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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The 2013 Review of the Faculty of Human Sciences (FHS) is part of the University’s quality enhancement initiative and will enable the Provost to assess the Faculty’s performance. While there have been reviews of four of the Departments in the Faculty, this is the first review of the entire Faculty since its establishment in 2009. The Review itself was held over three days in the Australian Hearing Hub Board Room with over 20 group and individual interviews involving 65 staff, students, stakeholders and community representatives.

The implementation of a new organisational structure in 2009 resulted in the establishment of four faculties: Arts, Business and Economics, Human Sciences, and Science. For the Faculty of Human Sciences, this drew together areas of education, early childhood, linguistics, psychology, cognitive science and an opportunity to grow the intersecting health areas of the spread.

The Panel was provided with a self-evaluation report (SER) which aligns with the terms of reference of the review and aimed to provide an evidence-based assessment of the Faculty’s activities and performance over the 5 years since its establishment. It sought to provide an overview of the structure and resources of the Faculty and evaluation of the Faculty’s performance in learning and teaching, research and research training, external engagement, partnerships, international activities and a consideration of issues, trends and future developments.

This review and its resulting report will enable the Provost to assess the Faculty’s performance in relation to the strategic goals of the University over the past 5 years and its capacity to fulfil the University’s goals going forward. The Review considered the Faculty’s performance relative to its vision, mission and strategic goals and its capacity, in its current form, to operate sustainably and to contribute to the innovation needed to take the University in the new direction being developed in Our University: A Framing of Futures, the university-wide planning initiative being undertaken in 2013.

1.2 Membership of the Review Panel

The external review panel comprises the following individuals:

1. Professor Deborah Terry, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, University of Queensland (Chair)
2. Professor Sue Willis, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Social Inclusion, Monash University
3. Professor Darren Rivett, Head of School, Health Sciences, Faculty of Health, Newcastle University
4. Professor Gillian Wigglesworth, Director, Research Unit for Indigenous Language, School of Languages and Linguistics, University of Melbourne
5. Professor John Simons, Executive Dean of Arts, Macquarie University (due to misadventure, Professor Simons was unable to attend the Review)
1.3 Summary of Affirmations (A), Commendations (C) and Recommendations (R)

1. Structure and Governance

C1  The Panel commends the Executive Dean’s work in identifying the themes that integrate the departments and the centres that define and unite the Faculty of Human Sciences.

R1. The Panel recommends that the Department of Education and the Institute of Early Childhood merge into a single department.

R2  The Panel recommends that ASAM formally be established as a separate Department in the Faculty with the Dean of Medicine reporting directly to the Executive Dean of the Faculty and senior staff in the School being fully represented on the core Faculty committees.

R3  The Panel recommends that the Department of Health Professions be strengthened through the:
   a. shift of the other major health professional programs (Audiology and Speech Pathology) offered in the Faculty into the Department of Health Professions, and
   b. introduction of additional teaching programs in the health professions.

R4  The Panel recommends that consideration be given to the future focus and sustainability of the Department of Linguistics and the potential advantages for both the Department of Linguistics and the Department of Cognitive Science were they to merge.

2. Leadership and Management

C2.  The Panel commends the Executive Dean, Professor Greeley, for the strong and collegial leadership that she provides to the Faculty.

R5.  The Panel recommends that:
   a. the number of Associate Deans be reduced to two: Associate Dean, Academic (subsuming quality/L&T) and Associate Dean, Research (subsuming research and research training) and that the Faculty Executive be reduced in size accordingly;
   b. other roles, if required, be deemed as Directors or Assistant Deans who report to the relevant Associate Dean and attend Faculty Executive meetings only as required;
   c. the new Associate Deans be designated as standing deputies for the Executive Dean; and
   d. delegated levels of authority be clarified for the two new Associate Dean positions.

3. Finance and Facilities

R6.  In terms of budget issues that can be addressed at the Faculty level, the Panel recommends that:
   a. consideration be given to a revision of the Faculty budget allocation model given the discrepant student-staff ratios across the Faculty; and
b. appropriate training be undertaken to improve Heads’ understanding of the University and Faculty budget allocation model.

C3. The Panel commends the University and Faculty for the establishment of the Hearing Hub and the facilities that have been put in place to support the new Physiotherapy program.

A1. The Panel endorses the Faculty’s master plan and the recognized need for the space currently occupied by the Department of Psychology to be significantly updated and upgraded.

4. Academic Programs
A2 The Panel endorses the Faculty’s plan to grow the number of health professional training programs that it offers in the future.

R7. The Panel recommends that the Faculty:
   a. Clarify the role and focus of the proposed Bachelor of Human Sciences; and
   b. Consider whether additional academic programs might be introduced in order to draw on the strengths in Education and Health in the Faculty.

R8. The Panel recommends that the Faculty reduce the relatively large number of postgraduate coursework programs with small enrolments and focus on courses of strategic significance and strong student appeal.

5. Accreditations
A3 The Panel endorses the Faculty’s plan to provide support at the Faculty-level to ensure that departments meet program accreditation requirements.

6. Research
C4 The Panel commends the Associate Dean (Research) and the Faculty research team for the excellent leadership and support that they provide for research in the Faculty.

