

The Senate

Employment, Workplace Relations
and Education Legislation Committee

Provisions of the Higher Education Legislation
Amendment Bill (No.3) 2004

August 2004

© Commonwealth of Australia

ISBN 0 642 71449 5

This document was produced by the Senate Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate, Parliament House, Canberra.

Membership of the Committee

Members

Senator John Tierney	LP, New South Wales	Chair
Senator George Campbell	ALP, New South Wales	Deputy Chair
Senator Guy Barnett	LP, Tasmania	
Senator Kim Carr	ALP, Victoria	
Senator David Johnston	LP, Western Australia	
Senator Natasha Stott Despoja	AD, South Australia	

Substitute Members

Senator Andrew Murray	for Senator Stott Despoja – Workplace Relations
Senator John Cherry	for Senator Stott Despoja – Employment
Senator Lyn Allison	for Senator Stott Despoja – Schools and Training

Secretariat

Senate Employment, Workplace Relations and Education
 Legislation Committee Secretariat
 Suite SG. 52
 The Senate
 Parliament House
 Canberra ACT 2600
 Phone: 02 6277 3520
 Fax: 02 6277 5706
 E-mail: eet.sen@aph.gov.au
 Internet: www.aph.gov.au/senate_employment

Table of Contents

Membership of the Committee.....	iii
Chapter 1.....	1
Majority Report.....	1
Provisions of the bill	1
Provision relating to Melbourne University Private	1
Other matters.....	7
Recommendation.....	7
Chapter 2.....	9
Opposition Senators' report.....	9
General comments.....	9
Melbourne University Private:	
Conditions for continued recognition as a university	11
Compliance with Ministerial Order on research output.....	12
Governance and independence of MUPL	17
Compliance with MCEETYA Protocols.....	19
Sector-wide implications.....	20
Objections by MUPL to Senate scrutiny.....	23
Conclusion and recommendations	23
Appendix 1	27
List of submissions	27
Appendix 2	29
Hearings and Witnesses.....	29
Appendix 3	31
Tabled documents and answers to questions on notice	31

Appendix 4	33
Additional information	33
Appendix 5	35
Ministerial Orders.....	35

Chapter 1

Majority Report

1.1 On 11 August 2004, the Senate referred to the Legislation Committee for inquiry, the Higher Education Legislation Amendment Bill (No.3) 2004. The committee was due to report on 2 September.

1.2 Submissions were called for immediately and a public hearing was arranged in Melbourne for 19 August. Nine submissions were received.

Provisions of the bill

1.3 The Higher Education Legislation Amendment (No.3) Bill is omnibus legislation which amends four acts. Among other provisions, the proposed amendments extend funding for radiation oncology training; they ensure the continuation of summer school arrangements; add Melbourne University Private Limited (MUPL) to the list of Table B providers eligible to access Commonwealth funding for research and FEE-HELP; and allow more flexible arrangements for students applying for financial assistance, including extension of access to assistance for students under the OS-Help scheme. Altogether, the amendments proposed in the bill will increase appropriations by over \$500 million.

1.4 The committee's consideration of the bill was limited to the inclusion of Melbourne University Private to the list of Table B providers. Matters were raised about the timeframe of the legislation in view of the Senate's crowded schedule of legislation, and the lead-times for the drafting of amendment bills following consultation with universities. While the committee recognises the obligation on governments to plan legislative measures well ahead of time, it is also sympathetic to claims from interested parties affected by legislation to ensure that consultation takes place and that governments are able to act on the best advice available. These requirements weigh more heavily on the Senate workload toward the expected end of a parliament.

Provision relating to Melbourne University Private

1.5 The committee notes that government policy is to develop a more sustainable and diverse higher education system so as to meet the varying training and professional skills needs of industry. The flexible and multi-disciplinary delivery of academic courses is a challenge taken up just as readily in the private sector as in public universities. It is Government policy to encourage the private higher education sector to increase its share of that market.

Relevant facts about Melbourne University Private

1.6 Melbourne University Private Limited (MUPL) is an unlisted public company of which the University of Melbourne is the sole shareholder. The university was established in July 1998 under a Ministerial Order of the Minister of Education, renewable in five years.

1.7 During its inquiry into higher education in 2001, the committee received evidence from Melbourne University and its vice-chancellor at the time, Professor Alan Gilbert, about the potential of MUPL to use its competitive advantage, and the Melbourne University 'brand' and world-class expertise to generate revenue for the university. This would happen as a consequence of tapping into niche markets servicing the specialised needs of industry: markets which traditional universities could not meet because they lacked the course flexibilities required.¹ The committee notes that while capital growth projections may have been optimistic, MUPL has been successful in developing courses for government agencies and several foreign clients, including PETRONAS, the large Malaysian oil corporation, and for a number of foreign aid agencies.²

1.8 The committee notes advice from MUPL that it is a self-accrediting institution whose academic and commercial operations are focussed on its School of International Development, School of Applied Language Studies and its School of Enterprise. Around 130 full-time equivalent staff are employed, including staff placed overseas in joint ventures. MUP currently has 344 award students, over 1000 non-award students and a turnover of \$55 million in 2003-04.³

1.9 At the end of first three years of operation, the Minister for Education and Training in Victoria ordered a review by an expert panel to establish whether MUPL had met the MCEETYA principles known as the National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes. The committee heard evidence from Professor Simon Marginson, one of the accreditation panel members appointed by the Minister, that reaccreditation was recommended subject to MUPL developing a comprehensive research program.⁴ The way was now clear for MUPL to apply to be placed on the Table B list of higher institutions eligible to accept FEE-HELP recipients, and recipients of Commonwealth funded research grants.

Table B inclusion

1.10 The *Higher Education Support Act 2003* provides for two ways for approving funding for institutions: either through an amendment to the act to list the institution on either Table A or B, or through identification and approval by the Minister as a

1 Senate EWRE Committee, *Universities in Crisis, Report on Higher Education*, p.241

2 Submission No.4, Melbourne University Private, p.2

3 *ibid.*

4 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, Melbourne, 19 August 2004, p.2

'higher education provider'. This second option, which is subject to disallowance by the either House, is not appropriate in the case of Melbourne University Private. A listing on Table B through legislative amendment will allow MUPL eligibility for research funding through the Institutional Grants Scheme and allow its teaching staff to apply for Australian Research Council grants. This amendment will allow the provisions that currently apply to some other private universities to apply also to Melbourne University Private.

