



MONASH University
Education

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Meeting No. 3/09
22 July 2009

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Meeting No 3/09 of the Research Committee of the Faculty of Education to be held on Wednesday 22 July, 2009, at 10.30am, in the Room G08, Education building, Clayton Campus.

Apologies are to be forwarded to Dr Chris Siva on ext 52896 or email:

Chris.Siva@education.monash.edu.au.

Dr Chris Siva

Executive Officer

AGENDA

Members having a direct commercial or financial interest in any item before this meeting must declare that interest to the Chair via the Executive Officer prior to consideration of the item, and must not take part in a vote on any matter concerning it.

1. ATTENDANCE

ACTION

1.1. Present

1.2. In Attendance

Ms Susan Plowright, Dr Bernard Holkner, Professor John Loughran and Dr Paul Richardson

1.3. Apologies

1.4. On Leave

Professor Dennis Moore, Professor Terri Seddon

2. *CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA

2.1. Starring of Items

The Chair will provide members with the opportunity to star additional items for discussion

2.2. Notice of Motion

The Chair will move that for all items other than those starred the recommendations contained therein be adopted without discussion or the information noted.

3. *MINUTES

3.1. Meeting No 2/09

Recommendation

That the Minutes of Meeting No. 2/09 of the Research Committee held on Wednesday 29 April 2009 be confirmed as a correct record of the meeting and signed.

RC 31/09

3.2. Matters Arising from the Minutes

4.

4.1. Presentation

Dr Fiona Neilson will provide a short presentation on the outcome of the ERA trials in the Arts Faculty and their implications for the Faculty of Education.

5. ITEMS FOR REPORT

5.1. *Chair's Report

a. Internationalisation: The chair will discuss the new internationalisation grants

b. Research Budget

6. *ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

6.1. Future Node Policy

Future Node Policy and other matters – outlining Research Support within the Faculty.

**RC 32/09
RC33/09**

6.2. ARC Working Group update

The ARC Working Group will present a process for ARC Discovery and Linkage applications that involve a minimum of 9 months planning in advance of project submission with a set of milestones for feedback and revisions.

RC 34/09

6.3. ECR Working Group update

The ECR working group will report on feedback from Information sessions presented across the three campuses and also on plans for the rest of the year.

7.0 OTHER ITEMS

7.1 Research Month

Research Committee to suggest possible ways in which the Faculty can engage with the next Research Matters - August 2009.

RC35/09

7.2 Node Update

2 presentations:

1. CEMM – Michael Henderson/Bernard Holkner
2. PPL – John Loughran
3. Psychology of Teachers and Students – Paul Richardson

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 16th September, 2009

DISTRIBUTION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Professor Jane Kenway (chair)
Professor Margaret Somerville
Professor Marilyn Flear
Professor Ilana Snyder
Ms Bronwyn Smith
Elected Members:
Professor Terri Seddon
Professor Dennis Moore
Associate Professor Helen Watt
Dr Joel Windle
Dean's Nominees:
Associate Professor Phil Payne
Dr Michael Henderson
Student Representative:
Hazel Tan

FOR INFORMATION

Professor Sue Willis, Dean
Mr Peter Lawford, Faculty Manager
Ms Susan Plowright, Manager, Academic Services & Quality
Mr Romesh Perera, Manager (Finance and Resources)
Ms Anita Forsyth, Director Research Degrees
Mr Andrew Jackson, Assistant Manager, Research Development
Mr Mayur Katariya, Coordinator Research Degrees Administration
Mrs Halina Oswald, Director Research Office
Ms Winifred Hirst, Education Subject Librarian, Matheson Library

(RC 31/09)



MONASH University
Education

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Meeting No. 2/09
29 April 2009

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Meeting No 2/09 of the Research Committee of the Faculty of Education held on Wednesday 29 April, 2009, at 11.00am, in Room G08, Education building, Clayton Campus.

Ms Prue Madden

Acting Executive Officer

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Present

Professor Jane Kenway (chair), Professor Margaret Somerville, Professor Marilyn Flear, Professor Ilana Snyder, Professor Terri Seddon, Professor Dennis Moore, Associate Professor Helen Watt, Dr Joel Windle, Associate Professor Phil Payne, Dr Michael Henderson, Ms Bronwyn Smith, Ms Hazel Tan.

In Attendance

Ms Sue Plowright, Ms Prue Madden

Apologies

On Leave

Dr Chris Siva

*CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA

Starring of Items

Notice of Motion

The Chair moved that for all items other than those starred, the recommendations contained therein be adopted without discussion or the information noted.

MINUTES

Meeting No 1/09

Recommendation

The Minutes of Meeting No. 1/09 of the Research Committee held on Wednesday 11 March 2009 were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.

ITEMS FOR REPORT

4.1 *Chair's Report

a. Internationalisation. The Research Resource Sub-committee allocated \$15,000 in its budget to support the internationalisation of Faculty research. The Chair called for all Committee members to think about a Faculty strategy for internationalisation.

Action: This matter would be an item on the agenda of the next Research Committee meeting.

b. ERA. A small number of Education researchers publish in Humanities and Creative Arts cluster journals. In relation to Education Field of Research codes, all Faculty researchers will be encouraged to give an Education code as a proportion of the code allocation for their publications. Jane Kenway advised that she will send a communication to all researchers about ERA codes and

will also present information sessions in the Faculty to advise Faculty members of this matter and wider implications of the ERA.

Action: JK to send email to all Faculty members.

