PRESENT

Members
Professor Ned Pankhurst, Chairperson
Professor Parlo Singh, Deputy Chairperson
Professor Wyatt-Smith
Professor Andy Bennett
Ms Lyn Bosanquet
Professor Graham Cuskelly
Professor Andrew O'Neil
Ms Mary Meadowcroft (Secretary)

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

1.0 APOLOGIES
Associate Professor Michael Blumenstein
Professor Lesley Chenoweth
Professor Lyn Griffiths
Dr Vicki Pattemore (Director, OR)
Mr Tony Shiel (Associate Director, OR)
Professor Howard Wiseman

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
2.1 The minutes of the 02/10 meeting were confirmed.

3.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

3.1 ARC and NHMRC awards and update

a. ARC Linkage applications Round 1
12 applications were submitted from Griffith, which is one third less than round 1 2010. There was a good spread of applications across the Academic Groups, and requests for 10 APAI stipends. A possible concern may be that the successful Linkage grantees at Griffith are fully occupied, and so we may need to review whether we should encourage more people who aren’t already applicants to submit Linkage Projects.

b. ARC LIEF
The Chair directed the Committee’s attention to the list of applications, and the substantial number where Griffith is the lead agency.

3.2 Federal Budget and Research
The Chair advised that the briefing in the agenda papers was prepared by Universities Australia. It is likely that the number or size of ARC and NHMRC project grants will decrease. The Linkage Project success rate is falling, but is still better than that for Discovery Projects, which look set to become even more difficult to obtain.
NHMRC are to receive an increase in funding. The major issue for Griffith in respect of NHMRC project grants is to achieve a success rate that approaches the national average. This is the area of the greatest potential for the University to significantly increase NCG funding.

Action

The Chair will report on progress to the August meeting of the Committee.

3.3 Incentive scheme for Nature/Science publications

The University is still providing $20,000 for those who publish in either Nature or Science. Two publications a year in Science or Nature will elevate the University to within the top 200 to 250 universities in the Shanghai Jiao Tong university rankings. There is nothing equivalent for other research areas. If it can be demonstrated that there are venues of similar prestige and tactical advantage outside of Science and Nature, then the University would consider recognition of high profile importance in other disciplines too.

3.4 Update on NHMRC reference group

The University is to establish a reference group for NHMRC, with the intention to review our performance in granting rounds and consider strategies to improve performance, group or centre processes, and then to monitor implementation of initiatives by the Groups and centres. Suggested membership is a chair with significant NHMRC experience, two representatives from each of the Health and SEET Groups, and any others as necessary. It is likely that the reference group will be convened in the 2nd half of this year.

Action

The Chair will report on progress to the August meeting of the Committee.

3.5 Overheads charge on research grants

Senior management had decided that implementation of an overheads charge on research grants did not require wide staff consultation as it is an administrative decision. The responses to the introduction of the charge have been mixed. Some researchers did not realize that the overhead was on top of project costs, and that it does not apply to schemes that do not allow overheads. The key issue now is to get to the stage where the charge is understood and accepted. The Chair asked Committee members to help with the implementation by talking through issues with staff who are upset by the requirement to charge overheads. If a real problem is identified, then the guidelines can be amended.

3.6 Griffith’s 2009 CRC bids

The Chair advised that the University is looking for a 4:1 cash return on our investment in CRC applications. Difficulties have arisen where partners have expected us to participate for a lower return.

3.7 Other matters

Centre and Institute Directors Forum - The Chair reported that the Forum had resulted in a good conversation around strategic issues. Topics for discussion at the next Forum will be the interaction between Centres and schools, and RHD students.

GURG feedback – The Chair advised that he had received two diametrically opposed responses to the decision not to offer GURGs in 2010. Some have reacted very positively, seeing it as a strategic move that would deliver funding to those who are trying very hard to get ARC or NHMRC grants. Others have indicated that they run their research on GURG funding and are very concerned about the move. The GURG scheme seems to have given some people the message that it was more rewarding to
apply for internal grants than to apply for ARC/NHMRC. OR reported that most Queensland universities were diverting the funds into people support instead of project support. The following points were made in the ensuing discussion:

- the difficulties faced by researchers who had been counting on a GURG round this year; that not every one is ready to be competitive for ARC/NHMRC, and that these people would have no funding.
- With abolition of the GURG there is less opportunity to become research active. People who are not ECR and not research active will have to find other means to participate in research, for example through a CRC or consulting work. If people are not research active, yet get the same % of their time for research as those that get NCG grants, there is an inequity which should be dealt with through performance management and a discussion about their activity profile.
- Some Groups have schemes to induct people to NCG – about $5,000 that helps them to learn how to apply, and how to construct project budgets.
- At the Queensland OR Directors meeting, it was apparent that Griffith funds researchers quite generously. At UQ only very small amounts of funding are available. For example, UQ attribute an increase in the number of Linkage grants to an increase in their own internal grant from $2,000 to $3,500. Perhaps Griffith could investigate other mechanisms to supply a small amount of money, either through centres, or for ARC Discovery seeding, or to help with writing up and/or continuing with the review process for publications. Rather than running schemes, we need to consider where the provision of a small amount of money would make a difference. This may vary from year to year.

