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Dear Professor Howard Morphy and Committee,

After my consideration of the RSHA proposed restructure document and the lack of information presented to us at the 2 meetings, which I attended last week about this proposed merger, I attach my submission opposing the merger of Art History in SC1 with the School of Art at the ANU, as requested by the due date of 2 August 2013.

With best wishes,

Andrew Montana
Submission- in response to the proposal document Change Management Proposal: RSHA Restructure (22 July 2013) – Andrew Montana

‘Every image of the past that is not recognised by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably’, Walter Benjamin, Thesis on the Philosophy of History, 1940.

Thank you for the invitation to make a submission regarding the proposed merger of the Humanities Discipline with the School of Art. This forms a part of the proposed disestablishment of the current School of Cultural Inquiry (SCI) at the Australian National University and the establishment of a new School of Languages. I draw your attention to the fact that the proposal document Change Management Proposal: RSHA Restructure dated 22 July 2013 does not mention Art History and Curatorship. Moreover, current directorship bathos in this restructure documents fails to address the Working Party reviews and the learned convictions of staff and students in SCI. The restructure document is disingenuous.

My submission in response to the Change Management Proposal RSHA Document confirms that the views of Art History and Curatorship staff is in league with the staff of our other disciplines in the SCI.

It confirms that the teaching and research staff and the students of Art History and Art History and Curatorship oppose the proposed merger with the School of Art and will join our Humanities cognate areas in the current SCI with the newly established School of Languages.

Why? The document has no budget proposal plan; no mention of the impact the proposed changes will have on students who undertake quality degrees, in fact no pedagogical or culturally directed basis.

Unfortunately, the recent report on the new pathways to the world of art at the School of Art at the ANU in the Canberra Times (July 25, 2013 ) may be interpreted as promoting the appropriation of contemporary indigenous art practice and ignoring changes in indigenous arts practice and non indigenous art practice across the centuries, because these practitioners are dead and their art making is not visible but related to ‘history’. This report is out for the world to see, and Professor Sasha Grishin’s irrefutable response published in the Canberra Times (July 31, 2013) concerning the proposed merger of Art History and Curatorship with the School of Art is also out for the world.

- The Art History and Art History and Curatorship disciplines play a leading and vital role in the learning and development of the many Humanities oriented ANU undergraduate students, and the large number of postgraduate art history students taking Masters and PhD degrees.
- The discipline is a Humanities pillar of inspiration, encouragement, expertise, research publication records and pedagogy. This proposed merger with the Art School is opposed by students who are astonished, disoriented and disgusted by the potential sacrifice of their monies, ambitions, and career opportunities in the arts and the humanities, and the disrespect for the expertise and value of their teaching and research academic staff in the current SCI.
- It is proposed that Art History and Curatorship remain with the other Humanities disciplines teaching and researching in the current SCI and it forms an integral part of the proposed new School of Languages

Why study Art History and Art History and Curatorship as a part of an integrated Humanities School at the ANU?

This practise develops the skills to undertake primary and secondary research, write coherent and well argued essays and papers, which are fully documented and sourced. Students gain knowledge in research, acquire confidence to speak to peers and in public about art history, and learn that the study and interpretation of art history brings together analytic skills in penetrating cultures, societies and periods. This enables a student to make lateral connections, think independently, and to develop a specialist language that transmits and communicates information, creative ideas and aesthetic philosophies in writing and in presentations.
The study of art history illuminates subtleties, respects traditions and challenges orthodoxies. In turn it gives back an enormous amount of knowledge about changing cultural, political and aesthetic social processes that contribute to the empowerment and pleasure of communities and audiences.

The quality of academic, scholarly education is severely compromised for present and future students by a merger with the School of Art. Further, the vocational possibilities in the wider world of gallery and art museum work in arts education, arts administration, public programs, arts philanthropy, curatorship, research and writing is compromised. A basic job in these sectors requires a degree in Art History and/or Art History and Curatorship and advertisements do not advertise that a degree in studio practice is required. Some artists and former students of studio practice return to the ANU to gain a degree and postgraduate degree in Art History and Curatorship, with a view to a career change.

**Personnel employed in the arts sector have studied Art History, and Art History and Curatorship at the ANU:**

Throughout Australia, many former ANU Art History and Curatorship and Art History students work as curators, researchers, writers, educators, directors and philanthropic developers in our art galleries, art museums and universities:

The following persons represent a small section of the Art History and Curatorship alumni and current student body of Art History and Curatorship. There are many other graduates of this program who contribute to local, national and international communities and are in professional contact with Professor Sasha Grishin, Dr Charlotte Galloway and me:

Carol Cains, Curator, Asian Art, National Gallery of Victoria

Dr Michael Brand, Director, Art Gallery of New South Wales.

Lucie Folan, Curator, Asian Art, National Gallery of Australia

Lucina Ward, Curator, International Painting and Sculpture, National Gallery of Australia

Dr Christopher Chapman, Senior Curator National Portrait Gallery

Dr Jane Kinsman, Senior Curator, International Prints and Drawings, National Gallery of Australia

Laura Webster, Art curator, Australian War Memorial

Harriet Elvin, CEO, ACT Cultural Facilities Corporation.

Ben Divall, freelance Art curator, Edinburgh

Jane Cush, Director, Goulburn Regional Gallery

Melanie Eastburn, Curator, Asian Art, National Gallery of Australia

Bree Richards, Curator, Australian Art, Queensland Art Gallery

Dr Ann Sanders, Research and Exhibitions development, National Portrait Gallery

Dr Deborah van der Plat, Academic and freelance curator, University of Queensland

Associate Professor Peter McNeil, Academic, University of Technology, Sydney, University of Sweden.

Gwen Horsfeld, Visitor and Learning Services, National Gallery of Australia

Thomas Middlemost, Curator, Wagga Wagga Art Gallery
What does a typical job advertisement for a competitive position in the art museum sector outline as the key criteria and what is the expected qualification for an assistant curatorial position?

Responsibilities:

Under general direction and professional supervision participate in the control, maintenance and care of the art collection, including:

Prepare recommendations related to acquisitions;

Undertake accessioning and cataloguing of works of art;

Arrange for movement of works of art through the collection management system and upgrade data and arrange for conservation of items;

Ensure all relevant documentation is entered in collection management system;

Respond to copyright issues in relation to the art collection;

Perform project, publication and research assignments.

Contribute to the development and implementation of related policies, strategies, systems and standards.
Manual handling and movement of a wide range of objects including but not limited to works on paper, framed works of art and items from the collection.

Liaise with researchers, dealers, museums, institutions and organisations and respond to public enquiries related to the art collection and provide advice on its historical and cultural significance.

Contribute to the activities of the section including taking responsibility for project and administrative tasks.

**A Tertiary qualification in the field of Art History or Art History and Curatorship is required for the assistant curatorial position.**

Clearly, the above position requires an art historian, a thinker, writer, researcher, organiser, documenter and communicator, with the important public interface role of advisor on the collection’s historical and cultural significance.

Why? Intellectual flexibility is acquired through studying a breadth of historical periods and cultures in Art History, whether these engage with traditional, modern or contemporary Western, Asian or Australian indigenous arts. An Art History student does not seek to be an imitator or forger of art techniques but to situate art and artists in the wider political, social, intellectual and aesthetic context.

**Staff in Art History and Curatorship in the SCI at the Australian National University**

The Art History and Curatorship lectures and researchers in the SCI are PhD qualified in their discipline. A small staff, each member is well published both in Australia and internationally. Professor Sasha Grishin is an Order of Australia and is the Sir William Dobell Professor of Australian Art, and is releasing a major publication on the history of Australian art and developing an exhibition and catalogue for the National Library of Australia and the State Library of Victoria Galleries. I am is publishing a major art book at the end of this year and was the recipient of prestigious grants from the arts philanthropic foundations. Dr Charlotte Galloway serves as a trustee on an international heritage advisory board, is an Asian arts specialist and is an expert witness in courts of law on Asian art. Each teaching and research Art History and Curatorship staff member clearly strives to uphold and extend the reputation of this Humanities discipline., as sworn by our submissions.

**The Art History and Curatorship Student body.**

Apart from the large number of undergraduate Art History and Curatorship students, there are over 20 PhD students enrolled currently in Art History, and a large number of Masters students. None of them is a practicing artist, as the Art School at the ANU caters for artists’ objectives, through studio practice, a practice orientated short Honours thesis, a practice reflective postgraduate thesis and ultimately exhibition exposure, through the School of Art Gallery and often at Canberra Contemporary Art Space.

Art History engages with scholarly documentation from across many centuries to the present day, and engages with historic and contemporary artworks and archival documents interpretatively; it is evaluative and engages with material hermeneutically. It is a philosophic and aesthetic enquiry that engages with, and seeks to uncover the material conditions of life, both historic and contemporary, This knowledge base is looked for by employers- through the degree or the post-graduate degree in Art History and/or Art History and Curatorship.

Art History continues to attract students outside of CASS into its student body. These students with strong literacy levels come from the disciplines of Law, the School of Art, Commerce, and International Relations. The Art History and Curatorship program attracts international students from China, Japan, Singapore, Italy, the US, France and Eastern Europe. At the graduate level, our students work on course work and programs in conjunction with the other Humanities disciplines in the SCI.

**Where to from here?** In line with my other teaching and research colleagues in the SCI, my submission opposes the merger of Art History and Curatorship with the School of Art. As a highly ranked Humanities discipline, devoted to the progress and development of students, and the advancement of knowledge through
its staff and graduates to the world, Art History and Curatorship must remain with the SCI intellectual
disciplinary cognates, and both schools merge in their entirety with the newly established School of
Languages. Compelling objectives of this merger with the School of Languages are: advanced pedagogy,
the synergies of the integrated Humanities, the national and international cultural, economic and
humanitarian benefits, and the economic infrastructural merits, and not least this University’s management
reputation.

This is the broader vision for our Humanities students at the ANU, endorsed by my colleagues across the
SCI.

Andrew Montana (Dr), Art History & Curatorship, School of Cultural Inquiry, Australian National
University. July, 2013
ART HISTORY/ART THEORY PROPOSED MERGER

Helen Ennis’ submission to the Working Party examines possibilities for collaboration and cooperation between Art Theory and Art History in terms of our graduate and research programs. This submission will focus on the possibilities for collaboration within our undergraduate programs.

Role of art theory in the undergraduate program at SOA

The Art Theory program is integral to the three degrees offered at the School of Art. We play a vital role in training our students in the study of the visual arts, preparing them for careers in the arts sector, either as artists, as museum professionals (including as curators and conservators), as arts bureaucrats, as writers, and sometimes in several of these career streams at once.

Art history is central to our undergraduate teaching: Our first year program provides a thorough grounding in the history of art from the late C18 to the present, for example. Later year courses include subjects as diverse as design history, Australian modernism, Asian modernism, the Renaissance canon, indigenous visual culture, and contemporary art in Australia and in Asia. However, we consider a broad interdisciplinary approach to our program essential in order to provide a foundation for rigorous practice-led research. Examples of courses that grow out of this approach include courses on theories of the image and theories of the object, as well as cross-disciplinary courses on memory, on self representation and identity and on art and the city.

Productive affinities between the two areas already exist

Whilst it is true that Art History and Art Theory deal with different constituencies, there are productive affinities between our two student cohorts. This has already been demonstrated by the ways in which the two areas have begun to cooperate through guest lecturing in each other’s courses, through the co-listing of each other’s courses in major and minor streams, and through the development of the new Asian Art History Minor.

The new degree structure has already opened up opportunities for students in Art History and the School of Art to take each other’s courses. This year several students enrolled in BAs (including some from Art History) have enrolled in our Visual Arts Practice Major/Minor, for example, and a number of Art History students have enrolled in Art Theory subjects. Some of our students have also taken advantage of the new structure to enrol in subjects offered by Art History: indeed, one changed her program to allow her to take a double major in art theory and art history.

The combined degree has also provided a useful example of the ways in which art history, theory and art practice can have a productive dialogue. A number of students enrolled in the BA/BVA have taken art history as a
major, including two students finishing their studies in Printmedia and Drawing this year who have done exceptionally well.

A merger between Art History and Art Theory would take advantage of these affinities, and enable us to build further collaborations between the two areas in a more structured and coherent way.

**Potential for extending existing collaborations and new initiatives within undergraduate programs**

1. A shared first year program.

In fact some work has been done on this already. A series of unofficial meetings took place in 2011 between members of the art theory and art history staff to look at the possibility of developing a shared first year program. It was established that although our programs had some differences, there was enough affinity between the two courses to consider developing a shared program. The concept involved teaching a shared stream in the morning from the National Gallery of Australia, building on the Gallery’s strong holdings of modernism and contemporary art, and separate streams in the afternoon. This would allow Art History to cover a greater historical range and Art Theory to focus on the specific needs of the School of Art cohort. Tutorials for both cohorts would be run separately.

2. Development of new Major and Minor streams.

Building on the concept of the new Asian Art History Minor, there would be the possibility to develop new major and minor streams based on existing courses in the program and the research expertise of the staff of the two departments. Some examples might include:

- Histories and Theories of Craft and Design. This would be relevant not only to the large cohort of students in craft/design based workshops at the SOA, but would expand the opportunity to study a rather neglected area within academia and provide a useful adjunct to the training of curators interested in this area.

- Histories and Theories of the Image. This could draw on the expertise of the staff of the two departments in the history of photography and of printmaking as well as drawing on already existing courses on theories of the image.

3. Opening up the School of Art’s Professional Practices Program.

Professional Practices is a thriving program, which, amongst other things, focuses in detail on practical relationships between the artist and the museum. The course could provide a valuable adjunct to Art History’s Curatorship Theory and Practice course. Bringing trainee artists and curators together would be constructive for both cohorts, and could also provide the opportunity for innovative and productive projects and assignment outcomes.
Professional Practices Advanced is an internship program that locates students in small arts organisations in Canberra. More recently, the program has expanded to include residencies for students in high schools. This year the program placed 25 students in a variety of organisations and schools. A merger between the two departments would offer us the opportunity to rationalise and streamline our internship programs whilst increasing the opportunities for students from both SOA and Art History and Curatorship.

4. Development/sharing of research methodologies courses at both an undergraduate and graduate level.

**Co-location**

In order to forge new and strong collegial relationships between Art History and Art Theory and to provide the greatest benefit to students, the School of Art and the wider University, it seems essential for the two areas to co-locate within the School of Art.

**Respecting the value of both areas**

We envisage that under the merger, all efforts would be made to recognise the differing needs of the student cohorts of the two areas, and, where necessary, to preserve the integrity of the programs offered by the two departments. At the same time, the integration of staff from both areas would enable us to benefit from each other’s expertise and to rationalise our programs in ways that would be beneficial to both.

**Anne Brennan**  
**Head, Art Theory Workshop and Undergraduate Convenor**  
**School of Art**
Dear Rosemary,

I am writing to express my strong support to the proposed amalgamation of Art History and Art Theory into a single program. I believe there are substantial academic gains to be had from this amalgamation, as all members of both units will benefit from synergies in teaching and research. We will be able to capitalise on the already known strengths of both units, including possibilities for streamlining and co-teaching a number of courses. I think that this outcome will be to everyone’s benefit.

Further, I think it is both logical and important that the unit Art History and Theory, should be located within the School of Art. I have always found, as a student and as a teacher, that good art historical practice is informed by what artists do in their studios, and vice-versa, that good studio practice needs an alliance with art history.

I would be happy to provide any further information as requested by the Working Party.

Sincerely,
Chaitanya

Dr Chaitanya Sambrani
Senior Lecturer, Art Theory
ANU School of Art
Research School of Humanities and the Arts
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200 Australia

T: +61 2 6125 8402
M: + 61 421660844
Submission - RSHA Change Management Proposal:

It is very difficult to write a submission in response to a change management proposal when the proposal is in opposition to outcomes suggested by the Working Party reports on the restructure completed in Dec 2012-Jan 2013, has been argued against by the SCI, and is opposed by myself and my colleagues in Art History. As such, my submission returns at first to the fundamental premise of separating Art History and Curatorial Studies staff from its current academic cohort.

The restructuring process, from the initial tabling of the proposal through to the supposed consultation, has been a process without merit and reflects poorly on its instigator, who appears disinterested in accuracy or meaningful discussion. It is clear that there is intent on achieving an outcome, the motivation for which the proposer has been spectacularly unable to communicate.

I am cognisant of the submissions presented by my colleagues Professor Sasha Grishin and Dr Andrew Montana. We are all agreed in our fervent opposition of relocating the discipline of Art History and its companion program of Curatorial Studies to the School of Art. Any suggestions to the contrary would be completely inaccurate and a fabrication. Throughout the entire process there has been no interest shown by proposer in discussing the disciplinary rationale that drives our rejection of the proposal. The report of the relevant Working Party, finalised in January 2013, notes there was no common ground to be had between the two entities of the School of Art (SOA) and Art History. This has been ignored in all subsequent documentation and meetings. Should the proposal be implemented, Art History staff members are the only constituents in the SCI who would be required to accept a major disruption to their current work practices. Such a lack of interest in our concerns can only be interpreted as a disregard for our professional knowledge and experience, and the integrity of our discipline.

