Submission to Review of Higher Education

John Goldring

My background is set out in Appendix A. I have had 30 or so years experience as a University teacher; longer as a researcher; and I chaired the Commonwealth Committee of Review of Private Overseas Student Policy in 1984-5.

This submission is directed primarily at the way the activities of Universities are characterised and the allocation of resources.

In general, I find little to disagree with in the general statement by the committee of the purposes and functions of higher education in Australia.

Scholarship

The acceptance of a dichotomy between "teaching" and "research" is troubling. I have always conceived the function of universities as the maintenance and furtherance of **SCHOLARSHIP**, an expression which finds distressingly little place in your discussion paper. In my submission, the word "scholarship" should be substituted for "research" in many of the contemporary debates about higher education.

Scholarship encompasses the development and transmission of knowledge and understanding. Those who take the leading role in higher education, especially in Universities, should, foremost, be scholars. They should be supported, but not supplanted, by effective and efficient managers. Scholarship entails an obligation to develop knowledge – an activity which is certainly not confined to experimental or observational research – and to transmit knowledge. Transmission of knowledge encompasses publication of scholarly work, and the encouragement of student learning – in other words, teaching. Therefore there can and should be no clear division between "research" and "teaching".

Investment in social capital

I agree with the thrust of your Discussion Paper that both aspects of scholarship represent an investment in the nation's social capital, and higher education should therefore be regarded primarily as a national investment, rather than a commodity which leads to individual good. This affects the allocation of resources both at a national and an institutional level. It justifies the expenditure of public funds on higher education, and should influence both the amount of resources allocated to higher education and the way those resources are allocated.

One size does not fit all

Uniformity among institutions of Higher Education is, in my submission, undesirable. The "Dawkins" reforms of the late 1980s, in my submission, represented a significant retrograde step for Australian higher education, not least by inhibiting the growth of smaller institutions, which often served particular regional or specialist educational needs (in both teaching and other scholarly activities). I make this comment having spent 3 years as a senior academic in a College of Advanced Education, whose programs of teaching and research compared favourably with those of some Universities at the time, and which met specific needs not catered for by Universities. Indeed, although the Dawkins changes are often described as "reforms", it is difficult for me to see any benefits resulting from them.

There should be arrangements, which make it easy for those who complete studies in a particular type of higher education institution to gain entry to another institution in order to further their studies. In the past Universities have been reluctant to grant academic credit for studies or practical learning completed outside Universities, and this has resulted in duplication of study and waste of resources. There should be a presumption in favour of the granting of credit for previous studies or equivalent experience, even if in a different institution, where there is substantial similarity of content. This should not be a problem. If the students admitted with such academic credit cannot achieve the standards required in the new institution, they will not qualify for the awards. This is a self-enforcing mechanism.

Subject to this, there is a need for a wide range of very different post-secondary education and training institutions. The degree of scholarly activity, and the degree to which it is “pure” or “applied” will also vary, without detracting from its overall value. However, if these courses are post-secondary, it does seem necessary that the instructors are themselves, at least to some extent, engaged in scholarship or appropriate professional or trade activities. Those activities other than their teaching can only improve their ability to inspire learning in others.

Within any institution, there can be a range of educational/training activities. My own experience is in the discipline of law. This discipline provides both a broad general education, through the study of the interaction of politics, economics, history and sociology which is necessary for a full understanding of the development and operation of the law and legal system, and the foundations for a professional qualification. Additional elements of what have traditionally been regarded as “professional” rather than “academic” (though there is no reason why they should be any less intellectually rigorous) are frequently taught (commonly as a Graduate Diploma course) in Universities. University Law Faculties also offer courses leading to qualifications as “paralegal workers”, conveyancers, land and property managers, and so on. They also offer professional postgraduate programs for prosecutors, forensic scientists, etc. There is nothing illegitimate about these, and they do not detract from the essential scholarly task of the Law Faculty. Scholarship is necessary for high quality teaching, and the experience of a wide range of students is beneficial to teaching staff.

This experience is probably common to many disciplines that have a professional dimension.

Therefore I see no reason for a “one size fits all” approach to higher education institutions; appropriate recognition of activities and academic awards should extend to any institutions that they meet acceptable standards of

- financial management, (to ensure proper accountability for public funds) and
- scholarship,

measured by reference to clearly identified benchmarks and assessed by external, independent assessors.