R9. In order to improve research performance, the Panel recommends that the Faculty:
   a. develops a clear research strategy for the future, with a specific focus on the research strategy for the Hearing Hub;
   b. ensures that resource allocation is consistent within departments, particularly for research higher degree students;
   c. reconsiders the definition of ‘research active’;
   d. ensures that appropriate HR practices are in place to build the Faculty’s research capability (in relation to selection of staff, workload management, use of teaching-intensive positions, and rigour of the probationary review process).

7. Research Training
C5 The Faculty level of support for the research higher degree program is commended particularly the excellent and knowledgeable support provided by the administrative team.
8. Student Profile
R10 The Panel recommends that the Faculty put in place a clear set of goals to increase the proportion of low SES and Indigenous students and that the Faculty’s leadership team ensure a Faculty-wide commitment to meeting such goals.

9. Staff Profile
R11 The Panel recommends that the Executive Dean address the discrepancies in student-staff ratios across the Faculty.

10. Community Engagement
C6. The Panel commends the Executive Dean for her commitment to the Faculty Advisory Committees.

11. International
R12 The Panel recommends that the Faculty develop a clearer, well-articulated internationalization strategy.

12. Future Directions

2 REPORT

2.1 Structure and Governance

The Panel commends the Executive Dean’s work in identifying the themes that integrate and unite the departments and the centres within the Faculty of Human Sciences. Given that the current Faculty structure was introduced only in 2009, it is testament to the strength of Professor Greeley’s leadership that the Faculty is already functioning as a coherent and cohesive unit.

Commendation 1

*The Panel commends the Executive Dean’s work in identifying the themes that integrate the departments and the centres that define and unite the Faculty of Human Sciences*

However, the Panel was of the view that the current structure within the Faculty is not optimal and, unless the existing structural tensions are addressed, it is unlikely that the Faculty will meet its potential. As a consequence, the University’s capacity to deliver on its ambitious strategy may be impeded.

In terms of structure, there are three sets of issues that need to be addressed. These are ordered in terms of priority but it is the clear view of the Panel that all three sets of structural issues should be addressed sooner rather than later.
2.1.1 Department of Education and Institute of Early Childhood

One issue that emerged early in the Panel’s deliberations was the anomalous situation of the Faculty having both a Department of Education and the Institute of Early Childhood (IEC). The Panel appreciates the long and proud history of the Institute of Early Childhood and the fact that, in the past, the distinction between Early Childhood Teaching courses and Primary Teaching courses was clear. However, the requirement for Early Childhood teachers in NSW to now hold Primary Teaching qualifications in order to be registered to teach in the school sector, means that both the Department of Education and the IEC offer Primary Teaching qualifications. This situation renders the distinction between the two organizational units much less clear and hence not justifiable.

From the interviews, it was clear that the Department of Education and the IEC are now working together more closely than they did in the past. Nevertheless, the fact that there are two units – within the same Faculty and University – with overlapping core functions has implications not only for effectiveness and efficiency but also for clarity. On the latter point, interviews with relevant external stakeholders pointed to the pressing need for the situation to be addressed. They cited a recent example of having received correspondence on the same issue (relating to student placements), separately, from both organizational entities. In a climate where it is essential that universities communicate with a single institutional voice with their external stakeholders, such occurrences must be avoided. Furthermore, the Panel received feedback that indicated a degree of confusion among students in relation to the current split between the Department of Education and the IEC.

On the effectiveness and efficiency side of the argument, it is clear that there is duplication in the support functions across the two entities. On this point, the Panel is of the view that the student experience would be enhanced if the collective resources of the two entities could be directed towards a single set of goals and objectives. This view does not refer only to professional staff support but also to the ability of academic staff to have sufficient time and capacity to fulfill their teaching responsibilities as well as to build strong and productive programs of research. Given the challenges of managing increased student-staff ratios in the Department of Education and the IEC, it was clear to the Panel that research performance in both entities is suffering as a consequence.

When questioned about the rationale for the continued separation of the two entities, staff referred to philosophical differences in approach. Such differences often characterize sub-disciplines within broad discipline-based departments/schools. Hence, the presence of philosophical differences in approach is not a strong reason in support of the status quo. Indeed, although external stakeholders clearly recognized the distinctive strengths of Macquarie teaching graduates, they were not able to point to any differences – philosophical or otherwise – between IEC and Department of Education graduates.

On this basis, the Panel was of the view that the Department of Education and the Institute for Early Childhood should be merged into a single department, perhaps called the Department of Early Childhood and Education. The combined department will need to ensure that the narrative around the distinctive features within the suite of Education courses is clear, and that wherever possible, resources and approaches are aligned around common issues, such as placements.

It is acknowledged that this will be a significant change. To ensure that the change is facilitated in a smooth manner, it is recommended that a change manager be appointed to assist with the process. In terms of the identity issues that may arise from this recommendation, the Panel suggests that letterhead and other collateral for the new department be framed in the following way: Department of
Early Childhood and Education, incorporating the Institute of Early Childhood for at least a period of transition.

Recommendation 1
The Panel recommends that the Department of Education and the Institute of Early Childhood merge into a single department.

