

JE.

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION - [REDACTED]**

From 2003 to 2007 (a period of five and a half years), I worked predominantly within the speech pathology discipline as a part-time or casual lecturer, course co-ordinator, researcher and/or clinical educator with the then head of discipline, [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”). During this period, my conference presentation and paper publication rate was similar to or greater than most other staff members in the discipline. I also contributed a substantial amount (around one to two days a week) of my own unpaid time supporting students, ongoing and casual staff. I was involved in a number of external grant applications and had an NMHRC UQ administered post-doctoral fellowship for three years. For four years I was on an annually-renewed contract as a clinical educator with the university’s highly successful aphasia groups, run as a joint project between the speech pathology discipline and

During this lengthy period, I also discussed a number of problems that arose within the discipline with [REDACTED]. These problems included soft marking, being told to ignore plagiarism, staff absences due to personal interests, unfair, incorrect and unrepresentative exam papers and assignments, as well as a lack of preparation and support for students on their clinical placements, amongst other difficulties. On all these occasions, [REDACTED] was receptive to these difficulties and spoke openly about the staffing difficulties she was having.

In mid-2007, a new ongoing lectureship was approved for the discipline. [REDACTED] approached [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”) to fill the position. [REDACTED] did not fulfil the essential criteria for the position and was the only person interviewed. Furthermore, there was a conflict of interest on [REDACTED]’s part during the recruitment process. I discussed these anomalies confidentially with the Faculty representative in Human Resources.

Reprisals against me were swift, immediate and devastating. I have been subject to “harassment” and “bullying” as defined in Policy [REDACTED]. This situation is known to the Head of School, Humanities and Social Sciences, and to Human Resources but no action has been taken.

In December 2007, on the second working day after my HR meeting and whilst I was still employed, I was told by [REDACTED] that I was hostile and could not work with a team. She told me to relocate my office and refused to renew my aphasia group contract, despite the fact that the groups had already been organised for the following year and that around 30 patients would be without therapy. She said that I must not contact her directly – only via the head of school. She later also told me that I could not enter my office during working hours. At that stage, I was using software licensed to my computer for my NHMRC research (on which [REDACTED] was an investigator). It then took two and a half months before I was able to continue my NHMRC research in my new office. I had a personal item stolen and was physically prevented from attending meetings, obtaining my mail and removed from all mailing lists or any contact with Speech Pathology, despite [REDACTED] being my “supervisor” on the NHMRC project and also despite my name and personal website appearing on the speech pathology discipline webpages.

Subsequently, I have been ostracised by the majority of SP academia in Australia. My applications for employment as a lecturer/researcher and email contact with colleagues in other universities are not acknowledged and previous teaching in Sydney has been discontinued. I have been unable to obtain employment as a lecturer and/or researcher within speech pathology. At conferences and workshops within Australia, my research colleagues actively scorn me. [REDACTED]'s lack of involvement in the NHMRC resulted in our research data being incomplete.

In April 2010 I made a Protected Disclosure to [REDACTED], VC of the University as well as a complaint regarding the reprisals that had been taken against me. Both these were dismissed by the university.

I was subsequently employed within the School of Architecture and the Built Environment at the university (March 2009 to February 2012). When my contracts came up for renewal at the start of the academic year (2012), the Pro-Vice Chancellor refused to allow any further employment contracts be issued to me, despite the fact that my contract, number of hours and number of students had already been arranged within the Head of School. I have never been notified of the reasons for this, or contacted by the Head of School. I am now not employed.

## SUBMISSION - [REDACTED]

After raising problems concerning the speech pathology discipline at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I was excluded from activities and lost my position.

Beginning in 2003, I was employed by the Speech Pathology discipline, [REDACTED] for nearly five years, in various positions as a researcher, lecturer and/or clinical educator on casual and fixed-term contracts. I have taught most of the courses in the program at various times. I also worked as a researcher on a number of small grants and was involved in a number of large ARC grant applications with Associate Professor [REDACTED]. From March 2006 I had an NHMRC postdoctoral fellowship (via the University of Queensland) and [REDACTED] undertook to provide me with the research infrastructure necessary for this research.

During these nearly five years, I was also involved in unpaid activities in the discipline taking one or two days a week, including:

- Consultation on an almost daily basis with students on academic, professional, clinical and personal matters, as well as on clinical placements (according to the students, the clinical education co-ordinators were often not available or inexperienced).
- Viva Examination panels (4 days a year over four years)
- Co-supervisor to 3 PhD students (2 now completed).
- Research consultant to Honours students
- Training staff and students re audiovisual and information technology.
- Providing casual lecturers with support and information.
- Acting as tutor/lecturer to students when staff were absent pursuing personal activities.
- Working as the sole supervisor (unpaid) of a final year student placement (SPTH4090)(2004 – 2 months).
- Setting up audiovisual equipment for an unrelated research project (1½ days of work–January 2006).

In five years, I authored and co-authored 15 refereed publications and 34 presentations at national and international conferences — a record at the upper end of performance compared to my colleagues — representing Speech Pathology and the [REDACTED] (even though the research and conference attendance were always in my own time and at my own expense). I also conducted professional development presentations to local and regional professionals and the public on behalf of the discipline and [REDACTED] I continue to make this contribution to local and regional professionals.

