

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Enhancing Victorian University Governance

Melbourne – Thursday 14 May 2026

MEMBERS

Alison Marchant – Chair

Kim O’Keeffe – Deputy Chair

Roma Britnell

Anthony Cianflone

John Mullahy

Nicole Werner

Dylan Wight

WITNESSES

Danae Bosler, Assistant Secretary, and

Oscar Kaspi-Crutchett, Senior Research Organiser, Victorian Trades Hall Council; and

Yolanda Robson, Director, Young Workers Centre.

The CHAIR: Welcome to the public hearings for the Legislative Assembly Economy and Infrastructure Committee's Inquiry into Enhancing Victorian University Governance. All mobile telephones should be turned to silent.

Evidence given today is being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the Parliament's website. While all evidence taken by the committee is protected by parliamentary privilege, comments repeated outside of this hearing, including on social media, may not be protected by this privilege.

Witnesses will be provided with a proof version of the transcript to check. Verified transcripts and other documents provided to the committee during the hearing will be published on the committee's website.

I invite you now to introduce yourself and maybe your role. Thank you very much, firstly, for coming along today as well. Then we are going to jump straight into questions around your submission. Thank you, and I will hand over to you.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Hi. My name is Oscar. I am the Senior Research Organiser at Victorian Trades Hall Council.

Danae BOSLER: Hi. Danae Bosler, Assistant Secretary, Victorian Trades Hall Council. Thanks for having us back.

Yolanda ROBSON: I am Yolanda Robson, Director of the Young Workers Centre. Lovely to see you.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I might go to – oh, Dylan is not there, sorry. Kim, I am going to go to you, thanks, as Deputy Chair.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Sure. Here he comes. Good morning and thank you so much for being here. I might actually go to you, Yolanda, just in regard to what are the main concerns that young workers are voicing with regards to universities and how are these issues linked to the governance system, and if you could provide some examples specific to Victorian universities.

Yolanda ROBSON: Yes, sure. To kick off, I would first just quickly like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we are gathered today – that is the Wurundjeri Woi-wurrung people of the mighty Kulin Nation. We pay our respects to elders past and present and acknowledge that sovereignty was never ceded. We would like to congratulate the First Peoples' Assembly and the state government for setting the nation's first treaty – congrats, amazing.

To answer your point of how it plays out on the ground for young workers, it is poorer education. How can we expect our heavily casualised university staff to set curriculum and great learning outcomes every semester if their job is pulled into jeopardy and there is fear of potential vested interest? To me, I could not personally operate with that type of anxiety if my job was so insecure. So how that plays out on the ground is poorer learning outcomes and poorer engagement.

Obviously Victoria is the worst state in the country for student representation through its governance processes. I think for young workers, we are told over and over and over again that our voice is worth less, that our efforts are worth less, we deserve to be paid less, we have to slog it out to have any type of validation or a living wage, and this is just how it is. I think that lacking representation of a student voice reinforces that notion of 'why should we listen to young people?' when the young people are the ones going to the university, paying their tuition fee and actively looking to pursue a career in whatever they are studying or through academics.

I think second to that – and I am sure we will touch on it more – the notion of having a minimum of one student representative is simply not enough. That does not just play out for a student representative. If we want to go above and beyond tokenistic representation, we have to reset the playing field and make sure that it is not just one student carrying the burden of sitting in the room with decisions being made directly about you and the cohort you are supposed to represent.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Thank you. From the first people coming we have heard that as well. Representation is looking like it is going to be the conversation we will hear over today and tomorrow.

Yolanda ROBSON: I am sure you will hear all about it, yes.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Thank you for that. I think when we look at younger people, it is not always just younger people too. It is also mature students –

Yolanda ROBSON: One hundred per cent, yes.

Kim O'KEEFFE: I am sure the vulnerabilities felt are the same, so thank you for that.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Dylan, I will go to you.

Dylan WIGHT: Thank you. Comrades, how are you? Thanks for coming.

Danae BOSLER: Good. Good to see you.

Dylan WIGHT: You too. Your submission speaks a fair bit about social licence, and says that universities will not be viewed with that social licence or through a lens of having a social licence unless they are administered like a social good. Can you just maybe extrapolate on that a little bit and perhaps set out a road map to get back to a place where universities have that social licence?

