

REVIEW OF ASIA RESEARCH CENTRE

Review Panel Report



Murdoch
UNIVERSITY

REVIEW CONTEXT

As part of a series of organisational reviews into research at the University, a panel comprising external and internal members was convened by the Office of the DVC(R&D) to review the Asia Research Centre.

In keeping with the broader series, the intention of the review was twofold.

Firstly, to provide an accurate and detailed account of the Centre itself (not only in terms of its structure and purpose but also its links with other groups on and off campus).

Secondly, to evaluate the how Centre aligns with the University's broader research strategy.

In this way, the review was oriented by the terms of reference which have been addressed in the pages that follow and which, in turn, have served as the basis for recommendations to the University.

**Report Prepared by Professor Natasha Hamilton Hart
Panel Chair**

September 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report's Findings and Recommendations were as follows:

Key Findings

1. The Asia Research Centre makes a highly significant contribution to the University and it has great utility for the School in which it is located. It has put Murdoch University on the national and international map.
2. The quality, volume and impact of its research outputs mean that the Centre stands as a 'beacon of excellence' within the University.
3. The positive externalities generated by the Centre are of great value. Its success in developing a strong research culture, providing mentoring and intellectual support to faculty and research students, and attracting outside research grants have been outstanding. It is a major factor driving the ability of the Schools to recruit high performing faculty and quality research students.
4. The Centre is well-aligned with the University's strategic direction for research. The core strengths of the Asia Research Centre in areas of political economy and environmental issues lie at the heart of the Murdoch Mandala. These topics speak strongly to the radial dimension of sustainable development, with strong potential complementarities along the other spokes as well.
5. There is scope to develop fruitful cross-faculty collaborations with colleagues outside the traditional Social Science and Humanities disciplinary areas.
6. This is a critical juncture for the Centre, with the recent or impending loss of seven senior scholars who have played vital roles in developing and upholding the Centre's research performance, visibility, ability to attract postgraduate students and ability to lead major collaborative research programmes. At the same time, the Centre does retain several high performing scholars at both senior and more junior levels, representing a considerable amount of human capital.

Summary Recommendations

1. The reputation of the Asia Research Centre represents an enormous amount of capital that the University should seek to protect and develop.
2. The Asia Research Centre's value-added services to the School and the University arise from its catalytic role in generating a strong research culture through knowledge sharing, mentoring and collaborative research. The conditions that have fostered this record need to be preserved by ensuring that the University maintains a critical mass of Asia-focused scholars with the potential to be part of the scholarly community that the Centre has fostered.
3. Providing immediate assurances that there is strong commitment to the Centre at the University level should be a priority.
4. The Centre should be included as a prominent University Research Centre under the proposed Policy on Institutes and Centres.
5. The Centre should be adequately resourced in terms of administrative support. Implementation of the new university Policy should seek to reduce the administrative load; if additional administrative requirements are unavoidable, the Centre needs to be provided with the resources to meet them.
6. The staffing issue is urgent and on-going. In view of the loss of senior fellows, there needs to be a mechanism in place to ensure that high performing Asia-focused

researchers are recruited and retained.

7. To this end, there is a need to embed the Centre's voice more formally at upper levels within the University and its hiring units. There needs to be an institutionalized mechanism of consultation between the Centre and the Schools to ensure sufficient Asia expertise is hired at the School level, as well as to ensure coordination with postgraduate programmes, other teaching matters. The Centre should be engaged with planning to develop the strategic directions for University research.
8. The governance structure of the Asia Research Centre has scope for some alteration in line with changing circumstances. The panel proposes a two-tier structure consisting of an outward-looking Advisory Board and an internal Management Committee.

DOCUMENTATION AND PROCESS OF REVIEW

The review was conducted by a panel comprising:

Professor Natasha Hamilton-Hart (Chair)
University of Auckland Business School

Professor Paul Cammack (Co-Chair)

Professor Giles Hardy
School of Veterinary and Life Sciences
Murdoch University

Professor Chris Hutchison
Director of Research and Development
Murdoch University

Professor Vijay Mishra
School of Arts
Murdoch University

Professor David Morrison
Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Development)
Murdoch University

T Flanagan served as Secretary.

The Panel visited Murdoch University for two days, on 20 and 21 August 2015. During this time the Panel met with internal and external members and associates of the Asia Research Centre, as well as other figures, as listed in Appendix 1.