During this time, I discussed the following activities and actions with [REDACTED] (my immediate line manager). These activities and actions can be considered as Maladministration, according to the Protected Disclosures Act 1994 (and [REDACTED] Policy ):--

“For the purposes of this Act, conduct is of a kind that amounts to maladministration if it involves action or inaction of a serious nature that is: (a) contrary to law, or (b)

unreasonable, unjust, oppressive or improperly discriminatory, or (c) based wholly or partly on improper motives. “

- Two members of academic staff ( [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] ) instructing me to ignore student plagiarism in assignments (I followed the university guidelines and the students subsequently admitted plagiarising from the answer sheet which they had found).
- “Soft marking” by [REDACTED] :- students were given additional marks solely based on *making* an inquiry about an assignment/exam, not on the merits of their inquiry/complaint or what their query actually was.
- Also “soft marking” by casual staff – markers and clinical educators stated and continue to state that they know that Speech Pathology does not want students to fail so they adjust the marks accordingly. I have been told as recently as mid-2009 by a casual marker that “soft marking” continues to be commonplace and that she had no problem with that.
- Problems with [REDACTED]’s exam papers and assignments as well as presenting disorganised and outdated material (e.g. from her own student days). An example of exam paper problems occurred in 2006, when the statutory declarations of almost the entire second-year class regarding the inappropriateness of their exam were presented to the Dean of Students and to [REDACTED]. Students considered the exam to be “not a fair assessment”, “questions designed to test memory and rote learning”, “not a representative assessment of information taught in the course”, “question weighting seemed illogical”, “exact quotes and authors, not core concepts” and incorrect weighting to sections (compared to course outline). No action was taken and at a staff meeting we were told that the students’ marks had been adjusted.<sup>1</sup>
- Students reporting the behaviour of their clinical educators which contravened the Code of Ethics (Speech Pathology Australia). For example, three students were instructed by a clinical educator to elicit the gag reflex three times each – 9 times in total – on a patient who became upset and refused to return to the next therapy session, despite the fact that this reflex does not provide evidence of a swallowing disorder – no action was taken by the Clinical Education Coordinator regarding this). Another example: following a difficult and unproductive therapy session, a student was told by the clinical educator to repeat the same therapy tasks at the following session. When the student queried this, the clinical educator said that if this was done, the client’s family could be told that the client was not ready for therapy and should only return for therapy six months later.
- Academic staff pursuing their own interests (e.g. skiing holidays, voluntary organisations, purchasing farms etc) leaving me to provide unpaid teaching/ tutoring/ clinical education advice, etc. to the students.

---

<sup>1</sup> The general dissatisfaction of students was reflected in the [REDACTED] program reports showing that the continuing students’ overall satisfaction was 23.77 (50 is equivalent to agree) and the Goals and Teaching Scale and Learning Resources Scale were both in the bottom 25% of scores in the University. The Overall satisfaction Index in 2006 was substantially lower than it had been in the assessments from 2002 onwards.

- Students not getting support/advice for their clinical placements due to clinical education coordinators being inexperienced, unsupportive or absent. Also students not receiving correct information and appropriate training for clinical education placements. Some local speech pathology clinical placements have refused to take [REDACTED] students on placement as the students have been considered unreliable and of low standard.
- Clinical educators and casual staff not being provided with information, training or support to allow them to carry out their duties.
- Staff and staff family members using university equipment (e.g. scanners, colour printers) extensively for their own purposes, resulting in students being disadvantaged.
- [REDACTED] not permitting me to speak in any meetings by cutting me off as soon as I began speaking (This had been commented on by visitors from outside the university). [REDACTED] said she herself had observed this and volunteered to discuss this with [REDACTED].

These matters were all discussed on a one-to-one, face-to-face basis with [REDACTED]. She always appeared receptive and spoke openly and candidly about staffing difficulties (e.g. stating that she wished [REDACTED] would retire to Queensland).

In Semester 2, 2006, when I was employed by [REDACTED] for two days a week, she told me I was not allowed to take time off (although I had spoken to her previously about taking a week off). However, she permitted [REDACTED] (who was employed on a full-time basis) to take a week off during the same semester.

### **New ongoing speech pathology position**

Mid-2007 a new fulltime, ongoing lectureship was created for the program. [REDACTED] did not tell me about it but I heard about it inadvertently during a staff meeting. When I asked [REDACTED] about the position, she said she "had not told (me) as (she) did not think (I) would be interested". She told me she had already approached [REDACTED] about applying. [REDACTED] denied that [REDACTED] had been "brown-nosing". [REDACTED] also said that [REDACTED] needed the position as [REDACTED] "had spent a long time discussing her need for a career and also the need for money to build her and her husband's new house". ([REDACTED] had also frequently mentioned the need for employment at Clinical Linguistics Group meetings at the University of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] University). When I said that I was also interested in a career, [REDACTED] said that if I was upset about the situation, I could go to the University Counselling Service. She also said that the full lectureship had been "promised" to [REDACTED] so that it would be [REDACTED]'s position as Clinical Education Coordinator (50% clinical/50% teaching) that would be advertised.

The Clinical Education Coordinator position was subsequently advertised. [REDACTED] was the only person interviewed for the position. Before the interview, she told me that she knew everyone on the panel, except the HR person (whom [REDACTED] said had no say anyway) and therefore there would be no problems.

██████████ had delayed the date of the interview so that she could be on the panel because she told ██████████ that she did not want anyone from outside to be recruited “as had happened in Linguistics” (Some time previously, a new position in Linguistics had been awarded to a person from outside the university as no representative from Linguistics was on the selection panel.). The HR Guidelines for the Staff Selection Committee states that “any member (of the selection committee) who feels that their knowledge of an individual (relationship with, or any other factor) may influence their ability to fairly consider them on merit, must withdraw from the committee” and “It is essential that irrelevant or private information from outside or personal sources should not be introduced for consideration of a candidate.