1.11 Inclusion on the Table B list is dependent on a state legislative or executive instrument, as earlier described. The committee took evidence from the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). Officials told the committee that in the course of deliberations on the inclusion of MUPL on Table B, the minister had asked for assurances that MUPL's inclusion was consistent with the MCEETYA protocols. A financial viability check was done, including the adequacy of capital backing and sustainability, and possible issues that would bring into question MUPL's continued financial viability. The minister acted on the basis that there was adequate asset backing and that quality assurance processes met the required standard.⁵

The independence of Melbourne University Private

1.12 Government senators noted the extensive probing that their opposition colleagues made in relation to the independence of MUPL and its relationship with the University of Melbourne. There has been consistent ideological opposition to the establishment and continued operation of MUPL. The case against MUPL has been made at some length in evidence to the committee, although this cause has not been pursued with as much vigour by those associated with the higher education sector as it has been by the opposition. As the NTEU pointed out, they have members associated with MUPL.⁶ While the opposition members of the committee take the view that MUPL is a failed institution approaching the end of its existence, the NTEU has stated that it has little argument with the importance or quality of the services offered by MUPL, and recognises its potential value as an income stream for its parent institution, the University of Melbourne.⁷

1.13 The issue of the independence of MUPL vis-a-vis Melbourne University is irrelevant to the issue of including MUPL on Table B. It is difficult to understand the link that the opposition is attempting to make. The MCEETYA protocols declare that institutions must be self-accrediting, as MUPL is, but they do not stipulate 'independence' as an essential criterion to be met. As the NTEU submission points out, MUPL is a wholly owned subsidiary of Melbourne University. The board of MUPL includes among its number the vice-chancellor of Melbourne University. The chairman of the board of MUPL is a University of Melbourne council member and the

5 Mr William Burmester, *Hansard*, Melbourne, 19 August, p.45

6 Submission No.7, National Tertiary Education Union, p.2

7 *ibid.*

third (of a total of eight councillors) is a senior administrator of Melbourne University. The president of the academic senate of MUPL is appointed by the vice-chancellor of Melbourne University. So while MUPL is a self-accrediting institution, its role as an adjunct to Melbourne University remains. The Government has not regarded the status of MUPL – as compared to completely autonomous institutions such as Notre Dame or Bond universities – as being relevant to the issue of inclusion on Table B.

1.14 Opposition senators have suggested that the relationship of dependency between MUPL and Melbourne University means that MUPL has breached MCEETYA protocols and on these grounds is ineligible for Table B status. As DEST officials advised:

Regarding independence under the MCEETYA protocols, if you were seeking to be a self-accrediting institution or a university, it goes to your academic independence and your financial viability. Financial viability can be achieved through partnerships and arrangements with owners who have equity. The requirements under the new arrangements for Melbourne University Private mean that they establish their own independent academic board and committee to establish the qualifications that Melbourne University Private accredit. So they have independence in the accreditation of their award offerings.⁸

1.15 DEST officials were asked whether the independence of the course accreditation process was affected by the 'branding' of MUPL's courses. The response was that this was a commercial arrangement between the two institutions: that Melbourne University Private has the power and the responsibility to determine and accredit its own awards. If it then chooses to badge them with a Melbourne University crest, then it has to get certification for that award from the University. The fact that MUPL has chosen this course does not mean that they cannot change this approach and determine their own awards beyond that agreement. MUPL is entitled under Victorian law to make its own arrangements in regard to licensing agreements, just as it has the right to issue and accredit its own awards.⁹ The committee sees this as meaning that the Commonwealth is bound to take that as a protocol met in full. The committee regards MUPL's decision to enter into these arrangements as determined by commercial considerations which are not relevant, in the case of this inquiry, to the committee's scrutiny of the bill.

Recognition of state legislation

1.16 As noted above, the MCEETYA protocols have legislative force in Victoria through the *Tertiary Education Act 1993*. This is the legislation under which the Ministerial Order is made to approve MUPL's operation as a university. The states are the 'gatekeepers' to the higher education sector. That is their role. As the submission from Melbourne University noted, Commonwealth funding vetos on universities

8 Mr William Burmester, *Hansard*, Melbourne, 19 August, p.46

9 *ibid.*

properly constituted under state acts, and meeting MCEETYA guidelines would effectively block new universities which lacked significant political patronage.¹⁰ The submission continued:

It would create a situation in which state governments insist on research output while the federal government forbids new universities access to the funds required to produce this output. It is difficult for new universities to attract researchers and research students if they are denied access to research funding available to other (in this case, all other) universities.¹¹

1.17 To take no regard for the decision of the state minister in extending accreditation, despite national agreement on the MCEETYA protocols, would be an unwarranted affront to all state governments by implication. Government senators note the inconsistent attitude of opposition senators in the view that they hold on this issue. In previous reports on higher education they refer to the Government's disregard for state prerogatives. Their action in recommending that MUPL be removed from Table B amounts to the same thing.

Research issues

1.18 A major condition in the 2003 Ministerial Order relates to research output. It is stipulated that Melbourne University Private must achieve an average research output of one DEST research point per equivalent full-time member of academic staff per year. The committee notes the claim that many universities do not meet this criterion, but that Melbourne University Private accepted this condition, and the research report to be presented to the Minister Kosky at the end of August shows that MUPL has surpassed this benchmark with 1.14 papers per full-time equivalent academic staff member. Government senators are prepared to accept that the research output conditions have been met if that has been the conclusion arrived at by the Victorian Government. As evidence from DEST officials made abundantly clear, this has nothing to do with the Commonwealth. They acknowledge only that MUPL is adhering to conditions laid down by the Victorian minister.

1.19 Opposition senators appear to find some of the research effort questionable, and identify the possibility that academics working across the two institutions, MUPL and Melbourne University, may have had their publications counted twice. It is not the role of this committee to engage in any speculation amounting to an audit of its own.

1.20 A reference was made during debate on this bill in the House of Representatives to the absence of the MUPL's 'research profile' and the 'sticking point' that has been raised with the Victorian Government.¹² As noted earlier, this 'sticking point' was easily resolved through the MUPL's ready acceptance of the MCEETYA research protocol. The committee notes the response to such comment from the vice-chancellor

10 Submission No.3, University of Melbourne, p.2

11 *ibid.*

12 Ms Jenny Macklin MP, *Hansard* (HoR), 10 August 2004, p.32319

of Melbourne University, Professor Kwong Lee Dow, who submitted that such a research capacity could not be developed without funding.¹³ The committee makes the point that few of the universities that we now refer to as the Group of Eight had any research capacity in the early 1950s. Capacity was developed through Commonwealth funding distributed on not dissimilar lines that that operated today by the Australian Research Council. The committee sees no reason why MUPL staff should remain ineligible for ARC grants, which are made against merit criteria.

1.21 Furthermore, the Council of Australian Postgraduate Association (CAPA) and the Federation of Australian Scientific and Technology Societies (FASTS) have tried to argue that the admission of MUPL to Table B will in some way 'dilute' the total research funding that is available to all the other universities.¹⁴ This is a spurious argument given the number of institutions already eligible, and given that grants are based on merit. It cannot be argued on the one hand that MUPL lacks sufficient differentiation and autonomy from Melbourne University to be a Table B member, and at the same time ignore the fact that MUPL is a likely partner in research with Melbourne.

1.22 From the committee's perspective, the synergy that was intended to exist between the two institutions is capable of embracing research within the commercial relationship. The committee sees the objections of interest groups like CAPA, FAST and the NTEU as demonstrating a barely disguised ideological antipathy toward the kind of commercial experiment pioneered by Melbourne University and which is still evolving. The objection which the Government's critics have to the inclusion of MUPL on Table B is the impetus that this may provide for collaborative research efforts entered into by Melbourne University Private.

1.23 Finally, the committee notes comment from Professor Simon Marginson that the success of MUPL may encourage similar public-private arrangements by other members of the Group of Eight.¹⁵ This is highly speculative. It is answered in part by comment in the submission from MUPL. New universities will only be established if they meet the MCEETYA protocols, which are a major disincentive to new entrants. Of six recent applications for university status, only Melbourne University Private has been successful.¹⁶ More broadly, the peculiar business and political circumstances that saw the birth of MUPL are likely to arise infrequently. As Professor Marginson has observed, the issue of public benefit probably transcends the old argument about public versus private in the education sector. The committee regards community service obligation as befitting private institutions as well as public institutions, and, with Professor Marginson, notes the indigenous education work done in the Kimberleys by Notre Dame University as noteworthy in this regard.

