



University of South Australia



Report on the
Nominated Review of Research
2005



DIVISION OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Terms of Reference

The Pro Vice Chancellor of the Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences established the Review of Research in the Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences in accordance with University policy A-35.B5 Review. The Review Panel was asked to consider and make recommendations for the further development of the Division's research culture and performance. Specifically, the panel was asked to advise the Division on planning and performance in research. In summary, the panel was asked to address:

Planning

- the Division's planning and review processes in setting the research direction for schools, research centres and research institutes and for monitoring their performance
- the congruence between University and Division research development goals

Resourcing

- resource models for supporting the number of centres and Institutes within the Division
- financial support for the Division Research Performance Fund and the manner in which the funds are allocated through the Division Research Committee
- the role of the Division Business Development and Marketing Manager

Organisation and research culture

- the roles of Dean of Research and Dean of Research Education
- the relationship between schools and research institutes, centres and groups
- The Division's ability to create a stimulating research culture for staff and post graduate students and to become recognized nationally as a research effective Division

Research training

- relationship between research and the research degree education program
- quality of the Division's research education program
- support provided to research degree students by the schools, research centres and the Division

Performance and standing

- productivity as indicated by research income, and publications and research outputs
- links with other research organisations, locally, nationally and internationally
- standing as a research organisation relative to equivalent divisions and faculties in other Australian universities

The full Terms of Reference are set out in Appendix 1.

Review panel and process

The panel members were:

- Professor Sue Rowley (Chair), Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), University of Technology, Sydney
- Professor Belinda Probert, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic) University of Western Australia
- Professor Lynne Yates, Foundation Chair of Curriculum, University of Melbourne
- Associate Professor Bernard Hughes, Dean: Research, Division of Health Sciences, University of South Australia
- Dr Don Ellis, University of South Australia postgraduate representative (Doctor of Philosophy)

The Review Panel was assisted by Mr Nick Ketley, Executive Officer.

Prior to meeting at the University on August 2005, members of the panel had the opportunity to read relevant University and Division documents and submissions, as listed in Appendix 2. External research partners and staff of the Division were invited to make written submissions, and a list of submissions received is at Appendix 3. A teleconference in June 2005 enabled the panel to seek additional information and input.

During its meeting at the University, the panel met with Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professors Ian Davey and Michael Rowan; other senior staff of the University, the Division and the Hawke Research Institute for Sustainable Societies; groups of staff and postgraduate students of the Division; and external partners drawn from government and industry. A full list of these colleagues and partners is at Appendix 4. The panel did not explore the impact on research of the Division's offshore or distance learning activities.

Based on the self-assessment report, other submissions and interviews with staff and external stakeholders, the Review Panel commends the Division for significant achievements in its research performance to date.

Nevertheless, analysis of performance data, together with interviews of key stakeholders, has led the Panel to identify several key issues which must be addressed to enable the Division to achieve its vision.

The key issue is the need for the Division to re-focus its research planning and strategies, along the lines of the PVC(R)'s 2006 Priorities and 2006-2008 Medium-Term Priorities. Both of these seek to align the University to significant changes in the Australian Government's performance assessment through the introduction of the Research Quality Framework.

Planning

- the Division's planning and review processes in setting the research direction for schools, research centres and research institutes and for monitoring their performance
- the congruence between University and Division research development goals

To date, the Division's planning in research and research education has reflected and implemented the University's planning. The performance indicators have been shaped by the current DEST formula-driven research block grants (IGS, RTS and RIBG). The formulae have given priority to productivity indicators (research income, publications, HDR load and completions), and university research cultures have become habituated to these performance indicators.

The Review Panel recognizes that the University has taken this research policy framework and worked very successfully within it. The University has also succeeded in attracting large numbers of very loyal graduate research students since its foundation. The Division has demonstrated a strong capacity to develop cross disciplinary collaborations and it has remarkable industry links. Further, the Division has performed very well on relevant benchmarked comparisons and indicators.

The development of the Australian Government's Research Quality Framework (RQF) is bringing about a seismic shift in research planning.

Within a very short lead time, the University will need to change its focus and rebuild its research culture around the RQF indicators of quality, esteem and impact. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), Professor Ian Davey, has announced 2006 Priorities and 2006-2008 Medium Term Priorities for Research and Research Training. The 2006 and medium-term priorities build on the current Strategic Plan, but add new emphasis on preparing for the RQF.

- For research, improving the quality and impact of research and publications is an additional 2006 priority. The Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences will need to re-focus its research planning, priorities and strategies around the immediate 2006 priorities, and the medium term priorities, as set out by the PVC(R&I).
- For research education, increased research degree completions is the major 2006 focus. The Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences has built this priority into its current Plan. Under RQF, it is likely that funding for research training (i.e. Research Training Scheme (RTS)) will be based on 2 components: completions (30-50%) and an RQF index (50-70%). Consequently, while maintaining its emphasis on the quality of supervision, the Division will also need to develop a more coherent strategy to achieve greater integration of research and research training.

The RQF will be based on expert peer-assessment, supported by appropriate metrics. Whilst the broad outline of the Australian model is likely to be announced in late 2005, much of the technical development will occur over 2006. The 'census' date is likely to be late 2006 or 2007, with funding based on RQF outcomes introduced in 2008 or 2009. Under expert peer-assessment, a wide range of research outputs may be

recognised as appropriate to the field, and these could include creative works and other ‘practice-based’ outputs, reports to government, and improved school curricula. Assessment panels are likely to include international and Australian leading researchers and ‘end-users’.