Danae BOSLER: I know we were not allowed opening comments, but that actually has helped me out there because I guess the opening comment that I did want to make is we have hit 170 years now since the eight-hour day, and it was stonemasons who walked off the job at the University of Melbourne that started the 8-hour day. Then they walked past Trades Hall, walked down to Parliament and Trades Hall was established. So universities play a role in our society – Melbourne society, Victorian society – that almost predates Parliament. Do you know what I mean? It is a fundamental role that universities play as a backbone of our society. Universities, Trades Hall, Parliament – we all have a really critical role to play, and universities have historically had that social licence because of the fundamental role that they have played. Whether it was RMIT – the workers' university; do you know what I mean? – just across the road from Trades Hall as well, they have had a social licence to operate and that social licence has been because they have contributed to public good. Their contribution was about more than just a pipeline into industry. It was about innovation, creativity, supporting industry across Victoria, which has been a backbone of the manufacturing sector that has boomed in Victoria because of and supported by our world-class universities here in Victoria. And so it was that public good that meant they had a strong social licence to operate.

The other part of it, of course, is that historically it was a good place to work. It was a place where you contributed; you had a job for life. You had time to work with students and teach students and train students, but you also had time, and you were allocated resources, to do innovation and to do research so that we could have a constant cycle of learning and teaching and learning and teaching, which is a backbone of a modern society, that constant innovation. We need to get back to that public good so that you have social licence. I think those two things are kind of inextricably connected, and universities absolutely have that role to play.

I also just want to say: there have been so many inquiries that have been on right now, and you have heard from the NTEU as well that the sector is rife with problems and that government intervention must occur when there have been sector failures. I am confident that this panel is alert to all of the sector failures that have occurred, but also – and maybe I am just biased because I am forever the optimist – I am so confident that universities can be restructured, can be rebuilt to bring back that public good and that social licence. They will absolutely continue to play a pivotal role in this state. As they have done for the last 170 years, they will continue to do as well, but a moment of intervention has occurred. Sorry, that was a long one.

Dylan WIGHT: No, that is all right. Just to build on the whole social licence theme, we just heard from the NTEU that wage theft amongst the sector has been pretty rampant, which goes hand in hand with the insecure work piece, and we heard about a fair bit of insecure work in universities now. It probably was a question for the NTEU, but you will be able to answer it as well: in your experience are there pretty consistent contraventions of the Act and of industrial relations law, outside of wage theft, through universities in Victoria?

Danae BOSLER: Sorry, was that 'it is a consistent theme'?

Dylan WIGHT: Is there, yes.

Danae BOSLER: Yes, absolutely. I am really sorry to say – I know Joo-Cheong was like, 'Victoria must lead' – Victoria is kind of leading in this one, and it is not in a good way. The NTEU, I think, said the number

\$132 million in stolen wages as well. I think that is absolutely the headline figure, and stolen wages sits alongside absolute casualisation of the workforce. But I think also there is a second tier that sits under that, which I do not think has been as well documented, which is just the rampant closing of whole departments – just shutting down whole departments, often in regional areas. Do you know what I mean? And cycles of redundancy after redundancy after redundancy, and often it is under the pretence of not enough students in regional areas, but there is just the shutting of whole departments without even the intention to try and find a way through to offer other pathways to education, particularly in regional areas.

Oscar pulled up some numbers just recently which were from Federation University, one of our regionals, which has gone through five rounds of redundancies in five years and has shut down a whole department – their geosciences department, which is a 155-year-old department there. The impact it has on students in regional areas – I mention that because I know there are a number of people that represent regional areas here as well – we talk a lot about University of Melbourne and the city universities, but the regional universities are just embedded in those communities as well. So yes, there is rampant wage theft and casualisation but also redundancy cycles and shutting of whole departments.

Dylan WIGHT: Thank you.

Yolanda ROBSON: I think to make the point as well, yes, we talk a lot about Uni Melb, RMIT, whatever, because they are in front of us, but when a uni in Melbourne stuffs up, those students have options. When Federation Uni makes a decision, what options do the kids in Ballarat and the Wimmera region have? Where do they go?

The CHAIR: Thank you. Roma.

Roma BRITNELL: Yolanda, I think you were talking before about the consequence of the insecure workforce or the transient workforce, and I understand the anxiety aspect, but can you be more specific about how this contributes to the poor governance outcomes?