2.1.2 Department of Health Professions and the Australian School of Advanced Medicine

The second set of structural issues relates to the emerging health focus within the Faculty of Human Sciences and within Macquarie University more broadly. It is clear that this focus is key to the University’s future vision, a vision that aligns closely with the previous decision to co-locate a hospital on the University campus. The opportunities afforded by this development are very significant; hence the Panel was of the view that a strong and coherent focus on health and medical sciences needs to be a core focus of the Faculty of Human Sciences going forward.

Currently, the Faculty comprises both a small Department of Health Professions and the Australian School of Advanced Medicine (ASAM). The Department of Health Professions is essentially the new Discipline of Physiotherapy. The discipline is developing well, with the Doctor of Physiotherapy on track to deliver its first graduates in 2015.

ASAM is focused on post-registration training for medical professionals who trained overseas. This focus is developing, but it is not clear how it will sustain a sufficiently large department/school in the future. Putting this point aside, ASAM has recruited some good staff and the research and research training foci of the School are developing well. Nevertheless, the Panel considered ASAM’s structural position to be anomalous, a situation that should be addressed as soon as possible. Specifically, the Faculty is currently providing Faculty-level support for ASAM’s activities, despite not having formal responsibility for the School or receiving financial resources to undertake this role. As ASAM’s research profile strengthens, the required level of Faculty support is increasing rapidly, a situation that is ambiguous in terms of responsibility and one that is placing strain on Faculty resources. Moreover, the situation is opening up the Faculty to risk, for example, because of the possibility that grant applications and ethics approvals may be missed. Compounding the situation is that fact that the Head of ASAM reports not to the Dean, but outside the Faculty to the Provost.

The Panel’s view on these issues is two-fold. First, the governance issue with ASAM needs to be addressed as soon possible. Our recommendations are that: (a) ASAM be integrated into the Faculty of Human Sciences; (b) the Head of the School report formally to the Executive Dean of the Faculty, and (c) senior staff in the School be fully represented on the core Faculty committees. These recommendations will provide the clarity that is required for staff both within the Faculty and the School. It will also tighten up the governance arrangements in a way that is appropriately responsible, given the increasing size and scale of ASAM’s activities. It is acknowledged that, in light of the University’s current focus and ambition, the Head of ASAM will need direct access to the Senior Executive. The Panel does not consider that this will be impeded in anyway by the School’s formal location within a Faculty. Indeed, it could be argued that it will be strengthened given that the Executive Dean will be unambiguously responsible for presenting ASAM’s interests in University-wide forums.
Recommendation 2

The Panel recommends that ASAM formally be established as a separate Department in the Faculty with the Dean of Medicine reporting directly to the Executive Dean of the Faculty and senior staff in the School being fully represented on the core Faculty committees.

Second, the Panel recommends that the nascent Department of Health Professions be strengthened through the shift of the other major teaching programs within the health professions – Speech Pathology and Audiology – from the Department of Linguistics to the Department of Health Professions. Not only is it highly unusual to have teaching programs of this nature in a Department of Linguistics, there is much to be gained from moving them to a more professionally-oriented department. Inter-professional education is now a major focus in the health professions at most universities. This is an important focus because it prepares graduates for the type of professional environment in which they will be working. Moreover, it brings about efficiencies in terms of the teaching of the core preclinical disciplines, the majority of which are common across the health professions.

As well as shifting Speech Pathology and Audiology to the Department of Health Professions, consideration needs to given to the type of programs that would compliment these programs (in addition to Physiotherapy). The Panel encourages the Faculty and University to consider the introduction of an Occupational Therapy program, given: (a) the obvious links that such a program would have with Physiotherapy and Speech Pathology; (b) the quality of students typically attracted to Occupational Therapy programs; and (c) future workforce demands in areas such as aged care and disability services.

More broadly, consideration should be given to the introduction of those courses that will facilitate a focus not only on inter-professional education but that will help to build research capacity and profile. Possible additions include: exercise science; nutrition and dietetics; and nurse practitioner training. Clearly, appropriate external consultation and detailed business planning will need to underpin any decisions about which additional health programs should be introduced. The important point is that the Faculty is well positioned to develop a significant focus in health given its current strengths and the overall vision and direction of the University.

Recommendation 3

The Panel recommends that the Department of Health Professions be strengthened through the:

a. shift of the other major health professional programs (Audiology and Speech Pathology) offered in the Faculty into the Department of Health Professions, and
b. introduction of additional teaching programs in the health professions.

2.1.3 Other structural issues

In the longer term, the Faculty will need to consider other structural changes, particularly after the cessation of the ARC funding for the Centre of Excellence for Cognition and its Disorders, and in light of both the formation of the Hearing Hub and the likely growth of the Department of Health Professions. In this respect, the Panel detected a constellation of factors that questions whether the Department of Linguistics, in its current form, is structurally sustainable.
Specifically, there is a strong rationale for the view that the Speech Pathology and Audiology programs should move from the Department of Linguistics to the Department of Health Professions (see Recommendation 3).

Moreover, it is not clear why the Translating and Interpreting programs are located within the Department of Linguistics rather than in the Faculty of Arts (alongside Macquarie’s strong suite of language offerings). Indeed, the Panel understands that demand for the Translating and Interpreting programs is declining, a trend that means that there needs to be the flexibility to deploy staff resources across the Translating and Interpreting programs and into other language offerings.