13 Submission No. 3, op. cit, p.2

14 Submissions Nos 5 and 8 respectively

15 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, Melbourne, 19 August 2004, op. cit., p.7

16 Submission No.4, MUPL, p.3

1.24 The committee believes that this work must begin somewhere. It looks to the long-term benefit likely to accrue to Melbourne University Private and to the beneficiaries of the research and the teaching it undertakes.


Other matters

1.25 The committee received submissions relating to one other matter: amendments to the *Higher Education Support Act 2003* to facilitate out-of-semester full-fee undergraduate subjects. Submissions from the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and the University of Melbourne gave strong support for this measure which has become necessary as a result of a review of the legislation. Under the act as it stands, most universities would be forced to discontinue their summer school programs, given that it is unlikely that students would choose to enrol for a fee-paying course if they could enrol as Commonwealth supported students. Universities would lack the additional income to cover the costs of the summer school.¹⁷

1.26 As noted at the beginning of the report, this amendment can be regarded as normal 'machinery' legislation, and its delay can be attributed to the exigencies of the legislative timetable at the end of a parliament.

Recommendation

The committee commends this bill to the Senate and **recommends** its passage without amendment.



Senator John Tierney
Chair

17 Submission No.6, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, p.3

Chapter 2

Opposition Senators' report

General comments

2.1 The Opposition has accepted the necessity and desirability of speedy passage of all provisions in this bill, with the exception of that contained in section 16-20, regarding Melbourne University Private (MUPL). However, the Government's decision to prorogue the 40th parliament means that any such speedy passage is precluded. The issues discussed in this report, and that are dealt with in the bill more generally, will now become a matter for the next parliament.

2.2 Opposition senators note the submission to the inquiry from the Department of Education, Science and Training and supporting evidence provided at the public hearing of 19 August 2004. It is accepted that, with the exception referred to in 2.1, the amendments to the four Commonwealth Acts proposed are reasonable and, in some instances, essential for the conduct of important functions and activities of higher education institutions. In particular, as the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC) has pointed out, the amendments, contained in sections 36-10 and 36-11, designed to allow universities to continue to operate summer schools on a fee-paying basis (provided that units offered are also available at other times to Commonwealth-supported students), need to be enacted as soon as possible. To fail to do this would be to prevent universities from offering such programs during the coming summer break and would seriously affect many students. In making these observations Opposition senators draw attention to the fact that the central purpose of this bill is to deal with omissions, oversights and mistakes on the part of the Government in the formulation of its higher education legislative package of 2003. Some of these errors, especially that concerning the conduct of summer schools mentioned above, would, if unattended to, cause significant hardship and difficulty for universities themselves as well as for students.

2.3 It is unacceptable that this bill, seeking to redress these problems, was introduced so hastily, and at a point in the legislative cycle where severe time constraints would inevitably arise. Unfortunately, by introducing the bill so late in the life of the parliament, the Government has now ensured that universities and their students will be inconvenienced by delays in righting the oversights and errors of the legislation passed with such haste by the Parliament in December 2003. There is no reason discernible to the Opposition that these matters could not have been dealt with in a more timely fashion.

2.4 The legislative framework for higher education enacted in 2003 is, as Labor senators noted at the time, fraught with inconsistencies, administrative ambiguities and bad policy. It creates grave problems for universities in attempting to navigate its impossible provisions. The bill currently before the Parliament tries to deal with a few of the unworkable aspects of the legislation as enacted. The deal struck between the

Government and the four independent senators immediately prior to, and even during, the Senate debate of December 2003 bears the hallmarks of a rushed job which has neither internal consistency nor policy integrity. Concessions and amendments made on the run with independent senators in order to secure their support have left an unfortunate legacy that universities, their staff and students have to live with. The independent senators, for their part, pursued isolated issues and goals, apparently unable to see the legislation as a whole package that required internal coherence. The Government's deviousness and ruthlessness in pursuit of passage of the bill led to the unfortunate and entirely avoidable outcome of a weak, unworkable legislative framework.

2.5 Further, in accordance with common practice on the part of this Government, this bill attempts to introduce, alongside eight non-contentious provisions, one particular amendment to higher education legislation that is highly controversial: the matter of the addition of Melbourne University Private Limited (MUPL) to Table B of the HESA legislation. In this way the Government seeks to force the passage of this particular provision on the back of arguments that the remaining provisions are routine, desirable and even essential for the continued operation of various functions of universities. Opposition senators do not regard it as appropriate for the Government to try to secure by such means passage of a measure about which serious questions and doubts have been raised, and which is strongly opposed by major stakeholder groups and policy experts alike.

2.6 The issue of Melbourne University Private is extremely contentious. Ever since the initial establishment of this entity by the University of Melbourne in 1997, controversy has reigned about its nature, purpose and status. It is reported that the Board of the AVCC recently rejected an application by MUPL for membership of that body, apparently on the basis that MUPL was not a university independent of its parent, the University of Melbourne.¹ The question of the relationship between MUPL and the University of Melbourne has proved to be a crucial one for this inquiry. The independence and self-sufficiency of MUPL as an academic institution is a matter of central relevance to its capacity to meet the test of the MCEETYA Protocols.

2.7 Opposition senators have serious doubts about the capacity of this entity to comply with the MCEETYA Protocols as set out for universities, and in particular to meet the conditions laid down by the Victorian Minister for Education and Training, Ms Kosky, for the continuing accreditation of MUPL as a recognised university in that State. Of crucial concern is the status of MUPL's research profile, and the question of its standing as a site of scholarly research. Opposition senators contend that no institution that fails to measure up to the standards required by the MCEETYA Protocols should be recognised by the Commonwealth through listing on Table A or Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*.

1 Perry, Louise, 'Private uni to be snubbed by AVCC', *Australian*, 3 August 2004, p.2

2.8 Accordingly, Opposition Senators believe that the bill under consideration should be split to allow immediate passage of all amendments except that relating to the addition of Melbourne University Private to Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*.

2.9 The remainder of this chapter deals with the matter of Melbourne University Private's inclusion on Table B of the 2003 Act. Due to concerns regarding the independence and self-sufficiency of Melbourne University Private's operations, and a concern to ensure that the standards set out in the MCEETYA Protocols are upheld, Opposition senators believe that at this time it is inappropriate to include Melbourne University Private on Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*. As such it is recommended that the portion of the Bill to include Melbourne University Private on Table B should be opposed in the Senate.

Melbourne University Private: Conditions for continued recognition as a university

2.10 The committee received eight written submissions pursuant to this inquiry, and heard in addition evidence from five parties, including two expert witnesses. Aside from that of the Government, only two submissions (those of Melbourne University Private itself and its parent institution, the University of Melbourne) supported the addition of MUPL to Table B. Evidence provided at the public hearing, in particular the evidence offered by MUPL representatives, leads Opposition senators to conclude that Melbourne University Private should not be admitted to Table B. The Opposition believes that, given the provisions of the licensing agreement between the two parties, MUPL cannot be regarded either as a genuinely independent, self-accrediting university. Nor can it be regarded as a higher education institution that satisfies the standards and requirements of the MCEETYA Protocols as approved by all States and Territories and the Commonwealth in 2000.² The MCEETYA Protocols form the basis of the conditions set out by Victorian Minister, Ms Lynn Kosky, in her Ministerial Order of July 2003 granting the institution provisional approval for a further five years as a recognised university under the *Victorian Tertiary Education Act 1993*.