The Division’s strategy should maintain its priority on achieving international standing, especially for the Hawke Research Institute for Sustainable Societies. However, since it is likely that impact on the broader community will be included in the RQF, it should strengthen its commitment to external partnerships, through increased participation in contract research and collaborative projects funded under the ARC *Linkage Projects* program. Consistent with the profile and mission of the University, strengthening research undertaken in collaboration with external partners may prove to be critical to the Division’s performance under RQF.

The other reason for focussing on collaborative research is to ensure that the Division has a sustainable research program, given the real possibility of diminished funding from the Australian Government under RQF. In this, the Division’s sustainability strategy will reflect that of the University and other ATN partners.

In interviews with staff, external partnerships and relationships did not appear to be a priority theme or key characteristic of research in the Division. However, the Review Panel met a number of external partners and was impressed by their generally positive view of the University and its willingness to engage with researchers in the Division. In particular, the South Australian Government officials were well-disposed towards the Division, and could support the development of innovative research collaborations.

The Division has been active and successful in developing partnerships with external stakeholders. This area was noted as being of particular advantage and the Division should strive to maximise this in light of the history and culture in South Australia which supports and values particular kinds of research. Therefore the Division should focus more strongly on external research opportunities by identifying the needs and interests of potential partners and developing a communication strategy to promote its capacity to undertake research of interest to external organisations. This would enable the Division to benefit not only from building a more distinct research identity but would also establish strong evidence of impact and esteem. A corollary could be to build capacity within the Division to meet partners’ requirements. Based on comments from external partners, there is a need for researchers involved in collaborative research to better accommodate the demands of contract research in terms of meeting deadlines and writing clearly.

The Division would be well-advised to develop an internal communication and planning strategy to increase the level of ‘RQF-awareness’ within the Division. The ATN Trial will provide useful insight, noting that Professor Ian Davey, Mark Hochmann and Professor Phyllis Tharenou are participating in the Panel in Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences, and that submissions have been prepared for the Hawke Research Institute and The Centre for Sleep Research.

Recommendation: That the Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences re-focus its research planning, priorities and strategies around the immediate 2006 priorities, and the medium-term priorities, as set out by the PVC(R&I).

Recommendation: That the Division develop a coherent strategy to achieve greater integration of research and research training.

Recommendation: That the Division develop a strategy to collect better evidence regarding existing research collaborations and their impact; and work to develop stronger partnerships and to identify new potential external partners and clients, and promote research linkages by:

- increasing its consulting, and contract and collaborative research funded under the *ARC Linkage Projects* program;
- developing a communication strategy to promote its capacity to undertake research of interest to external organisations; and
- building capacity within the Division to meet the requirements of external partners and clients.

Recommendation: That the Division develop an internal communication and planning strategy to increase the level of ‘RQF-awareness’ within the Division.

Recommendation: That the Division develop new strategies for collection of evidence related to esteem and impact flowing from collaborative research.

Recommendation: That, in developing appropriate policies and practices such as those recommended in this report, the Division support a system for ongoing collaboration between research and teaching portfolios at University, Division and School levels.

Hawke Research Institute for Sustainable Societies

UNISA Council approved three long-term thematic priorities (‘sustainability’, ‘healthy lifestyles’, and ‘modelling and managing complex systems’) in late 2002. Under the Emerging Thematic Priorities Program, research centres have been encouraged to collaborate to form new research institutes.

In August 2004, funded institute status was granted to the University’s third flagship institute, the Hawke Research Institute. Institute status and funding has been accorded on the basis of:

- research performance of its leading researchers and/or research centres (international reputation);
- organisational coherence, plan and leadership (common goal, clear leadership, well-integrated research plans involving postgraduate training);
- collaboration with government, industry and the professions; and
- strategic ‘fit’ in addressing an approved long-term thematic priority.

The Hawke Research Institute was formed through the collaboration of seven research concentrations (six from the Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences and one from the Division of Business), apparently taking into account both the strategic fit of the concentrations to the theme of ‘sustainability’ and the research performance of their lead researchers. Whilst it is still in its formative period, interviewees expressed a degree of confusion over the Institute, including how funding is organised, membership, impact on Schools, and role in postgraduate education.

In addressing the thematic priority of ‘sustainability’, the Institute has cast a wide net, intending to distinguish itself from comparable research concentrations at other universities. At this stage, its broad interdisciplinary approach comes at the expense of clear focus and direction. To some extent at least, this is a consequence of the

University's Plan – the constituent concentrations appear more closely aligned than this broad theme implies. In developing the University-wide themes, the University probably envisaged cross-Division collaboration and, to a limited extent, this has been achieved in the Hawke Research Institute. However, the University could assist the Institute by ensuring that effective strategies, performance indicators and incentives are in place to foster cross-Divisional research.

Having reached its first milestone, the Hawke Research Institute now needs to implement a tighter planning process that 'drills-down' the Research Plans of the University and the Division. Its current Strategic Plan 2005-2008 does not do this, and as a result, its 'critical success factors' and its strategies do not sufficiently reflect the University's profile in balancing the quality research with research that has beneficial impact in the broader community. The current focus on building international networks and developing large-scale, interdisciplinary, internationally-collaborative projects should be complemented by a stronger focus on its external clients and collaborators. The Advisory Board could play a significant role in setting 'stretch targets' for the Institute aimed at strengthening links with industry, business, government, and the community. The Panel noted the contribution that the Senior Business Development Manager could make, and supported her participation in meetings of the Advisory Board. The Institute could achieve a stronger sense of its identity, capacity and direction, by focussing more closely on the needs of external partners and the specific areas of expertise available within the Institute. In doing so, it will also contribute to greater 'RQF readiness' within the Division.

