

SUBMISSION ON THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND
DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN 2005-2012

The University's Strategic Plan for the next seven years should inspire those of us who belong to the University to pursue its mission and objectives with pride and passion. Much of the document states specific Objectives with which we would all be happy to agree. Yet its fundamental premise fails to accord with the traditional values of a world class university. The thrust of the document is narrow and instrumentalist. Overall, it offers no inspirational vision for the University and no touchstone for the Vice Chancellor, as the academic leader of the University, and we as his colleagues and peers, to move forward.

Our submission addresses in particular two major deficiencies in the strategic plan¹:

First is the failure to recognise that it is the staff – academic, support staff, librarians – who, alongside the students, collectively make this University. The document is written from the perspective of the Administration being “the University” and the academic members being ‘staff’. The problem is that ‘the University’ is its academic members, and their role is to teach well and do internationally significant research. The role of the Administration, on the other hand, is to support the teaching and research efforts of ‘the University’. It is timely to recall that, according to the University of Auckland Act 1961, section 3(2):

The University shall consist of the Council, the professors emeriti, the professors, lecturers, junior lecturers, Registrar, and librarian of the University for the time being in office, the graduates and undergraduates of the University, the graduates of the University of New Zealand whose names are for the time being on the register of the Court of Convocation of the University of Auckland, and such other persons and classes of persons as the Council may from time to time determine.

This is not an anachronism; it is a truism. Without the staff, the University does not exist.

In this document, however, the staff are treated as an individualised proletarian workforce that is subordinate to an organizational hierarchy of managers. This relationship is expressed in disciplinary language: staff are people ‘of whom the University must demand excellence’ (p.12:11); whose ‘reward systems’ are to be based on competition and reflect their individual value to the organization (p.14:20); and who are to be ‘led and coached’ by managers to pursue the University’s strategic objectives (p.14.29). Our research is treated as a commercial venture whose value is to be judged in terms of research income and scores on the deeply flawed PBRF ranking, while students are treated as a source of revenue.

Constant references to competition, flexibility and individual merit clearly signal a desire to replace collective employment salaries and conditions with discretionary, individualized and differential ‘rewards’ for achieving these

¹ We have not addressed some stylistic and structural aspects of the document (for example, repetition, location of some bullet points, language). Equally, we have concerns about whether some Objectives are objectives, and about the relationship between objectives and performance measurement. We assume that these issues will be addressed by others and tidied up in a revised version.

instrumentalist objectives. The Strategic Plan as written risks alienating, rather than uniting, the academic members and general staff of ‘the University’.

Nor is there any recognition of our essential role, especially as senior academics, in the collegial governance and management of the University and its constituent parts. This ignores the statutory role of the Senate, as academic board, to provide advice on academic matters to Council and the duty of Council to receive and consider such advice before making decisions on those matters. ‘Staff’ and ‘managers’ are referred to as discrete entities, ignoring the role of academics in senior management and the increasing element of administrative responsibilities in every staff member’s daily employment.

Second is the complete absence of objectives that reflect the University of Auckland’s role as a public institution that is an integral part of a national university system and plays a vital public good role in the social, political, cultural as well as economic life of the nation. A major reason that staff remain loyal to this University, despite attractive offers from prestigious universities overseas, is because of our commitment to its public good role and to contribute through our teaching, research and outreach activities to the present and future wellbeing of the nation.

It is our role as a scholarly community to collaborate constructively, rather than compete, with fellow academics in other universities in New Zealand, Australia and elsewhere.

Public subsidies remain a significant (albeit inadequate) source of the University’s funding, for which taxpayers justifiably expect some return. Our activities are governed by a tertiary education strategy that recognizes [through Section 159AA of the Education Act 1989] the critical importance of the economic, social and environmental context and the development aspirations of Maori and other peoples. The University also has a statutory obligation under section 162(4)(a) of the Education Act to accept a role as ‘critic and conscience’ of society and to respect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Yet the University of Auckland appears in this strategic plan as an isolated and detached education corporation competing for status and revenue in an international education marketplace.

These concerns are addressed with reference to each part of the document; however, we emphasise that it is the orientation, language and tenor of the Strategic Plan that we believe needs to be rewritten, not simply isolated parts.

