I am pleased to have this opportunity to contribute to the Business/HIGHER Education Round Table newsletter on the topic of leadership.

Australia’s future economic and social prosperity will depend on its broadly tertiary educated population. My government’s main goals are to improve the access which Australians have to tertiary education, to increase the higher education sector’s quality and responsiveness and to expand opportunities for lifelong learning. These reforms will help Australia meet the challenge of an increasingly internationalised economy and the demands this makes on Australians to remain competitive.

A more responsive higher education sector

To be successful, the higher education sector must become more responsive to the needs of students and the needs of other education users. Only by being flexible and adapting to the changing conditions can this sector position itself to take advantage of the opportunities offered by new technologies and globalisation.

We are working towards a more decentralised system of higher education. The new system encourages universities to make the most of the opportunities offered by deregulated postgraduate study and offers new opportunities in undergraduate education. By subsidising over-enrolments we give universities more flexibility in determining their student numbers, so that they can create more student places when they have spare capacity. These deregulatory reforms were set in train in the 1996 Higher Education Budget Statement, leading to over 17,000 more domestic student places today than there were in 1996.

Universities are now being funded according to the actual numbers of students they attract and retain, with operating grants adjusted by the minimum up-front HECS payment for undergraduate enrolments above or below their profile target. Policy development is focused on increasing differentiation and innovation from universities.

A more flexible higher education sector

Differentiation between institutions and student access are being assisted by improvements in the flexible delivery of education associated with the development of information and communication technologies. Flexible delivery via the Internet means that both the boundaries of geography and time, which have in the past restricted student access and caused a duplication of courses are no longer so strong.
Online flexible delivery offers improvements over traditional distance education techniques which mean that students can engage in study at a time of their own choosing, as well as have more responsive interaction with fellow students and the course lecturer via email or online discussion forums. It also means that low enrolment courses are no longer dependent on the number of students at any one campus. Higher education institutions can offer flexible delivery units for their students from other institutions which have decided to specialise in a particular subject area.

These improvements in the opportunities offered by the flexible delivery of education are also associated with developments in lifelong learning. The need for people to change careers a number of times in a lifetime means that lifelong learning opportunities need to expand to meet the increasing demands of this workplace flexibility.

While traditionally there has been a focus on providing education to school leavers and other young people, lifelong learning can offer re-skilling opportunities to those with many years experience in the workforce, or to those who have been out of the workforce for some time. Flexible delivery of re-skilling education allows people who are working full-time to learn at times that suit them.

The changing patterns of learning and variety of education options has meant that it is important for better links between universities, TAFE and private providers. This means that it is very important that clear articulation pathways are offered across the various levels of qualifications. Increasingly policy will need to be considered in a wider post-secondary framework.

A more accountable higher education sector

My government believes that its leadership role in higher education should be about creating an environment in which institutions can respond innovatively to changes in the domestic and international environment. We are committed to institutions which are more flexible and devolved, whilst remaining accountable to students, industry and the community.

In order to promote accountability by providing relevant information to students, industry and the wide community, the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA) now regularly publishes, for universities, a set of comparative institution-level indicators on the Internet. In addition, universities are required to provide DETYA with a Quality Assurance and Improvement Plan with their annual strategic plan, including details of their annual Graduate Destinations Survey, the annual graduate satisfaction survey and details of employer satisfaction with graduates. These plans will provide evidence that universities are applying quality management practices and will be published annually in a form that allows universities to be easily compared.

My government is also concerned to ensure the international competitiveness of Australia’s higher education sector. In order to help measure our international competitiveness, we will invite a number of universities to redevelop the American Graduate Record Exam for Australian conditions so we can establish that our graduates are internationally competitive. A qualitative survey is also being developed to measure the quality of the supervision of research students, and to pinpoint areas of supervision that can be improved.

A greater focus on teaching quality

Whilst rewards for university staff have by tradition focused more on research than teaching, every year over 200,000 new students rely on universities to deliver high quality teaching. Higher education institutions need to devote more attention to delivering quality teaching to students and to rewarding their staff for providing this teaching of a high standard. In 1997 the government initiated the Australian Awards for University Teaching as a way of highlighting the importance of excellence in university teaching for the benefit of students and the community at large. My government is committed to the continuation of these Awards.

A greater emphasis on collaboration with industry in research

My government has increased the available funding for university research to over $450 million, more than $50 million more than was available to universities in 1996. We have also announced a number of important initiatives in research policy. These initiatives include giving higher priority to collaboration between the universities and industry, improving Australia’s research infrastructure, and improving Australia’s high performance computing capabilities.

Greater collaboration between industry and the universities is being achieved through the strategic partnership Industry Research and Training (SPIRT) scheme. The scheme gives support to projects involving collaboration between the university and industry sectors and encourages research and training developments through awards and fellowships. Both the government and industry provide equal grants as part of the SPIRT scheme. My government has announced that we will increase our contribution to the scheme by $58.1 million over the next three years.

In order to improve Australia’s research infrastructure and high performance computing capabilities, my government has also announced additional funding of $90.5 million over the next three years for research infrastructure. This initiative will increase the research infrastructure funding to thirty cents for every dollar spent on direct research funding, double what was provided in 1995.

Over $19 million will be spent on establishing a unified national high performance computing infrastructure, through the new Australian Partnership for Advanced Computing. This new body will include representatives from both industry and the universities and will work to establish Australia as one of the top ten users of high performance computing technology in the world.

A challenging environment for education managers

The new opportunities offered by the more decentralised higher education system, and the changing environment on which it operates, also means that managers in institutions are confronted with new challenges. Students, who have to contribute to the cost of their education, are now increasingly demanding better quality teaching and facilities. In order to grow and prosper, they must now take on responsibilities that were absent or easier in the past. Managers are called on to make strategic decisions on how to allocate their resources and how to position their university in order to attract the best students.

As managers, in order to respond rapidly to changes in student demand, they will have to take full advantage of the flexibilities offered both by new technologies and by enterprise bargaining using the Government’s Workplace Relations Act.

My government sees its leadership role in higher education as true partnership with the sector. By establishing the broad strategic directions for a higher education and removing regulatory impediments, institutions are in a much stronger position to respond flexibly and innovatively to Australia’s education needs in the new millennium.

JOHN HOWARD
Prime Minister of Australia
Big business has been criticised as being overly concerned with profit and failing to take its broader responsibilities seriously. Such accusations reflect a shift in what society expects of business. Increasingly, we are recognising that to survive and prosper, business must look beyond short term profit considerations. We must look to deliver against the triple bottom line of profit, corporate citizenship and environmental performance.

This raises difficult questions about exactly what is - and is not - expected of business. Should it play a bigger role in society, by participating more actively in policy development and in the delivery of social services and infrastructure? How far should business go in pursuing these broader roles if they are at the expense of returns to shareholders in the short term?

How we respond to society's changing expectations is the major leadership challenge facing business as we enter the new millennium. It will require business leadership of a different kind. It will require business to actively engage with a wider, more diverse group of stakeholders. And it will require a greater willingness to listen, to understand and to discuss social and community issues, often with people who have very different points of view.

Higher education is an important case study of how business leaders are attempting to respond to the challenges, and how much more remains to be done.

In Australia, the relationship between big business and higher education has not always been as close as it might have been. This is changing, for several reasons. Universities are responding to the changing financial incentives under which they operate by more actively seeking out private sector funding and collaboration opportunities. Businesses too are more actively seeking out competitive advantage in all aspects of operations, including training and recruitment. Face with an increasingly competitive job market, are looking for more opportunities to interact with business through their years of tertiary study.

For business, this closer relationship brings with it responsibility. Business must now play a more active role in helping to shape future directions in higher education. This means, at the macro level, contributing to policy development for the sector. At the micro level, it means being prepared to commit time and resources to ensure that we do our part to promote a vibrant, responsive, world-class higher education system in Australia.

The growing momentum of the Business/Higher Education Round Table reflects a wider recognition of this responsibility. In 1998 we increased corporate membership significantly, expanded our range of activities, and established a stronger profile as the focal point for co-operation between the business and university sectors. This culminated in the successful staging of the Inaugural Awards Dinner for Outstanding Achievement in Collaborative Research and Development in November.

Looking to the year ahead, we have an active and challenging program. We will continue to expand our recognition of ‘best practice’ collaboration between universities and business through our Awards. We will seek to further develop links between the sectors at the regional level through the establishment of State Chapters. And we will continue to promote leadership skills in research through the provision of training courses in conjunction with CSIRO. Of course, our continued success will depend upon maintaining the level of commitment and participation from business as well as university leaders.

A particular challenge for the year ahead will be increasing our level of contribution to policy development in higher education, particularly in the areas of research and the interface between business and higher education. Building on our work in 1998, we aim to actively participate in debate about the future of Cooperative Research Centres, about research in universities more generally, and about the scope and greater collaboration between business and higher education in research and education.

Leadership is about listening, engaging, learning, encouraging others and acting decisively to achieve goals. I believe that this is a useful guide for us in the Business/Higher Education Round Table. By building on earlier success, and with an emphasis on the practical and achievable rather than the grand but unattainable, BHERT is gaining strength as the focal point for co-operation between business and university sectors.
I t is tempting to think that the contemporary call for ‘leadership’ across so many aspects of Australian life is somehow a new phenomenon – a product of millennial anxiety perhaps, or the pressures of economic globalisation and social change.

As someone deeply fascinated by Australia’s history, I know that need for leadership has of course been a constant throughout our life as a nation. What is new is the kind of leadership today’s challenges demand.

Today, I believe we face a future – and a world around us – which demands leadership that creates opportunities for all Australians to pursue and fulfil their own goals.

Education policy – which I know is close to the heart of those who read this newsletter – provides one of the best tests of this kind of leadership today.