The Commonwealth as a major source of funds

The Commonwealth government can and should be expected to provide the majority of funds for all public higher education institutions. If it is accepted that education is an investment in social capital, the government, as representative of the nation, has a clear role. Private persons, both natural and corporate, are more likely to give priority to their individual, rather than any community, interests. The Commonwealth government alone is able to channel investments on behalf of the public and to determine national priorities. I am not persuaded that “market forces”, as determined by student choice, can effectively determine the allocation of educational resources, for example, say, to undergraduate courses, because the consumers (students) at the time of entry to universities cannot have, and cannot be expected to have, the degree of access to information and means of analysis of that information necessary to make informed choices about say, detailed content of courses. The requirements of equity and the "social investment" character of higher education entail that the community as a whole meet the cost of most higher education, rather than individuals and their families.

Accreditation and private investment in higher education

Accreditation of higher education institutions should acknowledge that the public nature of the academic community precludes secrecy: intellectual property developed in the institution should be the property of that institution, subject to a recognised financial share for the individuals who develop the property, proportionate to their contribution. It follows that Universities’ conditions of accreditation should prohibit the making of any arrangements whereby a person (a corporation or government body, such as a Health Department) providing funding or other support for scholarly activities should be able to prohibit publication of the results of the funded scholarship, or to influence or suppress findings, or to influence results of any course provided under such funding arrangements. If higher education institutions lose their perceived independence, they forfeit intellectual integrity and respect. Ensuring publication of their efforts is a price worth paying for intellectual integrity.

Private institutions may appropriately offer educational courses. There, in my submission, is no case for public funding to be allocated to such courses unless a special determination is made that there is a public interest in offering the course. If public funding is allocated, it should be on the condition that the institution comply with appropriate requirements, which would have to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

International students

In my committee's 1984 Report *Mutual Advantage*, we recommended encouragement of government funding of international students, but warned that if fee-paying international students were admitted in large numbers to Australian educational institutions, there may be a danger to Australian educational standards and a distortion of the academic profiles of Australian educational institutions. It is clear that the fees generated by international students have been a godsend for higher education when government expenditure on higher education per student, in real terms, has been declining steadily since 1975, and especially since 1996. However, although the introduction of more adequate measures of quality assurance has alleviated the position, by the time I left the university in 1997, it was clear that, even in my own institution, there was some evidence that standards were being eroded in order to ensure that international students would re-enrol, and that courses were being designed to accommodate international, rather than domestic, student demand. I could have no objection to this so long as the programs and courses designed for international students were resourced entirely from funds generated by those students, without cross-subsidy from funds provided by the Australian taxpayer for the education of Australian students. I was not totally assured that this had been done.

I submit that there are good reasons for restricting the proportion of international students in any one institution within Australia, say to 20% of undergraduate students. The argument for restriction does not apply to postgraduate students, whether by research or coursework. These students, apart form those grated scholarships funded either by the Commonwealth government or the institution itself, should pay the full cot of their courses and possibly also a small margin for profit. If there is to be cross-subsidisation, international students should subsidise domestic students, rather than the reverse.

I should add that in my submission there is still a strong case for the Australian government, as part of its aid program, to provide scholarships for both undergraduate and postgraduate study in Australia, especially where (as in the case of many South Pacific nations) no appropriate courses exist in those countries. The fees charged to the government for scholarship students should be less than those charged to private students, given the government's contribution to infrastructure funding.

Universities should be permitted to establish branches of various types outside Australia, provided that no public funds are expended on the staffing or administration of any of these branches, or on students enrolled there, unless they are Australian citizens or permanent residents. These branches should be entirely self-funding, and must not be subsidised in any way, directly or indirectly, by funds provided by the Australian taxpayer. If they operate at a profit, I have no objection to those profits being used in Australia. There should be assurances that if a University invests funds outside Australia, these funds should not be derived from moneys provided by the Australian government, but generated from commercial or other sources.

No full-fee places for domestic students

I applaud the current government's abolition of full-fee places for Australian students. These may have been attractive to Universities, but are socially divisive. These should not be reintroduced.

Infrastructure funding

The Discussion Paper refers to the lack of funds to maintain infrastructure and the measures proposed in the recent budget directed to this issue. By 1997 the position was a looming disaster, and it has not improved. What is proposed by the way of a permanent fund is admirable, but I doubt that it is adequate, and there is a strong case for an additional one-off round of funding to restore infrastructure to 1975 levels. (I take 1975 to be the commencement of the current decline in higher education funding).

Funding of research and scholarship

I am by no means satisfied that current models for research funding are appropriate. A degree of competition may assist, especially in the allocation of scarce funds to expensive projects which require large amounts of equipment and personnel. Much scholarship does not require these resources. It requires only time and "knowledge" resources (libraries and information technology).