A World-Class University in New Zealand

This preamble reflects how we see our University. It talks about ‘national goals’, as well as contributing to the region and the wider world. It recognises our diverse and balanced contribution to social and cultural development, social justice and equity, critical inquiry and intellectual discourse, scientific discovery and a sustainable future, innovation and wealth creation. It affirms our goal of providing all New Zealanders with greater opportunities and a better future, and advancing the well-being and social progress of our country. These are the aspirations and objectives that attracted us to academia and to this University and have encouraged each of us to

remain here for many years, indeed decades. Sadly, the preamble bears little relationship to what follows.

International Standing

The Strategic Plan is driven by the desire for the University of Auckland to be, by implication, the only truly world class university in New Zealand. This is to be achieved by a corporatised model of the University, led by a CEO who decides policy (accountable only to a Board of Directors) and Division Managers (DVCs, Deans and the Librarian) whose role is to cajole or induce an intrinsically reluctant, menial workforce to do what is required by 'the University'.

This is absolutely not in the tradition of significant universities world wide. Indeed, it is worth noting that many of the great universities around the world have existed for most of a thousand years and have out-survived any national government or commercial corporation because they retain a clear collective vision of what they are trying to do.

By contrast, the quest for international standing in this Strategic Plan centres on international rankings, which are treated as valid measures of quality despite controversy over their methodology and integrity,² and by benchmarking whose criteria and comparators can be crudely quantitative, arbitrary and inappropriate.³ It is depressing to see that our University's aspirations for the next seven years are supposed to be measured by our position on such scales. There are many more valid qualitative and collegial methods of assessing and enhancing the reputation of a University. International collaboration and connectedness should be encouraged for the benefits it brings to the university, not because it can add value to our brand name in a regional or international marketing exercise. Universitas 21 and APRU both have a role to play, provided their activities are motivated by genuine academic, rather than commercial, considerations to benefit students, staff and the intellectual enterprise and are open and accountable to the academic communities of the universities involved.

²Oon the Shanghai Jiao Tong methodology, see Anthony Van Raan, (2005) 'Fatal Attraction: Conceptual and Methodological Problems in the Ranking of Universities by Bibliometric Methods', 62(1) *Scientometrics* 133-43; Nian Cai Liu, Ying Cheng, Li Liu (2005) 'Academic Ranking of World Universities using Scientometrics', 64(1) *Scientometrics* 101-9; Anthony van Raan (2005), 'Reply to the comments of Liu et al.' 64(1) *Scientometrics* 111-2. For a university-specific critique of the Shanghai Jiao Tong ranking process and criteria see Graduate Students Union, Trinity College Dublin, <http://www.gsu.tcd.ie/node/52> . See also a report by the UK Institute for Public Policy in 2003, *Time to say Goodbye? The Future of School Performance Tables*, described tables that rank schools as "a poisonous thorn" in the side of educational progress and responsible for skewing schools' priorities and damaging students' education. For an analysis by the Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University of the flawed presentation and compilation of league tables of UK universities as 'deeply flawed', see <http://reporter.leeds.ac.uk/485/s7.htm>

³ See eg. Brian Easton's warning against using US University Economics Departments as a benchmark for New Zealand universities: 'Beyond the Utilitarian University', Paper to Forum on the Future of Universities, University of Canterbury, 17 November 1999.

Suggestions that these simplistic ranking measures of ‘international standing’ would ‘emancipate’ us from national qualification frameworks are deeply disturbing. New Zealand qualifications are subject to a quality control process through the Committee on University Academic Programmes and the Academic Audit Unit that is overseen by the universities themselves, something we have fought hard to retain. Threats from future governments to impose the NZQA or other frameworks on the universities must continue to be fought on the basis of principle; they cannot be substituted for by a flawed international ranking exercise.

Of equal concern is the expectation that these rankings would be used to differentiate us from New Zealand’s other universities within our national tertiary education system. Paragraph two refers to moves by governments and ‘stakeholders’ internationally to focus on how tertiary systems can meet national goals and aspirations. We would like to see this plan spell out in concrete terms how the University of Auckland will meet these national goals and aspirations and how our intrinsic responsibilities as a quasi-constitutional public institution will be performed and enhanced over the next seven years.

Given these concerns, we are relieved to see that there is no explicit reference to rankings in the Objectives and that the goal of being ranked in the top 50 of the world’s 7,000 universities is referred to simply as an expectation.

Objectives 1 and 2 are expressed sufficiently broadly to allow for a less actuarial approach. The danger is that they will not be interpreted that way, but rather in light of the preceding commentary.