██████████ was ██████████’s first referee, although ██████████ was also on the interview panel (contrary to HR policy on conflict of interest and Policy ██████████).

The essential criteria for the position included “at least three years clinical experience” and a track record of research publications and presentations. ██████████ had qualified at ██████████ some years previously and had continued to reside in the ██████████ area. She had worked in a limited way (for the equivalent of around a year full-time) on short-term, part-time and locum positions. This did not amount to the “at least 3 years” experience required. Although she had also worked as a clinical educator at ██████████, she had not achieved the experience necessary for this according to ██████████ Policy ██████████ (“All students undertaking a placement will be supervised by a professional in the field preferably with at least two years professional experience, or a designated individual supervisor of equivalent clinical/professional/industrial experience”). Although she may have stated or intimated that she had three years’ experience, it was well known by the speech pathology discipline and clinicians in the ██████████ area that ██████████ did not have much clinical experience. ██████████ was aware that ██████████ did not fulfil this essential criterion but this information was not shared with at least one other member of the panel (██████████ – personal communication – meeting 5.12.2007) and may not have been shared with the other members of the panel and HR (HR Guidelines “The purpose of this process (shortlisting) is to exclude those applicants who do not satisfy the essential requirements in the advertisement” and “Those shortlisted should demonstrate the capacity to meet the essential criteria in their application”). In addition, ██████████ did not have a track record of research publications and presentations (one journal paper and a few presentations).

Within an hour of her interview, ██████████ (in the company of ██████████) was verbally notified that she had been successful. Without waiting for formal written notification (as directed by HR policy), ██████████ announced to students and staff at a speech pathology dance that ██████████ had been appointed. ██████████, then director of HR, expressed his concern about this announcement at a meeting (attended by ██████████ ██████████ and myself in January 2008). The employment of ██████████ can be considered as a “serious and substantial waste may not be material in financial terms but maybe significant by nature. That is it may be improper or inappropriate - staff being remunerated for skills that they do not have, but are required to have under the terms or conditions of their employment,”.

Before the interview took place, I requested a meeting with the faculty representative in Human Resources. I was given an appointment on 29th November 2007 (after the job interview had taken place). I had a meeting with [REDACTED], then faculty representative, on to raise my concerns about the recruitment process. I spoke in confidence to her and raised the following concerns (described in detail above):-

- According to HR policy, if there is a poor response to a position advertisement, the criteria should be revised and the position re-advertised.
- [REDACTED] had approached [REDACTED] to fill the position.
- [REDACTED] was [REDACTED]'s first referee, although [REDACTED] was also on the interview panel.
- [REDACTED] had qualified some years previously. However, she had worked locally in a limited way on short-term, part-time and locum positions and therefore had not accumulated the requisite experience. Her lack of clinical experience was well known locally, due to the relatively small number of speech pathology positions available in the area.
- [REDACTED] did not have a record of research publications.

[REDACTED] said (without consulting any colleagues or documentation) that the process had been handled according to policy and that nothing would happen unless a formal complaint was made which I did not do (in order to maintain confidentiality).

### **Immediate repercussions**

Three working days later, on 4th December 2007 [REDACTED] told me (whilst I was still employed by [REDACTED]) that I was hostile and could not work with a team. She told me that she was not prepared to discuss the issue with me. I was given no further reasons and there had never been any prior discussions or warnings and none since. [REDACTED] said she would not renew my annual clinical educator contract and that I must "relocate". (In a subsequent meeting with the then head of school, he apparently had no knowledge regarding my "relocation"). She told me not to contact her directly, but to communicate via the head of school, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] also said she would not renew my annual clinical educator contract (then entering its fifth year). Although my contracts were renewed annually, there was the expectation that it would again be renewed. By that stage of the year, the university students had already left on vacation; however the preparations which had been made for the continuation of the groups the following year were that:-

- In September 2007, the dates for the placement had been mutually discussed and agreed between [REDACTED] (acting Clinical Education Coordinator) and the Stroke Team,
- The group members (around 30) had been notified of the continuation of their groups and the dates scheduled for the entire year, and

- Students had been allocated to the group from the end of January (this meant that the students had to return early from the summer university break to attend this placement).
- Students had already specifically requested a placement on my clinical group placement.
- Letter from Clinical Education Coordinator [REDACTED] stated that “Although this agreement is current until the end of 2007, it is anticipated that with recurrent funding from the [REDACTED], the Student Unit will continue in 2008” (see attached). [REDACTED] herself (see aphasia Group report) had stated that “The cost-efficiencies of the program are highly efficient for clinical services, and in the mid-range of efficiency for clinical education provision”. Both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (then acting Clinical Education Coordinator) had told me that there was “plenty of money” in the clinical education budget. [REDACTED] had stated that “The cost-efficiencies of the program .. in the mid-range of efficiency for clinical education provision”.

I specifically asked if the clinical educator position for the groups could continue without my involvement; the groups were dependent on the university’s input to continue because the Stroke Team was unable to sustain the groups without support. [REDACTED], who had been involved in setting up the group program, knew that this would directly result in around 30 communicatively-disordered [REDACTED] clients no longer being able to access therapy. However [REDACTED] declined to provide support for the group and said she would reconsider it in 2009. However Speech Pathology has subsequently said that they have no intention of placing students at the group – “no students were placed there in 2008” and “there are no plans to include an aphasia group placement for students in 2009”- emails 17.12.09).

