A Message from the CEO

Welcome to the Go8’s June newsletter. I am writing this following the Federal Budget and as we grind our way through the longest Federal election campaign since 1954 – Robert Menzies’ 94-day campaign.

Our newsletter contents are very pertinent given the political timing, and our three main features are interlinked.

In our regular “From the Outside Looking In” column – where we ask those external to our sector to give us their views – respected economist Professor Judith Sloan (who is always a much-appreciated excellent and forthright contributor) discusses universities in an election context, and also what will follow for us regardless of who wins the election on 2 July.

Professor Sloan’s views on university financial health would not of course be agreed upon by the Go8 but we totally understand why from an outside perspective she takes her position. Professor Sloan says the sector grew its student load by 27.5 per cent between 2009 and 2013. However the Go8 did not take a “bums on seat” approach as some others in the sector did. Far from bolstering Go8 general revenue the demand driven system has not assisted us with the distorted funding model that damages us – where we must cross subsidise our critical underfunded research programs from teaching revenue.

The fact is (as we keep advising Government and Opposition) the more we research, the more costs we have to subsidise, and, as Australia’s leading research intensive universities, we do feel that current research funding shortfall more than others in the sector. The Go8 spends more than $6Billion each year on research. We receive funding for just $2.5Billion of that.

Professor Sloan’s column makes the contribution by Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington, ANU Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic particularly potent. Read this and weep as you confront the complexities of identifying equivalent full time student load and the funding that flows from such calculations. Professor Hughes-Warrington manages to make this a highly amusing read. But we know she isn’t laughing.

Both of the above contributions segue neatly into an extract from a recent thought-provoking speech of Professor Warren Bebbington, Vice Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. It seems all roads lead to the demand driven system, its funding blow-out, its success in driving participation, yet its failure in ensuring students from disadvantaged backgrounds can benefit from a university education as they should be able to. Professor Bebbington speaks from both a personal and professional perspective; as a student who arrived at university only because he had been able to secure a targeted Commonwealth scholarship. This context makes his views that much more powerful.

As always we include in our newsletter a selection of the awesome research carried out in our universities; research that delivers such obvious impact for the lives of so many people. I will continue to keep saying it… at the Go8 we are incredibly proud of our research capacity and high quality, and our researchers and what they achieve.

These examples of what Go8 members contribute to society globally, and to the Australian economy, are indicative of the Go8’s position as Australia’s leading research intensive universities. They are also indicative of why the Go8 is using the time between now and the 2 July election to make our submission to the Government’s “Options Paper” which was released on Budget night, and also to provide both major parties with our priority directions for the next term of Government.

Our incoming Government should be left in no doubt that an innovative Australia, with innovation driving our nation as a knowledge economy, is impossible to deliver without the university sector. Other nations have long-recognised that.
Better ways of funding participation in university
Professor Warren Bebbington
Vice Chancellor, University of Adelaide

Instead of spreading available funds ever more thinly, we should think how to properly fund a finite number of students with real aptitude for university study, chosen from all parts of society.

Speaking at a CEDA post-Budget lunch on higher education, Professor Warren Bebbington said his own educational experience demonstrated that the awarding of scholarships to disadvantaged high school students of ability would be a more powerful way of lifting disadvantaged success at university than the present unlimited entry.

“At my school, only a minority finished Year 12, and it never occurred to my father, who had left school at 14, that I should think about university study,” he said.

“Being awarded one of the old Commonwealth Scholarships is what made me think about studying at university.”

Professor Bebbington noted that both sides of politics are committed to the present demand-driven system, in which universities may accept as many students as they wish.

“A key purpose of the system was to lift the participation of disadvantaged students in university study. But such enrolment has increased less than 1% since the system began.

“The sure way to increase disadvantaged student success at university is by improving aspiration and preparation for university in disadvantaged schools, so their students can meet entry standards,” he said.

“Simply removing limits on entry numbers is not the answer,” he said.

The demand-driven system was reviewed by Kemp-Norton in 2014.

“A little-noticed finding of that review was that school programs aimed at lifting numeracy and literacy are more plausible ways of lifting disadvantaged entry and achievement at university,” Professor Bebbington said.

According to Professor Bebbington, Minister Birmingham’s post-Budget discussion paper sets out “reasonable and effective” ways of dealing with the accelerating cost of the university sector.

“But neither side of politics seems ready to tackle the root cause of the cost rise,” he said.

“Instead of spreading available funds ever more thinly, we should think how to properly fund a finite number of students with real aptitude for university study, chosen from all parts of society.”
Life on Mars and in University – what’s the EFTSL?

Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington*

You haven’t lived, or at least lived on Mars, until you have attempted to explain EFTSL – Equivalent Full Time Student Load – to university staff.

This is because EFTSL, and its international equivalents – FTE in the UK, EFTS in New Zealand – are policy palimpsests. Somewhere in what now seems like deep time, someone thought it was a good idea to express the idea of full-time, academic year student enrolment with the number 1.

You could tell it would end in tears even then. For the average subject in a university program, a student represents 0.125 EFTSL. Try telling that to a university teacher who sees persons, not decimals, and please do not assume that I am only talking about my colleagues in the humanities.

Then try to help them understand the budgetary implications that flow from that 0.125 EFTSL and the other decimal components in their classroom. This is where you really find yourself tumbling through more policy swing shuffles back to the 1980s than a Stock Aitken and Waterman hit. It can leave even the smartest person feeling slightly concussed.

For every person who might understand even part of the current intricacies of whether fees are set by the government or the university, how much a student contributes relative to any government contribution, and cluster (discipline) or high/low cost rates, there are many more whose understanding is far from current. I have on occasion even had to explain that there isn’t a block grant for teaching, and that we all missed the email on that because demand driven funding was introduced before email existed, in 1989.

I don’t blame everyone for being a bit confused, or for standing in past policy space. As a teacher, I might think it a simple calculation to work out how much income is earned for a first-year undergraduate subject. It isn’t. Put aside fee remissions, the students who attend but who don’t pay (‘fairy load’ in my parlance), whether your university has negotiated a cap on undergraduate numbers, enabling and HECS exempt students, and you might still find yourself having to come to grips with at least five different kinds of contribution all sitting simultaneously in your classroom: domestic bachelor; domestic diploma with a government place; domestic diploma without a government place; domestic non-award; international student at any level.

Pop a couple of graduate students taking an undergraduate course in there – one on a government place and the other not – and both budgeting and administrative hell breaks loose.

Here’s a crude summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Government contribution?</th>
<th>Are the fees fixed by the government?</th>
<th>Are the number of government places fixed?</th>
<th>Does this student pay the same amount as a domestic bachelor student?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, bachelor degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, diploma</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes they do, but the University does not receive the government contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, non-award</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, not applicable</td>
<td>No: full domestic fees because there is no government contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International diploma, bachelor degree or non-award</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, not applicable</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, graduate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, the government contribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic, graduate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even if you figure out how many of each kind of student you have enrolled, you still have to factor in discipline cluster rates for the particular course, which are generally not the same for domestic and international students. They might even differ for subjects offered by the same school or department, depending on the skills and content taught.

People keep telling me that this is like differential airline pricing, and that we should just live with it. The point is, folks, that I have never met an airline steward who was held accountable for understanding and improving revenue in the way that academics are. Nor does airline pricing strategy appear to be something that crept up on firms in an organic, set of criss-crossing decisions, decision orphans and short term expediencies with more layers than a new romantic feathered fringe.

There’s a lot about the 1980s that deserves to be forgotten. But it also marks a divergent moment that deserves pause. While higher education set out on a course of asking for student contributions that led to a succession of piece by piece decisions on funding, this was also the era of the desktop computer.

I am sure that my father was not the only one out there who thought that the apocalypse would result if I didn’t learn Fortran, Pascal, Perl, C, or all of the above. I bore the opprobrium that resulted from buying a Mac Classic, and learned HTML very easily when I needed to. I even learned a little bit of Python and played with Ruby without rails just for the fun of it. Something important happened here: useability.

Useability is the feature by which changes in our digital world stand or fall. You would not dream of introducing a new product or service unless you had a good steer on whether people thought them valuable and simple enough to use.

Budgets, fee settings and EFTSL aren’t immune from useability. It’s a bad day when we find ourselves remonstrating with staff because they generate multiple, conflicting versions of their own budgets. They are simply at the pointy end of a policy landscape that we all have the responsibility to fix.

So by all means ask me about how we might think about funding for a particular student cohort, how the rules about contributions for one cohort might apply to another, and how places might be distributed in a transparent, and fair way. I’ll even check my answers, right back to the 1980s. But why not ask the biggest question: why did it have to start with 1, and where could we take it from there in a way that is simple, transparent, and makes sense?

*Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington is Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic National Secretary The Rhodes Scholarships Australia Australian National University*
Higher education policy and the election

Professor Judith Sloan*

Like previous election campaigns, higher education policy is unlikely to be a major political issue emphasised by either of the major parties.