Concerns of Art History staff have been manipulated and minimised to suggest our main interest is in maintaining visibility if transferred to the SOA. While that is an issue, it is by far an inconsequential one when considering our core objection which relates to our disciplinary framework. Art History is a Humanities enterprise, and we are intellectually aligned with our fellow Humanities disciplines – at ANU this includes English, Classics, History (Western/Asian), Philosophy, Languages, among others. Our engagement with our colleagues within the School of Cultural Inquiry (SCI) is very positive, and intellectually complementary. We share similar methodological approaches to our teaching and research, evidenced clearly through our graduate cohorts who share the requisite PhD coursework. Our undergraduate students are almost exclusively Bachelor of Arts students, who are also studying within the current SCI, and undertaking study in languages, sociology, history, law and the like.

My own research and specialist area of Asian Art History is firmly based within the Humanities – with close connections to Anthropology and Archaeology, and Asian Studies. I am also the lecturer responsible for the core Curatorial Studies subjects. My years of experience working within a major cultural institution gives me accurate first-hand knowledge of the academic expertise required to be successful in curatorial practice – success is founded on a broad and deep knowledge and grasp of core Humanities disciplines.

Regarding the ‘Proposal and Rationale for an Enlarged School of Art’ - I am disturbed to read that the Proposal specifically states there will be a single program of Art History and Theory. This immediately has implications for the delivery of the current courses. ‘Coordinating of staff
appointments’ assumes Art History and Art Theory are interchangeable. This is incorrect. In 2011 Elisabeth Findlay and I met with Anne Brennan and Gordon Bull to review our programs and look for synergies. The result was an acknowledgement of our disciplinary strengths and differences, and it was resolved by both groups it was only appropriate to cross-list a small number of courses. The idea of ‘common core teaching’ for First Year has been investigated by Art History staff and rejected. From my perspective this position remains unchanged. The statement that no ARC applications have been submitted by Art History staff because of teaching commitments is imaginative and has no basis in reality. To state that a group of 9 staff will lead to ANU occupying a ‘leading global position in art history and theory’ is also ‘creative’. The only way staff can be relieved of their teaching load is through major program change, and there has been absolutely no discussion on the implications program change would have on the current Art History discipline, or students. However, if the objective is to completely change Art History as the discipline is currently taught at ANU, then the objective will be achieved.

ANU continually states that its primary goals are to deliver teaching and undertake research at the highest standards. If the ANU is serious about this, then Art History must remain intellectually aligned with the broader Humanities subjects as taught at ANU. Our PhD cohort has made this very clear. Placing us, the Art Historians, within another academic frame will inhibit our abilities to interact with our Humanities colleagues, and maintain our personal disciplinary interests. We will also be separated from our Film Studies colleagues, which has happened without any consultation. I wonder if anyone was aware that Film Studies and Art History were part of the same grouping in SCI.

I have little professional issue with the proposed amalgamation of the SCI and SLS but if it proceeds it MUST be done in its entirety. Indeed, I see significant potential for example in working with our European Languages colleagues to create engaging and innovative programs relating to culture and history for our students. Art History students and staff will continue to benefit from being situated in an environment that facilitates active and creative interactions across a range of interrelated disciplines, and fosters research endeavours. Art History staff will continue our very amiable ongoing relationships with our SOA colleagues, acknowledging the significant differences that exist in our approaches to learning and teaching that befits the distinct disciplinary activities.

In summary: separating Art History from its disciplinary home in the Humanities will inevitably result in fundamental change to the academic endeavours of Art History staff and subsequently be to the detriment of our currently very successful programs in Art History and Curatorial Studies.

Dr Charlotte Galloway

E: charlotte.galloway@anu.edu.au
9th August 2013
Change Management Steering Committee
Re: Integration of Art History into the School of Art

The opportunity to build substantial strength in Art History and Theory as well as Art Practice at the ANU School of Art is truly significant, establishing one of the largest teaching and research departments of this kind in Australia as well as acknowledging the contribution the ANU has made to the Visual Arts. This ‘Art History and Theory Department’ within the School will enable closely related disciplines to have an essential critical mass in key areas of research and teaching. This merged contribution will further ANU’s international reputation in these fields and importantly build on current strengths, expanding resources and extending educational offerings. The strategic congregation of researchers is crucial and the close association of allied researchers with practitioners in object and image making disciplines is invaluable for both parties.

Currently synergies exist between Art History and the School of Art, in undertakings such as professional curatorship as well as discipline specific research. There are clear educational interactions through verifiable student course enrollments and staff collaborations- I have given guest lectures to Art History Masters students, as have my colleagues. As well, evidently there are Art History students who welcome the possibilities of joining our school, engaging with practice-led research and leading researchers. Several HDR Art History students have approached me at public functions and spoken of their positive response to a greater pool of supervisory support, as well as the possibility of a more organic relationship with art practitioners and their HDR cohort whose research is practice based.

The background training for many eminent curators is an art school based education. The School of Art is proud to count amongst its alumni curators and leaders in institutions including the National Gallery of Australia, the National Portrait Gallery, Canberra Museum and Art Gallery, and Heidi Museum of Modern Art to name a few. Our flourishing Professional Practices Program has expanded through student demand and such a program would complement or combine with Art History and Curatorship’s current offerings. Identifying cognate pathways and course options through effective use of academic strengths from both areas is educationally advantageous.

The School has consistently grown undergraduate and HDR numbers, achieving a 4 ranking in ERA. It is uniquely positioned with close ties to the national cultural institutions and with an unrivalled capacity for research and practice-led teaching. The national and international reputations of staff in the School of Art, Art Theory and Art History have the potential to fully activate and then cultivate a vitally important grant culture. An Art History and Theory Department of appropriate scale holds greater promise of fostering the support necessary to achieve success in being awarded grants and carrying out the necessary research in a busy and complex teaching and learning environment. Over decades I have been in a position to observe the mutual advantages of co-location for Art Practice disciplines and Art Theory at the School of Art. Those tremendous reciprocal benefits I certainly hope to share with colleagues and students from Art History and Curatorship in future.

Denise M. Ferris
English Program, School of Cultural Inquiry

Submission to RSHA Change Management Steering Committee

The English Program welcomes the opportunity to outline a response to the change management proposal for RSHA restructure.

Background

As a discipline, English has undergone significant generational and gender renewal in the last 5 years. We have a strong band of early-mid career researchers and our research has national and international impact and recognition (reflected in the 2012 ERA rating of 4 for Literary Studies to which English staff made a major contribution, ARC grants, and the editorship of an important journal in the humanities, Australian Humanities Review).

English makes a major contribution to the BA at the ANU – according to the BA review papers, it is the fourth largest major in the BA (behind the International Relations and Political Science majors and only just behind History). Our teaching across the English program has been consistently recognised as outstanding relative to other CASS disciplines (see recent SELT results), and it is a priority for us to maintain and build on this strength. Our curriculum is clearly focused, reflecting key areas of research in the discipline and staff expertise, and we would like to maintain and develop the work we have undertaken in renewing our offerings. For example, we have recently revised our first year courses to ensure a clear pedagogical framework, pathways to future courses, including graduate work, and attractiveness to students within and beyond the major.

We are currently in the process of restructuring our honours offerings, creating modular courses that involve collaborative teaching, a high degree of access to academic staff and which will be able to be badged across AQF8. The changes we have made are appreciated by a cohort of talented students who represent prospects for graduate research – for example, 35 students attended an honours information lunch on July 31 2013, part of our plan for fostering interest in the discipline. We would hope that any merger would enable us to maintain and build on our areas of strength, and minimize disruption for students. The uncertainty around the future of SCI, since the review in 2010, has had an ongoing negative impact for both staff and students – we would like to provide our students with some confidence about the future of their studies and of the English program.

It is our view that a strong and dynamic English program is essential to a strong and dynamic BA and to the broader mission of the ANU to be ‘both responsive to student needs and to the requirements
of the nation’.\textsuperscript{1} The study of literature is a fundamental Humanities discipline, as emphasized in the recent report of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences ‘The Heart of the Matter’.\textsuperscript{2} Our courses introduce students to a range of critical approaches to literary texts, to considerations of historical change, cultural difference and the history of ideas, and to works of literature that will stay with them for the rest of their lives. English provides students with the skills to be strong and confident communicators and critical, engaged and empathetic citizens, essential for 21\textsuperscript{st} century Australian culture and society.

**Opportunities**

We welcome the opportunity for further visibility for the English program as part of a restructure, on the basis that English is recognised as a ‘broad church’. English is the global brand name for literary studies in the English language, and the discipline has a global focus examining works not just from the British archipelago, but from around the world. English is innately interdisciplinary and can include Film and Drama courses, as well as Creative Writing. We identify opportunities for the following:

- **Building and developing our film and drama offerings** after a period of some uncertainty around the future of these disciplines. Staff members Clifford, Flaherty and Russell are committed to reinvigorating Drama within the framework of the discipline of English, in terms of both pedagogical innovation and research projects. As the Ethel Tory Endowment supports the activities of both SLS and SCI, amalgamation might enable more effective utilization of these funds for the mutual benefit of drama and languages. The fostering of creative Writing would be part of this aim, as Lucy Neave teaches script writing and there are natural synergies between drama and creative writing. In relation to film, the English program has had a number of film and literature courses for many years – it was the first in Australia to have a Shakespeare and film course – and some of our staff e.g. Monique Rooney have research interests in film. We believe that there is significant student interest in film related courses which could be developed in conjunction with colleagues in SCI and those in SLS such as Leslie Barnes. **Part of the implementation process should entail**

\textsuperscript{1} ANU by 2020, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{2} ‘Emphasizing critical perspective and imaginative response, the humanities—including the study of languages, literature, history, film, civics, philosophy, religion, and the arts—foster creativity, appreciation of our commonalities and our differences, and knowledge of all kinds’: The Heart of the Matter: The Humanities and Social Sciences for a vibrant, competitive and secure nation, (June 2013) 
planning a review of the curriculum in order to identify possibilities of collaboration and innovation.

- **Developing postgraduate offerings**, e.g. in creative writing. Currently in S2 2013, enrolments for ‘Advanced Fiction Writing’ are strong (75) and there is potential for development in creative writing PhDs. Publications in creative writing have the potential to raise the profile of the new school, and the Humanities generally, as indicated by national media attention for Lucy Neave’s new novel and for that of a current PhD, Christie Thompson’s novel, recently published by Allen and Unwin. There is potential for collaboration with staff teaching in languages who wish to use creative writing as a pedagogical strategy for language teaching.

- **Incorporating relevant strengths of IHuG into the new School’s work** e.g. in literary digital humanities. Critical mass is essential if the new configuration is to develop and prosper and it would be useful if all staff and graduate students working in literary studies were grouped together in the same AOU. This would provide opportunities to support and build the interdisciplinary research already undertaken in English. (See also later comments on the role of the HRC).

- **Maintaining the profile of gender** The interdisciplinary focus of English means that issues relating to gender are an important aspect of our research and teaching and English would like ensure that the profile of gender studies is maintained and enhanced within the new School, not least because it attracts the kind of high achieving students (at both undergraduate and postgraduate level) that enhance the quality of our offerings as a whole.

**Challenges**

- **Staffing** – as the core element of ‘Literature’ in the new configuration it is important English’s strength be maintained and developed, not eroded, particularly if our ERA ranking of 4 in Literary studies is to be sustained and hopefully improved. It is also essential that we continue to be able to teach a viable English major.

- **Naming the school** -- It needs to have a name that is credible, reflects what we actually do and gives the disciplines within it effective visibility, though we recognise that it is impossible to include all the disciplines in the title of the School. We would accept School of Languages and Literature. **It is essential in our view that Literature (or something similar) is included in the title of the School.**

- **Morale** -- It is important that staff and students in English and Classics regard themselves as having a positive investment in change and that SCI and SLS are equal partners in the
restructure, rather than SCI staff being continued to be identified as the main problem. It would be unfortunate if there were a perceived ‘takeover’ or absorption of SCI by SLS with English and Classics as ‘junior’ partners, or as a rump of the SCI. The effect of this would be to militate against the kind of synergies, collaborative approaches and collegiality which a successful restructure requires.

- **Physical co-location** -- for the foreseeable future, it is likely that the School would cross the Baldessin Precinct and A. D. Hope buildings. Teaching facilities, particularly proximity to the Arts Centre for drama and other kinds of teaching (which we would like to develop) and other considerations such as the location of the Classics Museum, mean that staying in A. D. Hope is the preferable option. Because of the likelihood of continuing to occupy separate buildings, it is essential that SLS and SCI develop from the beginning of the amalgamation lines of communication in order to foster mutual understanding, cooperation and collaboration. Once the proposal is approved, we would suggest the desirability of an early ‘retreat’ for both Schools to discuss how to manage the change.

- **Location of administration** -- If the elements of the School are not to be physically co-located, it is important that some administrative support is maintained in both buildings.

- **Budget** – in order to foster cooperation and mutual trust between the entities of the new School we recommend a transition period of 2-3 years in which the budgets are kept separate before a whole of School budget comes into operation. If possible we recommend a policy of budget transparency and the development of a workloads model, **taking into consideration significant differences in pedagogical practice across disciplines**. In the transition period the dual budget model could be managed by a Head and Deputy head from SLS and SCI. Consideration should also be given to how communication with the staff body as a whole is structured and managed in order to foster collegiality and cooperation in the vital early stages of the amalgamation.

**The role of the Humanities Research Centre**

In addition we would like to comment on the prospective role of the Humanities Research Centre as a result of the disestablishment of IHuG. Historically, English has had close ties to the HRC – indeed it was from the English Department that that HRC was developed in the 1970s. The HRC contributes to the ANU’s profile in the Humanities globally and enhances the ANU ‘brand’: its reputation overseas is likely to be a contributing factor in ANU’s rankings in the Humanities. Its future should therefore be a very important consideration for the steering committee as it is relevant to CASS and ANU as a whole. We value the existing connections with the HRC and see potential for collaboration into the
future as a means of strengthening existing research in English and the broader humanities, augmenting the global and interdisciplinary nature of English at ANU. Deeper connections may enable more collaboration in terms of research and HDR supervision, and richer programs for HDR students. The English program would therefore welcome the HRC’s location in a School of Languages and Literature but would also like to see a proper review of the its current and future role in the College separate from this change management process. We would like to reiterate one of the suggestions of the Informal Consultation Committee on SCI and SLS amalgamation:

‘a reconception of the place of IHuG within CASS as a whole provides opportunities for rethinking the role of interdisciplinary research and teaching in the Humanities in ways that would allow it to function better as a college-based entity rather than as an element of a single Research School [or indeed a school within a Research School].’

Conclusion:

The succession of restructures affecting the School of Cultural Inquiry has had a detrimental effect on the morale of both staff and students, and has contributed to a perception among some students that Humanities at ANU is in decline. This can only have a detrimental effect on recruitment, not only for the disciplines taught in SCI, but for others in the College. We in English are strongly committed to countering this perception of decline, and would very much like to move on to a position of medium to long term structural stability within the RSHA and the College that would enable us to consolidate and strengthen the discipline.

Prof. Gillian Russell (in consultation with staff in the English Program, SCI).
ART HISTORY/ART THEORY PROPOSED MERGER

Background
Art history is a crucial and integral part of what we teach in the Art Theory undergraduate and graduate courses at the ANU School of Art. However, we do not make a sharp distinction between art history and other approaches to the visual arts, those drawn from art theory, art practice, cultural studies, for example. Our aim is to provide our students with a rigorous and rich training in the study of the visual arts which equips them for the contemporary world, as professional artists and professionals working in the arts sector, including museums and galleries. We therefore consider it crucial that our pedagogy be based not on exclusivity but on inter-related and, where useful, interdisciplinary approaches.
Note: I use the term visual arts in the broadest sense to refer also to craft and design.

Art historians in the Art Theory Workshop
All of the Art Theory staff identify as art historians at some level but we are also active simultaneously in a significant number of other areas including art practice, curatorship, biography and so on.

Existing collaborations between Art Theory and Art History
Combining Art History and Art Theory into a new department of Art History and Theory located at the ANU School of Art would formalise collaborative arrangements that are already occurring such as:

- Cross-listing of undergraduate courses.
- An Asian Art minor built from courses offered by both areas.
- Art Theory staff give guest lectures in Art History courses and vice versa.
- Postgraduate supervisory panels with members from both areas (a current Art Theory doctoral student has her Chair and supervisor in Art Theory and an adviser in Art History).
- Postgraduate conference programs which are open to students in both areas (and across the university). The Art worlds graduate symposium organised by Art History postgraduate students in 2012 included papers by both art history and art theory students. Art history students are invited to attend the SOA graduate conferences.
- Postgraduate master classes (not for credit) are open to students from both areas; for example, Dr Frances Gray’s workshops on phenomenology and art held at the School of Art in 2012.
- The School of Art Gallery hosted an intern from the Art History curatorship program which, in the words of Gallery coordinator, James Holland, ‘was a great success’.

