EDITORIAL

The Business/Higher Education Round Table (B-HERT) sees philanthropy as an essential ingredient in the long-term development of Australia’s universities. In comparison with leading developed nations there is considerable scope for a much increased level of private support for universities in this country.

B-HERT decided to actively pursue this matter and early in 2006, in conjunction with Campus Review, hosted a summit on the theme ‘Funding Tomorrow’s Universities - Philanthropy, a Critical Source of Income’. The summit attracted wide representation from the higher education sector, particularly those with an interest in university fund-raising.

As a positive and constructive outcome of the summit B-HERT established a Task Force to consider policy options and actions to encourage and assist universities to seek more philanthropic patronage. We were fortunate in that the Task Force (Chaired by Emeritus Professor Dennis Gibson AO, Chancellor, RMIT University) comprised members with significant experience in a number of relevant areas and they contributed not only considerable time and effort but also the invaluable benefits of their knowledge.

As an outcome of the Task Force, B-HERT published, in December 2006, Position Paper No. 13, Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities. This Position Paper brings together a number of initiatives that B-HERT is pursuing to enhance the level of philanthropic support for universities in Australia.

It is worthwhile noting that in developing this Paper advice was widely sought from Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors of Australian universities, members of B-HERT, leaders in business and industry, philanthropic organisations, and community leaders in general. For their detailed and enthusiastic responses, we thank all who contributed.

The Minister for Education, Science and Training, Hon Julie Bishop MP, has indicated quite clearly that philanthropy is high on her list of priorities and the active participation of her staff in B-HERT activities has kept her abreast of our project.

In 1998 B–HERT instituted a series of prestigious annual awards to recognise outstanding achievements in collaboration between business and higher education in the fields of Research & Development and Education & Training, and Entrepreneurial Education (see later in this volume). The objective of the program is to highlight at a national level the benefits of such collaboration, and enhance links between industry and universities. The Awards are presented at an Awards Dinner in November each year.

In 2006 for the first time an award was made recognising philanthropic support for higher education, to draw attention to the extent of this support, and the key role it plays in enabling important and innovative programs, and in leveraging further support.
When I returned to the UK from the US to lead the University of Aberdeen ten years ago, one of my key priorities was to put fundraising at the centre of our institutional strategy. When I first mooted the idea of a campaign to raise £150 million, however, many colleagues were sceptical – even though five hundred years previously Aberdeen had been founded on private donations, and had continued to attract them up to World War II.

Ten years ago, the B-HERT Report would have made my task of persuading the sceptics considerably easier. The Report puts forward a powerful case for Australian universities embracing private fundraising. Its core arguments hold true just as much for universities in the UK or Europe. Two years ago the UK government sponsored a similar review, led by Eric Thomas of Bristol University. In essence it came to the same conclusion – that private fundraising was a viable and obligatory option for universities.

There is no doubt that when it comes to the business of asking for support, US universities lead the world. It’s a highly sophisticated business. Maintaining contact with alumni from the day they graduate is

“Increasing private support for Australian Universities”

“Ask and ye shall receive. Ye have not, because ye ask not.”
important. But it would be misleading to explain the wealth of US universities through general alumni giving alone. The practice of cultivating major donors, many of whom won’t be alumni, is close to an art form.

It’s equally important to remember that the philanthropic culture of US society is quite different to many other western societies. The concept of the welfare state was never as far advanced in the US and accordingly the philanthropic culture, both in terms of giving and asking, is more deeply ingrained. Americans give 2.1% of their GDP or $260 billion (USD), compared to giving rates of 0.9% in the UK and 0.76% in Australia. About $23 billion (USD) went to higher education in the US in 2005, and Harvard alone raised the equivalent of £310 million. The entire UK university sector raised £450 million in the same period.

With that said, of course, and as this report reminds us, there are plenty examples of philanthropy having made major contributions to universities in Australia long before the arrival of the welfare state. This is equally true of British universities. But somewhere down the line we lost sight of our respective philanthropic roots. The B-HERT Report and the Thomas Report are proof, however, that Western societies have recognised the limits of the welfare state. Government can’t do all, but it can help us to help ourselves. The B-HERT Report quite rightly emphasises that philanthropy is not a substitute for the support of government, but that equally universities must be prepared to look beyond the taxpayer. As well as answering the question of ‘can it be done?’ this Report provides some persuasive arguments on how a fundraising culture can be a positive force within our universities.

There is no doubt that when it comes to the business of asking for support, US universities lead the world. It’s a highly sophisticated business.

I can only comment on my experience of the UK and the US, but to me it is self-evident, that to look no further than the government for funding is to settle for second best. Political paymasters by definition have to distribute funds on a basis which supports public priorities and that more or less retains the status quo of all but the largest institutions. This is entirely appropriate, but it can’t be sufficient for universities. Private fundraising, on the other hand, offers the opportunity for universities to pursue their own priorities and projects which can help them achieve their ambitions. And because private donors are not imprisoned by political agendas they can be encouraged to do what government cannot always do – for example, support the place of areas of non-applied research or the humanities that may not have the kinds of utilitarian appeal that the taxpayer may prefer.

Another consideration is that the pool of potential donors stretches far beyond national borders, and lies wherever your institution can develop a network of connections to lever funds from. Most important of all is the fact that private donors won’t invest in anything second rate – and this by itself is a force for excellence within institutions.

The Report naturally looks to learn lessons from the US. If you compare the history of British and US universities over the course of the twentieth century, it is striking just how many examples in the US there are of universities that have risen to world importance in a relatively short period of time. Conant at Harvard, William Rainey Harper at Chicago, more recently the case of Stanford, the change of MIT from a regional technical college to perhaps the greatest technological university in the world – these are all classic examples. To a lesser extent, the rise of NYU to real prominence in the 90s is another.

It isn’t so easy to think of British parallels. Warwick University is one – but it’s hard to point to the same levels of transformational change across the system. Having worked in both countries, my feeling is that the dynamic of a system that is geared towards private fundraising almost compels universities towards attempting major step changes in quality. Indeed, I would argue that it instils a greater culture of ambition and risk-taking within universities. The reason it does so is because institutions know they can’t depend on government and that their energy is far more productively spent in developing new projects that may also attract private finance. The culture means one can dare to dream.

I repeat, however, that I see no contradiction between fundraising and the continuing role of government. The model of the US public university rather than the private institution bears most relevance for British or Australian universities. Twenty years ago many of these undertook no substantive fundraising activities, but are now very successful at it. Nevertheless they continue to depend on public funding for a significant amount of their income. The differing approaches of countries to fee income from students, of course, will also make a major difference to the wealth of an institution.

