Minutes
RESEARCH COMMITTEE
Meeting 04/10 held 10 August 2010

PRESENT

Members
Professor Ned Pankhurst, Chairperson
Professor Parlo Singh, Deputy Chairperson
Professor Andy Bennett
Associate Professor Michael Blumenstein
Mr Malcolm Wolski
Professor Lesley Chenoweth
Professor Graham Cuskelley
Professor Lyn Griffiths
Professor David Shum
Professor Howard Wiseman
Professor Claire Wyatt-Smith
Dr Freya Mearns (Secretary)

Rights of Audience and Debate
Dr Calvin Smith (Deputy Director, Griffith Institute for Higher Education)
Ms Julene Finnigan (Corporate Resources Manager, FBS)
Mr Tony Sheil (Deputy Director, OR)

Invited
Dr Graham Wise (Manager, Research Development, OR)

1.0 APOLOGIES
Professor Andrew O’Neil
Dr Vicki Pattemore (Director, OR)
Ms Daina Garklavs (Deputy Director, OR)

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
2.1 The minutes of the 03/10 meeting were confirmed, with two minor corrections:
   Item 3.3 – “top 200 to 250 universities” corrected to “top 400 to 450 universities”;
   and Item 7.1 – “both centres undergo a fourth year review in 2010” corrected to “both
   centres undergo a fourth year review in 2011”.

3.0 CHAIR’S REPORT
3.1 Welcome to new member
   The Chair welcomed Mr Malcolm Wolski to his first meeting.
3.2 ARC and NHMRC awards and updates
   a. 2011 ARC Centres of Excellence outcomes
   The Chair expressed his delight with Professor Wiseman’s success as a partner of a
   UNSW submission. Professor Wiseman reported 87.5% funding for the successful
   project, which was better than most successful submissions. The Chair noted that the
biggest hurdle to CoE success appeared to be selection for submission of full proposal.

b. ARC Linkage Projects Round 2 2010

The Chair was reasonably happy with the University's success rate but noted the difference between Griffith's average funding and the national average, advising that the message from this round was that Griffith applicants should not request too little - $100,000 per year over three years is not an unreasonable target.

c. Rejoinders for DP, LP and rebuttals for NHMRC Projects

3.2.c.1 The Chair reported that the University had considered a more formal internal review process for rejoinders, like that provided at the University of Western Australia, but that there was not enough time in the rejoinder timeframes to allow this. The Committee agreed the Office for Research (OR) should ideally provide proactive support within rejoinder timeframes and that academic staff should ask for advice on their response, as appropriate.

3.2.c.2 The Chair noted that two DP applicants chose not to submit rejoinders and suggested researchers have an obligation to go through with the process once an application has been submitted. The Committee agreed, noting that there is corporate history in the panels and so a well-outlined rejoinder can, at least, put an applicant in good stead for future applications, and that the panel can override the recommendations of the reviewers if the rejoinder is very good. The Committee agreed rejoinders should be mandatory and that OR should manage this, with Academic Groups embedding such behaviour.

Action:

3.2.c.3 OR to inform future grant applicants that rejoinders to assessor reports are mandatory.

3.2.c.4 Professor Griffiths reported that problems were evident in the NHMRC 2010 rejoinder process – prompt emailing to applicants to inform them that their comments are available has not always occurred, instead leaving them to find the reports by checking regularly, even though they only have 7 days to respond. Additionally, Professor Griffiths reported that on at least one occasion a Griffith applicant had responded to all comments only to have the NHMRC tell them at a later date that another assessor report had been made available and that the rejoinder needed to be rewritten and submitted within 24 hours. The Committee agreed the University should do an assessment of the rejoinder process once it has finished.

Action:

3.2.c.5 OR to assess 2010 NHMRC rejoinder process upon completion.

d. Australian Laureate Fellows

The Chair noted that approximately two thirds of the fifteen successful applicants were previously Federation or Australia Fellows and so, despite one of the aims of the scheme being to attract new high-quality researchers to Australia, there appeared to be a lot of recycling of previous ARC/NHMRC Fellowship winners. The Chair reported that UNSW had taken a very vigorous in-house approach to who they would support for the scheme and that this had worked well for the University.

