item would be held over to the following meeting of Council on 1 November 2006.

9. 2007 ACADEMIC PLANNING REPORT

The Academic Policy Committee’s seventh report on new courses and amendments to existing courses, majors and minors was noted by Council. The Supplementary Agenda item regarding the Academic Policy Committee’s recommendations in relation to the proposed new Bachelor of Planning was also noted. Council resolved to
Resolved: AC/115/2006

(i) to approve the introduction in 2007 of the Bachelor of Environmental Management, with the structure as attached and located within the Division of Science and Engineering;

(ii) to approve the availability of Honours within the Bachelor of Environmental Management; and

(iii) to RECOMMEND to Senate to amend the following regulation as indicated below [additions in bold]:

Bachelor Degree Regulation 1. (1)

Insert: Bachelor of Environmental Management (BEnvMan)

(iv) to approve the introduction in 2007 of the Master of Arts in Education for Sustainability, with the structure as attached and located within the Division of Arts;

(v) to RECOMMEND to Senate to amend the following regulation as indicated below [additions in bold]:

Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 2. (1)

Insert: Master of Arts in Education for Sustainability 48 points

(vi) to approve the introduction in 2007 of the Master of Laws (Coursework), with the structure as attached and located within the Division of Arts;

(vii) to RECOMMEND to Senate to amend the following regulation as indicated below [additions in bold]:

Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 2. (1)

Insert: Master of Laws 24 points

(viii) subject to receiving sign-off from the Executive Deans Arts, Health Sciences and Science and Engineering and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) to approve the introduction in January 2007 of the Bachelor of Planning, located within the Division of Art and as per the structure as attached to the Supplementary Agenda to Academic Council;

(ix) to approve availability of Honours within the Bachelor of Planning;

(x) to RECOMMEND to Senate to amend the following regulation as indicated below [additions in bold]:

Bachelor Degree Regulation 1.(1)

Insert: Bachelor of Planning (BPlanning)

10. VICE CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

The Vice Chancellor spoke to his written report. Key points included:

➢ It is apparent from the recently released AUQA that the University’s self-review aligned with the views of the audit team, which was a good result. The report was well received by the media, and will be followed up by an implementation committee and sub-committees of Council.
Arrangements for the allocation of the various Commonwealth funding pools are yet to be resolved. Prof Andris Stelbovics will be the IRUA representative in relation to RQF issues.

The awarding of the HERDSA Fellowship to Rob Phillips is an excellent achievement.

The launch of the WA Biotechnology Industry Development Strategy at the on-campus State Agricultural Biotechnology Centre presents an excellent opportunity for the University in this sector.

Minister McTiernan recently launched the Murdoch precinct plan, which is also good news for the University. The Department of Industry and Resources and Health Department developments around the Murdoch precinct are supportive of the University, and proposed developments on campus support the precinct.

Resolved: To commend the efforts of Professor Jan Thomas, Ms Jane Michell, and all University staff involved in preparing the AUQA report.

AC/116/2006

11. AWARD OF DEGREES, DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES

Divisional Boards and the Research and Development Board have recommended that degrees, diplomas and certificates be awarded to the students listed on the document attached as attached to the Agenda. Also attached are thesis details for candidates recommended for the award of a research degrees.

Resolved: To approve the award of degrees, diplomas and certificates on the list as attached to the agenda.

AC/117/2006

12. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO UNIT OFFERINGS POLICY

The policy on the cancellation of units with small enrolments authorises Executive Deans to determine that a unit is exempt from cancellation, even though the unit has small numbers, on the basis of ‘strategic’ grounds. The audit of Course and Unit Enrolments conducted by the Office of Internal Audit recommended that further guidance be provided to Academic Divisions on what constitutes acceptable “strategic reasons”.

It was agreed that the President of Academic Council recommend to Council that the Unit Offerings policy be amended by adding to Clause 3.2. Amendments to the policy can be seen as additions in bold.

As the Unit Offerings policy has been amended within the 6 months prior to the meeting, this item was put to the vote, and all members of Council present agreed to the resolution, satisfying the requirement for an absolute majority in accordance with Standing Orders for Academic Council and Subordinate Bodies Clause 30.

Resolved: (i) To approve the revised ‘Unit Offerings’ policy as attached to the agenda; and

AC/118/2006

(ii) To rescind the ‘Unit Offerings ’ policy as approved by AC/50/2006.
13. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO DISCONTINUATION OF COURSES, MAJORS, MINORS AND UNITS POLICY

Academic Policy Committee recommended changes the Discontinuation of Courses, Majors, Minors and Units Policy to ensure staff implications are considered, that consultation occurs with those responsible for other courses impacted upon by discontinuations and to bring the policy up to date.

A query was raised in relation to the proposed change to clause 4.3 of the policy, to make consultation in relation to discontinued units mandatory, and in particular, whether equivalent wording should be included within clause 2 on majors, and clause 3 on minors.

Discussion ensued and it was agreed the item should be held over for consideration of this issue and review at a subsequent meeting of Council.

14. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS & PROBATIONARY REVIEW POLICIES

The proposed amendments are to the Appeals process and structure of the Appeals Committee membership. The main change is to the Promotions policies to reflect the appeal process will now happen before the Vice Chancellor makes the final decision. Changes have been identified through “Track Changes”.

The President noted that the copy attached to the agenda contained erroneous references to “the official observer of the union”, which should be corrected to refer to “the process observer appointed by Academic Council”. Subject to making these corrections, the President recommended that the proposed amendments be made.

As the Academic Promotions & Probationary Review Policy has been amended within the 6 months prior to the meeting, this item was put to the vote, and all members of Council present agreed to the resolution, satisfying the requirement for an absolute majority in accordance with Standing Orders for Academic Council and Subordinate Bodies Clause 30.

Resolved: To ratify the actions of the President in RECOMMENDING to the Vice Chancellor to approve the following:

AC/119/2006

(i) Academic Staff Probationary Review Policies and Procedures

(ii) Academic Staff Promotions and Probation Policy – Part 1 Promotion to Lecturer (Level B)

(iii) Academic Staff Promotions and Probation Policy – Part 2 Promotion to Lecturer (Level C)

(iv) Academic Staff Promotions and Probation Policy – Part 3 Promotion to Lecturer (Level D)

(v) Academic Staff Promotions and Probation Policy – Part 4 Promotion to Lecturer (Level E)

15. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT STUDY CONTRACTS POLICY
(formerly Independent Study Contracts in Undergraduates Degrees policy)

Following a review from the Academic Policy Committee’s Postgraduate Independent Study Contracts Working Party, APC agreed to recommend to Academic Council
revised documentation to include both undergraduate and postgraduate ISC students.

Additions in **bold**, deletions **struck through**.

**Resolved:**

(i) To approve the ‘Independent Study Contracts’ policy, application form and guide, as attached to the agenda; and

(ii) To rescind the ‘Independent Study Contracts in Undergraduate Degrees’ policy, application form and guide as previously approved via resolution AC/97/2004.