During the recent election I said that if I became Prime Minister I would want to be remembered as the education Prime Minister. I said this because I believe education is an area where real leadership is vital. Education lies at the centre of creating opportunity in our community – and opportunity all can share.

As we approach the new millennium there are many issues demanding the attention of our community and its leaders. Unemployment and future jobs growth is the most urgent. There are many others: the future of our industries; of regional Australia; the shape of our economy; the stresses on families; the services available to older Australians; and access to health services.

In all these issues, education plays a role, as it does in all aspects of life.

Australia is, and must remain, a decent civilised democracy. We are, and we must remain a skilled and successful economy. Whether or not we meet these twin objectives will, I believe, depend centrally on the quality of our education system. Our success will be determined by whether or not the system will be open to all Australians, whatever their status, whatever their income, wherever they live, and whatever are their aims in life.

Education’s minimum purpose is to develop people’s basic living skills; literacy and numeracy. But education’s real obligation, on behalf of the community, is to provide the opportunity for every student to go as far through the education system as they are able. That is why accessibility and affordability are so important. They must not be barriers to education; if they are, both the individual and the community suffer.

It is vital that students are able to reach their full academic and skills potential. Education systems must be designed and must operate to achieve that goal. This is especially so with higher education, and other post compulsory forms of education. If capable students are prevented from completing higher education because of cost or access barriers, the community suffers.

But there is also a practical reason why education, and especially higher education, is so important. And it is why governments must see expenditure on the provision of higher education as a long-term investment, rather than a cost.

The forces of economic globalisation are changing everything. They have moved against nations relying...
With this challenge in mind, we must also steer a path through the education funding debate, which I see as having two main trends at present:

The first is that education is a source of private benefit to an individual, in the form of better jobs, greater participation in society, and higher income. The logic is that individuals should meet the majority of the costs of the provision of these education services which deliver these advantages to individuals.

The other trend emerges from consideration of strategies for national competitiveness. Such analysis identifies education as an important resource for nations and their competitiveness in today’s globalised economy, and therefore a public good for which there is a compelling logic for public provision.

It is tempting to see these two trends as conflicting, which, indeed, they are in places. But the overriding question must be practical, not ideological. We accept both public and private provision in education today, and we will continue to do so in future. The question must always be one of balance.

That balance must recognise that private investment in education flows according to the expected private benefit from education. It cannot therefore be expected to provide adequately for the public benefits which flow from education. Put simply, an over-reliance on private provision and private sources of funding for education will produce an inadequate level of investment in education for our future as a nation.

Achieving a balance means focusing on the total national investment in education, including the important distributional effects on educational, social, and economic equity. My argument is that education is not simply a matter of social justice and equity. It is also, fundamentally, a matter of national competitiveness.

Recognising this, and recognising therefore the responsibility for adequate public provision of education is centrally a task for national leadership – indeed, a test of the capacity to lead Australia to a better future.

Real leadership is not just leading for this generation, but for future generations as well – educating and enabling those who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

It is this demand for national leadership which lies behind the Australian Labor Party’s focus on education – through school, technical education, universities and mature-age education and training. I still believe this review to be necessary.

“ Our future will depend more on the accumulation of human capital than on the accumulation of physical capital and the exploitation of natural resources.”
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The result is that on many occasions, women are not considered contenders for leadership and managerial positions.

Leadership is not an ‘elite’ issue. Leadership is necessary in all walks of life. Women have a great contribution to make and there are sound economic reasons for encouraging and supporting their greater involvement in the decision-making processes which affect and shape our nation. If women are not participants in all public and private sector decisions concerning Australia’s future, the outcomes will not reflect the hopes, aspirations and experiences of all of its citizens.

Historically, women have not participated equally in decision making in Australia’s political life in all three levels of government. They remain under-represented in Australian parliaments. Women make up 25% of the Commonwealth parliament, approximately 15% of state parliaments and are low in number of local government elected representatives.

Women are also poorly represented on decision making bodies such as boards and committees in both the public and private sectors comprising 30% of Commonwealth board appointments but only 7.6% in the private sector.

Last year, the Affirmative Action Agency reported that since 1995, the number of women in senior management has increased by just 1 per cent to 11 per cent.

Inequality in decision making denies many women realising their full potential in relevant fields and making their best possible contribution to this country.

Lack of female role models in the higher echelons of management and on company boards also affects the hopes and aspirations of our younger generations who like to see themselves, or women whose lives are like theirs, among those representing the community.

The business case for including more women is supported by research which now speaks the language of the business world. That is, for a business bottom line the effective use of diversity pays and discrimination costs.
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Encouraging diversity is not just making sure that the head count of women is higher than it was. It also involves employers understanding that their employees are more than just workers. They are wives, mothers, sisters, cars – even husbands, fathers and brothers.

Family-friendly work arrangements, as they are now increasingly referred to in consideration of the dual role of parents, not just women. They offer part-time or flexible hours, or work from home. Encouraging flexible work arrangements can allow employers to attract and keep employees and create the widest possible pool of qualified and experienced people. Not having these arrangements costs business an extraordinary amount of money each year through loss of staff, training costs and simply dropping out and starting up their own businesses.

Varied experiences and different perspectives can have a real impact on the bottom line of business. New ideas and ways of doing things produce more innovative ideas and services that reflect the needs of a broader customer base.

The more rapidly Australia changes, the more necessary it is to have a leadership diverse enough to respond to these changes.

We also need to address the drop out rate among women from corporate life which, in some professions, is alarmingly high.

We know some of the reasons people leave big organisations prepare to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society and as they equip themselves for life in the new millennium, the issue of leadership always emerges as the key issue. In this respect the churches are no exception.

Status of Women, Jocelyn Newman, believes that leadership is not about a small group of elite women doing even better. As far as the Government is concerned, ensuring more women take leadership roles is ensuring Australia is doing its best for all its people.

If we simply just sit around and wait for change, at the current rate it will take almost two centuries to achieve one person in five in Australian management and boardrooms.

With this in mind, the government has developed and implemented various initiatives as part of a broad strategy to increase the number of women appointed to the highest levels in both the public and private sectors.

In an effort to encourage change in the private sector, the federal Office of the Status of Women (OSW) has provided funding to the Australian Council of Businesswomen for the National Women’s Leadership Project involving the selection and training of suitable women candidates for possible appointment to private sector boards.

OSW has also assisted with the development of a seminar series for women who want to learn more about Commonwealth boards and bodies.

Federal government funding has also been provided towards a series of training films focusing on women in leadership. The film series will cover issues such as managing the course and the business case for diversity, leadership constructs and capabilities, key skills for new times, teamwork and meetings.

But changing embedded cultures takes time. While it is still too early to judge the success, there have been some very positive lessons learnt from these initiatives, particularly the heightened awareness, among the public and private sectors of the importance of including women in their top jobs.

Practical strategies, designed to make a real difference, will continue to be implemented so that women can achieve their goals and aspirations.

Leadership, like entrepreneurship, calls for courage, risk taking, vision and a sense of the community. Australian women are prepared for this and it is time to use them in the service of our country.

A s organisations prepare to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society and as they equip themselves for life in the new millennium, the issue of leadership always emerges as the key issue. In this respect the churches are no exception.

My own experience within the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane has been essentially the same as that of all other people in business and the community in general. Having endeavoured to improve our structures of management, the primary question comes back to the issue of leadership and how that spirit of leadership can be fostered in every part of the diocese, its parishes, institutions and other ministries.

Like many other dioceses and comparable structures in other denominations, we have put in place a ministry planning process, the aim of which is to help the church become more effective in its mission and service and, in particular, how to foster the idea of servant leadership among our clergy and laity.

The gradual acceptance of the importance of leadership in the modern organisational context probably goes back to the work of Robert K Greenleaf in his seminal essay on the idea of Leader As-Servant in 1970, which finally drew the attention it deserved in his book entitled Servant Leadership in 1977.

The Robert K Greenleaf Centre in Indianapolis has subsequently promoted lively discussion across the world on issues of leadership as it seeks to advance the notion that true leadership emerges from those whose primary desire is to serve others.

The theme has been taken up by many others in various countries, including Australia, with the result that there has been an explosion in publications about leadership and, with it, an increasing recognition of its central importance for an organisation’s vitality and viability. In some of this literature there has also been a clear distinction drawn between ‘leadership’ and ‘management’.

John Kotter identified outstanding managers as people who were disciplined at planning and budgeting, and systematic about maintaining organisations that can accomplish plans. Managers make hierarchical function, and a lot of the key objectives is organisational efficiency.

Leaders were identified as people who helped create a vision for the future and then developed strategies to achieve that vision. They also communicate direction in such a way that relevant parties understand and believe the message. Good leaders have strong motivational skills and are capable of producing change in organisations. Leadership is a critical factor in providing direction, mobilising staff, and bringing about organisational change.

Kouzes and Posner identify leaders as people who:

■ Challenge the existing processes
■ Inspire and share a vision
■ Enable others to act
■ Model the way
■ Encourage the heart

Effective leadership in any organisation is thus an active process which generates a desire to make something happen by changing the way things are and creating something new. Good leaders also recognise that they cannot change things on their own and so they surround themselves with good people. Subordinates judge leaders by assessing whether they actually practice what they preach. At the core of effective leadership is the ability to encourage others and to keep everyone consistently focused upon and committed to the central goals of the organisation.

There is no doubt that leadership styles have changed dramatically over the past decades. There is no longer any doubt that there is no single formula that can achieve good leadership.

Good leaders, however, must all have the capacity to do three things. Firstly, to articulate clearly what the organisation needs to achieve in relation to its vision and goals. Secondly, to convince people why these objectives must be pursued through motivation and persuasion. Thirdly, to set out the goals to be achieved by selecting the right strategies at the right time, and then to put in place planning and management processes.