The political implications of the coding policy as currently defined, on the education discipline was discussed. The Committee decided to hold a special meeting of the Committee and to invite Peter Goodyear from the University of Sydney to attend by videolink. A representative from the Monash Research Committee would also be asked to attend.

Action: JK to invite Professor Goodyear.

c. ECR Induction Sessions. Jane Kenway and the ECR Working Group will be holding ECR Induction Sessions at each campus

d. Monash Research Month. Research Committee encourages all Faculty members to become involved.

e. Interdisciplinary Activities. The Chair encouraged all Faculty members to undertake interdisciplinary activities.

f. Institutes and Centres. The Chair reported that this matter was not on the current agenda for the Monash Research Committee, but hopefully it would be shortly.

***ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

5.1 Node Working Party

Notes from the Node Working Party of 25 March were tabled. There was considerable discussion about involvement of non-Node members, appropriate size of the Nodes, open/closed membership, workload point issues for Node Leaders, types of Node and alternative Node nomenclature including the use of the term 'centre', epistemological and performative reporting and accountability.

Agreed: Research Committee members agreed unanimously that Nodes should be of the 'hothouse' type as set out in the Working Party notes. Most Research Committee members preferred the name 'Group' rather than 'Node'.

There was considerable discussion about the workloads of Node Leaders. Committee members supported the view that Node Leaders should have a workload allocation. Any decision on this would have to take into account of activities undertaken by Node Leaders.

Action: JK and PM will contact each Node Leader to ask them to indicate their activities as Node Leader and their teaching load.

Action: PM to send Phillip Payne and Marilyn Fler a copy of tabled Node Working Party notes.

The Chair commended the current Node webpages and noted that Node Leaders would be asked to think of ways further to improve their webpages, such as listing the activities of their HDR students.

Action: PM to send email asking Node leaders to think of ways to improve their Node webpage with links to the webpages being provided.

There was discussion about resourcing of Nodes in relation to their size and the productivity expected of them. It was thought vital to strike a balance between epistemological and performative issues, particularly in the light of the ERA.

Action: PM to put the resourcing/productivity issue on the agenda for the next meeting of the Node Working Party.

5.2 ARC Working Group update

The ARC Working Group had met and was in the process of developing a document summarising the resources and opportunities available at the Faculty level for promoting ARC grant applications. At present, Linkage applications are low throughout the University. The Chair congratulated Joel Windle and Jenny Miller for their Linkage submission. The Chair noted that increased conversation between the Development Office and the Research Office would be beneficial in relation to Linkage applications. The Working Group was asked to circulate the draft document before the next meeting.

Action: JK and Bronwyn Smith to share information from the University Linkage working party.

5.3 ECR Working Group update

The Early Career Working Group had met to discuss ideas for improving research development support for Early Career Researchers. It had been decided to hold an ECR day as part of the MERC Conference and also as part of Faculty Day. The Group would also provide information as part of the ECR Induction Day on each campus.

Other recommendations included a handbook for ECRs and a webpage. The Chair suggested that ECRs' approaches to research leadership could also be put on the agenda for the next ECR Working Group meeting.

Action: Chris to talk to Tania Bull about an ECR webpage.

OTHER ITEMS

6.1 *Monash University Draft Strengths and Themes

The Chair noted that Research Committee members did not think that the list of University strengths and themes in Research Committee Agenda Paper 13/09 was entirely appropriate for Education. Members were asked to look at the strengths and themes and suggest additions.

Action: PM to circulate Node Leaders with a table similar to the table in Agenda Paper 14/09, asking Node Leaders to note where they see their activities fitting in.

6.2 *Faculty Seminar Series

This item was held over until the next meeting and was to be placed early in the agenda.

6.3 *Research Month

All Committee members were asked to involve themselves in this event.

6.4 *Node Update

Phillip Payne and Margaret Somerville each presented a summary of their recent Node activities. The Chair thanked them for their interesting summaries and noted that Node Leaders should consider using some of the \$15,000 earmarked for international activities when considering the resourcing of their Node Visiting Scholars.

Action: This matter would be an item on the agenda of the next Research Committee meeting.

Action: CS to circulate MEC operational plan to members of the research committee.

7. Any Other Business

Hazel Tan advised the Committee of the MERC Conference on 3 July and the Global Education Systems Day on 8 June.

8. NEXT MEETING

Page 4 of 5

Wednesday 22 July, 2009

DISTRIBUTION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Professor Jane Kenway (chair)
Professor Margaret Somerville
Professor Marilyn Flear
Professor Ilana Snyder
Ms Bronwyn Smith
Elected Members:
Professor Terri Seddon
Professor Dennis Moore
Associate Professor Helen Watt
Dr Joel Windle
Dean's Nominees:
Associate Professor Phil Payne
Dr Michael Henderson
Student Representative:
Hazel Tan

FOR INFORMATION

Professor Sue Willis, Dean
Mr Peter Lawford, Faculty Manager
Ms Susan Plowright, Manager,
Academic Services & Quality
Mr Romesh Perera, Manager
(Finance and Resources)
Ms Anita Forsyth, Director Research
Degrees
Mr Andrew Jackson, Assistant
Manager, Research Development
Mr Mayur Katariya, Coordinator
Research Degrees Administration
Mrs Halina Oswald, Director
Research Office
Ms Winifred Hirst, Education Subject
Librarian, Matheson Library

Research Support within the Faculty and Faculty Research Groups (formerly Nodes) (RC32/09)