**16. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BACHELOR DEGREE REGULATION 1.1(1)**

A request to Callista has provided data on courses that have been discontinued and have zero enrolments. These are now able to be removed from Bachelor Degree Regulation 1 (1).

**Resolved:**

To **RECOMMEND** to Senate to amend the Bachelor Degree Regulation 1.1(1) as outlined below [deletions **struck through**]:

Bachelor of Animal Science (BAnimSc), Bachelor of Applied Economics (BAppEcon), Bachelor of Applied Information Technology (BAppIT), Bachelor of Applied Science (BAppSc), Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Asian Area Studies (BAAS), Bachelor of Asian Studies (BAsianSt), Bachelor of Asian Studies (Specialist) (BAsianSt), Bachelor of Biotechnology (BBiot), Bachelor of Business Administration (BBusAdmin), Bachelor of Business Informatics (BbusInformatics), Bachelor of Business Information Technology Studies (BBusITSt), Bachelor of Chiropractic (BChiro), Bachelor of Commerce (BCom), Bachelor of Community Studies (BCommSt), Bachelor of Computer Studies (BCompSt), Bachelor of Development Studies (BDevSt), Bachelor of Divinity (BD), Bachelor of Economics (BEcon), Bachelor of Education (BED), Bachelor of Education Studies (BEdSt), Bachelor of Engineering (BE), Bachelor of Engineering Science (BEngSc), Bachelor of Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA), Bachelor of Environmental Science (BEnvSc), Bachelor of Extractive Metallurgy (BExtMet), Bachelor of Finance and Economics (BFinEc), Bachelor of Health Sciences (BHSc), Bachelor of Information Systems Studies (BInfoSysSt), Bachelor of International Business (BIB), Bachelor of Journalism (BJour), Bachelor of Laws (LLB), Bachelor of Legal Studies (BLS), Bachelor of Literature and Communication (BLitComm), Bachelor of Marketing and the Media (BMM), Bachelor of Media Production (BMedPr), Bachelor of MultiMedia (BMMedia), Bachelor of Nursing (BNurs), Bachelor of Nursing Conversion (BNursConv), Bachelor of Policy Studies (BPoSt), Bachelor of Professional Studies (Education) (BProfSt), Bachelor of Psychology (BPsych), Bachelor of Science (BSc), Bachelor of Technology (BTech), Bachelor of Theology (BTheol), Bachelor of Tourism (BTour), Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery (BVMS), Bachelor of Women’s Studies (BWomSt).
17. **MEMBERSHIP – COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE (CUE)**

The Membership of CUE includes at least one person who is an elected member of Academic Council (AC/160/2005).

Dr Robert Bennett, whose term expires at the beginning of semester 2, 2007, has recently been elected a member of Academic Council. This satisfies the requirement that one of the appointees must also be an elected member of Academic Council.

Resolved: To note that Dr Robert Bennett is the member of the Committee on University Entrance that is also an elected member of Academic Council.

18. **MEMBERSHIP – ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

Following the resignation of Professor Pritam Singh, representing the Division of Science & Engineering, from the Assessment Committee the Executive Dean nominated Associate Professor Glenn Hefter to fill the casual vacancy. This appointment was approved by the President of Academic Council.

Resolved: To ratify the actions of the President in approving the appointment of Associate Professor Glenn Hefter from the Division of Science & Engineering to the Assessment Committee with his term of office expiring on 31 December 2007 (replacing Professor Pritam Singh).

19. **MEMBERSHIP – ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

The membership of the Academic Policy Committee (APC) includes the appointment of two persons from the Division of Arts, one from the Division of Health Sciences and one from the Division of Science and Engineering (Divisional appointees). Associate Professor Dominic Gasbarro was appointed to APC in June 2004 as one of the representatives from the Division of Arts, however, has had to resign from APC due to an increase in teaching commitments. The President has liaised with the Executive Dean of the Division of Arts and received a nomination to fill the casual vacancy.

Resolved: To appoint the Dr Vernon Nase (School of Law) to the Academic Policy Committee, with his term of office expiring at the commencement of second semester 2007 (replacing Assoc Prof Dominic Gasbarro).

20. **REVISIONS TO SCHEDULE FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AND ACADEMIC QUALITY (SPAQ) 2005 REPORTS**

As foreshadowed in the minutes of the last meeting the schedule for presentation of 2005 SPAQ (AC/44/2006) has been altered to enable the provision of more timely information. Members are asked to ratify the revised schedule.

Resolved: To adopt the following amended reporting schedule for Strategic Planning and Academic Quality (SPAQ) reports.
21. **2005 STRATEGIC PLANNING & ACADEMIC QUALITY (SPAQ) REPORTS**

The revised timetable for SPAQ Reports, as proposed in the preceding item, provides that the written reports from the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), Deputy Vice Chancellor (Enterprise & International) and the Executive Dean of the Division of Science & Engineering be circulated with the agenda papers for this meeting, with verbal presentations to be given at the 1 November 2006 meeting.

The reports from the DVC (A) and Executive Dean of the Division of Science & Engineering will be included in a supplementary agenda that will be tabled at the meeting. The report from the DVC (E&I) will be circulated electronically by 9 October 2006 as data for his SPAQ report is not available at this time.

Any questions on notice for the Deputy Vice Chancellors or Executive Dean should be submitted in writing to the Secretary to Council by noon on Monday 23 October 2006.

22. **2007 MEETING DATES**

A query was made as to whether it was possible to shift the proposed meetings for April and July 2007 so as to not coincide with school holidays. It was noted that Council meeting dates are in part dependent upon proposed dates for Senate, the that the two sets of meeting dates would need to be looked at in conjunction.

Council agreed to approve the proposed dates, and to provide feedback at next meeting on 1 November 2006.

**Resolved:** To approve the following meeting dates for Academic Council for 2007:

AC/126/2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC(R) report circulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation DVC(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Deans Arts &amp; Health Sciences reports circulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation – Executive Deans Arts &amp; Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC(A), DVC(E&amp;I), Executive Dean Science &amp; Engineering reports circulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations – Executive Dean Science &amp; Engineering, DVC(A) and DVC(E&amp;I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. **UNITS SUBJECT TO QUOTA AND RESTRICTED COURSES 2007**

A consolidated list is attached for information.

**Resolved:**

To note the consolidated list of restricted courses, admission only restricted courses and quotaed units for 2007.

*AC/127/2006*

**24. SENATE**

At its meeting on 6 September 2006 Senate approved the first five of the recommendations listed below, with the sixth being approved by Senate by way of circular resolution on 10 August 2006. These recommendations were generated from the Academic Council meetings of 12 April 2006, 17 May 2006, 14 June 2006 and 19 July 2006.

- Certificate Regulation 1.(d) – insert new courses
- Diploma Regulations 1.1 (c) – insert new courses
- Bachelor Degree Regulations 18, 25 and 28 – clarification in relation to minors
- Master by Coursework Degree Regulations 1.(1) and 2.(1) – insert new course
- Postgraduate Research Degrees Regulations – redrafting and update
- Student Appeals Committee Regulation 6 – Committee membership

**25. OTHER BUSINESS**

The President acknowledged the significant contribution Ms Gerry Dunne had made to Council and the University as Secretary to Council.