One also needs to be careful that private fundraising isn’t mistaken as an easy solution. The B-HERT Report rightly emphasises the need for serious front-end investment in professional fundraising staff,
who are frequently very difficult to recruit and retain. No Vice-Chancellor finds that kind of investment politically easy among their academic colleagues. It can also take many years to see a return on that investment. This again makes dedicating significant budgetary expenditure to fundraising activities at the expense of competing claims from elsewhere in the institution politically difficult. That difficulty underlines the B-HERT Report's conclusions on the importance of the support of governors, both inside and outside the academy.

The role of Vice-Chancellors is, however, perhaps most important of all. In a European context, it requires a redefinition of the traditional role of the Vice-Chancellor. It means hiving off many operational duties to a senior deputy in order to free up time to dedicate to fundraising and the external work dedicated to it. In the US, university presidents spend more than 50% of their time on fundraising work. The other side of the leadership role lies within the academy, in persuading an often sceptical academic community to embrace a role in fundraising, because ultimately it is their work that donors must be persuaded to invest in. A hugely positive by product, happily, is that fundraising compels universities to communicate and engage much more actively with the world.

There’s no question that increasing private fundraising represents a challenge. If one looks at the progress UK universities have made in fundraising compared to the US Ivy League universities like Harvard, it is all too easy to become depressed by how far behind we appear to be, despite the considerable increase in philanthropic awareness and university fundraising activity of recent years. The gap between the ten largest university endowments in the UK and the US, for example, has widened by some £12.5 billion during the last three years.

For British or Australian universities this, in a sense, is to miss the point. We may never replicate the absolute levels of giving to US universities, but it is within our means to try to get what we can. The work of our universities should be a source of pride. We should not be embarrassed to share that story with the world and in so doing secure the means to advance our universities to even greater achievements in the future.

The recent B-HERT paper Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities immediately caught my eye and I read it with keen interest. The observations and recommendations reminded me not only of my time fundraising for higher education at Durham University in the United Kingdom between 1997 and 2003 but also of my experiences at Wilfrid Laurier University, my current employer in Canada since 2004.

I have great empathy for the situation in which Australian universities find themselves. Universities are universally keen to establish meaningful long-term relationships with constituencies that can support their objectives, yet the climate and culture within the organizations that I have had experiences with are such that the development profession must invest significant amounts of time, effort and resources in order to facilitate this process which can also require a significant “leap of faith”? I’d like to share a few hard learned lessons in support of much of what is identified in the paper.

Fundraising in the UK in 1997 was still very much in its infancy. At Durham, there was little confidence in the development office. It had previously set rather lofty fundraising targets goals and then never realized them. Although the Director of Development reported directly to the Vice-Chancellor, a good relationship was lacking with the rest of senior management who, without sufficient guidance and experience in development, viewed development activities as nice-to-have but not as essential. On its own, the Development Office became an easy budget target and not a high priority. The lack of understanding internally, coupled with a poor return on investment (they had had a development function there for many years) and no real “buy in” from most of the senior management and therefore no real voice at the strategy table, spelled potential doom. The culture of development was such that the Vice-Chancellor,
although a champion of the area, was not as involved in donor relationship building and in asking for money as he should have been. This was because neither the development office nor the VC pushed each other to be active in this regard. It is no wonder that they raised little money.

Upon my arrival, the equivalent of a University Advancement team was established. Advancement at Durham soon included the research grants office, development and alumni relations, public affairs, media and publications, domestic and international student recruitment and events management. As the Development Director I reported to the Director of Corporate Communications, a dynamic and well respected individual within the organization who sat at the senior table. What a time we had! We developed a concept called “integrated income generation” where we developed priority initiatives with the faculties, worked up cases for support, looked at all the possible funding sources and then used one (philanthropic, research grants, European funding or regional funding) to leverage the other funds to raise what was required. We developed a strategy, implemented robust development plans, engaged volunteers who understood their roles and worked with the team and soon we found ourselves working towards a £175 million capital campaign. By the time I left we had generated over £100 million towards our goal. Furthermore, we had secured the confidence of the faculty and senior management because we formed a team that achieved a critical mass and we used the experience and processes of teams like the research grants office that were already well understood. The development area was able to score well above its weight because it could take advantage of the mass and synergies realized by the formation of the new advancement area.

Fundraising in the UK in 1997 was still very much in its infancy. At Durham, there was little confidence in the development office.

We made great strides at Durham but there was much still to do when I left. A review conducted by a well-respected US fundraising consultancy supported the view I held that to move to a higher fundraising level the university needed to significantly increase development resources. Durham was in campaign but there was no campaign budget. Campaigns with their increased publicity, increased activity and higher expectations required higher costs to be successful. I understand that some aspects of the recommendations from the review were accepted and that development is doing well there.

At Laurier, just prior to my recruitment, a major change had occurred. Development had been around for a long time with varying degrees of success but since the last campaign, which ended in 1997, the development office had not been allowed to maintain its campaign resourcing levels which jeopardized any gains made with donors and prospects during the campaign. The governing body sensed that momentum had been lost in what they knew was an area critical to the institution’s long term viability. A feasibility study was commissioned in 2003 to study preparedness and capability for the next campaign. The Deans attended “Fundraising for Deans” conference in the US and came back highly motivated to support a significant increase in resources for the development area so long as faculties were represented.

The result was a hybrid model where Laurier has 25 staff working centrally but with senior major-gift officers focusing on specific faculties with a solid reporting line to a new senior post of Assistant Vice-President and a dotted line to their Deans. Deans share the salary and development event-related costs but reap the benefit of long-term relationship established for their faculties and funds raised for their priorities. The Laurier Development Office includes advancement services (prospect research, alumni and donor database and donations processing, IT), development and campaign communications, annual giving (annual gifts from alumni, parents, retirees, faculty, staff and governors) donor stewardship, planned giving (bequests, gifts of insurance, charitable remainder trusts etc) and major gifts (gifts over $10,000 from individuals, corporations and foundations). As AVP I have a voice at the senior table and play a key role in helping identify and develop the priorities and their feasibility. Laurier developed a strategic plan called the Century Plan which clearly identified the priorities and the key projects it needed to move forward to its next century. We developed the Century Campaign to raise $100 million to help resource the plan. In my first year I tabled a significant campaign budget and some governors questioned if I had enough! They were prepared to take a “leap of faith” and wanted to make sure that development be sufficiently funded to help the institution achieve the campaign goals and, more importantly, provide for sustainable development activity over the long term. The end result is that in 2006 Laurier posted its best year ever with over $9.5 million raised, a 250% increase since 2003. We have now raised $68 million towards our Century campaign goal of $100 million. This was a significant shift up from Laurier’s last campaign that raised just over $15 million.