On 8th January 2008, I was told by [REDACTED] that I could not go to my office during working hours because she needed [REDACTED] to be there and [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] would not come in to her office if I was in my office. She told me that I could work at home although I stated that I did not have the facilities (e.g. computer, specialised linguistic analysis software licensed to the university computer) that I needed in order to continue the NHMRC research. (despite [REDACTED] undertaking to provide me with research infrastructure for my NHMRC Post-doctoral Fellowship – According to this grant application, [REDACTED] undertook to provide me with the research infrastructure necessary for this research (“Shared office space and shared access to computers will be provided through the School, along with support for general consumables, email, internet, library access. The School will provide access to software for linguistic analyses and recording equipment that are already available in the School from the completion of previously funded research in the area of discourse analysis. The University will provide the infrastructure support for the financial management of funds received.”)(Application attached). At that stage, I had over a year of my NHMRC fellowship to complete

I went to HR to discuss my treatment but the faculty representative was not there. A representative from another Faculty, [REDACTED], attempted to help me but then referred me to



██████████, the Manager of HR. Although my initial meeting was in confidence, she obviously knew about my previous confidential visit to HR.

Six weeks later, I was allocated another office on the other side of campus; there was no computer in the office. During this time I was not able to proceed with the analysis of the research data as the licensed software needed was installed on my previous office computer. After intervention by the NHMRC Chief Investigator (██████████ of the University of Queensland) (19.02.2008), my computer was moved to my new office. However, all my belongings, including my research and personal items, remained in my previous office.

██████████ had not notified IT services that she had given permission for my computer to be moved to another building so my use of the computer in my new office was considered “illegal” and I was disconnected at the end of May. After one week, I was reconnected to the network.

After repeated emails to the head of school, ██████████ (which were opened by him but mostly unacknowledged – see attached proof that ██████████ opened the emails), he emailed me after 14 weeks and told me that “there was never any intention to restrict (my) access”. No formal relocation process was organised (despite HR’s assurance that I would be “assisted, by removalists or other University workers, to move all of the things “(1.04.2008) and my husband and I transported the filing cabinets and boxes to my new office over weekends. I was only allowed to enter my previous office when ██████████ gave permission. I was escorted to my old office by an employee of the school to finalise my packing and an admin assistant helped to move the remaining boxes to my new office. The key from my old office was retained by the school employee (although I had signed responsibility for it at Facilities Management) (end of April 2008).

During this period, I could not collect my mail as it was taken into the Speech Pathology Clinic to which I no longer had access.

An academic colleague accessed my private locked office, knowing I was not there, and stole one of my personal items. I sent repeated email requests to ██████████ which were opened but never acknowledged. After seven months with no reaction from ██████████, I sent him an email suggesting that I ask Security to speak to the academic responsible for taking the item (27.06.2008). Shortly thereafter, the item was returned to me by an administrative employee who said he had no knowledge of how it had been retrieved. I did not receive a single acknowledgement by ██████████ of my emails regarding this stolen item.

██████████ (a university academic) subsequently admitted to trespassing and stealing from my office to ██████████ or the RISQ group. No action was taken by ██████████, ██████████ or anyone at the university regarding this.

During the almost five years, I was also involved in unpaid activities in the discipline taking one or two days a week (complete list attached). ██████████ asked me to provide clinical supervision to a fourth year student to enable her to complete her program faster and I agreed

to do so. This was a standard university course. However I was not paid for this work which took place during the Christmas holiday period. ("I can't provide any additional funds to support supervision (sic) of a 4th year student" ( [REDACTED] 15.12.2005). I was subsequently told by the then Head of School, [REDACTED], at a meeting between the two of us on 5th December 2007 that the school had sufficient funds to pay me for this and other work I had done in the discipline. He also said that if I had been asked and had completed this work, I should be paid for it.

In January 2008, I attended a meeting at the request of the head of HR ([REDACTED]) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the Faculty of Education and Arts ([REDACTED]). I was told that because a person had already been recruited and also because I was no longer employed by [REDACTED], no action could be taken.

I was removed from the discipline email list, despite the fact that I continued to conduct research under the auspices of Speech Pathology and that I was listed as a conjoint lecturer on the [REDACTED] speech pathology website. Thus I was not provided with information on local or regional workshops, research meetings, forums, university-based speech pathology activities or potential employment opportunities.

During 2007, I complied with [REDACTED]'s request not to contact her directly and had been communicating via the Head of School, [REDACTED]. During this time, no-one ever queried, discussed with or provided me with a reason for this arrangement and there was no discussion regarding its validity or appropriateness. At the end of 2008 (one year later), I was told by [REDACTED] of HR that "there is no University Policy which deals with the matter raised by you" (10.12.2008). After contacting the Acting Head of School in December 2008 (11.12.2008), I was told that "It's fine for you to communicate with whomsoever you might wish". No further information or elucidation was provided then or now.