My main criticism of the current scheme is that it assumes, quite wrongly, that all research is of the same type as that carried out by scientists in laboratories and other places designing experiments or making observations, and that it is best carried out by teams.

Much scholarship in the humanities and social sciences is not of this type: many scholars with worldwide reputations in the humanities and social sciences have achieved this without competitive research grants and working individually. My comments on these issues are coloured by my experience not only as an academic, but also as a member of the Humanities/Social Science research panel for the ARC for a couple of years.

My submission is that the ARC/NHMRC model of research funding by means of competitive grants is **entirely inappropriate** for much scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. For appropriate disciplines, academics should be given the choice of a non-competitive additional component of funding (to be provided in the form of teaching relief for significant blocks of time, travel expenses, research assistance, etc.) on condition that they do receive competitive grants during a particular year in which they receive non-competitive funding. I would hazard a guess that scholars making this choice would be more likely to improve their research records because they would be relieved from the pressure of writing innumerable fruitless grant applications, and of devising research projects which are really not suited to their talents and interests, as currently seems to happen. A block of funds allocated to research would be granted to institutions, rather than to the granting bodies, for use in this way.

I am also not certain that peer review of grant applications fosters the best research. I have been influenced by Paul Feyerabend (*Against Method),* but more by my experience in assessing research grant applications for the ARC. I could not help but suspect that in many cases success was not so much a matter of what you knew but rather of who you know; or, in other words, the extent to which reference is made to the work of fashionable academics. Challenging orthodox assumptions or methods in any discipline appeared to be a guarantee of failure.

My own published research (mostly unfunded) has included extensive interdisciplinary research carried out with political scientists, scholars of public administration and sociologists. My experience with the ARC is that any proposal for cross-disciplinary research was regarded with curiosity, if not suspicion, and was less likely to be funded.

Leaving aside most doctrinal research in my own discipline of law, other scholarly activities as well, such as the preparation of edited manuscripts, philosophical studies, much historical research in archives, require no expensive equipment. It requires no team of collaborators and research assistants, but it does require time. Academics have little time, because their institutions are under constant pressure to increase student numbers (and therefore class contact hours and marking), and they are required to do much work which would be more efficiently done by administrative assistants (photocopying, completion of returns etc).

The provision of adequate administrative support for academic staff at professorial and more junior levels is also worth consideration by the review, but in my experience it is not a subject that Vice-chancellors want to hear about: they will entertain proposals for academic or research staff, buildings, and equipment, but not for additional administrative support staff.

The Discussion Paper refers to the current situation where some institutions receive “block” funding for the provision of salaries and research infrastructure. I certainly submit that this funding should continue and be augmented. In the humanities and social sciences, in my submission, block research funding should be the norm, rather than the exception. The measure of performance should be in published scholarship, measured appropriately for the particular discipline.

Meeting the demand

The Discussion Paper appears to assume that as demand increases, higher education institutions will expand to meet the demand. Already, as the Discussion Paper noted, the average student:staff ratio has doubled to about 25:1 since 1990. In my own discipline, the Pearce Committee in the mid 1980s recommended 15:1 as the absolute **maximum** for law, and I am not aware of anything that would alter this. The staff student ratios that apply now must adversely affect the quality of teaching.

It may be that the result of globalisation and the consequent decline in the public sector is that we can no longer assume that there will be a free place in higher education for everyone who seeks it. The obvious solution is to ration places in higher education to ensure that educational standards are not watered down further. This may mean that the government should support a smaller number of institutions. That should be a last resort. The limitations, it is suggested, if necessary should be on student numbers within institutions, rather than on numbers of institutions. Rationing should be on the basis of demonstrated academic merit, subject to a quota of 10-15% of places being reserved for students over the age of 25 who wish to enter higher studies. This would best be done, in my submission, by the Commonwealth government making available scholarships or funds covering student support (on FEE-HELP or whatever other basis was considered appropriate) for studies in areas to which it gave priority (eg, rural medicine and nursing, science and primary teaching, engineering etc). The funds would not be provided to institutions: students could select the institution where they studied. However, I do submit that the numbers of students (both undergraduate and postgraduate, separately) in institutions and courses should be capped, depending on the academic staff available in those institutions, and bearing in mind a desirable staff: student ratio.

I do not say that there is a particular ideal number four the student body of the University. My experience both in Australia and overseas is that, in general, productivity and innovation by both staff and students tends to be greater in small to medium institutions rather than large institutions -- at least in the humanities and social sciences. Economies of scale in equipment may result in a different approach where the scholar is working in the physical or experimental sciences. My experience is that it is better to have a large number of small autonomous institutions than a so-called "multi-campus" institution. I would favour the general adoption of a principle that each institution should aim for a student body of about 12-15 000 and no more than a total of 20 000 students at all levels.