So, I have learned a number of key lessons at Durham and Laurier, which can be summarized as follows:
• Invest in a feasibility study of the fundraising potential and the options for implementation for fundraising at your institution. That will guide you, along with reviews conducted at milestones along the way, as you introduce this important function to your institution.

• Send executive management and deans to a fundraising conference now! They will return full of ideas and enthusiasm to make development work. The US model has been adapted to work extremely well both in Canada and the UK and is growing well throughout Europe and many other regions of the world.

• Hire professional fundraisers, listen to them, support them and give their leader a voice at the senior management table.

• Look very carefully within your organization at those areas that already raise profile and funds externally. Grouping these together as an advancement area with a development team and an “integrated income generation” strategy and plan will help you move quickly to take advantage of relationships, synergies and expertise already there.

• Success in fundraising comes from a good plan that includes well thought out innovative projects that are linked to the strategic plan and easily articulated, lots of well-researched prospects (potential donors!) and lots of activity. The activity is mainly focused on face-to-face visits where you wish to develop a lasting relationship based on trust, shared concerns and vision.

• Be prepared to take a “leap of faith” and sufficiently fund the development office from operating funds. Government funding to assist in development start-up and government matching funds for some funds raised would be wonderful but the institution must demonstrate its commitment. Properly funding and budgeting for the development activities will play a significant role in achieving the mission of the institution but it is a long-term game – don’t expect huge returns overnight! Relationships take time to develop. And if you mount a campaign as part of your overall development strategy and activities, it will need its own budget.

• And remember, if you don’t ask you won’t get!

Sustained development activity will reap benefits for your institution and it is a lot of fun too.

The wonderfully useful B-HERT paper, Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities, opens up several possibilities. It suggests to us that philanthropy, as a human motivation for participation in an organisation, has a welcome home in Australia. Across the board, we find that those who care about their education, their home institution and its future and their own ability to make a difference will come to share the goals and vision of that university – if they are asked. The 6.6% of the Australian philanthropic dollar that goes to education is more than the 4% of the British pound that goes to higher education, though not as great as the 23% of the US dollar that support such causes. But through the focus of an institution, the commitment of their leadership, the involvement of loyal volunteers and the employment of professional staff, the percent of donations in Australia can only rise. You are, I think, at the take off point, and papers like the one under discussion underscore that moment.

There is obviously a problem in seeking donations for a cause that is perceived to be the financial responsibility of government. Charitably-minded individuals are often willing to let the government get on with it. Tax funding of higher education does a good job at providing across the board opportunities and access to all Australian citizens who seek higher education. This system is a broad church, but it is probably not one with points of exceptional brilliance. The unique stamp of excellence that a university can claim must, it seems to be, be linked to seeking sources of private support. Philanthropy, after all, does not buy the basics of an education. The state can lay just claim to that bedrock. But it does buy excellence. It buys the icing on the cake, and with some good planning, it buys very good icing indeed.

Since Australia is coming to terms with the possibilities and limits of state funded universities, it is timely that this paper offers advice in two directions: what the state can do and what the universities can do. Much of what is solidly suggested here mirrors the work in the UK of the
Thomas Commission, on which I served. (Task Force Report to Government on Increasing Voluntary Giving to Higher Education, 2004). The first set of recommendations focus on the PR efforts of the government in promoting the values of institutions of higher education and their impact on individual lives. They are transforming institutions; on the whole, students emerge greatly improved. The government should consider providing resources on a matching basis to allow institutions to begin or expand their fund raising offices, and once that is underway, to consider using additional resources to match the private funds that universities do raise. Both these activities are underway in the UK now. It should carefully consider the tax structure and how it might be used to provide incentives to those able to give, both at the small and large level. In a nutshell, the government should repeatedly say that giving money to universities is a good thing to do and it should then use a series of pump-priming schemes to reward those who can move ahead in that area.

All very useful, but important to see that the government is not the prime mover in this arrangement. The universities are. This much is said in the very solid conclusion of the paper, that the government has restricted roles and the responsibility for increasing support lies with the institutions themselves.

How can institutions best do that? There is a good bit in the paper about internal practices that universities can bring to bear. They need to have a place for development in the overall strategic plan, they need to hire professionals and give them adequate resources, they need to recruit vice chancellors, deans and other administrators who are committed to this activity, they should codify best practice, they should have measuring sticks for costs, results, they should manage the gift money with extreme care and they need to have ways to take advantage of tax structures.

But something is missing here. The phrase that seems to encompass all this is to “increase capacity”, but in my vocabulary that does not mean installing better systems (which is of course a good in itself), but it means bringing in more money. The missing focus here is the donor. The word “donor” appears in the table of contents, but nowhere else. The word “gifts” appears but is disassociated from an actual person who chose to give that gift. The key is for universities to be externally focused on the donor, not on internal structures. That means that someone(s), preferably a combination of university leader, faculty member, volunteer and a gift officer must sit in a quiet room with a person of means and present to him or her a case for support which may or may not be compelling. They must do all the right things to get to that meeting and they must do all the right things to follow it so that the gift is closed, a cheque arrives which goes into the right account, and the donor is appropriately recognized. And they must do that over and over again. The relationship between the donor and the institution is embodied directly in that meeting, and it is the quality of that relationship that will largely determine the gift. All that takes time and it all cannot be done from behind a desk. The respect we show for that donor, for his or her hard accumulated wealth and for the way in which he or she chooses to use it is critical. They do not have to hand it over; in fact, if they don’t actually want to do that, there will be no gift either. The increase in capacity lies in that cheque and its purpose, not just in the skill with which we process it.

I think the heart of this process is difficult to describe because it is intensely repetitive. It is easier to talk about and mobilize better systems, better measuring devices than to point out where the real initiative and hard work lie.

Setting up all the best systems in the world will produce no money if someone does not actually ask for it. There are many strategies to increase that asking potential and all must be explored.