3.3 Update on modified Intellectual Property Policy

3.3.1 The Chair reported that the Intellectual Property Policy was currently in a consultation phase – a pre-consultation had been carried out with selected
staff and the NTEU, and the DVC(R) would email academic staff within the next fortnight regarding a wider consultation of the Policy. It was noted that the intention was to have the Policy ready for presentation at the October meeting of Council but that it may be necessary to delay it until the December meeting of Council, should changes be necessary post-consultation.

3.3.2 The Chair reported that the main purposes of the modified Policy were:

1) To formalise the situation with regards to IP assignment;
2) To make commercialisation arrangements with staff more explicit;
3) To encourage commercialisation of creative outputs by distributing 70% of profits, rather than 50%, for creative works; and
4) To make clear that the right to publication is primary (the decision lying with the staff member).

Action:

3.3.3 The Chair to report feedback on the Policy at the next meeting of the Research Committee.

3.4 Update on SRE, ERA and HERDC

3.4.1 Tony Sheil reported that OR was comfortable with the number of research outputs reported in the University’s ERA submission (11,226), noting that the University currently reports approximately 1,950 research outputs in HERDC returns but this number was approximately 1,500 research outputs at the beginning of the ERA reference period (i.e. 2003). It was noted that the final research outputs number showed the INS ERA team and academic ERA committees had been effective in collecting “X” publications and creative works for the submission. It was additionally noted that the verification of 565 creative works had been particularly time-intensive for the AEL group. Mr Sheil reported that the University’s ERA strategy had been to show evidence of activity in almost all fields of research, while reaching the assessment threshold in approximately one third of them. Informal information provided by a large Go8 university indicated that university had submitted approximately 29,000 research outputs (consistent with the expectation of them producing approximately three times Griffith’s research output) and would be assessed in 102 fields of research (approximately two thirds of all possible fields of research). The Chair reported that Griffith’s IRU colleagues would each be assessed in 50-60 fields of research so Griffith’s submission was consistent with this. Mr Sheil reported that the DVC(R) would be releasing summary data of the submission (at the 4-digit level) to University staff during August; the Chair noted that while ERA is not about individual staff members’ performance, it was important to show staff the shape of the University’s submission. Mr Sheil reported that the ARC had not yet announced the membership of the Research Evaluation Committees but that their training would be carried out in September, with assessment being performed in October and November; the ARC have informally told OR that the final Evaluation Committee meeting would be held in December and, therefore, results would likely be released early in 2011. The Chair reported that the ARC had stated that it intended to release individual results to each university a few days before the results were publicly released.

3.4.2 Mr Sheil reported that the second survey of academic staff for SRE was being carried out between 26th July and 6th August and that, while the April survey had recorded a strong (84%) response rate, this second survey was the important one because DIISR had now advised it will be used as an input
for the SRE 2011 funding. The Chair reported that responses to the second survey were due by Friday (13th August) and that the University would follow up on non-responses next week (prioritising NCG holders) – the assistance of Deans and Heads of Schools might be necessary at that time. Mr Sheil reported that FBS had done a lot of work on the transparent costing aspect of the exercise and had submitted this to DIISR on 31st July. It was noted that there is quite a bit of uncertainty about what the SRE formula will be, even within DIISR, but that ERA results will be included from 2012 at the earliest. It was noted that the intent of the policy is to increase support for indirect costs of Australian Competitive Grant research from 20 cents in the dollar to 35-40 cents in the dollar and that some smaller universities were already seeing the benefits of this, with seven currently receiving close to 50 cents in the dollar.

3.4.3 Mr Sheil reported that the 2009 HERDC return was most satisfying for the University with the largest ever growth in reported income and the number of publication points in all publication categories having increased. FBS’ involvement was acknowledged, Staircase having increased the level of interest in HERDC data, causing the returns to now be more complete. Mr Sheil reported that the increase in NCG income from $11million to $22million would lead to scrutiny from DIISR. It was noted that $7.5million of the $63million reported had come from the Adult Stem Cell Facility and that this would not be present for future HERDC returns. The Chair noted that the real test of the University’s research strength would be whether this could be picked up in other areas. It was noted that IRU colleagues and the rest of the sector were all on similar HERDC trajectories and so Griffith would need to keep increasing to keep up with the pack. The Committee agreed that while publications were looking reasonable, Griffith should aim for income levels similar to the University of Newcastle. Mr Sheil noted the pleasing increase in book chapters, putting Griffith in the top eight universities, nationally, in social science research, but that journal article numbers had temporarily reached a plateau.

Noted

3.5 Membership of NHMRC reference group

Membership of the NHMRC reference group was noted by the Committee. The Chair thanked members for volunteering for the role.