The panel consulted a number of documents made available prior to the visit to Murdoch University, including a Self-Evaluation Document prepared by the Director of the Asia Research Centre, a number of written submissions and other reports as listed in Appendix 2.

FULL REPORT AGAINST TERMS OF REFERENCE

The key findings and recommendations of the Review are based on the following report against the Terms of Reference provided to the Panel.

1. Determine and evaluate the purpose and utility of the Centre

The Centre is long-established with a purpose and objectives that have remained constant for more than a decade. Does the Centre continue to meet its objectives? Do the purpose and objectives remain relevant? Does the Centre have utility for the School and University?

The Centre was established in 1991 with funding ‘to provide analysis of social, political and economic change in contemporary East and Southeast Asia.’ Its objectives are to produce high quality academic research publications; to foster the development of high quality research graduates; and to contribute to public policy debate and public understanding on issues concerning contemporary Asia.

There can be no doubt that the Centre fulfils its objectives. The high quality of the Centre’s academic publications, the extent and quality of its research activities, its continued success in obtaining Category 1 grants (particularly ARC Discovery), its outreach and engagement with outside audiences, and its sustained record of excellence in nurturing successful postgraduate research students all stand as convincing evidence of the Centre’s contribution to the University, to the academic community and to a broader set of stakeholders. In view of this record of past and current achievement, it is clear that the Centre has great utility for the School in which it is located and the University.

The objectives of the Centre remain relevant. Asia is no less important to Australia than it was in 1991: the country’s engagement with the region has deepened, and the need for informed analysis of contemporary Asia has grown along with this engagement and the opportunities the region represents.

One question to be addressed under this heading is whether the objectives should be broadened to go beyond research on ‘social, political and economic’ change.

- There is an argument for remaining with this set of objectives, to focus on the strengths of the Centre and avoid overly diffusing what are limited resources.
- There is also a case for broadening the objectives of the Centre to include research on issues that share natural affinities with the Centre’s established expertise in the social, political and economic spheres, to cover areas such as natural resources, environmental management and business. These are all areas that offer scope for cross-disciplinary collaborations anchored by the established emphases of the Centre since 1991.

Recommendations:

- There is value in explicitly recognizing a commitment to inter-disciplinary research on issues of contemporary societal relevance. Not only does this align with the current funding environment, it fits what one of our interlocutors referred to as the transformation of Asian studies, from the study of ‘out there’ to a ‘platform for

collaboration.’

- Any such broadening in scope should be mindful of the need to maintain critical mass in some core areas of research excellence. It is not feasible to cover all issues of contemporary relevance and precise areas of focus should emerge from researcher-led collaborations that draw upon the particular strengths of Centre fellows and associates.

A second question relating to the objectives of the Centre is whether the current specification of geographic scope is appropriate. The Centre’s objectives specify research on ‘Asia’ and on its establishment ‘East and Southeast Asia’ are specified as research subjects. During our visit we heard opposing views. On the one hand, some felt that the focus should be narrowed to Southeast Asia, to recognize formally the current strength of the Centre. On the other hand, others put forward the view that the Centre should broaden its scope to include more coverage of China (an area of research strength in the past) and India.

Recommendation:

- That the Centre retains the reference to research on ‘Asia’ in its objectives. There will necessarily be areas of geographic concentration within such a broad region, and these will fluctuate according to the resources available to the Centre. It would be unnecessarily restrictive to specify particular countries or sub-regions in the Centre’s objectives.

2. Determine and evaluate the reputation of the Centre

What is the volume, quality and impact of the research and training conducted by the Centre? Consider whether the Centre has a local, regional, national and/or international reputation. Comment on the value and suitability of the name of the Centre. Consider the significance of Centre engagement with the non-academic community through media contributions and other public engagement.

It is hard to overstate the reputation of the Centre. It has put Murdoch University on the national and international map. Submissions to this review, conversations with interlocutors and the prior knowledge of the panellists are all in accordance on this point: on the basis of a relatively small investment in personnel and resources, the Centre has gained a reputation as a respected centre of research excellence that holds its own against peer institutions at other universities, including many that are located within much larger and better-resourced universities. As put in a submission to this review: from a social science perspective, the centre was ‘the only part of the University instantly recognizable’ from outside Australia.