Recommendation: That the Hawke Research Institute further clarify, tighten and focus its identity, mission and objectives.

Recommendation: That the Hawke Research Institute revise its Strategic Plan so that it 'drills-down' the Research Plans of the University and the Division, and ensure that its 'critical success factors' and its strategies reflect the University's profile in balancing the quality research with research that has beneficial impact in the broader community.

Recommendation: That, in consultation with the Senior Business Development Manager, the Advisory Board assist the Hawke Research Institute to strengthen links with industry, business, government, and the community and set 'stretch targets' for income generation.

Resourcing

- resource models for supporting the number of centres and institutes within the Division
- financial support for the Division Research Performance Fund and the manner in which the funds are allocated through the Division Research Committee
- the role of the Division Business Development and Marketing Manager

The Panel examined the Division's resourcing based on the information provided in the self-assessment report, other submissions and interviews with staff. Infrastructure and performance-based funding is provided centrally to recognised research institutes and centres. Divisions also receive a share of the University's research income which

incorporates a base component and a performance component (Divisional Research Performance Fund).

The University's strategy seeks to balance capacity-building and focus research through concentration in areas of strength, opportunity and strategic fit. A key strategy in capacity building has been to encourage staff to complete PhDs. A key strategy in focussing research has been to fund Institutes, centres and groups.

Together, the University and Division invest approximately \$1 million p.a. in research. Of this, approximately 2/3 is allocated to research concentrations and 1/3 to individual members of staff (see tables 1 & 2 below).

Table 1: Breakdown of University and Division research funding

Institute, Centres, Groups	\$ 671,000	67%
Individual staff	\$ 251,000	25%
Postdocs	\$ 70,000	7%
Other	\$ 6,000	1%
TOTAL	\$ 998,000	100%

Table 2: University and Division research funding programs

Source	Allocated to	Programs	total (2004/2005 data)	
University/Division funding				
University	Concentrations	Hawke Research Institute (incl. 3 centres)	\$ 377,000	38%
University	Concentrations	2 centres (outside HRI)	\$ 174,000	17%
University	Staff individuals	Supported Researcher Fund	\$ 111,000	11%
University	Division	Division Research Performance Fund	\$ 235,638	24%
Division	Division	Division Research Performance Fund	\$ 100,362	10%
TOTAL			\$ 998,000	100%
Division Research Performance Fund				
Division	Staff individuals	Cat A Research grants	\$ 60,000	18%
Division	Staff individuals	Cat B SRIs	\$ 40,000	12%
Division	Staff individuals	Indigenous	\$ 20,000	6%
Division	Staff individuals	Staff PhD completions	\$ 20,000	6%
Division	Postdocs	Postdocs	\$ 70,000	21%
Division	Concentrations	Infrastructure (9 research groups)	\$ 120,000	36%
Division	Mixed	Research culture support	\$ 3,000	1%
Division	Mixed	Dean's discretionary fund	\$ 3,000	1%
TOTAL			\$ 336,000	100%

Whilst the Panel did not comment directly on the proportion of funding allocated to research concentrations and individuals, it inferred that funding is currently allocated

across a number of small schemes and that the Division could be more strategic in its allocation of funding and other resources. The Institute, centres and groups should be encouraged to use their funds strategically to build research programs, secure necessary infrastructure, invest in external partnerships, etc.

The Division is advised to focus funding strategically on the emerging RQF environment. The logic of RQF is to concentrate resources in areas of strength, and on top researchers. RQF performance indicators relate to the excellence of research and the recognition of its significance by peers, and its impact in the broader community. The Division could be proactive in anticipating metrics for quality, peer esteem and impact, noting that productivity measures will continue to provide useful baseline data. The Panel noted that there is ‘in principle’ understanding that research resources including staff time and funding will need to be more strategically invested.

The Panel noted the intention of the Division to increase investment in research from 2006 by increasing its contribution to Schools from 20 to 25 cents for every dollar earned in National Competitive Grants. This will amount to approximately \$475k, significantly exceeding the amount that the Division invests directly in its research concentrations. In the context of devolution of research funds to Schools, the relationships between the PVC, Dean Research and the Heads of Schools—and their respective accountabilities and performance—could be critical in encouraging the effective investment of these funds in research. (See below.)

On the basis of the interviews, the Panel inferred that staff seem unsure how the RQF and likely changes in resourcing and funding may impact on their research activities. They were unsure about the impact of the Hawke Research Institute on the funding to schools, centres and groups. The value-add of Institute status is yet to be determined, but does not appear to reside in greatly increased University and Division combined funding to the centres and groups that comprise the Institute (aggregating University funding of \$87k each to 3 centres and the Division’s average infrastructure grants of \$13k to 3 groups).

In the long run, the sustainability of the Division’s research rests on the income mix and total quantum from grants, contract research and consulting.

Table 3: Research income 2004

Income source	Income (2004)	%
Category A	\$ 1,895,758	35%
Category B	\$ 1,194,000	22%
Category C	\$ 1,303,000	24%
Consulting	\$ 955,000	18%
TOTAL	\$ 5,347,758	100%

The Panel recommends that the Division sets targets for its total income and income mix. It is likely that this approach would increase the proportion of funding from consulting and contract research. The evident success of the Senior Business Development and Marketing Manager, Annie Campbell, suggests that this is a viable

strategy. Her proposal for the Hawke Research Institute will make available the expertise of leading researchers for contract research and consulting.

