



Confirmed outcomes of the Fourth IARU Presidents' Meeting

University of Cambridge

28 - 29 April 2009

Agenda item 2: International Scientific Congress “Climate Change: Global Risks, Challenges and Decisions”

Presidents agreed that the Congress had done much to raise the profile of IARU, with around 80 countries participating.

Cambridge suggested a follow-up article in Science and Nature next year after the 2009 Senior Officer Meeting.

Copenhagen offered to facilitate involvement of students from IARU partners in COP15 in Copenhagen later this year.

2.1 Letter from the Steering Committee

Presidents noted the letter from the Steering Committee. The IARU Chair will refer the letter to the sustainability group and ask the group to consider coordinating a mapping exercise of what each IARU partner is currently doing in the climate change/sustainability area. This information will be then be forwarded to the Steering Committee.

Agenda item 3: Sustainable Campus Initiatives

3.1 IARU Campus Sustainability Project

It was agreed that good work was being done in this area. Presidents accepted the recommendation that central IARU funding should be provided for the annual meetings of sustainability officers (for the next three years).

3.2 Sustainability Fellowships Program

The success of the program was noted.

Agenda item 4: IARU Global Summer Program 2009 and beyond

The Presidents agreed the GSP, in only its second year, has proven successful. The total applications were over 700. All partners are participating (both offering at least one course and sending students).

It was agreed the Senior Officer Meeting should set directions but the GSP working group should draft a statement about the value of the IARU GSP ‘brand’ which each partner, in turn, can use separately to garner financial support.

NUS suggested the group explore developing networks between students outside GSP session times. NUS highlighted their use of the online platform “Second Life” in their Asia Now! program, as one way for students to build networks with each other, both prior to and after the course.

Agenda item 5: Industrial Innovation (and the Role of the Modern Research University) workshop outcomes.

Workshop participants said the workshop had been extremely valuable, reporting that it was very helpful to see the range of models in use at different universities and especially to have corporate representatives involved in the discussion. The workshop identified next steps, which included the development of: key themes, an IARU interest group and a ‘Good practice’ guide. These actions were endorsed by Presidents. Presidents discussed whether IARU universities should agree to a set of principles to be followed in engaging with companies, given their size and skill advantage (e.g., in terms of legal support) and to avoid them playing one institution off against the other. The group decided against this, noting that universities need to be able to experiment and have the flexibility to develop innovative relationships appropriate to their situation.

Professor Mike Gregory (Cambridge) was asked to table these outcomes for the Senior Officer Meeting, build the interest group and start work immediately on the set of ‘standard’ models of industry collaborations and compile case studies of successful industry partnerships.

Agenda item 6: Education in a research – intensive university: How can we enhance our students’ learning? Workshop outcomes

Those who attended found the workshop useful. The Presidents did not support the specific workshop recommendations and thought that the agenda was far too broad. Indeed, this highlighted the need for a clearer definition of outputs when funding such a meeting.

The Presidents recommended that:

- 1) A network be developed involving Pro Vice Chancellors (Education) or equivalent Senior University Officer with an education profile to discuss a broad range of common issues
- 2) That the value of research-led teaching be explored more narrowly in the context of the GSP by the GSP Working Committee group
- 3) That the new proposal from NUS regarding “The Transforming Power of Global Education” (agenda 9.5) incorporate any relevant work/experience into their proposed agenda/discussions.

Agenda item 7: General discussions of other IARU projects

Progress in the projects listed was noted.

In reference to 7.4.2 IARU Career Development Professionals Network: Global Students, Global Careers: the Presidents asked that the network bring a proposal for a pilot on reciprocal access to careers services involving two or more IARU universities to the senior officers meeting. The careers guide proposal is in principle a good one and is an opportunity for the network to start real work together. The decision to fund the guide will be deferred to the senior officers meeting, and is contingent on the reciprocal access proposal.

Today and Cambridge requested the Women and Men in a Globalising University project be kept on the IARU agenda. It was agreed the project should continue but with a focus on benchmarking, not research. Cambridge will consider how to reinvigorate the project.

Agenda item 8: Future directions for IARU

Dr Heather Bell agreed to re-work her document to reflect the Wednesday morning discussions (attached as an appendix to the outcomes).