Noted

3.6 Griffith’s 2010 CRC bids

Dr Wise reported that the next stages of the CRC application process are submission of detailed project proposals in September and interviews in October. All indications are that the process will not be affected by the outcomes of the Federal election.

Noted

3.7 Other matters

The Chair reported that the Australian Water and Environmental Research Alliance with the University of Queensland had been signed on Friday 30th August but that a formal launch would take place after the Federal election. It was noted that, collectively, the Alliance places UQ/Griffith unambiguously at number one in the country in its field as well as approximately number 12 internationally. Contributions to this combined ranking are approximately two thirds UQ and one third Griffith.

Noted
4.0 DEAN’S REPORT

4.1 Research Week

The Dean advised the Committee that it is Research Week next week and asked Committee members to promote the activities to staff and students in their Schools.

Action: Research Committee members to promote Research Week in their Schools.

4.2 Revised HDR Policy

4.2.1 The Dean reported that a revised HDR Policy would go to Academic Committee for approval on Thursday, 19th August. The main revisions were “RHD” changed to “HDR” throughout, as well as:

Section 4.1 – inclusion of an expectation that candidates would normally have at least one peer reviewed output (for which they are the principal author) accepted for publication during their candidature, with direct implications on the candidature milestones program – the Committee agreed that “normally” allows for exceptions where a publisher takes a long time to decide on the publication of an output; and takes into account discipline specificities, as well as instances where it may not be appropriate to publish during candidature.

Section 4.5 – addition of Head of Element (with possible delegation to HDR Research Convenor) to recommend appointment of supervisors;

Section 4.7 – clarification of expectation that PhD candidature is three to four years full time equivalence (currently the average completion at Griffith is 3.9 years but a long tail causes the delay of much RTS income as well as extra costs not covered by RTS);

Section 4.8 – moved to 4.13, with subsequent renumbering of the previous sections 4.9 to 4.13;

Section 4.12 – amended to reflect the fact that the Dean/Deputy Dean (Research) may approve an extension to maximum candidature of six months FTE but that extensions beyond this period are unlikely and would need to be approved by the Dean, GGRS, and that candidature will lapse for any candidate who fails to complete within the maximum period of candidature or for whom an extension is not approved;

Section 4.13 – introduction of candidature milestones, including an early candidature milestone (conducted at Faculty level), a confirmation of candidature milestone, a mid candidature milestone (with the expectation that candidates would normally have submitted an output to a recognised outlet by this stage), and an annual progress report; and

Section 5.1 – inclusion of the expectation that candidates would normally be enrolled at the time their thesis is submitted for examination but that a candidate whose period of candidature has lapsed may still submit within three years of the lapse if authorised by the Dean, GGRS (subject to certain conditions, including a minimum period of re-enrolment).

4.2.2 The Dean reported that the new policy, if approved by Academic Committee at its next meeting, would take effect from 1st January 2011, and that it will apply to all new students. Current students will be encouraged to publish during candidature and complete additional milestones, but this requirement will not be compulsory. It was noted that the early candidature milestone was an important addition to the milestones program to ensure candidates reach...
confirmation of candidature within one year to eighteen months and because it is important to track satisfactory student progress in HDR programs, as this is a condition of enrolment for all students, and particularly so for students awarded scholarships, and international students. The committee agreed that a distinct preamble stating the application of the policy to current students versus new students would be appropriate in the implementation strategy.

**Action:**

4.2.3 GGRS to add a preamble outlining the application of the policy to current students versus new students.

4.2.4 The Dean reported that the accepted format of doctoral dissertations for examination may be amended to “thesis with publications”. Currently students are encouraged to publish during candidature, so this shift in policy is to explicitly encourage this practice, and provide students with research training to encourage publication during candidature. The candidate should be the principal author of publications produced during candidature; where there are multiple authors on a publication, the signatures of co-authors on publications would be necessary for publications to be accepted as part of the final dissertation submitted for examination. The committee discussed whether guidelines would be provided regarding protocol of authorship and publications produced during candidature, as well as how publications are acknowledged, referenced and/or included as part of the dissertation submitted for examination (considering the differences between disciplines), as well as advice provided to supervisors, candidates and potential examiners. The Dean confirmed that if Academic Committee approved the changes to HDR policy then an implementation strategy would be developed and discussed at Board of Graduate Research meetings and appropriate guidelines, forms and templates produced to guide academic staff and students as per the practices at other Australian universities. The Chair noted that the overarching policy on authorship would be the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. The Dean added that the inclusion of a new authorship form would be required in the acknowledgement sections of theses.