Yolanda ROBSON: I guess how it contributes to the poor governance – you mean casualisation and how it contributes?

Roma BRITNELL: The transient population, that is right.

Yolanda ROBSON: It is sort of one and the same, I would say: poor governance leads to a heavily casualised workforce rather than –

Roma BRITNELL: But what are the actual, tangible – what can I touch and feel that will be different because people are coming and going and there is not the continuity? What happens? Outline what actually has changed that has been a consequence of that.

Yolanda ROBSON: When people are chopping and changing and when there is no through line, no consistency of who is necessarily representing and progressing knowledge within a department, you can only imagine when that is not becoming ingrained – when that knowledge is not becoming institutional – what the learning outcomes are then. It would be the same for literally any other department. In the majority of industries where there is high turnover, the outcomes are the exact same: it is poorer for the consumers or the workers beneath them when there is constant change and constant disrupt in people of middle management and higher making decisions. In saying that, for young people who want to pursue a career in higher education the pathway looks like they graduate and they are a casual lecturer on a fixed-term contract just on repeat, with no guarantee of permanency. Again, this issue is not exclusive to universities: that insecure work and that not knowing if your contract is going to be renewed and worrying about all the peripheral things that you could make a decision on, but whether you tread your foot in the wrong direction and then your contract is not renewed and you are staying up late wondering whether that is a coincidence or not – you can probably argue maybe it is not a coincidence.

Roma BRITNELL: What exactly are people coming to you with complaints of? What are the things you are hearing?

Danae BOSLER: That come to us from the NTEU staff?

Roma BRITNELL: From the students, from the teachers – what are you actually hearing on the ground?

Danae BOSLER: I think one of the examples that we could point to was Matt Abbott, who is from Federation University. He is a lecturer at Federation University and he is also one of the NTEU presidents out there. He appeared at the federal inquiry into this last year, I want to say, and the experience he talked about where he was on university council as well. He is one of the staff-elected university council reps. I really encourage you to go and read the testimony that he gave at the federal inquiry. He talks about the experience there. I could use some quotes from him where he is excluded from being able to participate in meetings:

My experience tells me that, when that voice is raised, the response is one of intimidation ... exclusion and attempts at silencing.

...

I was once called into a meeting by the chancellor where I was instructed to 'quieten down' in relation to my role ...

There is this real fear of speaking out, I guess is the first part, and then the second part is –

Roma BRITNELL: We have actually got all that as part of our research that we have had to do before this inquiry, but I want to understand what you have actually experienced. You mentioned before about the regions and the changes and where people go. I have certainly seen that in our part of the world with Melbourne Uni pulling out of Glenormiston and not having the veterinary surgeons that we require in western Victoria, because there is not the willingness to actually bring the courses and the needs to the region, so I certainly understand that.

But I just want to hear from you what you are seeing as tangible examples – I think I might have just given one – of those course changes and things that happen with no voice from the students who need that education or from the teachers who are really passionate about making sure the services are delivered to regions that need the educated people out there.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: I think that on every campus there are different changes that are being made. There are different forms of restructuring, and we are hearing different stories, but by and large what this inquiry is going to hear over the coming days – over the course of public hearings – is a whole range of issues: whole disciplines being shut down, staff and student voice not being listened to, wage theft. What we want to emphasise is that these are all multiple heads of the same hydra, in a way: which is the deeply inappropriate import of autocratic corporate management styles into the running of a public good and what that looks like tangibly in real life.

To tie it back to your question about how casualisation impacts governance, when such a large share of staff are not confident that they have a guaranteed future in an institution, we see something happen that Trades Hall and the union movement sees happening in all sorts of industries – if your position is not secure, you do not feel safe to speak out. If it is already a risk to your career and your progression to challenge senior management or to publicly raise concerns, if you are not on a stable contract, that risk is exacerbated – it is multiplied by orders of magnitude. So even though we think it is really important that all of the different issues in this sector are examined in their own right and that there are tailored solutions to all of them, we would really like to stress that it is that loss of social licence and the straying from the university's fundamental purpose as a tool of knowledge creation, uplifting the general public, skilling the workforce – the drift from that into universities as a way for senior consultants to build a career, or to make money, is taking the taxpayer for a ride. It is hurting student outcomes and it hurts the governance of universities because staff do not feel safe to raise the true costs of decision-making.