Make no mistake. I am a bureaucrat at heart and nothing pleases me more than good paperwork, well run accurate data bases, reports that show exactly what I want to show and fellow academics and administrators who can talk my lingo and create new and appealing strategies with me. I am one of the movers behind the only reporting structure in the UK to measure philanthropic activity in the higher education sector and I believe strongly in helping new universities get it right in introducing this currently-adolescent profession into their respective institutions. There is indeed plenty to get right, and a newly formed office may take as much as a year to get themselves sorted before being able to ask donors properly and with consistency. But the engines that drive the philanthropic machine is “the visit”, the face-to-face attempt to interest an alumnus in a project and then to ask for support. The number of times you do it can be measured, the outcome of it can be measured—that is real capacity.

I am in this business because I believe education is the greatest engine for social change going and I am thrilled to be a part of that. I can only assume that those who prepared the B-HERT paper share that enthusiasm. They have come up with creative, useful and workable ways to enhance that activity and their recommendations deserve all the attention that can be paid to them. Forget about comparisons to Harvard, Yale, Stanford and the other US big boys. They have been doing it for some 200 years and such contemplations produce only a tummy ache. Universities in Australia are poised to make their own mark and their own contributions. There is no time like the present.
‘EMBRACING PHILANTHROPY AS A FORCE IN MAKING OUR INSTITUTIONS GREAT’

CLARE L PULLAR
Director of Development
Trinity College
The University of Melbourne
(Recently appointed Director of Advancement Melbourne Business School)

‘Who would have thought, when I first attended kindy on Thursday Island in the Torres Strait, babbling away in the local language, that I might in my 21st year be given the opportunity to be an intern for an African– American Democrat representative in the US Congress, and be a year from graduating with a BA with a political science major and a law degree. I hadn’t even met a lawyer before I came here.’

So said Sana Nakata in 2004, the first Indigenous student at Trinity College in its 135– year history. She explains her journey thus,

‘Amidst a relatively secure upbringing, I gained an introduction to what it meant to be Indigenous in this country… It is in this space, between my life of privilege and the Indigenous life of poverty, crisis and racism, that I feel Trinity has helped me come into my own… For it is here that I have worked out what is shared in all these traditions that have shaped my life.

‘I have found my feet here, unsteady on them still at times, but I am ready to stride out. …I will in turn repay this generosity, so that those following me may have the wonderful opportunities that I have had. Not just to Trinity but to Indigenous Australia...

This is a simple demonstration of how modern philanthropy in education can transform an institution and build the human capital of a nation.

As a ‘broker’ for educational philanthropy these last 20 years, I believe that we have barely scraped the surface of private support for programs which underpin excellence in teaching, learning and research. It is indeed a milestone even to be writing about educational philanthropy in a publication such as this one.

Resources for Australian universities have always been critical on the education agenda, both national and state: resources for research, excellence in teaching, equity challenges, the need for a vast endowment for scholarships, building appropriate campuses – the list goes on. Funding discussion has focussed largely on government responsibility for the basic services of teaching and research. Philanthropic support has not been part of that discussion of basic services – and nor should it be.

My work with people who want to invest in education and excellence has convinced me that people and organisations with philanthropic vision are not interested in the provision of basic educational services in universities. That is rightly the responsibility of the public purse. A philanthropist’s interest lies in the achievement of great outcomes for individuals, for communities and for whole societies. They gravitate towards programs with lofty goals and high ideals, and potentially transformative. Sana illustrates this point in her message to Trinity College.

The prevailing dismissive attitude which says that philanthropy can never play a major part in supporting Australian educational institutions is holding us all up. The conversation invariably ends up in the same place; that philanthropy is a phenomenon more associated with the USA and to a lesser extent the UK and Canada, that Australia lacks a philanthropic heritage and perhaps the wealth and while philanthropy has played a pivotal role in making many good institutions great, that option is not open to Australia.

The sooner we reject this frustrating and persistent myth, the better. To take our institutions from very good institutions to great institutions, we need a powerful three–way partnership of government, business and community. The business and community role can provide the level of investment which will create transformative outcomes in every sphere. Our challenge is to make the case for universities – why they merit investment by private money – and to actually engage prospective donors/investors in the conversation about how to make that contribution transformative.

And we can learn from colleagues with a more evolved understanding of the role of philanthropy from Canada, America and Britain. We can learn from more recent examples closer to home in Hong Kong, Singapore and China where spectacular philanthropic investment has changed the course of history for recipient institutions. The landscape is changing quickly in this region – the first
international conference on educational philanthropy for the Asia–Pacific region last year attracted 40 countries. What a revolution! As Elisabeth Cham once said off the cuff, ‘The great philanthropists used to be dead.’

Let’s not forget that the foundation and early development of many of our tertiary institutions was made possible by transformative philanthropy: the Samuel Wilson benefaction at the University of Melbourne, the Clarke and Horsfall benefactions at Trinity College, Frances Ormond’s benefactions to both Ormond College and the Working Men’s College, now RMIT University, the Mayne family gift of the site of the University of Queensland, the John Challis bequest to the University of Sydney, the Walter Watson Hughes benefaction for the University of Adelaide, and the Winthrop Hackett benefaction for the University of Western Australia. The list goes on.

There are no fewer philanthropists today. They are thriving and in greater numbers than at any time in history. That’s been my experience. Why that experience is uneven is a measure of institutional culture. We need to open up our institutions in a way that encourages philanthropists to play a major part. This is the key paradigm shift, the key cultural change needed and the key reason why there has not been private investment on a broad scale.

Making the case for support asks an institution to make the same change in perspective – from looking inward to focussing on its relationship with the community. To put it simply, inviting philanthropic support is to engage with the donor’s perspective of the purpose of a university. This changes the focus of the institution outward, from a ‘telling’ mentality to a listening and responsive one, from one which is cloistered to one which is open, engaged, nurturing and responsive to its external communities. ‘Knowledge changes fate’ the motto of the Li Ka Shing Foundation sums it up.

To be brutal, we have failed to tap into great good–will and wealth in Australia because we don’t ask for philanthropic support, we fail to make the challenge meaningful for donors, and often hide behind the excuse of privacy laws. When we are successful, we often fail to thank the donor appropriately and in a way which ensures future gifts.

Consider this story. A few years ago a private philanthropist decided to host a party for the beneficiaries of his support. He contacted all his institutions and organisations to solicit their help. One institution responded to a request for a list of scholarship winners by refusing on the grounds that it contravened the institution’s privacy policy. He accepted this. He then asked the institution to send the invitations to the scholars and to key representatives of the faculty. The party was splendid and over 100 people attended from education, welfare, and the environment sectors. But not one person represented this particular institution.