4.2.5 The Committee discussed current practices of research education and publication during candidature. The Chair noted that one of the purposes of the new policy was to instil a practice of training students to draft their own outputs for publication – with the sector pushing for four-year PhD programs, the Government will expect increased accountability for training outcomes. The Committee discussed which journals students should be aiming to publish in and agreed that this would have to be judged on a case-by-case basis with decisions being made in each student’s best interest.

**Noted**

4.2.5 The Dean acknowledged that the changes to the HDR Policy would require the University to re-think training, and reported that the next stage would be a revision of the Supervisor Accreditation Policy. The Chair noted that the reconstructed research administration database (with HDR module for electronic processing) will help push the HDR culture change at Griffith, and asked the Dean to thank the Board of Graduate Research for this excellent advance.

**4.3 Revised Professional Doctorate Policy**

The Dean advised that the Professional Doctorate Policy had been revised to reflect the same changes as the general HDR Policy. Candidates enrolled in Doctorates
with a 66% research component (HDR Professional Doctorates) will normally be expected to have at least one research output accepted for publication during candidature while candidates for Doctorates with 33% research component (non-HDR professional doctorates) will be encouraged to publish during candidature. It was noted that milestones for Professional Doctorates will be dependent on the structure of the specific program.

Noted

5.0 SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESSES FOR EXTERNAL GRANTS

5.1 The Committee noted the review process for each Group and Centre. All Groups have valued the approach in peer review. Some Groups have made peer review quite formalised while others have adopted a less formalised approach. Associate Professor Blumenstein reported that SEET was considering the idea of formalising the Group’s peer review approach but that discussions were on-going. The Committee agreed to monitor the outcomes of less-formalised peer reviewing to ensure problems do not arise; however, it was noted that some Centres that appeared to have less-formalised peer reviewing approaches were producing very good results.

Action:

5.2 Committee to monitor outcomes of less-formalised peer reviewing.

5.3 The Committee agreed that the expectation of all researchers to submit rejoinders to the assessor reports for their ARC and NHMRC grant applications should be embedded in peer reviewing discussions. The Chair noted that all researchers should expect their grant applications to be read by peers before being submitted to the Office for Research.

Action:

5.4 Committee to embed expectation of researchers to submit rejoinders into peer review discussions.

5.5 The Chair encouraged Committee members to share the Summary of Peer Review Processes with their colleagues.

Noted

6.0 INCLUSION OF CREATIVE WORKS IN RESEARCH KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

6.1 Tony Sheil advised the Committee that OR recommended creative works be included in research KPIs on a trial basis in 2010 (for 2007-2009 data), but not be related to research centre funding at this stage. The Committee noted that ERA preparations have resulted in creative works for the 2003-2008 period already being verified as research outputs and so only 2009 creative outputs will need to be verified before they can be included in Research Active status and Staircase indicators. Professor Cuskelly noted that ‘units’ of publication, and not publication ‘points’, should be referred to when discussing Research Active status, so as to avoid confusion with HERDC publication points.

6.2 The Committee was advised that the recommendations were being presented to the AEL Research Committee that afternoon. The Committee endorsed the
recommendations in principle, subject to recommendations from the AEL Research Committee.

**Action:**

6.3 OR to change publication ‘points’ to ‘units’ in paper and advise Research Committee of AEL Research Committee recommendations at next meeting.

7.0 **2011 INTERNAL TRAVEL SCHEMES**

The Committee approved all proposed changes to Internal Travel Schemes.

8.0 **2011 GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM**

The Committee approved all proposed changes to the Research Infrastructure Program.

9.0 **MEMBERSHIP OF THE HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE**

9.1 The Committee ratified the Chair’s executive approval of the creation of a new category of membership of GUHREC and the appointment of Mr Alan Dowd, Mr Christian Frost, Mr Greg Chapman, Mr Bob Harriman, and Dr Warren Millist to serve on GUHREC.

**Action:**

9.2 Forward to Academic Committee for approval.

10.0 **POSTPONEMENT OF 4TH YEAR REVIEW FOR THE SOCIO-LEGAL RESEARCH CENTRE**

10.1 The Chair reported that Professor Brad Sherman had been confirmed as the new Director of the Socio-Legal Research Centre. The Committee agreed to an informal review of the Socio-Legal Research Centre in February 2011, followed by a formal review at the end of 2011.