As stated above, I regularly presented papers at national and international conferences (32 in five years) at my own expense. In May 2007, I was notified that I had had two papers accepted for a conference in Edinburgh and one (co-authored with [REDACTED]) for a conference in Toronto, Canada (both conferences took place in September 2007). [REDACTED] suggested that I apply for a travel grant from [REDACTED], despite my conjoint status, on the basis of my ongoing contribution to the discipline and [REDACTED] ("I think this is REALLY worth doing I think the School should be supporting this" [REDACTED] 2007). [REDACTED] wrote a letter of support to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], stating "As [REDACTED] lists her affiliation as being with this University, we have derived Research Quantum benefits from her productivity" and "...so I am confident that the investment of School funds will return published outcomes". After deliberation by the HSS research committee, I was told that "this has been viewed sympathetically and a decision to grant \$1500 assistance for attendance at the Edinburgh conference has been made". I then attempted to obtain the funding and was referred by [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Subsequently I contacted [REDACTED] who referred me to [REDACTED]. The latter responded that "The institutional requirement of all research funding (such as for conferences etc), where this funding comes from IGS funds, is that it be expended and claimed in the year it was awarded.

If this has not been done, then any entitlement is foregone”. I replied to him that “I have tried repeatedly to find out how to claim this allowance but since I was ostracised from speech pathology, it has been difficult to get a response from anyone” and attached a list of the conferences and workshops where I had made presentations. I have had no further response regarding this and to date have not received any of this travel allowance.

### **On-going repercussions**

I had been a member of the [REDACTED] Group comprised of members from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Universities for five and a half years (March 2002). I had been an active and regular participant and contributor to this group and had presented at two conferences as part of the group’s invited colloquia. This group met and collaborated regularly. At a scheduled meeting on Friday 7th December 2007 (following a reminder letter from [REDACTED] stating “Hope to see you there”), I arrived at the meeting place. [REDACTED] opened the door and told me “It was not a good time”. When I asked what the problem was, - she repeated that it was not a good time and closed the door to physically prevent me from entering the venue of the meeting. I could see and hear [REDACTED] already inside the venue. Since then I have not been contacted with any information from this group.

[REDACTED] has close personal and work-related contact with many of the more senior aphasia academics and researchers in Australia. In contrast to the once warm and engaging interactions I previously enjoyed with these academics and researchers (including visiting their homes and having meals with them), since December 2007 these colleagues actively and purposely shun me in face-to-face encounters and actively distance themselves from me. Furthermore, they no longer respond to my emails, no longer collaborate with me or continue with previously planned journal papers (many of whom previously collaborated with me in research projects, journal papers and conference presentations)..

Since then, I have applied for numerous jobs in speech pathology or in research (at the [REDACTED] University and at the [REDACTED]). My application forms and enquiries relating to the job are unacknowledged and “never received”, my emails about work “disappear”. I appear to have been blacklisted by these departments. For example,

- I had provided casual teaching for [REDACTED], the then [REDACTED] course coordinator on a Masters program at [REDACTED] University for four years. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] collaborate regularly and were fellow PhD students. Since early 2008, I have no longer been asked to provide these lectures and [REDACTED] did not respond to any of the four emails I sent her in 2008 (including one containing photos taken of us together in Canada).
- In November 2007 I had applied for a teaching position at the University of Sydney. I was shortlisted and interviewed for the position. I was told in January 2008 that [REDACTED] had given a verbal reference regarding me but then had telephoned and withdrawn it. I approached [REDACTED]’s Human Resources to find out why [REDACTED] had withdrawn the reference. I was referred to [REDACTED] (HR) (the content of my previous confidential meeting with HR had obviously been discussed with her).

██████ told ██████ that she had been “caught off guard”. The University asked for the reason why ██████ had withdrawn the reference – in order not to malign ██████, or Human Resources or speech pathology at ██████, I decided not to explain the situation until I had been given permission to do so by ██████. ██████ and I discussed this and I then provided the University (██████) with a brief general view of what had happened. The University (██████) declined to progress this further with me as “we were concerned that they may have a bearing on suitability for employment here” (5.09.2008).

- ██████, one of the American convenors of an international research collaboration of which I am a member, presented a workshop in Sydney in August 2008. This workshop was arranged by ██████ of University (██████), a member of the ██████ and a research collaborator of ██████’s. I was personally invited to the workshop by ██████ -“I am also doing an AphasiaBank day in Sydney, which i can invite you to myself please let ██████ know you will be there” (5.06.2008) and “You are definitely included....I will let you know the venue (22.07.2008)”. ██████, the project co-ordinator, emailed me to say “I have received copies on a couple of letters from ██████ to you and they were rather specific in terms of making it clear that you were included in the workshop...All I can say from here is that my understanding is that you are included and that all you need to do is to contact ██████ regarding details” 22.07.2008. I emailed ██████ for the venue details on 5th June, as directed, but I received an autoreply stating that “██████ will be back in the office 14 June”. I emailed a number of times again and had a response on 22nd July. She refused me a place at the workshop on the basis that the workshop was full (“Unfortunately I booked the venue/catering some weeks ago and we are unable to take any more people” 22.07.2008). However, only five participants (which included ██████) attended the workshop. Furthermore, one of the five participants (██████ from Adelaide) was invited to attend the workshop after I was told that the venue was full.
- In March 2008, I applied for a lecturing position at ██████ University. I emailed ██████ (also a research collaborator of ██████’s and a member of the ██████) stating that I had not given ██████ as a referee but that I could provide further information in an interview. I asked for ██████’s assurance that I would not be disadvantaged in any way. I had no response to my letter and no further progress was made regarding this position.
- In December 2008, I applied for a research post at the University (██████) (December 2008). A researcher, ██████, phoned me a number of times and emailed me to discuss this as she felt I was very suited to the position. She told me she needed to tell the research director, ██████ about her discussions with me and that she wanted to employ me. ██████ is one of ██████’s close colleagues. I was then turned down for this position.
- Research collaboration with other academics has been terminated. For example, I was invited to co-present at two conference colloquiums by ██████, one of