However, these collaborations are not part of a coherent overall program and are not as substantial or as productive as they could be.

Possibilities for extending existing collaborations and introducing further initiatives
A merger of the two areas would create a bigger, stronger force of art historians/theorists, with a range of potential advantages. For example:

- The richer spread of research expertise would be beneficial for research grant bids as well as ERA purposes.
- Art history and art theory staff would be able to develop stronger collegial relationships and capitalise on each other’s expertise. This may involve the development of joint initiatives – not only in undergrad and postgrad education but in hosting conferences etc as well.
• Art history staff could benefit from and contribute to the Staff Research Forum, engaging in on-going dialogue to enrich the research culture and collaboration across both areas.
• Postgraduate students would benefit from the expansion of the research base by having greater, seamless access to supervisors in what are currently separate areas.
• Greater utilisation of external visitors funded through the RSH would become possible.
• We would be able to mount a stronger combined presence at peak conferences in the field, notably the Art Association of Australia and New Zealand.
• The combined department would provide a higher profile and presence so that we could better compete with the University of Melbourne and University of Sydney with recruitment of undergraduate and postgraduate students.
• A combined department of Art history and theory would mean we can present a more coherent image to the public. At present there is a lot of confusion and I am often called upon to explain who teaches what and where.
• A combined intern program could be developed across the three areas of Art History, Art Theory (Professional Practices) and Museums and Collections. This would allow the streamlining of otherwise uncoordinated approaches from ANU arts students to institutions and organisations.

And, the merger would strengthen Art Theory/Art History as a discipline at ANU and raise the SOA’s visibility, national and internationally.

**HDR coursework courses**
One of the biggest pedagogical advantages would be bringing together students who are artificially separated during the course of their studies but who are likely to work together in their professional lives – artists and curators for example. In the HDR program the content of the following two courses could easily be augmented to reflect this changed emphasis.
ARTV8107 Arguing Objects
ARTV8207 Writing About Practice
Both courses involve a critical engagement with works of art, writing about them from different perspectives, including art history and practice-led research.

**Art and curatorship**
Many SOA postgraduate students are active as curators during their studies, in relation to their own work and that of others. Bringing them together with art history students would provide the latter with crucial experience in curating exhibitions of the work of contemporary artists as an integral part of their studies.

It should also be noted that there is a great deal of national and international curatorial experience within the Art Theory Workshop which could be utilised more fully in a combined department that also incorporates Museums and Collections.

**Graduate coursework courses**
In the Graduate Coursework program, courses offered by the School of Art could be more widely promoted to Art History students; they would benefit from being part of a more diverse student cohort in the visual arts. This applies to:
ARTV8100 Points of View
ARTV 8208 Issues in Contemporary Craft
DART 8067 New Media, Innovation and Research

**Shared career pathways**
There is a long history of individuals trained as artists being employed in curatorial positions within art museums and galleries. At the National Gallery of Australia, for example, all the directors, with the exception of Brian Kennedy, went to art school. The following senior curators all trained as artists in the first instance: Robert Bell, Gael Newton, Roger Butler, Lucina Ward. Recent curatorial appointments to the NGA reinforce the fact that the skills and training acquired at School of Art are well suited to a curatorial stream: Miriam Kelly (Australian Painting and Sculpture), Sarina Noordhuis-Fairfax (Australian Prints and Drawing). Also in Canberra the directors of both Canberra Museum and Gallery and CraftACT are School of Art graduates (one trained in photography, the other in ceramics).

A new name for a new department
This is essential to underline the fact that the ANU has made a substantial commitment to the visual arts. The Art History and Theory Department is my suggestion for the title of the new entity.

Co-location
I see co-location of the Art Theory staff at the School of Art as crucial for the forging of the strongest possible collegial relationships, for the greatest benefit of students, the School of Art and the ANU.

Museums and Collections
My comments have addressed Art History and Art Theory but I think it is essential that the Museums and Collections program is also brought into the School of Art so that the Art History curatorship program and the RSHA offerings in similar areas can be better aligned.

Helen Ennis
Graduate Convenor, Research

19 November 2012
Addendum to IHuG Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to add to the IHuG submission sent in by Professor Paul Pickering. There are just three additional points that the IHuG professional staff would like to add;

• We wanted to make it clear that the submission document was developed by all the staff in IHUG, both academic and professional. We are just as invested in research and education outcomes as the academic staff. We do see ourselves as stakeholders in the future of the research school and care a great deal about the outcome of this proposal.

• We would like to ask the committee to consider including professional staff in any groups/committees/working parties formed during the implementation stage. This proposal presents a great opportunity and we would like a chance to contribute.

• That the committee take into consideration the level of administrative support and collaboration required to undertake many of the projects in IHuG. We are closely involved with the majority of the projects/work currently being undertaken, and we are concerned that they will not continue to have the same level of support and assistance after the restructure.

Thankyou
Leena Messina, Ursula Frederick, Lan Tran, Hannah Vittorio, Emma Arnold & Sharon Komidar.

Sharon Komidar
Senior School Administrator
Interdisciplinary Humanities Group - IHuG, Research School of Humanities & the Arts
ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences, The Australian National University
Room 3.41, Sir Roland Wilson Building # 120.
Canberra 0200 Australia

P + 61 2 6125 9299 - F + 61 2 6125 2438 - E sharon.komidar@anu.edu.au

CRICOS Provider #00120C
Please find attached a submission from myself as division/discipline head of Heritage and Museum Studies within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology.

Regards,

Laurajane

Professor Laurajane Smith
ARC Future Fellow
School of Archaeology and Anthropology
Sir Roland Wilson Building, 120
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200

T: +61 2 612 58162
w: http://archanth.anu.edu.au/staff/dr-laurajane-smith
http://anu.academia.edu/LaurajaneSmith
Submission from Head of Discipline, Heritage and Museum Studies, School of Archaeology and Anthropology

re: Change Management Proposal, RSHA Restructure, 22 July 2013

4. Make more visible the emerging strength in Heritage and Museum Studies and locate it within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology which would be renamed the School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies.

I am writing in support of the above proposed outcome of the restructure.

At a School Meeting on Friday 26 July a unanimous decision was made to support the idea of situating a Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies in the School of Archaeology and Anthropology, and thus to co-locate other RSHA academics working in this area within the school. It was agreed that the school would then go through a period of review during 2013 to reconsider the name of the school.

I support this overall decision, and believe that it is vital that all those working within the area of heritage and museums be co-located under one AOU.

Heritage and museum studies is a growing interdisciplinary area of research and teaching which is gaining increasing international and domestic attention. For ANU to keep abreast of these developments it is vital that the university has a clearly defined unit that provides staff in this area with a clear identity and structure within which to develop their research and teaching.

I envisage the Centre as having high visibility, with a semi-independent image from the School. Thus, although I agreed with the School’s decision of 26 July to postpone the issue of the name change, my strong preference is either that:

a) the name of the school is eventually changed to recognise the existence of the Centre; or
b) failing a name change, or until a change of name is brought into effect, that the School’s web site and other advertisements be changed to read ‘School of Archaeology and Anthropology (incorporating the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies)’.

Having a clearly defined and visible Centre with a critical mass of academic staff is important for a number of reasons, these include:

1. Showcasing staff research both internationally and domestically. Centres for heritage and museum studies are being established around the world – indeed Canberra University even has one. A Centre that has international and national visibility will be important for maintaining and bolstering the international and national reputation of staff in this area.
2. It provides a recognizable home for the International Journal of Heritage Studies, which is the leading journal in the field, and is currently edited by myself.
3. Research implications. In bringing together a critical mass of academics with internationally recognised and esteemed research, the Centre will provide:
   a. A platform from which to lobby the ARC on the development of FoR codes that adequately reflect the developments in this field.
b. Integrated research projects and grant applications that can feed more effectively into teaching.

4. Student recruitment. A visible centre is important for attracting undergraduate, graduate and HDR students.
   a. Undergraduate students are often unaware of heritage issues and the possibilities this area may hold for employment. Conversely, while undergraduates will be aware of museums as a potential area of employment most will have little idea of how they might gain employment in this area. Having a visible Centre is integral to undergraduate enrolment.
   b. Postgraduate enrolment, either in the form of masters or HDR students, is often dominated in this field by mid-career professionals from the heritage and/or museum sectors, or professionals in related areas wanting to make a career change. Having a Centre whose title finds synergy with the workplace experiences of these students is again highly important for maintaining and developing student recruitment. Professionals in this field routinely work with a variety of experts such as historians, anthropologists, archaeologists, planners, art historians, and tourist managers and so on. Potential students may well be put off enrolling in a School that emphasises or defines itself entirely by traditional disciplines. The visibility of a Centre, which stresses its interdisciplinary nature, is necessary for developing postgraduate enrolment.
   c. A centre, featuring prominent scholars in the field of heritage and museum studies promotes international visibility. Reworking the postgraduate coursework offerings to reflect the interests of new staff, emerging trends in the field and synergies with existing areas in the School (notably applied anthropology and the anthropology of development) will not only attract HDR students, but also offer significant possibilities for the recruitment of overseas masters students.

5. Student retention within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. My experience in working within a Department of Archaeology (University of York) and working and teaching with anthropologists (UNSW and CSU), is that many students while having a keen interest in either of the two disciplines fear that they will not find employment within them. Thus, students often take electives in these disciplines to pursue their interests, but major in areas with clear employment prospects. It is safe to say that significant numbers of archaeology and anthropology graduates will work in the heritage and/or museum sectors on graduation. The existence of a highly visible Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies within the School has the potential to provide both archaeology and anthropology students not only with training relevant to such employment, but will exist as an example of the career paths available to such students.

I warmly support the above proposed outcome and enthusiastically look forward to the development of a Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies.

Professor Laurajane Smith
On behalf of the Heritage and Museum Studies discipline and staff within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology.
Dr Sally May and Associate Professor Kylie Message.
I would like to submit comments in favour of the proposed amalgamation of Art History and Curatorship and Art Theory within the School of Art. This proposal unites the established strengths of both groups of scholars, but energizes them with the context of art practice provided by the School of Art.

There are obvious efficiencies and synergies to be gained through, for instance, bringing more closely together first year introductory courses in art and history and theory for both Arts and Visual Arts students or, at the other end of the scale, widening and deepening the pool of HDR supervisors and advisors. It is also easy to see how the options for electives and professional internships could be enhanced for all students. For instance some double degree students who are majoring in both Art History and Photomedia have commented to me that they have benefited from being able to think ideas through in both disciplines. Other Arts students who have taken the occasional Visual Arts elective in Photography and Media Arts have commented that the ‘hands on’ experience enhanced their overall program. These examples indicate how, without vitiating disciplinary strength, bringing together the already very closely aligned teaching methods, courses and research directions of Art History and Art Theory within an enlarged matrix of options for students, enriches the environment for everybody.

The School of Art is an excellent context in which the established research and teaching of both groups can continue, while also encouraging new and innovative research and teaching directions. Of the many ‘turns’ which have characterized the arts and humanities recently, the turn to practice based research, and an increasing interest in the various materialities of culture, is one of the most significant. Around the world, art schools are the origin for teaching, research and publications of the highest order, while practitioners are increasingly forming dynamic parts of collaborative teams. None of this need diminish the established work already being done so successfully, it can only add to it. In particular I am thinking of particular universities I have worked with in the UK and Canada who have taken advantage of the benefits of bringing these aligned areas together, where I have seen tangible benefits in the form of new research projects and interesting journals.

Within the RSHA as a whole it is the strength through dialogue across the areas which I have found personally most rewarding, and it is also that richer context which I know my students find most stimulating in their experience of the ANU.

Yours Sincerely

Martyn Jolly
PROPOSAL TO STRENGTHEN VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITHIN THE SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Background
Visual anthropology at the ANU has a world-class reputation, on the back of decades of high calibre work in ethnographic filmmaking, ethnographic research in Aboriginal Australia and the Pacific, as well as broader scholarship in art and visual culture. In 2008 the Master in Visual Culture Research (VCR) was established as a postgraduate coursework program drawing upon this diverse expertise to offer a suite of courses tailored to the interests of a variety of students, from prospective HDR through to those with more vocational concerns. In 2009 VCR was incorporated into the Master of Liberal Arts. Further curriculum development in recent years has established ANU as the only university in Australia offering visual anthropology courses at undergraduate, postgraduate and HDR levels, with a wide diversity of visual research feeding into these teaching programs as well as a series of research-related forums and projects. Recent appointments of postdoctoral and future fellowships (Natasha Fijn and Jennifer Deger) have added further strength and vitality to this network.

Recent initiatives
Since 2010 we have been working to build up the program through a series of initiatives:

- Establishing the virtual Centre for Visual Anthropology
- Running a monthly work-in-progress forum CVA (with excellent regular attendance from across the university and further afield)
- Establishing the visualanth email list, with 220 subscribers at July 2013
- Developing new practical methods courses at undergraduate level
- Offering supervision and methods training to a growing cohort of HDR students — in 2012 60 students across CASS and CAP completed intensive ethnographic film courses
- Establishing the John Darling Fellowship in conjunction with Ronin Films, Herb Feith Foundation and Sara Darling. Plans are underway to expand this program
- Fostering a growing network of scholars from major centres of visual research across Europe, the US and UK through visiting fellowships and conferences
- Developing an integrated suite of visual programs and panels at the forthcoming Australian Anthropology Society conference at ANU in November 2013
- Supporting the Vice Chancellor’s Visiting Fellowship initiative to stimulate new research synergies with Vanessa Barbay, a recent PhD in the School of Art granted a VF in A & A

Barriers to strengthening the program
At present the growth of visual anthropology and visual culture research is hampered by the complex structure of the RSHA. The DHH was established in part to ensure the continuation of innovative visual research being carried out by CRIIO. However in recent years this stream of the DHH has lost two out of three visual anthropology staff, with no plans for replacement. Collaborative teaching and administration of the masters program across the DHH and A & A has also been a less than ideal arrangement as the two streams of the Hub (Digital Humanities and Visual Anthropology) have effectively operated separately and at times in tension with each other. Coordinating activities and building an integrated suite of teaching and research programs with a
vision for future expansion would benefit enormously from co-location of visual anthropology staff within a single AOU.

**Proposal to disestablish the DHH into its constituent units**

The proposed restructure of the RSHA presents an ideal opportunity to allow the two streams of the Hub to be relocated in order to strengthen the capacities of each. To ensure a viable base for visual anthropology I propose that the visual anthropology component of the Hub — staff, resourcing, equipment — be transferred into the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. This would allow us to achieve administrative and collegial cohesion and establish a more focused, visible and less compromised Centre for Visual Anthropology within the school, through which teaching and supervision programs, research projects and public events could be fostered.

**Physical and administrative Co-location**

Ideally all visual anthropology staff, fellows and visiting fellows would be physically located together in the school, along with edit suites and equipment.

Consolidating the current dispersed network in a single school would place us in a significantly stronger position to build on existing strengths, expand the program and promote ANU’s unparalleled ability in Australia to offer a comprehensive suite of visual programs.

*Melinda Hinkson 31 July 2013*
Submission regarding the restructure of the Research School of the Humanities and the Arts

Dr Natasha Fijn, CASS Postdoctoral Research Fellow

I am in full support of a restructure within the RSHA and am primarily concerned within my submission with the integration of iHuG within other schools, particularly within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology (SOAA). From my position as a postdoctoral research fellow within the SOAA the current RSHA structure is problematic and I would welcome restructuring in this area in the form of an integration of the visual anthropology and heritage and museums staff members within the SOAA.

When I undertook my PhD at the ANU from 2004-2008 there was an exceptionally strong base of staff available to assist with visual components within an anthropology-based PhD thesis. I appreciated the structure of the former Centre for Cross-Cultural Research where I would often attend seminars and seek advice from staff, such as Pip Deveson, Kim McKenzie, Katie Hayne and David and Judith MacDougall. I would also seek advice from Gary Kildea in the Ethnographic Film Unit in what was then RSPAS. Many masters and doctoral students benefitted greatly from the expert advice of these staff and would not have been able to incorporate visual media within their theses without such assistance. Where I was based, within the SOAA, there were no facilities or staff available to provide support in ethnographic filmmaking or the practical use of digital media. Many of the staff positions mentioned above have now ceased to exist, or were not renewed, which has been to the detriment of recent postgraduate students.

The Digital Humanities Hub is no longer cohesive, as the CCR was, as there are two divided facets: digital humanities studies, which would be more appropriately aligned with the proposed School of Language and Literature; while the visual culture research element is more aligned with the SOAA, particularly visual anthropology. The only person now available to continue to teach and assist students within the Digital Humanities Hub in relation to visual media is Pip Deveson. I have taught courses within the Visual Culture Research program and inevitably have spent much of my time within the Digital Humanities Hub teaching classes or attending seminars but I am
situated within the SOAA and my office is located across the other side of the university.

