 Minutes for Distribution of Meeting 4/04 held at 1:30pm on Thursday, 26th August 2004 in the Faculty Meeting Room, Building 39, room 150A.

PRESENT: Prof D Steel (Chair), Dr S Gower (Deputy Chair), Prof J Fulcher, Prof M Gaffikin (External member), Dr J Goard, Mr A Krishna, A/Prof T Marchant, A/Prof F Naghdy, Prof P Ogunbona, Prof R Safavi-Naini, Prof J Seberry and A/Prof T Wysocki.

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms K Sheridan.

1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1.1 Apologies/Leave of Absence

Apologies were received from: Dr M Nelson

1.2 Confirmation of Minutes for the Meeting of 17 June 2004

The minutes of the meeting held 17 June 2004 were confirmed.

1.3 Business Arising from Previous Meeting

1.3.1 RIBG-Pool 2

As a result of discussions at the last meeting, please note the following action:

- Dr Steve Gower sent an email to RIBG-Pool 2 applicants, offering to provide feedback on the applications submitted.
- The recommendation that all grant applicants be given equal opportunity to clarify any aspect of their application during the ranking process will be adopted for the URC Small Grant Application ranking: applicants have been asked to be on standby – or to nominate a spokesperson to be on standby – to clarify aspects of their application, if required.

1.3.2 URC Small Grant Applications

As a result of discussions at the last meeting, please note the following action:

- Dr Steve Gower sent an email to academic staff regarding assistance with URC Small Grant Applications for 2005.
- New procedures have been adopted to ensure that written feedback can be provided to applicants after the process is completed.

1.3.3 Funding of faculty research initiatives

As a result of discussions at the last meeting, a memo was drafted regarding the funding of faculty research initiatives and forwarded to the Dean.

1.3.4 First Year Research Proposal Review Guidelines

The Associate Dean (Research) is reviewing the guidelines and considering the appropriate implementation required at Faculty level.
2. REPORT FROM CHAIR – VERBAL REPORT

Professor David Steel, the incoming FRC Chair and newly appointed Associate Dean (Research) thanked Dr Steve Gower for taking on the role of FRC Chair over the last year. The Chair noted that Dr Gower will continue on the Committee as Deputy Chair.

The Chair noted that an AUQA Research Reference Group meeting will take place next Thursday or Friday and those involved will be contacted soon regarding an appropriate time.

3. REPORT FROM POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE (PRPC)

Nothing to report.

4. ANNUAL RESEARCH POSTGRADUATE CONFERENCE

Professor John Fulcher reported that SITACS will be holding their annual postgraduate research conference on Wednesday 20th October 2004. Last year there was some interest in expanding the conference across the whole Faculty, therefore, SECTE and SMAAS are again invited to be involved in the day if they wish.

Contacts in both Schools should speak with Professor Fulcher regarding the arrangements for the day.

5. RANKING OF URC SMALL GRANT APPLICATIONS 2005

Each member present at the meeting provided a preliminary ranking prior to the meeting.

The Chair noted that a budget of approximately $48 000 was available for the FRC to allocate directly. This budget is approximately proportional to ARC research income brought in by the Faculty: the Faculty brings in approximately 12% of the University's research income and has received 13% of the funding directly available to Faculties through the URC Small Grants Scheme.

100 applications were received from across the University, of which 23 were from Informatics, plus an additional 3 multi-disciplinary applications. It was noted that the quality of Informatics applications has improved considerably over the last few years. This combination of both quality and quantity of applications is very healthy for the Faculty.

The Chair discussed the process to be undertaken and it was agreed that the Committee would first assess eligibility and provide feedback for each application, after which final ranking and recommended funding will be allocated. Clarification from an applicant on points of fact may be sought, if deemed necessary.

It was noted that each applicant would receive written feedback on their application after the process was completed.
The Chair noted that, due to conflicts of interest, A/Professor Wysocki could not rank the application of Vial/Wysocki and A/Professor Safavi-Naini could not rank the application of Baek. A method was devised where both applications could be appropriately compensated for this disadvantage.

The Committee discussed the eligibility of staff on limited term contracts that are due for renewal before the end of 2005 and noted that they could still be offered a grant by URC contingent on the continuation of their appointment. Given this, it was agreed that contract status should not be a consideration when ranking applications.

The Committee discussed each application, providing specific and general comments. The following general comments were made:

- The executive summaries in many applications were too technical – the guidelines require applications to be written in plain English, and specifically state that executive summaries need to be intelligible to an audience of academics representing all faculties.
- Methodology – need to ensure that applicant clearly states what they are really going to do.
- Applicants should focus on more generic issues rather than coming up with a product.
- Applicants need to learn how to communicate what is innovative or ‘new’ about the proposed research. This can be done by indicating how the research area has changed or will change and what is ‘new’ about the proposed project.
- Many applications would be suitable for linkage funding - applicants should be advised of the availability of the internal linkage funding scheme.

At the conclusion of discussions, the final ranking and recommended $ were approved.

[Ranking omitted due to confidential nature]
6. ITEMS FOR NOTING

6.1 New and Revised Higher Degree Research (HDR) Policies

The following new/revised rules, policies and guidelines were approved at the Academic Senate meeting of 28 July for immediate implementation:

- **Code of Practice – Supervision**
  The Code of Practice – Supervision has been updated and revised to more accurately reflect current practice and to address anomalies. The revisions include the addition of a first interview checklist and a commencement of candidature form.


- **HDR Student Academic Grievance Policy**

- **Progress Review and Probation Guidelines**
  The new guidelines have been written to assist Faculties in apply these processes consistently across campus.


- **Revised HDR Course Rules**
  The HDR Course Rules have been updated and revised to more accurately reflect their coverage and intent.


7. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

8. NEXT MEETING

**Thursday 11 November, 2004  Faculty Meeting Room, Building 39/105A**

It is likely that PG Research Scholarship Applications will be ranked at this meeting.

Professor David Steel
Chair