This institutional culture made it easier to apply a rule than work to engage the philanthropist in the great work of the university. As an institution, we need to cultivate the art of listening to potential investors. We need to embrace new ways of responding to our communities and resist the growth of ponderous bureaucratic administrations.

I believe that my own institution is currently in the early throes of transformation through engagement with philanthropists who are investing in a vision. Take scholarship support; the total endowment for scholarships which has been built over the last 135 years has grown – just in the last ten years – by more than 30%. The catalyst for change was a recognition that the community of students was narrow and did not reflect the community at large – a result of a meagre scholarship endowment. The College had to turn away many outstanding students – indeed whole groups – who needed scholarships to access a collegiate education. Whole sectors of the wider community were in effect denied access.

The vision to build the capacity to welcome any able student regardless of their means – a ‘needs blind’ capacity – caught the attention of many alumni and supporters. Thirty new scholarships – most of them perpetual – have been added to the endowment. The student population has never been richer in its diversity.

A quick look at who is responding demonstrates their diversity. A senior businessman from the 70s, a doctor and an engineer from the 50s, and a lawyer from the 60s have endowed the first scholarships for Indigenous students. This year, Indigenous students either studying or graduated as a result of this philanthropy will number fourteen. Others have endowed scholarships for refugee students, new immigrants, students from remote and rural communities, students from under–resourced schools, and first generation university students. Others have given generously for students who fall on hard times during their studies.

Explaining the case for scholarships also encouraged others to enrich the wider fabric of the College: creating better cultural contexts, enhancing academic programs and teaching. A judge gave the College library a considerable collection of manuscripts on Indigenous matters and valuable
paintings by Indigenous artists. A student encouraged his family to donate three valuable paintings for the College walls. Others invested in teaching fellowships, which allowed the College to welcome intellectuals, elders, researchers, artists and activists as Visiting Fellows.

‘Cheque book philanthropy’ is dead. More like an investor, the modern philanthropist expects to engage with the people who will deliver the outcomes. They are eager and diligent in evaluating the difference their investment will make. They want to keep abreast of the challenges – the failures as well as the successes. It is a real partnership. Institutionally, we have to be primed and ready for that.

The name of the institution glamorous as it might be is not enough (unless you’re Harvard). What inspires donors is not the institution itself, but the outcomes a donor can see for their investment.

When it comes to making it happen, success is not a solo act. Certainly the head of the institution is key when it comes to securing the larger gifts. But engaging with potential supporters is a whole of institution effort. Everyone – from the voice on the switch to the teaching staff, Advancement staff, volunteers, Deans, and the VC have key roles in engagement and advocacy. With empowerment and the right sort of peripheral vision a major gift can come from anywhere.

Let me conclude with three brief examples of this:

A $500 annual donor scrawled this note on his gift, ‘If you need help for Indigenous students please contact me’. A $400,000 endowment for a perpetual scholarship was the outcome. Annual donors can be waiting for the right program to be inspired to make a major investment and Annual Giving staff are key people in picking up on cues like this one.

Two. An elderly retired grocer, who became one of the great modern benefactors of the College, was initially inspired by how he was welcomed and cared for on his first visit to the campus. His obvious enthusiasm for education displayed in that fleeting visit and perhaps his own disappointment in leaving school at fifteen led to further conversations and involvement in College life. His imagination was captured first by the cultural collection to which he made a gift of a commissioned artwork. An especially personal resonance with the ‘needs blind’ vision of the College inspired him to establish a scholarship endowment for talented but needy country students. He opened his historic home regularly for College activities – both for staff and for students. His final act of generosity was to leave the College an interest in his substantial estates. Everyone who values education is a potential major benefactor.

The last story illustrates that adage, Ask for money and get advice, ask for advice and get money. Exploring the challenge to find that transformative single gift for scholarships, we asked a senior alumnus, banker and philanthropist, was there someone in Australia, whom he knew, who could be inspired to transform an institution’s scholarship capacity through giving an endowment in the vicinity of $20 million. His immediate and enthusiastic response was ‘Yes... and I would be prepared to lead that discussion.’ This story is not finished, except to say that conversation has begun this year and early enthusiasm for such an ideal has meant we have two full scholarships newly created as an ‘account opener’. The donor has not visited the College yet, but is inspired by the volunteer’s conviction about the outcomes for less privileged young people.

Engagement with potential supporters requires the same personalised approach whether the institution counts its community in the hundreds of thousands or in the tens of thousands. The formula does not change: the identification of a potential supporter, the conversations which need to happen, the program created for involving that potential supporter in the life of the institution, the actual ask, the thank you and the ensuing relationship, including the next ask, are the key steps. The challenge is to embrace the notion institutionally that ‘we do philanthropy’.

A last helpful hint from Henry Rosovsky, former Dean of Harvard’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences who in his book, The University: An Owner’s Manual says ‘cultivate the art of asking people for money; your career may depend on the results’. He goes on:

‘Fundraising will always be the leitmotif of academic life. Rich or poor, public or private, college or university – there is never enough money to go around. Fundraising is necessary, but it is much more than a necessary evil. I grew to like it, and never ceased to be amazed by the loyalty and generosity of our alumni, or by the intelligence and probing minds of many foundation officials. Asking for money is an excellent way to test the free market, a most effective method of surveying the feelings and priorities of any constituency. “Development” is a form of education for the giver and receiver. Making the case and convincing a potential donor of its validity is healthy for all concerned.’

An experience which strongly resonates with me.
Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities (B-HERT Position Paper No. 13) has been an important and timely contribution to the discussion and promotion of philanthropy for Australian universities. These remarks look beyond this paper to what might come next.

NOT TOO MANY BIG NUMBERS PLEASE

One of the most dangerous outcomes for the development of philanthropy for Australian universities would be a premature escalation of expectations. Monash University is planning a significant fundraising campaign. It has gone about the task methodically – building relationships with donors, recruiting fundraising staff and so on. When Monash announces its campaign target I expect it will have done the homework to know that such a target is achievable. Other universities may be tempted to rush in to campaign mode and announce a target that is not supported by solid donor development and research.

Universities are warned of announcing grand fundraising targets and failing to meet them. The main danger is damage to institutional reputation. You don’t want be known as the University that put up a big number only to find the community didn’t support you at that level. Overseas experience shows that institutions that risk fundraising failure try to avoid it by creating the appearance of success, usually by counting income that would not normally counted as fundraising income. Donors need confidence that the universities’ statements on funds raised are straightforward with no creative counting.