2.11 In her letter of July 2003 to Mr David Lloyd, Chief Executive Officer of MUPL, Ms Kosky makes the following statements regarding the conditions laid down:

I must emphasise that I will treat each and every one of these conditions, and their timelines very seriously. If they are not met by the times specified I would revoke MUPL's approval to operate as a university.

2.12 Opposition senators have paid close regard to the conditions and caveats associated with the Victorian Minister's Order. It is contended that the demonstrated

2 MCEETYA *National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes*, 2000

failure on the part of MUPL to meet all of these conditions by the times specified should cast grave doubt on the credentials of the entity, and its claim to university status.

Compliance with Ministerial Order on research output

2.13 During the public hearing of 19 August the committee devoted considerable time to an examination of the extent to which MUPL had met Condition One laid down by Minister Kosky. This condition set a deadline of July 2004 (taken by all parties to mean 1 July 2004) for the provision of a report on the research output of MUPL, as follows:

Condition One: As a condition of approval to continue to operate as a university there be by July 2004 from each of the three Schools evidence of at least one peer-reviewed externally-published research output per equivalent full-time (EFT) of academic staff, and that this level of research productivity constitutes the minimum for each of the subsequent four years.

Such research outputs should meet the specifications required by the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training for its higher education research data collection.

2.14 The Opposition senators interpret this condition, in its reference to the DEST specifications, as referring directly to research outputs: that is to say, the Condition requires the *research outputs* (publications) to meet the DEST specifications as set out in its guidelines. Accordingly, the research outputs as listed by MUPL were examined closely in the preparation of this report.

2.15 In an answer to a question on notice, MUPL asserts that it had been advised by the Office of Higher Education in Victoria that:

...the condition referred to the total number of publications produced by staff in the University, provided that the total number divided by the total number of full-time equivalent academic staff was equal to or greater than one publication per academic staff member.

2.16 This statement does not refute the claims made below by Opposition senators on the status of MUPL's research publications vis-a-vis the DEST guidelines. This advice is immaterial to the issues discussed below: the condition referred to a requirement that the publications themselves meet the DEST criteria, and did not refer to point values to be assigned to the publications.

2.17 The publications are clearly required by Condition One to meet the DEST guidelines. Condition One does not specify that only some of the DEST guidelines are relevant, but refers to all the criteria. This matter does not go to what MUPL refers to in the same answer to a question on notice as 'the academic merit or social significance of research publications' except in so far as the academic merit of such publications is underpinned by the DEST criteria, including the requirement for

application of strict peer review processes. The DEST criteria go to issues of originality, scholarly achievement and contribution, and to the status of any given publication according to well-accepted measures such as the standing of journals and publishers in the academic community. It is a nonsense to assert, as MUPL tries to do, that reference to the DEST guidelines entails only that MUPL's research publications are to be counted according to DEST point values, and its staff weighted along DEST-approved lines, if the publications produced do not meet the other requirements set out in the guidelines: requirements that go to their acceptability in the academic community as bona fide scholarly works.

2.18 In the view of Opposition senators, there is very strong evidence that MUPL has failed to meet Condition One. If this evidence is sound, it entails the conclusion that MUPL is not a university, as defined by Victorian legislation. It is of course a matter for the Victorian Government to assess this evidence for itself. It is not the business of the Senate to examine the merits of the actions or decisions of any state government. The Commonwealth must look to its own interests. Whatever the position to be taken by Victoria, Opposition senators believe that the detail of the considerations that have come to light in the course of the inquiry bring into serious question the advisability of the Commonwealth's moving at this time to accord MUPL the status of a stand-alone university, satisfying the MCEETYA Protocols to the extent that it deserves inclusion on Table B of the Act.

2.19 Under detailed questioning about its research record and output, as presented to Minister Kosky pursuant to Condition One in its Research Report 2003-2004, MUPL representatives exhibited a disturbing ignorance of the DEST eligibility criteria for research publications, and in particular of the extent to which the research publications listed in the report met these criteria. For example, in the case of two undergraduate history textbooks co-edited by an academic staff member, the representatives asserted that the publications satisfied the criteria as set down.³ They appeared unaware that the DEST guidelines specify that books 'unlikely to meet the criteria' include 'textbooks, anthologies, edited works...and revisions/new editions'.⁴ Furthermore, the representatives seemed unaware that both books fitted all of these descriptions, meaning that the publications were extremely unlikely to meet DEST's criteria: they failed on four counts.

2.20 The representatives of MUPL also seemed unaware of the DEST specifications regarding author affiliation stated on research publications. Two publications by a second academic staff member of MUPL, listed in the MUPL Research Report, identified this staff member as employed by the University of Melbourne and not by MUPL. Comments made in answer to a question taken on

3 Dr Vin Massaro, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.23

4 Department of Education, Science and Training, *Higher education research data collection: specifications for the collection of 2003 data* DEST, Canberra, December 2003, section 4.4.1 p.22

notice on this matter by MUPL representatives do not go to the salient issue: the DEST guidelines (4.3.2, p.19) specify that the author has to identify an affiliation with the relevant institution on or in the publication, or otherwise provide a statement that the publication was produced in that person's capacity as a staff member of the relevant institution.

2.21 The written answer says: 'So it is actually irrelevant whether [the staff member in question] lists himself as both Melbourne University Private and University of Melbourne'.

2.22 The point made by Opposition senators is that the staff member failed entirely to mention in the publications in question that he worked for MUPL in any capacity whatsoever or at any time: he identifies himself only as a staff member of the University of Melbourne.

2.23 Further matters were raised, including the nature and standing of a number of conferences held in Indonesia, China and Hong Kong. The representatives were unable to assure the committee that papers submitted for these conferences had been subjected to peer review processes equivalent to those followed in Australia. Subsequently, in an answer to a question taken on notice, MUPL stated that all publications, including conference papers, were 'properly referred by international academic peers'. Opposition senators have undertaken their own investigations on this matter and have satisfied themselves that, at least in the cases of two of four overseas conference papers to which a certain MUPL staff member contributed, refereeing processes were almost certainly much more lax and informal than those normally required in Australia. For example, no written referees' reports were required. The avowed inability of MUPL to produce referees' reports pertaining to these conference papers may be apposite to the issue.

2.24 It was put to the representatives that, of the twelve publications claimed by MUPL as contributing to its research output for the purpose of satisfying the Victorian Government's Condition One, only two items clearly met the required DEST criteria. Serious doubts existed about five further publications, while it seemed clear that five failed to meet DEST specifications.

2.25 Witnesses for MUPL told the committee that the research output listing had been audited by a firm of accountants, HLB Mann Judd.⁵ However, it was unclear from the comments made by MUPL representatives that the auditors had done any more than to examine the report to ensure that it included correct calculations of the number of effective fulltime academic staff and the point value that the DEST rules would ascribe to the publication, should the listing be submitted to the Department for its own research data collection purposes. As Dr Massaro said:

They are required to establish that we have followed the processes, the measures and the definitions which have been stated by DEST to be the

5 Dr Vin Massaro, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.21

way in which a calculation is made of both the value of each publication and the number of academic staff.⁶

2.26 The Opposition senators note that Condition One attached to Minister Kosky's determination did not require MUPL to assign value points, as specified in the DEST guidelines, to its research publications as listed: the Condition went only to the criteria for eligibility for actual inclusion on the list as provided.