**Resolved:**

To formally express Council’s thanks to Ms Gerry Dunne for the significant contribution to the business of Academic Council in her role as Secretary to Council.

*AC/128/2006*

Meeting concluded at 4:30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE MEETING DATES</th>
<th>DOCUMENT DEADLINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 1 November 2006</td>
<td>Friday 20 October 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed as a true record of the meeting of the Academic Council held on 13 September 2006.

**PROFESSOR MICHAEL BOROWITZKA - CHAIR**

Dated:
AGENDA ITEM 10

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

This item will be distributed separately.
Date: Thursday 29 September 2006
Time: 11:30 am
Venue: Vice-Chancellor’s Dining Room, Chancellery Building
Present: The Chancellor (Chair)
           Professor Nick Costa  Professor John Yovich
           Mr Philip Hocking
Secretary: Mr Jeremy Rigg
Apologies: Ms Alison Gaines, Mr Nathan Giles, Professor Tom Lyons,
           Professor Simone Volet
Official attendees: Nil
Observers: Nil

MINUTES

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
   Nil.

2. MINUTES
   Subject to the correction of a minor typographical error in item 4, the Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 10/08/2006.

3. HONORARY DEGREES
   The Chancellor updated the Committee in relation to the nominations of Professor Marilyn Renfree and Professor Stuart Macintyre for the awarding of honorary degrees, as raised at the previous Committee meeting. It was resolved to award both Professor Renfree and Professor Macintyre honorary Doctorates.

   The Committee reviewed the nominations of Dr Godfrey Barrett-Lennard and Mr Peter Trefort for honorary degrees. It was resolved to award Dr Barrett-Lennard and honorary Doctorate of the University, and Mr Trefort an honorary Doctorate of Science.

   It was also commented that Dr Barrett-Lennard had spoken well at the opening of the University’s new counselling centre in Cottesloe, and could be considered as a potential speaker for a future graduation ceremony.

   **Resolved:** HACC/03/2006
   To award the following honorary degrees in 2006:
   (i) A Doctor of Science to Professor Marilyn Renfree;
   (ii) A Doctor of Letters to Professor Stuart Macintyre;
   (iii) A Doctor of the University to Dr Godfrey Barrett-Lennard; and
   (iv) A Doctor of Science to Mr Peter Trefort.

   The Chair will write to the awardees, notifying them of their selection.
4. **2007 GRADUATION DATES**

Mr Nathan Giles was unable to attend the meeting to provide an update.

The Committee agreed that he should be requested to circulate the proposed 2007 dates to Committee members.

5. **RESOLUTION REGISTER**

A 2006 resolution register had not been included with the agenda papers, but it was noted that the two resolutions made this year were as indicated in the minutes of the 10/08/2006 meeting.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

A suggestion was made to the Committee that Dr Wangari Maathai from Kenya, be considered as a possible candidate for delivering the 2007 Murdoch Lecture. It was agreed that Mr Nathan Giles should be asked to take this suggestion through the normal processes.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the committee will be decided at a later date.

The meeting closed at 11:47am.

Signed as a true record of the meeting of the Honorary Awards & Ceremonial Committee held on 29/09/2006.

---

**EMERITUS PROFESSOR GEOFFREY BOLTON**

**CHAIR**

Dated: October, 2006

---
Effective date: 12/10/2006

Result: In accordance with Senate Standing Order 3.9.5, an absolute majority of members of the committee voted in favour of the resolutions below.

Members eligible to vote:

Alison Gaines (Chair)  
Prof John Yovich  
Janice Bowra  
Mal Bradley  

Gabriel Moens  
Jeremy Rigg

Abstentions: 

Secretary: Jeremy Rigg

Apologies: Not applicable

Official attendees: Not applicable

Observers: Not applicable

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (SENATE STANDING ORDERS CLAUSE 4.2)

Nil.

2. 2007 ACADEMIC PLANNING REPORT

On 13/09/2006 Academic Council resolved to recommend several amendments to regulations due to the introduction of new courses as part of the seventh 2007 Academic Planning Report, and these were put to the Legislation Committee. The Committee resolved the following:

Resolved: to recommend to Senate to amend the following regulations as indicated below [additions in bold]:

LC/10/2006

(i) Bachelor Degree Regulation 1. (1)
Insert: Bachelor of Environmental Management (BEnvMan)
Insert: Bachelor of Planning (BPlanning)

(ii) Master by Coursework Degree Regulation 2. (1)
Insert: Master of Arts in Education for Sustainability 48 points
Insert Master of Laws 24 points

Resolved: to recommend to Senate to amend Bachelor Degree Regulation 1.1(1) as outlined below [deletions struck through]:

LC/11/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Academic Council endorsement:</th>
<th>13/09/2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Council resolution number:</td>
<td>AC/121/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Legislation Committee endorsement:</td>
<td>12/10/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation Committee resolution number:</td>
<td>LC/10/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bachelor Degree Regulation 1.(1)**

**Proposed Amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed amendment: (all changes to be shown in mark-up)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Animal Science (BAnimSc), Bachelor of Applied Economics (BAppEcon), Bachelor of Applied Information Technology (BAppIT), Bachelor of Applied Science (BAppSc), Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Asian Area Studies (BAAS), Bachelor of Asian Studies (BAsianSt), Bachelor of Asian Studies (Specialist) (BAsianSt), Bachelor of Biotechnology (BBiot), Bachelor of Business Administration (BBusAdmin), Bachelor of Business Informatics (BBusInformatics), Bachelor of Business Information Technology Studies (BBusITSt), Bachelor of Chiropractic (BChiro), Bachelor of Commerce (BCom), Bachelor of Community Studies (BCommSt), Bachelor of Computer Studies (BCompSt), Bachelor of Development Studies (BDevSt), Bachelor of Divinity (BD), Bachelor of Economics (B Econ), Bachelor of Education (BEd), Bachelor of Education Studies (BEdSt), Bachelor of Engineering (BE), Bachelor of Engineering Science (BEngSc), Bachelor of Environmental Impact Assessment (BEIA), Bachelor of Environmental Science (BEnvSc), Bachelor of Extractive Metallurgy (BExtMet), Bachelor of Finance and Economics (BFinEc), Bachelor of Health Sciences (BHSc), Bachelor of Information Systems Studies (BISSysSt), Bachelor of International Business (BIB), Bachelor of Journalism (BJour), Bachelor of Laws (LLB), Bachelor of Legal Studies (BLS), Bachelor of Literature and Communication (BLitComm), Bachelor of Marketing and the Media (BMM), Bachelor of Media Production (BMedPr), Bachelor of Multimedia (BMMedia), Bachelor of Nursing (BNurs), Bachelor of Nursing Conversion (BNursConv), Bachelor of Policy Studies (BPolSt), Bachelor of Professional Studies (Education) (BProfSt), Bachelor of Psychology (BPsych), Bachelor of Science (BSc), Bachelor of Technology (B Tech), Bachelor of Theology (BTheol), Bachelor of Tourism (BTour), Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery (BVMS), Bachelor of Women’s Studies (BWomSt).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date of meeting: Tuesday, 03 October 2006