My submission is in agreement with the proposals made by Melinda Hinkson. From a PhD student and now a postdoctoral research fellow perspective, I would appreciate the following recommendations to be seriously considered:

1). The Centre for Visual Anthropology has already been established within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. It would be beneficial if this Centre was not just a virtual presence on the Internet but functioned in actuality. The Centre could function to bring staff and students under a single building with rooms for teaching, seminars, and to house both staff and students with a focus on visual culture research, as well as practical facilities for workshops and an accompanying editing suite.

2). The A D Hope Building, currently housing staff within the SOAA, is full to capacity. Research-based staff members, such as myself, are currently sharing offices due to lack of space and there is the constant threat that this office space will be lost, as priority is given to full-time teaching staff. The staff within the Digital Humanities Hub will inevitably be relocated elsewhere in the course of the restructure and due to the current state of the demountable building. It would make sense for research and teaching staff that are aligned with filmmaking, visual anthropology and visual culture research within the SOAA to be located together within a building that is purpose built (or designed), one that is capable of really assisting students and staff to produce good quality films and multimedia projects in a collegial atmosphere.
Submission to

RSHA Change Management Steering Committee

Nicolas Peterson
School of Archaeology and Anthropology


The principal matter I wish to comment on is that of the proposed renaming of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology.

Naming of the School

I support the proposal to establish a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School.

I have concerns, however, about the proposed renaming of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology as the School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies. For the reasons set out below I do not believe it is in our collective interests to do and certainly not in the immediate future.

There are three concerns:

- The name ‘School of Archaeology and Anthropology’ is a brand well known nationally and with an international profile as well. It is a name that has caused some difficulty in the past in relation to development as many international students in particular have been bemused about a major internationally recognised development program being in a School of Archaeology and Anthropology. Due in very large degree to the teaching and marketing work of Dr Patrick Kilby, but also of professor Merlan and Dr Guinness, this hurdle to the profile has been overcome.

  However, to bury the significance of development in the teaching and research of the School by further extending the range of subjects in the School's name that are not closely associated with mainstream development studies is to send a signal that the School does not really take development seriously.

- The second concern relates to the significance of development studies in the financial viability of the School. The MAAPD graduate program, and the undergraduate Development Studies program are hugely important to the financial viability of the School, indeed they have not only kept the
School in the black but also generated substantial surpluses in recent years.

- Thirdly the Group of Eight Universities are generally based on disciplines and have highlighted inter-disciplinary and other areas mainly through centres, institutes etc.

The proposal for the name change did not come about through appropriate consultation.

The discussion paper, ‘Proposal to restructure a number of the Schools of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts’ released on 30th August 2012 says, inter alia that ‘The name of the School [of Archaeology and Anthropology] would likely remain unchanged’ (page 6).

On 6th September the Deputy Director of RSHA acting as Director set out the details of the ‘Informal Consultation Process’ and the establishment of working parties in each of three areas. The ‘Working Party on the Integration of Heritage and Museum Studies’ was set up to consider the proposed changes that included those that affected the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. The appointed members were: Dr A. Greig (sociology) Chair; Dr Kylie Message (newly appointed Head of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology), Dr Laurajane Smith, Dr Sally May, Dr Sharon Peoples.

The disciplinary composition and affiliations of the members of this working party was a cause for some concern. No longstanding member of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology with any deep knowledge of its organisation or teaching and research history was on the working party, only the newly appointed head who came from RSH and works in the area of museum studies. The other three appointed members were all from outside the School and part of heritage and museum studies themselves. No anthropologist, archaeologist, development studies or bio-anthropologist from the School was included. Concern about the lack of representation from the other disciplines in the School was raised at the time but ignored.

The Report of the Working Party made no recommendation for a change of name. It is relevant, however, that a view was expressed to the Working Party that placing heritage and museum studies in a School of Archaeology and Anthropology might lead some students to think that heritage and museum studies only relate to these two fields (page 4).

This is the same issue of visibility, which is the central to the anthropologists’ concern in relation to development. Through hard work and a very effective and high quality program we have overcome that visibility issue in relation to development. Excellent visibility can be provided to heritage and museum studies by establishing a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies within the School with its own website (a key feature in visibility) without damage to the brand that has been established.
The proposal to change the name of the School has been inserted into the ‘Change Management Proposal: RSHA Restructure’ document issued on the 22nd July 2013, unilaterally and from a position of privilege. The Deputy Director of RSHA (on his own admission at the Staff Meeting held in the School on Friday 26th July) was responsible for the proposal to add ‘heritage’ to the name of the School. The Deputy Director works in the broad area of heritage studies.

This process of restructuring has not been well served by too casual attention being given to the broad representation of all interests at various stages in the deliberations, as was recommended by the ‘Report of the Informal Consultation Committee’ (4th December 2012). This specifically emphasised the importance of ‘broader representation from those affected’ on committees (it was speaking specifically about ‘consultation’ committees, but it surely applies to others as well).

A final concern relates to a throwaway line by the chair of the Staff Meeting on 26th July 2013, that we will reconsider the name change in 6 months time. If a Centre is to be set up then it needs a couple of years at least to see whether or not this provides the profile desired. Further there is evidence that the views of the School on the name change issue are not being accurately reported in other meetings: ‘its only the anthropologists who don’t want change’. I have asked a number of non-anthropologists about their views and they range across the spectrum.

There seems to be undue haste to change the name.

**Recommendations**

- That any consideration of a change of name to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology be postponed till mid-2015.

- That any committee set up to look at this matter represent all disciplines within the School and involve meetings or all members of the School.

**Other matters**

**Problems with a move of the School to the Roland Wilson building**

At the end of the recent staff meeting the Head of School joked with the Deputy Director of RSHA that she was planning to take over the Roland Wilson building for the School. While this has certain attractions in relation the high quality of the facilities there, and the potential to have everybody under one roof I think that such a move needs to be thought about very carefully in connection with the School’s relationships to undergraduates in particular. **The grounds for not moving are strong.**

The AD Hope is very centrally located and it is easy for students to get to see us; we are close to the lecture theatres; and it gives the School a high profile, especially as the building is a thoroughfare. Aspects of the building may not be
ideal. If we move to the Wilson building, which is 7 minutes fast walking away and 10 minutes for most people, we are out of sight, we will spend considerable amounts of time walking back and forth to lectures and we are not easily available to students. The School may have to postpone complete co-location until such time as the new building proposed by the Dean becomes a reality.

But in any case it is vital for the whole School to be involved in any discussions about changes in location and for those who are actually doing the teaching and managing day to day relationships with the undergraduate as well as the postgraduate population to be fully involved in planning from the outset. I think there are several possibilities for dealing with space issues in the immediate future, which can be achieved within the scope of the AD Hope building as it is at present.

**Loose ends**
There seems to be a number of loose ends in the restructure documents and the circulation of information, especially as it relates to iHug and IPPA's proposed relationships to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. In the interests of transparency it would also be beneficial if material on the postgraduate load being brought to the School were made available.

**Recommendations**
- That a committee representing all disciplines in the School should be established to discuss locational issues relating to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology, *if any consideration at all is being given to relocating it*.
- That the details of the postgraduate load to be brought to the School be made available to interested staff.

2/8/13
August 2, 2013

Dr. Nadine White  
Chair, Change Management Steering Committee  
via: RHSAconsult@anu.edu.au

NTEU Response to RSHA Restructure Proposal

Dear Dr. White,

I write to provide a formal response to the change proposal for restructuring of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts.

The NTEU has noted the considerable discord this proposal has generated within the Schools potentially affected by this proposal, even before it was formally released. We are concerned that this proposal is further developed with collegial staff engagement and that the legitimate concerns of specific discipline clusters are respected and fully responded to as the anticipated change is further developed.

Clearly disruptions associated with the process to date suggest that the ongoing uncertainty during the consultation phase will need to be anticipated and sensitively managed by the College. We believe there would be considerable value in an ongoing consultative forum for all affected staff to ensure the processes of design and implementation reflect a collaborative and respectful engagement with diverse staff concerns and discipline needs.

Our primary concern is that in already under-resourced areas that the notion of creating a ‘critical mass’ is not used to justify further resource reductions that would clearly threaten the viability of disciplines, sub-disciplines and research centres. We recognise that no redundancies are planned at this stage, but the NTEU believes it is critical that additional resources are provided to any new formation to ensure it is able to manage the extremely difficult transition proposed and that any new formation can legitimately be capable of operating as an area of academic strength.

We also note the legitimate concerns of staff in the School of Cultural Inquiry about the need for the university to ensure the distinctiveness of the disciplines it currently offers and the need to maintain a genuine diversity in the range of programs, subjects and research areas any new formation offers. The NTEU also noted the ongoing under-resourcing of the School of Language Studies and believes this remains a serious and unresolved issue.
In addition, we believe there will be significant short term disruptions, not least of all the physical relocation of workplaces, which will require open and transparent management as well as a recognition of the disruptive potential of this for the work of various areas of the School.

We are concerned there also appears to be the clear potential for significant workload disruption as a result of what appear to be difficult and not necessarily efficient new reporting relationships. The impact of the proposed changes and associated disruption needs to be taken into account during the period immediately prior to, as well as after the specific proposed changes are enacted. The NTEU believes that senior staff and staff with supervisory responsibilities need to be advised to take the impact of the disruption into account when making determinations regarding allocation and assessment of work.

The NTEU would also expect that a formal OH&S assessment of the likely stressors and workload implications of the restructure would form a key part of the planning phase, should the restructure proceed. An OH&S assessment report should be made available to staff to assist them in minimisation and avoidance of risks during the proposed disruption. Hence we believe all associated risks should be identified in a Formal Risk Assessment process. The outcomes of such a formal process should be made available to staff to assist them in minimization and avoidance of risks during the disruption.

Further, it is the NTEU’s belief that this anticipated disruption and associated workload, OH&S and risk management matters will be exacerbated during the current professional staff hiring freeze. Further the NTEU is greatly concerned as to the likely randomized impact of the proposed Voluntary Early Retirement Scheme (VERS) on the staff affected by this proposal. Given this, the NTEU will reserve its judgment on whether this will mean over time this proposed restructure is unviable.

Finally, we note that students and staff have raised reasonable and well argued concerns in the consultation process regarding reduction in collegiality and student support as a result of the proposed restructure. We believe these concerns are valid and would ask ANU treat them seriously along with the concerns we have raised in this submission.

We would appreciate a response to these issues once all submissions have been considered.

Stephen Darwin
ACT Divisional Secretary
Heritage and Museum Studies
The School of Archaeology and Anthropology has agreed near unanimously to the establishment of a centre for museums and heritage studies within the School. I support that.

The nature of a centre has not been defined. The stream of Museums and Heritage Studies has been an integral part of the School for three years so there is no clear reason why the Centre makes that area more visible. What then is envisaged for this Centre which changes the dynamics? A minor has already been approved, and postgraduate students in the Liberal Arts coursework program and PhD program have long been associated with this stream. The RSHA Restructure needs much more clarity on the following issues:

a) The appropriateness of the name and the scope of the group. If this Centre plans to include other arms of the Liberal Arts program or the PhD students supervised by Paul Pickering and Howard Morphy then a different name would be more appropriate. ON the other hand Museum and Heritage Studies is already long – could there be more succinct ways of capturing the diverse interests of this group?

b) Finance. It is important that the Centre not be seen as a separate budget line. The School works best as a unit where budget is managed across the School rather than divided into the different streams.

c) Staff. Staff would be linked to the Centre but could also be linked to other streams in the School, just as development studies stream staff are also included within the anthropology stream. These cross-cutting links within the School provide some cohesion for the School as a whole and encourages some sense of joint responsibility for what goes on in the School.

d) If the centre is to provide ‘interdisciplinary leadership across the college and university’ that potential group of students and staff should be identified. Who are these staff who work elsewhere in the university but could look to the Centre for leadership? How would the Centre best meet their interests?

I do not support any change of name for the School at this stage. There are five streams in the School as well as several centres affiliated to the School (Archaeological Practice, Rock Art, Native Title, Visual Anthropology). A name cannot possibly recognise all these diverse streams and interests. It is therefore essential to keep the name simple and broad. Archaeology and Anthropology does that, recognising the two disciplines that are most core to the School. It should be noted that Biological Anthropology and Development Studies are making strong contributions to the School, comparable to those of anthropology and archaeology, but there is no demand to fit those into the name of the School. The name is also written on countless forms and documents and for that reason needs to be short. The richness of the School can be marketed through its website rather than in the name itself.

Dr. Patrick Guinness
School of Archaeology and Anthropology
Australian National University
Tel: 61254775
Fax 61252711
Dear All,

My feedback on the RSHA restructure. The key issue from the recommendation is the proposed name change for the school of Arch and Anth (to add Heritage and Museum studies) and the rationale for it, which is:
‘…emerged a significant mass of scholars in heritage and museums studies, School be amended to include Heritage and Museum Studies so that this emerging strength is clearly visible to undergraduate and postgraduate students’. The key issues emerging are:

i) The proposed name is cumbersome and hard to sell as a pithy name, especially with important disciplines, such as development studies, being lost;

ii) The logic in terms of strength is hard to see when Development Studies is the largest P/G course program in the College (and half of Anth’s teaching income, if it is put in there which it often is) but does not get a mention in the report. On this logic the name could well be Archaeology, Anthropology, and Development. Likewise Bio-anthropology is the largest U/G teaching group and similarly is over looked.

iii) I think names should reflect the major program in terms of staff, research, and teaching, rather than seem to be picking winners which we know seldom works.

iv) The idea of having centres within the School might be a solution.

The report in drops in numbers is not correct for P/G coursework students; in the MAAPD program (80% of the total) numbers from the second semester enrolments will be about the same or a very slight drop for this year from last year but not 12.4%.

Patrick
Dear Peter,

Thanks for your set of questions. I will count this as a submission to the committee so that we can consider the various questions you pose.

Best

Howard

---

From: Peter Brown <Peter.Brown@anu.edu.au>  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2013 7:56 AM  
To: Howard Morphy <howard.morphy@anu.edu.au>  
Cc: Rosemary Shepherd <rosemary.shepherd@anu.edu.au>  
Subject: RE: Merger SLS-SCI

PS One other question.

You mentioned the other day that someone in SLS is supported by the Block Grant. Who is this person, please? Jane Simpson did not know.

Thank you,

Peter

---

From: Peter Brown  
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:22 PM  
To: Howard Morphy  
Cc: Rosemary Shepherd  
Subject: Merger SLS-SCI

Dear Howard,

I was interested to read your proposal to merge SLS and SCI. I was sorry that the meeting ended the other day an hour earlier than scheduled, as your document raised many issues.

Sustainability is one. It is where principles cannot easily be separated from an understanding of operational matters.

To facilitate this, I would be grateful for your advice on the following:

1. What parts of IhuG are covered by the Block Grant?

2. Does the HRC have a governance charter? If so, is this available for consultation?

3. You said that the current VC has overturned his predecessor’s 3-year limit of SRE funding for Jane Simpson’s Chair. What length of extension has he provided?

4. Has the current VC made a different determination to that of his predecessor concerning the Ethel Tory Endowment and the 5-year position allocated for French?

4. Are there any administrative commitments by the ANU in relation to the Freilich Endowment?

5. You made reference to the Art History group being 'small', at 4.5 positions. Does this reference have any implications in terms of the viability of programs?
5. Following the transfer of ANUCES to RSSS, are there any long-term implications for the new proposed merger, eg Jacquie Lo’s position?

I look forward to further discussions on the proposal.

Regards,

Peter
To the RSHA Restructure Steering Committee,

Gender, Sexuality and Culture (GSC) offers a major and two minors.

GSC is only mentioned once in the RSHA restructure document, which states that “GSC remain as a major in the BA and is convened out of the School of Sociology.” This statement, reportedly repeated to students at the RSHA restructure forum, has caused considerable confusion for staff and students. Since the creation of the School of Humanities (later named Cultural Inquiry), GSC has been administered through SCI. Until 2010, the three staff in GSC were all located in SCI. In 2010, Helen Keane moved to Sociology and in 2012, Gaik Cheng Khoo resigned. Between 2010 and 2013, the convening of GSC has shifted between Keane and Kennedy, but the administrative responsibility GSC has remained within SCI. I have spoken to both Helen Keane and Stewart Lockie and neither are aware of plans to move GSC to Sociology. Hence, I have concluded that the statement in the RSHA document resulted from a misunderstanding about the location of GSC. However, the RSHA proposal raises the opportunity to address fundamental issues.