2.27 If the auditors actually examined the publications to assure themselves that the books and papers listed met the scholarly and other formal requirements to be included on the list as eligible research publications, then it is contended by Labor senators that their auditing processes failed to reveal the inadequacies and irregularities in the listed publications referred to here. While it is accepted that universities often engage accountants to audit their research reports, it would seem that, on this occasion, a thorough audit was apparently not conducted.

2.28 Subsequently DEST officers told the committee that, to their knowledge, MUPL had not submitted the listing to the Department.⁷ They pointed out that, because the institution was not listed on either Table A or Table B of the Act, MUPL was not required to submit the report to DEST. Therefore no claims could be made that the report had been approved in any sense by DEST.

2.29 It seems to Opposition senators that representatives of MUPL obfuscated the issues surrounding the compliance of its research report listing with the DEST criteria. They have tried to concentrate the committee's attention on technical issues concerning the allocation of point values and the calculation of fulltime equivalent staff numbers, rather than the real issue of the extent to which MUPL's research output measures up according to commonly accepted scholarly criteria. It is understood that the DEST specifications are well known by members of the Australian academic community, all of whom must prepare annual returns of their own research publications for submission to DEST. Therefore it is more than a little odd that the MUPL Research Report for 2003-2004 has been signed off by Professor Michael Webber as 'Vice-President and Provost'. It is difficult for Opposition senators to believe that Professor Webber would not have raised doubts about the advisability of including at least some of the publications listed in the report.

2.30 Labor senators contend it is more than likely that all five publications said to emanate from the School of International Development for the year 2003-04 fail to meet the DEST criteria as eligible publications. Thus it follows that MUPL has failed to meet the condition laid down that all three schools must produce eligible research outputs within the year. One school has failed the test.

6 *ibid.*

7 Dr Evan Arthur and Mr William Burmester, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, pp.42-43

2.31 Opposition senators conclude that there is clear evidence that MUPL has failed to meet Condition One as laid down by the Victorian Government in that, by 1 July 2004, the institution could not provide a list of research publications, meeting the DEST criteria, including a number of eligible publications equal to or greater than the number of effective fulltime academic staff of MUPL. If it is accepted that the audited number of fulltime-equivalent staff is correct at 7.6, then, even were only the prima facie obviously ineligible publications excluded, the listing would number 7.0. If, as is much more likely, all or most of the five publications of doubtful status were examined in detail and found also to be ineligible, the ratio of publications to academic staff would fall further. MUPL would clearly fail the test of Condition One. Therefore there is unambiguous evidence that MUPL's research output does not measure up to that expected of a genuine university.

2.32 Under these circumstances, Opposition senators consider that the Commonwealth would be extremely ill-advised to proceed at this time to list Melbourne University Private on Table B of the Act. The future of MUPL as an accredited university that meets the MCEETYA Protocols must be in grave doubt.

2.33 MUPL in its submission, and the Minister, Dr Nelson, have both claimed that without listing on Table B of the Act, MUPL will have difficulty in achieving a satisfactory standard in terms of recognised research output. Dr Nelson put the argument as follows:

The Victorian government approved the operation of the university subject to it making ongoing improvements in its research profile. It should be remembered that while Melbourne University Private remains unlisted members of its academic staff are unable to apply for—or, indeed, to hold—grants from the Australian Research Council. The university cannot access funding under the Research Training Scheme or the Institutional Grants Scheme.⁸

2.34 Opposition senators point out that the other universities listed on Table B - University of Notre Dame and Bond University - were both required to attain appropriate research profiles prior to their recognition for Commonwealth research funding. Indeed, it was their standard and record in this regard that was considered in assessing those institutions for this purpose.

2.35 Finally, Government senators in their report say: 'Government senators are prepared to accept that the research output conditions have been met if that has been the conclusion arrived at by the Victorian Government'.

2.36 Opposition senators emphasise that, as at the date of tabling of this report, the Victorian Government has made no announcement that it has arrived at such a conclusion.

8 Dr Brendan Nelson MP, *Hansard* (HoR), 10 August 2004, p.32331

Governance and independence of MUPL

2.37 MUPL is a wholly owned subsidiary of the University of Melbourne. It was established essentially as a commercial entity to ensure a revenue stream to the University of Melbourne; to allow the University of Melbourne to avoid regulatory requirements of the former *Higher Education Funding Act 1988*; and to permit the University of Melbourne to conduct activities and accredit courses that might be narrowly commercial in focus.⁹ With regard to accreditation of courses, the licensing agreement between MUPL and the University of Melbourne states that the President of MUPL is to be appointed by the Board of Directors on the advice of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne (who is also a member of the board). This was confirmed by MUPL at a public hearing.¹⁰ The NTEU told the committee that this significantly strengthens Melbourne University's hand on the board.¹¹ The Opposition also heard evidence that the accreditation and certification process as it currently stands makes it hard for MUPL to sustain the argument that it operates as an independent entity.¹²

2.38 The committee was told that MUPL is to deliver courses effectively only where they are certified by the University of Melbourne. MUPL informed the committee that the University of Melbourne certifies its courses, which are awarded using the brand name of Melbourne University Private with the Melbourne University crest: 'the purpose of the agreement is to ensure that whenever that crest is used as part of our awards, the award itself has been duly certified by the University of Melbourne in terms of the use of that crest'.¹³ It is difficult to imagine how, practically speaking, MUPL could deliver courses and make awards that were not so certified. The Opposition believes that this consideration undermines MUPL's claim of independence and indicates the nominal nature of its self-accrediting status.

2.39 The Opposition also notes that the AVCC has recently rejected an MUPL application for membership of that body. This is a significant development in its quest to achieve independent status and to attain recognition as a university of equal standing to other Australian universities. While MUPL could not advise the committee of any reasons why its applications had been rejected, Professor Simon Marginson told the committee that it was his understanding that the AVCC '...did not want to give the University of Melbourne two votes at the table and that until Melbourne

9 Mr Grahame McCulloch, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004 p.35, makes this last point.

10 Dr Vin Massaro, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.28

11 Mr Grahame McCulloch, NTEU, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.38

12 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.5

13 Dr Vin Massaro, *op. cit.*, p.26

University private has established its bona fides as a quite separate, independent institution the matter will not get to its first consideration'.¹⁴

2.40 Mr John Cain, appearing in a private capacity, told the committee that, in the establishment of MUPL, the concept of the university as funded entirely by the private sector was not discussed or properly examined. At a public hearing Mr Cain made reference to a remark by former MUPL CEO, Dr Barry Sheehan, who reportedly described to Mr Cain the establishment of MUPL as involving 'a certain amount of smoke and mirrors'. He told the committee there was a degree of deception surrounding the process for the establishment of MUPL because it was, and still is, promoted as a private university funded by the private sector.