The rationale for these shifts (Speech Pathology, Audiology, and Translating and Interpreting) is strong, but if implemented, will impact on the future sustainability of the Department of Linguistics. There is already some disparity among the staff-student ratios in the Faculty that is being brought about by recent drops in student load in the Department of Linguistics. Specifically, the student-staff ratio is lower in Linguistics than in the other departments (other than in the Department of Cognitive Science, which essentially has no undergraduate student load), which suggests that the Department of Linguistics is likely to come under budgetary pressure in the near future. Moreover, the formation of the Hearing Hub has led to some fragmentation within the Department (and associated differences in resource allocation) depending on whether or not groups are housed within the Hearing Hub (see below).

For these reasons, the Executive Dean should consider a merger between the Departments of Linguistics and Cognitive Science, particularly if the Speech Pathology, Audiology, and Translating and Interpreting programs are re-located, as recommended. A combined Department of Linguistics and Cognitive Science would have the advantage of protecting the Department of Cognitive Science from the impact of both the future cessation of ARC funding for the Centre of Excellence and the budgetary pressures that are likely to occur as a consequence of the Department’s very low student load.

**Recommendation 4**

The Panel recommends that consideration be given to the future focus and sustainability of the Department of Linguistics and the potential advantages for both the Department of Linguistics and the Department of Cognitive Science were they to merge.

### 2.2 Leadership and management

The Panel was very impressed with the evidence of positive morale in the Faculty. It was clear to the Panel that collegiality is strong and that Faculty staff share a common purpose and vision. There was uniform praise and support for the Executive Dean, Professor Janet Greeley, both for her style and approach and for the leadership she provides the Faculty.

**Commendation 2**

The Panel commends the Executive Dean, Professor Greeley, for the strong and collegial leadership that she provides to the Faculty.

The Panel was also impressed with the commitment and the passion of the Associate Deans. Nevertheless, in terms of strong and robust governance, the current structure is not ideal. Specifically, the Panel was of the view that: (a) the number of Associate Deans is too large; (b) there is some lack of clarity between the roles (e.g., between the Learning and Teaching portfolio and the Course Quality...
Moreover, there is a perception among the associate deans that they do not have sufficient authority to be as effective as they might be, and that the roles, as configured, are not necessarily attractive, particularly for senior academics. The Panel was of the view that the number of Associate Deans should be reduced to two: Associate Dean, Academic, and Associate Dean, Research. Such a move would bring the Faculty in line with other major Australian universities, where it is typical for faculties to have two Associate Dean positions. Moreover, the Faculty Executive would be reduced in size; two clear deputies would be apparent in the Faculty structure; and the portfolios would be clearer in scope (and hence authority) than is currently the case.

**Recommendation 5**

The Panel recommends that:

a. the number of Associate Deans be reduced to two: Associate Dean, Academic (subsuming quality/L&T) and Associate Dean, Research (subsuming research and research training) and that the Faculty Executive be reduced in size accordingly;

b. other roles, if required, be deemed as Directors or Assistant Deans who report to the relevant Associate Dean and attend Faculty Executive meetings only as required;

c. the new Associate Deans be designated as standing deputies for the Executive Dean; and that

d. delegated levels of authority be clarified for the two new Associate Dean positions.

### 2.3 Finance and facilities

**2.3.1 Finance**

At a University level, two issues about the budget allocation model may benefit from review and change. These relate to: (a) the process by which the initial budget is prepared on the basis of retrospective load data; and (b) the fact that faculty income from student load does not appear to be differentiated in terms of whether students are international or domestic.

In terms of the first point, the fact that any budget adjustment for current student load is not made until sometime into the year makes planning difficult. This is notwithstanding the fact that there were discrepant views as to when the adjustment in response to actual student load data actually occurs.

On the second point, the approach that attributes international student load with the same per EFTSL funding as domestic students appears to limit the incentive to attract international student load at the department/faculty level. One response could be to allocate higher funding for international students than domestic students, at least for postgraduate coursework students.

These are clearly broader University, rather than Faculty, issues. Nevertheless, there are some budgetary concerns at the Faculty level that do need to be addressed. The discrepant student-staff ratios across departments concerned the Panel, particularly given the signs of adverse effects of large student-staff ratios in some parts of the Faculty. This issue needs to be addressed, if the teaching and research outcomes across the Faculty are to be strengthened. It was also apparent to the Panel that Heads do not have a good understanding of the University and Faculty budget allocation models. This understanding is essential if the Heads are to lead effectively in an environment where it is likely that higher education funding will continue to be challenging.
Recommendation 6

In terms of budget issues that can be addressed at the Faculty level, the Panel recommends that:

a. consideration be given to a revision of the Faculty budget allocation model given the discrepant student-staff ratios across the Faculty; and

b. appropriate training be undertaken to improve Heads’ understanding of the University and Faculty budget allocation model.

2.3.2 Facilities

The panel commends the University and the Faculty for the work that has been undertaken to support and establish the Hearing Hub and to ensure that the new Physiotherapy program has appropriate infrastructure. These are world-class facilities that position the University and the Faculty very well for the future.