After the SCI review in 2010, the status of GSC was uncertain. The HoS at the time, Jill Matthews, felt that it was too small to be a discipline and moved staff to disciplinary homes (Khoo to film; Kennedy to English – see attached document). With the resignation of Khoo, the GSC major and the minor in Cultural Studies are in a precarious position, particularly given the principles being laid down for majors and minors in the BA review. In 2008, GSC staff planned a coherent and clearly articulated major, with two first year units, one later year unit in Feminist Theory, and one core course in sexuality, Going Public. Feminist Theory was designed to prepare students for entry into Honours, and would fulfill the requirements for a ‘capstone’ if it could be taught often enough. In addition, staff in the disciplines of English, Italian, anthropology, history, philosophy, sociology and politics typically offer at least one later year unit every other year. But, the precarious position of the major stems from the fact that the Head of SCI currently has no control over what gender courses are taught by associated staff, and thus has no control over the major. Moreover, the remaining two staff - Kennedy and Keane – cannot consistently teach the four required courses, two of which are first year. (Khoo was involved in the teaching of these core courses). Without at least a dedicated part-time position in gender, it is hard to see how GSC will meet the requirements of the BA Review, and how it will survive as a major.
There is currently strong interest in GSC, as demonstrated through enrolments in the two first year units. In 2013, both first year GEND units (1001 & 1002) have increased enrolments from 2012 (80 & 67 respectively). The SELT evaluations for GEND1001 (Helen Keane) show overall student satisfaction at 4.5, which is accompanied by glowing comments on the course and teaching. This has helped to cultivate a body of students with strong interest, which has carried over into GEND1002. Helen reports that the 2013 class is very strong academically and we should attempt to retain them in the major and in CASS.

But GSC students have also been anxious about the future of the major, in part because one of the three core staff resigned at the end of 2012. Due to this unanticipated resignation and other staff movements, there were fewer of the core (and popular) later year courses on offer this semester. Students want to have some choice in the major, and don't want to be forced to take electives in cognate fields they are not especially interested in because there are few core offerings.

Staff in SCI, especially in English, are keen to retain and build GSC, either in SCI or in a new School of Language and Literatures. Staff have pointed out that having strong enrolments in GSC feeds into cognate disciplines such as English, Film and Drama, and also draws students from fields such as Politics, History, Sociology, Psychology and Law into SCI. GSC tends to draw a particular type of student, often with a strong interest in theory and interdisciplinary approaches, that is not always catered for in the disciplines. In short, then, it seems that GSC should remain with SCI rather than move to Sociology, which has expressed concern about taking on the role of convening with limited resources.

In a new school of Language and Literature, additional synergies could be developed with staff in French and Italian, one of whom already teaches a gender course. The proposed merger does not, however, solve the fundamental problem of lack of core staff in GSC, or the problem of managing a transdisciplinary major. These are problems that will have to be addressed outside of the RSHA consultation process if the GSC major is to remain viable.

Rosanne Kennedy
Interim Head of Cultural Inquiry
CASS
Hi Denise,

I am very happy for the submission I wrote in support of the proposed Art Theory /Art History merger to be put on the RSHA website in its original form, or in whatever form you consider most appropriate. I have copied it below:

thanks,

Ruth Waller

As Head of Painting at ANU School of Art I support the merger of Art History with Art Theory within the School of Art. This seems a natural and timely proposal, making efficient use of resources and staff and a very positive educational outcome for students in both the School of Art and Art History. The teaching of Art History has always been an important component of our Studio Theory program in Painting. Secondary school art education currently generally lacks a significant engagement with art history, so our students come to us with little background knowledge. We have long incorporated a historical perspective into our studio teaching and our students respond very positively to this. They also benefit significantly from the excellent history courses currently taught in Art Theory. I imagine this amalgamation will further enrich the range and depth of art historical study available to our students and will be enthusiastically embraced by them.

Just as significantly, the students of Art History and Curatorship would benefit enormously from interacting with the staff and students of the School of Art by:
- developing a richer understanding of the nature of art practice: technically, formally, materially and conceptually, and gaining greater insight into the operation of the creative process;
- experiencing directly the issues, challenges and professional realities of contemporary practice in the work of School of Art students and staff; and
- learning from the distinctive approaches to critical analysis and reflection developed by art practitioners and theorists.

There is exciting potential for greater creative exchange and interaction between these two aspects of the arts sector. Several of the School of Art staff are also curators of significance. The School of Art also regularly produces graduates who have gone on to work on curatorial projects. Art History/ Curatorial students could work with art students in developing collaborative projects, to the educational and professional benefit of both parties.

Indeed, Painting Major Double degree student Annika Harding (now a curator at Canberra Contemporary Artspace) delivered a paper at the Art History students’ Artworlds conference during her Honours year arguing passionately for the benefits for Art History and Curatorship students having greater engagement with the School of Art.

Currently our Art theory staff are experiencing very heavy workloads. They are involved in teaching across the entire undergraduate student body of the School of Art, while in addition, carrying a very significant supervision load, given the large numbers of HDRs and Post-Grad coursework students the School of Art consistently attracts. With this merger our students could benefit from the additional supervisory contribution of scholars in Art History. Together Art History & Theory would constitute a stronger unit with shared benefits as regards research capacity and ERA performance.

Given the projected review of our curriculum in 2013, this is an opportune time to respond creatively to such a proposal and develop Art History & Theory at ANU School of Art as an area of distinctive expertise developed out of an effective integration of art history, art theory, curatorship and art practice.

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Waller

Head of Painting
ANU School of Art
November 15, 2012
Dr Sandy Blair  
Rock Art Research Centre and  
Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts  
Research School of Humanities and the Arts  
Australian National University

P: 61 2 6125 5887  
M: 0419 447 372  
E: sandy.blair@anu.edu.au  
W: http://rsh.anu.edu.au/rockart/  
W: http://ippha.anu.edu.au

Dear RSHA Change Management Steering Committee

I have the following comments on the proposed restructure in relation to my experience over 4 years as Program Co-ordinator of IPPHA, and also sessional teaching in the graduate C&EH program here and at an undergraduate level in heritage courses at the University of Canberra:

Your document ITEM2.

In relation to the 3rd numbered point, about disestablishing IHuG through co-location of research centres with AOU - I assume the level of financial and administrative support would remain the same, or at least not be diminished, as this support is crucial to delivery of IPPHA’s programs to government and industry clients through the current OneStop Web Conference Registration system, which is highly inefficient and requires many administrative processes.

In relation to the 4th numbered point, I think there are certainly great opportunities for a well-structured, thoughtful focus on Heritage and Museums for the various reasons put forward in the consultation document. IPPHA will be able to contribute strongly in an ongoing role of linking university research and teaching to industry and government in the heritage and arts sector. The advanced IPPHA short course program delivered cooperatively with the graduate program in C&EH has attracted great support and won a VC award for teaching excellence.  

Anecdotal feedback on these courses is that there is a strong ongoing demand for hands-on training, experiencing the real life problems and realities of managing cultural heritage and that this is important on graduate CVs to demonstrate work readiness. Several of our students have secured jobs after graduation as a result of these networking opportunities with potential employers. I am keen to be involved in discussions about how the newly focussed heritage and
museums centre can build on the most successful elements of the current collaborative programs. I look forward to further discussions about how we might best do this.

My only other general comment is that I have very much enjoyed the genuinely interdisciplinary environment created through IHuG and am hopeful that this will be maintained and even better, enhanced in the restructure proposal. My view is that heritage-related research and practice can only thrive in this environment, and we must avoid the artificially constructed boxes, or silos as they become, that diminish the multi-disciplinary nature of the sector.

I am happy to discuss any of this further if my points are not clear.

Regards, and good luck in the ongoing endeavour!

Sandy

Dr Sandy Blair
Rock Art Research Centre and
Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts
Research School of Humanities and the Arts
Australian National University

P: 61 2 6125 5887
M: 0419 447 372
E: sandy.blair@anu.edu.au
W: http://rsh.anu.edu.au/rockart/
W: http://ippha.anu.edu.au
Submission concerning Professor Howard Morphy’s Change Management Proposal: RSHA Restructure dated 22nd July 2013

From Professor Sasha Grishin AM, FAHA, Sir William Dobell Professor of Art History, ANU

29 July 2013

The so-called Change Management Document is disappointing, poorly reasoned, inaccurate and does not take into account the considerable number of corrections and feedback made in the formal and informal consultations over the past two years. There is a clear failure of process as feedback is being ignored which in any way contradicts the intentions of the proponent of this proposal. Surely it is a failure of process for the main proponent of a radical and very unpopular change to the structure of the teaching of the humanities at the ANU to be responsible for the assessment of the feedback and the critique of his proposals.

All the comments made below have been made on many occasions in submissions by academic staff and many postgraduate students in Art History and Curatorship.

Our objections primarily concern two aspects of Professor Morphy’s document, namely:

Item 2 Proposed Outcome

2. Strengthen Art History and Art Theory through the integration of Art History from the School of Cultural Inquiry into the School of Art.

And

Rationale: Enlarged School of Art
Art History & Curatorship in the School of Cultural Inquiry and Art Theory in the School of Art jointly comprise 9.5 FTE staff (4 FTE in SCI and 5.5 FTE in SoA). Joined together in a single program within the School of Art they would create one of the strongest bodies of art theorists and historians in Australia and would enable ANU to occupy a leading global position in art history and theory. Separately neither Art History & Curatorship nor Art Theory has critical numbers to support the existing teaching load or take account of the exigencies of leaves of absence. Each will continue to depend on temporary appointments to cover leave of absences and neither can cope easily with unanticipated staffing issues. Younger staff would have greater opportunities for research development with less teaching pressure placed upon them. The separation has been one of the reasons why ANU has not been able to take advantage of its stellar individual reputation in Art History in the award of research grants. For example over the past 5 years there have been no ARC applications from the Art History group due to the pressure of maintaining teaching obligations. ANU has a number of leading art historians and if they were managed more as a whole, the overall performance would be enhanced. The combined unit is likely to increase graduate coursework numbers by opening up the possibility for new programs with the option of common core teaching to both cohorts of undergraduate students. The staff members of both schools have close relationships with the national cultural institutions and a more coordinated approach will bring benefits to the ANU and increase the visibility of the exceptional contribution RSHA makes to Canberra’s cultural life. The creation of a single program of Art History and Theory will have no effect on the present degree programs but will facilitate the planning of new initiatives and coordinating staff appointments.
Submission

We argue that the proposal would seriously weaken the teaching of Art History and Curatorship at the ANU, simply because the main purpose of the SoA is to train art practitioners, while the purpose of Art History and Curatorship is to train art historians and curators. The proposed shotgun wedding would destroy the discipline of art history at the ANU and it is for this very reason why the universities of Melbourne and Sydney, Queensland and Adelaide, all of which have very distinguished art schools, have rejected such mergers. These mergers have happened in a number of instances, for example at Monash university, to the demise of the discipline.

Suggestions that Art History and Curatorship has failed or is working below capacity at the ANU is demonstratively untrue. As noted in our annual reports over the past decade our success rate in undergraduate teaching, HDR teaching, publications and in areas of public policy has been outstanding. Two of our four staff have been awarded ALTC awards, a third a CASS teaching award. There is nothing in Professor Morphy’s proposal that could assist us in our functions as the art school staff will continue to teach practitioners with courses designed for that purpose while we would continue to teach art historians with courses designed for these purposes, except we would be separated from our natural home in the humanities (where our students come from and belong), such as English, Classics, History, etc. If Professor Morphy argues that the merger will have “no effect on present degree program”, there are no savings to be made in teaching flexibility. Unless programs are closed, changed and integrated, the workloads cannot change. Graduate coursework numbers which we have been building up, contrary to what is stated in Professor Morphy’s proposal, will decline if we are forced into the art school. We attract these candidates precisely because we are not part of an art school and have developed an outstanding reputation. If we join a model of the other 27 art schools which offer such courses, any savvy prospective student will select Melbourne or Sydney, rather than us. Our very strong HDR program will suffer, existing students will leave and it will be more difficult to attract new candidates of calibre, once we are competing with COFA, RMIT and the VCA, all much stronger art schools than Canberra, rather than with Melbourne and Sydney universities as we are at present. This point has been made in numerous submissions from our postgrads to Art Working Party on the proposed merger.

Professor Morphy’s rationale is littered with factual errors. His claim the 9.5 staff in art theory and art history (3 of whom in SoA lack a PhD qualification) would make this into the strongest gathering of art historians is simply nonsense as a quick glance on the internet would make clear (something pointed out on numerous occasions). There is no explanation how the younger staff would benefit in this shotgun wedding while teaching loads remain constant to support the existing programs. No ARC applications made by Art History staff over the past 5 years is simply not true, as a quick check of the records will show. That temporary appointments need to be made to cover OSP is not true, while for LSL, this is fully funded and is part of the Enterprise Agreement. At the moment Art History is part of a teaching unit with Film Studies, which brings our teaching size to 6.5 and there is no explanation as to what happens with the joint courses and degrees. The tragic thing about these proposals is that all of these and many other objections have been made on numerous occasions and have been simply ignored. This is a failure of process.
**Possible solutions.** The SCI is viable and should remain and art history will continue to flourish within this school. If Professor Morphy is determined to destroy or disestablish this school and merge it into languages, Art History can continue to coexist within this newly merged school, which will teach such things as Ancient History, Literature and Classics, with which Art History has a natural affinity.

What is really needed is a proper review of the teaching of the humanities at the ANU, including the SoA, and within a broader review conducted professionally and at arms length, possible synergies could be determined. What is presently proposed in the RSHA restructure is poorly thought out and will harm teaching and research in the humanities at the ANU.

Sasha Grishin
Submission to the RSHA Change Steering Committee

Thank you for this opportunity to provide some feedback on the RSHA change proposal. There are a few points that I would like to raise for the committee to consider.

Firstly, I would like to say that I was extremely disappointed that there were no representatives from the professional staff on the three initial working parties. The professional staff are not just a separate group who merely support the activities of the academics, we actually work collaborative together. By leaving us out of the original discussion I think that it sent a message the professional staff have nothing to contribute, that we are not to be included as stakeholders in the future of the research school but are simply functionaries.

So, with this in mind, I would like to propose that any further working parties/groups have professional staff representation to ensure that our contributions and concerns can be included.

The proposal to disestablishment IHuG came as quite a shock to the professional staff involved. We have all worked hard to ensure that we have met all the college KPI’s for research, publications, teaching and outreach. We feel that we have contributed a great deal to the success of IHuG as an AOU, and that IHuG has contributed greatly to the success of the college. Now that IHuG is to be disestablished we are concerned that we will not have any agency in our future, that we will be redeployed in a manner that is expedient rather than consultative.

If, as professional staff, we are to be considered as stakeholders in the future of the university, then I would like the committee to take this into consideration when drafting the final submission. Please allow us some agency in how and where we finally end up. If you value our contribution as professional staff then give us the opportunity to have some input into our future deployment within the new RSHA.

Thanks

Sharon Komidar

Sharon Komidar
Senior School Administrator
Interdisciplinary Humanities Group - IHuG, Research School of Humanities & the Arts
ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences, The Australian National University
Room 3.41, Sir Roland Wilson Building # 120.
Canberra 0200 Australia

P + 61 2 6125 9299 - F + 61 2 6125 2438 - E sharon.komidar@anu.edu.au

CRICOS Provider #00120C
Classics and Ancient History Program
Submission to RSHA Change Management Steering Committee

As we indicated during the consultation phase of the restructure process, staff in Classics and Ancient History (CAH) were strongly in favour of the proposed restructure—and we continue to be so.

We are concerned, however, that the document seems overly “School of Cultural Inquiry (SCI)-centric” — and not in a good way. In addition to problems at the discipline level, such as a lack of visibility characterizing English and Museum Studies (see below, point 3) and the apparent inability of Art History to capitalize on its reputation to secure research grants (II.4 p. 5), SCI overall is characterized by a “decline in undergraduate load” (I.3 p. 3). The chart on p. 8 reinforces this impression but appears misleading (e.g., IHuG should not appear there since it does not teach undergraduate students) and, based on other evidence, inaccurate (the April 2013 figures are by no means definitive for the entire year; SCI’s second semester enrolments are rising as this is being written, for example).

We in CAH do not think SCI is a problem to be solved but a strong performer not just in undergraduate education (student satisfaction surveys for Sem. 1 2013 average well above the VC’s gold standard of 80%) but by the relevant research benchmarks (ERA ranking, research outputs)—the latter in spite of being disadvantaged in terms of traditionally heavy teaching loads when compared to other schools and disciplines.

CAH would also like to register the following specific concerns about the RSHA Change Management Proposal, particularly as it affects our current and future AOU.

1. **Integrity of the Classics and Ancient History program.** CAH seeks an assurance that it will continue to exist as an identifiable program within our future AOU, and that staff in CAH will be allowed to organize among themselves the teaching necessary to maintain our three majors without unnecessary interference from our future AOU’s management.