The Centre is most known for its research on Southeast Asia. At times in the past, it included well-known scholars of China and its current listed associates include scholars who work primarily on Japan. However, from its inception ‘the engine of the Centre, its dynamics and its research culture generally lay with Southeast Asian specialists.’ To have gained this recognition for research excellence in a sub-region of Asia is something to be celebrated. No Asia research institute in any university covers all parts of the very large Asian region, and most interlocutors readily recognized this inevitable limitation.

The metrics of research output and impact provided by the University in the documentation for this review were not developed enough to allow for explicit benchmarking against peer

institutions. We acknowledge that cross-institutional differences in the architecture of Asia-related research institutes mean that such benchmarking exercises need to be approached with caution. That said, the panel is of the view that had an appropriate organization-to-organization comparison of research output and quality been carried out, the Centre would have emerged in good light. We are confident of this on the basis of a number of indicators:

- The individual citation data that benchmarked selected Centre fellows against peers elsewhere confirms the high standing of many Centre fellows.
- Centre fellows are comparatively highly productive in terms of published research outputs.
- Material provided by the Centre attests to an impressive volume and quality of active research engagements through fieldwork, dissemination of research in scholarly arenas and high-level external scholarly collaborations.
- The PhD completion rate and the increased enrolment in PhD programmes and other research students are impressive given the relatively small number of Centre fellows. Although such research students are all formally enrolled in their respective disciplinary departments, it was clear from interviews that the Asia Research Centre provided a critical locus of intellectual engagement, encouragement and support for the research students supervised by Centre fellows.

Other aspects of the Centre's reputation and performance largely confirm its high standing. There were mixed perceptions of the level and type of outreach conducted by Centre fellows. Overall, however, there is good evidence that supports the claim in Director's report that Centre has been active in media contributions. It has also been active in developing areas of engagement with government agencies both in Australia and in Asia.

Recommendations:

- The reputation of the Asia Research Centre represents an enormous amount of capital that the University should seek to protect and develop.
- There is scope to develop the outreach agenda further, while being mindful of the need not to divert attention from research. It is the research strength that provides the basis for successful and impactful outreach. With some dedicated additional resource, there is scope to ramp up the translation and dissemination of research beyond the scholarly community.
- There should be no change to Centre's name: the Asia Research Centre brand is an extraordinary asset.

3. Determine and evaluate how the Centre meets the School's and University's research needs (as well as the needs of any other stakeholders)

The Centre is institutionally located in the School of Management and Governance and has a significant number of affiliated faculty and postgraduate students from the School of Arts. Does the Centre meet School research needs? Does the Centre engage in a University-wide way in order to be cohesive and leverage benefit? Who are the stakeholders/collaborators? What value does the Centre bring to the research portfolio at Murdoch?

The Asia Research Centre serves its host School very well. This emerged clearly from the

submission of the Dean of the School of Management and Governance, as well as all other voices from the School. To mention just a few of these contributions, Centre fellows have:

- Raised the School's research performance in external assessments;
- Improved the School's research productivity and research culture;
- Provided research-informed and well-received teaching in both undergraduate and graduate programmes, positively impacting the student experience;
- Played important roles in the delivery of programmes in the Sir Walter Murdoch School, a strong potential growth area in the postgraduate taught space;
- Provided support and input into research and teaching links with Indonesia, via the Indonesia Programme, and with Singapore, where the SCRIPT venture is set to raise the level of Murdoch's engagement and build on its considerable teaching delivery in country.

The Centre is one of a relatively small number of 'beacons of excellence' for Murdoch and thus provides an important service for the University.

Collaborations within the University have diversified from the Centre's initial clustering of fellows in Arts, partly as a result of the move of the Politics discipline to Management and Governance, but also as a result of recent collaborations across the campus. An exemplary case that demonstrates what is possible here is the association of Professor Loneragan in the School of Veterinary and Life Sciences with the Centre, which has led to the growth of a successful research programme in Indonesia. The Centre is well-positioned to pursue similar collaborations across the University, building on 'bottom-up' research synergies based on staff expertise and interests.

Collaborations and stakeholders external to Murdoch University are wide-ranging. Centre fellows have earned recognized successes in their academic collaborations leading to external research grant funding, joint research programmes and in-country programmes. The list of successful externally-funded research projects provided in the Director's report testifies to the extent and quality of such collaborations, as do the projects currently being developed by Centre Staff.