Developed by the Node Working Party of the Research Committee
Jane, Prue, Joel, Dennis and Margaret

FINAL DRAFT: do not cite or circulate please.
2009-06-12

Friends and colleagues, this paper arises from a long period of consideration and negotiation. Since the *Re-Imagining Our Research Otherwise Day* in February 2007, we have grappled with the difficult issue of how best to organise, support and develop each other and ourselves with regard to research (see Appendix 1 for a timeline). A huge amount of discussion, consultation and debate has occurred and the early steps were put in place last year when Nodes were funded. This year we also funded existing nodes and the funding is to last till the end of 2009. This year, through the work of the Node Working Party of the Research Committee and other working parties of Research Committee (ECRs & Grant Winning strategies), the Research Committee, the Dean and Executive and through our meeting with Node leaders, the final steps have been taken to bring this process to a conclusion. In this concluding decision, we have sought to be as clear and fair as possible. We have also sought to avoid micro management as much as possible while at the same looking to support, shape and seriously enhance Faculty research. The most contentious issue has been the formation and operations of the Nodes, hence we focus on these here. But please note that Nodes are now called Faculty Research Groups (FRGs). This is due to the widespread unpopularity of the term Node. Further Research Committee expressed disquiet about the name Node and showed a strong preference for an alternative name

Supporting all researchers in the Faculty

Not all researchers are expected or required to be members of Faculty Research Groups and if being an FRG member does not suit you then you should feel no pressure to join or feel disadvantaged by not joining. Further, all academic staff are expected to be active researchers and the work of all staff will be part of the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) exercise, whether people are members of Faculty Research Groups or not. We will ensure that being outside a Faculty Research Group does not disadvantage researchers. The Research Committee will thus provide the following sorts of support as of January 2010.

- Undertake the development of Early Career Researchers' generic research skills. These will be developed through the activities organised by the Early Career Researcher Working Party of Research Committee and activities will draw on the expertise of more established researchers. In effect this will be a form of group mentoring.
- Continue to offer research development workshops and other support for researchers generally, particularly with regard to writing for publication and applying for research grants (see Appendix 2 which describes the Faculty's future approach for developing skills in grant-writing applications).
- Continue to provide grants to support research projects and publications
- Each Campus will have a Campus Research Leader who will work with the Research Committee (each will be on the Committee), the Early Career Researcher Working Party and each other to provide generic research support for all researchers (see Appendix 5).
- Researchers wishing to work together should continue to do so even if their work is not of the type funded by the Faculty Research Group program. Some money will be available to support the ad hoc activities of these sets of researchers, but this will not be ongoing.
- In 2009, PDP support included research mentoring, and workload points were allocated accordingly. Although this will still happen to some small extent, PDP will no longer be

considered in this way and neither will workload be allocated for it. This load will be redistributed to those involved in providing generic research development support (e.g. Campus Research Leaders and others who take on very substantive roles).

- The 'Finding a Supervisor' section for graduate students on the web will be altered. The page will list the Field of Research (FoR) categories used by the ARC. Staff will be listed under the appropriate FoR category (one or more, depending upon what suits). When potential students click on a researcher's name, they will be taken to the Staff Profile webpage if that researcher is not a member of a Faculty Research Group. If the researcher is a member of a FRG, they will be taken to the FRG's web page. The Associate Dean Research Degrees & Induction (ADRI) will send those who want to work with an FRG member to a Faculty Research Group leader. The FRG leader will then be involved in the allocation of a supervisor. Those who want to work with other researchers will be allocated by the ADRI.

Please note this dot point needs to be further developed by Ilana and others in her team and also with Tania, the webmaster.

- All researchers will continue to be supported by Research Office staff on their campus and across campuses. (See Appendix 3).

What is a Faculty Research Group? (Formerly called a Node)

Research Committee has agreed that Faculty Research Groups are to be or become 'hothouses' of research in both epistemological and performative terms. A hothouse is defined as 'a place where a particular thing flourishes and develops, usually in an intensive way' (Encarta) and this is what we want with regard to FRGs.

Epistemological Work

- A Faculty Research Group is a group of researchers who share similar research foci and interests. It is however, more than just a collection of individual researchers. Rather it is a collection of people who share an epistemological program. In this sense, it is an intellectual home.
- To be a Faculty Research Group, the membership must clarify the pressing or new epistemological research directions to be explored and the pressing or new research questions to be articulated. FRG members are expected to collaborate on these matters and thus the process is understood as developmental.
- This epistemological program should be one with the potential to lead the field with which the Faculty Research Group associates itself and in so doing, to address significant educational questions of our times. FRGs are expected to be or become distinctive and distinguished in their research field. The lead-time towards achieving this will vary and those Groups who expect to take longer should factor this into their plans.
- The focus of the Faculty Research Group's work is on the core epistemological program. Members thus orient their FRG activities to this program. Of course members will have other research interests too but it is not the responsibility of the Faculty Research Group to keep adjusting its activities to the research interests of individuals. Rather the hope is that the FRG's focus will be more than the sum of its parts and will thus enhance individual research foci. Similarly it will enhance the Faculty's research profile.
- Of necessity this work is developmental, thus Faculty Research Groups are encouraged to see their epistemological program as ongoing.

Performative Work

- Faculty Research Groups are expected to attract external income and to have peer refereed publications that arise from the work of the Faculty Research Group. Not all FRG members are expected to be on all the Group's research projects or publications but it is expected that FRG work produces collective research grants and publications at least amongst sub-groups of the FRG. This will happen in various ways.