2. **Staffing.** CAH would like an assurance that staffing levels across its future AOU will be examined to ensure equity among academic staff, rather than simply remaining at levels determined by accidents of history or determined by a profit/loss approach to staffing. In order to maintain the internationally accepted standards within our inherently interdisciplinary field of study, it is
necessary for CAH to teach three separate majors (Greek, Latin, Ancient History). At present we do this (in addition to managing a named degree—the Bachelor of Classical Studies) with four staff, necessitating teaching loads which reduce our opportunity, in comparison with peers in some other disciplines, to research and publish (despite being held to the same expectations for research outputs). This inequity should be addressed.

3. **The Name.** The Change Management Proposal document (hereafter, “the proposal”) stresses the importance of “visibility” of disciplines such as English (II.4 p. 5) and Museum Studies (II.4 p. 6) in the restructure. CAH feels very strongly that its identity and visibility must be reflected in the name of its future AOU (along the lines of the new School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies). The proposal refers to the future version of SLS as “The School of Languages and Literature.” This will not promote CAH’s visibility or identity within our future AOU. We suggest that the name of our future AOU be “the School of Languages, Literatures [note the plural] and Ancient Mediterranean Studies.” The latter has been deemed to be the best (and least cumbersome) way of badging the inherent inter- and multidisciplinarity of Classics and its focus on the languages, literatures and histories of ancient Greece and Rome, their impact on the western intellectual tradition and their ongoing impact in the modern world. Members of CAH would like to be consulted directly on any proposed nomenclature for our future AOU.

4. **The Approach.** Throughout the RSHA Change Management Proposal, the prevailing attitude seems to be that SCI will be absorbed into some altered version of SLS. This approach to the fate of the academic staff reinforces its feeling of being rather marginal—a “poor relation” absorbed into a larger, more powerful existing school (SLS) rather than one of two schools (SCI and SLS) being disestablished and reformed as a new entity. The tone of the document in this regard reinforces the impression, mentioned earlier, that SCI is a problem to be solved rather than an equal stakeholder in the Change Management Process.

5. **Representation.** CAH believes that the Change Management Steering Committee should be expanded to include at least one more head of school from the existing AOUs affected by the restructure. We believe that SCI is the most suitable candidate since it appears to be the main (and often negative) focus in the Change Management Proposal and will be the school most profoundly affected by the outcome (disestablishment). Petitioning the
committee to take into account SCI staff’s concerns through submissions is not as potent a tool as membership of the committee and the attendant ability to help direct (indeed, steer) its debates.

6. **The Classics Museum.** CAH seeks written assurance that management and curatorship of the Classics Museum will not be removed from the academic staff best positioned to manage and curate it and interpret its content (CAH). It is primarily a teaching collection and is used for teaching purposes by CAH staff in their courses.

7. **Location.** In reference to the document, II.6 p. 9, CAH asks that it not be physically relocated from its current position surrounding the Classics Museum on the ground floor of the A.D. Hope building. CAH staff, the Classics Centre and the Classics Museum must remain a physically integrated and proximate entity.

8. **IHuG.** The dismemberment of IHuG and redistribution to the new AOU's must be transparent and equitable. The research achievements of its member centres and their ERA rankings will benefit the various future AOU's into which they will be integrated. Budget documents show how healthy IHuG's bottom line has been (only 60% of its budget absorbed by salaries, compared to the 90% average in the Schools), which can only help the bottom lines of the various future AOU's. The different centres currently under the IHuG umbrella should be distributed equitably between RSHA, SCI's future AOU and the proposed School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies. The redistribution of its economic and scholarly resources should be handled transparently and should not disadvantage any of the discipline areas involved in the restructure.

9. **Teaching – Research synergies.** It is unclear to us what the document means by its aim to “deepen the research culture within larger sustainable clusters to address declines in some of the teaching programs.” If this means distributing research funding more equitably across AOU's under the RSHA umbrella to subsidize teaching activity (that is, by placing research-intensive staff in teaching AOU's, along with their attendant PhD supervision funding, grant funding, etc.) then we think this is important—provided it is done equitably (see point 8). If, however, this means supporting teaching-intensive staff with teaching relief from research-intensive staff then CAH will be disadvantaged (as it was during the CASS “integration” of 2010) since we have no opposite numbers among the research-intensive staff with the training to teach our
courses. Equitable staffing remains an overwhelming concern for CAH (see point 2).

We look forward to a consultative and transparent process in the next phase of the RSHA restructure. Looking ahead to the second stage of the consultation process, focusing on implementation of “the agreed broad organisational and governance structure of the relevant AOUs” (III.8 p. 10), we request that academic staff in the relevant AOUs be permitted to choose their own heads of school rather than having HoSs imposed on them from outside their AOUs.

Dr Paul Burton
Dr Peter Londy
Prof. Elizabeth Minchin
Dr Ioannis Ziogas
Film and New Media Studies (FNMS) – the immediate future.

FNMS needs a new fulltime position as of 1 January 2014. Without this, the Program will be forced to offer a specialization minor only.

1) Position overview:

We are seeking an excellent researcher and teacher in the area of Film and New Media Studies, with a preference for an applicant with experience in Film Theory and/or Documentary Studies. The appointee should be cognisant of and enthusiastic about digital cinema. Experience in filmmaking will be an added advantage, but not essential.

2) Brief rationale:

To consolidate the position of Film Studies and New Media Studies across the University, the coherence provided by the existing FNMS major needs to be ongoing. If the position is not filled, the University loses this given interdisciplinary focal point.

3) Present position:

Film and New Media Studies, a relatively recent conjunction, have still more recently been aligned with Art History to form a ‘pillar’ within SCI. The School awaits a clearer outlook beyond the recommended amalgamation of SCI with SLS, and the hiving off of Art History to another area, but clearly both will impact on FNMS.

The FNMS Program currently has a single fulltime post, and 2.1 posts altogether. Present staff plans for phasing into retirement see that reduce to 1.6 teaching posts by the beginning of 2014, and to 1.0 by the beginning of 2015. To maintain the status quo of a major and a minor, addressing the staffing situation is urgent. The provisional list of course offerings for this triennium does not include the sole core course, FILM1002,
beyond the current semester. The School itself has confirmed at a staff meeting that it strongly wishes the major to continue, not least because of its close connections to other disciplines taught within SCI.

4) Brief background:

Film Studies to date has been perhaps the most interdisciplinary of all Humanities subject areas, and more and more disciplines, beyond the university teaching context, have seen the need to engage with it. With the shift to the digital era, the evolution from earlier film formats and aesthetics is already explored in our courses, and needs development.

Our postgrad students have had success, with our first PhD becoming a colleague, and our first MPhil student having her thesis published (McFarland, N. Carolina). Many of our students have been and are becoming active filmmakers. For example an honours student from 2011 is now studying documentary filmmaking at the Australian Film Television and Radio School in Sydney. The Head of Screen Music at AFTRS is enrolling in an ANU PhD, with Hillman on his panel. We currently have 9 postgraduate students, with 2 in the process of examination. Through Summerhayes, the FNMS Program is involved in graduate coursework (e.g. the MA in Social Research).

A strong link to the National Film and Sound Archive, and also to the Australian War Memorial and AITSIS, were established through our internship program. Students’ projects explored important curatorial areas, and have contributed to the research capacity of the Archive (websites, databases, floor talks, etc.). For example a 2006 ‘internnee’ even made a discovery of national significance for the Australian film industry while working at the NFSA. The Memo of Understanding between CASS and the NFSA sees the FNMS Program again poised in a crucial position.

Indeed in December 2012, Summerhayes convened the international Visible Evidence Documentary Studies Conference: a collaboration between the ANU and the NFSA that was claimed by the Dean and Director of CASS and the CEO of the NFSA as the first major undertaking under the MoU. This conference was convened as a direct
consequence of the FNMS’s presence at ANU, especially in the context of teaching and research in Documentary Studies.

5) Staffing:

Student numbers have never been a problem for this Program; staff numbers, and particularly this piecemeal configuration, have limited our capacity for expanding the Program further, for instance into a Masters by coursework degree. However, students taking the Graduate Certificate in Liberal Arts can take half their required courses in our area, relevant to AQF level 8 discussions at present.

We need to be able to offer more than one FILM/NEWM- prefix option/semester to maintain a viable profile. Just to mount our first-year course and one of the bigger options (e.g. U. S. Cinema, or Documentary) requires 10-11 hours’ weekly teaching plus 4 of screenings, i.e. at least a full u/g load for 1.5 posts.

6) Research:

Across the 3 current staff members, research radiates out from Film Studies without being confined to it. This is not surprising, considering our backgrounds. But it does keep coming back to Film Studies; each of us has seen at least one book completed, alongside other publications, within the last 8 years. Parallel to the evolution of the Program has come an impressive accumulation of University Library holdings, built up virtually from zero, and a visual library located in the A. D. Hope Bldg. One of us has assessed ARC applications in the Film Studies area, and we have been strongly represented at local and international conferences.

7) Outside links:

Close links exist to other universities, e.g. to Berkeley, for both staff and student exchange. The greater proximity in CASS of the RSHA, not least its world-ranking filmmakers and film-academics from the former CCCR, has been welcome in itself. But the ANU’s strengths have remained more discrete than we would have liked. Both I-HuG and visual anthropology and ethnographic film have remained largely separate. Within
the FNMS Program there is a strong hinge to these areas, with RSHA fellows already teaching into our Documentary course.

8) The future:

1) We hope for further clarity, both in staff profiles and in the Graduate School, of the relation of Film Studies to other ANU areas. The forthcoming SCI/SLS amalgamation opens new perspectives, as does the relocation of Art History, with the possible tandem movement of FNMS.

2) The Program’s signature and innovative expansion into the area of New Media Studies automatically offers links with the School of Art and ANU’s Digital Hub. Worldwide, cinema studies has moved into the digital realm in teaching, research and practice-oriented research with highly respected scholars such as Thomas Elsaesser now commenting on and researching the area of digital cinema. We see the future as expanding into this area of teaching, with Summerhayes already publishing in the area of digital documentary (*New Documentary Ecologies* Palgrave December 2013).

3) Another link capable of further innovation is with the original home of Film Studies, the then equivalent of SLS. One distinctive feature of our Program, probably unique in Australia, is its strong profile in European Cinemas, with native speaker competence. Italian Cinema and German Cinema have long been offered across both Schools, a French-language French Cinema course also exists, and a Spanish Cinema course would be welcome, with a strong language student base to draw on. European Cinema courses lend themselves to the SLS ‘common option’ pattern across languages. At least 3 of the current SLS staff are research-active in Film Studies.

4) The Film and Music course has in the past featured team teaching from both areas, which originally was unique in Australia (and may still be?). This too is an expanding area of academic interest and research. In the wake of last year’s upheaval at the CSM, it is currently being taught solo, for the first time; the sooner the severed link is recreated, the better.
5) Recent students have found positions at NFSA, the Los Angeles Academy Archive, and AFTRS, while others have made prize-winning short films. Part of our vision must include these success stories, whether as research assistants, guest lecturers, or else to showcase their work. 2 postgrads have already taught at undergrad level with considerable success through the Pinnacle Program.
Film and New Media Studies Program

Submission to RSHA Change Management Steering Committee

For our Program, questions of naming, (co-)location and the like are secondary. None of the ‘Changing Management’ document addresses the very survival of this Program, its visibility – wherever – into the future.

With the disestablishment of the Bachelor of Digital Arts, and the downgrading of our Program to ‘minor’ status, we run the very real danger of soon becoming invisible. For this Program to be a meaningful part of a combined School of SCI/SLS, new staffing is essential. Going by current plans, the sole remaining teacher from the end of next year on will be Gino Moliterno. His additional expertise in Italian is already of interest to that Program; even without it, he alone could not realize the interdisciplinary possibilities intrinsic to a Film and New Media Studies Program.

To address another aspect of the document, student numbers have never been a problem for this Program, but only staff numbers. In response to a CASS request to ‘tighten’ the major we reduced the range of offerings counting towards it. Though prepared to represent our area at last year’s Open Day, we were given no chance to. Such falls in student numbers as have occurred have been a self-fulfilling prophecy.

We are research-active, as ‘researchers’ profiles testify. Our postgrads already have a number of publications to their credit, in the course of thesis-writing. Falling through the cracks of disciplinary ranking for ERA [according to the ERA2012 report, code 1902 re the ANU was ‘not assessed’], is a mystery.

Digital Arts, across an extremely disruptive few years, has had to take in both the School of Art and Film Studies with its Janus gaze. Film Studies started in European Languages (plus ça change…), has been aligned to Art History for many years, as a postgrad program was related to English for some time, and now seems destined to land back in SLS.

That home could indeed have a future, if the Program itself survives. The Program is sympathetic to the request by Art History colleagues to join this cluster, rather than the School of Art. In addition, the case for the HRC linking up with SCI/SLS, a very attractive prospect, would be strengthened for all of us, including FNMS, by the presence of Art History.

For a fuller picture, please see the attached document, from just 3 months ago, as requested by our then Head, SCI.
Roger Hillman
Gino Moliterno
Catherine Summerhayes
We write in response to the RSHA change management proposal on the
disestablishment of IHuG and the proposed co-location of research centres
within one of the four AOUs. These AOUs, we note, are primarily organized
around distinct disciplinary clusters – named Schools in our university and
Departments elsewhere.

We agree with the proposal’s overall vision to enhance critical mass in key
disciplinary areas and to make visible areas of academic strength. To that extent,
the disestablishment of the IHuG and the relocation of its Heritage and Museum
studies group (represented primarily by IPPHA) to the School of Archaeology
and Anthropology is a good outcome. We also welcome the proposal’s
commitment to fostering research excellence within all AOUs and the active
integration of teaching and research at all levels.

The proposal to integrate the Humanities Research Centre within one or other of
the four AOUs, however, requires serious reconsideration on the following
grounds:

**International Best Practice**

Humanities Centres and Institutes have been established in all major research
universities around the world precisely to generate an environment for
advanced research in interdisciplinary humanities outside the conventional
departmental/school structure. Indeed, no other major Humanities Centre or
Institute globally sits in a Department or School.

Established in 1972, the HRC at ANU is one of the world’s first such Centres, and
has served as a prototype for similar centres across North America, the UK and
Europe. This is widely acknowledged at universities such as Cambridge, Chicago,
Brown, Duke and others.

Centres like the HRC work primarily as sites where humanities faculty from ANU
and other parts of the world retreat from their core departmental
responsibilities in order to undertake a period of concentrated research. This is
distinctly different from centres dedicated to advanced research within a specific
discipline or specialization – such as the Centre for Indigenous History, for
instance. At the same time, the programs of humanities centres such as ours -
comprising of projects, fellowships, conferences, symposia, seminars and
workshops – foster a research and teaching culture which draws in scholars
from across the campus. They bring a cohort of fellows into active contact with
scholars and students from all disciplines.

The HRC’s permeable culture of excellence ought to benefit the whole of RSHA
and CASS. Realistically speaking academic autonomy and diversity would
undoubtedly be compromised over time if the Centre were to sit under any disciplinary based AOU.

Not only would a disciplinary framework eventually shape academic orientation but also it would immediately affect the perception of the Centre externally.

Inevitably, such an action would be represented as a precipitate change in the Centre’s core mission that would compromise our credibility as a pure Humanities Centre in the eyes of our international colleagues.

In this respect it is important to learn the lessons of 2008 when the HRC was disestablished as an AOU and turned into ‘virtual’ Centre.

This action was widely misinterpreted and misrepresented both nationally and internationally. The implications of the word ‘virtual’ were catastrophic. It was widely believed that the ANU had effectively abolished the HRC giving up its leadership role in the Humanities in Australia. It has taken a lot of work to counter this perception and to convince the international Humanities community that the HRC still exists as a ‘real’ entity and has the full support of the University.

Another fundamental change to the status of HRC within the University structure would take us back to square one. Irrespective of any public assurances, it would be seen as a reduction of the status of the Centre, compromising its ‘independence’, its interdisciplinarity and an attenuation of its mission in the Humanities.

**National Role:**
The HRC is nationally recognized as providing ANU leadership for major networks of humanities scholars and institutions, both in Australia and around the world. Its membership on the advisory boards of the Australian Consortium of Humanities Research Centres (ACHRC) and the world Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes (CHCI) has generated for interdisciplinary humanities at ANU a precious resource - through grants, projects, high-profile events and advocacy– that requires careful stewardship.

**Endowment – Freilich Foundation**
The HRC established the Freilich Foundation in 1995 through a major bequest (between $6-8 million) from Herbert and Valmae Freilich. The Head of HRC is the Chair of the Freilich Foundation Board and, along with the Freilich Fellows, is responsible for the delivery of research and programs in accordance with the primary remit of the Foundation.

Moving the HRC to a School defined by specific disciplines would gravely jeopardize this endowment. The surviving donor, Valmae Freilich, has a strong intellectual commitment to the Foundation’s location within an explicitly interdisciplinary humanities centre. Over these years, our donors have expressed serious concern about the various administrative changes the HRC has
undergone. Each time we have been successful in reassuring them, by making a convincing case for our academic autonomy as a Centre for interdisciplinary humanities. It will become well nigh impossible to do so if we are administratively aligned with a single disciplinary AOU.