the [redacted] members from [redacted] University. After the second conference (July 2007), she, another group member and myself had dinner and discussed a research publication. (“Well after an inspirational weekend where I think we got more ideas than we could handle .....Our inspirational dinner came up with the following idea, if you remember, to write a 'discussion' paper on .....First goal to circulate papers to each other that we might be able to use” [redacted] 2.07.2007). Subsequent to this I attended a conference in Canada in September 2007 and [redacted] and I spent a day together visiting a rehabilitation centre (Photos available). Following this, I emailed her four times during 2008 (one included the photos of Canada). However I had no response to my emails until I emailed her on 20.3.09 saying that I now assumed that [redacted] had spoken to her. She then responded by saying that “Your email must have disappeared into the proverbial email backlog”. Since Canada, I have attended five conferences and workshops which she has attended and she acts as if she has never seen me before.

- Other speech pathology academics (e.g. [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]) no longer collaborate with me and no longer want their name associated with mine or even be seen talking to me. I know many of the active aphasia researchers in Australia; however at conferences, meetings and workshops, many of them actively scorn me, let alone work or collaborate with me. Even those academics with whom I had close contact state that they cannot be seen talking to me or else their careers would suffer.

The [redacted] was named in the [redacted] grant application as a resource for my research ([redacted] “has been involved in the [redacted] [redacted], for which [redacted] is the convenor, and it is expected that this Group will continue to be an important cross-institutional source of intellectual support.”). My involvement with this group was acknowledged by [redacted] in an [redacted] grant application. As one of her “Five leading achievements in capacity building and reasons for choices”, she stated that “In my capacity as convenor of the [redacted], I introduced [redacted] to the field of Systemic Functional Linguistics, resulting in a sole-authored publication using this perspective”. In April 2008, I emailed the group about further meetings. [redacted] replied that the group would be a “looser and more open association” allowing people to come together “as needed”. There has been no further contact since then, despite my previous involvement in at least two ongoing projects that the group were involved with.

My name was removed from the discipline email list despite continuing to be listed as a conjoint lecturer on the speech pathology website until 2009. Thus I was not provided with information on local or regional workshops, research meetings, forums, university-based speech pathology activities or potential employment opportunities. This was the last link I had with speech pathology, despite [redacted] being “responsible for the supervision and direction of ([redacted]), as well as assisting directly in data collection as needed”. This contact is also of particular importance for me as I provide supervision to some of the University’s clinical educators and student unit leaders and act as academic and research support for local and regional clinicians. On January 28, 2008, my name was removed from the university all-staff mailing list and on 22.01.2008 from access to the shared address book of HSS (even

though I continued to be a conjoint and had had these privileges from when I was initially made a conjoint in 2003). My name also continued to be listed as a conjoint lecturer within HSS for at least a year from when my name was removed from the lists (see webpage dated 11.12.2008).

During this entire period (i.e. December 2007 to date), [REDACTED] has never contacted me about meetings regarding our NHMRC grant (as we were the only two Newcastle team members (“Researcher team members from each site will meet as frequently as is deemed necessary”). She was not involved in any (except one) of our very frequent team teleconferences or regular face-to-face meetings (“In addition, team meetings via teleconferencing will take place monthly. . Email and telephone contact between all team members will be made on a frequent and ad hoc basis. The progress of the project will be continuously reviewed during team contact. It will be revised and modified if necessary after each stage of data collection and analysis“). In addition, it was stated in the NHMRC grant that “The intellectual environment for [REDACTED] (...) will be primarily through the research chief investigator, [REDACTED]”. Furthermore, as stated above, [REDACTED] was to “be responsible for the supervision and direction of employed research personnel working in the local area, as well as assisting directly in data collection as needed”. I was the *only* “research personnel” in the local area and I did not therefore benefit from any “intellectual environment”, “supervision” or “direction”. At no time did [REDACTED] n or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] provide a replacement supervisor or director, or provide another “intellectual environment” for me.

Furthermore, in the ethics application, [REDACTED] stated that “The information collected will be stored in the [REDACTED] Archive, which is kept in the General Purposes Building ( [REDACTED] ”. However the information has never been stored there because I did not and still do not have access to that archive due to the actions that [REDACTED] has taken against me. [REDACTED], as [REDACTED] site supervisor, has never requested information regarding the location or security of the storage of these data.

In addition, in [REDACTED]’s ethics application for the NHMRC grant’s activities in [REDACTED] (approved by the [REDACTED] Ethics Committee – see copy attached), she stated that a potential conflict of interest for the researcher (me) “may arise if the researcher is also nominated by a participant as the treating speech pathologist. If this situation arises, the co-investigator, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will conduct the interviews with that participant so that no conflict of interest occurs”. For 88% of the [REDACTED] participants (Aphasia group members), this conflict of interest did arise. However, due to [REDACTED]’s lack of involvement in the grant, the participants could not be interviewed regarding this period of therapy (group therapy) and these data relating to this period, the longest of their rehabilitation, could not be collected. This situation curtailed the data collected from 34% of the total number of participants for the entire project, resulting in an incomplete set of data, particularly relating to a specific type of therapy. However, [REDACTED] continues to benefit from publications arising from this grant.