2.41 Research carried out by John Cain and associate John Hewitt showed that, while 12 private companies were going to contribute to MUPL's establishment, no private capital was contributed:

Instead of it being a private university with three prestige, modern buildings on University Square that they would occupy...all the buildings were built at public expense. They borrowed from the National Australia Bank up to \$200 million...and it was a lemon. Do you know how many people from Melbourne University Private occupy those building? Six.¹⁵

2.42 Mr Cain concludes that MUPL is not a private enterprise partly occupied by the public university, but essentially a public enterprise which has drained resources away from the University of Melbourne. The important point is that the University of Melbourne's expenditure of \$180 million on new buildings for MUPL came at a time when it was restricting its capital expenditure for the public university. Other than of the need to finance the outward appearance of a 'stand-alone' private university subsidiary, according to Mr Cain the University of Melbourne would not have outlaid such a large amount of money, with a consequent annual interest bill of approximately \$18 million. It is acknowledged, however, that the University of Melbourne had other purposes in mind for some of the buildings constructed as part of this program, including housing for the Law Faculty.

2.43 The issue of the financial independence of MUPL is highlighted by an examination of the financial performance of the entity. MUPL generated substantial losses – in the millions of dollars – over a number of years until the University of Melbourne undertook a rescue mission: it 'restructured' its commercial entities by merging the financially successful Melbourne Enterprises International (MEI) with MUPL, masking MUPL's poor financial performance behind MEI's success. The new commercial entity, however, retained the name 'Melbourne University Private'.

14 *ibid.*, p.4

15 Mr John Cain, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.13

2.44 Yet Mr Cain and others believe that the organisation continues to place a financial burden on its parent, the University of Melbourne. During the public hearing MUPL representatives were questioned about the stated operating result of \$132,000 claimed by the company in 2003 (despite the Annual Report's representation of this amount at \$140,000). This figure, whatever its true value, appeared not to take account of a loss of \$893,000 from foreign currency transactions, specified in the financial statement for that year.¹⁶ In evidence, Mr O'Keefe for MUPL assured the committee that this amount was included in the company's bottom line: 'All I can say to you is that if we have brought to account and declared in our financial accounts some foreign currency losses then of course they are included in the bottom line'.

2.45 Subsequently, in an answer to a question taken on notice, Melbourne University Private acknowledged that the foreign exchange deficit was not accounted for in the posted operating surplus of \$140,000 but that the amount of \$893,000 was treated as an extraordinary item and accounted separately.¹⁷ The committee cannot take the assurances given by the witnesses at face value. Witnesses gave unequivocal accounts that, at best, were confused. It may well be argued that the committee was misled and no amount of reference to accountancy standards changes the nature of the evidence given directly to the committee.

2.46 Further, this admission indicates that the company, although propped up financially by a previously profit-making subsidiary of the University of Melbourne, continues to be a potential financial burden on its parent institution. This has implications for the financial health of the University of Melbourne and thus for the considerable amount in taxpayers' funds made available annually to this University.

2.47 On the other hand, it might be argued that, while MUPL was propped up by a capital injection from the proceeds of the sale of another wholly-owned subsidiary of the University of Melbourne (Melbourne IT), it has not directly drained funds from its parent institution. However, the proceeds from the float of Melbourne IT could have been put to other uses by the University of Melbourne.

2.48 Labor senators believe that it is impossible to reconcile MUPL's insistence on its independence, which underpins the argument for inclusion on Table B, with its actual degree of practical, legal and financial dependence on Melbourne University. Attention is also drawn to the financial drain on the University of Melbourne of the commercial entity.

Compliance with MCEETYA Protocols

2.49 Turning to the MCEETYA Protocols, the committee was told that these protocols are very important to higher education and to Australia's global reputation

16 *Melbourne University Private Limited Annual Report 2003* p.15

17 Statement of Performance, *Melbourne University Private Annual Report 2003, Financial Report*, p.15

for higher education. Professor Marginson argued that under the protocols universities must measure up as doctoral institutions that are genuine academic operations not solely concerned with commercial revenues and whose degrees have international standing. The protocols have established norms and standards which have been subscribed by Commonwealth, state and territory governments.¹⁸

2.50 The Protocols require both that an institution have a broad research profile and that it be an independent entity, established in its own right. The Opposition does not believe that MUPL meets the definition of 'university' under the protocols. It takes particular note of the view of Professor Marginson, a member of the committee established by Victoria's Minister for Education, Hon. Lynn Kosky, to review the university and establish a broader set of criteria for MUPL's second phase:

My sense is that [MUPL] does not currently fulfil our understanding of what a university is. It is an exception which is an anomaly in the system. It does not have a substantial staff in its own right, and the tactic has been to point to the University of Melbourne staff as the supporting staff structure, when in fact that is the structure of a university separate from the one Melbourne University Private purports to be as a self-accrediting institution. Yet it is fully controlled by the University of Melbourne. So it is an odd beast.¹⁹

2.51 An institution that fails to meet the standards required by the MCEETYA protocols, according to the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*, cannot, under the provisions of that Act, be placed on Table A or Table B of the Act and is ineligible for Commonwealth funding.

Sector-wide implications

2.52 The committee heard evidence that admission of MUPL to Table B would set a precedent for other universities to establish adjunct private institutions under their own auspices. This would have major implications for the higher education sector as a whole. The concern is summarised by the NTEU:

The inclusion of MUPL in Table B would establish a major precedent, and open the way for a large number of small, niche providers to seek access to the funding tables of the Act. This would be all the more serious given the lack of open and transparent processes surrounding the Government's selection of MUPL, a scenario likely to be replicated by the Government in its choice of other candidates for inclusion in the Tables of the Act.²⁰

2.53 Professor Simon Marginson argued that if the Parliament were to legitimate MUPL as a Table B member with the capacity to build up its fee paying enrolments, it

18 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.4

19 *ibid.* p.2

20 Submission No.7, NTEU, p.4

would be inevitable that other major universities would be in a better commercial position to become full-fee chargers through similar mechanisms. The public sector would be transformed and weakened under this scenario in one of two ways. First, the public and private arms of higher education institutions would compete with each other for student enrolments, for research activity and for reputation:

In the world of higher education, money is important but reputation is the lodestar on which the whole thing turns. You would have a situation where the reputation of our strongest global competitors would be diminished by their own commercial child walking alongside them. That to me is a very odd situation – and I do not think it is a very productive one.²¹

2.54 The NTEU submitted that in the longer term, this situation would most likely drive down the quality of higher education across the sector by forcing established public universities to compete with smaller, boutique institutions with limited course offerings.²²

2.55 Second, fee-paying would become the normalised route to a prestigious, socially and economically advantageous education. This would mean that institutions on the metropolitan fringes which educate up to 50 per cent of higher education students, and the degrees which they award, would be considerably affected. The Opposition is therefore concerned about the implications of diluting public funding for higher education research, which were highlighted by the Federation of Australian Scientific and Technology Societies (FASTS).²³

2.56 Opposition senators are also concerned that, if MUPL is added to Table B, other higher education institutions will consider establishing parallel secondary institutions for additional benefits such as receiving a second vote at the Vice-Chancellor's Committee and a second allocation on Table B.²⁴ They also take into consideration concerns raised that placing MUPL on Table B would '...confuse, confound and ultimately undermine the existing basis of research funding'.²⁵ This is because of the double-counting which, it is argued, is directly, if not indirectly, taking place as long as MUPL relies upon Melbourne University staff.