Recommendations:

- The Asia Research Centre's value-added services to the School and the University arise from its visibility to external collaborators and stakeholders and its catalytic role in generating a strong research culture through knowledge sharing, mentoring and collaborative research. The conditions that have fostered this record need to be preserved through ensuring that the University maintains a critical mass of Asia-focused scholars with the potential to be part of the scholarly community that the Centre has fostered.
- There is scope to develop fruitful cross-faculty collaborations with colleagues outside the traditional Social Science and Humanities disciplinary areas, but these cannot be imposed from above. Successful inter-disciplinary research emerges from genuine synergies in the research agendas of those engaged in such collaborative research. The Centre may foster such collaborations through knowledge sharing and providing a platform that values research that crosses disciplinary boundaries.
- There may be scope to develop [more institutionalized mechanisms through which the Centre can engage with senior management of the University and its research office](#). It would be undesirable to add to the administrative load carried by the Director, but

there is also a case for embedding the Centre's voice more formally at upper levels within the University. This is particularly the case on issues relating to resourcing and staffing, to ensure that the Director has an ear open and a voice into, for example, the research office and School-level staffing decisions.

4. Determine and evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership and management

What is the leadership style and how effective is it in terms of team-building and ensuring contributions are made to Murdoch's research portfolio? Is management efficient its achievement of research outputs? Is the Centre's management fit for purpose? Consider the current governance of the Centre and make recommendations as appropriate.

Leadership has been highly effective and deeply committed, a major factor in promoting a strong research culture and its dissemination to the School.

Although the Director plays a key role in taking on administrative tasks, leadership appears to be distributed across the more established fellows. Together they have generated a collegial ethos that envelops a range of fellows and students associated with the Centre. Several relatively younger fellows and all of the PhD students we met with endorsed the leadership style and commended a number of specific facets, from hosting formal events to informal mentoring, fostering a community of scholars and providing opportunities for knowledge sharing and intellectual growth.

The panel encountered some dissenting voices that expressed a sense of not being included within the collegial support structure and atmosphere of the Centre, whether for reasons of geographic area of interest, disciplinary boundaries or gender-based barriers. These views stand in contrast with those of a larger number of current and former Centre fellows and associates from whom the panel heard, who expressed strong appreciation of the inclusiveness of the Centre. The latter collectively represent a diverse set of disciplinary and geographic interests, as well as personal characteristics.

The major management issue that was raised as a challenge by many interlocutors related to the management processes of the University: the amount of red tape, administrative barriers to research and cumbersome, user-unfriendly processes. The Panel believes these deserve to be mentioned as important issues for the University, but considers them beyond the remit of this review in terms of making recommendations.

Recommendations:

- An essential element of the strong and effective leadership provided by the Director has been the Director's personal stature as a leading scholar of Asia. This is set to be maintained with the designated choice of successor to the current Director, and should be a central consideration for succession planning in the longer term.
- The Centre leadership may consider its implicit messaging to ensure that an atmosphere of intellectual openness is transmitted to newcomers. There is ample evidence that the Centre has not operated as a closed shop, but the task of perception management is an ongoing one. Conversely, there should not be an obligation placed on the Centre's leadership to attempt to encompass all conceivable research areas relating to Asia. Similarly, fellows who do not feel that the Centre is relevant to their research should not feel an obligation to lend their names or research outputs to the

Centre.

- The governance structure of the Asia Research Centre has served it well, but there are options for some alteration in line with changing circumstances. Several interlocutors expressed the view that the Board might be more informed by perspectives from outside the campus and noted that the Advisory Panel was almost exclusively made up of academics. Any change to the governance structure needs to be mindful of retaining focus and academic integrity, as critical conditions for the Centre's reputation and ability to maintain its strong research record. One option for a governance structure that might be more useful to the Centre would be an altered two-tiered structure:
 - A management committee, resembling something like the current board, which deals with housekeeping, academic issues, finance and administration.
 - An advisory board with a preponderance of senior scholars, including the Centre Director *ex officio*, representatives from the Murdoch senior management team, and carefully-selected individuals from business, government and the social sector. Non-academic members would need to be well-briefed and well-chosen, so as not to represent a burden or a distraction for the Centre. Well selected, such players have the potential to serve as allies and bridge-builders for the Centre.