Present:
Mr Terry Budge (Chair)
Mr Gerry Georgatos
Prof Stuart Bradley
Mr Phil Hocking
Mr Tony Ionnella
Mr Bob Pett
Prof J Yovich

Secretary: Robin Lees

Apologies: Mr Garry Hunt
Ms Shirley McPherson
Mr Ian Callahan (DVC – Corporate)
Mrs Julie Keene (Director – Office of Financial Services)
Mr Jeremy Rigg – General Counsel & University Secretary
Mr Craig Spence (Director – Commercial Services)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (SENATE STANDING ORDERS CLAUSE 4.2)

The Chairman an interest with item 04 of the agenda relating to the Student Village proposal due to his position with Landcorp.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 August 2006 were confirmed.

3. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising that were not otherwise covered in the agenda.

4. RESIDENTIAL SERVICES OUTSOURCING PROPOSAL

The business proposal to outsource management and maintenance of the Student Village on the South Street campus tabled at the previous meeting was presented, together with the supplementary information requested by the Committee comprising:

- detailed financial analysis of a range of economic scenarios with summaries, coupled with the assumptions that have been applied. It included comparisons between each of Murdoch or Campus Living Villages (CLV) operating as owner and operator. Deloitte Consulting have also tested the models to confirm they are robust and appropriate.

- an executive summary of the proposed lease agreement.
management responses to the other matters raised at the previous Committee meeting on 22 August 2006 which encapsulated exit strategies, performance, rentals, quality standards, adequacy of the sinking fund and utilising alternative developers.

Members scrutinised the additional information and management responded to follow-up questions as follows:

- **Rentals**
The ability to control future rentals was limited but Murdoch would have an opportunity to provide its perspective and influence outcomes. CLV will require a return that provides an adequate sinking fund to preserve the quality of the development. Recent soundings of other Universities revealed a high level of pastoral care by CLV which goes some way to justify the level of its rental income.

Current University rentals are probably below market rates and a communication strategy is evolving to deal with any escalation issues that arise in the formative years.

- **Exit strategies**
The management team will negotiate an option for Murdoch to buy out CLV at Murdoch’s choosing. It was recognised that this would involve a hefty premium if CLV was an unwilling seller. However it was considered desirable to note, in the agreement, an agreed pricing formula which would operate in such an instance, to ensure clarity at the very commencement of the relationship.

- **Sinking fund**
The sinking fund will be actively monitored by the joint management committee. It was appreciated it was in CLV’s interests to retain sufficient funds to ensure the facilities are preserved to a high standard to retain competitiveness with the market. CLV are also incentivised inasmuch as they would otherwise have to fund any shortfall from their own resources.

- **Management Committee**
Following implementation, management will actively participate and be pro-active with the contemplated joint management committee to ensure continuous monitoring, compliance and performance.

- **Audit**
The agreement should allow for Murdoch’s internal audit group to inspect and review the operations and report to the Audit Committee as part of that Committee’s annual activities.

**Resolved:** To recommend that Senate:

RC/17/2006

(i) Authorises the Vice Chancellor or his delegate to conclude contract and other negotiations to outsource residential and associated services to Campus Living Villages on substantially the same terms and conditions detailed to Resources Committee on 27 June 2006 and 3 October 2006: and

(ii) Authorises the signing of all contract documentation in relation to the outsourcing of student services, including the associated lease agreements.
5. UNIVERSITY INVESTMENT POLICY

The proposed Investment Policy was tabled, reflecting minor adjustments suggested by members at the previous meeting. This included a broader definition of assets.

It was noted that the appointment of fund managers to administer the reserve and endowment investment pools would be undertaken at a later date, when cash reserves reach an appropriate scale.

Members debated the frequency of policy reviews and agreed the sub-committee should annually review the settings to verify their appropriateness, providing recommendations to the full Committee when it is considered desirable. It was also agreed the sub-committee’s brief should extend to examination of individual asset management and strategy issues, especially within the property development portfolio. This would assist in determining the magnitude and timing of investment returns to the endowment pool.

Resolved: To recommend that Senate approves the revised investment policy statement, number 1601.

6. 2006 FINANCIAL FORECAST

The revised financial forecast, for the year ending 31 December 2006, on a divisional basis, was tabled. This showed an expected surplus of $3.8M (excluding assets) against the budgeted surplus of $2.1M. The consolidated result provided a forecast surplus of $3.2M against an expected surplus of $1.4M.

The revision reflects the lower than expected student load numbers and government funded research revenue, totalling $2.4M. However, final 2006 student load numbers have just become available. This latest data reveals a further reduction in the surplus of up to $1.9M (equating to a consolidated surplus of $1.3M). An updated forecast is in the course of preparation.

Members were apprised of the superior relative performance in student load of Murdoch as compared to the vast majority of its peers. Student retention remains relatively high as a sizeable number have taken the part-load option, whereas other Universities have experienced a significant drop off in absolute terms. Strategies are being devised to build up future loads which include leveraging off the Rockingham and Peel assets to address local community and student needs in those regions. An example is the Australian Technical College taking up space at the Rockingham facility.

It was emphasized to members that the forecast may be impacted by:

- Annual leave provisions for academics (accrued for first time at 31.12.2006)
- Research grant revenue and related adjustments to match research income and expenditure; and
- Effective management of capital obligations and asset acquisitions for the balance of the calendar year.

Consequently, it is expected that 2006 was likely to be a near break even
result or generate a small surplus.

The report was duly noted.

7. DEPUTY VICE CHANCELLOR (CORPORATE) OVERVIEW & PROJECTS UPDATE & INCORPORATING THE LIST OF CREDITORS.

A summary of current projects and other initiatives were detailed to and noted by the Committee as follows:

- the negative outcome of the recent application to (State) Treasury to borrow funds for commercial undertakings. After further dialogue with Treasury, new applications directed at infrastructure and educational developments, namely, Peel campus, Tavern and the Feeder College building are to be lodged. Members agreed the apparent Treasury policy vacuum in regard to borrowings for commercial outcomes was not ideal, noting this was partly caused by the multiplicity of recent applications from other local Universities. Members noted that the commercial banks were seemingly very comfortable in providing funds (at competitive rates) to Universities.

- first progress report for the Peel campus development (Stage 2) which commenced in July 2006. Satisfactory progress to end August with no major costs increases or time delays incurred. The report will not be provided to future meetings but is available to members separately who wish to closely follow the development. However any major issues will be flagged to members if and when they arise.