I have approached Speech Pathology Australia (our national body) about the possible breach of Speech Pathology Australia's Code of Ethics by its members, including ██████ who is a Fellow of Speech Pathology Australia. These breaches are

- ██████'s misrepresentation of her clinical experience in her job application ("Any form of professional misrepresentation could potentially breach the Association's Code of Ethics),
- ██████ removing me from my office and not permitting me to discuss the situation or providing me with an explanation as well as not permitting me to contact her for a year and also removing me from all speech pathology contact (" Yes, certainly the Association's Code of Ethics extends beyond the realm of clinical practice to include management and other areas that may form part of a speech pathologist's role. Eg supervision of staff, clinical support, etc.").
- Being shunned by numerous members (██████, ██████, ██████, ██████, ██████, etc) of Speech Pathology Australia as well as clinicians in the ██████ area.
- In her sudden decision to end clinical education to the aphasia group, ██████ placed all these patients in a situation where they would not be able to obtain further therapy and this contravenes our code ("We also seek to prevent harm and do not knowingly cause harm"). ██████ herself set up the groups in collaboration with the Community Stroke Team and was therefore well aware of the implications and effect on these patients of her actions.

In August 2009, I received a letter from ██████'s personal (rather than ██████) lawyer threatening to sue me for defamation. I had sent a report on events to ██████ and ██████ to provide them with the opportunity to correct any factual inaccuracies therein. I did not receive any corrections from either person regarding this report. After being refused attendance at the ██████ workshop (see above), I sent a copy of the report to ██████ so that she was aware of the events that had taken place at ██████ and how they had affected me and my activities. As my lawyer indicated to ██████, "the factual matters .. are true. There is therefore no actionable defamation" and "With respect to the alleged publications to ██████ ██████ and ██████, our client is additionally entitled to the defence of qualified privilege". No further response from ██████'s lawyer has been received.

In August 2009, myself and two other researchers submitted an ethics application to the Human Research Ethics Committee of which ██████ is Chair. After submitting our first revision as directed, we were then told to make three more revisions (to insert two short sentences and to change "has" to "have") and were asked to respond again in writing. According to a Senate member "i always worried if paperwork went back twice. Once is ok but twice is a problem & a trigger to contact the researchers to stop the paperwork circuit". The second revision was not, as scheduled, reviewed during the next Committee meeting and was only reviewed and approved after intervention by the Head of the School of Architecture and the Built Environment. This caused a substantial delay in obtaining ethics approval. At no time did ██████ remove herself from this if she considered it a conflict of interest.

My name and details of the student placement I conducted during my employment in Speech Pathology was listed on the Speech Pathology main webpage, indicating the specialist nature of this placement (see copy). These details continued to be used to promote the discipline until June 2010. Therefore my name was falsely used for two and a half full years to promote the speech pathology degree *after* I had been removed from speech pathology. In addition, the aphasia group placement was no longer available to students and was thus falsely advertised (also for two and a half years).

### **Protected Disclosure and complaint**

After many discussions and consultation with the [REDACTED] Complaints Office, I made a protected disclosure to [REDACTED] at the University on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2010. Under the instruction of [REDACTED] (Director of the Complaints Office) I also made a formal complaint regarding the retaliations (“detrimental action”) that had been made against me. [REDACTED] asked the PVC, [REDACTED], to investigate this matter, together with [REDACTED].

On 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2010, I received the outcome of my Protected Disclosure from [REDACTED] (copy attached). This concluded that

In conclusion the investigation

- (i) found that your disclosure did not meet the requirement that:

*“To be protected, a disclosure must include information that shows or tends to show corrupt conduct... A disclosure must be more than a mere allegation. Matters must be stated which, if substantiated, amount to the alleged conduct, or tend to do so...”*

- (ii) did not find any evidence to substantiate the alleged conduct.

Therefore no action was taken regarding my Protected Disclosure.

In November 2010, I responded to the outcome of this investigation, indicating the numerous issues that had not been investigated, responded to or accounted for in their investigation (see attached).

At a meeting with [REDACTED] he told me that there was nothing he could do about the bullying as he was “only” a Pro Vice Chancellor and was limited in what he could do.

My formal complaint regarding the reprisals against me had not been investigated by [REDACTED]. After a second request for this to be investigated, I was notified by [REDACTED] in December 2010 that she had “engaged an external investigator to undertake an investigation into the issues you raised in your complaint”. I subsequently met with [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] Group, Sydney. [REDACTED] was given specific terms of reference for the investigation by the University (e.g. he was not allowed to interview others generally about issue but had to state that it was in connection with me and what I alleged). During his investigation, [REDACTED] interviewed a number of people who were implicated in my situation.

[REDACTED] told me that his investigation had revealed that I was highly admired as being very competent etc but that I had had reprisals taken against me due to “personal” issues before



December 2007. In my email to [REDACTED], I stated that he had told me “that the reason why [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had “personal” issues with me was because of particular events that occurred before December 2007:-

- A complaint (purportedly made by me) about plagiarism in [REDACTED]’s PhD
- Details of this plagiarism appearing on a stuttering blog
- [REDACTED] threatening to sue me for defamation.

However

- The complaint to the University of concern to [REDACTED] occurred in September 2009. I attach the University’s email in response to my request for the date of the complaint. However, I contacted the man you mentioned who runs the stuttering website and he notified me of the details. Attached is his email.
- The letter from my solicitor to [REDACTED]’s solicitor regarding defamation was dated 26th August 2009. (In this letter my solicitor stated that there was “no actionable defamation” and no response by [REDACTED] was received).

These events occurred between 18 months and 2 years AFTER I was told to leave. Therefore I do not understand how these events can be put forward as the reason for me being removed.”

