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**(prebudgetsubs@treasury.gov.au)**

**A Time of Reckoning and Rethinking for**

**Australian Higher Education Policy**

**OVERVIEW**

The National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) represents the industrial and professional rights of around 30,000 members working in Australian higher education and research.

**Time of reckoning for higher education policy**

The onset of COVID19 was an existential crisis for our universities. According to the latest Universities Australia estimates[[1]](#footnote-2) released on 3 February 2021, Australian universities lost $1.8billion in 2020 compared to 2019 and at least 17,300 jobs, including permanent, limited term and casual employees. Those employees that retained their jobs in 2020 were required to devote enormous amounts of time and energy to transition to online delivery of classes.

While the government spent hundreds of billions of dollars supporting businesses and their employees in response to COVID19, it abandoned our universities. The direct funding available to universities in its COVID19 rescue package amounted to an average of just over $1m per university. The eligibility rules for JobKeeper were explicitly changed to exclude public universities and their employees.

The true nature of the government’s hostile attitude to our universities was made even clearer with the introduction of its incoherent, unbalanced, unfair and unsustainable Jobs-Ready Graduate (JRG) policies, which slashed the average level of public investment per student and increased average student fees.

From the NTEU’s perspective the whole policy approach and regulation and funding of higher education and our universities is fundamentally broken and unsustainable. The increasing reliance on casual and short-term contract employees by our universities is evidence of this flawed policy framework and the NTEU believes it requires a major re-think.

**Time to rethink higher education policy**

From the NTEU’s perspective a major re-think of higher education policy needs to:

* acknowledge the important and unique role of our public universities and promote and protect **institutional autonomy and academic freedom**;
* establish an **independent higher education agency** with funding and regulatory powers
* raise the level of **public investment** in our universities to 1% of GDP while phasing out tuition fees for government supported students;
* use **Public Accountability Agreements (PAA’s**) as a planning, accountability and funding framework that is a flexible yet managed way of allocating public funding to individual universities;
* reduce the influence of corporate governance and executive power in our universities by reverting to a more **collegial model of governance**;
* reduce the level of **insecure employment** at our universities which is a direct threat to the to the quality of teaching and research and academic freedom.

The rationale for our position in relation to each of these is outlined below.

For further information please contact:

Dr Alison Barnes, National President (abarnes@nteu.org.au)

Paul Kniest, Director (Policy and Research) (pkniest@nteu.org.au)

**COVID19**

Australia’s higher education system, predominantly made up of public universities, makes an enormous contribution to Australia’s economic, social and cultural prosperity. It educates more than 1.6million students, one in three from overseas, and employs more than 200,000 workers. Higher education generates more than $30billion in total revenue and pays in excess of $17billion in employee benefits. Education is Australia’s fourth largest export industry, only behind iron ore, coal, and natural gas.

Australia is widely acknowledged as having one the strongest higher education systems in the world. Not only are Australian universities highly visible in various world university league tables, Australia’s researchers punch well above their weight in terms of research publications and impact. On a per-capita basis, Australia’s universities attract the most overseas students in the world.

All evidence shows that Australia’s globalised higher education sector has, on any measure, been highly successful. The level of global interdependence however, means our higher education sector, like many other industries, is vulnerable to unanticipated external shocks such as COVID19. The direct impact on universities was profound with Universities Australia estimating that there was a loss of $1.8billion in revenue and at least 17,300 jobs in 2020.

This unanticipated external shock required an unprecedented public policy response.

The public health response to COVID19 was to close our international border and to shutdown much of our domestic economic, social and cultural activity. The economic response was record levels of public expenditure to support affected businesses and their employees. The government spent well over $200billion on programs including generous wage subsidies (JobKeeper), boosting the below poverty line levels of unemployment benefits (JobSeeker supplement), business cash flow and investment subsidies and accelerated investment in infrastructure projects.

As outlined below, our public universities were largely excluded from this assistance.

**2020 a year of reckoning for higher education policy**

Despite the severe negative impact of COVID19, our public universities were largely abandoned by the Australian government. The very modest ($80million) higher education COVID rescue package released in April targeted assistance to private providers, largely through fee relief and funding of additional short courses. This package delivered on average less than $1million per public university. It has to be noted that the eligibility rules for JobKeeper were rewritten on more than one occasion to effectively exclude our public universities from qualifying, while private for-profit providers, including a number of international universities, received millions in wage subsidies.