Agenda item 9: New initiatives

9.1 Research collaboration seed fund

It was noted in discussions that some universities already have a fund to facilitate their researchers' participation in projects with IARU partners. Some institutions (ANU, Copenhagen; \$500,000 each) have specific budgets to support IARU collaboration of all kinds. Other institutions that do not (Yale, Cambridge, ETH) appreciated the intent of enabling academics, particularly those early in their careers, to work with colleagues internationally, but would not earmark funds specifically for IARU projects and activities.

There was discussion about why just these ten institutions and not others? NUS was cautiously supportive of the seed fund proposal as they have grants for this type of activity and could direct staff. For ANU, there is value in knowing whether other institutions support any given project; Copenhagen did not think the bureaucracy was worth it.

The group agreed it was for those interested in the idea to pursue with like-minded IARU partners.

9.2 Internship program pilot

NUS and Oxford are piloting a summer internship program. Both universities will share their experience (regarding visas, insurance, timing, applications, quality of students) with other partners who may wish to participate in 2010. It was noted this is an employment initiative and therefore course credit is not an issue.

9.3 Proposal for a workshop on Open Access Publishing

A one and a half day workshop will be held 21 and 22 January 2010. Participants should include university presses. Partners have been invited to provide ETH with the names of contacts/experts in this area.

9.4 Proposal for a workshop on academic entrepreneurship and spin-off incubation

Presidents agreed that it was an area of interest. NUS was asked to submit a more detailed proposal for formal approval.”

9.5 Proposal for a workshop on “The Transforming Power of Global Education” (2011)

In-principle support was provided. This topic was viewed as a potentially useful positioning tool.

The meeting agreed that the workshop should take place in 2010 instead of 2011.

This group was asked by Presidents to incorporate any relevant work already undertaken in the Education in a research-intensive university project.

9.6 Improving Administrative Services

Mr Indi Seehra, Head of HR at Cambridge reported on work they are undertaking to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the university’s administrative services. Partners were asked if they are engaged in similar work. NUS advised they have been working on this for the past four years. Oxford is looking at this area. The U.S. universities advise they are no further along than the rest of us, and are looking at a number of areas. Cambridge will keep the group updated on their progress, and contact NUS directly to see what they can learn. This may lead to a proposal for a workshop in the future; for now, it would be premature.

Agenda item 10: Business Matters

10.1 Finances

Funding was agreed to for the following:

- Sustainable Campus Officers - up to USD15 000 for annual meeting costs.
- Global Summer Program - up to USD 10 000 for annual meeting costs
- Industrial Innovation (and the Role of the Modern Research University)- up to USD 15 000 (case would need to be made to go beyond \$15,000) for further proposal development
- Open-Access Publishing - up to USD 15 000 for January 2010 workshop
- The Transforming Power of Global Education” up to USD 15 000 for 2010 workshop

The Secretariat will circulate an updated financial statement to the Senior Officers by end of May.

10.2 IARU Chair 2009 - 2011

The Presidents unanimously endorsed President Tan to take over as Chair of IARU at the end of the meeting. President Tan warmly thanked Professor Chubb for his commitment to IARU and acknowledged his many achievements.

10.3 2010 Presidents' meeting

The Presidents meeting will be held 15-16 April 2010 in Beijing.

10.4 2011 Presidents' meeting location

The University of Copenhagen nominated to host the 2011 Presidents' meeting.

Confirmed 2009 meeting dates

The GSP Working Committee meeting will be held 14-15 September in Oxford

The Senior Officer meeting will be held 22 – 23 October in Oxford.

IARU Memorandum of Understanding

The changes to the MOU (since the last Presidents' meeting) were endorsed by Presidents. It was agreed the MOU is a statement of principles and not intended to be legally binding.

It was further agreed that if/when the occasion arose for a new MOU to be drafted, wording along the following lines would be included: "This Memorandum of Understanding is a statement of principles and does not constitute, nor is it intended to be, a legally binding contract between the IARU institutions".

Appendix: Future directions for IARU: an activity classification

Prepared by Dr Heather Bell, Director of International Strategy, University of Oxford

The IARU alliance is now several years old. We all know a lot more about the different ways that we can work together, and about what makes for successful collaboration. At both the senior officers' meeting and the presidents' meeting, we thought it made sense to reflect on IARU's achievements to date, and on the future directions we might wish to pursue.