- Faculty Research Groups should attract collective reputation. Eventually they should have a visible collective presence in their appropriate epistemological communities; nationally and internationally.
- Faculty Research Groups are encouraged to develop national and international networks related to the work of the FRG.
- We anticipate that Faculty Research Groups will engage with appropriate parts of the broader education community (however defined by the FRG) in order to disseminate their research and to secure grants.
- All such matters need to be built into Faculty Research Group planning, *taking into account as much as possible the Group's particular stage of development.*

Faculty Research Group activities

- To achieve all this, Faculty Research Groups have to be active throughout the year; they can't exist in name only or only involve brief flurries of activity. They are meant to be lively active communities of intellectual work and research practice.
- Faculty Research Group activities will include: regular gatherings; publications and grant applications from certain subsets of the FRG at least; seminars or conferences; symposia at appropriate conferences beyond Monash; visiting scholars category 2 and possibly category 1; activities specifically oriented to the HDR Associate Members (see below). They should particularly include reading and discussion groups around their epistemological program.
- Faculty Research Groups are encouraged to collaborate with other FRGs where appropriate (such as joint funding of events or visitors). Further, they are also encouraged to be inclusive when it comes to researchers who are not in an FRG or who are members of other FRGs. For instance, FRGs may have Visiting Scholars from whom other Faculty might benefit.

Membership

- Faculty Research Groups should ideally have a minimum full membership of around 6-8 and a maximum of 14. An ideal size would be around 8-10 full members as this size would best enable the Group to focus its activities. It is much more difficult for big groups to be 'hot-houses' of research activity. However, this size may vary to accommodate new staff members.
- Faculty Research Groups are ideally expected to include a range of seniorities and particularly to include Early Career Researchers. They should have at least one member who is a leading researcher (with a substantial track record and with experience of research leadership).
- Researchers can be members of more than one Faculty Research Group but Full Membership requires an active commitment to the work of that FRG. Researchers might thus best consider becoming a full member of one Faculty Research Group and an Associate Member of another if they continue to want to be a member of two FRGs. Less active involvement will be expected of Associate members
- Postgraduate students can be Associate members of Faculty Research Groups and while some FRG activities will be directed towards them not all need include them.
- FRGs are encouraged to have Partner Research Groups or Partner Researchers if they are *actively* involved with other groups of researchers or individual researchers nationally and internationally.
- At the end of each year, Faculty Research Groups will reconsider their membership and members who are not active in the work of the FRG should reconsider their membership. Reports to the Faculty and requests for future funding will require clarification about active membership and Associate membership

Leadership and support

The FRG's leadership will be up to the Group but that person must be prepared and able to do the leadership work listed in Appendix 4.

- The responsibilities of Faculty Research Group Leaders will be considerable (See Appendix 4 for the Position Description of this role). They will thus have a Faculty workload allocation.
- Each Faculty Research Group Leader will be allocated a support person from the Faculty's Research Office. This person will also assist FRG members with specific FRG activities.
- The Faculty will allocate money to support Faculty Research Group activities; although it is expected that after a period of three to five years FRGs become self-supporting.

Visibility

- All Faculty Research Groups currently have basic websites which indicate who their members are (with links to staff profile pages) and have a brief statement of the broad collective interests of the FRG. Some websites also have a list of Associate Member graduate research students and the names of their research projects. This is a minimum.
- It is vital that Faculty research has an impressive public face. To this end, Faculty Research Groups are expected to have an active website which clearly articulates the epistemological program and associated research questions of the FRG (see above). It should also indicate the range of activities that the FRG is involved in, including meetings schedules, conferences, seminars, retreats, shared publications and shared research grants and projects.
- Such active websites will be required in order to secure Faculty funding in future.

Accountability

- Faculty Research Groups will have to report to Research Committee annually (early Nov). The Research Committee will appoint an external panel of peer referees, to be chaired (only) by the ADR, to consider these reports and to make recommendations to the Research Committee about each FRG's funding and to provide advice about its future development. The outcomes will be announced in late November.
- The reporting protocols will firstly require the Faculty Research Group to outline its collective and subset activities and achievements for the year of reporting. The external panel will not be interested in the individual work of Group members unless it arose from FRG activities specifically. It will only be interested in the work that has arisen from the FRG and the epistemological development and performance that has resulted. The report should also include a brief statement of how the money allocated to the FRG was spent.
- The report will secondly require Faculty Research Groups to develop a plan for the following year, particularly focussing on the further development of the epistemological program and on how the FRG plans to further build its research performance (publications, grant income etc). This should also indicate how any monies provided by the Faculty will be used. Future funding will be based how well the Faculty Research Group met its aspirations, so these need to be realistic.
- Faculty Research Group websites will be part of this process.
- Not all FRGs will be funded for the following year. Those that do not meet the criteria laid out above will lapse but may use the following year to gear up to apply for FRG status the following year.
- Invitations to establish a new FRG will be annual. New FRGs will be judged by the same peer review panel process as that used to consider FRG reports and future Faculty recognition.

Research Centres

- We continue to wait for advice from the University on this question. However, we can probably safely assume that future Faculty funded and endorsed research centres will be based upon previous success (both epistemological and performative). We can also assume that they will constitute a critical mass of researchers (possibly more than one Faculty Research Group) and will speak to either the University's research themes and/or national research priorities. Faculty Research Groups may like to build into their planning preparation to become a Faculty funded and endorsed research centre.
- It will be made clear on the Faculty research website which Research Centres meet the University Criteria and are Faculty funded and endorsed.