Recommendation: That the Division, Institute, schools and centres review their funding schemes and strategies to establish a coherent strategic set of mechanisms for meeting research targets and generating greater RQF ‘readiness’ through a more targeted directing of resources to areas of research strength and potential.

Recommendation: That the Division be proactive in anticipating appropriate indicators for quality, peer esteem and impact, noting that productivity measures will continue to provide useful baseline data.

Recommendation: That the Division sets targets for its total income and income mix and communicate its funding sources, allocations and strategies clearly within the Division.

Recommendation: That the Senior Business Development and Marketing Manager continue developing her role and assist the Division to implement the recommendations above.

Organisation and research culture

- the roles of Dean of Research and Dean of Research Education
- the relationship between schools and research institutes, centres and groups
- the Division’s ability to create a stimulating research culture for staff and post graduate students and to become recognized nationally as a research effective Division

The Review Panel, particularly through its interviews with a large number and broad range of internal stakeholders, explored the structure of research and key responsibilities for research and research training.

Leadership and key accountabilities

The responsibilities of, and relationships between Deans (Research and Research Degrees), Heads of Schools, and Director of the Hawke Research Institute are critical to the Division’s research performance. Currently, the authority and accountabilities of these key leaders are not well integrated, and they do not consolidate joint responsibility for research and research training.

Whilst leadership is included in the position descriptions of the Deans, they have relatively few resources to back their leadership role (in terms of funding, executive management responsibilities and authority). Specifically, the Deans ‘assist’ Heads of Schools, leaders of research concentrations and leading researchers. Since academic staff and directors of research centres and groups report to Heads of Schools, the accountabilities, work plans and performance management of Heads of Schools are key elements in building the Division’s research performance and viability. The Panel also commended the two Deans for their commitment and contribution to the vitality of research and research training in the Division.

In relation to staff appointments and workload planning, a number of interviewees commented on the tension between the Division’s research priorities and the Schools’ teaching needs. Drawing on the experience of other universities, tensions may emerge

(or be exacerbated) between the Hawke Research Institute and the Schools if they perceive themselves as competing for a limited pool of key staff and resources. The Director of the Hawke Research Institute should be a member of the Pro Vice Chancellor's senior team, if this is not already the case.

The Panel recommends that the Division review the position descriptions, work plans, accountabilities and key relationships of Deans, Heads of School, Director of Hawke Research Institute and research centres to ensure that they are complementary and coherent. Priority should be given to ensuring that strategic research appointments can be made, and that workloads of early career researchers and key researchers are well-managed.

Further, in order to achieve better integration of research and research training, the Panel recommends that the close relationship between the Deans of Research and Research Degrees is reinforced by more cross-referenced membership and objectives of the Division's Research Committee and Research Degrees Committee.

Staffing for research

The Review Panel noted that the Division's capacity-building and research training programs were constrained by the relatively low proportion of academic staff who have completed PhDs or equivalent doctorates. Continued support for staff who are currently completing PhDs and recruiting staff who hold this qualification are key strategies.

During the interviews several issues arose relating to the performance management of research activity. Generally, there were concerns about how workloads can negatively impact on the retention of staff who wish to engage in intensive research activity. This appeared to impact particularly on staff who have recently finished PhDs. Early career researchers who addressed the Review Panel clearly expressed the need for more support in managing their workloads to enable them to concentrate more on their research. The Division should consider reviewing its performance management system to give an added focus to achieving improved research outputs. This would involve a more stringent approach by Heads of School and other managers with research responsibility in directing staff performance towards research priorities. A mechanism for research leaders and the Director of the Hawke Research Institute to give input into the research performance of individual staff members could be an invaluable complement to the existing performance management system.

The Panel noted that the early career researchers generally found the University's development program useful but also expressed their need for more targeted activities. The Panel advises the University and Division to consider addressing this deficit by reviewing the existing program in collaboration with the participating parties, and developing a program which includes more specific activities.

Several issues arose in the interviews relating to the placement and experience of postdoctoral fellows and early career researchers in the Division. In particular, the diverse processes through which these researchers are 'attached' to research concentrations became apparent (researchers are either located within the Hawke Research Institute, in Research Centres, 'swimming' within Schools, or with no attachment to any research concentration). The level of attachment to a research group impacts on support and resourcing as well as networking potential. In order to support focussing Divisional research activity on its strengths, the Division should therefore aim to provide an equivalent level of attachment, support and resourcing to

postdoctoral fellows and early career researchers further its objective to build on its research strengths and focus research activity.

The current Enterprise Agreement includes a workload model which defines, for every academic staff member, an allocation of time for research. While the workload model *allows* for all academic staff to be research active, there was a general acceptance that not all staff avail themselves of this opportunity. Currently, the Division needs to use discretionary judgements to focus workload and resources. While the current Enterprise Agreement workload model may not appear to support strategic planning and investment in research, it could enable a future Agreement to register differential levels of research activity in workloads.

Recommendation: That the Division review the position descriptions, work plans, accountabilities and key relationships of Deans, Heads of School, Director of Hawke Research Institute and research centres to ensure that they are complementary and coherent.

Recommendation: That the Division prioritise the building of research capacity by:

- developing a process of consultation between Heads of Schools, Deans and research concentration leaders when making academic staff appointments and developing work plans of early career researchers and key researchers.
- giving continued support to staff who are currently completing PhDs or equivalent doctorates.
- providing a policy whereby academic staff without a PhD can only be appointed with the specific approval of the Pro Vice Chancellor.