[REDACTED] responded to this stating that this was his “personal opinion” but that he would investigate further. [REDACTED] notified also me that he would give me the recordings of our meeting but this has never occurred.

[REDACTED] wrote a draft report to the University which I did not see and have never been provided with a copy. He notified me that [REDACTED] had admitted to stealing the personal item from my locked office. There were a number of outstanding issues which he undertook to investigate. However, I was subsequently notified that my complaint was “dismissed”. A number of queries remained unanswered by this external investigation. I notified the university ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED]) that there were still outstanding issues (see document). This was never responded to.

The University has “declined” to consider the complaint I made under the Privacy Act against the rumour-mongering [REDACTED] spread about me.

[REDACTED] has notified me that he will not respond to any further correspondence about my employment at the University.

### **School of Architecture and the Built Environment (SABE)**

Due to the fact that I had conducted research for SABE in 2006, I was invited to continue conducting research, tutoring Masters students and providing additional assistance to Masters-level international students. I was employed there on a number of short to medium-term contracts from March 2009 to February 2011. During this period I had been involved in

setting up the ‘ [REDACTED] ’ website (see separate submission) and had been prevented from putting up posters at the university, despite the fact that they complied with the Poster policy.

Over the 2011-2012 holiday period I was employed in SABE conducting research. This contract was extended until the end of February 2011, immediately before the students returned for the start of Semester 1. My last contract there expired on Friday 24th February 2012. I had met with the Head of School, [REDACTED] and he had again offered me work during Semester 1 and 2 of 2012. We had discussed my hours etc for employment for the 2012 academic year. I had also had email discussions with other lecturers regarding the number of students and the number of hours I would work, and I was listed as one of the tutors on a research course for final year and Masters students. My new contract (part-time fixed term) for 2012 was due to begin on Monday 27th February (first day of Semester 1).

I was told by my husband who teaches on Construction Management that [REDACTED] (Pro-Vice Chancellor had notified HR that no more contracts would be issues for me, despite the fact that my position in SABE was already arranged. I was subsequently approached by another part-time casual employee in the school who had been directed by [REDACTED] asked to do the tutoring and research that had been offered to me.. My other (not completed) research work with academics in the School has been left hanging in mid-air. I was then no longer employed by the University. No-one has given me any reason for this nor was I notified formally about this.

The Head of School of SABE, [REDACTED], did not contact me at ANY STAGE of these events. He has never spoken to me or contacted me electronically and I have never been given any reason why no further contracts could be issued for me.

I subsequently contacted [REDACTED] to request the reason for this. I also stated that

“I know that you have told me previously that you would not respond to correspondence from me. However, I have copied [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in this email in the hope that someone would have the decency to explain to me the reason for your/the University's behaviour regarding my contract.”

I have had no response in any form from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (Head of HR) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Vice Chancellor) or anyone else regarding this.

### **New positions in Speech Pathology at the [REDACTED]**

In mid-2011, two positions (for a lecturer and senior lecturer) were advertised in speech pathology at the university. I applied for these positions. I also asked for confirmation that ‘ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have declared their conflict of interest regarding my application for this position so that my application can be considered in the fair and transparent manner advocated by the [REDACTED] Recruitment Policy’. My qualifications and experience matched the selection criteria of the new positions. There was subsequently a delay due to the fact that insufficient applications were made. I was notified that I did not fulfil the criteria for the position. As per University policy, I requested

feedback regarding my application. I was notified by [REDACTED] that I did not have a track record of research, or sufficient experience in teaching and supervision.

Another new position was advertised in April 2011 – whilst the senior lectureship had been filled, the lectureship had been given to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]'s position (half-time lecturer, half-time clinical educator) was advertised. I also applied for this position but was notified that I would not be interviewed, despite easily fulfilling the compulsory selection criteria.

### **Ethics and publications**

I discovered when reading some publications that [REDACTED] had used data from the participants in the groups I run, from myself and also from a colleague in two of her publications. I asked [REDACTED] whether she had obtained consent to use these data from the group members ([REDACTED] Health patients). I know that I did not give consent for this. After I received no response from [REDACTED], I asked [REDACTED] for a response. After an investigation by [REDACTED] (Research), I received a reply from [REDACTED] stating that "There were opportunities for any concerns about the relevant permissions to have been raised with [REDACTED] prior to the first publication of the transcripts". The patients concerned all have communication difficulties and would not have been able to raise concerns. He concluded that there are "insufficient grounds to support an allegation of research misconduct or serious research misconduct against [REDACTED]". [REDACTED] did not address the issue of the [REDACTED] Health patients whose data was used without their consent and without them being given the "opportunities for any concerns" to be raised. These people are considered a "vulnerable population" due to their communication difficulties.

I responded that "According to the uni's human-ethics website, "Ethics approval must be sought for research involving human participants. A 'participant' is someone who actively provides research data e.g. .... participates in interviews, discussions or observations..". My understanding of this is people actively give consent, not that there were "opportunities for any concerns about the relevant permissions to have been raised..". The latter would mean that ethical permission would not be needed - all researchers would have to do is provide "opportunities for concerns" to be raised. Could you (or alternatively [REDACTED] as previous Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee) please clarify this situation? It would certainly make our work as researchers much easier if we could do that".

[REDACTED] responded that he was satisfied that he have provided me with an outcome.

I subsequently contacted the [REDACTED] Health Research Committee regarding the use of personal data belonging to [REDACTED] Health patients. I was told that "the Chair of the [REDACTED] Research Ethics Committee and we are unable to be involved in this issue". No further action has been taken.