**Action:**

10.2 Forward to Academic Committee for approval.

11.0 **OUTCOMES FROM THE 2010 GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY POSTDOCTORAL AND RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS SCHEME**

11.1 The Committee noted the Chair’s executive approval of the appointment of eight 2010/2011 Griffith University Postdoctoral and Research Fellows, and approved the list of nine reserve applications. The Chair reported that all seventeen successful and reserve applicants for the current round of the Griffith University Postdoctoral and Research Fellowships scheme were of good quality.

11.2 The Committee agreed to formally review the guidelines and processes for the 2011/2012 Griffith University Postdoctoral and Research Fellowships Scheme in 2011. The Committee noted that the automatic allocation of one Fellowship per academic Group worked well in that it allowed for a more manageable process and recognised discipline differences between fellowship applicants. The Committee agreed that the assessment criteria for Research Fellows should be adjusted to reflect the higher expectations of Research Fellows compared to Postdoctoral Fellows. The Chair reported that he had responded to all queries for feedback from
applicants and noted that it would be useful if the Panel wrote a short feedback paragraph for each unranked applicant for future rounds.

Action:
11.3 Committee to formally review guidelines and processes in 2011.

12.0 RESEARCH INTEGRITY INFORMATION SHEET SERIES – NO. 4 STORAGE OF RESEARCH DATA/MATERIALS AND RESPONDING TO CHALLENGES ABOUT RESEARCH RESULTS

The Committee noted the Research Integrity Information Sheet Series – No. 4: Storage of research data/materials and responding to challenges about research results.

Noted

13.0 REPORTS FROM THE OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

The following reports were noted by the Committee:
• Research Applications for 08/05/2010 – 31/07/2010
• Grants Awarded for 08/05/2010 – 31/07/2010
• Consultancies Awarded for 08/05/2010 – 31/07/2010
• Animal Ethics Committee Minutes meeting 4/10
• Human Research Ethics Minutes meeting 5/10

Noted

14.0 2010 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

2010 Meeting Schedule listed below

Meeting Day: Tuesdays 9:30am - 11:30am
* meetings will proceed only if business warrants
** Chaired by Professor Parlo Singh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7 September*  | Video Conference: Nathan and Gold Coast | N72 Room 1.18
|               | Please note that this meeting will start at 10am | G34 Room 2.12 |
| 12 October**  | Mt Gravatt      | Social Sciences M10 Room 5.01 |
| 9 November    | Nathan          | Bray Centre N54 Room 2.01 |
| 7 December**  | Gold Coast      | Chancellery G34 Room 2.02 |
|               |                 | (Council Chambers)     |

Noted

15.0 Other Business

15.1 NCG Encouragement Grants – Professor Shum asked the Committee if there were specific eligibility criteria for applications for NCG Encouragement Grants. The
Chair reported that in the previous year successful applicants were all either ranked 5 by the NHMRC or in the top 10% of ARC applications; however, it was noted that more money was available this year and so the Committee needed to be flexible regarding eligibility criteria because results would be dependent on who applied. The Chair advised that staff can be assured that funding would be offered to more applicants this year.

15.2 Philanthropic HERDC Income – Professor Griffith reported that the Health Group had been seeking more strategic funds for research, including bequests, and asked if these funds could be included in HERDC returns. Tony Sheil confirmed they could be subject to meeting HERDC guidelines for inclusion.

15.3 Following the meeting, Daina Garklavs confirmed that the University already has a process in place to capture donations and bequests as research income. Development and Alumni is the office responsible for processing funding from these sources and, therefore, as a first priority, researchers must run their donations through that office. Development and Alumni alerts OR of income relating to research and OR enters these on the database as donations. During the HERDC process OR goes through an exhaustive process to ensure all donations are captured.

15.4 Professor Griffith enquired whether funds to support research students should be treated in the same way. The Chair responded that he would have an offline discussion with the Dean, GGRS and report back at the next meeting.

Action:

15.5 DVC(R) and Dean, GGRS to consider mechanisms to incorporate philanthropic funds to support research students into HERDC returns and report decisions to the next meeting of the Research Committee.

15.6 Tony Sheil reported that funded Chairs were also an issue and that research needs to be specified in the initial contracts (for audit trail purposes) to make them eligible for HERDC.