For those connected to higher education, this may well be a source of frustration. After all, the numbers of students enrolled is high – well over one million; the numbers employed in the industry are substantial; and higher education is one of the major sources of export income for the country.

There are also a number of important unanswered questions in the higher education space:
- Will fee deregulation proceed and in what form?
- What will happen with student tuition subsidies?
- Will there be changes to the HECS-HELP arrangements?
- What will happen to research funding in the future?

Another factor potentially supporting an emphasis on higher education in the campaign is the commitment by the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, to his personally devised “Ideas Boom”, to replace the fading mining (investment) boom. Surely this must translate into higher education and research figuring more prominently relative to previous campaigns?

The trouble for the Government is that there are no settled positions on a number of tricky higher education issues – think fee deregulation and cuts to student tuition grants, in particular. It’s just easier to avoid higher education, certainly in a specific sense, than to get into a brawl on the details of particular policies.

By contrast, Labor has laid down a number of clear higher education policies, having initially hesitated in its support of demand-driven enrolment.

There is no doubt that higher education spokesman, Kim Carr, has personal reservations about the arrangement based partly on his view that educational quality has been compromised.

But Labor has now endorsed demand-driven enrolment, which after all was implemented under its watch. It wants to see completion rates increase and will increase funding for the quality auditor and a new higher education commission.

It has also backed away from the spending cuts affecting higher education put forward in Labor’s 2013 budget. These cuts were announced in part to help fund the Gonski reforms to school funding. But when the Coalition Government attempted to introduce the cuts to higher education, they were blocked by Labor in Opposition.

Labor also isn’t having a bar of fee deregulation or extending HECS-HELP to sub-degree programs or private institutions. Labor has also made comforting noises about maintaining the real value of research funding, as well as making some dubious proposals to promote STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics).

So what does the outcome of the election hold for higher education? In the short-term, it is unlikely that there would be much difference between a re-elected Coalition Government and a new Labor one. The current education Minister, Simon Birmingham, has delayed any cuts to student tuition monies until 2018 and a discussion paper was released with the Budget which outlines options for fee deregulation. The clear message is that full fee deregulation is off the table.

Mind you, the toxic mixture of HECS-HELP, as it is currently structured, with full fee deregulation was an under-appreciated risk by former education Minister, Christopher Pyne. The scope for the older universities, in particular, to charge much higher fees, in the knowledge that some students would never repay their loans, simply transferred an unacceptable risk to the taxpayer.

That the income threshold for HECS-HELP is relatively high; that debt holders can escape repayment while overseas; and that the debt is extinguished upon death are considerations that need to be taken into account (and potentially changed) before any serious consideration can be given to freeing up the fees charged by higher education institutions. There may also be a case for charging all students an administrative loan fee as applies in FEE-HELP.

The likely outcome were the Coalition to be returned to office is that universities would be able to raise fees for some nominated flagship courses, but this would be restricted to a fixed percentage of enrolments or fee income. Every university would be given this chance. It would not be out of the question for a Labor Government to consider a similar initiative.

Another factor potentially supporting an emphasis on higher education in the campaign is the commitment by the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, to his personally devised “Ideas Boom”, to replace the fading mining (investment) boom.
But when it comes to election campaigns, I’m afraid it is always the bridesmaid, never the bride, for higher education.

The reality is that we are likely to continue with a set of regulated prices for most undergraduate courses, even though those centrally determined fees don’t necessarily make a great deal of sense.

There is little doubt that these fees have created some perverse incentives. For example, the high fee for Law and its relative low cost of delivery has led to a proliferation of Law courses offered by Australian universities, notwithstanding the dismal employment prospects of law graduates, certainly in legal jobs.

The bottom line is that we are likely to muddle on with a mixture of higher education policies, some of which make sense but in combination create some bizarre gaming and outcomes.

But we should not forget that over the past decade or so, higher education in Australia has never really had it so good.

Between 2009 and 2013, undergraduate numbers increased by 27.5 per cent and by much more in some universities. Demand-driven enrolment has been a boon to many universities, even if it has involved reaching deeper into the pool of potential students with lower school grades.

Spending on higher education has nearly tripled in real terms since 2000. And with a very small number of exceptions, universities are in good shape financially.

But when it comes to election campaigns, I’m afraid it is always the bridesmaid, never the bride, for higher education.