**Digital Humanities Hub**

We believe that the DHH should be folded into the HRC as separate and clearly identifiable program. We believe that this is important in light of the growing role of digital humanities in interdisciplinary Humanities Centres and Institutes globally. The core international projects in the Digital Humanities are currently linked directly to the HRC. Incorporating the Hub into the HRC would consolidate this leadership role on behalf of the College.

The current Head of the Hub will transition into a continuing position in SCI (or a newly established SLL) at the conclusion of her current contract. There is already a budget line in the SCI budget to facilitate this.

A second academic staff member in the Hub has recently been employed.

The aim of transitioning academic staff of the Hub, present and future, would continue as originally intended. This would, of course, be subject to budget considerations and succession planning at that time.

**Academic Integration within RSHA**

The case for autonomy from the four proposed AOUs *does not preclude* active articulation with the teaching and research programs of RSHA. In fact, such academic alignment already exists at the level of graduate training, undergraduate teaching and research programs.

- Our Fellowships Committee is currently represented by members from the School of Cultural Inquiry, School of Art, and the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. Members currently represent disciplines as diverse as literature, law, art history, art theory, history and anthropology.
- Our fellowships program hosts two internal fellows every year from one or more of the Schools of RSHA.
- Our annual conferences are convened by colleagues from one or more of the Schools of RSHA.
- Our Visiting fellows regularly offer Master Classes and Workshops, which are open to students from all Schools within RSHA (and CASS) and have regularly been attended by a large cross-section of students.
- The Head of the HRC is the convener of the First Year Seminar coursework in the Graduate Program in Interdisciplinary and Cross Cultural Humanities.
- The Head, the Professorial Fellows and the Adjunct Fellows of the HRC are primary supervisors or advisors of up to a dozen PhD students at any one time across RSHA and CASS.
Furthermore, we see this cooperation as being further developed in the years to come. The new double-degree model is being strongly promoted by ANU and is seen as central to its national and international reputation. This provides a unique opportunity for humanities scholars to contribute to the double-degree model in ways not previously attempted either at ANU or elsewhere in the country through the development of genuinely interdisciplinary courses taught dialogically across two or more units. This would enhance the capacity of the ANU to offer an integrated education in the interdisciplinary humanities, from undergraduate offerings through graduate courses and on to doctoral level. The Humanities Research Centre is ideally positioned to contribute to this initiative.

**Governance Issues**

In terms of governance we believe that the Centre should remain outside a School attached to the Directorate. Following the disestablishment of IHUG the supervision of the Head of the HRC would revert to the Director, RSHA. The Director of RSHA would replace the Head of IHUG as the delegated authority.

When it was a separate AOU the governance of the HRC was invested in the Director assisted by an advisory Board appointed by the Vice Chancellor. The Board comprised ANU staff (Director, Deputy Director, Head of Graduate Studies, Director, Centre for Cross Cultural Research) and an equivalent number of external members. It was chaired by an external member.

We believe that an Advisory Board needs to be re-established comprising representatives from the 4 AOUs and chaired by an external member. Two or three external members could be appointed for fixed terms. The Dean would be an ex-officio member.

The Fellowships and Program Committees should be expanded to include representatives from the 4 AOUs.

**Financial viability**

The Headship and the core programs – Visiting Fellows and Conference – Program – of the HRC have traditionally been funded from the Block Grant (or its equivalent), either directly from the Chancellery (when it was an AOU) or via the distributed College budget to RSHA and latterly IHUG.

The provision in the current proposal to continue hypothecate funding for the HRC in the RSHA budget means that, as a consequent, the issue of the financial viability the Centre is not relevant.

Nevertheless, the location of the HRC within a School budget must inevitably increase the risk the to hypothecation of the funding in the long term.

The HRC generates income from teaching and conference receipts. This income is used to offset the costs of administration. This would continue irrespective of
the issue of location and is thus not in and of itself a reason for incorporation into a School.

By
Assoc Professor Debjani Ganguly, Head of HRC
Professor Desmond Manderson, Professorial and Future Fellow.
Professor Paul Pickering, Deputy Director, RSHA
IHUG SUBMISSION.

At a meeting of academic and professional staff in IHUG on 29 July 2013 there was a consensus in relation to the following principles:

- That IHUG be disestablished as an AOU.
- That a Centre for Heritage and Museums Studies be established in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.
- That the Institute for Professional Practice and the Arts be transferred to the proposed Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.
- That the Centre for Native Title Anthropology be transferred to the proposed Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.
- That the Convenorship and Administration of the Liberal Arts program be transferred to the proposed Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.
- That the Convenorship and Administration of the Interdisciplinary Cross Cultural Research Program be transferred to the proposed Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.
- That the Humanities Research (and the Freilich Foundation) NOT be located in a School
- That the Digital Humanities Hub be folded into the Humanities Research Centre and become a program within it.

Disestablishment of IHUG as an AOU.

We believe that IHUG has performed an important and necessary role in RSHA as currently configured. It was a structure of convenience. We recognize that the present proposed restructure allows issues to be addressed that, should they proceed, will obviate the need for an umbrella administrative structure.

The establishment of a Centre for Heritage and Museums Studies in the School of Archeology and Anthropology.

One of the key issues/concerns that inspired the formation of IHUG was the future of research and teaching in the area of Heritage and Museum Studies. In particular there was concern that those efforts would not be given sufficient prominence should they be located in the School of Archeology and Anthropology. Despite the fact that key staff in this area were transferred to A&A
it was not clear at that time what the School was proposing to do with the programs. This led to a bifurcation of the teaching and research efforts in this area. It has also proven to be administratively complex. However, the fact that the A&A had only part of the programs meant, we feel, that the School did not fully embrace heritage and museum studies and that without due prominence we felt that our successes (and opportunities) in this area would be endangered.

We believe that changing the name of the School would address our concerns in this respect.

We recognize, however, that the A&A have rejected the proposed change of name. We welcome the fact that the School has agreed to consider the name change over coming months.

The Head of IHUG attended the A&A School meeting and reported that the School has unanimously supported the creation of a high profile Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School.

IHUG believes that this is a positive and appropriate alternative and at the meeting unanimously agreed to support it.

Contingent upon the creation of a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies would be the following:

- The transfer of the Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in School of A&A).
- The transfer of the Centre for Native Title Anthropology (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in School of A&A).
- The transfer of the Convenorship of the Liberal Arts program (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in School of A&A).
- The transfer of the Convenorship of the Interdisciplinary and Cross Cultural Research Graduate Program (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in School of A&A).
- The transfer of related academic and professional staff (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in School of A&A).

There was NOT a Consensus in relation to the transfer of the visual culture component of Digital Humanities Hub to the Centre for Visual Anthropology in the School of A&A. Colleagues recognized the merits of this proposal as well as the strategic advantages of keeping that part of the program in the Hub.

Members of IHUG also believe that it is vital to recognize the importance of the ongoing contribution of HRC and HUB staff to the graduate program of Interdisciplinary and Cross Cultural Research.
Members of IHUG noted the importance of preserving the high profile of the Interdisciplinary Program for the Research School and the College as a whole.

However, we recognized that the proposed restructure means that the program should be administered in the School of A&A. A large number of ICCR students have supervisors based in the School of A&A, and the external convenorship of this program in IHUG has created duplication and confusion for some students and supervisors alike.

We also recognize that the proposed relocation provides an opportunity to build critical mass for HDR students in the growing field of Heritage and Museum Studies, and believe that the consolidation of programs under the new Centre will do this.

Nevertheless, members of IHUG noted the importance of

- preserving the high profile of the broader interdisciplinarity of the ICCR program for the Research School and the College.
- recognizing that there are many students in ICCR who are working in unrelated areas of the Humanities and that it is important to reassure them that the program will retain its broad Humanities focus (ie that this move will not represent a narrowing of the program to projects in Archeology, Anthropology or Heritage and Museum Studies).
- that it is vital that we make every effort to continue to attract students to ICCR who are working in areas of the Humanities beyond those covered by A&A and the new Centre (eg. Interdisciplinary biographical studies, human rights, and world literature).

The location of the HRC, Freilich Foundation and the Digital Humanities Hub.

Members of IHUG OPPOSE the proposal to integrate the Humanities Research Centre within one or other of the four Schools on the following grounds:

Humanities Centres and Institutes have been established in all major research universities around the world precisely to generate an environment for advanced research in interdisciplinary humanities outside the conventional departmental/school structure. Indeed, no other major Humanities Centre or Institute globally sits in a Department or School.

Centres like the HRC work primarily as sites where humanities faculty from ANU and other parts of the world retreat from their core departmental responsibilities in order to undertake a period of concentrated research. At the same time, the programs of humanities centres such as the HRC - comprising of projects, fellowships, conferences, symposia, seminars and workshops – foster a
research and teaching culture which draws in scholars from across the campus. They bring a cohort of fellows into active contact with scholars and students from all disciplines.

The HRC’s permeable culture of excellence ought to benefit the whole of RSHA and CASS.

In terms of discipline previous visiting fellows, conferences and themes extend far beyond the disciplinary remit of any single School. For example, over the past 40 years fellows have come from literature, history, biography, art history and theory, art, music, musicology, philosophy, cultural studies, gender studies, linguistics, heritage and memory studies, cultural studies, gender studies, linguistics, heritage and memory studies, landscape architecture, archeology, anthropology, classics, film studies, law and human rights, criminology, political science, sociology etc., etc.

Realistically speaking the academic autonomy and diversity of the HRC would undoubtedly be compromised over time if it were to sit under any disciplinary based AOU.

**Freilich Foundation**

The HRC established the Freilich Foundation in 1995 through a major bequest (between $6-8 million) from Herbert and Valmae Freilich. The Head of HRC is the Chair of the Freilich Foundation Board and, along with the Freilich Fellows, is responsible for the delivery of research and programs in accordance with the primary remit of the Foundation.

Moving the HRC to a school defined by specific disciplines would impact upon the continuing relationship between the HRC, the College, and the endowment. The surviving donor, Valmae Freilich, has a strong intellectual commitment to the Foundation’s location within an explicitly interdisciplinary humanities centre.

**Digital Humanities Hub**

We believe that the DHH should be folded into the HRC as separate and clearly identifiable program. We believe that this is important in light of the growing role of digital humanities in interdisciplinary Humanities Centres and Institutes globally. The core international projects in the Digital Humanities are currently linked directly to the HRC. Incorporating the Hub into the HRC would consolidate this leadership role on behalf of the College.
SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY  
SUBMISSION TO RSHA CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

This submission is written on behalf of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology in response to the RSHA change management proposal released on 22 July 2013.

This submission addresses two of the four proposed outcomes listed in Item 2 of the proposal:

- **Outcome 3**: Disestablish IHuG through the co-location of research centres wherever possible with AOUs to provide a strong sustainable base and enhance research capacity within the AOU, while recognising and preserving the governance and financial structure of the centres to ensure that they play an important interdisciplinary role across RSHA, the College and the University.

- **Outcome 4**: Make more visible the emerging strength in Heritage and Museum Studies and locate it within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology which would be renamed the School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies.

PROCESS AND SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

A School meeting was called for and held on Friday 26 July, toward the end of the first week of consultation, during which information sessions and forums were held by the RSHA. Email comments and contributions were made in the week’s lead-up to the meeting.

The School meeting was attended by Kylie Message, Nic Peterson, Hannah Bullock, Simone Dennis, Chris Gregory, Patrick Guinness, Francesca Merlan, Dougald O’Reilly, Marc Oxenham, Tim Denham, Colin Groves, Natasha Fijn, Cate Frieri, Laurajane Smith, Sverre Molland, Joyce Noronha-Barrett, and Paul Pickering (RSHA).

Academic staff at the meeting voted (unanimously, by a show of hands) for their preference to:

- Establish a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies within the School;
- Transfer relevant IHUG components and people (Heritage; Visual Anthropology element of Digital Humanities Hub) into the School;
- Retain the School’s name at this time but begin an internal process to consider an alternative name that would more adequately signal the inclusion of the Heritage and Museums group.

As Head of School I have considered the responses sent or expressed directly to me, as well as the discussion and vote result achieved in the staff meeting. I have decided to endorse the outcomes of the staff meeting as the formal position of the School at this time.

In terms of the proposal’s recommended outcomes, this response indicates three things:

1. Proposed name change to be revisited/considered over the next 6-12 months.
2. Heritage and Museums stream should be made more visible by establishing as a Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies which would be incorporated within the School of Archaeology and Anthropology.
3. Cognate IHuG people, programs and should be transferred into the School. This is as described below but would include:
   - Convenorship and administration of ICCR HDR program (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies).
   - Convenorship and administration of Liberal Arts program (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies).
   - Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts (into Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies).
   - The Visual Anthropology stream of the Digital Humanities Hub (into Centre for Visual Anthropology in School).

See appendix 1.
EXTENDED RESPONSE

(1) Name change

The pairings of Archaeology and Heritage Studies and Anthropology and Museum Studies are commonplace in universities worldwide. In some places, the interdisciplinary fields of Heritage and Museum Studies are included in formal School names (e.g. Department of Archaeology, Heritage and Museum Studies at Leiden University), while in other places, programs in Heritage and Museum Studies are taught within Schools that maintain traditional disciplinary nomenclature (e.g. Division of Archaeology at the University of Cambridge teaches archaeological heritage and museums). The cognate nature of Heritage and Museum Studies and Archaeology and Anthropology is signalled by the growth in the post-war period in programs in Archaeological Heritage and Museum Anthropology. These have now become established and ubiquitous in many leading universities; and have generated important research outcomes.

In some places, particularly in the UK, Museum and Heritage Studies programs are affiliated with archaeology and anthropology collections and museums. The museums play an important role in the teaching and research work conducted by academics and students alike. It is not uncommon for people based in Anthropology or Archaeology streams to have joint academic/curatorial positions where they are based in both the University museum and academic department or faculty. They also provide a link and service to the community beyond the university which increases the profile and recruitment potential of the interdisciplinary fields they represent.

The School does not support the immediate change of nomenclature as recommended in the RSHA Change Proposal, however, it has agreed to conduct an internal process to consider an alternative name that would more adequately signal the inclusion of the Heritage and Museums group in the School of Archaeology and Anthropology in order to more appropriately reflect the work that scholars in the Centre do, as well as the broader global trends and context as indicated above. This process to determine a new name will (if accepted), begin alongside the implementation phase outlined for the RSHA Change Proposal begins.1

The recommended name change was rejected primarily on the grounds that the current School name is an established ‘brand’, and that any change to the School’s name would require additional consideration and consultation. While it was generally accepted that the ‘third’ element of the name should indicate the role of interdisciplinary presence of interdisciplinary teaching and research in the School, there is no agreement at this time about what that should be. Some felt that the name of the School was less important than the profile promoted for the component parts and programs within the School.

(2) Establish Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies within the School

- and transfer ICCR and Liberal Arts programs, people and resources from IHuG into this Centre

There are currently three members of Heritage and Museum Studies in the School (A/Prof Kylie Message (Head of School), Dr Sally May, and Prof Laurajane Smith). Reframing the stream as a Centre will increase visibility for this field – important both for attracting research grants (and working toward ERA submission) and building a student cohort.

We recommend that the Interdisciplinary Cross Cultural Research (ICCR) HDR program and Liberal Arts graduate programs (both convened and administered in IHuG) be transferred to the new Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies. The majority of courses included in three streams of the Liberal

---

1 Although it is outside of the scope of this submission, it was also noted during the meeting that further consideration could be given to other ways of highlighting the profiles of other interdisciplinary fields (Bioanthropology and Development Studies) through possible renaming as departments or additional centres within the School.
Arts program (Museums and Collections; Cultural and Environmental Heritage; and Visual Culture Research) are already taught out of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. The fact that the program has been convened in a separate AOU has led to great frustration, a lack of curriculum planning in some cases, and administrative inefficiencies. Similarly, a large number of ICCR students have supervisors based in the School, and the external convenorship of this program has led to duplication and confusion for some students and supervisors alike. We also wish to build critical mass for HDR students in the growing field of Heritage and Museum Studies, and believe this consolidation of programs under the Centre will do this.

This recommendation has been endorsed by:

- the School of Archaeology and Anthropology (26/07/13)
- the relevant elements of IHuG and the Head of IHuG (confirmed 31/07/13)

The recommendation to extend and consolidate the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies has been developed in consultation with key staff working in IHuG, principally the Head of IHuG, Prof Paul Pickering. It is proposed that following the disestablishment of IHuG, relevant academic and professional staff be relocated and affiliated with the School. This would include Prof Pickering, who is also convenor of both the ICCR and Liberal Arts programs, who would move into and become a key member of the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies, and the graduate student administrator from IHuG. Prof Howard Morphy, an anthropologist, would be affiliated with Anthropology and the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School.