Since the publication of Increasing Private Support an Australian university has announced that its long term goal is a fund of one billion dollars and it will soon open a fundraising office. You can never be proved wrong with a “long-term” goal, but it would be unhelpful if our Vice-Chancellors started to play fast and loose with big fundraising targets.

There is an extensive body of knowledge about fundraising, alumni relations, and donor development drawn from overseas higher education, and from the experiences of Australian schools and charities. There are some reasonable processes (calling it “science” would be overstating the case) around estimating campaign results, and they centre on extensive donors interviews. As Australian universities add Development or Advancement to the portfolios of their senior executives, they will need to become acquainted with this knowledge.

KEEP FOCUSSSED ON THE DONORS

For universities beginning fundraising or putting more resources to the task, it will be tempting to start with an analysis of the university’s needs. “What should we ask donors to fund?” The alternative would be to ask, “What would potential donors want to fund?” and this seems unpalatable because a university would not wish to be beholden to donors’ wishes. Three responses to this are important. First, universities are already beholden to funders’ (governments and research agencies) wishes, and donors are much easier to deal with than any of these other sources.

Secondly, donors can never make a university do something it doesn’t want to do. Power always resides with the University. If the donation does not suit the University, graciously decline to accept it.

The third response will confound people inexperienced in fundraising, but will set experienced heads nodding: by concentrating on the University’s needs, it will be hard to develop donors’ interests; yet by keeping alert to donors’ interests you will find funding for the university’s needs. Without donors, all the planning, prioritising and writing comes to nought. Stay focussed on donors. Get potential donors involved as early as possible in your project planning and selection. Most of them will make a useful contribution even before they give you a dollar, and they will certainly give more of those to projects they helped create.

MATCHING GIFTS – THE GOOD AND THE BAD

A Vice-Chancellor once admonished his chief development office, “Stop raising money -- the University can’t afford it.” This situation arose because that university, in its ambition to raise funds, was offering to match gifts that were given. The result was that new initiatives could be undertaken with only half the funds raised, and the University had to provide the balance. Although donors look for indications that a project is important to the university before they agree to put their own funds in, a widespread matching gifts program leads to solicitations for only half the amount required and drains university funds. The university can find other ways to demonstrate the importance of projects for which it raises funds. It is much better to have a donor who is prepared to match donated funds. This way you get the...
motivation of funds being matched but not the drain on university funds. Of course if you get two donors prepared to match funds, you can match with one donor and match again with the other, leading to a fourfold increase in the value of donations.

Governments may consider matching certain gifts to Universities, and this will have value if used correctly, but note that Hong Kong universities have failed to meet the maximum donation levels that could be funded by their government. While the Hong Kong universities have done a good job in developing fundraising capacity quickly, lack of investment in their fundraising staff, and in donor relations has limited their ability to raise funds.

INVITE THE WHOLE FAMILY OVER
A number of Australian universities that currently bemoan their lack of fundraising experience have an experienced fundraiser at nearly every exit gate. They currently work for affiliated residential colleges, medical research institutes, and in some cases, affiliated hospitals. At this stage in universities’ fundraising development there are many advantages in taking a broad view of the university, and including in your fundraising planning, database development and staff training the development officers from all affiliated institutions.

GLOBAL CITIZEN
Singapore recently announced that it would remove the requirement that its charitable foundations distribute at least 80% of their funds within the country. In theory this might lead to a greater proportion of foundation funds being sent overseas.

In Australia ordinary charitable foundations may not distribute any of their funds overseas, and while the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom provide tax benefits to donors to Australian universities (albeit usually through a local intermediary organisation), Australia provides no such facility for its taxpayers to obtain consideration for their donations to foreign universities.

It is worth speculating on the real impact of a change to tax laws that allowed Australian taxpayers to receive a deduction for donations made to overseas universities. At the moment, foreign universities give a light touch to their Australian alumni because they know there is no local tax relief. If this changed, and the development officers of Stanford, Harvard, Cambridge and the London School of Economics were let loose on their alumni here, I suspect we would see some very large gifts. Then, having had a positive experience of university philanthropy, these individuals might be open to approaches from Australian universities.

DON’T WRECK THE NEIGHBOURHOOD
We have already seen one Australian University seeking to fill more than twenty fundraising positions in the last year. Several others will recruit more than ten each. We know that there are few experienced university fundraisers available, so there will inevitably be some poaching of fundraising staff from other organisations, particularly from medical research institutes, museums, libraries, galleries and hospitals. When you consider that many of these organisations only have one or two fundraisers on staff, and that the viability of small organisations depends on fundraisers in a way that universities do not, you can see that a rapid increase in university fundraising numbers can have a deleterious effect on the organisations from which it recruits. It would be neighbourly to recognise this and to provide assistance of some kind to the organisations who are losing vital staff. Paying for recruitment advertisements or allowing their fundraising staff to participate in university training sessions would be welcome.

ALL BOATS RISE WITH THE TIDE
This expression is often used about philanthropy. Certainly a rise in university philanthropy -- particularly high value, conspicuous philanthropy -- encourages others to give and in time will benefit all universities. The tide is beginning to rise and every university needs to be in a boat to take advantage of it. A few are afloat. Others are at least asking how much a boat would cost.

In conclusion, I appeal for the sector to take a broad, co-operative view. While institutions might feel they compete for donors’ funds, competition has less effect on the amount received than the total of funds available and donors’ confidence that universities are good recipients. It is in each university’s interest that all universities have capacity to raise funds, to implement funded projects in a quality way, and to communicate effectively with their donors.
2006 B-HERT Awards

for

Outstanding Achievement in Collaboration in Research & Development and Education & Training

MAJOR SPONSOR

Australian Government
Department of Education, Science and Training

Applications were sought earlier this year and were judged by an experienced panel of judges comprising:

- Professor Leon Mann, Director, Centre for R&D Leadership, The University of Melbourne (Chairman)
- Dr Peter Binks, CEO Nanotechnology Victoria Ltd
- Ms Sharon Coates, CEO, Innovation Business Skills Australia
- Dr Annabelle Duncan, Associate Director and Chief Operating Officer, Bio21 Institute
- Mr Peter Laver AM, Vice-President, Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering
- Associate Professor Jane Munro, Head of College & CEO, International House, The University of Melbourne
- Dr Peter Scaife, Director, Centre for Sustainable Technology, The University of Newcastle

THE CRITERIA FOR EVULATION INCLUDED:

1. Innovativeness
2. Strength of the relationship between collaborating partners
3. Outreach inclusion (e.g. overseas - to other groups, companies)
4. Wider outcomes achieved
5. Cultural impact on the partner/organisation

The Hon Julie Bishop MP, Minister for Education, Science and Training, presented the Awards at a gala dinner at The Arts Centre in Melbourne on Tuesday, 14 November 2006.