The exception to these comments is the goal in Objective 2 (already adopted by the University) that no single source country should provide more than 25 percent of the total international student body; while this is desirable, it also appears to be unrealistic.

Research and Creative Work

This section relies on another simplistic, quantitative and dubious measure to assess our research performance. To claim that ‘The PBRF is the only widely accepted measure of university research excellence in New Zealand’ is derisory. The PBRF is emphatically not accepted as such, especially by academic staff to whom it was applied.⁴ Indeed, the debriefing on PBRF sponsored by the Royal Society of New Zealand held at the National Library last year exposed a litany of deficiencies of process and substance, including from key players who were involved in designing and implementing the exercise. These revealed major problems across and within disciplines, unfairness on senior academics involved in management as well as demoralization of new researchers, inappropriate assessment of the performance of individual rather than academic units, and the dangers for the country of the low value placed on research about and for New Zealand. Successive official reports have

⁴ For a comprehensive analysis of the implications of the PBRF for staff see Bruce Curtis and Steve Matthewman, ‘The Managed University: the PBRF, its impacts and staff attitudes’ forthcoming in *NZ Journal of Employment Relations* (2005, volume 30, number 2), currently accessible on <http://saanr.rsnz.org/CurtisMatthewman.pdf>

confirmed this and have forced revisions in the forthcoming partial round that may require further, potentially drastic, changes in the future⁵.

The 2004 PBRF round has had profoundly negative impacts on many staff and spawned a misguided and instrumentalist approach to producing ‘research outputs’. Beginning academics, in particular, struggle to identify research pathways that will satisfy their intellectual curiosity while maximizing their potential ranking on the PBRF. This is especially difficult for Maori staff and those whose research is designed to serve professional, social, cultural and governmental communities within New Zealand.

The uncritical celebration of the competitive model of research is also likely to alienate those staff who believe our research should be driven by the quest to create knowledge that has intrinsic, not simply revenue, value. Under pressure from University and faculty expectations, many researchers in many disciplines, especially in social sciences and humanities, now feel they are required to waste an inordinate amount of time preparing competing applications for the crumbs in the Marsden Fund. While we all appreciate the importance of research income to the University, some sensitivity to these realities is required.

It is therefore profoundly disturbing that Objectives 3, 5 and 6 for research are framed exclusively in terms of PBRF performance, external research income and large scale research institutes. We are also concerned at the implication in Objective 3 that staff might be rewarded individually for their achievement on PBRF, which would contravene the assurances given during the first PBRF round. Surely our Objectives for research should centre on supporting and encouraging young colleagues in the difficult and exhausting task of elevating their research (and teaching) to outstanding levels? Being threatened or bribed into doing so by a Dean or HOD is unlikely to do more than alienate our next generation of young academics. Being supported and encouraged by colleagues, who in turn believe their research is valued for the contribution it makes to the international storehouse of knowledge, will be much more productive.

A further Objective is required that explicitly recognizes the University’s commitment to produce research of value to diverse communities within New Zealand, in accordance with our responsibilities as a public university, and to create an institutional climate that is conducive to academic freedom and the performance of the University’s critic and conscience role. That Objective should also assure staff who engage in quality research of that kind that their contribution is valued as much as research that raises revenue.

⁵ The *Education Guardian* reports that senior academics overseeing the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise in the United Kingdom have urged universities to abandon their obsession with top journals, saying they will treat equally all types of research and journals across all subjects.

Sir John Berringer, who chairs the panel that will assess biological sciences, is reported as saying: “The jolt will come for those [academics] who take the mindless approach – ‘I have so many publications in journals X and Y, therefore I am excellent.’ It is terribly important to break the link that publishing in a journal such as *Nature* is necessarily a measure of excellence.”

Practical difficulties in achieving over-ambitious quantitative targets for research degree completions in Objective 4 were pointed out at Senate. So were the risks of focusing too much on ‘large-scale research institutes of excellence’ where this may erode the research capacities of faculties and the ability to sustain research-informed teaching that involve our best research academics.

An illustration of the bizarre management decisions which can be justified by the use of ill-conceived “objective” research performance schemes is provided by the original proposal by PBRF to use Impact Analysis which is essentially a measure of the significance of an individual’s research by taking into account both the perceived prestige of the journal (*Nature* and some medical journals very high, top journals in most other fields much lower) and the number of citations and the prestige of the journals in which these citations occur. In order to try this Impact Scores were obtained for three Physicists: Albert Einstein, an Auckland Professor of Physics and Stanley Pons who published the entirely erroneous and possibly fraudulent discovery of “Cold Fusion” in *Nature*. The management conclusions that would be drawn from this exercise were that Albert Einstein should be fired (he published in “obscure” German journals!), the Auckland Professor of Physics probably qualified as a research informed teacher and enormous efforts should be made to hire Stanley Pons.