Commendation 3

The Panel commends the University and Faculty for the establishment of the Hearing Hub and the facilities that have been put in place to support the new Physiotherapy program.

The Panel strongly endorses the Faculty’s Master Plan. The goal of co-locating more of the Faculty’s activities is essential if the structural changes outlined above, particularly in relation to the Department of Education and the Institute of Early Childhood, are to realize the anticipated benefits. The need to renew the space for the Department of Psychology is clearly an imperative. The University’s support for this project is endorsed, as is the approach that the Department is taking to develop shared rather than ‘owned’ research space.

Affirmation 1

The Panel endorses the Faculty’s master plan and the recognized need for the space currently occupied by the Department of Psychology to be significantly updated and upgraded.

2.4 Academic Programs

A number of comments have been made above in relation to academic programs, particularly in relation to the burgeoning focus in the Faculty on the health professions. The Panel is supportive of this plan – it maps on very well to the overall direction of the University and, indeed, the broader health workforce issues that will undoubtedly continue to be significant challenges for governments in the future.

Affirmation 2

The Panel endorses the Faculty’s plan to grow the number of health professional training programs that it offers in the future.

In terms of other specific points, the Panel understands that there is a plan to introduce a Bachelor of Human Sciences. The purpose of this program was not made as clear as it might have been. In particular, it was unclear to what extent it is intended to act as a pathway to the Faculty’s major teaching programs in health. If this is the case, the implications of such a degree program for the future of the Bachelor of Speech and Hearing, a distinctive program that has been offered by Macquarie University for sometime, will need to be carefully thought through.
Given the Faculty's focus, there is capacity for distinctive academic programs that draw on the Faculty's strengths in education and health to be introduced. For instance, consideration might be given to the training of teachers who have the skills to deal effectively with special needs children in classroom settings, particularly those children who have speech and hearing difficulties.

At a broader University level, the extent to which there are robust processes in place to ensure good inter-faculty relationships around the approval of and input into programs led by another faculty was unclear. This point was apparent when an effort was made to understand the links between the language programs offered by the Faculty of Human Sciences and the Faculty of Arts, and it was also evident when Faculty staff were asked to outline how inter-faculty teaching relationships were managed.

**Recommendation 7**

*The Panel recommends that the Faculty:*

- Clarify the role and focus of the proposed Bachelor of Human Sciences; and
- Consider whether additional academic programs might be introduced in order to draw on the strengths in Education and Health in the Faculty.

At the postgraduate level, the large number of coursework programs with relatively small enrolments needs to be addressed as a matter of some urgency. This is a major challenge for most Australian universities, but that reality simply strengthens the need for attention to ensure that the Faculty's academic resources are utilized in the most efficient and effective manner, and that its programs offer distinct and coherent experiences for students.

**Recommendation 8**

*The Panel recommends that the Faculty reduce the relatively large number of postgraduate coursework programs with small enrolments and focus on courses of strategic significance and strong student appeal.*

2.5 **Accreditation**

The Panel was impressed with the Faculty’s approach to course accreditation issues. In a Faculty of this type, successful accreditation reviews are essential to the reputation of the programs and the University, but they entail a significant overhead in terms of support for and understanding of the specific accreditation requirements and processes. The Panel endorses the new Faculty-level resource that is being proposed to support departments to deal effectively with accreditation reviews. This support should assist departments to prepare the necessary documentation for accreditation visits; to follow-up, systematically, on review recommendations; and to archive and track relevant materials.

**Affirmation 3**

*The Panel endorses the Faculty’s plan to provide support at the Faculty-level to ensure that departments meet program accreditation requirements.*

In terms of workload for staff in departments, it would be very helpful if the link between periodic accreditation reviews and University reviews could be strengthened. This can be achieved by allowing
the joint occurrence of such reviews, with the expectation that any distinctive accreditation and/or Macquarie University requirements are satisfied through the common review process.

2.6 Research

The Faculty has a number of high points in research, most notably the ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders and the recent establishment of the Hearing Hub, which co-locates relevant research groups and service providers in the broad field of language and hearing disorders.

In terms of research support, it is clear that the support provided by the Associate Dean (Research) and the research team in the Faculty is excellent and much appreciated by staff across the Faculty.

Commendation 4

The Panel commends the Associate Dean (Research) and the Faculty research team for the excellent leadership and support that they provide for research in the Faculty.

The 2012 ERA outcomes reflect the breadth of research capacity in the Faculty, and the improvement in 1303 (Specialist Studies in Education) and 2000 (Linguistics) from 3s to 4s is commendable. However, the shift from 5s to 3s in 1700 (Psychology and Cognitive Science) and 1702 (Cognitive Science) is concerning, as is the shift from a 4 to a 3 in 1701 (Psychology), particularly given Macquarie’s substantial investment in these areas over a considerable period of time. Understanding the basis for these declines in performance from 2010 to 2012 is important.

In addition to the recent ERA outcomes, there were indications that research performance within the Faculty needs to improve. Although the establishment of the Hearing Hub is positive, there were external reports of a lack of a shared research strategy for the Hub, as well as some complexities in terms of resource allocation as a consequence of whether a research group is located in the Hub or not. This appears to be most problematic in relation to allocation of resources for research higher degree students.