Recommendation: That the close relationship between the Deans of Research and Research Degrees be reinforced by more cross-referenced membership and objectives of the Division's Research Committee and Research Degrees Committee.

Recommendation: That the Division review the performance management process and consider a mechanism to incorporate input from research leaders and the Director: Hawke Research Institute in the performance management of staff's research performance.

Recommendation: That the University and Division review the existing Early Career Researcher Development Program to ensure it meets the needs of the Division's staff.

Recommendation: That the Division provide an equivalent level of attachment, support and resourcing to postdoctoral fellows and early career researchers to further its objective to build on its research strengths and focus research activity.

Research training

- › relationship between research and the research degree education program
- › quality of the Division's research education program
- › support provided to research degree students by the schools, research centres and the Division

The Review Panel was supplied with the research funding formulae and research degree data in the self-assessment report and interviewed the Dean: Research Degrees, postgraduate students, and research degree coordinators. In general, the Division can be commended for the advances made in research education over the

past years, as indicated by the large increase on both research degree candidatures (up from 75 in 1996 to approx. 400 in 2005) and completions (growing from 16 in 2000 to 39 in 2004 with a target of 50 per year for 2005-2008).

The need for a well-defined set of expectations placed on both postgraduates and their supervisors was emphasised by the interviewed postgraduates. The Panel noted that these have been put in place in a Statement of Agreement, which is signed off by the postgraduate and their supervisor at the commencement of candidature, though at present communication with and support for research students appears uneven across the Division.

The Review Panel established that the capacity for research degree supervision in the Division is reaching saturation and in some areas may even be stretched beyond a reasonable limit. This phenomenon also results from the low numbers of staff with a PhD as described in the section *Organisation and Research Culture*. As noted above, the Division should not only increase numbers of supervisors by ensuring new appointments have a PhD, but also by facilitating staff to complete their PhDs. The Panel recommends that Schools plan and target their capacity for supervision and encourage and support staff to complete their PhD in a timely manner.

During the interviews it became apparent to the Panel that barriers exist which impede cross-school and cross-divisional supervision. This type of supervision support is of particular importance for Indigenous PhD students. The Indigenous College of Education and Research is well-aligned within the University and is using PhD completions as the 'hard measure' of improved capacity. As Indigenous PhD students exhibit a lower completion rate than other cohorts, they are often perceived as a financial 'risk' in a system where a significant percentage of the RTS funding formula is based on completions. The Panel suggests there is a need for the Division to identify and remove real and or perceived barriers for cross-school and cross-divisional supervision and to develop incentives for Heads of School to recruit postgraduates. This is of particular importance where Schools may perceive that the way in which research training is resourced, e.g. through RTS, is an impediment.

The postgraduate cohort experience was reported to be quite fragmented. Examples of this are: the effect of having to study on more than one campus; being a part-time or full-time student; the impact of access to childcare. Further, the postgraduates expressed concerns about inconsistencies in supervision, the availability of resources, transparency and communication. A stronger and more systematic linking of the cohorts and research training resources to research strengths and concentrations would greatly alleviate these issues, and positively impact on the success and speed with which candidates complete their research degrees. The Division is therefore advised to give priority to improving consistency in the factors influencing research education through better integration of research training and resources in research concentrations.

In a similar way to the Early Career Researcher Development Program, the view was expressed that the central Research Education Support Activities (RESA) does not necessarily cater for the specific needs of the postgraduate cohort. In particular, the postgraduates would like activities to be offered more frequently and at different times of day and/or on weekends. Events were also not always advertised with enough notice for students to attend. There was strong agreement that the statistics program did not offer enough depth, especially at the advanced level. While the Panel

recognises that a central model cannot meet every need, it recommends that the Division review the RESA in the light of the issues outlined above.

Recommendation: That the Division identify and remove real and or perceived barriers for cross-school and cross-divisional supervision.

Recommendation: That, as matter of priority, the Division develop greater integration of research training and research through such mechanisms as locating postgraduates and postdoctoral fellows in research concentrations.

Recommendation: That the Division review Divisional Research Education Support Activities to ensure that communication, supervision and resource support is even across the Division, and that more support and more effective forms of support are provided.

Performance and standing

- productivity as indicated by research income, and publications and research outputs
- links with other research organisations, locally, nationally and internationally
- standing as a research organisation relative to equivalent divisions and faculties in other Australian universities

The Review Panel commends the Division's achievements in research productivity to date as outlined in the self-assessment report. In particular, the Division has performed strongly on relevant benchmarked comparisons and indicators. This achievement is largely the result of the research activity stimulated within and by the Division's research concentrations. Productivity and performance are captured using data on national competitive grants, other grants, consultancies, publications, research degree enrolments and completions, etcetera. Apart from the growth in research education performance outlined in the previous section (*Research Education*), the Division has shown stable growth in several performance categories. Publication rates have increased considerably in recent years, up from 0.36/FTE in 1999 to 0.76/FTE in 2003, and this trend is expected to continue. Grant submission rates have increased, in particular for ARC *Discovery Projects* grants. Grant income has also steadily increased and the Division has achieved considerable success in the areas where effort has been focussed. There has also been continuous and considerable growth in income from contract research and consultancy.

The Review Panel acknowledges the Division's effort and success in the internationalisation of research (see also *Planning*). The Division has demonstrated its success in building on existing relationships and in identifying and developing emerging fields and projects. The Panel has already noted that the current focus on international networks and the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, internationally-collaborative projects needs to be complemented by a strong focus on external partnerships, contract research and consulting.