We also note with concern the suggestion in Objective 19, that internal incentives for research activity should reflect the level of indirect funding attracted, risks skewing the research focus of the universities further towards ‘wealth creation’ at the expense of ‘knowledge creation’.

Teaching and Learning

This section of the draft plan is particularly concerning for two reasons – the commitment to further, if minor, growth in student numbers, and the proposed shift in emphasis from undergraduate to postgraduate teaching. The University must consider carefully whether any growth in overall student numbers is warranted, given the rate of increase in numbers over the last decade or more, the emergence of a ‘tail’ of less able students and its effect on grading standards, and, above all, the pressing issue of workload. The most important issue is that of workloads. Adverse shifts in staff-student ratios are not compatible with sustained research excellence, especially where the expectation of the highest quality teaching exists. The Vice Chancellor himself recognized in a recent *NZ Herald* think-piece that underfunded growth has resulted in serious quality concerns. Staff have recognized this to be the case for many years and many now make invidious choices between teaching preparation and research effort. More student growth will exacerbate this problem and the draft strategy needs to reflect this dilemma.

The move to more postgraduate teaching (see also Objective 4) is significant because of its resource implications. Research-based programmes are staff-intensive (particularly when considered in relation to extended compliance requirements) and traditionally have not been given realistic weight in teaching allocation models. Taught postgraduate courses make demands on staff over and above those in undergraduate teaching as, for example, they often involve introductory research experience. The Plan needs to state explicitly how the resources required to

accomplish this shift will be provided. Otherwise, staff will see the Plan as little else than more of the same: increased research outputs, more and better and more demanding teaching, on the same short rations. The idea of greater interaction between senior staff and researchers and students at all levels looks hollow if the teaching resources issue is not addressed head on.

None of us believes that the University's resources should be wasted through inappropriate duplication of programmes or courses. But we are also aware that what appears to outsiders as duplication often reflects divergent technical requirements and conceptual approaches that are necessary for different disciplines. The proposition in Objective 8 that all duplication of programmes and courses will be eliminated raises serious academic questions about who would make such decisions, according to what criteria, and whether this foreshadows a forced restructuring within and between academic units, with associated redundancies.

Also of concern is the absence of any explicit commitment to maintain research-informed teaching (as required by the Education Act definition of the characteristics of a University). Such an assurance would help to stem the perceived erosion of this fundamental requirement through use of contract teachers in summer school and teaching, examination and/or marking of large-scale lecture streams by part-time staff and tutors who are not research active.

We also note that the creation of 'objective' teaching quality measures (Objective 9) is at least as challenging as a genuine quality assessment of research and potentially subject to successful gaming. This problem is widely recognized internationally.

Community Engagement

Few would argue with the general thrust of this section and related Objectives, as far as it goes. However, this section begs a number of critical questions.

First and foremost, where in this Plan and its Objectives is the explicit and detailed response of the University to its Treaty of Waitangi obligations? As the document stands, these responsibilities appear to be equivalent to any number of other community relationships. We suggest that this is simply unacceptable and requires significant amendment of the Plan, based on appropriate consultations.

Despite the fanfare that accompanied the opening of the Fale Pasifika, that dimension of the University, as well as our relations with Pasifika communities in Auckland and in the Pacific Islands, are invisible. Again, we suggest that this is simply unacceptable and requires significant amendment of the Plan, based on appropriate consultations.

Also invisible in any tangible sense are Objectives that reflect the University's public good responsibilities in teaching, research, service and outreach. Actions under Objectives 10,11 and 12 are all exceptionally vague. Nor is there any equivalent commitment to recruitment, employment, appraisal, promotion, reward and retention of staff to service these essential elements of the University's activities.

This is all the more disturbing when the example of 'partnerships' with communities and leadership of national policy debate is again in the area of business and economic

development. There are many more compelling examples of the commitment of staff to our communities ranging across health, public policy, Maori studies, law, music, media and film, education, architecture and much more. The implicit devaluing of these disciplines throughout the document is most evident in this section, and does nothing to encourage a sense of ownership, commitment and inspiration for those who dedicate their academic lives to these activities and communities.