Action:

3.8 Chair and OR to investigate other mechanisms to provide support to researchers, and report back to a future meeting of the Committee.

4.0 DEAN’S REPORT

The Dean presented the Board of Graduate Research action sheet.

5.0 REVISED RESEARCH CENTRES POLICY AND 4TH YEAR AND ANNUAL REPORT FORMS

5.1 Issues discussed by the Committee were:

- Members were concerned that centres would be required to accept any research active researcher who applied for membership.
- The committee identified a problem with the revised definition of membership, as it does not differentiate between the membership used for university reporting purposes, and the different bar that centre directors may set for full membership (centre determination of membership). For example, the Australian Rivers Institute admits people who are research active, but there are different categories. There is a well defined and public matrix delineating the benefits and expectations of different levels. Each individual’s membership is reviewed every 3 years. Senior fellows not are not eligible for conference funding, they are expected to generate enough money for their own conference expenditures.
- For external showcasing it is important that Centres are able to determine who is presented as a member. For the web, or brochures, a centre may not want to include people on the membership list who are barely research active.
- The Chair advised that Centres will retain the capacity to determine their levels of membership.
- Centre Directors should have close involvement in performance review. Without this, Centre Directors are limited in the influence they can have on the research performance of staff
5.2 Changes to the draft policy agreed by the Committee were:

- That the first sentence of section 10.5 be deleted so that joint membership is not discouraged.
- To include a statement about impact and quality.
- Item 8: To increase the number of full members of university centres from 12 to 20, and of Faculty Centres from 6 to 10. A transitional exemption would be allowed for centres that do not meet the new minimum.
- Item 8: To increase the staff profile to 12 for University Centres and 8 for Faculty Centres.
- Item 10: To amend centre membership definitions to make the distinction between the definition for reporting purposes, and the definition that centres must apply to their membership.
- Item 8: To include Learning and Teaching in the time commitment of a Centre Director.

5.3 It was agreed that the 10% cap on an increase or decrease to a centre’s funding allocation over the previous year, would remain in place for 2011 funding allocations.

5.4 The fourth year review and annual report forms were approved by the Committee.

5.5 Following the meeting, the revised research policy was sent to the committee for approval, by flying minute. All Committee members approved the policy, with the following matters raised:

- Professor Wyatt-Smith was concerned that the impact of the expanded membership on centres/institutes, and in particular on the Griffith Institute for Education Research, has not been addressed in discussion to this point. Another related matter raised by the Dean is the funding allocation, and the basis for changes to allocations. This question is motivated by the direct consequence of the considerable expansion in GIER membership, following the implementation of the changed policy.
- Professor Andy Bennett sought clarification that Associate members may not receive the same level of support as full members, at the discretion of the Centre Director. An amendment was made to item 10.3 to clarify this point.
- Professor Howard Wiseman was concerned that some centres may fall below the new, higher minimum staff levels and staff profile. A note was included in Item 8 to clarify that there may be exceptions to the minimum staff levels and profile.

Action

5.6 That the draft Research Centre Policy be amended as described in paragraph 5.2, and that it be sent to Committee members for approval by Flying Minute. If Committee members approve the revised policy, the Chair will seek executive approval of the policy from the Chair of Academic Committee.

Resolution

5.7 The Research Committee resolved to consider a further draft Research Centres Policy by Flying Minute, and if approved, to recommend to Academic Committee for approval.

6.0 NEW RESEARCHER GRANT GUIDELINES AND FORMS

Resolution

6.1 The Research Committee approved the 2010 New Researcher Grant guidelines and forms with the following changes:
1. That ‘Group’ be substituted for ‘Faculty’ throughout the documents.
2. That the assessment criteria relating to potential be reduced to 20% and the criterion relating to quality be increased to 40%.

7.0 EXTENSION OF TERM OF RESEARCH CENTRE FOR WORK, ORGANISATION AND WELLBEING AND THE GRIFFITH INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Resolution

7.1 The Research Committee ratified the Chair’s executive decision, and recommends to Academic Committee that the terms of both the Griffith Institute for Educational Research and the Research Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing be extended to 31 December 2011, and that both centres undergo a fourth year review in 2010.

8.0 REPORTS FROM THE OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

8.1 The following reports were noted by the Committee:
   • Research Applications for 07/05/2010 – 31/05/2010
   • Grants Awarded for 07/05/2010 – 31/05/2010
   • Consultancies Awarded for 07/05/2010 – 31/05/2010

Noted

9.0 2010 Schedule of Meetings

2010 Meeting Schedule listed below
Meeting Day: Tuesdays 9:30am - 11:30am
* meetings will proceed only if business warrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 July**</td>
<td>Mt Gravatt</td>
<td>Social Sciences M10 Room 5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Bray Centre N54 Room 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September*</td>
<td>Video Conference: Nathan and Gold Coast</td>
<td>N72 Room _1.18 G34 Room 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October**</td>
<td>Mt Gravatt</td>
<td>Social Sciences M10 Room 5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Bray Centre N54 Room 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December**</td>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Chancellery G34 Room 2.02     (Council Chambers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noted

Confirmed:……………………
Date: ………………………….