* Professor Judith Sloan is contributing economics editor, The Australian. She is also Professorial Fellow, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economics and Social Research, University of Melbourne.
Vaccination to help reduce the risk of heart attacks and strokes

To our knowledge this is the first and only trial registered in the world exploring this possibility.

A major national Monash University collaboration is now testing whether a safe, one-off vaccination can help to reduce the risk of heart attacks and strokes.

The Australian Study for the Prevention through Immunisation of Cardiovascular Events (AUSPICE) is recruiting 6000 men and women aged 55 to 60 years across six centres in Newcastle, Gosford, Canberra, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth to be part of this pioneering research.

The Melbourne study centre is based at the Centre for Cardiovascular Research and Education in Therapeutics (CCRET) in the School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University. Principal Investigator Professor Andrew Tonkin, assisted by Dr Ingrid Hopper, will lead the study from Caulfield Hospital.

The study will formally test whether the existing pneumococcal vaccine can not only reduce invasive pneumococcal disease but also help to prevent heart attack and stroke.

Professor Tonkin said that studies suggest there may be a component of the adult pneumococcal vaccine that looks like oxidized LDL, the bad cholesterol that builds up in arteries of people with heart disease.

“The antibodies that are generated in response to the vaccine appear to bind and reduce the build-up of cholesterol, thereby reducing vascular disease. The only way to explore this efficiently is through a randomised controlled trial,” Professor Tonkin said.

“To our knowledge this is the first and only trial registered in the world exploring this possibility.”

Cardiovascular disease is still the number one killer in Australia, despite ongoing efforts in prevention and treatment.

“If shown to be effective, it would be relatively easy to incorporate changes into clinical practice because the pneumococcal vaccine is safe and has already been used in Australia for over 20 years in a different target group,” Dr Hopper said.

Each trial centre is aiming to recruit 1000 participants, who are asked to attend a single clinic visit for less than one hour.

People with at least two risk factors for heart disease – high blood pressure, high cholesterol, or overweight/obesity – will be randomised to receive either the active vaccine or a saline placebo.

Health record linkage will be used to determine the rates of heart attack and stroke in the treatment and control groups, four to five years after vaccination.

“This novel new study could dramatically improve the health outcomes for so many Australians affected by adverse cardiovascular health – we are asking anyone who receives an invitation for AUSPICE via mail to please take the time to consider participating and to complete the eligibility screening, either in hard copy or online,” Professor Tonkin said.
Computer scientists at the University of Adelaide have developed a sophisticated but easy-to-use online tool to help build people’s trust in the cloud.

Cloud computing is widely recognised as a highly useful technology, with multiple benefits such as huge data storage capabilities, computational power, lower costs for companies and individuals, simplicity of use, and flexibility of application.

But the potential growth in the uptake of the cloud is being hampered by a major issue: people simply don’t trust it.

“The potential growth in the uptake of the cloud is being hampered by a major issue: people simply don’t trust it.”

Professor Sheng says: “The basic concept behind this is like the website Rotten Tomatoes, which is widely used by people to review and rank films. But what happens when people are not being entirely honest in their views?

“How do we cut through comments that are designed as a malicious and systematic attack against a product, and also those that are well-executed self-promotion? To be able to give consumers an accurate understanding of trustworthiness, we need to be able to sort through this false feedback.”

“Trust management is a top obstacle in cloud computing, and it’s a challenging area of research,” says the University’s Professor Michael Sheng, ARC Future Fellow in the School of Computer Science.

“There are many reasons why people lack faith in the cloud – there’s little to no transparency, often you don’t know who provides the service, and it’s difficult at times for users to know whether certain cloud-based applications or sites are malicious or genuine,” he says.

For the past few years, Professor Sheng and his students have been developing a system known as Cloud Armor. Cloud Armor is aimed at showing which cloud sites, applications or providers are more trustworthy than others, offering a score out of 100.

“To do that, Cloud Armor relies on a “credibility model”. An in-house-designed crawler engine scans all of the comments made on the internet about any aspect of the cloud, and the credibility model works out what feedback is credible and what isn’t – such as certain statements that are repeated over and over, indicating potential false feedback.

“We’ve tested this with and without our credibility model – without the model, some cloud applications receive a maximum score of 100; but with the model, that score might only get to 50 or 60,” Professor Sheng says.

“We’re very proud of the work we’ve done on Cloud Armor. We’ve presented it at a number of top-tier conferences and several prestigious journals and already it’s attracting a lot of attention from the international community.