Some people have a greater natural inclination on these directions than others. It is clear that leadership consists of an observable, learnable set of practices in most instances. There is, however,
divergence of opinion on what makes the difference between an outstanding leader and a competent one. Research over the past ten years has indicated two main models of leadership: transformational leadership and transactional leadership. There is an important distinction between the two in that transformational leaders have a relationship with their followers, whereas where they exchange one thing for another, such as increased pay for improved performance. They also tend to lead or manage by exception – taking action only where there is evidence of something not going according to plan. Australian managers have typically relied on transactional leadership to achieve organisational change, perhaps because of our bargaining based industrial traditions and our anti-authoritarian culture which resists formal leadership with a measure of scepticism.

Transformational leaders, on the other hand, recognise the needs of their followers and attempt to motivate them by raising their expectations of their own needs and their performance. They have the capacity to inspire their followers through intellectual stimulation or close knowledge of individuals. They are also very good at turning followers into leaders.

Sashkin and Rosenbach suggest that transformational leaders empower their people to achieve beyond expectations, due to their ability to inspire followers and influence them to use a wider range of methods to solve problems. This takes place through:

• Inspiration - inspiring their people to set high expectations, express important purposes in simple ways, and communicate a vision to everyone.

• Caring about individuals - giving personal attention to followers, building relationships with each individual, focusing on that person's needs. They help followers learn and develop by encouraging personal responsibility, exhibiting trust and respect for followers which is returned in kind.

• Intellectual stimulation - providing a flow of new ideas, challenging people to rethink old ways and stimulating people to develop new approaches to solving problems.

How then, does good leadership influence and change behaviour? According to Sashkin's Visionary Leadership Theory, this occurs through the development of a clear, simple value-based philosophy, a statement of purpose that everyone understands, which involves an element of the organisational context, environment and key factors in the environment, as well as incorporating the thoughts, values and beliefs of others into that vision. Others are then empowered to develop organisational policies and develop programs that revolve around the philosophy and demonstrate their values and beliefs through their own personal behaviour.

One of the initial challenges we had to face in the diocese was to help clergy in particular to see that these new models of leadership bore direct relationship to the traditional doctrines and teachings of the church itself. This is perhaps not the place to develop these connections, but it is worth saying that the Scriptures have countless examples of team words and team concepts, and indeed Jesus' own practice of leadership was one of servanthood rather than hierarchy. The idea of the church as the "body" again highlights the inherent notion of a team of people with a diverse range of skills working together in a common mission involving the transformation of lives and the transformation of community.

To conclude, there is a quiet leadership revolution under way, and at the heart of it is the need for senior executives in organisations to help middle managers develop a new mindset about themselves and their roles, moving from reactive paradigms of administration, procedure, approval or disapproval to pro-active paradigms which are entrepreneurial, broad in scope, and focused upon the business at hand. They also need to think through the roles of their organisation in the context of the goals of their unit; rethinking their unit's contribution to the whole organisation and how to express that contribution in terms of a mission; how to teach that mission to the people working in the unit, aligning resources appropriately and then measuring and evaluating the quality of the outcomes. Followers thus become partners and leaders can help people to embrace change and have confidence in seeing themselves as a valued resource.

Leadership is thus not an exhibition of individual charisma, but the development of a culture applicable at all levels of the organisation which can be taught, transmitted, mentored and supported.

If these kinds of values, attitudes and practices can be introduced throughout an organisation, its future will be assured. Meanwhile, it needs to be added with a measure of humility, that most of us in positions of leadership have quite a long way to go!
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M y comments apply to leadership in science - science in the broadest sense, including engineering and technology. There are similar principles in leading any enterprise, but some special twists to leading a group of very creative people. The nub of the task of leadership is to define what you want to do, then persuade a group of people that this is a worthy goal and lead them to achieve it.

The work leading to the goal must be world class to have a real impact. ‘World class’ means that the work will be recognised by a group of global peers as being of the highest standard and will make a contribution to the building of new knowledge.

Science is probably the one truly global culture. Scientists in a field all speak the same technical language and they all speak English. They all know more or less what is going on in other laboratories around the world. I meet in large groups and smaller specialist groups throughout the world regularly. They have global associations that serve the interests and govern the activities of the different disciplines. They are constantly exchanging people - students, post-doctoral fellows, sabbatical scholars, visiting scientists, etc. are common in all major laboratories. They have worked out pragmatic ways of dealing with the problems of communicating information and protection of proprietary intellectual property. They monitor the quality of work published through a well established system of international peer review. They come together to influence policy makers globally on such issues as global warming, ozone layer depletion and loss of biodiversity. So in short, it is a truly global enterprise. While others worry about globalization, scientists are comfortable science has always been a global enterprise, limited in the past only by the possibilities of communication.
Assembling your team, that is choosing your people is a critical task. Go for excellence, surround yourself with people who are truly outstanding and really value their discipline. Avoid “yes people”. You need people who are capable intellectually of challenging your own ideas and who can make innovative contributions to the group. However, beware of the very talented person who has a difficult, fractious personality. His/her contribution to attaining the goals should be balanced against the time you may have to spend managing higher other interactions with members of the group. You need to look at your mix of people, the “wild idea” person needs to be aligned with the careful, methodical organiser of data. You should try to appoint people who themselves are good judges of people. The people you appoint should be capable of appointing excellent people and developing their abilities.

This is one of the common themes of leadership – to be a good judge of people and to develop their abilities.

R&D Leadership Challenge 3 – Inspire and Guide the Team to Work Towards the Goals

Leadership in guiding the team has many hallmarks of managing the interactions of a family. Generally the family pulls together, but sometimes they squabble and “tell on” each other and sometimes there are cries of “it’s not fair”. Just like the children. Leadership involves parenting.

New members of the team need special care and support until they are well settled in and look comfortable. Give the members of the team the general direction and delegate with confidence. You should assume that they will do their best, and when things go wrong, as they inevitably do from time to time, don’t lose confidence. This is where leadership is especially called on, to sit with the team and work your way together to a new direction.

Young people have special needs. They must make mistakes and sometimes they do really silly things. They have to learn from mistakes and working their way out of them. Sometimes you need to “not see” certain things. It’s a “they know that you know” – an unspoken thing that gives them some breathing space to get back on track again.

People are imperfect; the trick is to build on their skills and to coach them through the areas of their weakness. This is a skill in itself, that being settled in and look comfortable. The leader needs to have sufficient self confidence to go forward without continuous recognition.

This is one of the themes of leadership – to be able to bring the best out of individuals to contribute to the common goals.

R&D Leadership Challenge 4 – Create the Environment and Culture from Which Excellent R&D can Emerge

The culture of an organisation is hard to define – its really the way that things are done, the way that problems are approached, the way that conflicts are resolved and the way that people are treated. It’s about ideals and attitudes.

Leadership in creating the culture and environment has many hallmarks of managing the interactions of a family.

For an R&D organisation (and indeed any organisation), the culture is set at the top. It can be embodied in a vision statement or a statement of core values. These are useful but somewhat sterile. What translates them into reality is the way that the top people behave. What they do, not what they say.

Standards of excellence. The leader sets, by example, the standards by which the group will be known. The leader sets the way science is done in the group. Of course this is the well known scientific method based on rigorous experimentation, interpretation, criticism and testing of hypotheses. The leader sets the standards of excellence of the work that is done by the group and also the standards of public presentation of work that comes out of the group.

This may be done by setting up a system of internal critical review before any work is submitted for publication. The group, and this is to be encouraged, has this as one of its aims of the organisation, and to help the other people who serve the organisation.

Standards of honesty and integrity. This includes intellectual honesty as well as honesty in everyday dealings with people. What you say is one thing, but what you do is far more powerful in sending messages.

Outwards to the rest of the scientific world, both within Australia and to the rest of the world. For this there are two key skills, firstly to be able to write simple concise English and secondly to be a master of public speaking. When you publish a paper you reach a few people, when you deliver a plenary lecture at a major international congress you reach thousands of people. These people go away with an impression of you, an impression of the work of the group, an impression of the standards of your institution, and an impression of the standing of science in Australia. You are an ambassador.

Towards. I have mentioned the importance of maintaining clear and open communication channels with the group. Building strong alliances with other scientific groups is also important. For these to be effective you must build on mutual respect. The scientists really need to like each other and enjoy each others’ company. They cannot be forced to work together, they must have the will to do it, but they can be lead. Alliances with other groups such as key members of the community and the bureaucracy are also important. Build alliances at all levels.

This is one of the themes of leadership – the ability to communicate the direction of your organisation effectively at all levels.

R&D Leadership Challenge 5 – Build Communication Channels and Networks at all Levels

This is at the heart of any organisation and when things go wrong it is often because of breakdowns in communication. You need to have good sources of accurate and timely information and an efficient and effective way of getting ‘information out’. There are several levels at which this two way flow needs to happen.

Upwards. To the bureaucracy – there is a higher duty then that of being a junior member of the group and that is to keep the primary aims of the organisation, and to help the other people who serve the organisation.

Outwards. For example, selling your skills to users. The difficulties of doing this effectively is the topic of a whole book. However, the experience with the Co-operative Research Centres is starting to yield useful lessons both in what works and what does not work.

R&D Leadership Challenge 6 – The Organisation Takes on the Personality of the Leader

Whether you like it or not, people watch you and listen instantaneously to what you say. They often act and react. So you must set an example. You must be consistent and fair and even tempered and pleasant, even when you are beleaguered. “Grace under pressure” is important.

Indeed the character “Mrs-Do-As-You-Would-Be-Done-By” from Charles Dickens, “The Water Babies” said many of these things in words of another era. In the end, it is many of these virtues of honesty, compassion, self-control and persistence which are needed for success as a leader of R&D. This, in combination with excellence as a scientist.
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Leadership is all about taking people where they have never been before, for the right reasons, and to prepare the community to seize the opportunities that are produced from an ever-changing society.