2.57 The Opposition believes that any attempt to draw a comparison between the success of private universities in the US and the potential for the concept to mature in Australia is highly misleading. Professor Simon Marginson told the committee that it is a myth to describe American higher education as a market: 'It is a heavily

21 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.4

22 Submission No.7, National Tertiary Education Union, p.4

23 Submission No.8, FASTS p.1

24 Professor Simon Marginson, *op. cit.*, pp.2-3

25 Mr Grahame McCulloch, NTEU, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p..35

subsidised one, if it is one. It has competition...but it is heavily subsidised not only from government sources but from non-government sources of a non-market kind'.²⁶ Furthermore, a number of the elements involved in establishing a viable private university in the US do not exist in Australia. He pointed in particular to the range of alumni, corporate and donor-financed sponsorship schemes which are lacking in Australia: 'We cannot replicate the American structure that underpins the private sector...because we do not have the kinds of institutions which will support the remission of the fee cost for the majority of students...'²⁷

2.58 Opposition senators also reject the suggestion made by MUPL at a public hearing that opposition to MUPL's inclusion on Table B stems from a wider ideological opposition to the creation of private universities in Australia. This is simply not the case. The Opposition agrees with John Cain's assessment that there is a place for private universities in Australia: however MUPL does not provide a sound example of how to proceed in this endeavour. The implications of extending public subsidies to commercial entities should always be kept in mind.

2.59 The Opposition notes the important differences between MUPL and two other private universities, the University of Notre Dame and Bond University, and rejects any suggestion that MUPL's current status has created an anomaly in the higher education system. MUPL's status as a 'conditional university' is substantially different from that of either Notre Dame or Bond. Both of these private universities were established under state Acts and they operate under a not-for-profit status. According to Professor Marginson, Notre Dame is a well-run and independent private university which, unlike MUPL, is establishing a comprehensive research framework and a range of disciplines. It also is performing 'public good' roles in the Kimberley region in relation to indigenous education.²⁸

2.60 FASTS, in its submission, picks up on the concept of 'public good' by noting that a critical feature of public funding of research is the notion of the 'public interest', something which apparently is specified in the enabling legislation of Bond University.²⁹ The Opposition agrees, and notes further that no compelling case has been made that placing MUPL on Table B would be in the public interest.

2.61 Several witnesses and submissions drew attention to the fact that MUPL, unlike the three other institutions listed on Table B, is not established under its own act of state or federal parliament. The Opposition takes the point made by MUPL representatives, who have argued (in the MUPL submission) that the institution is in fact duly established under an act of parliament – that act being the Victorian *Tertiary*

26 Professor Simon Marginson, op. cit, p.10

27 ibid.

28 ibid., p.8

29 Submission No.8, FASTS, p.2

Education Act 1993. However, the provisional and temporary nature of the Victorian Government's accreditation of MUPL as a university is a stumbling block for its inclusion on Table B. The Opposition senators do not believe that any institution without full, unconditional accreditation by the relevant state or territory authority should be admitted to Table B of the Commonwealth Act.

Objections by MUPL to Senate scrutiny

2.62 In a letter to the committee following the public hearing of 19 August 2004, representatives of Melbourne University Private claimed that questioning in the Senate had caused damage to the reputation of the entity. These claims were subsequently reported in *The Age* newspaper of Sunday, 29 August 2004. Labor senators regard it as ludicrous to assert that proper parliamentary scrutiny of an institution seeking access to public funds is in itself dangerous or undesirable. In questioning representatives of MUPL as to the status of these institution, senators are performing their proper function. Universities other than MUPL take this process very seriously and respond with genuine efforts to provide prompt and accurate information to the Parliament.

2.63 If witnesses feel aggrieved about being subject to this kind of scrutiny, they are seeking to present themselves more like a commercial entity than a university. It has been the practice of Opposition senators over a number of years to ask uncomfortable questions of entities in receipt of Commonwealth funding, and those seeking such funding. A willingness to be publicly accountable is inherent to the seeking of public funds: it is an obligation. Representatives of MUPL, on the other hand, seem anxious to avoid the scrutiny of the Parliament.

Conclusion and recommendations

2.64 The reputation and standing of the Australian higher education system, at home and abroad, depend on the scrupulous and transparent application of appropriate standards to institutions aspiring for Commonwealth recognition for funding purposes. It is exactly because of the status conferred to institutions in this regard that Opposition senators believe Melbourne University Private has sought admission to Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*. While actual financial advantages in terms of research funding might be small in the short term, the symbolic value of inclusion in the Act would, however, be significant, as would admission of the institution to the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee—something that, it seems, the institution has been denied.

2.65 Therefore it behoves the Commonwealth to look long and hard at the academic and organisational credentials of any entity seeking implicit recognition through the Act. This inquiry has provided the Senate with an opportunity to consider the standing and credentials of Melbourne University Private against the MCEETYA protocols, and also against other criteria relevant to its claimed status.

2.66 The Opposition members of the committee find MUPL wanting in several respects. The institution fails to achieve the standards required by the MCEETYA Protocols, particularly with regard to research profile and output. Its representatives have failed to convince Opposition senators that the institution is a bona fide stand-alone entity that truly accredits its own degrees. It has an academic staff of approximately 13 persons, many of whom are also staff members of the University of Melbourne. Its income is derived overwhelmingly from commercial activities such as consultancy and English-language teaching, rather than the provision of undergraduate and postgraduate award courses. While MUPL may have met the requirement of the Victorian Government for a minimum of three per cent of students enrolled in award courses, this hardly makes it a genuine university. Further, it is financially dependent on its parent institution.

2.67 At the very least, the Opposition senators believe that the temporary nature of the institution's accreditation on the part of the Victorian Government would imply the advisability of delaying the admission of MUPL to Table B until such time as its accreditation is confirmed, in four years' time.

2.68 Inclusion on Table B of the Act would provide access for MUPL students to FEE-HELP loans. The capacity of the institution to grow its student base provided by FEE-HELP accessibility is a further real motivation for MUPL's request. This, as Professor Marginson noted, has significant and open-ended implications for public funding, especially if other commercial adjuncts of existing universities are allowed in the future to follow MUPL onto Table B.³⁰

2.69 For all of these reasons, Opposition senators do not believe it is in the interest of the Australian higher education system as a whole to admit Melbourne University Private to Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*. Nor is it in the public interest. Accordingly, it is recommended that the provision allowing this measure be opposed by the Senate.

Recommendation 1

That the *Higher Education Legislation Amendment Bill (No.3) 2004* be split to remove the section dealing with the admission of Melbourne University Private to Table B of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*, and that, should the Government wish to proceed over the matter of Melbourne University Private, this should be dealt with separately from the bill as a whole.

Recommendation 2

That the provision of the *Higher Education Legislation Amendment Bill (No.3) 2004* admitting Melbourne University Private to Table B of the *Higher Education Support*

30 Professor Simon Marginson, *Hansard*, 19 August 2004, p.10

Act 2003 be opposed by the Senate. That, if the bill is split, as recommended, the ensuing legislation be opposed.



