

**College Leadership Advisory Committee Meeting, 10.00am -11.30am, 21 November 2025, LWCM 1.03  
Minutes**

**Attending:** Michael Gilding; (chair); Christopher Kee; Gerry Redmond; Hossein Esmaeili; Ian Goodwin-Smith; Jacqueline Rosa; Jessica Genauer; Jonathan Pheasant; Katherine McLachlan; Madhan Balasubramanian; Mark Hopps; Melissa de Vel-Palumbo; Naser Pourazad; Neville Crossman (via Teams); Philipp Dautel; Rodrigo Praino; Samantha Kontra; Vipul Pare; Vivienne Brand (via Teams); Yealynn Ji; Melinda Pike

**Apologies:** Angie Shafei; Julie Strunk; Kelly Walewicz; Pam Zorn; Phil Palmer; Stacey Henderson; Tania Leiman

Agenda items	Notes	Action items
1. Welcome/ Apologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgement of country</li> <li>Apologies noted</li> <li>New members and persons attending were welcomed: Jonathan Pheasant, Yealynn Ji, Stacey Henderson, Naser Pourazad</li> </ul>	
2. Minutes	<p><i>Document: Minutes CLAC 22 August 2025</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes were approved</li> </ul>	
3. Vice-President & Executive Dean report	<p>The VP&amp;ED reported regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicators of growth momentum continuing into 2026, with total first preferences already exceeding those for whole of last cycle</li> <li>Restructure matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merger with Creative and Performing Arts, Media &amp; Communications, Geography</li> <li>Recent attendance at presentation night at CDW and screenings and performances</li> <li>Getting to know strengths, problems, synergies, with a view to developing ambitions</li> <li>Confident that all have potential to grow</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In response to questions it was observed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership structure was still in development, and was an opportunity to review what was optimal</li> <li>Consistency of leadership roles across the College was the goal; to date reviewing structures across both colleges there had been no implications for change from the current BGL structure</li> <li>Active consideration was being given to optimal sub-structures within the new College in discussion with the disciplines and the VC, with the view that the College acted as a holding entity for a number of clearly identified sub-entities, acting as brands externally</li> <li>A new organising principle for research leadership would be needed in the new college; noting that need, not symmetry across disciplines, should be the guiding principle</li> <li>Combined degrees gave a good indication of closest cross-disciplinary synergy; natural synergies were better than forced ones</li> <li>Synergy existed around research method and theoretical frameworks, and how teaching was organised</li> <li>Mutual engagement was beneficial; lack caused opportunities to be missed</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites of belonging could be multiple, some functional, some administrative, and were not mutually exclusive</li> <li>• Physical co-location would be of great benefit; no plans to move staff as yet, but wholesale change could provide an opportunity to optimise</li> <li>• Building names were becoming increasingly out-of-date; Name change would affect system room names and consequently timetabling</li> <li>• Consideration was already being given to management of an increased HDR load; there would be a large cohort of Social Sciences HDRs in the new college</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Dean (Research) report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Research Institute</li> </ul>	<p>The Dean (Research) briefed regarding current and future status of research performance and infrastructure, highlighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coalescing around core areas of research strength and concentration had worked well and staff were doing good work; the College was on track to achieve 125% of an ambitious research income target, one key success metric</li> <li>• Moving forward, building teams to address societal issues would drive concentration and fulfil the University's impact mission; not putting quality second, but thinking of research in a teams science way</li> <li>• The University's four areas of focus, namely Health &amp; Wellbeing, Sustainability, Society and Culture and Defence &amp; Productivity; areas less important than the drive to work in areas of strength</li> <li>• Wicked Problems report supported/enabled research focus and set a direction to move from what we are good at, to what we are good for</li> <li>• Implications for the research structure going forward included DVCR preference for the establishment of a whole College Institute, with some associated funding</li> <li>• A graphic depicting areas of overlap in current areas of strength which might be the nucleus of the Institute, some of which were Centres, some clusters/communities, noting that HASS areas of strength had not yet been incorporated into the diagram</li> <li>• Existing Centres and research clusters would retain their presence within the overarching Institute, and present externally under their own names</li> <li>• Academic Senate had approved the governance model for Transdisciplinary Hubs to be established, under the DVCR portfolio, in addition to Centres and Institutes</li> </ul> <p>In discussion it was observed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Institute Director would be the Dean (Research); centrally funded largely Business Development role a possibility, unconfirmed</li> <li>• Not all research must conform, but University themes were likely to guide strategic funding; University themes were broad and encompassed majority if not all current BGL research</li> <li>• FFF would be governed as a Transdisciplinary Hub, but staff would continue to be administratively located in home College; salary funding might have multiple sources</li> <li>• Staff would be aggregated differently in Research and Teaching, which might provide challenges for research teaching nexus</li> <li>• Further consideration about involvement of Teaching Specialists in the proposed Institute was warranted; noting some would seek involvement due to nature of their interests</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional bureaucracy was to be avoided</li> </ul>	
5. Dean (P&R) report	The Dean (People & Resources) had no matters to report.	
6. Jonathan Pheasant (Vice-President (Corporate Services))	<p>The Vice-President (Corporate Services) was welcomed to the College. He briefed regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• His background and experience, and observation that Flinders was in a positive growth position relative to the sector</li> <li>• His focus on ensuring that the Corporate Services portfolio had a service model underpinning teaching and research activity, as well as new opportunities; his experience working at College level providing insight into those needs</li> <li>• In response to a question he advised that Building naming was not trivial, but symbolic, and could define the way we think about ourselves; we need to maintain older infrastructure as well as invest in new buildings</li> </ul>	
7. Committee reports for noting	<p>The Committee noted that it had received the following minutes:</p> <p>College Education Committee Minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feb 2025</li> <li>○ Mar 2025</li> <li>○ Apr 2025</li> <li>○ May 2025</li> <li>○ Jun 2025</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Research Committee Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mar 2025</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Next meeting:** The next meeting will be in 2026 at a date to be advised.

MP:MG – 25 November 2025