To look at Victoria today is to see one of the great success stories of the 1990s. A pattern has emerged from six years of sweeping policy reforms, credits are steadily building up and it is possible to see real progress toward the Government’s longer term objectives.

In the Victoria of tomorrow, we will continue providing the leadership which has underpinned this progress and reinstated pride and confidence in its people.

Leadership and strategic direction have been important factors in the revival of Victoria’s fortunes. The Government has adhered to a set of five leadership principles which have seen results in the change in the culture in Victoria - the transformation into an economy and society of the modern world that can measure up to the challenges of the world of the 21st century.

The five principles that define good leadership are:

1. An understanding of what you want to achieve and the setting out of clear goals
2. Development of a strategy to achieve these goals
3. Consistency of policy
4. The effective management of people
5. The ability to communicate clearly to people what your aim, goals and strategies are.

I believe that these five principles are fundamental to good leadership across the corporate, education, public and community service sectors.

When the Coalition came to power in 1992 we clearly identified where we wanted Victoria to be in the short term, to 2001, and in the medium term to 2050. We set ourselves a clearly defined program of activity that we have been working towards.

These goals were sound economic management and business stimulation, education and health management, investment in major capital works projects and a recommitment to the importance of the agricultural industry to the State.

Strong leadership requires a conviction to stick to necessary, yet sometimes unpopular, decisions. In Victoria, we have not wavered from our goals. At times, of course, we have slightly refined the program, when others have been able to point us to ways in which we can do our task better.

It hasn’t been easy and our agenda hasn’t always been communicated as well as it should have. Of course there will always be opposition from some quarters. But the Government has never failed to accept responsibility for the leadership that it has delivered to the people of Victoria.

As a result of the collective efforts, Victoria is posting faster economic growth and growth in private sector investment, and buoyant construction activity and retail sales. These measures all reflect confidence in the future of the State and are positive signs for new employment opportunities. They underline what we have termed our holistic approach to Government and that no matter what we do it has one primary objective. The economic and financial agendas have not been pursued as ends in themselves. By implementing reform and new management systems we have been able to pay off debt and provide quality services more efficiently.

We can, therefore, direct our resources to the ultimate goals of building Victoria’s social capital to create a better quality of life for all Victorians and to provide our children with a better start to life and the opportunity to secure the future.

As we approach the new millennium, Australia faces new challenges and new possibilities for the community, the corporate sector and across all governments.

Victoria has made a contribution by example and leadership towards the re-engineering of Australia’s economic and social culture and the development of a more global outlook among Australians.

Australia will need to continually re-invest its goals, practices and activities to remain relevant and to grow socially and economically.

The State Government has started to prepare its agenda for the next ten years of Victoria’s development from the year 2001 to 2011. The challenge is to identify and promote industries of the 21st century that will continue to create wealth for Victoria and bring jobs to the community.

Hand-in-hand with maintaining employment growth and creating new business opportunities is the education of young people and the upgrading of skills of older Victorians to help them better their employment opportunities and lead more fulfilling lives.

The challenges of the future will be achieved with leadership, vision and adherence to principles. They are challenges that require us to respond to what we as individuals, business and political leaders are doing to make the future today.
LEADERSHIP FOR UNIVERSITIES

At its core, leadership in universities is a high wire act balancing two ideas about how universities should be managed.

L
eadership in universities has always embodied the notion of an academic and intellectual dimension. Primarily, this is built around a capacity to inspire and to give direction to our students in their undergraduate and postgraduate education, and to our academic staff in their scholarly work. But there is also the historically significant role of university academics, who embrace public intellectualism, leading society debates on fundamental questions and showing how in scientific and technological innovation. (Which explains, incidentally, the preference among many academics for new Vice-Chancellors to be Nobel laureates who, in advancing their university’s interests, combine the Cicero’s advocacy skills and Alexander’s strategic virtuosity, with a Socratic delight for endless debate!)

I suspect that had Vice-Chancellors of an earlier generation been asked to contribute their thoughts on leadership, they would probably have concurred with the world of university leadership almost entirely in these intellectual terms. For that matter, some would also have considered the university itself as the community of civilised scholars idealised by John Henry Newman from his Oxford days.

But the world has moved on and with it the demands of university life, if not entirely yet its culture.

As a consequence of that global shift, the other idea of leadership which has gained increasing importance is that which requires university managers, particularly Vice-Chancellors, to instil confidence in and provide direction to staff, to provide leadership, so we as they traverse a seemingly endless mindfield of changes - challenges brought on by cuts to government funding, the technological revolution, shifting public perceptions of what a university should be all about and global competition, not only for traditional universities but also from a wave of new corporate ‘universities’.

Inevitably, at the edges, the balance of the two ideas of leadership creates uncomfortable tensions.

The academic tradition often characterises university managers and their efforts to provide corporate leadership as fundamentally flawed, at odds with the principles of Academe. In this view, the role of the university corporate leader - actually, leaders of the corporation, to be more correct - is seen in essentially political terms, and our attempts to provide vision and direction in the academic and non-academic than doing the bidding of the Government or the donor or the strategic investor.

Conversely, it is often a frustration to those charged with corporate strategy and planning that academic freedom is made to serve more than its true high purpose of free expression and protecting the iconoclast to pursue ideas in their academic field. This is especially the case for senior managers who come to universities from other industries, where collegiality generally implies collective effort around organisational goals. Too often in universities, it seems that the collegiate tradition implies opposition to corporate goals as a matter of principle! One test of a Vice-Chancellor’s leadership is the ability to lift the academics’ identification from the discipline or department to the wider plane of the University itself. Another is to get closure in reasonable time on critical issues - to shift the culture away from a sense that all decisions are appealable when the next committee meets, if not when the Committee next meets!

Although these two notions of leadership in universities are conceptually distinct and often in conflict, of necessity they are in constant dialogue and it is the management of this dialogue to achieve improvements - or just not falling into the abyss - which is the true measure of modern university leadership.

Neither of these counterweights, which we caricature as academic collegiality and managerialism, can provide lasting solutions for the challenges universities face today. Each required alone, offers only short term fixes: the one an unsustainable defence of the status quo ante, and the other an endless exercise in tail-chasing after ever narrowing penny packets of tied income, with the wider purpose of the income forgotten.

On the one hand, academics would be right to lambast the short-sightedness of governments which are failing future generations of Australians by focusing exclusively on the financial bottom-line, and the managerial logic which underpins this otherwise inexplicable absence of vision.

On the other, the revolution of globalism and the demands society has placed - and continues to place - upon universities, requiring radical realignments of university resources, could not have been (and will not be) effectively managed by riding solely on the intellectual integrity of the college. For universities adjusting to these changes about them, erecting impregnable barriers to the outside world has not really been an option for at least a generation.

Our success in traversing the middle way - the key test of leadership in our universities - should not be judged next week, next month, or next year. At a minimum, we can not expect these judgments to be in under ten years and longer. This is why I feel that our duty on this is just entering kindergarten now, and they will be cold eyed in their assessment of how well we have done.

Universities are today highly responsive to the needs of the Australian community and a vastly expanded cross-section of our citizens now understand what universities do and aspire to a university experience for themselves.

Over the last decade as federal governments have cut ever deeper into the sinews of university funding, university people have...
A business perspective on leadership

Australia faces huge challenges over the coming decades if we are to secure our place in a rapidly evolving new economic world order.

Globalisation, together with increasingly sophisticated communications and technology is paving the way for ever more mobile investment, trade and commerce opportunities. Countries which are unable to compete effectively in this changing world will, quite simply, be bypassed. The consequences of such competitive disadvantage would be felt firstly in job losses, but quite rapidly thereafter would reduce the nation’s ability to fund the level of health, education and social services that the community has come to expect in a modern society.

The resulting social discord would, by any measure, be unacceptable. The only way to avoid such social discord is for the community to position itself to meet the challenges of globalisation. This will not just happen - it requires leadership.

It is not surprising therefore, that we should be increasingly focused on the quality of leadership in Australia.

Leadership is important because it gives a common purpose. It binds, despite diversity. It focuses attention on what is possible and provides the strategic direction to achieve what is desirable.

From a business perspective, the main challenges facing Australian society is how we can:
- achieve the right settings for a strong economy on which we can secure our future prosperity, as a basis for a fair and caring society while, at the same time,
- manage the impacts of continually modernising our economy in a way that minimises social discord, yet identifies and maximises the opportunities that can be provided to the community from the new world order.

What are the characteristics we will require from our leadership into the next century? The answer is as diverse as the range of skills needed?

Broad based and representative leadership

First of all, modern leadership must be broad based and representative. Historically, with the only real exception being at times of war, Australians have viewed leadership almost exclusively as being the province of governments. We have looked to government to define the problems, to put forward the choices and to provide the direction. But the social and economic problems that arise in our increasingly complex and diverse society require each part of the community to provide a share of the answer.

All aspects of our society, from the churches to business, community groups and educators, must take on the responsibilities of leadership. The importance of inclusive leadership is found by bringing together as many perspectives, new ideas and approaches as we can muster from the community as a whole.

Inclusive Dialogue

The adversarial style of negotiation and debate that has characterised Australian politics, work place relations and environment debates, to name but a few issues, will not yield the results we need as a community to move forward. We need to find a new language, that emphasises what we have in common, not what sets us apart. We need to concentrate on what we can agree as common ground.

The process of leadership

The process of involving the community in meaningful debate on substantive and important issues should be our common purpose. How we get there is just as important as reaching the end point. Effective leaders are able to secure the commitment of others to make the effort to meet the challenges of such a future.

The value of something that binds is hugely important to any organisation or society. There are few characteristics which so clearly set aside a leader from the pack than the ability to provide a focus on common purpose, while reducing the divisiveness of difference.