In 2020 the government policy went beyond abandonment in the wake of COVID19 and became more aggressive and hostile with the government pushing ahead with its Jobs-Ready Graduate Package (JRGP) policies which, all other things being equal, slashed public investment in higher education by $1billion and increased average student fees, with fees in some humanities courses more than doubling. The JRGP was not only highly unfair and unbalanced with some fees more than doubling and others falling, it was also highly incoherent with some so-called jobs ready disciplines also suffering a cut in funding. The JRGP is also unsustainable because even though on average students will pay more, universities will on average receive less to educate them.

The government’s hostility toward the sector was reinforced with more direct intervention and interference into universities’ day to day operations. More troubling is the new foreign relations legislation, which treats universities in the same vein as an arm of government in terms of arrangements (undefined) with oversea entities having to comply with the government’s (undefined) foreign policy. The government is also assertively pushing ahead with its ‘free speech’ agenda, most recently appointing Emeritus Professor Sally Walker to undertake a very detailed review of universities implementation of the (voluntary) French code of free speech and academic freedom. We also note that ‘free speech’ legislation is currently before Parliament. However, while the NTEU supports legislative strengthening on academic freedom, the measures proposed by the government will not be effective in ensuring that academic freedom is protected, and the convolution of academic freedom with ‘free speech’ will only serve to weaken the former.

In reckoning the government’s higher education policy responses during 2020, it is difficult to conclude that it went beyond simply abandonment or neglect, but was purposefully antagonistic and even hostile. The NTEU is concerned that the continuation of such an approach has the very real danger of undermining and damaging our highly successful higher education system and public universities.

The NTEU is calling for a major re-think of the government approach to higher education policy which needs to cover:

* regulation:
* funding;
* governance; and
* employment

**Regulation**

The NTEU supports the view that there needs to be a consistent and coherent regulatory and funding framework which covers both HE and VET. This regulatory framework however must acknowledge the purposes, structures and different pedagogical approaches adopted in VET and HE. The reasons why the NTEU believes that Australia should continue to operate a ‘tracked’ rather than unified tertiary education system is outlined in great detail in our submission to the Joyce Review of VET[[2]](#footnote-3)) but comes down to:

* the political reality that VET policy and funding is very much in the State/Territory jurisdiction while HE policy and funding is effectively (if not constitutionally) in the Commonwealth government’s jurisdiction
* the very different structural make-up of the two sectors with some 70% of the 4.2million students in VET enrolled in one of more than 3,000 private providers, whereas 90% of the more than 1.5million higher education student are enrolled at one of 43 (predominantly public) universities (See Table 1)
* the very different educational philosophies and approaches with VET adopting narrowly defined and industry focused competency-based training compared to HE which focuses on student’s capabilities many of which are generic and transferable skills.

Table 1

****

From the NTEU’s perspective it would be a mistake to continue pushing higher education towards a more standardised competency-based approach to education, which is likely to be a result of recent policy initiatives aimed at officially recognising and funding micro-credentials and short courses.

It is also essential that the regulatory framework specifically acknowledges and accounts for the particular role of universities within the higher education sector and, in particular, the need for universities to engage in teaching, research, and community service. Also paramount is the necessity for institutional autonomy and academic freedom to be both protected and promoted, so that universities as institutions of public good are able to fulfill their obligations as specified in the Objects of the *Higher Education Support Act 2003.*  This includes the requirements for our universities to contribute to the intellectual, cultural, economic and social life of Australia, and to create and advance knowledge and to apply that for the better of communities in Australia and overseas.

Institutional autonomy and academic freedom are essential if our universities are to fulfill their obligations to create new knowledge and contribute to the intellectual life of Australia. As is shown in the final section of this submission, only one in three university employees now enjoys ongoing secure work, which is a major threat to academic freedom.