Other employers of graduates (e.g. industry, “faith-based” schools, state and local governments (including regional health and education authorities) etc) could provide funds on a negotiated basis to institutions in the same way and award scholarships – even, possibly, bonded scholarships – to allow additional students to take the courses nominated by the employers.

Distance and off-campus education

Some Australian universities were pioneers in what used to be called "external" courses. More recently such programs have been referred to as "distance" or "off-campus" activities. During the period when I taught at Macquarie University, I was heavily involved in the external law program. This program was established as part of the conditions for the initial funding of a law course at the University. The legal profession was demanding a program, available to students outside the metropolitan area, which would enable them to qualify as legal practitioners while still working in legal offices.

Some members of the academic staff were, and remained, vigorously opposed to any course which was not a full-time on-campus educational program. When I arrived at the University, I was open-minded about the course, but my experience in teaching in this program convinced me of its great educational value both to students and to staff.

All the students and the program were mature. Indeed there was a minimum age of 25 for admission to the course. Most of the students were working full-time as court clerks, judges' associates, law clerks or public servants. Most students had a wide range of life experience, and about 50% were graduates in other disciplines. Their experience, when shared with other students and academic staff (who may have had little practical experience) greatly enhanced the learning of all the students.

The educational opportunity and experience of these students is the main reason that convinced me of the value of the program. However, it was university policy that all students enrolled in a course were required, as a condition of completing the course, to attend at least one on-campus session of two to five days’ duration. While this was an expense for the students, the value of face-to-face contact with academic staff and fellow students was, in my view essential and invaluable. While new technology, such as Internet chat rooms, may provide opportunities for exchange between students, in my view it cannot be a substitute for face-to-face contact and the intellectual and social bonding which reinforces the students' learning experience.

For several years I taught administrative law to an external group of students which included some senior State and Commonwealth public servants. While I considered myself reasonably experienced and aware, the insights that these students provided into the practical operation of the law, and the difficulties involved in the formulation of legal policy, was of great value not only to their fellow students, but also to my teaching and my research. I am sure there are analogies in other disciplines.

The other advantage of the external program was that it required staff to engage in proper educational design. Most academic staff at that time had no training at all in teaching methods. Contact with instructional designers forced them to think about the learning objectives of the course and the appropriateness of the materials and exercises (including various forms of assessment) to those learning objectives. The past 15 years have seen a revolution in the understanding by university teachers of proper instructional design and learning theory. Nevertheless, the preparation of materials for the external course enabled these materials to be used also for the full-time on-campus students, so that class time was used in ways other than traditional lectures. There were a few traditional lectures on important aspects of the course.

These were invariably recorded on audio tape and made available to off-campus students. During my time at Macquarie University campus policy changed so that the audio tapes were available also to on-campus students. Without realising it, my colleagues and I were exposed to good educational practice and forced to be involved in student-centred learning.

I do not suggest that there is an appropriate substitute for full-time on-campus study as the preferable form for at least the major part of the learning experience of a student who has just completed secondary education. I do suggest that for mature students and those already in the workforce, distance education is a useful alternative.

In my submission adequate distance education requires the allocation of greater resources than full-time on-campus education. It is essential that material and exercises be prepared properly and thoroughly by academics knowledgeable in the area, with the assistance of those skilled in the appropriate technologies. The introduction of electronic technologies has increased the potential to distance learning but my experience (through my involvement with the National Judicial College of Australia) in the preparation and design of professional development programs available throughout the country has demonstrated that the development of on-line learning is costly and fraught with technological problems, even after several years experience.

Allocating funding

You refer to the introduction of the “Relative Funding Formula”. I was the Dean of a Law Faculty when this was introduced, and I am greatly relieved that I left the University shortly afterward. This model – and the method, if any, of fixing HECS fees - is and always has been grossly inequitable. It has never been based on empirical data. The justification is that most graduates (in law, in the case with which I am most familiar) will quickly earn high remuneration. No doubt some will. Many do not.

In 1983/4, no Australian University or CAE would or could tell my committee what was the annual cost per student, either on average or per course. Without this information, there is no rational basis for charging fees. Projected future earnings are not a basis. I understand that this information is now readily available. **The only rational basis for allocating funds within institutions is the cost to the institution of providing the relevant course.** It follows that laboratory-based courses and courses with low student numbers will have higher costs and therefore should command higher fees. If in the case of doctors and nurses prepared to serve in rural and remote areas, the government perceives a priority, which market forces would not determine, it should provide an appropriate subsidy.