Danae BOSLER: I think you will hear this afternoon from the National Union of Students as well. I met with them earlier this year. The impact for students is everything like shorter access hours – you know what I mean – to your library and to your teachers, through to a course that was much loved that gets shut down and stuff like that. Shut down with no explanation and no consultation with the students beforehand as well. So it is those sorts of –

Roma BRITNELL: Can you give us some examples of that? Where courses have just been shut down that were – well, more than loved, but well needed, well utilised, well evidenced. What are the examples that you have got?

Danae BOSLER: The one that I have got in front of me is the one from Federation Uni, but you said you had already investigated that one. That was the main one that I was going to refer to. But the NUS will have a ton of examples, so I am not going to take the limelight off the NUS.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: It is worth adding that when you do hear about course cuts, you will also inevitably hear university councils say that extensive consultation happened, that staff were listened to and that feedback was gathered. I do not expect that you will hear directly –

Roma BRITNELL: Is there a framework of consultation that would work better then, rather than that throwaway statement being able to be used?

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Yes, there is – the joint reform proposal by the NTEU.

Danae BOSLER: Yes. I was just going to say on that one as well – and here I am kind of straying about – about the accountability measures: I was actually prompted, because the Deputy Chair is a former local councillor, like I am as well, and I just compared the budget of a local council to the budgets of universities. It is just a magnitude of 10, do you know what I mean – the difference between these two budgets and the scale of the staff that they are employing. In terms of how to do public consultation better, how to do community consultation, student consultation, staff consultation – local councils have to consult on like every square metre of footpath, do you know what I mean? So if you want models or templates about accountability, in the same way that local councils are regulated by the state government, I am sorry to say, universities also rely on state government for some legislative frameworks. I think there are some examples of accountability mechanisms and consultation mechanisms that are textbook examples that can be used as well.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Most concretely, it would be, as the NTEU mentioned, that there simply need to be more staff and student voices on university governing bodies. Having just one staff and one student, which is the bare minimum, and also what the majority of universities are doing – they are just doing the bare minimum – it is so easy for that person to be browbeaten and isolated and cowed. This has to be fixed from the top in the rooms where decisions are being made about the future of higher education, there needs to be students in the room and there needs to be more staff. I think that is the number one recommendation that we would stress here.

Danae BOSLER: It triggers something in me, which is: remember when 20 years ago we had these conversations about having more women on boards and we all started with public boards having one woman on them, and we thought it was going to take a lifetime and that this was going to be – we all had to go around proving that having women on boards is a good outcome. We had to go around and prove it, and now it is just normalised, now it is just expected and now it is just mainstream. I remain confident that it will be similar for our universities as well.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Anthony.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Thanks, Chair. And thank you for appearing and your fantastic submission as well. I am not sure what page number it is, but in your submission I think you crystallised this perfectly, just extrapolating on this issue around accountability and social licence and really heading towards what I am going to ask on best practice:

‘Unlike in parliamentary democracies, where voters are both principals who can replace elected representatives and beneficiaries of public services, or in publicly traded corporations, where shareholders can both dismiss directors at annual general meetings and enjoy the profits of the company, university councils are largely self-perpetuating bodies insulated from meaningful accountability.’

Victorian university councils operate in secrecy. They are not required to publish minutes or to rationalise their decisions publicly –

in any way, shape or form.

That best crystallises it and takes me to the question: if that is where we are at now, what does best practice look like? What examples are there that you are aware of internationally and in other parts of the country? I know you mentioned councils, which I used to work in as well, and I totally understand where you are coming from in that respect as well, but best practice –

Danae BOSLER: Whoever thought local government would be best practice? I do not know.

Anthony CIANFLONE: What I am getting at is there are learnings –

Danae BOSLER: The state government intervenes there. If things have gone wrong, the state government intervenes and is quick to intervene there.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Yes. So in terms of best practice in other jurisdictions, what else can this committee look at and potentially recommend?

Danae BOSLER: We actually had a conversation about this beforehand, so I will go to Oscar. I guess our view was we have looked at some international examples. We did not want to endorse any of them publicly. We actually think going back to the past is a pretty good template of a good model, where you have got public investment in universities – the historical model of universities might actually be a better template of where we can go to.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Exactly. We do not believe that some enormous exercise of imagination is needed to see what we need to do to improve university governance.