To have leadership, one must have a leader. But there is another prerequisite for effective leadership - a community responsive to leadership - one prepared to consider new ways, and to be responsive to change.

This issue is arguably the most important and the most difficult to address. If Australia is to meet the challenges of the future, the community must place its trust and confidence in our leaders. In effect, all sections of the community must work towards putting aside private agenda if the overall outcome is to be in the greatest good for Australia as a whole.

In the past, if there was a more unquestioning trust by the community, it was because of limited education or understanding of the issues. This is clearly no longer the case. We must ensure that our leaders have the trust and confidence to take the community forward.

Leadership is important because it gives a common purpose. It binds, despite diversity. It focuses attention on what is possible and provides the strategic direction to achieve what is desirable.
DEVELOPING LEADERS: Learning to Lead Differently

One of the continuing challenges for Australia’s social and economic future is to achieve a significant improvement in the quality of leadership and performance of Australian managers and leaders. In the 1995 report of the Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills (the Karpin Report) rated Australian managers as deficient in such essential leadership qualities as vision, decisiveness, teamwork and self-confidence. The problem of finding and nurturing a pool of talent to lead innovative, responsible and profitable organisations has now become a pressing problem for Australian Industry.

Interestingly, at much the same time as the Karpin Task Force was drawing a picture of the strengths and weaknesses of Australian managers, two BHERT Task Forces were focusing on the issues of leadership in R&D. The Leadership Task Force Report (Mann, Mayer, Hutton & Cupper, 1994) identified narrow training, poor management skills and lack of commercial focus as a problem in many University graduates moving into careers in Industry. The Leadership Task Force recommended the establishment of a national centre for R&D leadership and a pilot leadership development program. In the short time since Karpin, Schapper, Mann and others commented on leadership at different levels of Australian organisations, the call for more and better leadership has grown.

This brief article will describe two initiatives in the area of leadership research, training and development programs which followed publication of the BHERT reports. The two initiatives will describe areas in which I have been involved. It is important to point out, however, that there are many initiatives in leadership development and leadership research underway in Australia at present, an encouraging sign that the call for more and better leadership is being heard.

A Research Study: Success Factors in R&D Leadership:

The first initiative is an ambitious longitudinal study of the leadership skills and performance of a group of 60 project leaders (comprising thirty new leaders, thirty experienced leaders) who head R&D project teams in four major Australian organisations - CSIRO, DSTO, BHP and Orica (formerly IC). The aim of the study is to trace and compare the performance of the new leaders and experienced leaders for a period of two years as they manage their teams through the life cycle of R&D project activity. The study is being conducted at Melbourne Business School. The study will be undertaken with Australian Research Council funding and support from the four participating organisations. It involves meeting and interviewing each of the 60 leaders (and frequently their teams), obtaining ratings and evaluations from the senior managers who know the leaders, as well as the customers and other stakeholders who have a vital interest in the project deliverables and outcomes. Many of the projects are complex and challenging and require considerable technical expertise and ingenuity to produce a commercially sound, innovative concept, product or process. The project teams range in size from as few as 3 team members to over 25 team members drawn from laboratories across Australia. Team members often come from different functions in the organisation and from different disciplines, posing a further challenge to the leadership skills of the team leader. The projects range from development of a hard wearing paint with all the characteristics of a water-based paint, to development of a new coating compound to enhance the durability of steel. The 60 leaders, their teams and their projects are indeed impressive, so that our leadership study is not a comparison of good and poor leaders, but rather a study of an impressive group to discover some of the factors that underpin effective leadership. The study is yielding many interesting findings about leaders and teams and there is a great deal to report. I will touch briefly on four findings.

Leader Roles: The 60 leaders were measured on how well they perform a set of leadership roles ranging from the traditional, task-focused roles of coordinator, producer, monitor, to more people-oriented roles of boundary spanner, negotiator, mentor and facilitator. Interestingly, the leadership roles vary significantly from team to team - (motivating the team to do the work, ensuring that project milestones and deadlines are met).

Leader qualities: We found that the best leaders are excellent across all roles, that is, proficient in the traditional skills of controlling and producing, and in the skills of leading the team and people-management. The leaders who excelled in all roles had the best performing teams and, usually, the most successful projects. It is important to recognise that the link between good leaders and good teams can go in both directions. Whilst it is true that good leaders can help create good teams, it is also true that good teams can manage without designated leaders and that good teams can make the leader look good by covering up mistakes and providing the space and support for a novice leader to learn how to lead effectively.

Transformational Leadership: The best performing leaders display a style called transformational leadership. Transformational leaders elicit trust and respect from their team members and motivate them to perform at their best. They achieve this by making team members more aware of the importance and value of the work they perform. By stimulating their interest in and excitement about the work and by influencing them to act in the interest of the team and organisation rather than in their own self-interest.

In our study, the 60 project leaders were rated on the following statements characteristic of transformational leaders: “communicates a vision of the project’s possibilities”, “ensures the team understands the importance of the project”, “aligns the team with the project’s interest in the project”, “insists pride and respect in the team”. Transformational leadership was somewhat more evident among the experienced leaders than among the new. The most interesting finding is that leaders who were rated strongly on transformational leadership were independently evaluated by key stakeholders, such as project customers, as having the best performing teams and the best quality projects. Also of interest, is the finding that transformational leadership was most strongly linked to the excellence of basic and applied research projects, in which new ideas and innovative products and processes are the main objectives. Transformational leadership was also significantly, but less strongly linked to the quality of operational development projects, in which application of existing knowledge is the main objective.

Learning from experience: Advances in Research and Development and excellence in innovation occur only when teams and their leaders are open to new ideas and approaches, are willing to experiment and take risks, are flexible and are quick to adapt and respond. Interviews with the 60 leaders and assessments made about them by others revealed that leaders who report they have learned a great deal from their current work and experience are more likely to have the most highly regarded transformational leadership characteristics. Thus, the term ‘leadership’ that has emerged across a number of studies (the other characteristics are an ability to translate direction and vision into reality; an ability to align people with the chosen direction; integrity and the ability to develop trust; and comfort with uncertainty).

Off course, it can be argued that the best teams and most interesting projects are assigned to leaders who are most receptive to new experience and learning or that leaders stand to learn more from leading an outstanding team than from leading a mediocre or pedestrian team. Our evidence suggests this is not the case. Rather, leaders who are ‘learners’ tend to introduce a healthy climate for team decision-making characterized by open discussion, constructive problem solving and considerable reflection about the project and how the team is working together. In turn, this decision-making environment is conducive to excellent project work and performance.

New and experienced: As expected, experienced leaders as a whole are seen as performing better than their newer, younger counterparts. But the difference is not great. The best of the new leaders are as impressive as the best of the experienced leaders in the way they lead and in the success of their projects. We found that some new leaders are still finding their way and do not match experienced leaders in capability and performance. But they are learning, and with experience and encouragement will succeed.

In general, we are finding that the best leaders are open-minded and open to learning, have a transformational leadership style, build trust and are trusted by their team members. They are well organised and motivate their teams to complete projects on time and to the highest standard. They are regarded by project customers, indicative of the time and effort they put into maintaining contact and open and clear communication. They are excellent ‘all-rounders’ and perform well across a range of leadership, management and technical roles. It is worth noting that the leaders are quite frequently not the best scientists nor most innovative members of the team.

While it is true that good leaders can help create good teams, it is also true that good teams can manage without designated leaders.
A Leadership Development Program
Achievement through Teams

A second initiative of great interest and importance is the CSIRO – BHERT leadership development program “Achievement through Teams”. The program is aimed at building the leadership awareness, skills and capabilities of managers who lead research and innovation projects in the public, private and University sectors. The program, introduced in 1996, takes approximately 20 participants in each cohort and is now in its seventh intake. Much has been written about this highly innovative program in BHERT News and Annual Reports. My reason for describing this initiative is to discuss how this kind of program fits into a culture of leadership in forward looking organisations.

The basic strategies for developing leadership abilities are well known (McCall 1993). They include challenging job assignments, exposure to exceptional people as role models, learning how to overcome obstacles, learning how to deal with failures and mistakes and, of course, learning from rich educational experiences. Whether or not people who attend leadership development programs gain significant positive benefits for themselves and for their organisations, depends, to a great extent, on the follow up support and how the new skills and abilities learned are used (or ignored) in the organisation. One of the main characteristics of what has been termed “the learning organisation”, is a commitment to lifelong education at all levels of the organisation. This includes formal leadership programs as well as pervasive support of any kind of developmental experience and a sense that learning, practising and improving are never finished. In the “graduates” of training and leadership development programs are encouraged to apply their newly acquired skills and knowledge in challenging tasks and opportunities provided by the organisation. An example of a learning organisation in the U.S. is Motorola, which has a policy that every employee has some educational experience every year.

John Kotter of Harvard Business School (Kotter 1990) described how some of the world’s best companies create a “culture of leadership”, another feature of learning. This includes formal leadership programs as well as pervasive support of any kind of developmental experience and a sense that learning, practising and improving are never finished. In the “graduates” of training and leadership development programs are encouraged to apply their newly acquired skills and knowledge in challenging tasks and opportunities provided by the organisation. An example of a learning organisation in the U.S. is Motorola, which has a policy that every employee has some educational experience every year.

The lessons from Faulding’s involvement in the “Achievement through Teams” program included: The value of experiential learning which produces strong self-awareness (see McCall’s list of the basic characteristics of effective leadership); the importance of studying and experiencing the interpersonal dynamics of groups and teams which can be applied directly to working relationships in the company; the advantage of building a cohort of program “graduates” to provide support to each other and to help spearhead change initiatives in the organisation; and the benefits of learning about the challenges of managing people and teams alongside managers from other organisations with different cultures.
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To be eligible at least one of the participants in the project or program had to be a member of BHERT.