5. Determine and evaluate the financial model employed and sustainability

What are the financial flows (income and expenditure)? Is the business model for the Centre fit-for-purpose? Is it financially sustainable? Does the Centre's support from University and School/s produce sufficient training and reputational benefits and research returns?

The review panel did not examine formal accounts. The essentials of the financial arrangements for the Centre are that the Director's salary, minor discretionary funds and the Indonesia Programme are supported at the university level, while the School provides the administrator's salary and some discretionary funds, as well as some in-kind services such as office space (although most of these services would presumably have to be provided regardless of the Centre's existence).

Overall, the Centre runs on an extremely lean operating model: all major staffing costs are carried by the fellows' respective Schools, which in turn benefit from the teaching, service and research successes of the Centre fellows and the postgraduate students they supervise.

It is important to draw attention to the significant positive externalities generated by the Centre: its success in developing a strong research culture, providing mentoring and intellectual support to faculty and research students, and attracting outside research grants has been outstanding. Above all, its profile and reputation is such that it is a major factor driving the ability of the Schools to recruit high performing faculty and quality research students. From this perspective, the University benefits tremendously from a very modest financial outlay.

Recommendations:

- The continuation of support for the Director, dedicated administrative support and the modest discretionary funds are all justified. There seems to be no dispute that at least

the current level of support should be maintained, but the current environment is perceived as somewhat uncertain. Providing immediate assurances that there is strong commitment to the Centre at the University level should be a priority.

- While all awards are administered by Schools, there is scope to align incentives more closely between the Centre and the Schools in terms of the financial resources and obligations stemming from the current staffing model. Under the current model, benefits run in both directions, but there is also scope for tension, exemplified by the different perceptions of those involved as to where the benefits of Australian Research Council (ARC) successes are captured. Greater transparency and a commitment to ensure mutual benefits can ensure the positive-sum nature of the relationship.
- Changes to the external funding environment are likely to affect the Centre, making it important that the leadership of the Centre and the University develop a strategy for advancing research in this environment. There are impending national-level changes to both the ARC and other systems for research funding to universities. Although these are beyond the remit of this review, we are mindful of the likelihood that the funding pot will not only shrink, but will become more oriented to applied and end-user oriented research. This has major implications for the ability of Centre fellows to continue to attract the same level of ARC and similar funding in the future. This in turn will have consequences for their ability to sustain high performance research and quality research outputs. Given the Centre's role in catalysing research success, its ability to navigate and provide guidance in the new environment is important.

6. Determine and evaluate the current capacity in terms of staffing and skills

Consider the staffing needs of the Centre in the context of the current research, teaching, supervision and service loads of Centre Fellows and staff? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current capacity? Is there a need for skills training/development?

This is a critical juncture for the Centre, with the recent or impending loss of seven senior scholars who have played central roles in developing and upholding the Centre's research performance, visibility, ability to attract postgraduate students and ability to lead major collaborative research programmes. At the same time, the Centre does retain several high performing scholars at both senior and more junior levels, representing a considerable amount of human capital.

The panel did not see a need for skills training or development beyond that which the Centre fellows are already conducting. The urgent staffing issue facing the Centre relates to replacement and retention, on which we make recommendations under item **10** below.

7. Appraise whether the Centre aligns with University's strategic direction for research.

The Centre is well-aligned with the University's strategic direction for research. Its research record is such that the core strengths of the Asia Research Centre in areas of political economy and environmental issues lie at the heart of the Murdoch Mandala, with its identification of Public Policy and Governance as central priorities. These topics speak strongly to the radial dimension of sustainable development, with strong potential complementarities along the other spokes as well.

It is easy to envisage how the future development of the Centre could see it lead strong research programmes in the directions set by the University's strategic priorities, as long as these are not interpreted in an overly restrictive fashion. The key issue affecting the Centre's ability to develop its strengths in this way will be that of staffing, an issue we take up in recommendations under item **10** below.

8. Assess how the Centre fits within the current research structure/governance arrangements for the School and University

The Centre is located in the School of Management and Governance, drawing its fellows from this and other Schools.