A Faculty Research Group is not

- just a set of researchers who come together to continue the research that they would be doing anyway — either individually or collectively. It is about enhancing what is there already.
- about a post hoc collation of performance data that has been produced in order to demonstrate performance and to gain official recognition and funding.
- about mentoring researchers with regard to developing generic research skills (see above). However, researchers at all levels will implicitly benefit as a function of their involvement in the Faculty Research Group's program.

Appendix 1: Timeline: the activities and consultations that have brought us to this point.

Timeline for Nodes

Date	Progress step
14 February 2007	Researchers in Education Day – “Imagining Our Research Otherwise”, Bayview Centre.
5 June, 6 August, 17 September, 10 October, 7 November 2007	Five meetings of the Research Directions Team
7 March 2007 28 March 2007 14 June 2007	“Imagining Our Research Otherwise” seminar series held at Clayton and Peninsula Campus. Session PowerPoints and recordings put up on webpage: http://education.monash.edu.au/staff/research/seminars2007/
17 September 2007 19 September 2007 21 September 2007	Campus Consultations about proposed Nodes and research groups held at each campus. PowerPoints and consultation session recordings put up on webpage: http://education.monash.edu.au/staff/research/seminars2007/consultations.html
5 December 2007	Faculty Board endorses the process and criteria for the establishment of Nodes
21 February 2008	Peter Sullivan (ADR) sends out ‘Implementing the Re-Imagining Research Recommendations’ document to all staff and invites staff to propose research Nodes.
6 March 2008	Expression of Interest form to propose a Node sent out
12 March 2008	Expression of Interest form and Proposal Form sent out
18 April 2008	Research Node Event held in Clayton Banquet Room, Node PowerPoint presentations given by 15 proposed Nodes. 43 attendees. PowerPoint presentations and recordings of discussion put up on webpage at: http://education.monash.edu.au/staff/research/research-nodes/
6 May 2008	Email sent out by Peter Sullivan (ADR) calling for formal proposals for Nodes. Clarification given about decision announced at Faculty Day in April 2008 concerning Nodes – all Expressions of Interest from Nodes were endorsed.
1 May – 29 May 2008	Full proposals received from 11 Nodes
13 May 2008 – 30 June 2008	Funding account codes set up for 11 Nodes
30 June 2008	Feedback committee, comprising Sue Willis, Margaret Somerville, Pauline Nestor, Peter Sullivan meets to provide specific advice on the proposals. The functions of the Nodes are to:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable new strategic research directions to be explored, new research questions to be articulated, new research capacities to be developed.
1 July 2008	<p>Letters sent out by Peter Sullivan (ADR) to Node Leaders giving feedback from Feedback Committee. Each Node Leader asked to provide back to the Committee info on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are your specific research questions? 2. In what way does your Node intend to develop its distinctiveness? 3. What is the nature of specific publications that will be developed as part of the work of the Node? 4. What is the likely focus of specific grant applications that will be developed as part of the work of the Node?
6 August 2008	<p>Meeting with Peter Sullivan (ADR) and Node Leaders to discuss concerns, lack of clarity about goals and processes.</p>
11 August 2008	<p>Email sent out to Node Leaders by Trudi summarising University's Research Priorities in response to Node Leaders</p>
11 March 2009	<p>Research Committee of 11 March sets up a Node Working Party</p>
19 March 2009	<p>Node Leaders Meeting chaired by Jane Kenway (ADR). 10 Node Leaders attending. 4 apologies</p>
25 March 2009	<p>Node Working Party of Research Committee meets to discuss issues concerning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Node leadership, membership, resourcing, training and support and accountability.

Appendix 2: The Faculty's future approach to developing skills in grant-writing applications.

Faculty of Education Research Support Scheme

ARC Working Group 2009 Concept Paper

Working Group Members: Helen Watt, Terri Seddon, Bronwyn Smith, Damon Anderson

Supported by: Rondinne Hills

Preamble:

The Faculty and the University currently provide a range of quality resources and information sessions towards undertaking ARC applications. The starting point for our ARC Working Group was to collate and consolidate current grant support resources, which Rondinne Hills has achieved within one document, including relevant hyperlinks.

The area in which we believe strong support and structure is currently lacking, is that of preparing to apply for grants, which we conceive as a distinct component from that of actually undertaking a grant application.

We recommend distinguishing between the following aspects of grant support:

New components:

- 1) Undertaking grant applications**
- 2) Preparing to apply for grants**

Relevant dimensions will include:

- building a track record
- selecting a topic, key publications, methodology and budget
- communication – grant genre and convincing the audience (“selling your project”); developing a grant writing style (not too discursive - succinct, powerful, “punchy”)
- developing a checklist of questions to ask yourself: “Become your own critic”
- attending workshops / accessing current Faculty resources (e.g. on Insite website – PPT’s, MP3’s, tips and guidelines, etc.)
- building a program of research
- building a research network
- forming partnerships with industry

It is recommended that the preparation process should begin at least 9-12 months in advance of undertaking the application.

Existing components:

- 3) Information about resources**
- 4) Faculty Readers scheme for penultimate draft applications**
(Note. paid \$500 honorarium, but not all are aware of to request their payment)

This Concept Paper focuses on components 1 and 2 above.

