

## NOTES ON CREP PROPOSALS

**F.E. Emery**

1. I wonder whether it is not inviting trouble to designate the senior person as Director. Too soon you would get a person who thinks of themselves as The Director, and you are back to the fuhrer-prinzip. I am not joking about this. When we were setting up the Institute of Operation Research (UK) Sir Charles Goodeve and others of the O.R. Society insisted that it be headed by a Director, in the tradition of Government laboratories and the industry Research Associations. Tavistock argued strongly (but unsuccessfully) for a Chairman with its connotation of ‘temporarily designated first amongst equals.’ Whilst Neil Jessup was director the distinction was in fact meaningless. When John Stringer took over he became The Director, and the Institute had a very unhappy period culminating in Stringer taking a chair at AGSM. Same at the CCE. Up to the end of 76 Chris Duke played down his role and the Centre was managed on collegiate lines. However, when some decisions went against him (particularly a staff appointment which he wanted for his de facto) he took up his full role as The Director and CCE has had an unhappy period since.
2. Efforts should be made to have 2 and 4 of the outside members of the College Council serving on the CREC at any one time. These member have a ‘window on the world’ function for the College as a whole and what goes on in CREP would be fairly central to the College’s image out there. We adopted this practice for the independent divisions within the Tavistock, to every one’s subsequent satisfaction. We have looked closely at the CCE’s advisory Committee and are completely convinced that a fully academic committee is a disaster – they get to thinking of themselves as devil’s advocates and watch-dogs of the central academic values and actually try not to put themselves in our shoes. Advisory Committee is not the only one in ANU that demonstrates this mentality.
3. Explicit recognition should be given to the Meeting in College of the involved academics as the source of the CREP policy framework. The policy framework obviously would have to be acceptable to Council. If the Chairman or the CREC felt that the would have recourse to the Head of College and Council. If important disagreements are emerging about the directions CREP should take then it is healthier to detect them early and have them debated at appropriate levels.

‘Meeting in College’ is in contrast to and not a substitute for ‘meeting in committee’. It is a very old social mechanism although its modus operandi as a search conference has only recently (since 1959) been the subject of analysis. If it

is adopted then it should be laid down that they must take place at least once a year. At Tavistock and the CCE we found that we could not afford to go more than nine months before subjecting the policy framework to review. The sort of matters that figured large in those reviews were the fate of ongoing projects and the selection of new initiatives. This proposal would not be popular with many incumbent Directors and Head of Department but then even a staid body like Melbourne University in 1973 abolished, by statute the role of Head of Department. This, for reasons even more cogent for Kurigai CAE, 1979. (Vestes, 1978, 3-4).

4. Given the existence of an explicit and updated policy framework it is possible to devolve further responsibilities to the Chairpersons of Centres and reduce the extent to which the Chairman of CREP is constantly at the centre of the stage. The chairpersons should be charged with not only their responsibilities in the vertical line of authority but with the lateral responsibility of coordinating any policy changes in their area with other areas that is can reasonably be expected to impinge upon (including services). The Chairman of the CREP would need to be involved only when coordination cannot be agreed upon or changes need to be made in the policy framework.

\*\*\*