Recommendation:

- Given the concentration of Centre fellows in the Politics area who are affiliated with the School of Management and Governance, it makes sense to retain the Centre's formal connection to this School. Although there are fellows with affiliations in Arts (and other Schools), this area of connection looks comparatively weaker. There do not appear to be any net benefits in returning to the former location in Arts.

One governance question that arises at the present is how the Centre should be located under the new University policy on Institutes and Centres. Provided that departing fellows are replaced, the Centre easily meets the criteria for a research centre under the new policy. Without such replacements this would be open to question.

Recommendations:

- The Centre should be included as a prominent university research centre. The advantages in terms of visibility, strategic location and influence within the University are all likely to be compelling.
- The option of having the Centre 'placed across Schools but managed within a single School' looks appropriate.
- The policy allows for a flexible administrative structure for centres. On implementation, this provision should be leveraged to introduce changes to lighten the Director's administrative burden. For example, the 0.5 contract that currently supports the Indonesia Programme could be transferred to the Director's office, depending on where the oversight of the Indonesia programme will reside.
- Given the high-cost administrative processes that many interlocutors reported on, it is essential that the new structure not impose additional reporting requirements or layers of red tape.

A significant cross-cutting issue relating to structure and staffing concerns the relationship between the Centre and the Schools, which are responsible for making all academic appointments. The Centre does not make appointments itself and has no formal control over whether appointment processes in the Schools take into account the role of the Centre or a prospective appointee's ability to contribute to the maintenance of the research strengths of the Centre.

One staffing model could be the direct hire of academic staff directly by the Centre, given that the Schools may not have incentives to appoint Asia specialists. This, however, has some significant disadvantages: the separation of teaching and research, and the introduction of a two-tier staffing model, with fellows on qualitatively different career tracks.

Recommendation:

- That the Centre continue to draw from the staffing resources of the Schools, in order to ensure that academic staff are securely embedded within, and able to contribute to, the academic life of their disciplines, including teaching.
- To ensure sufficient Asia expertise is hired at the School level, this model requires some institutionalized mechanism of consultation between the Centre and the Schools.

9. Assess the degree to which there has been implementation of recommendations from previous reviews.

No previous recommendations have been made available to the panel.

10. Make recommendations as to the future positioning of the Centre. Should the School and University undertake to:

Retain and develop the Centre, in accordance with specific recommendations from the Review Panel and School and University capacity.

Recommendations:

- The Centre should be retained and developed.
- It should retain the name Asia Research Centre, as this has worldwide recognition
- It should become a Murdoch Research Centre, if proposals for a new University policy on Institutes and Centres are eventually approved
- It should remain within the School of Management and Governance, officially designated as ‘placed across schools but managed within a single school’.
- Its administrative structure should be agreed in discussion with the Director, taking advantage of the flexibility proposed for Centre management (‘governance arrangements will be flexible and adaptable to allow for fitness of purpose’), and seeking to ensure financial sustainability through the sparing and efficient use of resources. We envisage that administrative support would be in the order of 1.5 posts (Full-time Business Manager/Executive Administrator and half-time Administrator), although additional resource would be required if new areas of activity or reporting requirements are to be added to the Centre’s portfolio.
- The Centre should have an Advisory Board that includes an internal chair (neither the Director nor the Dean) as well as external advisors; routine business should be handled by a Management Committee (Board Chair, Director, Dean and other appointees).
- Until a final framework is agreed and approved for Murdoch Research Centres, the current board should continue in operation. It should be charged, in addition to its current duties, with:
 - advising on the formation of a dual structure (Management Committee and Board), and preparing the academic and business case for establishment as a

Murdoch Research Centre;

- reviewing the current objectives and strategy of the Centre. These should situate the Centre within the Murdoch Mandala. The approach will need to be pragmatic and selective, to match the strengths and potential of the proposed centre and avoid too diffuse a mission.
- The staffing issue is urgent and on-going. Particularly in view of the loss of senior staff, there need to be mechanisms in place to ensure that high performing researchers are recruited and retained as Centre fellows. The necessity of retaining ‘critical mass’ was repeated throughout our visit, and for good reasons. The intellectual atmosphere and positive externalities provided by the Centre cannot be sustained if numbers run down too far or resources are too thinly spread. The Centre’s remaining fellows represent valuable assets for the University. Those at a relatively early stage of their careers need to be supported through the recruitment of some additional senior hires who can serve as mentors and academic leaders.