Danae BOSLER: We can just pack up now, can't we?

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: This idea of increasing staff and student representation is not an experiment. In 2000, for example, the share of staff and student reps on governing boards was significantly higher. These issues of systematic wage theft, the destruction of entire disciplines and widespread casual work were not present. There used to be caps placed on the share of workers at university campuses that could be casualised. These were in place until around 2006, so we would encourage the committee and the government to look at our own national history, our own track record, for inspiration. We know what works in the Australian and Victorian context.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Can I just pick up on that as well. I guess along with better representation from students and staff as well, do you think there are opportunities in terms of how councils are regulated at a state level for universities to also be more transparent publicly by more regularly appearing, for example, before the Parliament or government in settings like this?

Danae BOSLER: Yes, absolutely. I think it goes back to that first question. I talk about social licence and public good. This is not your local school. This is not big business. They play a very specific role in our society, and with that privilege comes great responsibility as well, and there need to be accountability mechanisms. We are not asking for weekly reports to Parliament – we are not asking for unreasonable burdens. But these are huge institutions with billion-dollar turnover that are training and teaching our next generation. There needs to be an accountability mechanism.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: We do not believe there is any justification, and neither does the Expert Council on University Governance, for minutes to not be published or for procedural matters to be completely out of view. All of us here today are being broadcast. We are accountable to the public. As Danae mentioned, these institutions support thousands of jobs and support the future of the state. They should be required to make their decisions in public view and to rationalise them to the people that those decisions affect.

The CHAIR: Thank you. John.

John MULLAHY: I just want to pick up a slight thing on governance. A lot of universities have a lot of international students. It is our largest export. We are very proud of it. Thirty per cent of my electorate is Chinese, and a lot of them come over here to study first and then build businesses and all that sort of thing. Has there been any consideration with regard to universities with a high proportion of international students or the dual-sector universities – RMIT or Swinburne – and differences in governance that may be needed for those types of institutions?

Danae BOSLER: I will go first and then I will pass to Yolanda as well. I met with the International Student Officer from the NUS earlier this year as well, and they are working really hard. Firstly, it is recognised within the NUS that international students need their own representation in addition as well. I do not know if they are appearing and I am a bit conscious of time, so I will be really quick, but yes, we need to have dedicated

structures within structures to make sure that international students get representation, because their needs are unique.

John MULLAHY: They are vulnerable, yes. Also on international campuses, so obviously we have got to think about how a lot of others have campuses in South-East Asia, that sort of thing, and how governance would look in different jurisdictions and how the legislation would have to consider that.

Danae BOSLER: Yes, I think none of this is a challenge. We can overcome all of these by developing structures. It is not rocket science. We have had models of this beforehand in universities, so I am sure that we can find a way to make it work on an international scale as well. It is purely about the will. Is there political will and is there the will of universities to become better versions of themselves?

The CHAIR: Thank you. You have touched on a little bit about the public good but then corporatisation of universities. You have talked about them being big business really – big budgets. In your experience, has the funding model that we have in Australia for Australian universities – and I know we are doing Victorian – over time forced universities to become more corporatised and look for business to be part of their solutions to fund the university? Can you just maybe talk about how that might then affect how the governance will work at a university?

Danae BOSLER: Yes, absolutely. Unsurprisingly, these two things are intertwined as well. The example is that the Australian government is pretty dependent upon the international student economy and their contributions to Australia, so those two things need to be understood together. Money talks, so those things go hand in hand. But I think there is a way to unravel it that does not mean that universities must be made poor, do you know what I mean? There is a way to unravel those things where you can still have the funding and the resources that universities need but also have accountability mechanisms as well. A huge amount of it is transparency, disclosures, all the things that you would be used to having to do in your roles as well, so I do not think that any of it is unreasonable. Oscar, do you want to build on that?