More broadly, there does not appear to be a clear research strategy at the Faculty level. There are declining levels of external research funding in Linguistics and Education and the University’s definition of research active (adopted at the Faculty level) is not sufficiently strong. Indeed, it would appear that a person can be classified as being research active without engaging in very much research at all. This definition needs to be tightened up considerably, and focused effort needs to be put into managing the long tail in research performance.

Multiple strategies will be needed to deal with this situation – effective workload management is essential, as is the systematic introduction of teaching intensive positions that are integrated into the promotions system. In addition, it is imperative that when new members of staff are selected, research performance is appropriately taken into account. The Panel heard reports pointing to the fact that high student-staff ratios in some parts of the Faculty are leading Heads to recruit staff who may not necessarily have the requisite research track record. This short-term approach to staffing needs is shortsighted and is more likely to perpetuate staffing difficulties in the longer term than to solve them, since a declining research strength in certain fields will act as a deterrent to talented early career academics applying for positions.
Any university that seeks to remain or to become a research leader must use the probationary period for teaching and research staff to ensure that its staffing profile is appropriate. The Panel heard disconcerting evidence that probationary periods, even for very early career researchers, can be very short (a year) and that the processes for ensuring and assessing outcomes during the probationary period may be less than optimal. The possibility that appointments may sometimes be made without strong evidence of research capability makes it even more imperative that the probationary period works well.

**Recommendation 9**

**In order to improve research performance, the Panel recommends that the Faculty:**

- a. develops a clear research strategy for the future, with a specific focus on the research strategy for the Hearing Hub;
- b. ensures that resource allocation is consistent within departments, particularly for research higher degree students;
- c. reconsiders the definition of ‘research active’;
- d. ensures that appropriate HR practices are in place to build the Faculty’s research capability (in relation to selection of staff, workload management, use of teaching-intensive positions, and rigour of the probationary review process).

**2.7 Research Training**

Overall, it is clear that the Faculty takes research higher degree training seriously. Total HDR load is relatively high at Macquarie, and completion rates have been steadily increasing. Macquarie’s new research training model is interesting, although the impact on PhD numbers will need to monitored closely to ensure that the Masters step does not deter students from either entering the research training pathway or proceeding through to the PhD.

Resources provided to students appear to be very good although, as noted above, there do seem to be some inequities depending on whether or not a student is working with a research group housed in the Hearing Hub. Faculty support for research higher degree students, both administrative and in the form of programs such as the Research Showcase and the Writing Program, is commendable.

**Commendation 5**

*The Faculty level of support for the research higher degree program is commended particularly the excellent and knowledgeable support provided by the administrative team.*

**2.8 Student Profile**

The Faculty’s overall student load has been growing significantly in recent years; indeed the rate of growth at Macquarie since 2009 has been highest in the Faculty of Human Sciences. However, the diversity of the student body – particularly in relation to socio-economic status and Indigenous status – does not seem to be attracting the level of attention that would be expected from such a Faculty, particularly given the recent Commonwealth focus on these areas.
Recommendation 10
The Panel recommends that the Faculty put in place a clear set of goals to increase the proportion of low SES and Indigenous students and that the Faculty’s leadership team ensure a Faculty-wide commitment to meeting such goals.

2.9 Staff Profile

In terms of the staff profile, there are discrepant student-staff ratios across departments, ranging in 2012 from a very low ratio of 7.44 in the Department of Cognitive Science through to 15.37 in the Department of Linguistics and more than 30:1 in the Department of Education and the Institute of Early Childhood. These discrepancies are an issue that the Executive Dean needs to manage. As noted above, the Panel is of the view that to do so, structural change will be necessary both in relation to the two Education entities and in relation to the interplay among the Departments of Linguistics, Health Professions, and Cognitive Science.

Recommendation 11
The Panel recommends that the Executive Dean address the discrepancies in student-staff ratios across the Faculty.

Induction processes (co-ordinated by the University) appear to be excellent. There are however some HR processes that need to be strengthened. These have been raised in earlier sections of this report. They relate to the management of research inactive staff and effective workload management, as well as the apparent discrepancies in probationary periods (prior to confirmation) for academic staff and what appears to be a ‘light touch’ approach to the probationary period itself. It is suggested that the Faculty take some leadership at a University level to propose and drive changes in these matters.

2.10 Community Engagement

The panel was impressed with the priority that the Executive Dean and the Faculty place on community engagement. There is a strong commitment to the PACE program and to the role that University clinics play, both as a vehicle both for professional training and community engagement. The Executive Dean’s commitment to community engagement was noteworthy, particularly through her establishment of and commitment to the Faculty’s Advisory Committees.

Commendation 6
The Panel commends the Executive Dean for her commitment to the Faculty Advisory Committees.

2.11 International

The Panel was aware that, at the time of their visit, Macquarie was anticipating the arrival of the newly appointed Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International). Given the importance of international student revenue to the University and the strategic importance of the area, this will be an important new appointment that will undoubtedly play a key role in terms of setting the Faculty’s internationalization strategy.