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

**The tertiary education regulatory framework should continue to recognise the distinction between HE and VET but also the important and unique role played by our public universities including the need to promote and protect academic freedom and institutional autonomy.**

**Funding**

The funding of higher education has become a political football. Since the introduction of the Demand Driven System (DDS) by the Rudd/Gillard government, both sides of politics have tried to achieve substantial budgetary savings by targeting higher education. In 2013 (only one year after DDS was fully implemented) the ALP introduced an efficiency dividend on university teaching grants – reclaiming over $900m. The Coalition failed twice under former Education Minister Pyne in 2014 to save $5billion by slashing funding per student by 20% and allowing universities to charge students anything they liked (in excess of $100,000 in some cases) for a degree. Former Education Minister Birmingham also failed in 2017 when he attempted to save $2.8billion by imposing an efficiency dividend on university grants and slowly ratcheting up student fees. Having failed on three occasions to get support for its attempts to slash public funding to higher education through the Parliament, the Coalition in December 2017 finally used what was meant to be a safety-net provision in the Higher Education Support Act to freeze the level of funding each university would receive for the education of CSPs at 2017 levels. This was estimated to save about $2billion. However, in 2020, (another former) Education Minister Tehan introduced the Jobs-Ready Graduate (JRG) package which again involves a substantial cut in public investment - only this time, the ‘savings’ are on top of record funding losses in the sector (according to Universities Australia, around $1.8 billion loss for that year), primarily driven by the collapse of international education following the closure of international borders due to COVID-19. However, it’s important to note that this is part of a long term, ongoing pattern, whereby successive governments over time have cut public funding in repeated and persistent attempts to supposedly “reform” higher education, but in reality, a more a grab for ‘savings’. The effect of this approach is that higher education is now hamstrung by a high degree of uncertainty, for both funding and regulation.

In order to depoliticise higher education funding the NTEU is not only calling for a long-term commitment by both sides of government to set the level of public expenditure at 1% of GDP (see below) but also to establish an independent higher education agency or commission which would have both regulatory and funding powers.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

**Establish an independent higher education agency or commission with regulatory and funding responsibilities.**

***Aggregate funding***

Australia has one of the lowest levels of public investment in tertiary education in the world and students attending public universities pay amongst the highest fees in the world. As a consequence, Australia’s share public investment is amongst the lowest in the OECD. (see Attachment 1 Figures A1 – A3).

The recently passed Jobs-Ready Graduate (JRG) policy slashes public investment per government-supported students by 14% and increases average tuition fees by about 8% (see Attachment 1 Figures A4 – A6).

The medium-term outlook is no better. Figure 1 shows the Parliamentary Budget Office’s (PBO) estimates of the value of the Commonwealth Grants Scheme (CGS) expressed as share of GDP to 2030-31. The short-term and short-lived increase shown in Figure 1 is a result of the COVID19 induced recession. Despite the government’s continual protestations about spending record levels of money on higher education, Figure 1 clearly shows public investment in the education of government supported students as a share of national income (GDP) is projected to decline steadily over the medium term. Before we are accused of using data selectively, it should noted that the PBO’s projections also show that when expressed as share of total government spending, the CGS will decline from 1.5% to 1.1% over the same period.

Figure 1 only includes expenditure on the CGS. If all government expenditure on higher education is included, including expenditure on R&D, in 2019-20 the total value of public investment adds to just over $13billion which is equal to 0.66% of GDP. The latest available comparative data (see Figure 1A) shows that the average level of public expenditure on tertiary education institutions for all OECD was 1% of GDP.

 While the NTEU acknowledges the $1billion increase in research support funding for 2021 (see Figure A4), it must be noted that this one-off payment does not address the longer-term trend of declining public investment in our universities.

The JRG will also increase average student contribution to almost 50% which is two and half times higher than the original 20% contribution rate when the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECSS) was first introduced in 1989.

Therefore, the medium-term outlook for Australian higher education will put Australia in an even worse position when compared to other industrialised economies in the OECD.

These declining levels of public investment in higher education are unsustainable. What is required is a long-term commitment to public investment in higher education. The NTEU believes that level of investment should be equal to 1% of GDP, which would put Australia in line with that of the rest of the OECD. As was shown in some detail in our 2020-21 Pre-Budget submission, this level of public investment would allow universities to be funded for the cost of educating government-supported students, increase investment in research support and training and the phasing out of tuition fees for government supported students.