B-HERT wishes to acknowledge the generous support of the following organisations:
Winning entries were:

**Best Research & Development Collaboration**

All winners are pictured with the Hon Julie Bishop MP, Minister for Education, Science and Training and Rob Stewart, President, B-HERT.

**Winner:** Brisbane Airport Corporation and Queensland University of Technology

**Title:** Brisbane Airport Corporation/Queensland University of Technology Collaborative Partnership

The BAC/QUT collaborative partnership seeks to implement world best practice to transform Brisbane Airport into an Airport City. It is based on a shared vision of mutual benefits that has resulted in a whole of organisation involvement for excellence in the management of a modern international airport, knowledge creation and application through robust scientific enquiry and academic rigour. QUT effectively functions as the R&D arm of BAC, whilst the airport provides a ‘living laboratory’ for QUT to undertake real world research and to strengthen its skills base.

The collaboration has allowed the delivery of relevant, multidisciplinary research outcomes through a wide ranging portfolio of projects and the realisation of tangible benefits. Additionally, other airports are looking to the Partnership for leadership in developing solutions to critical issues. QUT and other organisations view the Partnership as an exemplar model for industry and academia collaboration.

**and**

**Winner:** Edith Cowan University, WA Police Service, China National Computer Software & Technology Service Corporation (P R of China) and Northeast Normal University (P R of China)

**Title:** Optical and Photonic Techniques for the Positive Identification of Forensic Ballistics Specimens

The need for firearm identification systems by national and international police services continues to increase with greater accessibility to weapons. The difficulties associated with matching traditional images of ballistics specimens are numerous, and include the smallness of the samples, the nature of surfaces and shapes for the cartridge cases and projectiles.

Australian Police Services lack the funds to maintain a research and development program for the next generation of ballistics identification systems. Edith Cowan University advances the knowledge base in this discipline. The application of this project will enhance this knowledge base for the benefit of Australian Police Services. The potential to reduce the labour intensive activity of traditional ballistics identification provides the opportunity for rapid response in forensic ballistics analyses for state, national and military peacekeeping activities, with better crime detection rates by police at crime scenes. The Federal government has now placed a greater emphasis on a safer Australia.
Winner: Motic China Group Co. Ltd., Australasian Instrument Services Pty Ltd and Monash University (School of Biological Sciences, Teaching Facilities Support Unit)

Title: Interactive Teaching Laboratory

The project is about the continuing development and delivery of innovative, inspiring and effective learning and teaching environments in biology. The project involves a dynamic collaboration between a leading optical equipment manufacturer (Motic China Group) and a major tertiary education unit (School of Biological Sciences (SBS) at Monash University). It was initiated while the SBS was exploring options for upgrading its teaching facilities. The collaboration has resulted in the development of a cutting-edge teaching and learning environment that links microscopes to computers and student computers to teaching computers, thereby creating a truly interactive digital teaching laboratory and further facilitating a range of emerging pedagogies. Although the original driving force for the project was to update and invigorate a specific undergraduate teaching facility, the opportunity to build on the experience and create a working showcase continues to enhance the project and collaboration.

Honourable Mention: Best Collaboration involving a CRC – Research & Development or Education & Training

No Winner in this category.

Australasian Cooperative Research Centre for Interaction Design and the Royal Children’s Hospital Brisbane

Title: Diversionary Therapy Technology Devices

The Diversionary Therapy Technology project is about reducing pain and anxiety in burns in children.

Each year in Australia thousands of children undergo treatment for burns injuries. Treatment can involve removal of dressings and inspection of wounds, up to three times a week for several months.

Managing the severe pain associated with burns treatment is a constant challenge. Opioids are often inadequate, and this can lead to the patient avoiding or resisting treatment. Complementary cognitive techniques distract the patient during treatment – e.g. singing, breathing exercises, reading books or playing with toys – but become less effective over multiple sessions.

The Royal Children’s Hospital Brisbane approached ACID to develop an easy-to-use diversionary therapy device incorporating augmented reality technology, with the aim of reducing pain scores among burns patients.
Winner: Edith Cowan University, Emirates Group Security (Transguard), Emirates Airlines and International Civil Aviation Organisation

Title: Enhancing Security in an Increasingly Interdependent World – A global Collaboration with Emirates Airlines to serve international demand for Aviation Security Education and Training

Edith Cowan University has developed a strong partnership with Emirates Airlines, to develop and deliver specialised ECU Security programs to an International market. International terrorism and trans-border organised crime represent the major security challenge for Aviation sector stakeholders in the 21st century. Through the collaboration, ECU is positioning itself as a leading global provider of education and training to airlines, governments and international organisations to assist them in combating these major issues. The ECU partnership with Emirates has been active since 2001, and has developed into a joint venture Education Academy in Dubai running ECU programs in Security Management, Aviation Security, Crisis Management and Ground Handling. ECU has built on its work with Emirates Group to deliver these programs to new partners in Qatar, Oman, the United States and the United Nations World Food Program. The programs are affiliated with the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the aviation security syllabus has been certified by the UAE General Civil Aviation Authority.

Winner: Flinders University, Riverland Regional Health Service, Riverland Medical Group, Lake Bonney Private Medical Clinic, Waikerie Medical Centre and Loxton Medical Clinic

Title: Riverland Parallel Rural Community Curriculum

The Parallel Rural Community Curriculum (PRCC) commenced in 1997. The PRCC has enabled for the first time students to spend an entire academic year based in rural General Practice. The PRCC is a collaboration between the University, the regional health service’s and the regions private medical practices. The goals shared by the partners are to demonstrate the clinical excellence of rural practice to undergraduate medical students and to create a sustainable medical workforce in rural Australia.

The program’s success has enabled diffusion of this innovative and collaborative approach to the Greater Green Triangle and Hills Mallee regions of South Australia, remote communities in the Northern Territory, 6 other Australian medical schools, and 4 international medical schools.