Senator George Campbell
Chair



Senator Kim Carr

Appendix 1

List of submissions

Sub No: From:

- 1 Victorian College of the Arts
- 2 Department of Education, Science and Training
- 3 University of Melbourne
- 4 Melbourne University Private
- 5 Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations
- 6 Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee
- 7 National Tertiary Education Union
- 8 Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies
- 9 Mr Gavin Moodie, NSW

Appendix 2

Hearings and Witnesses

Melbourne, Thursday, 19 August 2004

**Monash Centre for Research in International Education, Faculty of Education
Monash University**
Professor Simon Marginson, *Director*

Private capacity
Mr John Cain

Melbourne University Private
Mr Neil O’Keefe, *Director, Melbourne University Private Ltd; and Chairman
Australian Centre for Public Infrastructure*
Dr Vin Massaro, *Executive Dean, School of International Development*

National Tertiary Education Union
Mr Grahame McCulloch, *General Secretary*
Mr Sean Cooney, *President, University of Melbourne Branch*
Mr Matthew McGowan, *Secretary, Victorian Division*
Mr Andrew Nette, *Policy and Research Coordinator*

Department of Education, Science and Training
Dr Richard Chadwick, *Director, Policy and Parliamentary Unit, Higher Education
Group*
Dr Evan Arthur, *Group Manager, Innovation and Research Systems Group*
Mr William Burmester, *Group Manager, Higher Education Group*

Appendix 3

Tabled documents and answers to questions on notice

Hearing: Melbourne, Thursday, 19 August 2004

Mr John Cain – transcript from interview with former CEO of Melbourne University Private, Mr Barry Sheehan [EWRE 13]

Senator Kim Carr – University of Melbourne Vice-Chancellor's Report to Council (Supplementary Report) [EWRE 25]

Senator Kim Carr – Letter from the Minister for Education and Training, the Hon. Lynne Kosky, MP to Mr David Lloyd, Chief Executive Officer, Melbourne University Private [EWRE 25]

Answers to questions on notice

Hearing: Melbourne, Thursday, 19 August 2004

Melbourne University Private
received: 27 August 2004

Department of Education, Science and Training
received: 31 August 2004

Appendix 4

Additional information

Hearing: Melbourne, Thursday, 19 August 2004

Senator Carr – Paper titled, Involuntary Resettlement, Production and Income: Evidence from Xiaolangdi, PRC

Senator Carr – Paper titled, Ansett Airlines Employees: A preliminary survey of post-retrenchment outcomes

Appendix 5

Ministerial Orders

Tertiary Education Act 1993

MINISTERIAL ORDER

The Minister for Tertiary Education and Training (referred to herein as the Minister) makes the following Order:

1. Authorising provision

This Order is made under section 10 of the Tertiary Education Act 1993.

2. Commencement

This Order comes into operation on the date of its publication in the Government Gazette.

3. Object

The object of this Order is to approve an institution to operate as a university, and to apply conditions to that approval.

4. Approval

Melbourne University Private Limited (A.C.N. 081 182 685) referred to herein as the institution, is hereby approved to operate as a university subject to the following conditions:

- i. the approval is for a period of five years (subject to the provisions of section 10 (5) and (7) of the Tertiary Education Act 1993), and commencing on the date this Order comes into operation.
- ii. higher education award programs must only be offered by the institution if the said programs have been certified by the Academic Board of the University of Melbourne as being equivalent in standard to University of Melbourne

Victoria Government Gazette

Higher education awards.

- iii. the institution must develop a discrete program of research activity aimed at achieving within five years –

- a) a level of research output acceptable to the Minister, and
 - b) at least three percent of its students in post graduate research programs, and
- iv. a report on the institution's progress towards implementation of the development plans, set out in its submission for approval to operate as a university dated 27 February 1998, will be provided to the Minister on or before 31 December 2001 by a person or persons acceptable to the institution and the Minister, and appointed by the Minister

Dated 14 July 1998

PHIL HONEYWOOD MP

Minister for Tertiary Education and Training

Tertiary Education Act 1993

MINISTERIAL ORDER

The Minister for Education and Training (referred to herein as the Minister) makes the following Order:

1. Authorising provision

This Order is made under section 10 of the Tertiary Education Act 1993.

2. Commencement

This Order comes into operation on 15 July 2003.

3. Object

The object of this Order is to approve an institution to operate as a university, and to apply conditions to that approval.

4. Approval

Melbourne University Private Limited (A.C.N. 081 1582 685; ABN 53 081 182 685), referred to herein as the institution, is hereby approved to operate as a university subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The approval is for a period of five years (subject to the provisions of section 10 (5) and (7) of the Tertiary Education Act 1993), and commencing on 15 July 2003.
- (ii) There be by July 2004 from each of the three Schools evidence of at least one peer-reviewed externally-published research output per equivalent full-time (EFT) of academic staff, and that this level of research productivity constitutes the minimum for each of the subsequent four years. Such research outputs should meet the specifications required by the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training for its higher education research data collection.
- (iii) The institution move progressively towards increasing the overall percentage of total enrolments in higher education award courses (as defined in the Australian Qualifications Framework) relative to total enrolments, while also maintaining the Institution's own growth targets for actual numbers of students in those courses (766 in July 2005), such that by 2008 at least 10% of total (headcount) enrolments are in higher education award courses. Movement towards this percentage is to be reported explicitly in the Institution's Annual Report. By July 2004 at least 3% of total

(headcount) enrolments should be in higher education award courses, rising to 5% in July 2005, 6% in July 2006, and 8% in July 2007.

- (iv) The Institution appoint within the first year of approval a Chief Academic Officer (initially on a fractional basis) to whom Academic Heads of School shall report, this position to be full-time by July 2006; that Academic Heads of School be at least three-quarter time with the Institution by 2006 and full-time by 2008; and that the proportion of full-time academic staff increase. Accordingly, by 31 December 2003, a one-quarter time Chief Academic Officer should be appointed, with this position being half time by July 2004, and three quarter time by July 2005. Similarly, Academic Heads of School should be at least half time by July 2004. Twenty per cent of the MUP academic staff should be employed full-time by July 2006.
- (v) The Institution is to retain an academic organisational structure comprising at least three Schools during the approval period, with each School to have a core of academic staffing resources to support its research and teaching activities. Conjoint Melbourne University Private academic appointments with the University of Melbourne are to include a proportion of time for research of not less than quarter of the teaching time.
- (vi) The Institution is to undergo a quality audit (including institutional responses to the audit report) by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) before July 2007, and that the outcome of this audit (including the Institution's responses) be deemed to be satisfactory. Provided that the Institution meets the other conditions any decision as to whether the Institution should receive further approval to operate as a university after July 2008 will be largely based upon this audit, and upon the AUQA view of the Institution response to its recommendations.
- (vii) The Institution provide information in its Annual Reports for 2005 and 2007 on client and student satisfaction with higher education award courses designed and delivered for corporate and government clients. This information should be based on appropriately structured surveys and interviews undertaken with a statistically relevant cohort of students enrolled in and graduates of award courses, as well as with a relevant sample of the corporate and government clients for whom the award courses were designed and delivered.
- (viii) The Institution should obtain from its shareholder (The University of Melbourne) an undertaking that it will not allow

its equity position in the Institution to fall below 51 % in the five year period to July 2008. The University of Melbourne is to give an undertaking to allow students to complete higher education award courses in which they are enrolled should the Institution be unable to continue to operate, and

- (ix) The Institution is required to table an Annual Report in Parliament at the same time as other Victorian universities, covering issues specifically identified by the Office of Higher Education and according to a template they provide. These Annual Reports will be expected to address the conditions outlined above.

Dated 25 June 2003

LYNNE KOSKY, MP
Minister for Education and Training