We should be far clearer about our commitment to community involvement at local, regional and national levels, and rename this section ‘National Responsibilities and Community Engagement’. There is much that happens on an ad-hoc, often successful basis. But there is no systematic approach to promoting such initiatives and to celebrating those outcomes and the people responsible. Specific Objectives should include a commitment to match the expertise of the University with community interests and requests.

Equally, the University often fails to engage in ways that are understood and appreciated by the community. The aspirations laid out in Objective 10 in particular require a mechanism that is open and able to respond to all elements of the community, not simply those with privileged access.

A further omission is the matter of collaboration with other tertiary institutions, especially but not only universities, both regionally and nationally. Often, community engagement is best met on the basis of collaborative initiatives across institutions. The University’s institutional approach to such collaborations is often at best lukewarm, which reflects the damaging impact of a competitive view of institutional relationships on the taxpayers and communities we are funded to serve.

Excellent people

We suspect that many staff, when they read the Strategic Plan, are likely to take great offense at this section. The second paragraph of the commentary, aside from the first sentence, is patronizing and implicitly threatening. It shows no understanding of the realities experienced by staff who are already excellent, who carry workloads that far exceed what should reasonably be required of them and who suffer stress levels that grow commensurately with the University’s ever-expanding demands.

As we noted above, staff *are* the University. Recruitment and retention of high quality staff across all aspects of university activity is vital, as is recognition of current staff performance. We welcome initiatives to remove impediments to participation of high quality students in university programmes. However, the choice of ‘Excellent people’ as the theme for this section clouds the key issues facing the University. Staff and students may well combine as ‘Excellent people’, but the categories are not commensurate. This elision obscures the key issues that need to be addressed, particularly for staff. There should be different Objectives for staff and students, reflecting their different circumstances within the institution.

Objective 13 is baffling in substance and language. Why is it not possible to state baldly that successful recruitment and retaining of staff depends fundamentally on two things: the provision of a remuneration package that is internationally competitive and an environment that in all aspects allows successful career development? These

have been at the heart of the University's growing difficulties in the international and domestic labour markets for many years, and rhetoric about 'the University's leadership role' in this area cuts no ice amongst staff who are starkly aware of international comparisons.

It is equally baffling that issues related to staff recruitment and retention are separated from the culture in which staff are to reach their potential, in Objectives 13 and 15 respectively. As it stands, Objective 15 broadly promotes a view of the staff as an individualized flexible resource, in place to meet the University's operational needs. Training will be promoted that will help staff to meet those needs. Rewards will '(focus) on the value of each staff member to the organization'. Staff will be 'led and coached' by managers within that framework. Putting to one side the asymmetry between this view of staff and that of the prevailing industrial relations legislation, staff will be greatly concerned by this Objective, for it imposes the rationale of a modern commercial enterprise on the University.

There is little, if anything, here about the essential collegiality that marks an academic institution. University staff are a far more complex body than an aggregation of individuals. We have collective identities across disciplines and research and teaching teams, and across departments, faculties and the institution as a whole. We view ourselves as part of an international community of scholars in which we can engage as colleagues, collaborators and peers in collectively and dynamically pushing the boundaries of knowledge. The very success of the University of Auckland depends on staff moving beyond their individual circumstances to work collaboratively within and beyond our University. In this context, the equitable measurement of one person's 'worth' becomes impossible. This has been one of the traditional rationales for the current scale and progression models in New Zealand universities that provide for recognition of individual achievement in ways that are transparent, equitable and relative, and is to be found de facto even in university systems with a rhetorical commitment to individual reward structures (e.g. the US system). This Objective must be substantially reworked to reflect these fundamental principles.

Resourcing and Organizing for Quality

This section starts with a fallacy. The implication is that 65% of University revenues are from sources other than the state. This is nonsense. When state funding over and above tuition subsidies are taken into account, the state contributes between 50 and 60% of university revenues in New Zealand.⁶ This situation is likely to continue as student fee revenues and other earnings are unlikely to grow dramatically. In other words, a sensible approach to revenues is to see New Zealand's universities as primarily dependent on a mix of government funding of various sorts, and student fees. The answer to the underfunding, quite properly noted in the Plan, lies with Government.