The program has resulted in a paradigm shift in the culture of medical education in Australia.
University of South Australia, Dept of Education and Children’s Services SA, Office of the North, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, Families SA and City of Salisbury Public Library Service

Title: University of South Australia Northern Adelaide Partnerships (UNAP)

The University of South Australia Northern Adelaide Partnerships (UNAP) is an innovative program that facilitates relationships in northern Adelaide between business, government and other agencies and the University of South Australia.

UNAP facilitates the development of partnerships that address the significant social disadvantage in the region both directly through program delivery and indirectly by addressing the professional development, evaluation and other needs of industry partners.

Gosnells Armadale Business Development Organisation, City of Gosnells, Great Southern Area Consultative Committee, Albany Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Small Business Centre Great Southern, TAFE Great Southern and Small & Medium Enterprise Research Centre, Edith Cowan University.

Title: The Practical Employee Management Skills Program (PEMS)

This program is about providing practical, accessible training in employee management skills to small and home-based businesses, based on SMERC’s action-based research which shows:

Small and home-based businesses have a high failure rate and also fail to thrive;
Operators generally offer quality goods and services, but often lack skills in HR management, financial management, marketing, IT usage;
The sector is the ‘non-glamorous’ end of the Australian business research continuum and is largely overlooked;
Rural and remote small businesses are even more neglected;
Size, location, staffing and financial issues shut these business people out of assistance;
Small and home-based business operators often feel isolated and alienated.
2006 Award for

The Best

Entrepreneurial Educator of the Year

PURPOSE
To recognise the importance of education in the process of developing and nurturing entrepreneurs; and to showcase best practice in entrepreneurial education.

Winner

Professor Scott Holmes
Dean of Graduate Studies
and Professor of Accounting
The University of Newcastle

2006 Award for

Outstanding Philanthropic Support of Higher Education

PURPOSE
To recognise support for higher education; and to draw attention to the extent of this support, the key role it plays in enabling important and innovative programs, and in leveraging further support.

Sponsored by

Winner

Mr Michael Hintze
Title of Project or Program:
Centre for International Security Studies, The University of Sydney

1 to r Mr Donald Wilson, the Hon Julie Bishop MP, Minister for Education Science and Training and Dr Daniel McDiarmid, Global Philanthropic. Award was accepted by Mr Donald Wilson in the absence of Mr Michael Hintze

Note your diary – applications for next year’s Awards for Outstanding Achievement in Collaboration in Research & Development and Education & Training, Best Entrepreneurial Educator of the Year and Outstanding Philanthropic Support of Higher Education will be called in May 2007.
As a unique group of leaders in Australian business, professional firms, higher education and research organisations, the Business/Higher Education Round Table (B-HERT) sees as part of its responsibility the need to articulate its views on matters of importance germane to its Mission. From time to time B-HERT issues Papers in this context – copies of which are available from the B-HERT Secretariat at a cost of $9.90 (GST incl.) per copy.

Position Paper No. 13 (December 2006) – Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities

This position paper brings together a number of initiatives that B-HERT is pursuing to enhance the level of philanthropic support for universities in Australia.


B-HERT Paper No. 9 (July 2006) – Tomorrow's Universities: The Need for Change in Australia

Summary of papers presented at the Higher Education Summit held in Melbourne on 7 June 2006.

Position Paper No. 11 (June 2006) – Universities' Third Mission: Communities Engagement

This paper outlines B-HERT's views on the scope and funding of the Third Mission of Universities: Community Engagement. It addresses Communities Engagement in the context of Australian Government interest in developing strategies to support universities and industry working together in engagement activities.

B-HERT Paper No. 8 – (July 2004) - THE FACTS: Higher Education in Australia

A compendium of statistics on higher education. The purpose of the report is to present some key relevant perspectives, statistics, trends and comparative data. The accurate and broad-based content of the report should help those in the higher education sector gain an informed view.

B-HERT Paper No. 7 (February 2004) – The Knowledge-Based Economy: Some Facts and Figures

An update to B-HERT Paper No. 4 which provides some useful and interesting comparative data on Australia’s relative global position within the context of the knowledge-based economy.

Recent B-HERT Publications

Leading Edge – Australian Public Sector Research (November 2003)

This publication seeks to showcase our developing research excellence, and widen the opportunities available to many of the researchers, their universities and agencies which supported this research, and to the nation. ($15.95 per copy)

B-HERT Paper No. 6 (February 2003) – Research Issues for the Service Sector, particularly for Community Service Professions and Export Services

This paper attempts to define the service sector, particularly on two important areas, the community services sector and the export industries sector.

B-HERT News

No. 24 May 2007 Increasing Private Support for Australian Universities
No. 23 March 2006 Emerging Skills–2020 and Beyond
No. 22 July 2005 The Humanities and Business
No. 21 March 2005 Case Studies in Regional Engagement between Post-Secondary Education and Business
No. 20 July 2004 The Changing Education Needs for the Professions
No. 19 March 2004 The Challenge of the Private Providers
No. 18 November 2003 Improving Teaching and Learning in Universities
No. 17 July 2003 Regional Provision of Higher Education
No. 16 April 2003 Developing Generic Skills: Examples of Best Practice
No. 15 November 2002 Productivity in the Higher Education Sector: What Does it Mean?
No. 14 July 2002 Excellence in Collaborative R&D
No. 13 March 2002 Vocational Education and Training (VET)
No. 12 October 2001 The Need for a Stronger Entrepreneurial Culture in Australia
No. 11 July 2001 The Knowledge Economy & Knowledge Management
No. 10 March 2001 Business, Ethics, Values and Education
No. 9 November 2000 The Triple Bottom Line: Shareholders, Society, Sustainability
No. 8 July 2000 Populate or Stagnate: Australia 2050
No. 7 March 2000 The Business of Education for Business
No. 6 October 1999 Lifelong Learning in the New Millennium
No. 5 July 1999 Australia – The Information Economy
No. 4 March 1999 Leadership
No. 3 October 1998 Innovation
No. 2 June 1998 Science Education and Science Research in Australia
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The purpose of the Business/Higher Education Round Table (B-HERT) is to pursue initiatives that will advance the goals and improve the performance of both business and higher education for the benefit of Australian society. B-HERT is the only body where leaders of Australia’s business, research, professional and academic communities come together to address important issues of common concern, to improve the interaction between Australian business and higher education institutions, and to help guide the future directions of higher education.

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

Mission Statement

B-HERT 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.

Membership of B-HERT comprises Australian universities, corporations, professional associations, the major public research organisations (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation).

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