“I hope that through the use of a tool like this, it will help to create a culture of transparency in the cloud, and ultimately become more trustworthy to users,” he says. Professor Sheng is co-author of a paper on research challenges for trust in the cloud, published recently in IEEE Computer Society’s flagship publication Computer, and is co-author of the book Trust Management in Cloud Services (Springer, 2014).

For more information about Cloud Armor, visit http://cs.adelaide.edu.au/~cloudarmor/.
Microsoft supports University of Sydney’s quantum effort

For more than a decade, Microsoft has undertaken theoretical quantum research through Station Q at the University of California, with an eye towards one day building a scalable universal quantum computer.

Now the blue-sky investment is ramping up as the world’s largest software maker extends its efforts with experimental research that could usher in a new digital revolution.

A select and very small number of labs worldwide are collaborating with Microsoft on quantum computing by doing revolutionary engineering and physics, including the Quantum Nanoscience Laboratory at the University of Sydney's Nanoscience Hub headed by Professor David Reilly – Australia’s Station Q.

Professor Reilly’s group is world-leading in understanding the interface between quantum physics and the grand engineering challenges of building reliable quantum machines. The Nanoscience Hub was officially opened on 20 April and co-funded with $40 million from the Federal Government.

“We are extremely pleased to have the University of Sydney as a partner on this journey,” said Dr Norm Whitaker, Managing Director of Microsoft’s MSR Next: Special Projects. “The group here (at Station Q Sydney) represents the rare combination of world-class research abilities with a pragmatic, can-do enthusiasm.”

Professor Reilly said his early focus at Station Q Sydney would be to scale up, constructing specialised electronic systems that operate both at room and cryogenic temperatures and go well beyond the specifications of off-the-shelf technology.

“Building a quantum computer is a daunting challenge; it’s something that will only be realised in partnership with the world’s biggest technology companies and we’ve been fortunate to partner with Microsoft,” Professor Reilly said.

University of Sydney Vice-Chancellor Dr Michael Spence said: “Sydney's membership in this highly exclusive international team represents a significant endorsement of our capacity in this area, focusing on long-term research, which can also have shorter-term spin-offs.”

For further information http://sydney.edu.au/nano/

“Building a quantum computer is a daunting challenge; it’s something that will only be realised in partnership with the world’s biggest technology companies and we’ve been fortunate to partner with Microsoft,” Professor Reilly said.
A world-first University of Melbourne-led study into the health and wellbeing of more than 154 million Indigenous and tribal people globally reveals the extent of work that needs to be done if the United Nations is to meet its 2030 goals of ending poverty and inequality.

The Indigenous and tribal peoples’ health (The Lancet-Lowitja Institute Global Collaboration): A Population Study, commissioned by Australia’s Lowitja Institute, is the most comprehensive ever compiled by world health experts.

It brings together data from 28 indigenous and tribal groups across 23 countries – accounting for more than half of the world’s native populations.

Lead author Professor Ian Anderson, Chair of Indigenous Education and Pro Vice Chancellor of Engagement at the University of Melbourne, said the key to the success of the report was in the international collaboration of 65 world-leading experts in Indigenous health.

“What was absolutely critical and unique to this project was being able to work with authors and contributors across the 23 countries,” Professor Anderson said.

Romlie Mokak, chief executive of the Lowitja Institute, said the research represented an important milestone for the institute.

“The Lowitja Institute values the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and we extend that purpose to our international global Indigenous family,” Mr Mokak said.

“The study highlights the importance of global networks that bring together Indigenous health experts, academics and policymakers to effect positive outcomes for First Peoples.”

The study responds to the United Nations 2030 Agenda signed in September 2015 with the stated aim to end all forms of poverty, fight inequalities and tackle climate changes, while ensuring that no one is left behind.

The participating countries included Australia, United States, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Russia, China, India, Thailand, Pakistan, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Myanmar, Kenya, Peru, Panama, Venezuela, Cameroon and Nigeria.

Researchers assessed data on basic population, life expectancy at birth, infant mortality, low and high birthweight, maternal mortality, nutritional status, educational attainment, poverty and economic status. They did not make cross-country comparisons.

Key findings and recommendations include:

- Health and wellbeing is generally poorer for Indigenous and tribal peoples, although the level of disadvantage varies across nations.
- Being Indigenous in a wealthy country does not necessarily lead to better outcomes.
- National governments need to develop targeted policy responses to Indigenous health, improving access to health services, and Indigenous data within national surveillance systems.

The Lowitja Institute is Australia’s only research organisation focused solely on the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. For more information, visit www.lowitja.org.au.

Access the paper here: www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(16)00345-7/abstract.
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