We have not emerged from these discussions with any definitive new direction. We have, however, emphasised the importance of:

- Constantly asking what value IARU brings to a discussion
- Focus, and following through on existing activities
- Tangible outputs
- Remaining flexible and open to ongoing experimentation.

As we think about managing our portfolio of activities, we thought it would be helpful as a first step to structure the different types of activities we have underway. Future proposals should specify which category they think they belong to, which will in turn influence the scale of the effort, the budget we allocate, and the output we expect.

I. Major research projects

For example:

- Ageing, longevity, and health
- Global security
- Sustainable cities

IARU's funding support for these projects is now winding down. It is not our current intention to provide further seed funding for such projects. We are delighted that some of the collaborations are now self-sustaining.

II. Student (and staff) learning and development

For example:

- Global Summer Programme
- Bilateral student exchanges
- Summer internships
- Reciprocal careers service access
- Staff exchange

These are programmes aimed at enhancing the international experiences and learning of our students (and to a much lesser extent, our administrative staff).

III. Institutional joint working

1) Networks

For example:

- Career development professionals
- Presidents
- Senior officers
- PVC/VP Education

These are specific groups of officers who meet to get to know one another, discuss a wide range of topics, share best practice, and identify possible areas on which they can work together. These would typically not be narrowly thematically-driven, in contrast to the institutional projects below. Where IARU funds the meeting/workshop, a written summary should be produced. IARU presidents may wish to direct a network to address a particular issue (e.g., reciprocal access arrangements at Careers Services for Career development professionals).

2) Articulation of principles

For example:

- Academic freedom
- Value of research-led teaching.

These are topics of importance to each research-intensive university, particularly in justifying our existence (and cost) to government. It may be valuable for the IARU presidents to commission the writing of a joint position on issues that are central to our identity as research-intensive institutions, where the backing of the alliance would be powerful in our discussion with our domestic stakeholders. A minority view proposed that such principles address political issues. We envisage these as short pieces of work: a 2-5 page paper that could be drafted by the IARU secretariat or a nominated IARU institution, and then discussed during a conference call. A small sum (\$3,000) could be paid to the institution doing the drafting. If a larger scale effort is envisaged – involving people meeting – then we are looking at an institutional project.

3) Institutional projects

For example:

- Women and men in global universities
- Industrial innovation

These projects enable comparison of benchmark data and our respective approaches to these issues at our different universities. To start such projects, IARU typically funds day-long workshops that convene

representatives of IARU universities and other relevant stakeholders (e.g., corporate sponsors in the case of industrial innovation). Success so far has depended on picking a topic of joint interest, assembling the right people, and ensuring sharp focus: these do not need to become major research academic research projects. IARU Presidents may in future wish to commission work on a particular topic (e.g., assessment of internationalisation strategies). It is important to be clear on the outputs IARU seeks from the project, from a network of interested people to a report comparing institutional benchmark data. At a minimum, any meeting should assemble and circulate all presentations, case studies, and summary of the discussion. We should consider the possibility that funding beyond meetings may be required to produce the outputs we seek on some topics.

4) Grand challenges

For example:

- Sustainability

These are large undertakings that tackle a grand challenge for universities and for humanity. They should be topics where universities are taking action and where IARU institutions are attempting to lead. So far we have only taken on one grand challenge: sustainability. As a grand challenge, it encompasses a number of the different activities above: an institutional project on sustainable campuses; a network of sustainability officers; and a student summer fellowship programme. We would expect our portfolio of activity to include a very small number of grand challenges that are well-executed.

5) Major events

For example:

- International Scientific Congress on Climate Change.

We have held only one of these events so far, and it related directly to our grand challenge. It is unclear if this should always be the case. This is the most outward-looking of our activities. We propose that every 2-3 years, IARU contributes a small amount of money, its brand, and the energies of its people to a major event. This event should address an important topic for humanity, where IARU universities are doing important research, and which would attract considerable media interest. (Perhaps energy production should be next.).

We should recognise that there may be movement between different categories. A network may decide to articulate a set of principles, which then becomes an institutional project that is so compelling that it flowers into a grand challenge, involving students and academic research.