- Progression of the settlement of new and improved terms with the retirement village operator concerning a range of agreements that have been the subject of extensive negotiations in recent months. These include the Village marketing and management agreement, the project co-ordination agreement and a lease agreement for the residential care facility. The latter is only awaiting finalisation of the financing and design arrangements by the developer. The agreements address issues raised by the Committee in December 2005. Stage 8 of the village is due to commence shortly to take advantage of the current property climate. A formal proposal is planned for the next Committee meeting.

- Expressions of interest are going out to selected land developers for the Forrestdale land holding and which will close at the end of October 2006. In tandem, negotiations with Satterley & Co for a joint venture arrangement are continuing.

**Resolved:** To recommend that Senate approves the following payments for the period 16/08/2006 to 25/09/2006 inclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creditor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Taxation Office</td>
<td>$893,356 (PAYG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Taxation Office</td>
<td>$855,432 (PAYG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Taxation Office</td>
<td>$883,158 (PAYG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesfarmers Energy Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$510,427 (Reimbursement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywest Constructions Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$679,315 (St Ives Stage 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COMMERCIALISATION CENTRE

Members reviewed the proposal to redefine the Murdoch Westscheme relationship. This is in recognition that the scientific progress made to date has brought the partnership to a stage where it is necessary to consider, in a strategic sense, how to leverage off this success. This is particularly so in light of Murdoch’s relative inexperience and capacity to engage with potential investors and/or financiers in the commercial environment.

Three separate projects (Cryptosporidium, avian flu and low impact biocides) have met the many technical milestones set by the partnership’s investment committee over the past 2 years. Each opportunity is about to be spun off into entities to, inter alia, attract additional non-dilutive funding from government agencies and to concentrate on the commercial attractiveness of their respective technologies to potential suppliers, customers, industry and other stakeholders as well as developing robust business cases to drive the commercialisation of the underlying intellectual property.

The simplified model and merits of outsourcing the investment management role, with the consequential mitigation of risk, was explained to members together with an outline of the progress of the Westscheme relationship to date.

Members reviewed the quality of the proposed investment management team and whether the immediate benefits they receive were commensurate with the longer terms benefits they are expected to deliver. The fact that each of the current technologies was, despite technical successes to date, are still very early stage and much ‘sweat equity’ needs to be applied, over a number of years, allayed much of these concerns.

The meeting noted the arrangements for the University to benefit from 3rd party owned intellectual property (in return for the provision of infrastructure). In turn, this will raise Murdoch’s profile, especially in the biotechnology arena which dovetails with its strategy to embrace that sector, attracting new partners and research funding on a broader front.

**Resolved:**
RC/20/2006

To recommend

subject to (ii), Senate approves the delegation to each of the Vice Chancellor, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate), the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) and the General Counsel, authority to make investments within the parameters of the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents (bolded terms used below refer to the terms as defined in the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents), being:

(a) the transfer of Murdoch IP to Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing no less than 45% of the capital in those companies;

(b) the provision of an In Kind Contribution to the Collaboration in exchange for ordinary shares representing 5% of the capital interest acquired by Westscheme in Investee companies formed in relation to Third Party IP; and

(c) the transfer of the University’s interest in Mixed IP to
Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing between 5% and 45% of the capital in those companies, as negotiated with the Investment Manager and the Third Party.

(ii) The Division of Research and Development will provide a report to Senate in each instance an Investee is established. This report will describe the investment and the nature of the technology, and substantive provisions of the relevant shareholders agreement. Further the Division will provide the committee a quarterly report detailing the value of the portfolio of investments obtained through the collaboration.

(iii) That resolutions S22(i) and (ii)/2005, being a standing exemption to the University's Policy for the Establishment and Operation of Incorporated Entities be rescinded.

9. LEARNING COMMON

The concept of developing a ‘Learning Common’ with the South Street Campus Library was described to members who were taken through the planned layouts and utility, from a student perspective, of having an integrated learning environment allied with on site support on a 24/7 basis.

Members scrutinised the design and layout noting the additional indirect cost benefits of having support, in particular IT services, in close proximity to customers and the ability to create additional space around the campus.

The projected cost of around $3.1M will be reduced by federal government funding (Teaching & Learning Fund) of $2.0M, leaving the University to find approximately $1.1M. It is intended to use the coming summer holiday period to commence and complete the works. However work will be staggered to ensure funding does not become an issue.

Resolved: To recommend that Senate approves the development of the Learning Common in the Library at a total cost not exceeding $3.1M.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

11. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled to be held on Tuesday 14 November 2006 at 8:00am.

Signed as a true record of the meeting of the Resources Committee held on 03/10/2006.

MR TERRY BUDGE - CHAIR

Dated:
AGENDA ITEM 13.A

SENATE BRIEFING PAPER

Date: 5/OCT/2006  Referred to Senate: through the Resources C’tee.

Subject: Residential Services Outsourcing Proposal

From: Professor Gary Martin  Division: Vice Chancellery

Purpose:
To seek the endorsement of the Senate Committee for the partnering with Campus Living Villages for the management, maintenance, upgrade and development of the Student Village facility at Murdoch University.

Background & summary:
Residential Services is a critical service offered by Murdoch University in order to attract prospective students and develop a vibrant campus environment. On campus accommodation, (Student Village) at Murdoch Univeristy requires expansion to meet current and forecasted demand, in addition to an upgrade of current facilities to ensure the service is provided in a safe, secure and professional manner.

In order to achieve an enhanced level of residential service the University is currently engaged in discussions with Campus Living Villages with the view to signing a contract to outsource the management, maintenance, upgrade and development of the Student Village.

The process of approval to date is as follows:
- An initial proposal was presented to Resources Committee on 27 June, 2006.
- A full business plan was presented to Resources Committee on 22 August, 2006. At that meeting Campus Living Villages made a presentation to Resources Committee. Members raised a number of matters for clarification at this meeting and recommended that Senate receive a briefing on the proposal at meeting of 6 September, 2006.
- At the meeting of 3 October, 2006, matters raised at the Resources Committee meeting of 22 August, 2006 were addressed.

Key characteristics of the proposal are as follows. Campus Living Villages will:
- Receive all tenancy revenue
- Assume full responsibility for the management of the student village and will bear all costs associated with its administration.
- Employ all village staff (all current employees bar one will be offered employment with CLV)
- Perform all required maintenance and upgrade facilities each at their expense.
- Develop new facilities. CLV will invest all funds required for the building of two new accommodation facilities, each with 300 beds. They will also invest in other communal facilities such as catering services, pool, and a convenience store as designated by the University. Subject to required approvals and capital raising, the first 300 new bed facility will be opened in July 2008. The second 300 bed facility will be developed based on the future demand study.
- Lease the University land and make an annual payment to the University. The University has the opportunity to receive the full term lease payments (approx. $3.9M) as a lump sum. This lump sum could be invested by the University in financial markets.
- Return the facility to Murdoch, fully maintained and operational, at no cost at the end of the lease term.
- Insurance: Take out all necessary insurances for the operation of the Student Village.