Information about resources is available but is being updated with relevant links, navigable under major questions.

The Faculty Readers scheme is already available to all NCG applicants and is a required activity for all ARC applicants submitting Discovery and Linkage applications. Involvement in this scheme is not contingent on involvement in other parts of the proposed research support scheme, outlined below.

Proposed scheme components:

The Working Group recommends a structured support scheme be put in place, geared towards assisting potential applicants to prepare to apply for grants. This “research mentoring scheme” would include several components, overviewed below and summarised in the table following:

a) monthly research mentoring seminars

These could occur in the Wednesday Faculty seminars slot, once a month, with topics such as navigating the research terrain, pathways towards ARC success, grant schemes available, targeting the right grant scheme, strategic research development, industry partnering, positioning your research, illustrative vignettes, and developing a strategic edge, for example. These would be useful to anyone in the Faculty to attend.

b) monthly mentoring group meetings

These may occur over a specified time period (e.g., second half of the year), and build in a focused way on the monthly research mentoring seminars. The intention of this second proposed scheme component is to focus on the process side of application writing, and develop an authentic cross-person support network. Proposed topics could include, for example: research methodologies, literature reviewing, Research and Development Office support. The work of the mentoring group would be focused using the development of an actual funding proposal. This funding proposal may be an ARC application, or may be oriented towards another scheme (including Faculty funding).

c) individual mentoring partnership

To be eligible for the third component of the scheme, interested individuals would be required to have actively attended scheme component (b) as a hurdle requirement for entry. The intention of this third scheme component is to provide intensive support and individualised feedback on ARC application (Linkage and Discovery) developed by potential applicants. Mentoring guidelines and mentee expectations would need to be further thought through. Funding to support the mentor and mentee will be available through Research Committee funding (NCG applications except Linkage) and the University’s Link Assist scheme (for Linkage applications).

component	target groups	focus	target outcomes	timeline
a) monthly research mentoring seminars	Whole Faculty	Induction and strategising	Generic understandings	Feb → June
b) monthly mentoring group meetings	Potential grant applicants	Process	Draft funding proposal	July → Nov
c) individual mentoring partnership	Individuals actively preparing a grant for submission	Content and style	Proposal submission	All year

Resourcing:

Our proposal requires, as a starting point:

- umbrella coordinator, as a 12-month commitment, to include group mentor commitment in Semester 2 (component (b) above), as a 6-month commitment with workload attached, and oversight of budget attached to the proposed scheme;
- research mentoring seminars coordinator, as a 6-month commitment, with workload attached;
- volunteer presenters each month (component (a) above), with travel expenses and honorarium to be paid to external guest speakers (indicative budget this component estimated at \$5000);
- individual mentors (component (c) above), including workload to be credited in the year immediately following, plus honorarium;
- video-conferencing facilities in place for cross-campus inclusion;
- web development and support.

Draft Budget 2009 “dry run” for evaluation prior to main implementation 2010:

Funding is available through the University’s Link Assist Scheme to support applicants developing Linkage proposals. Applicants for other NCG grants will be supported to the same amount using Faculty Research Committee funding.

Our draft budget is as follows, where the total \$ is dependent upon the number and type of mentees:

\$	<i>item</i>	<i>restrictions / eligibility</i>
500	Per mentee, in NCG scheme component (c)	Not for Link Assist awardees
1,000	Per mentor, in NCG scheme component (c)	Link Assist awardees need to pay from \$1,500 Link Assist *
1,000	Group mentor, who is also umbrella coordinator (b)	
300	Research mentoring seminar coordinator (a)	
4,000	Honorarium budget for research seminar guest speakers (a)	

* *Note.* The mentoring scheme is available to all, however if researchers preparing a Linkage submission choose not to access it, they are free to use the entire Link Assist funds as they prefer.

As an example, for 15 mentees, 10 of whom are ARC Discovery applicants, this would total:
 Expenditure: $500 * 10 + 1000 * 10 + 1000 + 300 + 4000 = \$ 20,300$

If further funds are available from unexpended research budget lines, **additional** funds could be usefully expended on the following items:

- providing a Faculty contribution to Link Assist recipients
- boosting Discovery applicants allowance by corresponding amount (to be used towards research assistance for literature reviewing, or pilot work for example; or editorial support)
- because of the workload anomaly this year, although workload should be assigned in following years, mentors could be paid additional moneys
- another idea canvassed by the Working Group, is to call for another round of Seeding Grants quite quickly.

Appendix 3 Research Office Support. All researchers will continue to be supported by Research Office staff on their campus and across campuses.

[Academic Research Support](#)

URL:

<http://education.monash.edu.au/staff/research/researchofficesupport2009.ppt>

Appendix 4: The Work of the FRG Leader

Note: Their responsibility is to lead but not to do all the work of the FRG. For their credibility and currency it is vital that they keep up their own research activities.

Most of the following has come from current Node leaders' lists of the work they do.

Epistemological work

- Develop activities that help the FRG to define and refine its epistemological program and research questions
- Generate a culture of scholarship and inquiry through participation in reading groups, presentations to each other of theoretical and methodological work
- Bring together different theoretical and methodological material for critique, debate, and philosophical interrogation
- Enable members to explore 'current issues' in relation to the FRG's epistemological program and research questions
- Encourage members to explore and identify what each can contribute to the collective thinking of the FRG.
- Assist members' networking by developing ways to link them to their national and international epistemological community
- Foster external collaborations and professional links with established groups, Centres, individuals and the community.