The quality and standard was very impressive and the panel had a challenging, but an interesting task.

The Business/Higher Education Round Table wishes to acknowledge the generous support of the following organisations:

The Australian National University
Central Queensland University
Edith Cowan University
Flinders University of South Australia
Griffith University
Mobil Oil Australia Limited
Philip Morris (Australia) Limited
P&O Australia Limited
Queensland University of Technology
RMIT University
Sheff Australia Limited
The University of Sydney

The Awards were presented by the Hon. Jeff Kennett, MP, Premier of Victoria, at a dinner on Tuesday, 10 November 1998, at the Sheraton Towers Southgate, Melbourne. Extracts from the Premier’s address prior to the announcement of the winning entries can be found on pages 26 - 29.
FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT IN COLLABORATIVE R&D

**Turnover less than $50m per annum and Project/Program less than 3 years in train:**

**Winner:** DSpace Pty Ltd
Institute of Telecommunications Research (ITR) at the University of SA

**Title:** High Speed Data Modems for International Satellite Organisations (INMARSAT)

**Sponsor:** The Australian National University

This program involves the development of new techniques to double the capacity of existing mobile satellite communication systems. The new techniques, known as Turbo Coding, have the potential to achieve large savings because the system can support twice as many users at the same time. This impressive collaboration draws on the complementary skills of the industry and university partners.

**Turnover more than $50m per annum and Project/Program more than 3 years in train:**

**Winner:** Dept of Biochemistry at the University of Adelaide
BresaGen Ltd
GroPep Pty Ltd
Bresatec Pty Ltd

**Title:** Establishment of Biotechnology industry

**Sponsor:** RMIT University

This is a very impressive example of a model partnership between university and industry. In 1982 the Department of Biochemistry in the University of Adelaide initiated a program of R&D activities which in time led to the establishment of three highly successful biotechnology companies:
1. BresaGen - for Animal Growth Hormones - Animal transgenesis
2. GroPep - for Insulin-like Growth Factor Proteins
3. Bresatec - for molecular biologicals

The University had pioneered a biotechnology industry for Australia, which in turn trains and employs university students and graduates.

**Honourable Mentions:**

1. The Centre for Design at RMIT with Southcorp Appliances, Schiavello Commercial Furniture, Email, MEC Kambrook, NIDA, Imaging Technologies, Caroma and Blackmores

**Title:** The EcoReDesign Program

In 1993, the EcoReDesign Program based in the Centre for Design at RMIT set out to develop a new environmental design process suited to the new requirements of product development in Australian manufacturing industry. Operating in design development teams, staff from the Centre for Design at RMIT University and staff from the partner company work together to make efficient innovative designs. The aim is to redesign products so as to improve their life cycle environmental performance. This collaboration had an impact on the cultures of the participating companies and is a program of clear national benefit.

2. Co-operative Research Centre for Eye Research and Technology with CIBA Vision/Novartis

**Title:** The See3 Project - new extended wear contact lenses providing hassle-free vision correction

An impressive collaboration between CIBA Vision/Novartis and the CRC for Eye Research and Technology, this project involves the development of an oxygen permeable soft contact lens, which can be worn without having an adverse effect on the eyes. The lens has considerable commercial and export potential.

3. The University of Sydney with Nippon Sheet Glass Company Limited

**Title:** Vacuum Glazing

This project involves the development and refinement of the vacuum glazing concept to produce highly insulating window glass. The product can be used in buildings throughout the world to achieve energy efficiency and environmental benefits. The collaboration, involving international partnership and outreach, is of considerable commercial interest.

**Turnover less than $50m per annum and Project/Program more than 3 years in train:**

**Winner:** Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Group
Dept of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, RMIT University
Crossle McKee Pty Ltd

**Title:** Innovative Cost-Effective Technology for Recovering Waste Heat in Industry

**Sponsor:** Central Queensland University

This program involves the development, demonstration and commercialisation of a new design for heat pipe heat exchanger systems. The exchanger recovers waste heat and reuses it in other processes which operate at lower temperatures. The program has the potential to achieve large savings in industrial fuel expenditure and a net reduction in usage of fossil fuels. This highly innovative program is a significant example of collaboration between business and higher education research.

**Turnover more than $50m per annum and Project/Program less than 3 years in train:**

**Winner:** Australian Logging Council
ANU Forestry Dept
CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products
University of Melbourne's School of Forestry

**Title:** Forest Technology Program

**Sponsor:** Edith Cowan University

This program brings together many small businesses in the logging industry to improve the commercial viability, environmental impact and social acceptance of forest operations. Among the many innovations are the use of satellite based navigation technology to track the movement of logging machines and their impact, the introduction of excavator or "shovel" logging to reduce impact on forests and a device for spacing young regrowth forest. This is an excellent program of great national benefit, It brings together major organisations to change industry attitudes, leading to more sustainable forestry and logging practices.
**FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT IN COLLABORATION IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

**Turnover less than $50m per annum and Project/Program less than 3 years in train:**

No eligible winning entry

Sponsor: Philip Morris Limited

**Turnover less than $50m per annum and Project/Program more than 3 years in train:**

Winner: GroPep Pty Ltd
CRC for Tissue Growth and Repair
Flinders University of South Australia

Title: Training Graduates for Commercial Careers in Biotechnology-Based Industries

Sponsor: Griffith University

This comprehensive training program has been developed to meet the staff and training needs of Australia’s growing biotechnology industry. The partnership, between GroPep Pty Ltd, the CRC for Tissue Growth and Flinders University of SA, involves the design and delivery of a set of articulated training programs at many levels from undergraduate students to senior scientists and potential CEOs.

**Turnover more than $50m per annum and Project/Program less than 3 years in train:**

Winner: Faculty of Education at The University of Newcastle
BHP Rod Bar and Wire
NSW Dept of Education and Training

Title: Retraining to become a school teacher following industry shutdown Announcement - a win-win for all Parties

Sponsor: Queensland University of Technology

This novel program involves the retraining of staff in BHP’s Rod Bar and Wire Division to become secondary school teachers. The program is being offered while the BHP staff are still employed in preparation for the closure of the Division in 1999. This is an exemplary project which deals creatively with some of the major problems caused by industrial restructuring.

Honourable Mention:

1. Myer Stores Ltd and RMIT Training Pty Ltd

Title: Computer Training and Internet Cafe

The Myer RMIT Computer Learning Centre, located in Myer Stores, Melbourne, is a computer training and Internet Centre. The Centre offers inexpensive packages to the general public in an attractive retail environment. The collaboration is impressive for its outreach and for the partnership between a retail store and a university with entrepreneurial initiative.

**Turnover more than $50m per annum and Project/Program more than 3 years in train:**

Winner: Central Queensland University
BHP Australia Coal
Qld Alumina Ltd
Boyne Smelters Ltd
Gladstone Port Authority

Title: Gladstone Engineering Development

Sponsors: Shell Australia Limited/P&O Australia Limited

This is an important initiative taken in Gladstone, Queensland to develop a world-class engineering education and research facility at Central Queensland University to support Gladstone’s major industries. All of Gladstone’s major industries worked together with the University to conceptualise, design, fund and implement the Engineering Management School and the Centre for Environmental Management, and their Graduate Certificate and Diploma programs. An exceptional example of Industry and University working together to address local regional needs.

Honourable Mention:

1. University of Adelaide, American Chamber of Commerce Australia and Ernst & Young Entrepreneurial Services Group

Title: Business Initiatives from Graduates (BIG)

The Business Initiatives from Graduates program is a highly innovative program for developing entrepreneurial and commercially successful graduates. Graduates with an innovative product, process or service idea are enrolled in a Graduate Diploma in Business Enterprise at the University of Adelaide, provided with scholarship support, office accommodation and other resources to assist them to develop their ideas into a business.

BHERT is delighted to announce that

Dr Bob Frater, AO,
Deputy Chief Executive, CSIRO and
Ms Moira Scollay,
Chief Executive Officer,
Australian National Training Authority have agreed to join the 1999 Awards judging panel.

NOTE YOUR DIARY:

Applications for this year’s Awards will be called in April.

Additional categories will include:

- Outstanding Achievement in International Collaborative R&D
  Sponsored by The University of Sydney
- Outstanding Achievement in Collaborative R&D involving a Cooperative Research Centre
  Sponsored by Mobil Oil Australia Limited
Thank you for the invitation to address members of the Business/Higher Education Round Table. Welcome to Victoria to all interstate visitors.

May I firstly congratulate this group on your commitment to a better Australian society through the development of closer links between businesses and higher education.

I know that your individual commitments are numerous so your continued effort in this area is appreciated by the Victorian Government.

The shrinking globe means that our universities must produce graduates with the skills, knowledge and attributes which our businesses need to be internationally competitive.

This is not to say that universities should focus 100% on the market place at the expense of the admirable pursuit of knowledge for knowledge’s sake.

However, Australia’s international success and prosperity in the next millennium rests, to a large degree, with the business and academic sectors working in tandem.

Businesses should not see themselves as simply the recipient of the universities’ output.

The business sector needs to be involved at all stages of the education process - providing input into the structure and content of courses, resulting in appropriately skilled and qualified graduates, and by providing active support for research.

The challenges which face both the business and higher education sectors also face governments.

One of the biggest challenges we all face is how to cope with the speed of change itself.

A second challenge is that, collectively, we need to identify and promote those industries which will create wealth, provide long term stability and growth, and most importantly, employ our people.

This means identifying our strengths, not just compared with other Australian States, but compared with the world’s best.

Victoria’s economy is focused on industries and opportunities of the 21st century - a mix of traditional and high technology industries which offer the greatest potential to add value to Victoria’s future.

We have identified our export competitive strengths in health and medical research, agriculture and food technology, engineering and automotive industries, multi-media and information technology, and in the delivery of services - namely health, education and environmental expertise.