⁶ Scott and Scott write that in 2002, 42% of funding came from government tuition grants, 29% from tuition fees (including domestic and international) and 29% from other sources including government research grants (research funding 13.6% in total (suggesting a national figure of at least 56%, a probable significant underestimate)

Regrettably, and perhaps inevitably. Objective 16 offers nothing new. We have become accustomed to strategic plans and their associated budgets that are monitored, measured and suddenly revised. In general, we have come to recognize them to be an unfortunate, but common, feature of a resource-constrained environment. Objective 17 addresses management practices that are consistent with the University's special mission; yet, apart from the third bullet point, it says or implies little about what the university-specific management styles and behaviours might be. In general, the exhortations in the Objective are similar to those found in any commercial organization and say nothing about the unique qualities of the university as an institution.

Nor do they provide any recognition of collegial governance, and the pivotal role of the Senate in providing advice on academic matters to the Council. This right and responsibility of the senior scholars and elected representatives of other staff has been systematically eroded by management, to the detriment of decision making and morale amongst the University community. The staff have understandings and insights that are invaluable to the success of the University as an academic enterprise. We urge the concrete recognition of this contribution, and a commitment to revitalize those governance mechanisms, through the Objectives of the Strategic Plan.

Objective 18 follows in the same vein as Objective 17.

Objective 19 is, presumably, the answer to our resource concerns noted above, including those relating to the shift into postgraduate teaching. Yet there is nothing in this Objective to suggest that there will be new sources of funding or to overcome the existing dependence on government funding – aside from new commercial activities that, by definition, involve risk and whose success or failure, by experience, remain shrouded in commercial confidentiality.

Rather, the argument is to develop a case for the University to be differentially funded (presumably, in comparison to other universities in New Zealand). We are presumably expected to lobby the community to support this outcome. Again, let us put to one side the divergence between this vision for the University and current government policy. In effect, the Plan carries forward the view, expressed elsewhere in different ways, that the University is not a public institution that is part of a government-funded New Zealand university *system*, but is in competition with the other universities in the country as if they were private corporations. Our intention is to compete with them and, if possible, do them down in a bitter struggle for resources. And the implicit expectation is that Government will respond to this strategy.

Our view differs from this markedly. We think that it is much more likely and desirable that the Government will address the (under)funding of universities in a measured way, taking into account national needs, regional aspirations and funding constraints. The present Government has clearly signaled its interest in such a process. We imagine that one outcome might well be differentiation on the basis of disciplinary coverage and funding levels. We also see that it is possible, even probable, that the University of Auckland will be privileged in this process. Surely it makes greater sense to engage in a system-wide, government-led assessment of universities and their contribution, rather than 'go it alone'? There is a *realpolitik* here that is missing from the Plan.

Conclusions

We have made a number of suggestions in the above text about ways that the Plan can be reworked to ensure staff buy-in into the vision for the University. The issue is for us not only about substance, but also about process. We are concerned about a combination of short lead times and the distance between those responsible for honing the Plan and the far wider numbers of staff who will be subject to its implementation. Ownership of the Plan requires staff to have the time to engage effectively with the drafting process and to enjoy adequate mechanisms for engagement. We suggest that thought be given to both these issues.

The general tenor of our comments leads us to suggest that the current draft Strategic Plan should be treated as a stepping stone towards a final document in which staff can have confidence and a sense of ownership. Put another way, we believe that the draft needs considerable reworking in terms of both tone and substance. Commitment to such a reworking will go a long way towards the creation of a strong consensus around the University's future.

Professor Geoff Austin, Physics
Professor John Bishop, Philosophy
Distinguished Professor Brian Boyd, English
Professor John Boys, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Professor Cris Calude, Computer Science
Professor Mark Cannell, Physiology
Professor Ian Carter, Sociology
Professor Wayne Cartwright, International Business
Professor George Clark, Chemistry
Professor Michael Davison, Psychology
Professor Pip Forer, Geography & Environmental Science
Professor David Gauld, Mathematics
Professor John Harvey, Physics
Professor Nigel Haworth, Management and Employment Relations
Professor Tim Hazledine, Economics
Professor John Hunt, Architecture
Professor Rosalind Hursthouse, Philosophy
Professor Jane Kelsey, Law
Professor Heath Lees, Music
Professor Richard Le Heron, Geography & Environmental Science
Professor Michael Neill, English
Professor Raylene Ramsay, European Languages
Professor Elizabeth Rankin, Art History
Professor Cris Shore, Anthropology
Professor Clark Thomborson, Computer Science
Professor Rufus Wells, Biological Sciences
Professor David Williams, Law