Performative work

Encourage and support members to

- establish performance goals and assist members to meet them
- actively seek collaborative publishing, funding and research opportunities
- develop shared publishing projects — especially in top tier journals and with top book publishers
- develop shared externally funded research project applications
- collaborate on these to enhance their quality
- establish a collective presence in their epistemological community through conference symposia, publications, building networks and the like. It is vital to collectively showcase node work outside the Faculty.

FRG activity work

Oversee the conduct of such things as

- *reading groups*
- *workshops, seminars and conferences* including those related to particular theoretical or methodological orientations
- *symposia* to attract leading researchers to the FRG to present their work and to give Monash researchers the opportunity to present their work and participate in scholarly conversation with external scholars
- *research retreats* for the purposes of identity formation, theoretical development, building collaborations
- *visiting scholars*; create an active visiting scholar program, host and organize visiting scholars, prepare applications for visiting scholars to help FRG members with their research activities
- Specific activities for Associate postgraduate student members; e.g. support their participation in MERC conferences, winter school and other conferences.

Organizational work

- *Strategic* planning for the FRG
- *Foster* FRG collegiality and build a sense of belonging

- Promote collaborations between FRG members including those across campuses.
- Schedule and develop the agenda for the FRG's annual program and regular meetings
- Chair meetings of the FRG
- Clarify, evaluate and refine FRG practices
- Attend to membership e.g. Associate members, new Full members, inactive members and leadership succession planning is the responsibility of the FRG.
- Oversee the RFG website and ensure it is active
- Attend research meetings when required by Research Committee or the ADR and respond to inquiries from the Research Office and the ADR
- Work with the Associate Dean Research Degrees & Induction (ADRI) in the allocation of graduate research students to supervisors.

Accountability Work

- Annual reporting to the Faculty on FRG's purposes, achievements and future plans.
- Management and reporting on the FRG's annual budget

FRG leader support will be provided by members of each campuses research office to:

- organise meetings, disseminate meeting papers, take minutes when necessary
- organise seminars, workshops, symposia and conferences
- update FRG webpages
- disseminate information from the Research Office or the ADR and collate feedback
- chase FRG members for information and feedback
- electronically distribute relevant information among FRG
- assist with FRG paperwork
- ensure any other communication with members.

Appendix 5 Campus Research Leaders

Note: For their credibility and currency it is vital that they keep up their own research activities.

1. The role of the Campus Research Leader is to build the research capacity of all academic staff.
2. This will be undertaken through various group-mentoring activities.
3. Their focus is on helping researchers to build their generic research skills.
4. Campus Research Leaders will develop their programs individually and with each other and the ECR working party. Their work will often be shared and when appropriate it will be offered across campuses via video link.
5. They will represent their campus on Research Committee
6. They will represent Research Committee on their campus through Campus staff meetings.

Their work will focus on the following themes

- Planning, building and sustaining a research career individually and in groups
- Winning and managing research grants
- Writing for peer refereed and professional publications
- Organizing ad hoc mentoring groups to provide feedback and support; this will involve such things as reading manuscripts and grant applications
- Generating opportunities for further research activity associated with Development projects
- Developing the research leadership skills of future research leaders in the Faculty.

Campus Research Leader support for all these activities will be provided by members of the Research Office on each campus. A budget will be allocated to support these activities.

Education Faculty Research Groups – within Monash University Draft Research Strengths and Themes (RC33/09)

Health and wellbeing	Sustainability	Community cohesion, peace and security	Design and manufacturing	Services
		Globalisation, Education and Social Inclusion		
		Inclusive Mathematics Education		
				Pedagogy and Professional Learning
Psychology of Teachers and Students				
	Space, Place and Body			
		Language, Literacy and Social Inclusion		
		Work - Learning Across Boundaries		
		Professional Practice and Ethics in Education		
				Educational Multimedia
				Furthering Early Childhood Research and Learning
				Science Education
	Movement, Environment and Community			

Faculty of Education Research Support Scheme

ARC Working Group 2009 Concept Paper (RC 34/09)

Working Group Members: Helen Watt, Terri Seddon, Bronwyn Smith, Damon Anderson

Supported by: Rondinne Hills

Version: 3 June 2009

Preamble:

The Faculty and the University currently provide a range of quality resources and information sessions towards undertaking ARC applications. The starting point for our ARC Working Group was to collate and consolidate current grant support resources, which Rondinne Hills has achieved within one document, including relevant hyperlinks.

The area in which we believe strong support and structure is currently lacking, is that of preparing to apply for grants, which we conceive as a distinct component from that of actually undertaking a grant application.

We recommend distinguishing between the following aspects of grant support:

New components:

- 1) Undertaking grant applications**
- 2) Preparing to apply for grants**

Relevant dimensions will include:

- building a track record
- selecting a topic, key publications, methodology and budget
- communication – grant genre and convincing the audience (“selling your project”); developing a grant writing style (not too discursive - succinct, powerful, “punchy”)
- developing a checklist of questions to ask yourself: “Become your own critic”
- attending workshops / accessing current Faculty resources (e.g. on Insite website – PPT’s, MP3’s, tips and guidelines, etc.)
- building a program of research
- building a research network
- forming partnerships with industry

It is recommended that the preparation process should begin at least 9-12 months in advance of undertaking the application.