Whilst governments can encourage new investment and facilitate business developments in these key industries, the close collaboration between universities and business is the key to ultimate success.

Information Technology

Take, for example, the development of the IT industry in Australia. In Victoria, our goal is to become the Asia-Pacific capital for information technology, multimedia and communications services.

To facilitate this goal I have established a Multimedia Taskforce to coordinate and improve linkages between the education and business communities and the Government.

Among other things, this Taskforce has highlighted the asymmetry between the employment needs of industry and the supply of skilled and relevant graduates.

It has been estimated that at present there are around 38,000 job vacancies in the IT industry in Australia. However the industry is concerned that universities are not producing the volume nor the type of IT graduates to meet current demands.

Just as important as the number of graduates are the relevancy of their skills. In an industry which is developing so rapidly, training undertaken only three years ago may rapidly become outdated.

Businesses and the higher education sector need to work more closely to develop the best education and training for this industry. And to ensure the desired outcome, business needs greater involvement at the input level.

Research and Development

Victoria has an unbalanced focus on the long term. A critical part of this is the continuing strong pursuit of research and development.

Already, Victoria has by far the highest level of R&D expenditure per head of population of all the States.

In 1996-97, gross expenditure on R&D by businesses, government, higher education and private non-profit organisations was $2.5 billion - 43% higher in real terms than six years earlier.

Business R&D spending in Victoria is more than 40% of the national total.

Our priority over the next decade is in the area of commercialisation of our research. The opportunity for synergies between business and the higher education sector in this field are enormous.

The Government’s strategy document Creating Our Future and the work of the Science, Engineering and Technology Taskforce have identified a number of directions for future action and investment.

While Australia and Victoria have a number of advantages in global high technology markets, we also face particular difficulties. These include the small size of our local markets, and our distance from major population centres in Europe, North America and East Asia.

Further, the fields on which we see our future prosperity depending are precisely those which our major competitors have also identified.

To succeed will require major effort and effective co-operation between all sectors.

For example, the numbers of graduates in the sciences and in engineering need to increase. Industry has a real role in helping governments and educational institutions to promote career paths in these areas.

Export Education

A third example of Australia’s competitive strength is in the field of education itself.

Australia’s international success and prosperity in the next millennium rests, to a large degree, with the business and academic sectors working in tandem.

Increasingly these countries will be looking to educate and train their students at home. Australian universities have to look at developing new products and adapting course delivery to suit this new demand.

In the longer term export education will involve the selling of our education expertise to other countries, more two-way international exchanges, and closer research collaboration.

Concluding Remarks

I hope that these comments and thoughts on strengthening the links between business an education provide some input to your consideration of these important issues.

May I commend the Business/Higher Education Round Table for their work in bringing the business and education communities together.

The inaugural awards which are being presented tonight are indicative of your commitment to achieving a productive relationship for us all.
In 1998 BHERT introduced a Distinguished Speaker series of addresses each year featuring eminent “thought leaders” speaking on topics of interest to both the business community and academics.

We are delighted to announce our Distinguished Speakers for 1999, as follows:

**Professor Peter Doherty, AC, BVSc, MVSc, PhD, FAAA, FRS** will deliver a luncheon address entitled, “Entering the first science-based millennium” on Friday, 6 August in Melbourne at the Hotel Sofitel.

**Professor Doherty**, is Chairman of the Dept of Immunology at St Jude Children’s Research Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee. He is a winner of the Nobel Prize for Medicine (1996) and was Australian of the Year in 1997.

**Dr Raymond Ch'ien, CBE, JP, DR PHIL, FRSA** will deliver a luncheon address on Friday, 17 September in Sydney, at the Hotel Inter-Continental.

**Dr Ch'ien** is Chairman of Inchcape Pacific Ltd, a US$1 billion diversified distribution company active in the automotive, industrial products, consumer products, office equipment and logistics services sectors.

He is Chairman of HSBC Private Equity Management Limited, with US$1 billion under management. He is on the Boards of HSBC Holdings plc and The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Limited, Co-Chairman of Beijing CAST Information System Technology Co. — and a Director of China Internet Corporation Ltd.

He is a member of the first Executive Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China; Chairman of the Industry & Technology Development Council; the Hong Kong Industrial Technology Centre Corporation; and the Hong Kong Japan Business Co-operation Committee. He is also a Board member of the Mass Transit Railway Corporation.

He serves on the Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. In mainland China, he is a Board member of the China Center for Economic Research at Peking University, honorary adviser to the China Aerospace Corporation, and honorary professor of Nanjing University. He is also a director of Kader Holdings Co. Ltd; Hsin Chong Construction Group Ltd; and Tianjin Development Holdings Limited.

He has a Ph.D in Economics from the University of Pennsylvania.

Members are asked to note these dates in their diaries. Further information on all functions will be given in due course.

The following extracts from an address by Professor Bryan Gould, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Waikato, New Zealand, and Chairman of the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, given at a Distinguished Speaker Luncheon on Tuesday, 6 October 1998, at the Hilton Hotel, Sydney.

It is almost a necessary condition of tertiary institutions around the world that they should be perennially and continuously subject to review. We’ve had a green paper, and we are currently expecting a white paper. The green paper painted a picture of New Zealand universities as elite service companies, run by boards of directors comprising of business people, appointed by the sole shareholder (the government), required to trade at a profit by selling its product into a competitive market place to individual students armed with vouchers.

We’ve already had a first and major instalment of that agenda through the funding regime which we have now encountered. Over the whole of the 1990s New Zealand universities have faced very substantial annual cuts. My university, the New Zealand universities, is now funded as to less than 50% by the government grant. The balance is made up of tuition fees paid by students, overseas students paying fees, research income, trading income, and so on.

The government had originally accepted, back in 1994, that it would pay 75% of the tuition fee, leaving the balance to the students. This year (1998), in the first budget that was delivered in May or June, that point was adhered to; the government had reached 75% and had stuck there. Within 2 months the cry had gone up that a further 5000 students’ numbers were required. And guess where they looked. They looked to us, and we’re back on track again for next year with even more severe cuts than we’ve endured in any year this decade. And worse than that, the 75% barrier has now been well and truly breached – there is now no obvious stopping point.

New Zealand universities are currently funded at about 65% of the rate of funding of Australian universities. An Australian graduate has lavished upon him or her about 50% more resources than would be true in a New Zealand university. That is very worrying in the longer term, because I can’t believe that level of additional spending will go unnoticed. It will reflect itself in the longer term, in better quality and that will be very bad news for New Zealand.

New Zealand universities are currently funded at about 65% of the rate of funding of Australian universities. An Australian graduate has lavished upon him or her about 50% more resources than would be true in a New Zealand university. That is very worrying in the longer term, because I can’t believe that level of additional spending will go unnoticed. It will reflect itself in the longer term, in better quality and that will be very bad news for New Zealand.

Historically the New Zealand universities, which had their common origin in the University of New Zealand, have worked together very closely. I can’t say that lasting for much longer. For all of those reasons I think competitive pressures are going to be increasingly the most important driving forces in New Zealand tertiary education. I say that, not because I wish to issue dire warnings, because actually I believe that it is not all bad, that there are some very important advantages to be gained from subjecting New Zealand universities to a greater exposure to market forces. I think we will find much greater innovation. We are already looking at the new techniques of delivering our core programs, we’re looking at that whole new range of academic studies. Innovation is clearly one of the pluses one can expect.
from the market place. We can expect a much greater sensitivity to our customers needs. The days when students were told they were lucky to get in in the first place, and you take it or leave it – those days have gone. A student who is not happy will make a fuss, will complain, will go to the press, and will in the end take his or her custom elsewhere. All of that will subject New Zealand universities to much greater market based disciplines. And the pressure will be on to be more efficient in the use of our resources, to satisfy the tax payer that our universities are well run, efficiently run, that the tax payer is getting value for money.

And there is a further worry - if we follow that model, we are in danger of avoiding the obvious threat to academic independence which is direct government intervention, but perhaps falling foul of another threat. If we are all slaves to the market, what then is left of academic independence? If the consumer is king, what freedom do we have to say, “No, we would like to research or teach in these areas”. If there is no one to buy those services, that teaching or that research, then it won’t get done. And a lot of the worth of universities historically is their ability to move into uncharted territory, not because somebody says, “I want to get to X”, but because people say, “I wonder where X is, or what it is”. If all of that changes, then again we have lost something very important about the role and value of universities.

There will come a day, and we are almost there now, when students will come along and say, “Look, I’ve paid you $10K this year, for my courses, and I’ve failed. I didn’t pay to fail – I paid for something of value, a piece of paper, a qualification, a pass. And the fact that I have failed shows that you have failed me, you did not teach me properly. And further more, you have failed to do that because you didn’t apply all of my $10K to my education. I want to know what happened to that $10K.” And there is a peculiarity with the New Zealand legislation which says that one of the functions of the minister is to get the critic and conscience of society. What I want to know is, is it very likely that students are going to pitch up and say, “He’s my $10K; I want to know why I was not given a pass, or why I was given a $500 so that you can be a critic and conscience of society”. I don’t think that will happen.

And there is another worry I have, and that is that one of the great strengths of the market is that it allows for failure. Indeed it is the very possibility of failure which had gone out of business. Failure is not something easily contemplated at a university, or in the university sector. If we see a university sector that exhibits those two characteristics, a statutory body which will supervise quality, and a mechanism whereby the minister can be assured that his or her procedures for ensuring quality are up to scratch or not. And yet that is what is being proposed.

Secondly, the New Zealand government professes to be frightened that some tertiary institutions might actually fail in financial terms. It is certainly true that the more we go for market based competition, the greater is the possibility of that failure. Therefore the government finds it necessary to put in place some pretty rigorous mechanisms to guard against it, and also some pretty careful supervision through its own appointees on what we used to call the Councils of the University, but which might in the future be called the Boards of Directors.