The School is very keen to build on the new minor in Heritage and Museum Studies and review the Liberal Arts program to achieve better integration in the School through the inclusion of courses in areas such as Museum Anthropology, Archaeological Heritage, and Public History. The transfer into the School of IHuG staff already working in the Heritage and Museum Studies field (plus associated student body) will help provide the critical mass required to undertake this important work. It will also help the research output and profile of the area, and will help build research collaborations in this area. Prof Pickering is a public historian whose work comfortably sits under the umbrella of Heritage Studies. His work is closely related to that undertaken by A/Prof Message and Prof Smith and will further build our reputation and HDR student cohort in this area.

It is important that the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies achieve this improved profile as it will be a key element of the proposal that is currently being developed by the School for the Vice-Chancellor’s Office (DVCA) for new space requirements. We are proposing a new museum for the School’s collections that will have exciting implications for the way we teach and research in the School, and which will lift our visibility across the sector internationally as well as throughout the local community. In the case that the museum is approved, the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies will become a core part of the School’s operation and reputation globally. An additional advantage to the proposal to have a Centre for Heritage and Museum and a museum of the School’s collections will be to draw on high profile Visitors to the School and consider an annual conference or other event that would high light the School’s strength in Heritage and Museum Studies.

(3) Transfer cognate people, programs and areas into the School following disestablishment of IHuG

- the Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts
- the Digital Humanities Hub

The previous section presented a rationale for transferring the ICCR and Liberal Arts convenorship and administration and staff related to these programs into the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies at the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. This section considers the Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts and the Digital Humanities Hub.

The Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts (IPPHA) is closely affiliated with the Liberal Arts program (particularly the Cultural and Environmental Heritage stream) and would sit most logically within the new Centre. In addition it has other pre-existing links to the School.
The Digital Humanities Hub (DHH) in IHuG has two main streams. One is Visual Anthropology and one is digital media. There are currently two highly specialised professional staff members currently associated with the Visual Anthropology stream in the DHH (one programmer and one multimedia and film project office) as well as an important set of resources and infrastructure.

We are proposing that the Visual Anthropology stream of the program (plus resources including staffing and equipment) be transferred formally into the Centre for Visual Anthropology in the School of Archaeology and Anthropology (CVA), http://archanth.anu.edu.au/visualanthropology/. The CVA draws its membership from across the University and is home to a dynamic community of scholars working across the broad fields of visual anthropology and visual culture research. Its reputation is indicated by the recent award of a Future Fellowship in this field (located in the School), and by the fact that members of the CVA include several internationally renowned ethnographic filmmakers and anthropologists.

ANU is the only Australian university to offer courses in the practical and conceptual methods of visual anthropology at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and Visual Culture Research is a stream of the Liberal Arts program addressed previously. Courses are taught by academic staff from the School. Further, there are many HDR candidates (enrolled in ICCR, Anthropology and Archaeology programs) that consider visual anthropology to be a crucial part of their research and outputs.

Transferring visual anthropology fully into the School would resolve the problems of duplication that have occurred previously (where visual anthropology resided in both the CVA and DHH, and where the Visual Culture Research program was taught from the School but convened and administered from IHuG). The move would allow us to achieve administrative and collegial cohesion and establish a more focused, visible and less compromised Centre for Visual Anthropology within the school, through which improved teaching and supervision programs, research projects and public events could be fostered. It would also allow for further collaboration between this area and the Heritage and Museums (and collections) field, which has increasing overlap with digital and visual media.

A/Prof Kylie Message
Head of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology
31 July 2013
APPENDIX 1

School of Archaeology & Anthropology

2013 - Now

Positives
- School well known as a ‘brand’ in ARCH and ANTH
- Faculty strength in research and teaching
- Top ERA ranking – 5
- One of the Schools which deliver on ‘ANU2020’ outcomes to College and ANU
- Developing additional streams – BIAN, DEV STUDIES, MUSEUM/HERITAGE

Negatives
- Student numbers down
- Academic staff have not been replaced after resignation/retirement/transition to retirement
  - Dependence on sessionals;
  - Some cancelled courses/students can’t complete programs

2014 – Implement Change Management AND Replace Permanent Positions

Establish the Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies

1. Additional staff transfer from RSHA to add to existing School Heritage/Museum staff (Message, Smith and May)
2. Begin ‘branding’ of center in its own right (no dilution of ARCH & ANTH brand)
3. Transfer into SOAA relevant IHUG students

- Replace all permanent positions (3 permanent and 1 temporary) which existed in School so School can operate at functional capacity.

OVERALL RESULT
Ranking will stay up!
Student numbers go up!
Courses/Programs will be taught by staff (not sessionals)
Students can complete their programs!
Greater profile for individual discipline areas!
Build better teams – equity for staff
To: The Review Committee,
Re: Humanities Research Centre and Digital Humanities Hub

We appreciate that the staff of the Humanities Research Centre (HRC) and Digital Humanities Hub (DHH) have a wide mandate, that there are high expectations of what they can achieve, and that they are a major research asset for the College, since related disciplines are to be found in both RSSS and RSHA.

**Background:** We do not believe that best use is being made of this major research asset. There is little flow between staff and visitors in the HRC and SLS. There is no outreach by the HRC to SLS, except for the notices of conferences and seminars, and the information flow is haphazard. Close ties are further impeded by the location of the HRC some 10 minutes’ walk from the Baldessin Precinct Building, and by the fact that seminars are often scheduled during prime teaching time, and often change times. These constraints make it very difficult for School staff to get to seminars, in particular given their heavy teaching loads. The DHH has had some engagement with SLS (including proposing a jointly taught undergraduate course), but this has been due to the outreach work of the Director, Katherine Bode, rather than to the structure of the DHH.

The relative lack of engagement between the HRC and SLS researchers is regrettable. It is in part due to the lack of information flow, and in part due to the structure of the HRC. This is detrimental both to the HRC and to the research culture of Humanities at ANU. SLS staff strongly favour the HRC and the DHH moving to central campus, and having structural connections put in place to ensure that the considerable resources invested in the HRC and DHH are made accessible to all staff working in Humanities at ANU.

**Proposal for the HRC**

We see certain synergies in having the HRC attached to the new School emerging from the coalescence of SCI and SLS, but as a separate budget entity, just as the Australian National Dictionary Centre is attached to SLS. We note that the new school will cover more humanities disciplines than any other school in RSHA (literature, gender studies, ancient and modern languages, ancient history, film studies, linguistics), which makes it a logical umbrella for HRC.

Currently, there is no means to ensure representation of all humanities disciplines in the distribution of fellowships or the choice of conference themes. Most RSHA Schools have no representation on the new humanities fellowship committee, with the committee being made up primarily of IHuG members.
Regardless of whether the HRC remains independent, or not, we believe that better use needs to be made of the College’s considerable investment in the HRC to ensure that it benefits all humanities disciplines.

Two partial solutions to the information flow and governance concerns would be:

1. A rotating directorship – every three years – to be advertised. The candidates (drawn from ANU scholars in the humanities) would be asked to present an application not unlike a grant application to show their ideas for what the HRC could achieve in their term as director, and how this would benefit ALL the humanities at ANU. The director of the HRC, and the HRC itself, would maintain independence just as the ANDC does (for example, although being administratively part of SLS, the director of the ANDC maintains links to History and teaches courses and organises internships in that School).

2. A Management Committee for the HRC comprising at least:
   a. Heads of RSHA and RSSS
   b. Dean of CASS
   c. Representatives of all the AOUs teaching in the humanities.
   d. Membership, open for application.

   Responsibilities of this committee would include matters such as choosing the Director and Deputy Director, enhancing the educational activities of the HRC, assisting the HRC to make its budget sustainable, ensuring that HRC is maximising its benefit to the humanities across ANU, and promoting the HRC. Either this committee or a sub-committee appointed by it would assess the visitor and fellowship applications, and choose the theme for the annual conference.

Other remedies for the information flow would be:

- Having once or twice yearly meetings with AOUs
- Outreach by the HRC to the Schools in the form of seminars by HRC staff and visitors in the regular Schools seminar series, rather than in the Roland Wilson Building.

Activities that a renewed HRC could undertake would be:

- Brainstorm research opportunities – how can the HRC help actively promote research on the humanities in different AOUs?
- Research-led teaching:
  - Visitors and doctoral students could be encouraged to give guest lectures in undergraduate and postgraduate coursework courses – for example courses such as “Language and identity in Europe” or “Postwar German society” are obvious candidates.
  - On a longer-term basis, SLS is expanding its offerings of “common options” – courses in European literatures, gender and intercultural studies and so on that are taken by students across the languages, which are likely to expand further with the merging of SLS and SCI; specialist options are also offered (e.g. a 2012 course on the language of Italian legal and government systems). The involvement of HRC visitors, postdoctoral fellows, staff and doctoral students in such courses could be regularised, which would not only benefit the students and enhance links between the Schools and HRC, but could also result in some income for HRC through EFTSL transfer.
• **Marketing:** The HRC could carry out outreach activities for high school students in conjunction with Schools, to get students excited about the humanities.

**Proposal for the Digital Humanities Hub**

One exciting possibility for the DHH would be to move into the AD Hope building, and operate as a virtual centre with co-location. As visualisation is essential for understanding large data sets, it is natural that it be incorporated with text. While the scholars DHH working in text have close links with languages, linguistics and literature, those working in visualisation have close links with anthropology. Thus, in moving into the AD Hope, the scholars in visualisation could readily work with, and be attached to Archeology & Anthropology, the text scholars could work with, and be attached to, the new School of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures. Digital Humanities would remain as a virtual centre but with the advantage of co-location. This would parallel the planned creation of a Languages Institute with the co-location or near co-location of language staff in CAP, SLS and CAIS.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Travis, Chair of Modern European Languages,
School of Language Studies
College of Arts and Social Sciences

Catherine Travis
Deputy Head of School
Chair of Modern European Languages

To: The Review Committee,
Re: SLS / SCI merger

The staff in the School of Language Studies see some potential for positive outcomes from the merger with the School of Cultural Inquiry. We welcome the bringing together of the expertise of the colleagues across the two Schools in the areas of literature, film, gender studies, languages and cultures, and it is hoped that the transcultural offerings that can emerge from this will enhance the teaching and research that is being done in these areas.

While continuing to teach advanced thematic courses in these areas in the target languages of French, German, Italian and Spanish, we look forward to including students of English in our Common Options (classes that are taught to students across the School, with lectures in English and tutorials in the target languages). As well as undergraduate Common Options, some of our advanced undergraduate and post-graduate courses, in particular in Linguistics, will be of relevance to students in the current SCI, whose participation already contributes to LING2020 Structure of English, and would contribute much to such classes (e.g. LING6509 Quantitative Methods in Applied linguistics; LING8010 Language, Text and Discourse; LING2104 History of English, as well as our Anglo-Saxon reading group). Likewise, a shared Honours seminar would be beneficial to many, for example an Honours seminar examining literature in English and in other languages. The recognition of graduate education in the field of literary studies would be another positive outcome of this merger.

There are many synergies we can take advantage of across Classics and areas in SLS, not only in terms of the language teaching, but also for Linguistics, where there are shared interests in the structure and history of Latin and Spanish, for example. Further, the merger has the potential to aid in the sustainability of smaller programs, by increasing the numbers of staff in such programs (for example, for Italian, Film Studies, Gender Studies).

As recognized by the informal consultation committee for the proposed amalgamation of SLS and SCI (Dec 2012), we look forward to exploring new research collaborations in areas such as Global English (advancing on research already being conducted in SLS on Global Spanish), as well as new teaching initiatives in creative writing, professional writing, literary and linguistic digital humanities, book history, and an English language major. The latter in particular (in which we combine courses in Linguistics, Literature and writing) is likely to be highly attractive to international students seeking opportunities to improve their skills in English.

There are several issues that we would like to highlight in this submission that are of particular importance for the successful merge of these two schools.
1) The name of the new School
   It is vital that Linguistics be included in the title of the new school, to give visibility to this field, in which ANU research is recognised on a national and international level (ERA ranked 5; ARC Centre of Excellence expression of interest approved and full application currently being prepared). The School of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures is preferable to the proposed School of Languages and Literature, as, while including Linguistics, it is not cumbersome, presents three key areas in the new school in alphabetical order, uses the plural for languages and literatures to reflect the diversity covered, and has a workable acronym (SLLL “S triple L”).

2) Facilitating collaboration
   Co-location offers the best and quickest prospect of achieving all the benefits of amalgamation (though some SLS staff see benefits in remaining in their current location, because of proximity to the ETC and to colleagues in languages in CAP). Without co-location, other steps will need to be put in place to foster collaboration in research and teaching, while ensuring smooth running of the School.
   a. Administrative staff will need to be housed in both buildings, so that staff have ready access to the help they need. In Baldessin, for example, particularly important is the administration of sessional staff contracts.
   b. School directorship: A Head of School that rotates across the current two schools, and a Rotating Deputy Head of School that comes from the current school not represented by the head.
   c. A shared seminar series
   d. Shared staff meetings
   e. Support for projects involving collaboration between members of the current schools aimed at developing external grant applications (e.g. through RSHA strategic funds for research or for teaching relief to free up time for research).

3) Workloads
   The current Schools have different teaching methods and practices, and thus different workload models. Equitable models, that respect the differences inherent in the fields, will need to be put in place. No changes must be introduced to our very successful pedagogical model without detailed consultation with the teaching staff involved.

   Though we regret the increasing casualisation of teaching at ANU, in particular in the area of languages, the retention of a casual budget is essential for the maintenance of language majors. Failure to do so would be highly detrimental to our teaching, and hence also our research. Thus, it is imperative that workload models take this into account, and financial arrangements be put in place to ensure that an adequate budget for casuals be preserved for language teaching.

4) Strengthening ties with HRC and Digital Humanities
   Despite many shared interests with the HRC and the Digital Humanities Hub, currently, SLS has virtually no involvement in, and poor communication with, these bodies. In order for the shared interests to be taken advantage of, we propose that these units be better integrated with the new School, as is outlined in the attached document.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Travis, Chair of Modern European Languages,
On behalf of SLS staff
RE: RSHA proposal to locate Art History within the School of Art

Yes, I am strongly in favor of the RSHA proposal to locate the Art History Department within the School of Art.

Students involved in practice-led research must study Art History and Art Theory. The study and application of AH/AT is integral to and inseparable from the conception, design, and making of serious artwork. Most serious art practitioners understand Art History and Theory as living disciplines that actively influence as well as respond to contemporary art making. Art practice students are deeply engaged in Art History and Theory, not only as part of their usual required and elective course load, but as a weighted portion of their required learning outcomes and assessments for every course in their major. Many School of Art students become involved with curating prior to graduating, and become valued employees in gallery/museum roles due to their finely attuned powers of observation assimilated with an academic knowledge of theory and history, which allows for cognitive recognition of techniques, styles, and capacity to understand the full context of contemporary artwork.

Having Art History and Theory co-located within the School of Art is essential to the development of meaningful and rigorous art making.

The distinction between Art History and Art Theory is real, but is certainly not so disparate as to be separately located in two different Schools. There is overlap in the coursework and research involved, and much of the same ground is covered, with slightly different perspectives, in the introductory courses. They are closely related, much in the same way, if not more so, than Anthropology and Archeology are related.

Being located within the School of Art certainly would have benefits for researchers and students of Art History who see themselves as part of a living discipline with contemporary relevance. Being proximate to art practice invites and allows for deeper engagement with art itself as it evolves. The student of Art History stands to gain a much more accurate sense of materials and processes in terms of both past and current techniques.

Artworks are not just lenses through which culture, history, and the gestalt are depicted; they are the evidence of the very dynamic, tangible dance between observation and reaction that happens between a maker and his/her medium, an experience of materiality. Academic understanding of this engagement would be well served by actual experience of art making. This has the added benefit of sharpening the visual perception of the student through active observation.

School of Art department heads have expressed interest in developing studio courses targeted towards techniques most relevant to Art History. Having the Art History department within the School of Art would allow for coordinated timetables to facilitate this type of course offering, which has, up to now, been difficult to accommodate.
The processes and boundaries of art are rapidly expanding and shifting. Having primary source data, a valued resource for historians in general, seems irreplaceable. All of the extensive research that goes into trying to fully understand the mind of the maker, their materials, their constraints and opportunities, the ideas and the pressures of their time; that is all right here at the fingertips of tomorrow’s Art Historian looking back upon today. Locating Art History within the School of Art presents an opportunity for Art History to be more relevant and in-touch with contemporary art as it moves forwards, and to reflect upon and enrich Art History not only in the context of history but in analogous relationships to current art making as reflection of the contemporary world.

The School of Art already integrates Art History and Theory into every studio course, and would be that much stronger for the additional specialized breadth and depth the Art History department houses. In my view, Art History would gain much through co-locating into the School of Art and embracing the opportunity to engage with the actual practice of that which they strive to understand so deeply: Art.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission.