

Appendices

Appendix A: Details on our participatory process

Our deliberative process

Phase 1: Community Engagement

- *Public Survey: Open to all ANU staff, students, alumni, and stakeholders to gather views on governance reform principles and proposals*
- *Kitchen Table Conversations (KTCs): Informal discussions across all Colleges under Chatham House rules, capturing diverse perspectives from academic and professional staff and students.*
- *Governance Workshop: Representatives from all Colleges and major work units provide feedback on community-generated principles and proposals, ensuring diversity of ANU's staff and student community.*

Phase 2: Future Proposal Development

- *Finalised Reform Proposal: The Governance Working Group collates feedback into comprehensive recommendations*
 - *Public Endorsement: ANU open letter supporting the recommended governance reforms. Signatories become public once 100+ signatures achieved*
 - *Policy Engagement: Presentation to ANU Executive and policymakers, including Minister for Minister Jason Clare, requesting collaborative implementation*
-

Appendix B: Reform of the Academic Board Charter:

As a step towards an Academic Senate and to address serious governance issues, the Governance Project recommends an immediate strengthening of Academic Board. Council can undertake this work immediately via reform of the Academic Board Charter. Six thematic changes are recommended below, with new or altered text for the Charter bold and italicised.

1. In order to **strengthen the Academic Board's focus on the academic mission** of the university, the Board's objective and responsibilities should be formally updated.
 - Clause 3 should be amended to read:

*"The objective of the Board is to ensure the University **remains focused on its academic mission** and maintains the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research"*

- Clause 25 of the Charter should be amended to read:
 - "The Board's responsibilities are:*
 - a) *accrediting and reaccrediting academic programs and changes to existing academic programs;*
 - b) *ensuring the maintenance of the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research within the University;*
 - c) *approving degrees and other awards;*
 - d) *from time to time, deciding the degrees and other awards that the University may confer, other than honorary degrees;*
 - e) *discussing, developing and approving policy in relation to academic matters;*
 - f) *maintaining an effective overview of the academic activities of the University, and advising on them and assisting in their coordination;*
 - g) *advising on the academic aspects and content of the University's strategic plan;*
 - h) ***[NEW] advising on the impact of change management or major institutional reform changes on the university's academic mission and the quality of teaching, scholarship and research;***
 - i) *developing and promoting principles pertaining to academic freedom within the ANU and of its staff, students and official visitors;*
 - j) *advising the Vice-Chancellor and Council on the safeguarding and implementation of ANU academic freedom policy in general terms and in particular cases, as they arise.*
 - k) *providing a forum to facilitate information flow and debate within the University and between the senior executive officers of the University and the wider academic community;*
 - l) ***[NEW] reporting to the Council on the impact of governance on the quality of teaching, scholarship, and research, and the university's academic mission***
 - m) *reporting to the Council on the exercise of its functions, at the times and in the manner, required by Council;*
 - n) *undertaking any other functions given to it by this instrument or that the Vice Chancellor from time to time directs.*
 - o) *Monitoring academic delegations and ensuring the implementation of appropriate delegations to support quality teaching, learning, research and research training."*

2. **Election of Academic Board Chair and Voting Rights:** To ensure that Academic Board is able to effectively represent the academic voice of the university:

- Clause 6 should be amended to read:
"The Chair of Academic Board should be an elected member of Academic Board, selected via election by all members of Academic Board,, for a period of two years."
 - If a clause must be added to specify the process of election for the Chair, this must be designed in collaboration with elected members of the Academic Board
 - Clause 13 on Academic Board membership should be amended to clarify that the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, and Pro Vice-Chancellors are ex-officio members and do not have voting rights.
- 3. The Vice-Chancellor should be required to engage with, and take the views of Academic Board, on proposals for institutional change and resource allocation. Such proposals should be in writing and based in evidence.**
- See changes to Clause 25 under item 1.
- 4. Improving board transparency:**
- Academic Board and other parts of the University as appropriate shall include in their messaging clear information about how to attend and observe Board meetings, inline with clause 43.
 - A clause should be added under 'Reporting' to require that all parts of Academic Board meetings be livestreamed and recorded for dissemination to staff and students of the university, with the exception of confidential items as per clause 37.
- 5. Improving quality of information to board members:** In order to ensure that board members have access to quality information ahead of meetings,
- Clause 50 should be amended and should read:
*"50. Relevant staff in the Executive Portfolios will be responsible for the development and preparation of reports and other papers to be presented to the Board. Such reports and papers will be submitted to the Corporate Governance and Risk Office for inclusion in the agenda papers. **Elected members of the Board will be permitted to request a change in format of reports including the inclusion of additional data, and to request a member of the relevant Executive Portfolio be available to answer questions upon request.**"*

- A clause should be added under 'Secretariat' to specify that Academic Board members must be provided with transparent proposals from the Vice-Chancellor for resource allocations to portfolios and colleges prior to the approval of annual budgets by Council.

6. Improving quality of information to Council

- Academic Board must have as a standing, non-confidential item, a report to Council that provides an assessment of decisions of senior executives on research, teaching, and ANU's strategic goals.
- Clause 30 should be amended to read:

"The Board regularly reports to the ANU Council on its operation and activities. This must include an Annual Report that:

- *a. provides a summary of the work it performed to fully discharge its responsibilities during the preceding year;*
- ***b. provides a report on the performance of the senior executive in relation to their impact on the academic work of the university;***
- *c. provides assurance to Council that the University has complied with the Higher Education Support Act 2003 and the*
- *d. provides details of meetings, including the number of meetings held during the relevant period, and the number of meetings each member attended.*
- *e. presents all Academic Policy considered (approved or otherwise) by the Board, pursuant to this authority being delegated by Council to Academic Board on 28 May 2021."*

Appendix C: Reform of the Council Charter, Standing Orders, and ANU (Governance) Statute 2024

While some elements of reforming ANU Council must be pursued via legislative reform, much can be done internally to improve Council's capacity to offer oversight of the national mission of the university, the impact of management decisions on quality of education and research, and addressing the quality of information flows between Council and the ANU community. Council can undertake this work immediately via reform of the Council Charter.

Four thematic changes are recommended below, with new or altered text for the Charter bold and italicised. They include:

1. Elected leadership
2. Enhancement of Staff and student voice

3. accountability and transparency
4. Deliberative quality of council

1. Elected Leadership

In order to allow for election of Chair of Academic Board, Clause 6.2 (d), which currently provides for the Chancellor to appoint the Chair of Academic Board, should be removed (see changes to Academic Board Charter)

2. Enhancement of Staff and student voice

- a. The ANU Act establishes the Nominations Committee of Council and provides for the Chancellor to determine its six members who serve alongside the Chancellor on this committee “in accordance with guidelines determined by the Council”. We recommend that a new clause be added above clause 33 in the ANU Governance Statute to establish guidelines for committee composition. It should read:

“That the Chancellor must appoint half of the nominations committee from amongst the elected staff and student members of Council.”

- b. To appropriately compensate and incentivise staff and student member for the additional time contributing to Council activities on top of their work and/or study, the ANU Governance Statute 2024 Section 16 (1) (Remuneration and allowances of staff and student members) should be amended to specify that staff members and student members be paid for their contributions to Council. For staff this could be calculated as a time loading.

3. Improving accessibility and transparency of Council

- a. In order to improve transparency and accountability of ANU governance, ANU Charter Clause 11.4 (Attendees and Observers) should be amended to read:

“Meetings of the Council are livestreamed and recorded for dissemination to staff, students, alumni, and the general public, for non-confidential items only. Where practical to do so, meetings of the Council are open to staff, students, alumni and members of the media as observers, for non-confidential items only. This process is managed by the University Secretary in consultation with the Chancellor. Observers have no speaking rights and may not communicate with Council members during the meeting. The Chair **may ask members to vote on whether a particular item should be made confidential** and observers will be asked

to leave for such items. **Items can only be made confidential for specific reasons, and must be agreed to by a two-thirds majority of Council members. Having determined that an agenda item must be made confidential, the Council must provide a written justification to be published in the minutes.**" (This may also require updating of Council Standing Order 34 to align with this recommendation above).

- b. ANU Charter, Clause 19 (Communication) should be amended to read:

"Livestreamed Council meetings will be recorded and made available within two days after the Council meeting. Either a brief report, or non-confidential minutes, are published **within a week** after every Council meeting. Members and relevant University officials may also receive a summary of key decisions (excluding the discussion) taken by Council at meetings to enable resolutions approved by Council to be actioned efficiently. The University maintains a comprehensive 'governance' section on its website, outlining key personnel, structures, meeting dates and practices in respect of the Council and Council Committees.

- c. Presumption against Confidentiality

ANU Council Charter, Clause 12.4 (Confidentiality) should be amended to clarify allow elected members to determine if agenda items be declared confidential:

"Items can only be made confidential for specific reasons, and must be agreed to by a two-thirds majority of Council members. When determining that an agenda item must be made confidential, the Council must provide a written justification to be published in the minutes. Prior to a meeting, a Council member may only discuss with fellow Council members or the University Secretary, any Council business marked or declared to be confidential. When appropriate such matters may also be discussed with members of the University Executive, other senior officers of the University. Council and Council Committee members will exercise discretion and judgement in the use and communication of Council business and members of Council should refer to the Chancellor, or the University Secretary when in doubt. If a particular member is alleged to have breached confidentiality that person may be the subject of action by the Council, for breach of one or more of their duties under section 25 – 29 of the PGPA Act. From time to time Council and Council Committee members, in the course of their duties, may encounter personal information related to staff and students of the University. The Privacy Act 1988 imposes obligations on the University (including Council and Council Committee members) in relation to the use of personal information

contained in University records. All members of Council and Council Committees are expected to adhere to the requirements of the University's Privacy Policy and any other related legal obligations."

4. Deliberative quality of council

a. Improving Quality of Information Provided to Council:

- i. ANU Charter, Clause 14 (Access to Information) should be amended to allow Council and Council Committee Members to access information without having to go through the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, or the University Secretary. Clause 14 should read:

*"Within the scope of their role and responsibilities, Council and Council Committee members may obtain any information they need from any employee of the University and/or external party associated with the University, subject to legal protections and obligations with respect to information. Requests for information **are encouraged but not required to be made through the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor or the University Secretary.**"*

- ii. The Council Agenda must include, as a standing, non-confidential item, a report from Academic Board that provides an assessment of decisions of senior executives on research, teaching, and ANU's strategic goals. This agenda item must always be open for debate and will require amendment of the Council Charter or Standing Orders.

b. Improving connections between Council and the University Community: While no wording changes are being recommended to ANU Charter, Clause 17 (Induction and professional development), we recommend that these materials be significantly revised to include greater engagement with the ANU community.

This could take the form of a recommendation that Council members attend a College or School townhall or similar event ahead of each Council meeting (ie 6 times per year), in order to hear from staff and students about the issues most important to them.

c. Improving the quality of debate during council meetings: While Council business is often undertaken 'informally,' the principles underpinning the standing orders ought to be upheld (Standing order 24 and 41) and others require amendment or abolishment (Standing order 25).

- i. While standing order 24 (Time for speeches) does not require amendment, the principle underpinning this standing order (5 minutes

for initial statements and 3 minutes for responses) should be upheld during informal council proceedings with the aim of promoting a plurality of voices rather than dominance by the VC and Chair.

- ii. Council Standing Order 25 (Members not to speak twice): This standing order should be abolished to allow proper free-flowing debate in order to effectively ensure oversight. We recommend the abolishment of Standing order 25.
 - iii. We propose replacement of Council Standing Order or 25 (Chair to move debate on): ***“The Chair can put a motion to move debate on with a majority vote of council members.”***
 - iv. In order to create sufficient time for deliberative debate and capacity to conduct oversight of the university, The Australian National University (Governance) Statute 2024 Division 3.4, Section 19 (2) should be amended to read: *“However, the Council must meet at least **12** times a year.”*
- d. In order to better reflect the deliberative nature of Council, we propose that Clause 40 2b be revised to read: *“to represent the **diversity of views** of the Council to the University community, government, business, civil society, and the public”*

Appendix D: Operational Matters and Internal Processes

This section sets out recommendations for reforms to ANU’s operational procedures and internal processes. These are specific mechanisms and proposals to improve practices, processes, and policies so that the University’s day-to-day operations more closely align with the ANU community’s values of good governance. These measures could be implemented directly by Council or the senior executive team, without the need for broader institutional or legislative reform.

First Nations Voice in Governance Reform

This is deep and critical work that must be self-determined by First Nations colleagues and community and given time and resourcing to reflect the importance of such a process. The ANU governance project is committed to supporting this essential work through advocating for this work to be implemented.

Regular review of administrative and governance policies

Recommendation 1: Council should task Academic Board to conduct an annual or biennial review of governance arrangements and their impact on education, research, and the academic mission of the university. This process should be led by the ANU community and informed by an independent survey of views on the effectiveness of governance at the executive and Council, College, and School levels.

This recommendation reflects the importance of ongoing, community-led evaluation of governance at ANU. A regular review process, anchored in staff and student representation and supported by independent survey data, would create an informed dialogue between the ANU community, Council, and the executive, and help ensure governance structures remain transparent, accountable, and effective. Possible models include a reformed Academic Board, a University Senate, or a continuation of the ANU Governance Project.

Recommendation 2: Administrative policies, including the roll-out of new systems, must be developed in genuine dialogue with staff and students, and should reduce – not add to – the overall administrative burden on staff.

Recommendation 3: The ANU should conduct a comprehensive audit of administrative systems and policies at least every five years, explicitly assessing administrative burden with the goal of freeing staff time for the University's core mission.

These recommendations reflect concerns about the growing administrative load on staff, driven by constant system changes and poorly designed processes. Ensuring staff and students have a genuine voice in the development of administrative policies, and establishing regular audits focused on reducing burden, would help protect time for the University's core mission of teaching, research, and public good.

Procurement policy and procedure

Recommendation 4: The university should have a policy and practice of 'insourcing,' drawing on expertise within the university community first before engaging external consultants.

Recommendation 5: ANU must review and strengthen its consultancy procurement and reporting requirements to ensure they are followed in practice, and that all consultancies are publicly listed in real time with meaningful, detailed information about the services provided.

This recommendation reflects concerns about the overuse of external consultants and the associated costs, opacity, and misalignment with the University's values. ANU employs world-class expertise across a wide range of fields, and insourcing should be the first option before seeking external advice, with staff participation treated as voluntary and either recognised in workload policies as service or appropriately remunerated. A preference for relying on in-house expertise should be recognised as a principle on the Procurement Policy and supported in the Procurement Procedure by requiring a positive duty to demonstrate that Medium, Large scale, and Major procured

services cannot be performed by employed staff, especially in cases where the procured service is in the form of advice and not technical labour.

Publishing detailed, real-time information on consultancies would increase accountability, allow scrutiny of spending decisions, and ensure procurement practices align with community expectations of transparency. ANU should benchmark its approach against recognised best-practice procurement frameworks. See also Recommendation 4, where procurement policy should be amended to include a positive duty to demonstrate that the procured advice could not have been delivered in-house.

Workload policies

Recommendation 6: ANU should publish workload policies across the University and ensure that Clause 52 of the Enterprise Agreement is implemented in practice, with transparent and equitable workload models developed in consultation with staff.

Recommendation 7: The Enterprise Agreement should specify that fixed-term and sessional staff hours are to be calculated with reference to local workload policies.

Both of these recommendations reflect concerns about the lack of transparent and consistent workload practices across the University. Staff reported inequitable and unsustainable workloads, the absence of clear models, and the impact this has on retention and morale. Transparent workload policies, developed with staff input, would enable fairness across diverse areas, and explicitly linking fixed-term and casual/sessional hours to local workload models would close a current gap in the Enterprise Agreement and provide greater equity for fixed-term staff.

Performance reviews

Recommendation 8: ANU must introduce annual 360-degree performance reviews for managers at all levels, incorporating feedback from the staff they manage as well as from peers and supervisors.

This recommendation reflects concerns that current performance assessments for managers rely too heavily on top-down reporting. Regular 360-degree reviews would provide more balanced evaluations, facilitate accountability to the staff they lead, and help foster leadership practices that support equity, transparency, and professional development. The Performance and Development Policy should include principles for these reviews of managers and they should be supported by an agreed Procedure document.

Equity, diversity and inclusion data and policy

Recommendation 9: ANU must regularly and systematically collect, publish, and update disaggregated demographic data of staff and students, in a way that does not

risk identifying individuals, in order to reveal progress towards inclusion throughout the university and inform improvements to Equal Opportunity and other relevant policies.

This recommendation is informed by sources of frustration experienced by the community when attempting to gather data about suspected inequities at the University. For example, the disproportionate ratio of male senior academics to female junior academics at the College of Health and Medicine should not have required a grand initiative such as the Nixon Review to uncover. It is recommended that the diversity criteria should include wider demographic indicators of privilege.

Recommendation 10: ANU must ensure that diversity is actively considered in the composition of governing bodies including Council and university committees, with meaningful representation of groups such as Indigenous peoples, people with disability, and students.

This recommendation reflects the importance of both measuring and embedding diversity in university governance. Comprehensive demographic data that includes factors such as gender, cultural background, disability, language(s) spoken at home, place of birth, sexual orientation, and Indigenous identity would provide a sound evidence base for policy. Ensuring governing bodies themselves are diverse would give voice to underrepresented groups and strengthen the legitimacy of university decision-making. The University's Equal Opportunity Policy should include a positive duty to set and meet these diversity and inclusive behaviour expectations.

Recommendation 11: Where possible, ANU should ensure that casual sessional staff, staff on fixed-term contracts, and students are included in staff meetings, governing bodies, and other decision-making forums.

This recommendation reflects concerns that students and staff in non-continuing roles are often excluded from decision-making despite their central role in teaching, learning, and research. Greater inclusion would recognise their contributions, reduce feelings of marginalisation, and ensure decisions are informed by their perspectives. For example, students could be invited to attend School and College Education Committees and Academic Board meetings twice yearly, while sessional staff should be routinely included in departmental and team meetings as standard practice.

Staff psychosocial safety, satisfaction, and wellbeing

Recommendation 12: ANU must consistently publish Pulse survey results in a timely manner. The methodology must be amended to remove the requirement to specify work unit, to ensure staff can provide honest feedback.

Recommendation 13. ANU must establish clear follow-up mechanisms so that issues raised in Pulse surveys are addressed and reported back to staff. Staff must also be involved in genuine co-design of survey design and process.

These recommendations reflect concerns that the current Pulse survey process does not deliver meaningful transparency or action. Timely publication, anonymity safeguards, and systematic follow-up would strengthen staff trust in the process, while involving staff in co-design would ensure the survey addresses issues of real importance within ANU and contributes to a constructive dialogue.

Recommendation 14: ANU must regularly publish disaggregated data on complaints related to bullying, sexual harassment, and other forms of misconduct. Reporting should also include evaluation of staff and student satisfaction with the processes (not outcomes) of misconduct and complaint investigations.

This recommendation reflects strong support for greater transparency around health, safety, and wellbeing at ANU. Regular public reporting would increase accountability, provide a clearer picture of the prevalence of misconduct, and highlight whether complaint processes are experienced as fair and effective. Where complainants who have similar cases voice dissatisfaction with the investigation process, common root causes for that dissatisfaction should be investigated and learning documents generated.

Recommendation 15: ANU must establish a safe and effective mechanism for staff to report misconduct (including bullying and harassment), with investigations carried out by an independent authority – either external to ANU or an empowered internal ombudsman.

This recommendation reflects concerns about the lack of credible avenues for addressing misconduct by senior officials. An independent mechanism would ensure complaints are handled impartially, protect staff from retaliation, and help address systemic cultural issues that have undermined trust in existing processes. This could include standing up the Staff Ombudsman as recommended in the Nixon Review and establishing a pathway for the Staff Ombudsman to request investigation by regulatory bodies.

Recommendation 16: ANU must cease the routine use of non-disparagement and non-disclosure agreements in employment and settlement arrangements.

This recommendation reflects concerns that such agreements are used to suppress criticism, conceal misconduct, and protect poor performance. Ending their use would improve transparency, strengthen accountability, and help ensure that staff can speak openly about their experiences without fear of sanction.

Recommendation 17: ANU should undertake a review of “in practice of” positions (e.g. professors of practice) to establish clear criteria and benchmarks for their use.

This recommendation reflects community concerns that awarding academic titles to industry experts without academic qualifications without appropriate oversight and

supervision can contribute to confusion and mistrust as well as undermine the integrity of academic positions and titles. A review would provide transparency, clarify appropriate standards, and ensure these positions balance recognition of professional expertise with the preservation of academic values. As an example, where “professors of practice” engage with teaching duties, the Procedure: Knowledge, Pedagogical Skills, and Qualifications requirements for Educators should quantify the specific AQF equivalents for various levels of industry experience.

Appendix E: University Senate Models - evidence from the Governance Project and International best-practice

To inform community deliberation over the pursuit of a university senate at the ANU, we are providing two concept pieces below. The first is based on community views shared through the Governance Project, provides a case for a university senate at ANU, and forwards two models. The second offers a number of international best-practice models for consideration and inspiration.

Discussion Paper 1: The case for a University Senate at ANU

A recurring theme in the Governance Project was the need for a clearer balance between delegatING and delegatED authority. Many contributors imagined a “*big, delegatING*” body of staff and students to set direction, standards, and strategy, and a “*small, delegatED*” body (like Council) to manage fiduciary and administrative tasks.

The core conclusion the ANU Governance Project working group has arrived at is that there is broad support for the ANU to have a Senate as a delegating body. The question is, what organisational form will that take? This should be decided with a good process, and we need to take the above immediate steps first, then commit to a process of Senate design.

ANU should establish a staff-representative body to design, implement, consult over, and review major decisions. These processes must ensure open and meaningful dialogue between ANU Council, the executive, staff, and students, and occur before decisions are made.

The ANU community widely expressed concerns that current consultation is often tokenistic or occurs after decisions have already been taken. A representative body, such as a reformed Academic Board, a University Senate, or a continuation of the ANU

Governance Project, would help embed genuine consultation into University decision-making and strengthen democratic participation.

Participants in the Governance Project made clear that ANU's current governance is not working. Staff and students described consultation as tokenistic, decisions as imposed from above, and information as hidden or manipulated (see finding sections). Many spoke of deep frustration that their perspectives were consistently ignored. One respondent put it plainly:

'You spend your life giving feedback and nothing gets listened to under our current system.' Another added: 'The consultation for feedback before major decisions is performative at best.'

These experiences highlight a structural problem. The University lacks a representative body with the authority to ensure genuine consultation, transparency, and accountability. Without such a body, major reforms are developed in executive circles or by consultants, with little regard for the expertise of staff or students. One participant asked bluntly:

'How about consulting with the internal and external communities before deciding on something so vast like Renew ANU? And when feedback is given, really consider it and take it.'

The need for a decision-making body that listens.

The call for a Senate arose directly from these experiences. It is not about adding bureaucracy but about fixing failures of governance. A Senate would guarantee structured consultation, embed ethical listening, and provide a check on executive and Council power. As one staff member argued:

'Principles of ethical listening must guide consultation throughout the reform. This takes time and resources but it is essential for good reform, participatory decision making and community cohesion. It also leads to better outcomes.'

Participants stressed that staff and students are not passive consumers but key stakeholders whose knowledge is essential for effective governance.

'Staff, as key stakeholders in the university, need a greater voice in the university's management.'

'A university is not a business, it's an institution for education and research. It's packed full of clever people who care very much that it works well – we are not just employees, we are members of the institution.'

Transparency was another repeated demand. Staff and students want to see the data that underpins decisions, not just summaries crafted by executives.

'Let us see the data on which decisions are based, let us examine the recommendations in detail, let us debate the best way to change and move forward.'

'Be actually transparent and engage in real consultations.'

A Senate would help solve these problems by creating an accountability loop between the ANU community and Council. Council and the executive would be required to table Senate reports and respond formally to its recommendations. Staff saw this as the only way to end the culture of secrecy and disempowerment:

'At present, it is deeply disempowering to see our perspectives consistently ignored while decision-making is concentrated in the hands of a small group of unaccountable individuals.'

What might such a Senate look like?

Participants imagined a representative body of elected staff, including continuing, fixed-term, and sessional, alongside elected students. External experts could be invited in an advisory role, but the Senate would be controlled by the academic community.

Meetings would be open by default, with closure permitted only under strict justification. Its functions would include oversight of teaching, research, and academic freedom; scrutiny of budgets and executive decisions; and setting standards for consultation and governance.

There was some variation in design. See discussion below. The Senate idea is rooted in lived experience. Staff and students want governance that values their expertise, guarantees transparency, and provides real accountability. As one participant put it:

'A bottom-up democratic decision making process which involves staff and students.' Another captured the spirit: *'More than anything, I want to see ANU rebuild a culture where people feel safe to contribute. Right now, many do not. That needs to be acknowledged before anything can change.'*

A Senate would not solve every problem overnight, but it would create the institutional architecture needed for ethical listening, transparent decision-making, and genuine participation. It offers ANU a chance to reset governance on a foundation of trust, accountability, and respect.

These are conditions staff and students see as indispensable if Australia's national university is to recover legitimacy and fulfil its mission.

The key principle was that the smaller body must be structurally accountable to the larger, representative one. Two possible models emerged for how this could be achieved at ANU:

Model 1: University Senate replaces Academic Board

This model simplifies governance to two peak bodies: a new University Senate and the existing Council. The Senate, made up of elected staff and students with external experts in advisory roles, would replace the Academic Board as the peak deliberative body. It would oversee academic standards, integrity, and intellectual freedom, and give strategic directives that Council must operationalise and respond to. The model strongly embeds staff and student voice and re-centres decision-making in the academic community. The risks are Senate overload, role confusion, and friction with Council unless responsibilities are clearly set out.

Model 2: University Senate alongside Academic Board and Council

This model creates a University Senate as the peak deliberative body above Council, while keeping a strengthened Academic Board with more members, an elected Chair, and greater responsibility for academic freedom and integrity. The Senate would replace the Council as the organ of community and staff representation. It would set broad strategy and consultation requirements. The Academic Board would safeguard intellectual freedom, disciplinary and academic quality. Council would retain fiduciary and administrative duties but be structurally accountable to the Senate and Academic Board. This model preserves the Academic Board's historic role and spreads governance across three bodies. It is more complex, risks overlap or accountability gaps, and would still need legislative change.

Table 1. Models for a new representative body with powers in the ANU Act.

	Model 1 Bipartite University Senate + Council	Model 2 Tripartite Senate + Council + Academic Board
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Senate becomes the peak deliberative body of the University. - Council administers Senate's decisions; Vice-Chancellor and Provosts sit on both. - Membership: elected continuing, fixed-term, and sessional staff; elected students; external experts by Ministerial invitation only (non-voting) - Senate Chair elected by academic staff. - Open meetings by default; closed sessions only with strict justification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - University Senate sits above Council as the "big delegating body." - Council membership remains as is. - Academic Board is retained and strengthened, with expanded membership, an elected Chair, and a broader remit over academic freedom and integrity. - Senate membership includes representatives from Academic Board, staff and students, plus external experts in advisory roles (non-voting).

Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replaces and expands the role of the Academic Board. - Oversees academic integrity, teaching and research quality, and intellectual freedom. - Provides strategic advice and scrutiny of Council and executive decisions. - Council must table Senate reports and respond formally. - Council's financial strategies and budgets serve Academic Senate priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Senate sets broad strategy, standards, and consultation requirements. - Academic Board safeguards academic freedom, integrity, and disciplinary quality. - Council manages fiduciary and administrative functions but is accountable to both Senate and Academic Board. - Council's financial strategies and budgets serve Senate and Academic Board priorities.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplifies governance to two peak bodies: Senate and Council. - Re-centres decision-making with staff and students, strengthening legitimacy. - Institutionalises staff and student voice at the highest level. - Clarifies that Council serves scholarly and educational goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserves the Academic Board's historic role and expertise. - Divides labour across three bodies, avoiding overload. - The Senate can focus on strategic oversight while the Academic Board manages academic quality. - Clarifies the financial and budgetary decisions that serve academic purposes.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential confusion between academic and operational matters. - Senate could be over-burdened if it takes on detailed governance work. - Questions may be raised about community representation, given Council's Minister-appointed members. - Friction with Council possible unless responsibilities are tightly defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creates a more complex governance structure with three peak bodies. - Risks overlap or accountability gaps if roles are not clearly delineated. - More workload for a larger number of people involved in decision-making (but potentially at same or lower cost if remuneration reform occurs).

Discussion Paper Two: International Models of Collegial Governance Best Practice

A major theme that has emerged from the ANU Governance Project's community consultations so far has been a desire for greater staff voice in governance. Many specifically called for the establishment of an Academic Senate, or a majority of staff-elected members to sit on Council.

As we release the draft project report for community consultation, we have collected below some examples of good university governance from around the world to inspire you. We hope this non-exhaustive list demonstrates that there are realistic, widely-practiced models of collegial governance that operate in equivalent, publicly-funded universities around the world.