If we see a university sector that exhibits those two characteristics, a statutory body which will supervise quality, and a mechanism whereby the minister can be assured that the university is going to be properly run in financial terms, I think that is the very position that may not be the case, I think that we may be in danger of gravely weakening the concept of the university.

Not because there is anything wrong intrinsically with the market as a discipline, but because we may have allowed the market to take too dominant a position. So I have to - I think it is very important that the minister be properly aware of the deficiencies of the market provision. It knows that whatever it may feel on ideological grounds may be the right answer, that the right answer is not necessarily the one that is going to give satisfactory results.

Roland Williams, Bryan Gould and Ashley Goldsworthy

None of this is bad news. Much of it is good news, much of it is what we should be doing anyway. If we are to fulfil our role in society, then there is no avoiding the fact that we are going to have to be more efficient in the use of our resources, to satisfy the taxpayer that our universities are well run, efficiently run, that the taxpayer is getting value for money.

The private sector has in the universities a resource of immense value.

I know very well that if I am to do my job properly as Chief Executive of my institution then I am going to get out there and adapt to that market place quicker than anyone else, because I want to see my institution succeed.

There is a synthesis to be achieved, between the growing pressure of market forces and the need to keep in place because of their value, the traditional virtues of the university. My fear is that even in market terms, if we go too far and unthinkingly down the road to market based provision we actually lose the one great plus we have in the market place – that is, that we are universities. If we can no longer be distinguished from institutes and polytechnics of various sorts, then we have needlessly wantonly thrown away our major market advantage.

Now one of the strategies that we should adopt in New Zealand – and one of the advantages you are achieving in BHERT is that we should do in New Zealand – is gaining friends and supporters from the private sector by virtue of the value which we can deliver. The universities have very few friends, politically or otherwise, and yet the contribution which they are required to make is of immense importance to our national futures. It is everybody’s advantage if, particularly in the field of research, the universities and the private sector can work more closely together. The private sector has in the universities a resource of immense value. The universities have in the private sector an ally, a partner, a market of equal value. It is certainly true in New Zealand that we suffer greatly from the fact that we hardly speak to each other, or speak far too little. I would like to see that remedied. I would like to see the universities, without sacrificing their independence, their traditional role, I would like to see them playing a more direct and important part in the research on which our economic futures will depend.

Professor Gould, BA, LLM (Auck.), MA, BCL(Oxon), who since graduating from Law with First Class Honours in the early 1960s in New Zealand, and attending Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar, has found his real vocation in law and management. He has been a consultant to a number of organisations spanning the legal, media, academic and parliamentary arenas in both the northern and southern hemispheres. In 1992 he was a candidate for Labour Party leadership in the United Kingdom. He served for seven years as a Member of the House of Commons.

A vote of thanks by Rob Stewart, National Managing Partner, Minter Ellison

Roland Williams, Bryan Gould and Ashley Goldsworthy

The private sector has in the universities a resource of immense value.
In today’s environment there is a certain tension which universities and their staff feel in attempting to maintain the traditions of high quality research, scholarship and teaching.

Increasingly, reducing resources, coupled with a greater emphasis on revenue raising and entrepreneurial activities as well as inter-institutional competition, both domestic and international, have led universities and their staff to question their capacity to maintain the quality of the learning experience that they provide and the values of the research they undertake.

BHERT has identified the necessary key features of the higher education sector in this country - the prerequisites for Australian universities to compete effectively at the highest international levels.

Position Paper No. 2 (October 1998) – The Development of Cooperative Research Centres

CRCs were established in Australia in 1991 to foster ties between universities, industry and government departments and research organisations, in order to bring research closer to commercial realities and provide education and training opportunities. The program was established to address a number of specific issues, among which were:

The need to ensure that advances in technological competencies were linked to applications in various sectors of the economy.

Related to this was the need to improve international competitiveness. The need to ensure that Australia’s undergraduate and graduate programs in science and technology were of world class, specifically involving researchers from outside the higher education sector to ensure better quality and performance.

The CRC Program was to play an important role in ensuring that Australia benefited from the strength of its science and technology resources. Specifically, it would help ensure that Australian research and research training remained at the forefront in those areas of specific importance to the country as a whole.

There are 67 Centres currently operating in six industrial areas:
- manufacturing technology
- information and communication technology
- mining and energy
- agriculture and rural based manufacturing
- environment
- medical science and technology.

Overall the program has resulted in a strong positive effect on Australian spending on research and development by government departments, universities, CSIRO and other public R&D agencies and industry.

The objectives for and rationale behind the formation of State Chapters are:

- it will involve existing BHERT members with opportunities to involve people from their organisations on a State basis by providing generic skill set opportunities;
- it will increase the activities in which existing members from Western Australia, South Australia and Queensland can be involved;
- to encourage greater staff mobility between business and universities through publicising methods which have worked and establishing a framework for exchanges etc;
- to encourage universities to produce graduates with outstanding generic skill set competencies;
- to find ways to give graduates more industry experience;
- to lobby state government for policies favourable to the development of high technology industries, spin-off companies;
- to provide a potential source of additional funding to finance BHERT research projects and lobbying activities;
- to increase the interaction between the private sector and the tertiary education sector - so they can better understand each other needs;
- to give BHERT greater clout as a lobbying organisation; and
- to focus on State based issues affecting the tertiary education sector.

The activities of the State Chapters do not need to be numerous. They do need to be relevant and focused.

Membership and Fee Structure

The objective is to attract and involve in the BHERT State Chapters:
- significant business organisations based in only one state;
- medium sized private sector organisations who recruit significant number of graduates;
- the branch offices of existing BHERT members.

All BHERT national members with operations in a State would be entitled to membership of a State Chapter as of right. No additional membership fee would be paid.

A limited number of State based organisations who are significant employers of graduates (for example, hospitals, the power industry, Statutory Authorities, significant private sector employers) would be invited to also join the State Chapter. Membership would be limited so that overall numbers do not become too great.

The fee for State Chapter members will be in the order of $1000 pa. State Chapter members would be invited to send representatives to all BHERT dinners and lunches.

Structure:

Each year the State Chapter would establish a small number of working groups to focus on specific objectives. It is planned that two be established in 1999:

- An Innovation working group - focused on assisting the commercialisation of research. The Universities in the State should place the most appropriate person from their organisation on that committee.
- A Human Resources working group - which would seek ways to facilitate exchange of staff between University and business, and to help universities produce more employable graduates.

Ad hoc working groups would be established from time to time to deal with specific issues.

All members of the State Chapter would have the right to nominate the appropriate person to join each working group. A convenor would be appointed for each working group.

The State Chapter would be chaired by an appointee of the BHERT Board.

The State Chapter as a whole may only meet twice a year (for example over lunchtime with a specific topic for discussion or presentation).

The BHERT Board would be responsible for the direction of the activities of the State Chapter. It would be entitled to appoint a representative to attend BHERT meetings and have voting rights.

At the initiative of Professor Roy Webb, Vice-Chancellor, Griffith University, a lunch and afternoon seminar was held in Brisbane on 27 November 1998 to generate interest in a State Chapter (refer program below). It was a very successful function drawing (despite the festive season) some 230 to the lunch and about 40 to the seminar. Follow-up discussions are being held to crystallise some opportunities canvassed at the meeting.
Mr Dick Davies was recently heavily involved in the preparation of a somewhat similar report which focused on the minerals industry and hence comes to the task with some very useful and appropriate background.

The purpose of the Business/Higher Education Round Table (BHERT) is to pursue jointly initiatives that will advance the goals and improve the performance of both business and higher education for the benefit of Australian society.

It is a forum where leaders of Australia’s business and academic communities can jointly examine important issues of mutual interest, to improve the interaction between Australian business and higher education institutions, and to guide the future directions of higher education.

Mission Statement

In pursuing this mission BHERT aims to influence public opinion and both government and non-government policy on selected issues of importance.

BHERT believes that a prerequisite for a more prosperous and equitable society in Australia is a more highly-educated community. In material terms it fosters economic growth and improved living standards - through improved productivity and competitiveness with other countries. In terms of equity, individual Australians should have the opportunity to realise their full social, cultural, political and economic potential.

The membership of BHERT comprises, by invitation, the chief executives of major Australian corporations and research organisations, and the vice-chancellors of Australian universities.

BHERT pursues a number of activities through its Working Groups, State Chapters and active alliances with relevant organisations both domestically and internationally. It publishes a regular newsletter (BHERT NEWS), reporting on its activities and current issues of concern relevant to its Mission.
Executive Search

Slade & Partners is an Australian owned Executive Search Firm with a distinguished record in the private and public sectors.

It has recently established a division, “Higher Education Search”, which will provide innovative educational executive search on favourable terms to BHERT members.

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING DATES FOR 1999 BHERT MEETINGS:

**Wednesday, 24 March 1999**
Sydney – ANA Hotel – 4pm - 7pm
(followed by dinner, at which Ms Wendy McCarthy, AO, Executive Director, McCarthy Management & Chancellor, University of Canberra, will be the after-dinner speaker)

**Thursday, 15 July 1999**
Melbourne – Sheraton Towers Southgate – 4pm - 7pm
(followed by a dinner)

**Thursday, 18 November 1999**
Sydney – Hotel Inter-Continental – 2.30pm - 5pm
inclusive of Annual General Meeting (followed by Awards dinner)

**Contact:**
Len Coyshtel (03) 9235 5116
fax (03) 9235 5110
email lyncmel@mpx.com.au

Len is a former member of Academic Staff and University Council with an ongoing interest in alumni affairs.

Lionel Parrott
(03) 9235 5146
fax (03) 9235 5110
email lyncmel@mpx.com.au

Lionel is a former long-serving member of University General Staff.