Figure 1



As discussed in the final section of this submission (Insecure employment), declining public investment has been one of the main drivers of our universities, increasing reliance of on the use of insecure employment.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

**The level of public investment on Australian universities be increased to 1% of GDP and that tuition fees for government supported student be eliminated.**

***Over reliance on private funding***

COVID-19 revealed how reliant and vulnerable Australian universities are to private funding and, in particular unexpected external shocks. As discussed above the public health response to COVID-19 which included international border closures and shutdown domestic activity had direct and serious consequences for university revenue and staff.

As Figure 2 clearly shows, in 2019 Australia’s universities earned close to $10billion in overseas student fee income, compared to about $7.5billioin in CGS funding. The NTEU contends that reductions in public investment in effect forced Australia’s universities to seek alternative sources of private income, of which overseas student fee income was by far the most important. Whether the government is prepared to admit it or not, this reliance on overseas fee income is an unofficial part of the government’s funding policy for our universities. The best way to reduce this vulnerability is to substantially increase public investment.

Figure 2



***Funding of individual universities***

In order to exert greater control and influence over the way in which universities spend ever declining levels of public funding, the government has not only tied an increasing proportion (up 7.5%) of university funding to the achievement of pre-determined sector wide performance criteria but also has engaged in a repeated unbundled and re-packing of core funding with specific eligibility criteria.

In the recognition that the Demand Driven System (DDS) of funding for government-supported students was unlikely to be politically and fiscally sustainable for the Commonwealth government (of both political persuasions), the NTEU first outlined in our 2015 Budget Submission[[3]](#footnote-4) a proposal for a sustainable regulatory and funding framework, administered through the introduction of Public Accountability Agreements (PAA). The PAA framework was seen as a way of having a well-planned and managed distribution of government-supported places while giving individual universities the flexibility to pursue their own missions. Rather than being a demand driven model, it might be described as a more managed (and constrained) version of the demand driven system, which incorporates funding and accountability mechanises.

A PAA would be a comprehensive individual (rolling 3-year) agreement between each university and (a yet to be established) independent higher education commission. Each PAA would include a university’s (negotiated/moderated) plans, a funding agreement as well as accountability/performance criteria, against which the negotiation of subsequent PAAs would be informed. PAAs would not increase overall compliance costs because they would replace a number of existing arrangements including institutional strategic plans, funding agreements, mission-based compacts, and institutional performance portfolios.

The PAA framework is not unlike that which is being proposed in relation to the National Priorities Industry Linkage Fund (NPILF) [Consultation Paper](https://www.dese.gov.au/job-ready/resources/npilf-consultation-paper). While the NTEU did not support the proposed model in relation to the NPLIF given the high costs relative to modest ($220m per year) funding and its highly targeted objectives, we believe such as framework would have some merit in relation to whole of institutional funding.

Like the proposed NPILF framework, the NTEU anticipates that the proposed accountability / performance criteria would not be restricted to a pre-determined set of industry wide indicators (one-size-fits-all model) such as that which is typically used in performance based funding framework, but instead provide a framework that gives each university the capacity to negotiate a set of criteria that aligns with its own objectives. These might include (as NPILF proposal outlines) a variety/mix of:

* sector wide metrics;
* university specific qualitative or quantitative information; and
* new commitments or innovative plans.

From the NTEU perspective PAA should not only cover each university’s core teaching / research / community service obligations but would act as the primary mechanism to administer the allocation of government-supported student places. For example, where a university is seeking a substantial increase in enrolments, the PAA would importantly require the university to demonstrate it has the necessary physical and staffing resources to ensure each student it intends to enrol has a genuine opportunity to successfully complete their studies. The independent higher education Commission could also use the information it collects from all universities to better manage the total number of enrolments in particular disciplines. It could negotiate/moderate individual university plans or encourage cooperation between universities if it believes there to many or too few enrolments in certain areas.

Other than these core areas the NTEU is also suggesting that PAAs could be used to help address two of the other issues (discussed below) that need to be addressed in relation to higher, namely:

* university governance; and
* employment security.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**

**That the government introduce a Public Accountability Agreement (PAA) framework as the primary or the planning/funding/accountability framework to replace existing strategic plans, funding and** **performance mechanisms.**

**Governance**

Before proposing the appropriate governance arrangements for Australia’s public universities, we must first come to an understanding of what the role of universities in the Australian society should be.