As one participant put it:

"The question is not whether academics should run the university. They do. The VC is an academic. The provost is an academic. The DVCRA is an academic. The DVCRI is an academic. The question is, rather, whether you want a small handful of a [specific type of] academics to run your university, or whether you want broad representation."

European models

The **National University of Ireland** demonstrates how federal structures can preserve collegial traditions whilst ensuring contemporary governance standards. The NUI Senate has member institutions, whose executive and community (via convocation) are represented equally, (2 of each from each). It is chaired by the President of each member college in rotating fixed terms. It has 38 members who serve short one-off terms, its own code of conduct, and oversees members' compliance with an agreed Code of Governance. This Code mandates independent audit committees and Annual Reviews of Internal Control Effectiveness and Risk Management and notes that: "the mere existence of risk management policies and internal control systems do not on their own constitute effective risk management."

Cambridge University is cited as typifying "academic democracy," where their Regent House, composed of over 7,200 current university staff and college fellows, serves as the primary legislative body and elects the Vice Chancellor. The Senate, comprised of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, all Regent House members as well as all alumni of the University who have a Cambridge Master's degree, Doctorate degree, or Bachelor of Divinity degree, elects the Chancellor of the University. The University Council is responsible for executive management of the university; it is formed of majority academic staff. The Board of Scrutiny, formed of 8 elected members from Regent House, as well as 2 Proctors and 2 Pro-Proctors, offers an additional accountability measure, scrutinising university accounts and Council annual reports, providing guidance to Regent House.

Oxford University also features a Congregation (over 5,000 members, including academic staff and college heads) responsible for approving statutes, major policies, electing Council members, and approving the Vice-Chancellor's appointment. Since 2006, Oxford's Congregation has used their power to reject an attempt to install corporate governance, to resist a code of discipline that was restrictive of staff and students' right to freedom of speech and expression on issues concerning the university, and to remove a graduate application fee viewed as discriminatory to those from low-income backgrounds.

US Models

As a public university, the University of Illinois system provides a particularly relevant model for ANU, featuring:

- A board of trustees, partly appointed and partly elected, handling fiduciary responsibilities (similar to University Council)
- A faculty senate constituted by all continuing academic staff with authority over:
 - All teaching matters, including courses and degree requirements
 - Departmental composition (preventing arbitrary restructuring)
 - Empowered to make subcommittees, etc., including ones to hear issues arising from (e.g.) casuals, students, etc.

Models such as this operate successfully across American public universities, including the **University of California** system, where UC Berkeley maintains its position as the highest-ranked public US university. Notably, the University of California's faculty senate exercises even stronger authority, including budgetary oversight.

American public universities operate under robust transparency requirements that could inform ANU's governance reform. This includes:

- Public and live-streamed governance meetings of equivalents to ANU's Council (detailed minutes published and often available on YouTube)
- Detailed public reporting on budgets, staff salaries, diversity, complaint records, and much more to education authorities
- Detailed and current budgets publicly accessible, including breakdowns by College and university work unit.

Even at US private universities, collegial governance is widely practiced. At Lafayette College, committees with a mix of faculty and staff representatives wield significant power in decision-making.

Harvard University is currently considering adopting an Academic Senate, as a representative form of governance to facilitate more effective shared deliberations and understanding on strategic, university-wide issues. Their intention is for this body to enhance communication both horizontally - across the faculty of Harvard's graduate and professional schools - and vertically - so that collective faculty views can be shared directly with the governing Harvard Corporation. Harvard already follows a Shared Governance Model: their governing bodies comprise Harvard Corporation (exercising fiduciary responsibility), and the Board of Overseers (ensuring that Harvard remains true to its charter as a place of learning and providing strategic counsel), the latter of which is currently comprised of the President, Treasurer, and 31 Harvard alumni elected by Harvard degree holders. Harvard's President is elected following a process that includes active consultation with the broader student, staff, and alumni communities, and the Board of Overseers must consent to the Corporation's choice.

There are many models beyond the above that could inform ANU governance design, including from Asian and Pacific Universities (for example, the University of Tokyo was raised by several project participants as a model of strong collegial governance). We are providing the above consultation information in the interest of time, and in the

hope that this sparks further discussion and interest in international models of best practice for university governance.