The Panel noted that the Division is planning to establish a second University recognised research institute in the Division, located in the School of Psychology. The institute is to be created by amalgamating the two remaining 'stand-alone' Divisional research centres—the Centre for Applied Psychological Research and the Centre for Applied Behavioural Science. The Panel inferred that the formation of this institute

could further consolidate research resources, improve the Division's focus in its research strengths and enhance the Division's research status.

The Panel noted that benchmarking was most useful when undertaken on the basis of disciplines or discipline groupings rather than at a high level of aggregation (e.g. Humanities and Social Sciences). The issue of appropriate "benchmarking" groupings will need to be re-visited in the light of the final decisions of the RQF regarding how disciplines are to be clustered and assessed.

Recommendation: That the University establish a new institute through the amalgamation of the Centre for Applied Psychological Research and the Centre for Applied Behavioural Science.

Recommendation: That the Division now begin to undertake benchmarking activities of groups within the Division rather than the Division as a whole; and that these benchmarks have regard to the new quality and impact criteria of the RQF.

Summary of Recommendations

Planning

Recommendation: That the Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences re-focus its research planning, priorities and strategies around the immediate 2006 priorities, and the medium-term priorities, as set out by the PVC(R&I).

Recommendation: That the Division develop a coherent strategy to achieve greater integration of research and research training.

Recommendation: That the Division develop a strategy to collect better evidence regarding existing research collaborations and their impact; and work to develop stronger partnerships and to identify new potential external partners and clients, and promote research linkages by:

- increasing its consulting, and contract and collaborative research funded under the ARC *Linkage Projects* program
- developing a communication strategy to promote its capacity to undertake research of interest to external organisations
- building capacity within the Division to meet the requirements of external partners and clients.

Recommendation: That the Division develop new strategies for collection of evidence related to esteem and impact flowing from collaborative research.

Recommendation: That, in developing appropriate policies and practices such as those recommended in this report, the Division support a system for ongoing collaboration between research and teaching portfolios at University, Division and School levels.

Recommendation: That the Division develop an internal communication and planning strategy to increase the level of 'RQF-awareness' within the Division.

Recommendation: That the Hawke Research Institute further clarify, tighten and focus its identity, mission and objectives.

Recommendation: That the Hawke Research Institute revise its Strategic Plan so that it 'drills-down' the Research Plans of the University and the Division, and ensures that its 'critical success factors' and its strategies reflect the University's profile in balancing the quality research with research that has beneficial impact in the broader community.

Recommendation: That, in consultation with the Senior Business Development Manager, the Advisory Board assist the Hawke Research Institute to strengthen links with industry, business, government, and the community and set 'stretch targets' for income generation.

Resourcing

Recommendation: That the Division, Institute, schools and centres review their funding schemes and strategies to establish a coherent strategic set of mechanisms for meeting research targets and generating greater RQF 'readiness' through a more targeted directing of resources to areas of research strength and potential.

Recommendation: That the Division be proactive in anticipating appropriate indicators for quality, peer esteem and impact, noting that productivity measures will continue to provide useful baseline data.

Recommendation: That the Division sets targets for its total income and income mix and communicate its funding sources, allocations and strategies clearly within the Division.

Recommendation: That the Senior Business Development and Marketing Manager continue developing her role and assist the Division to implement the recommendations above.

Organisation and research culture

Recommendation: That the Division review the position descriptions, work plans, accountabilities and key relationships of Deans, Heads of School, Director of Hawke Research Institute and research centres to ensure that they are complementary and coherent.

Recommendation: That the Division prioritise the building of research capacity by:

- developing a process of consultation between Heads of Schools, Deans and research concentration leaders when making academic staff appointments and developing work plans of early career researchers and key researchers.
- giving continued support to staff who are currently completing PhDs or equivalent doctorates.
- providing a policy whereby academic staff without a PhD can only be appointed with the specific approval of the Pro Vice Chancellor.

Recommendation: That the close relationship between the Deans of Research and Research Degrees be reinforced by more cross-referenced membership and objectives of the Division's Research Committee and Research Degrees Committee.

Recommendation: That the Division review the performance management process and consider a mechanism to incorporate input from research leaders and the Director: Hawke Research Institute in the performance management of staff's research performance.

Organisation and research culture (cont)

Recommendation: That the University and Division review the existing Early Career Researcher Development Program to ensure it meets the needs of the Division's staff.

Recommendation: That the Division provide an equivalent level of attachment, support and resourcing to postdoctoral fellows and early career researchers to further its objective to build on its research strengths and focus research activity.

Research training

Recommendation: That the Division identify and remove real and or perceived barriers for cross-school and cross-divisional supervision.

Recommendation: That, as matter of priority, the Division develop greater integration of research training and research through such mechanisms as locating postgraduates and postdoctoral fellows in research concentrations.

Recommendation: That the Division review Divisional Research Education Support Activities to ensure that communication, supervision and resource support is even across the Division, and that more support and more effective forms of support are provided.

Performance and standing

Recommendation: That the University establish a new institute through the amalgamation of the Centre for Applied Psychological Research and the Centre for Applied Behavioural Science.

Recommendation: That the Division now begin to undertake benchmarking activities of groups within the Division rather than the Division as a whole; and that these benchmarks have regard to the new quality and impact criteria of the RQF.

Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference

The Review is to consider and make recommendations for the further development of the Division's research culture and performance, including the level and sources of the Division's research income and the quality and impact of the Division's research publications, reports and other research outcomes, and the quality of the Division's research education program. The Review will also consider the Division and University priorities, plans and other material and information as may be relevant to reporting on:

Planning

- The effectiveness of the Division's formal and informal planning and review processes in setting the research direction for schools, research centres and research institutes and for monitoring their performance
- The congruence between University and Division research development goals

Performance

- The Division's performance in generating research income
- The Division's productivity in terms of publications and research outputs
- The relationship between research and the research degree education program
- The quality of the Division's research education program, and the effectiveness of the support provided to research degree students by the schools, research centres and the Division
- The effectiveness of resource models for supporting the number of centres and Institutes within the Division
- The level of financial support for the Division Research Performance Fund and the manner in which the funds are allocated through the Division Research Committee
- The effectiveness of the relationship between schools and research institutes, centres and groups
- The effectiveness of the role of the Division Business Development and Marketing Manager
- The effectiveness of the roles of Dean of Research and Dean of Research Education
- The Division's ability to create a stimulating research culture for staff and post graduate students and to become recognized nationally as a research effective Division
- The extent and utility of the Division's links with other research organisations, locally, nationally and internationally
- The Division's standing as a research organisation relative to equivalent divisions and faculties in other Australian universities

The Review should seek information from:

- EAS Pro Vice Chancellor, Dean of Graduate Studies, Pro Vice Chancellor Research & Innovation, Director of the Hawke Research Institute, the Dean of Research, the Dean of Research Degrees, the Business Development & Marketing Manager and the Division Manager, Heads of School and leaders of research groups
- Academic staff including where possible all members of the professoriate
- International partners - by correspondence
- Research degree and honours students
- Other parts of the University - other Divisions and the Research Office

Membership

1. An external senior academic (Pro Vice Chancellor or Deputy Vice Chancellor Research) as chair
2. An external person with extensive relevant experience
3. An external person with extensive relevant experience
4. A staff member of the University from another Division
5. A post graduate student representative
6. Executive officer from the Division staff

The panel will be provided with the following documentation:

- The UniSA Corporate Plan.
- The Medium Term Priorities – Research and Research Education 2005-2007
- The Division's self-assessment
- The Division 2003 Review
- The Medium Term Strategic Plan 2004-2006 and 2005-2007
- The 2003 and 2004 Division Research Performance Fund

General procedures of the review include:

- The Executive Officer for the Review will, in consultation with the Deans Research and Research Degrees, Director of the Hawke Research Institute and Business Development & Marketing Manager produce a self assessment report addressing each of the elements of the review.
- The review panel will invite relevant staff and/or stakeholder groups to provide brief submissions addressing the terms of reference.
- The review panel will meet initially to consider the self assessment report, any submissions received and any other material considered appropriate. At this meeting the panel will decide upon the review process, people they wish to interview in addition to those who have asked to meet the panel, and identify any further information required.
- The review panel will meet on a second occasion with staff, students and external stakeholders, as appropriate, and consider the self assessment report against their views and the material presented to the review.
- The review panel, with the assistance of an executive officer provided by the University, will provide a report to the Pro Vice Chancellor
- The Executive Officer for the Review will coordinate the provision of a response to the report to the Pro Vice Chancellor.
- The Pro Vice Chancellor will recommend a plan of action on the recommendations of the review to the Vice Chancellor.
- The report and recommended action plan will be presented to Division Board, and for review of Schools and other academic areas, to Academic Board.
- The response to the review will be provided to the panel following acceptance by Academic Board, and the outcomes of the recommendations made by the review panel will be reported to the panel 12 months after the acceptance of the response by Academic Board.

Appendix 2

University and Division documentation supplied to panel

- UniSA Corporate Plan 2005-2007
- UniSA Medium Term Priorities for Research and Research Education 2005-2007 and 2006-2008
- UniSA Research Priorities for 2006
- Divisional 2003 Annual Review
- Divisional Medium Term Strategic Plans for 2004-2006 and 2005-2007
- Divisional Research Performance Fund Guidelines for 2004 and 2005
- Divisional Research Performance Fund Report for 2003 and 2004
- The Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences Review of Research Self-Assessment Report
- Hawke Research Institute Research Report 2003-2004
- Hawke Research Institute Strategic Plan 2005-2008
- Divisional Research Expertise Directory
- EAS Summary of Key Research Projects
- EAS Contract Research and Consultancy - Client Feedback
- Early Career Researcher Development Benchmarking Report
- Early Career Researcher Development Program 2004 Report
- Early Career Researcher Development Program 2005 Report
- Early Career Researcher Development Program 2005 Conference Report
- Terms of Reference for the Lister Review of Reporting Relationships between Schools, Research Centres and Research Institutes
- Diverse data on Staff and Postgraduate students

Appendix 3

External and internal stakeholders who made submissions

External

- Professor Carol Austin, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary, Canada
- Dr Andrea Averis, Manager; Research Management Branch, NCVER
- Kevin Comber, Catholic Education South Australia
- Brian Crossman, South Australian & Eynesbury Institutes of Business & Technology
- Jim Davison, Assistant Director Research, Australian Housing & Urban Research Institute Ltd
- Dr Antonio Mercurio, A/Chief Executive, The Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA)
- Fiona Mort, Senior Policy Officer, Office for Women, Department for Families and Communities
- Strategic Planning and Research Branch, Department of Health