Term of Lease: 35 years, commencing 1 January 2007

Issues & alternatives considered:
Issue: Financial Modelling. A number of scenarios were modelled to reflect the impact of different assumptions on the internal rate of return (IRR) for the University. In addition, information on the estimated IRR for Campus Living was provided to Resources Committee for consideration.

Issue: Contractual matters. Due to the term of the agreement the Resources Committee requested a “Buy Out” provision be included into the contractual agreements. The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate) has agreed to explore this matter further.
Issue: Security for performance and financial risks. The Agreement for lease, lease and Student Accommodation agreement all include a bank guarantee clause to secure Campus Living Villages performance of its obligation under all three agreements.

Issue: Rental. To ensure the University community is comfortable with the rental arrangements a number of assistance mechanisms have been explored. The University currently has 50 Commonwealth Learning Scholarships, which provide $4,000 annually toward accommodation. These Scholarships will be promoted to all students with financial constraints.

Issue: Building Standards. The buildings to be constructed on the South Street campus are being designed by the Architects of Campus Living Villages, Architectus, in conjunction with the University’s appointed architects Hames Sharley

Issue: Sinking fund. The amount required to be provided by Campus Living Villages as a percentage of room revenue (2.5%) will total approximately $2.6 million over the 35 year lease period. The assessment by the Office of Commercial Services has validated this as an appropriate amount

Issue: History with Lakeview. Given the previous history with Lakeview the University needs to be assured the selected provider are both financially capable of delivering as per contract conditions, and has the professional approach required to mitigate associated risks. In addition, the University has the opportunity to receive the lease payment upfront, which minimises the financial risks.

Issue: Landcorp: Proposal for accommodation at Murdoch Train Station. A number of meetings have been held with Landcorp staff to discuss the plans for accommodation at the Murdoch Train Station. At this point in time Landcorp are unsure of the style of accommodation that will be built, if any. A joint meeting was arranged between Landcorp and Campus Living Villages to ensure both parties were aware of development plans.

Alternatives: A number of alternative providers were reviewed throughout the investigation phase. Unilodge and Student Housing Australia were considered in detail. Unilodge was not considered suitable due to both the proposed management arrangements and experience. Student Housing Australia are focused on off-campus housing developments, which could be utilised in a long term plan but does not address the required capital funds for upgrade or the need to additional beds in the short term.

Linkage to the University’s strategic plan:

☐ To provide quality, contemporary education which empowers the students of today to live and work in the world of tomorrow.

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

☐ To engage with communities in the Rockingham-Kwinana and Peel region and the sphere of influence of our campuses to build productive partnerships in order to expand community participation in lifelong learning, support the sustainable development of the region through relevant social and scientific research, and enrich the cultural life of the community.

☒ To achieve Murdoch University’s strategic objectives by providing effective leadership and applying our human, financial and physical resources in a planned and accountable fashion.

Comments (if relevant):

Risk management considerations:

A number of risks have been considered.

1) Financial: The financial risks have been considered in terms of lease and development. The Office of Financial Services and Office of Commercial Services have compiled and analysed the data. A report on the Financial modelling was tabled at the Senate Resources Committee meeting 3 October.

2) Lease of facilities and land: The risks associated with this matter can be minimised by obtaining the upfront lease payment.

3) Development: All expenditure required for development will be under contractual obligation of Campus Living Villages. The contract will also state the all facilities are returned to Murdoch University at an appropriate standard at the end of the contract period. Legal and Governance are advising on all matters of contract negotiation.

☒ SEG has considered and supports the proposal:  Date of SEG consideration:  5/MAY/2006

☐ SEG has considered, but does not support the proposal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG has not been consulted in relation to the proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation where SEG either does not support, or has not been consulted regarding, the proposal:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has been consulted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Village Staff and Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office &amp; Commercial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Unions - CPSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ No attachments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further information is available at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Gary Martin, DVC (Enterprise and International)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who to contact &amp; his/her contact details to discuss the matter before the meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Gary.martin@murdoch.edu.au">Gary.martin@murdoch.edu.au</a> Tel: 9360 2114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate resolves as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) To authorise the Vice Chancellor or his delegate to conclude contract and other negotiations to outsource residential and associated services to Campus Living Villages on substantially the same terms and conditions detailed to Resources Committee on 27 June 2006 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) To authorise the signing of all contract documentation in relation to the outsourcing of student services, including the associated lease agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed:</th>
<th>Supported:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agenda Item 13

#### Senate Briefing Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>19/SEP/2006</th>
<th>Referred to Senate: through the Resources C'tee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Subject:** Approval of Investment Policy

**From:**
- Ian Callahan, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate)
- Julie Keene, Director Financial Services and CFO

**Division:** Resource Management

**Purpose:**
To seek Resources Committee and Senate approval for the University’s revised investment policy statement.

**Background & summary:**
Attached is the updated investment policy statement which requires Resources Committee and Senate approval.

Since the last Resources Committee meeting in August, some minor amendments have been made to the policy, to incorporate a broader definition of assets to be included as part of the policy statement. These amendments were made in the “Introduction” at point 1.

In relation to implementation of the policy, and in particular, the appointment of appropriate fund managers to manage the reserve pool and the endowment pool, this will be undertaken at the time suitable cash reserves exist.

**Issues & alternatives considered:**
N\A

**Linkage to the University’s strategic plan:**
- To provide quality, contemporary education which empowers the students of today to live and work in the world of tomorrow.
- To contribute to the knowledge, wellbeing and sustainability of society by conducting high quality multidisciplinary research and development.
- To engage with communities in the Rockingham-Kwinana and Peel region and the sphere of influence of our campuses to build productive partnerships in order to expand community participation in lifelong learning, support the sustainable development of the region through relevant social and scientific research, and enrich the cultural life of the community.
- To achieve Murdoch University’s strategic objectives by providing effective leadership and applying our human, financial and physical resources in a planned and accountable fashion.

**Comments (if relevant):**

**Risk management considerations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG has considered and supports the proposal:</th>
<th>Date of SEG consideration:</th>
<th>/JAN/2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG has considered, but does not support the proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG has not been consulted in relation to the proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation where SEG either does not support, or has not been consulted regarding, the proposal:**
The revision of this policy has been managed through the University’s Resources Committee.

**Who has been consulted:**
PricewaterhouseCoopers have provided assistance

**Attachments:**
- No attachments
- The following documents are attached:
  - Investment Policy Statement
Further information is available at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who to contact &amp; his/her contact details to discuss the matter before the meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Callahan, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 9360 2571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:I.Callahan@murdoch.edu.au">I.Callahan@murdoch.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Keene, Director Financial Services and CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 9360 7449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:J.Keene@murdoch.edu.au">J.Keene@murdoch.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate resolves as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) To approve the University’s revised investment policy statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULIE KEENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND CFO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supported:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAN CALLAHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPUTY VICE CHANCELLOR (CORPORATE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Senate Briefing Paper

**Date:** 25/SEP/2006  
**Referred to Senate:** through Resources Committee

### Background & Summary:
After nearly 2 years, the MWEP model underwent a strategic review late in 2005, to reflect on its achievements, performance, identify improvements and to consider the way forward given the potential for success of some of the more promising and advanced projects. To date approximately 90 individual projects have been brought to the partnership’s Investment Committee of which approximately 24 have resulted in funding decisions. The partnership has a strict investment criteria targeting large potential markets (>\$100M pa). Three of these opportunities have successfully passed their milestones and are ready to be placed into ‘spin out’ companies.