Nevertheless, the Faculty’s approach to internationalization needs to be more clearly articulated than is currently the case, particularly in terms of the intention and purpose of international engagement.
Such a strategy needs to have buy-in from the Heads of Department. Key questions include: What is the Faculty seeking to achieve through internationalization? In which areas is it seeking more international students? What strategic international research partnerships is the Faculty seeking to establish or strengthen?

**Recommendation 12**  
*The Panel recommends that the Faculty develop a clearer, well-articulated internationalization strategy.*

### 3 APPENDICES

#### 3.1 Review Terms of Reference

1 **Structure and Governance**  
   Review the effectiveness of planning, leadership and management structure, processes and resources in supporting University strategic priorities.

2 **Leadership and Management**  
   Review the organisational structure of the Faculty and consider its appropriateness to the future development of the Faculty and the wider University. Include in the Review the presence of structures and mechanisms that contribute to inter-disciplinary collaboration and collaboration between faculties.

3 **Finance and Facilities**  
   Review the appropriateness of the current Faculty Funding Model and the funding distribution to Departments within the Faculty. Review the adequacy of facilities for current needs and future growth in achieving Faculty and University strategy in teaching, research and HDR.

4 **Academic Program**  
   Review the appropriateness of the degrees, programs, and numbers of units offered by the Faculty with reference to University priorities, employer and professional community demands.

5 **Accreditations**  
   Review the current accreditations associated with the Faculty and the ability of the Faculty to meet current and future government and professional accreditations.

6 **Research**  
   Review current research outputs, activity, and capability relative to University objectives including opportunities for developing research and knowledge leadership.

7 **Research Training**  
   Review the HDR program, including admission standards, methodology and skills training, completion times and drop-out rates, supervision and reporting standards.

8 **Student Profile**  
   Review the alignment of student profile and student support relative to current and future objectives and plans.
9 Staff Profile
   Review the alignment of academic, professional, and student profile relative to current and future objectives and plans and the recruitment and induction of new staff into the research and teaching culture of the Faculty.

10 Community Engagement
   Review the scale, scope, and quality of community/industry engagement, including external/professional contribution to and referencing of, curriculum and research development.

11 International
   Review the Faculty’s strategic direction in international engagement and its alignment with University strategic priorities

12 Future Directions
   Recommend future development opportunities for the faculty in terms of its resources, research, teaching and community/industry engagement activity.
### 3.2 Schedule for Review (21-23 October)

**FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES REVIEW**  
**21-23 OCTOBER 2013**  
**AUSTRALIAN HEARING HUB BOARD ROOM, LEVEL 5**

#### DAY 1 – MONDAY 21 OCTOBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Meet Panel Secretary at MGSM and walk to Australian Hearing Hub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:45  | Briefing with Professor Janet Greeley, Executive Dean                    | Professor Bill Thompson, Head, Psychology  
Dr Peter Whiteman, Head, Institute of Early Childhood  
A/Prof Cath Dean, Head, Health Professions - APOLOGY  
Professor Lori Lockyer, Head, Education  
Professor Anne Castles, Head, Cognitive Science  
A/Professor Lynda Yates, Head, Linguistics  
Professor Simon Foote, Dean, Australian School of Advanced Medicine (ASAM) |
| 10:30 | Review the organisational structure and consider its appropriateness to the development of the Faculty and wider University. Include in the Review the presence of Structures and mechanisms re inter-disciplinary and inter-faculty collaboration. | A/Prof Mark Wiggins, Associate Dean, Research  
A/Prof Judi Homewood, Associate Dean, HDR - APOLOGY  
Dr Michael Cavanagh, Acting Associate Dean, L&T  
A/Prof Pamela Coutts, Associate Dean, CQA  
Professor Mike Jones, Associate Dean, International  
Ms Linda Schofield, Faculty General Manager |
| 11:15 | Review the effectiveness of planning, leadership and management structure, processes and resources in supporting University strategic priorities | Ms Margo Droulers, Manager HR Client Relationships  
Ms Julie Crawford, Faculty Manager HR  
Ms Linda Schofield, Faculty General Manager  
Dr Scott Barnes, Lecturer, Linguistics – new staff  
Dr Kat Mills, Lecturer, Physiotherapy – new staff |
| 12:00 | Review the alignment of academic, professional and student profile relative to current and future objectives and plans and the recruitment an induction of new staff into the research and teaching culture of the Faculty | Mr Jonathan Wylie, MQ Deputy Registrar Mr Linda Maher, Faculty Student Admin Manager  
Ms Linda Schofield, Faculty General Manager |
| 12:45 | Lunch and Panel Discussion                                               |                                                                                               |
| 1:15  | Review the alignment of student profile and student support relative to current and future objectives and plans |                                                                                               |
| 2:00  | Review the Faculty’s strategic direction in International engagement and its alignment with University Strategic priorities | Professor Mike Jones, A/Associate Dean, International  
Professor Lynda Yates, Head, Linguistics – Korea  
Dr Cathrine Neilson-Hewett, IEC – Singapore  
A/Prof Pamela Coutts, Associate Dean, CQA – Malaysia |
| 2:45  | Review the appropriateness of the current Faculty Funding Model and the funding distribution to the departments | Dr Paul Schreier, Chief Operating Officer, DVC  
Mr John Gorman, Chief Financial Officer  
Mr Scott Jenkins, Deputy Chief Financial Officer |
| 3:30  | Afternoon Tea and Panel discussion                                        |                                                                                               |
| 3:45  | Review the adequacy of facilities for current needs and future growth in achieving Faculty and University strategy in teaching, research and HDR | A/Prof Mark Wiggins, Assoc Dean, Research  
Dr Michael Cavanagh, Acting Assoc Dean, L & T  
Mr Mark Broomfield, Director, MQ Properties |
| 4:30  | Panel discussion – Day 1 Wrap up and plan for the next day                |                                                                                               |
## Day 2 – Tuesday 22 October

### Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Review the appropriateness of the degrees, programs and number of units with reference to the University priorities, employer and professional community demands</td>
<td>Dr Michael Cavanagh, Associate Dean, Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Review the appropriateness of the degrees, programs and number of units with reference to the University priorities, employer and professional community demands</td>
<td>Academic and professional staff&lt;br&gt;Dr Mark Hancock and Angela Stark – Physiotherapy&lt;br&gt;Dr Kirsty Forrest – ASAM&lt;br&gt;Dr Cathrine Neilson-Hewett&lt;br&gt;Dr Mridula Sharma and Kylie Coldrake – Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Dr Grant Kleeman and Shyam Howlin – Education&lt;br&gt;Dr Julia Irwin, Radha Pathy, Novy Alday – Psychology&lt;br&gt;Professor John Sutton – Cognitive Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students – undergraduate and postgraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Programs (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Morning Tea and discussion with the below industry guests</td>
<td>Employer reps from: Advisory Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Regroup and brief panel discussion</td>
<td>A/Professor Pamela Coutts, Associate Dean, CQA&lt;br&gt;Professor Bill Thompson - Psychology&lt;br&gt;A/Professor Cath Dean – Health Professions&lt;br&gt;Dr Cathrine Neilson-Hewett - IEC&lt;br&gt;Professor Lori Lockyer - Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Review the current associated accreditations and the ability of the Faculty to meet current and future government and professional accreditations</td>
<td>A/Professor Pamela Coutts, Associate Dean, CQA&lt;br&gt;Professor Bill Thompson - Psychology&lt;br&gt;A/Professor Cath Dean – Health Professions&lt;br&gt;Dr Cathrine Neilson-Hewett - IEC&lt;br&gt;Professor Lori Lockyer - Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Lunch and Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Ms Louise Fleck, Director, MQ Research Office&lt;br&gt;A/Professor Mark Wiggins, Associate Dean, Research&lt;br&gt;Mr Colm Halbert, Faculty Research Manager&lt;br&gt;Ms Lisa Elliott, Head, Partnerships and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Review current research outputs, activity and capability relative to University objectives including opportunities for developing research and knowledge leadership</td>
<td>Professor Ron Rapee - Psych&lt;br&gt;Dr Mridula Sharma – Linguistics - Audiology&lt;br&gt;Dr Sheila Degotardi/Dr Shirley Wyver - IEC&lt;br&gt;A/Prof Joanne Mulligan/Dr Penny Van Bergen - Education&lt;br&gt;Professor Roger Chung/Professor Mark Connor - ASAM&lt;br&gt;A/Prof Anina Rich/A/Prof Amanda Barnier – Cognitive Science&lt;br&gt;A/Professor Cath Dean – Health Professions&lt;br&gt;Dr Simon Boag - Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Discussion with Researchers</td>
<td>A/Professor Cath Dean – Health Professions&lt;br&gt;Ms Robyn Bishop, Faculty HDR Manager&lt;br&gt;Associate Professor Jen Cornish, Psychology&lt;br&gt;Professor Julie Fitness, Psychology&lt;br&gt;Professor Ron Rapee, Centre for Emotional Health&lt;br&gt;Professor Lyndsey Nickels, Cognitive Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Review the HDR program, including admissions standards, methodology and skills training, completion times and drop-out rates, supervision and reporting standards</td>
<td>HDR students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Discussion with HDR students</td>
<td>HDR students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Afternoon Tea and Panel Discussion - Day 2 Wrap Up

### Tour of Faculty Facilities

### Panel Dinner
### DAY 3 – WEDNESDAY 23 OCTOBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Panel Discussion and plan for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the scale, scope and quality of community/industry engagement</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including external/professional contribution to and referencing</td>
<td><strong>PACE partners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of curriculum and research development</td>
<td><strong>Advisory Groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Morning Tea with the below and above guests</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the scale, scope and quality of community/industry engagement</td>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including external/professional contribution to and referencing</td>
<td><strong>Community/industry guests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of curriculum and research development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td><strong>FUTURE DIRECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend future development of opportunities for the Faculty in terms</td>
<td><strong>Professor Janet Greeley, Executive Dean, Faculty Human Sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of its resources, research, teaching and community/industry engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor Stephen Crain, Director ARC Centre of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>in Cognition and its Disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch and Panel discussion – Day 3 wrap up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td><strong>DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Working and preparation of a draft recommendation document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Appointment with the Executive Dean – provide verbal recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Final discussion/changes to recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td><strong>FINISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Organisational Chart for FoHS
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