According to the Australian Higher Education Standards Framework (Part B: Criteria for Higher Education Providers) in order to be registered as an Australian university a provider must:

* be authorised to self-accredit its courses;
* deliver undergraduate, postgraduate and doctoral (research) qualifications;
* undertake research;
* demonstrate a commitment to the systematic advancement and dissemination of knowledge;
* identify and implement good practices in student teaching which is informed by sustained scholarship;
* offer a wide range of student services;
* have systematic processes for quality assurance and the maintenance of academic standards and academic integrity; and
* demonstrate engagement with its local and regional communities and social responsibility in its activities.

The Objects of Higher Education Support Act (HESA) 2003 elaborate on this and make it clear that universities are expected to contribute to the intellectual, cultural, economic and social life of Australia and to create and advance knowledge and to apply that for the betterment of communities in Australia and overseas.

That is universities are expected to more than efficiently educate jobs-ready graduates or produce commercially variable research as has been the focus of much government policy in recent years but they are expected to act in and for the broader public benefit.

While the NTEU has outlined why we believe the current government’s policy stance is not consistent with its own legislation’s objects or regulatory requirements, we are equally critical of the way in which Australia’s public universities are governed.

In recent decades we have seen the emergence of the ‘enterprise university’ which Marginson and Considine (2000)[[4]](#footnote-5) described as universities trying to (and indeed being encouraged to by funding cuts and changes in government policy such the 2005 National Governance Protocols) to imitate corporate governance structures. These are characterised by strong executive control and the diminution of the roles of important academic functions through Senates, Councils and Academic Boards, which had previously been more collegial.

The NTEU questions whether a corporate governance, where the decision making power is concentrated in hands of a limited number of (highly paid) senior executives, is fit for purpose for a contemporary Australian university. We note that, in addition to educating “jobs-ready graduates”, universities are also expected to educate students and produce research that contributes to the intellectual, cultural, economic and social life of Australia, to create and advance knowledge, and to help improve communities, both in Australia and overseas. In other words, can a university be expected to act in and for the broader public benefit, while also be run like a for-profit corporation?

It is essential that if universities are to meet their obligations, that they must engage staff, students and communities in their decision-making processes. Yet, this does not occur in any meaningful way; instead, many universities have actively and purposefully diminished or attempted to remove staff, student and alumni representatives from their governance structures and limited stakeholder input.

The shift to a more corporate, managerial approach has been also assisted through successive government policies and a push for the sector to be ‘profitable’. With decreasing proportions of government funding, universities have shifted in a way that has seen them act more like large corporations, acting aggressively to compete for advantage in the domestic and international education market, spending millions on marketing, recruitment and brand image, and looking to grow their profitability to fund expansion. At the same time, universities have sought to reduce ongoing expenditure, the most significant being employment costs. It is not a coincidence that the spread of managerialism and corporatisation in university governance has occurred at the same time as the level of insecure employment has increased.

The NTEU shares Marginson and Considine’s (2004) view that in the enterprise university *“money is the key objective*” and in the search for greater institutional prestige and competitiveness, *academic identities are .. subordinated to the mission, marketing and strategic development of the institution and its leader.* This issue was explored in a recent article in the Times Higher Education (THE) (January 21 2021) titled *Only academics can run universities effectively*, in whichTerenceKealey chronicles the plight of various universities under what he refers to as senate (academically dominated) or collegial, as opposed to council (external expert controlled) or corporate governance structures. He drew a number of conclusions including that under a council dominated (corporate governance) Kealey concluded that senate (collegially governed) universities did better on a number of indicators than those governed in the corporate tradition.

The following passage from Kealey will ring true for many of the NTEU members working at Australia’s ever increasingly corporatized universities:

*So whereas employees in industry and commerce really are employees, personnel in universities are working largely for personal fulfilment. If they are treated by a council as employees, they will lose their motivation. Bonuses are particularly damaging of collegiality.*

The issue around money, bonusses and increasing executive power at the heart of the enterprise university may be one factor explaining the rapid increase in vice-chancellor (remuneration in recent years. Australia’s vice-chancellors are amongst the best paid in the world, with average remuneration in 2019 being almost $1million. (See Attachment Figures A7 and A8).

A NSW Legislative Council Portfolio Committee No.3 report (*Future development of the NSW tertiary education*) released on 25 January 2021 was so concerned about university hiring practices and the remuneration of vice-chancellors that it recommended that the NSW Auditor-General be given the power to examine staffing management and *the salaries paid to Vice-Chancellors and senior university executives* [Recommendation 3].