The review concluded that the commercialisation phase requires careful management and execution from both a risk and business perspective. Given the current lack of in-house commercialisation resources, outsourcing of this activity is preferred and could be accommodated by refining the existing partnership arrangements, the recommended model slightly dilutes both Westscheme’s and Murdoch’s initial equity stake in ‘spinout’ entities by a maximum of 5% each. The opportunity has also been taken to simplify the existing arrangements in light of the experience of the formative years. However, the investment pool dedicated to Murdoch research and development remains intact.

### Issues & Alternatives Considered:
Not applicable as the proposal is to refine an existing contractual relationship. However, the process involved exploration of a large range of issues and alternatives to improve upon the foundations laid down in the establishment phase of the partnership. The negotiations are being conducted by Director Research & Development, DVC (Corporate), General Counsel & University Secretary. The successful conversion of unproven concepts into potential successful outcomes and the depth of the current relationship rules out seeking alternative arrangements at this juncture.

### Linkage to the University’s Strategic Plan:
- To provide quality, contemporary education which empowers the students of today to live and work in the world of tomorrow.
- To contribute to the knowledge, wellbeing and sustainability of society by conducting high quality multidisciplinary research and development.
- To engage with communities in the Rockingham-Kwinana and Peel region and the sphere of influence of our campuses to build productive partnerships in order to expand community participation in lifelong learning, support the sustainable development of the region through relevant social and scientific research, and enrich the cultural life of the community.
- To achieve Murdoch University’s strategic objectives by providing effective leadership and applying our human, financial and physical resources in a planned and accountable fashion.

### Comments (if relevant):
A register of the University’s imperatives and risk mitigation has been compiled and are being negotiated.

| SEG has considered and Date of SEG/ consideration: /JAN/2006 |
| SEG has considered, but does not support the proposal |
| SEG has not been consulted in relation to the proposal |
**Explanation where SEG either does not support, or has not been consulted regarding, the proposal:**
The proposal is to refine commercial outcomes for a pre-existing approved arrangement.

**Who has been consulted:**
Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate), General Counsel & University Secretary and the Director, Research & Development

**Attachments:**
- No attachments
- The following documents are attached:
  - History of events and outcome of strategic review

**Further information is available at:**
Refer below

**Who to contact & his/her contact details to discuss the matter before the meeting:**
Director Research and Development. t.morrison@murdoch.edu.au
Tel: (08) 9360 2374 Mob: 0404 809 791

**Recommendation:**
Senate resolves as follows:

1. Subject to (ii), to recommend to Senate the delegation to each of the Vice Chancellor, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Corporate), the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) and the General Counsel, authority to make investments within the parameters of the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents (bolded terms used below refer to the terms as defined in the renegotiated MWEP Collaboration documents), being:
   - the transfer of Murdoch IP to Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing no less than 45% of the capital in those companies;
   - the provision of an In Kind Contribution to the Collaboration in exchange for ordinary shares representing 5% of the capital interest acquired by Westscheme in Investee companies formed in relation to Third Party IP; and
   - the transfer of the University’s interest in Mixed IP to Investee companies in exchange for ordinary shares representing between 5% and 45% of the capital in those companies, as negotiated with the Investment Manager and the Third Party.

2. The Division of Research and Development will provide a report to Senate in each instance an Investee is established. This report will describe the investment and the nature of the technology, and substantive provisions of the relevant shareholders agreement. Further the Division will provide the committee a quarterly report detailing the value of the portfolio of investments obtained through the collaboration.

3. To recommend to Senate that resolutions S22(i) and (ii)/2005, being a standing exemption to the University’s Policy for the Establishment and Operation of Incorporated Entities be rescinded.

**Signed:**

**Supported:**
Date: 5/SEP/2006

**Subject:** Learning Common

**From:** DVC Corporate

**Division:** Resource Management

**Purpose:**
To consider and approve the development of the "Learning Common" in the Library area of the University at a cost of up to $3.01m

**Background & summary:**
The University received Federal Govt funding of $2.0m relating to the Teaching and Learning Fund. These funds were earmarked by management for a project that enhanced and improved the student learning experience at Murdoch.

The Learning Common project has been designed to create:
- a high standard contemporary environment for students to interact with each other and university resources
- an environment where support facilities (IT, academic and library) are all on hand in a co-ordinated and easily accessible way (particularly important for first year students and those having difficulties) including teaching/tutorial facilities (for groups and individuals) for those needing that extra support
- facilities that are available 24 hours a day
- expanded access to IT resources

The designs attached show how the library facilities can be converted into the modern environment necessary to meet student expectations and to compete with other local universities which have similar facilities. This is imperative if we are to continue to fill student load and attract international students. The University’s existing facilities are rapidly falling behind what is expected to readily compete for students in the current market.

As part of the development significant additional IT capacity is being added to the Learning Common through more effective use of space. This has the flow on effect of freeing up space in other parts of the University which will assist in providing space for other uses such as the Feeder College.

In addition the conversion of office space used by Library staff to open planning has increased the number of staff able to occupy the area with the expected outcome being a more co-ordinated, efficient and integrated operation of library activities.

Costing estimates for the project are between $3m to $3.1m. This represents a contribution from University funds above those received from the Teaching and Learning allocation of approximately $2.0M-$2.1M.

**Issues & alternatives considered:**
Treasury’s rejection of borrowing approval for the Wesfarmers project has created some uncertainty relating to the timing of cash flows into the University. University management are working through the issues and believe the issues can be resolved given further interaction with Treasury and the ongoing support of the Education Dept.

A window of opportunity for this project to proceed with the minimum disruption to university activities exists over the summer period. Planning for the project needs to proceed to allow the work to be completed over this period. Planning is however being undertaken to complete the work in a variety of sub stages so that the project program can be easily modified to take into account a delay in resolving any funding uncertainties with Treasury.

**Linkage to the University’s strategic plan:**
- To provide quality, contemporary education which empowers the students of today to live and work in the world of tomorrow.
- To contribute to the knowledge, wellbeing and sustainability of society by conducting high quality multidisciplinary research and development.
To engage with communities in the Rockingham-Kwinana and Peel region and the sphere of influence of our campuses to build productive partnerships in order to expand community participation in lifelong learning, support the sustainable development of the region through relevant social and scientific research, and enrich the cultural life of the community.

To achieve Murdoch University’s strategic objectives by providing effective leadership and applying our human, financial and physical resources in a planned and accountable fashion.