Existing components:

- 3) Information about resources**
- 4) Faculty Readers scheme for penultimate draft applications**
(Note. paid \$500 honorarium, but not all are aware of to request their payment)

This Concept Paper focuses on components 1 and 2 above.

Information about resources is available but is being updated with relevant links, navigable under major questions.

The Faculty Readers scheme is already available to all NCG applicants and is a required activity for all ARC applicants submitting Discovery and Linkage applications. Involvement in this scheme is not contingent on involvement in other parts of the proposed research support scheme, outlined below.

Proposed scheme components:

The Working Group recommends a structured support scheme be put in place, geared towards assisting potential applicants to prepare to apply for grants. This “research mentoring scheme” would include several components, overviewed below and summarised in the table following:

a) monthly research mentoring seminars

These could occur in the Wednesday Faculty seminars slot, once a month, with topics such as navigating the research terrain, pathways towards ARC success, grant schemes available, targeting the right grant scheme, strategic research development, industry partnering, positioning your research, illustrative vignettes, and developing a strategic edge, for example. These would be useful to anyone in the Faculty to attend.

b) monthly mentoring group meetings

These may occur over a specified time period (e.g., second half of the year), and build in a focused way on the monthly research mentoring seminars. The intention of this second proposed scheme component is to focus on the process side of application writing, and develop an authentic cross-person support network. Proposed topics could include, for example: research methodologies, literature reviewing, Research and Development Office support. The work of the mentoring group would be focused using the development of an actual funding proposal. This funding proposal may be an ARC application, or may be oriented towards another scheme (including Faculty funding).

c) individual mentoring partnership

To be eligible for the third component of the scheme, interested individuals would be required to have actively attended scheme component (b) as a hurdle requirement for entry. The intention of this third scheme component is to provide intensive support and individualised feedback on ARC application (Linkage and Discovery) developed by potential applicants. Mentoring guidelines and mentee expectations would need to be further thought through. Funding to support the mentor and mentee will be available through Research Committee funding (NCG applications except Linkage) and the University’s Link Assist scheme (for Linkage applications).

component	target groups	focus	target outcomes	timeline
a) monthly research mentoring seminars	Whole Faculty	Induction and strategising	Generic understandings	Feb → June
b) monthly mentoring group meetings	Potential grant applicants	Process	Draft funding proposal	July → Nov
c) individual mentoring partnership	Individuals actively preparing a grant for submission	Content and style	Proposal submission	All year

Resourcing:

Our proposal requires, as a starting point:

- umbrella coordinator, as a 12-month commitment, to include group mentor commitment in Semester 2 (component (b) above), as a 6-month commitment with workload attached, and oversight of budget attached to the proposed scheme;
- research mentoring seminars coordinator, as a 6-month commitment, with workload attached;
- volunteer presenters each month (component (a) above), with travel expenses and honorarium to be paid to external guest speakers (indicative budget this component estimated at \$5000);
- individual mentors (component (c) above), including workload to be credited in the year immediately following, plus honorarium;
- video-conferencing facilities in place for cross-campus inclusion;
- web development and support.

Draft Budget 2009 “dry run” for evaluation prior to main implementation 2010:

Funding is available through the University’s Link Assist Scheme to support applicants developing Linkage proposals. Applicants for other NCG grants will be supported to the same amount using Faculty Research Committee funding.

Our draft budget is as follows, where the total \$ is dependent upon the number and type of mentees:

\$	item	restrictions / eligibility
500	Per mentee, in NCG scheme component (c)	Not for Link Assist awardees
1,000	Per mentor, in NCG scheme component (c)	Link Assist awardees need to pay from \$1,500 Link Assist *
1,000	Group mentor, who is also umbrella coordinator (b)	
300	Research mentoring seminar coordinator (a)	
4,000	Honorarium budget for research seminar guest speakers (a)	

* *Note.* The mentoring scheme is available to all, however if researchers preparing a Linkage submission choose not to access it, they are free to use the entire Link Assist funds as they prefer.

<p>As an example, for 15 mentees, 10 of whom are ARC Discovery applicants, this would total: Expenditure: $500 * \underline{10} + 1000 * \underline{10} + 1000 + 300 + 4000 = \\$ 20,300$</p>

If further funds are available from unexpended research budget lines, **additional** funds could be usefully expended on the following items:

- providing a Faculty contribution to Link Assist recipients
- boosting Discovery applicants allowance by corresponding amount (to be used towards research assistance for literature reviewing, or pilot work for example; or editorial support)
- because of the workload anomaly this year, although workload should be assigned in following years, mentors could be paid additional moneys
- another idea canvassed by the Working Group, is to call for another round of Seeding Grants quite quickly.

Research Matters (RC35/09)

17 August – 28 September 2009

Event pro-forma for website listing

Please complete all of the event details below and return to Anne-Lee Hakkennes: anne-lee.hakkennes@adm.monash.edu to have your event listed on the Research Month website. Return your event details as soon as possible to take full advantage of the promotional options available. Please note incomplete forms will not be uploaded and only Monash events will be promoted.

Event title

Insert event title

Date

Insert date

Time

Insert time

Venue

Insert full location details

For

Insert intended audience. For example: Current research students,

Format

Insert type of event (For example: lecture, seminar, lunch etc)

Overview

Insert one – two short paragraphs on the event (content and benefits of attending).

Speakers

List speakers and if relevant: name, title and institution/company, short bio, pic

To book

Insert RSVP details if applicable.

Organiser details (not for web)

Insert organiser's name, telephone and email address.