The NTEU believes that the evolution of the enterprise or corporatised university is not suited to the role public universities need to play. Not only has it suppressed staff, student and community role in our public universities’ decision-making processes, the elevation of financial objectives, including a drive for efficient (low cost) delivery of teaching and research, has not only resulted in a greater reliance on insecurely employed staff, it also severely compromises our public universities to act in and for the public good.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

Government should use their funding and regulatory powers to ensure that universities and other higher education providers:

1. develop open and transparent mechanisms and structures that incorporate staff, students and local communities into their decision-making processes, and transparently report the level of total remuneration received by vice-chancellors and other members of the senior executive as well as the key performance indicators attached to those positions

**Employment**

In order to be able to fulfill two of their core obligations – that being the provision of high quality teaching and learning informed by scholarship, and research that leads to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, our universities require highly qualified staff, whose employment is secure. This is particularly so if or when they express views that either their university or funding body (government or private) does not find to be in their interests. While we have already outlined the importance of academic freedom as a cornerstone in a world class higher education system, employment security is key to its sustainability.

***University Employees***

Figure 3 shows that in 2019 there were some 221,780 people (headcount[[5]](#footnote-6)) employed at Australia’s universities, of which only about one-in-three (76,713 or 35%) of whom enjoyed permanent or ongoing employment. Almost one-in-two university employees (99,492 or 45%) were engaged as casuals and one-in-five (45,575 or 20%) employed on limited term contracts. The proportion of insecurely employed staff as share of the total employees has increased from 60% in 2000 to 65% in 2019, with casuals increasing from 40% to 45% over that period.

Figure 3



As was shown in a 2018 NTEU report called *The Flood of Insecure Employment at Australian Universities[[6]](#footnote-7)* , in addition to increasing reliance on insecure jobs, university employment was also more specialised amongst academic staff. The increasing use of specialist academic staff, that is, those classified as either teaching-only (T-O) or research-only (R-O), as opposed to more traditional teaching and research (T&R) academics as shown in Figure 4, is also associated with an increasing reliance on insecure forms of work. As the data in Figure 5 shows, in 2018 only about 15% of FTE staff employed as T-O or R-O academic staff enjoyed secure employment. Three-quarters (73.8%) of T-O FTE academics were employed as casuals and eight out of ten (79.1%) R-O FTE academics were on limited term contracts.

The NTEU believes that increasing reliance on specialist academic staff without secure employment is an existential threat the quality and sustainability of our university sector. It is estimated at least half of all teaching is delivered by casual employees. Much of the research is undertaken researchers on limited term contracts. While the NTEU is not questioning the qualifications or motives of the individual involved, we are questioning whether it is an employment model which ensures our universities are attracting the very best people to pursue a university career.
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**RECOMMENDATION 6**

**Government should use its high regulatory and funding powers to encourage universities to reduce their reliance on insecurely employed .**

**CONCLUSION**

Australia’s world class public university system must be underpinned by:

* secure employment,
* a level of public investment that expose of public universities to unexpected external shocks, and
* appropriate regulatory and governance frameworks.

At present Australia fails on all of these elements and therefore the NTEU believes it is now time to take stock and rethink each of these aspects of Australia’s approach to higher education higher education policy. In rethinking higher education policy, the NTEU is recommending that:

* the tertiary education regulatory framework should continue to recognise the distinction between HE and VET but also the important and unique role played by our public universities, including the need to promote and protect academic freedom and institutional autonomy.
* An independent higher education agency or commission with regulatory and funding responsibilities be established.
* The level of public investment on Australian universities be increased to 1% of GDP and that tuition fees for government supported student be eliminated.
* That the government introduce a Public Accountability Agreement (PAA) framework as the primary or the planning/funding/accountability framework to replace existing strategic plans, funding and performance mechanisms.
* Government should use their funding and regulatory powers to ensure that universities and other higher education providers:
	+ develop open and transparent mechanisms and structures that incorporate staff, students and local communities into their decision-making processes, and
	+ transparently report the level of total remuneration received by vice-chancellors and other members of the senior as well as the key performance indicators attached to those positions
	+ reduce their reliance on insecurely employed staff.

**ATTACHMENT 1**
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