Comments (if relevant):

Risk management considerations:
University project team to manage project
Procurement strategy will be negotiated contract with builder where appropriate with university subletting a variety of work packages

☑ SEG has considered and supports the proposal: Date of SEG consideration: /JAN/2006
☐ SEG has considered, but does not support the proposal
☐ SEG has not been consulted in relation to the proposal
Explanation where SEG either does not support, or has not been consulted regarding, the proposal:

Who has been consulted:
DVC Academic
Vice Chancellor
Commercial Services
SEG
Library and IT Management

Attachments:
☐ No attachments ☑ The following documents are attached: Design Drawings

Further information is available at:

Who to contact & his/her contact details to discuss the matter before the meeting:
DVC Corporate
Director Corporate Services

Recommendation:
Senate resolves as follows:
(i) To approve the development of the Learning Common in the Library are at a cost of between $3m and $3.1m.
(ii)

Signed: Supported:
AGENDA ITEM 14

STUDENT AMENITIES FEE

There is no separate paper for this item.
### AGENDA ITEM 15

**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>03/09/2006</td>
<td>Child Care Centre</td>
<td>Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2006</td>
<td>Coral Bay</td>
<td>Licence Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2006</td>
<td>Lighthouse Laboratories Ltd</td>
<td>Licence to occupy office space and use facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# AGENDA ITEM 16

**SENATE MEETING DATES 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE SENATE MEETING DATES</th>
<th>DEADLINE FOR AGENDA ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*All Senate meetings will commence at 4.30 pm.*
Student debts heading towards $20b

UNIVERSITY students and graduates will owe the Government nearly $20 billion in three years as debt accumulates by almost $2 billion a year.

They now owe the Government a little more than $13 billion, figures provided by the Department of Education to a Senate estimates committee show, and the figure is increasing as fees for individual courses rise. By 2008-09 the debt will reach $18.8 billion.

The average outstanding debt was about $10,500, said a spokesman for the federal Minister for Education, Julie Bishop. This represents a rise of 7 per cent since last year. Fees for some courses have risen to more than $30,000.

Harriet Alexander Higher Education Reporter
September 13, 2006
The Opposition education spokeswoman, Jenny Macklin, said the debt had been forced by increases in university fees, which have more than doubled under the Howard Government.

"These are massive increases; they're not minor changes," Ms Macklin said. "Under the Howard Government, young people are graduating from university with ever-increasing levels of debt, making it much harder for them to buy a home, start a family and get ahead."

Ms Bishop has attributed the rise in debt to the rising numbers of students. "We have a record number of students - almost 1 million students, which is an increase of almost 50 per cent since 1996," she said.

However, figures from her department show that domestic student numbers rose by just 0.2 per cent from 2004 to 2005, while the accumulated HECS debt rose by nearly $2 billion. The record number of students was mainly caused by a 4.8 per cent increase in full-fee paying overseas students, who do not incur debts.

HECS was introduced by the Labor government in 1989 and since then about 41 per cent of people have repaid their debt.

The fees increased in 1997 and again last year, when universities were able to charge students up to 25 per cent more. Students begin repaying their debt when their income exceeds $38,149.

FEE-HELP, a loan repayment scheme for postgraduate fee-paying students, began in 2004. The architect of HECS, Professor Bruce Chapman, a higher education academic at the Australian National University, said it was likely the main reason the debt was rocketing to such a degree was the higher cost of a university education. "I don't believe it's a problem for policy, however," he said.

"I thought the 25 per cent increase in HECS was not bad policy because it was accompanied by a higher first threshold repayment .. it becomes somewhat easier to pay it."
Beware universities' quest for mediocrity

September 26, 2006

The "big is best" brigade has succeeded in making many first degrees second rate, writes Harry Messel.

HOW many students do you have now?" This is the question that is inevitably asked as soon as one mentions university, with the stress on the word "many". The thrust of the question is usually obvious: only large numbers of students indicate success, while small numbers are equated with failure. The insinuation is that a university that does not have, and never will have, large numbers of students, 10 deputy vice-chancellors and 20 pro-vice-chancellors, lecture halls to hold 1000 disenchanted students and so on, must be a second-rate institution. The opposite is usually the case.

Now, I can understand the above reasoning on the part of torchbearers for egalitarianism, for mass education and its concomitant mass mediocrity. In Australia, Canada, the US and more recently in Britain, they have, over the past 20 years, had one victory after the other, bringing tertiary institutions down to a common low standard not witnessed before. They can feel proud that a first degree from many universities is becoming an almost meaningless piece of paper, that they have managed to dupe the parents and betray the scholars into believing that just going to any university and getting a degree will ensure them a meal ticket. Unfortunately, this is not the case. It matters a great deal which university you go to and the quality of the education provided by that institution.

It is accepted generally that mass education and quality are a contradiction in terms, especially in the tertiary field, and normally mass education and mediocrity appear to be natural bedfellows. Yet we see many educational practitioners arguing vehemently to the contrary, extolling the virtues of almost free mass tertiary education for all, with its lower standards and paying lip-service to excellence. Their motto seems to be equal opportunity for all to be mediocre rather than equal opportunity for all to strive for excellence.

My remarks are based on 54 years' experience in university education in Australia. During this period there have been major transformations in secondary and tertiary education which, unfortunately, have close counterparts in Canada, Britain and in an increasing number of European countries. Thus my remarks often apply with equal force to these countries, which have determined that they have the sovereign right to make similar mistakes to Australia. In all instances we are viewing an essentially nationalised, struggling tertiary education sector as it passes from an elitist system to a system of mass education and, finally, a universal one.

It is evident that tertiary education is undergoing dramatic changes worldwide. One should not be surprised by this. The world is in the midst of an information technology revolution, which is proving to be the most dramatic revolution in its history.
Governments appear bewildered and at a loss as to how to respond in the information age. One response has been to encourage secondary and tertiary education for all. This has placed enormous pressure upon educational institutions to provide university entrance for all qualified secondary school students, which almost automatically ensured a significant decrease in standards, while increasing dramatically the number of students completing secondary education. This, too, was often achieved at the expense of quality.

Australia must seriously question whether it should continue to spend a couple of thousand million dollars a year on a school system which appears to be turning out an ever increasing number of undisciplined, irresponsible, greedy, often near-illiterate, lawless individuals who don't give a tinker's curse for the country, their mates or anyone else.

It appears that Australia is on the road to turning its school system into poor-quality child minding as both parents, in thousands of households, have been forced to take up jobs in order to eke out an existence. One outcome is that universities now often have to teach what was formerly taught at the senior school level. The value of a bachelor's degree from many institutions has been devalued and often fails to impress employers. Students who wish to get ahead now require a higher degree or several degrees or to go on to a second university.

Education must be deregulated and strong diversity among institutions encouraged. Students must be provided with a wide choice and at varying levels. As an opener, cut the management staff of universities by 50 per cent or more. This would slow - but not stop - the paper war which is going on at present. It should also put an end to all this nonsense about total quality management, quality assessment and various other time-wasting "processes". Let us get back to what universities are best at doing, namely teaching and research.

Harry Messel is emeritus professor of physics at the University of Sydney.
Education a huge, and growing, economic boon