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Yes. As the union movement, we are always going to be supportive of more support for education and governments really stepping up to that. But it is also important to add that there is a way corporate management in the university sector is seeing a significant amount of money being used in questionable ways. We would have all been familiar with *Four Corners* – I know that NTEU raised it – and the significant volumes of money going to external consultants on really dubious, opaque grounds. We did touch on this in our submission. Senior executives come in, senior managers come into universities, and they want to leave a mark. They restructure a school, they build a new building, and then they move on, most of them within five years before the effects of that have been seen. We really would like to challenge any notion that corporate management is more efficient with funds. Even though the government does need to step up, it is also clear that the current way that spending is being done under this corporate system should be scrutinised.

Roma BRITNELL: But how do you address that ladder-climbing, corporate legacy thing that destroys rather than builds?

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: You counterbalance the influence of that sector with staff and student voice for whom the campus is a home. They are not going to leave in five years. They are not going to move on.

Roma BRITNELL: Hopefully the students are.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: The students are, yes, but the students still have considerable skin in the game. If we look at what happened at Federation Uni, you had students who could not finish degrees that they had started because of the course cuts. There is obviously a really important role for people with professional experience in the private sector – that is not illegitimate. What we want to see is that their way of doing things is counterbalanced by more voice from students and from staff and from accountability to the university community as a whole.

Roma BRITNELL: But if you have three voices of teachers and three voices of students, and you have got a dominant person who says, 'We're going to build this Taj Mahal,' that does not necessarily stop –

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: Well, what I would point out there is, if we look at the example of the Australian National University recently, as we have heard today, existing structures are pretty weak. But even

there, staff and student and union mobilisation had been able to halt reform process to that campus, had been able to lead to a change in the organisational leadership at the very top, with the VC and the chancellor, and that kind of – our read on that is that it proves that student and staff voice can change outcomes, and with good legislative design, we can see that happening more and more before schools are cut, before jobs are destroyed.

Also, we think that student and staff voice is only one part of it. Our submission has a range of recommendations about recalling, a greater rollout of public meetings, and the NTEU reform proposal that we endorsed also boosts powers for TEQSA on the national level and the minister as well to intervene where necessary.

The CHAIR: We have probably got time for one more question. If someone has got a burning question, otherwise I will – Kim?

Kim O'KEEFFE: Yes. So we have talked today about how we feel we are in a crisis. This is why we are all here, and to have better governance across the sector. But the overarching objective is really to have staff stability and student retention. I think that is where we all want to end up, when you look at the actual pyramid of what we are doing. We have talked about course cuts and the impact on students. What else is actually affecting the retention of students in regard to good governance not being achieved?

Yolanda ROBSON: In terms of good governance not being achieved, a personal example that we can give at the Young Workers Centre is we are travelling out to universities and TAFEs to chat to young people about their workplace rights. It was not too long ago, within the last 12 months, that there were students sleeping in swags in the car park. It is really, obviously, super confronting. That has been obviously raised with the university, and there has been support offered for those students. But I cannot help but feel that whilst you can put that down to, 'Oh, it's a cost-of-living crisis,' it also kind of feels interlinked where it is like, 'Well, where was the person maybe scouting the car park?' Because if they had enough time to set up a swag and have already slept in it and no-one has checked in on them, where is the university accountability in terms of making sure that those students are supported with emergency crisis accommodation in that area?

For me, and I am sure for many of us who went to university, university was a real sense of community. It was my literal food bank at times. And I am eternally grateful for that experience and that emergency intervention support when I needed it. It was heartbreaking to see – I guess I was at uni a little bit ago, not that long ago – that it has just changed so drastically where students who are trying to get an education, how are they sleeping in a swag?

The CHAIR: Thank you. I just want to ask one more question: if you have seen a difference between the universities who have a TAFE, the dual sector. Do you think it is a better governance model if you have got a TAFE? Can you just talk to me about whether the TAFE system changes anything?

Yolanda ROBSON: I am going to take that one on notice, just to go away. My initial assessment, my initial reaction, is no, it is on a case-by-case basis, because we have had some pretty rife fights with some TAFEs as well too. So I do not want to suggest that the TAFE model provides any more integrity. Sadly, the TAFE model is often treated as substandard in the university context. If it is connected to a university, it is sometimes treated as the substandard cousin, so I would not want to endorse it as a good example.

The CHAIR: Yes, great. If you can come back to us, if you have got any examples about how that might work, that would be fantastic. We really appreciate you answering our questions today and giving us a better insight into this issue.

Witnesses withdrew.