Internal

- Prof Angela Scarino, Director, Research Centre for Languages & Cultures Education
- Dr Peter C Winwood, PhD candidate
- Associate Professor Ian Richards, Director, Postgraduate Journalism Program
- Dr Janet Bryan, Senior Lecturer, School of Psychology
- de Lissa Research Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies, school of Education
- Prof Marie Brennan, Dean and Head of School – School of Education
- Centre for Applied Psychological Research
- Dr Robert Crocker, Research Degrees and Honours Coordinator, Louis Laybourne Smith School of Architecture and Design
- Professor Roger Harris, Director: Centre For Research In Education, Equity & Work
- Dr Mia Stephens, Lecturer School of Communication, Information and New Media
- Dr Michelle Tuckey, Lecturer, School of Psychology
- Dr Nadine Pelling, Position: Program Director, School of Psychology
- Dr Nigel Starck - Position: Offshore Programme Director Area: COM -- Communication, Information and New Media
- Ms Pamela Zeplin - Position: Senior Lecturer Area: ART -- South Australian School of Art
- Dr Vicki Crowley - Position: Lecturer Area: COM -- Communication, Information and New Media

Appendix 4

Individuals who met the panel

- Ms Roma Aloisi, Senior Education Advisor, Catholic Education Office
- Ms Jenny Baker, Senior Lecturer, Unaipon School
- Mr John Barbour, Research Degree Coordinator, SA School of Art
- Ms Di Barrett, Program Director Photography, SA School of Art
- Mr Dave Birbeck, postgraduate student, School of International Studies
- Assoc Prof Peter Bishop, A/Prof Communication & Cultural Studies, School of Communication, Information and New Media
- Dr Lia Bryant, A/Director, Research Centre for Gender Studies
- Ms Annie Campbell, EAS, Senior Business Development & Marketing Manager
- Prof Ed Carson, Dean: Graduate Studies
- Dr Sharon Casey, Lecturer, School of Psychology
- Dr David Chapman, Lecturer, School of International Studies
- Dr Phil Cormack, Director, Centre for Studies in Literacy, Policy and Learning Cultures
- Robert Crocker, Research Degree Coordinator, Louis Laybourne School of Architecture
- Prof Ian Davey, PVC, Research and Innovation
- Prof Drew Dawson, Director, Centre for Sleep Research
- Dr Jill Dorrian, Lecturer, School of Psychology
- Prof Marjory Ebbeck, Research Degree Coordinator, Early Childhood, School of Education
- Ms Nerilee Flint, postgraduate student, School of Education
- Ms Cate Fowler, Director, Windmill Performing Arts
- Assoc Prof Suzanne Franzway, EAS, Dean: Research
- Prof Mads Gaardboe, Head of School, Louise Laybourne School of Architecture and Design
- Peter Gale, Research Degree Coordinator, Unaipon School
- Ms Pat Grant, Lecturer, School of Education
- Prof Kerry Green, Head of School, School of Communication, Information and New Media
- Mr Hugh Guthrie, Manager of Teaching & Learning, NCVER
- Prof Roger Harris, Director, Centre for Research in Education, Equity and Work
- Prof Paul Hughes, Dean: Indigenous College of Education and Research
- Assoc Prof Bruce Johnson, EAS, Dean: Research Education
- Ms Kaye Johnson, postgraduate student, School of Psychology
- Dr Tom Karmel (Managing Director, NCVER)
- Ms Rosemary Kennedy, Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work and Social Policy
- Prof Kay Lawrence, Head of School, SA School of Art
- Mr Stephen Loo, Program Director, Louis Laybourne School of Architecture

- Dr Kurt Lushington, Acting HoS, School of Psychology
- Prof Alison Mackinnon, Director, Hawke Research Institute
- Mrs Helen Marsden, postgraduate student, School of Psychology
- Mr Steve Marshall, Chief Executive, Dept of Education & Children's Services
- Dr Douglas Morgan, Senior Research Fellow Nunga Research
- Assoc Prof Helen Nixon, School of Education
- Dr Emily Potter, Postdoctoral Fellow, Hawke Research Institute
- Dr Rob Ranzijn, Program Director, School of Psychology
- Assoc Prof Ian Richards, Associate Professor Journalism, School of Communication, Information and New Media
- Assoc Prof David Roberts, Head of School, The Unaipon School
- Prof Michael Rowan, PVC, Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences
- Assoc Prof Angela Scarino, Senior Lecturer, School of International Studies
- Prof Dorothy Scott, Director, Australian Centre for Child Protection
- Dr Michele Simons, Senior Lecturer, School of Education
- Mr Alan Smith, Director, State Library of SA
- Prof Gary Smith, Head of School, School of International Studies
- Mr Sydney Sparrow, Lecturer, The Unaipon School
- Dr Nigel Starck, Offshore Program Director, School of Communication, Information and New Media
- Dr Tangi Steen, Lecturer, The Unaipon School
- Mr Trevor Temple, General Manager Business Development, SAGRIC International
- Ms Deb Tranter, postgraduate student, School of Psychology
- Dr Katharine Vadura, Lecturer, School of International Studies
- Ms Sue Vardon, Chief Executive, Department for Families and Communities, SA
- Assoc Prof Adrian Vicary, Head of School, School of Social Work and Social Policy
- Dr John Walsh, Research Degree Coordinator, Mawson Lakes EdD & PhD, School of Education
- Helen Wildash, Director, Learning Improvement and Support Services, Dept Education & Children's Services
- Prof Tony Winefield, Director, Centre for Applied Psychological Research
- Prof Claire Woods, School of Communication, Information and New Media