Autonomous, self-governing institutions

Internal management of institutions should, so far as possible, be collegial. The majority of members of governing bodies should be academics elected by academics, with some representation of other stakeholders (government -- both Commonwealth and State -- industry, regional community, etc), each member being answerable to his or her constituency. The Vice-chancellor or principal operating officer should be accountable to this body, not to government or any external corporation.

Institutions must, however, be accountable for funds they receive for earmarked purposes, and must provide proper financial reports in respect of those funds.

A coordinating body

Because higher education institutions, in my submission, should not be regarded as **Government** institutions, though they should be regarded as **Public**, it is not appropriate that they should be directly subject to ministerial and departmental control. The Minister and the Department can and should have control of the allocation of funds provided by government, and in appropriate cases should have the power to impose conditions on the granting of those funds.

However, the internal management of institutions of higher education should be a matter for the institutions themselves.

International and global imperatives, such as the European developments referred to in the Discussion Paper, suggest that there should be constant moves towards national standards and benchmarks, (though certainly not uniformity of courses and content). A body along the lines of the former CTEC would seem appropriate to perform these functions.

This coordinating body should also be responsible for the mechanisms of quality control. The current system has been introduced since I left the University. I am not familiar with it. However, one simple device is not in place. Statistics may provide some measure of quality, but in my submission, there is great merit in reviving the system of “external examiners” once common in England, and which applied to me when I began my academic career at the University of Papua New Guinea in 1970. A distinguished member of the discipline from another institution (possibly, but not necessarily, from another country), appointed for a limited and non-renewable term of no more than 4 years, who makes one or two visits of a week each year to the institution and reviews teaching and assessment, may be a very valuable and visible means of quality assurance which would augment more statistical methods. The report of the external examiner would be public, but not binding, and the department would have the opportunity to respond publicly. This system has never been seen to infringe any principle of academic freedom, because the visited institution is always free to reject comments and suggestions, provided that it gives reasons for doing so.

Remuneration, full-time employment and industrial relations

It has been a fact that, relative to comparable professional and public service salaries, academic remuneration has declined significantly. When I began teaching in 1970, the salary of a professor was roughly equivalent to that of a District Court Judge. In 1997, when I moved from a chair at a University to the District Court Bench, my salary doubled and the superannuation benefits were significantly better.

This relative decline is a major feature contributing to the problem caused by the aging of academic staff and difficulties in recruitment, especially in professional disciplines. (Medical faculties offer a clinical loading, but this is unique).

In my submission, unless the relative salaries of academics in all disciplines improves, there is a grave danger that the brightest intellects will move in even greater numbers to North America, Europe, and even to developing Asian institutions. Any future planning for higher education must encompass significant increases in academic salaries, both real and relative.

The gap between the salaries which new graduates can command in private employment, particularly the professions and those offered to junior academics has widened. It was not always the case that new academic appointments were expected to have completed doctoral studies; in law at least, graduates with good honours or master's degrees could expect appointment as a lecturer.

The starting salaries paid to graduates in professional disciplines -- even graduates who have no postgraduate qualifications at all other than a professional diploma -- are already far higher than those paid to young academics. These people are expected to obtain scholarships or otherwise support themselves while they obtain doctoral qualifications.

This is totally unrealistic, particularly in professional disciplines. Universities must accept that, if they are to attract the brightest graduates as young academics, they must offer very generous scholarship assistance to allow these students to complete the necessary postgraduate qualifications and must also consider, as a matter of course, rather than the exception traditionally made for medicine, the payment of professional loadings or the appointment of professionally qualified graduates at a higher level than would be the case in some other disciplines – or possibly both.

The attempt by the past Commonwealth government to introduce individual contracts was a disaster for academics. Even the introduction of enterprise bargaining was detrimental, so far as I could see, to Universities. Centralised wage fixing had the benefit of freeing up significant resources within Universities, which now have to be devoted to the enterprise bargaining process. Although institutions differ, the source of funding and the process of resource generation were common to all. That remains the position. There would be significant benefits in the establishment of national standards for base academic salaries, with freedom of institutions that could find the resources, to offer incentives in appropriate cases. Additional flexibility is obtainable by leaving some discretion in the level of appointment, awarding of accelerated increments, and ensuring that granting of any increment is strictly conditional on performance assessment.

The Discussion Paper seems to accept as a reality that university education, for both students and teachers, will be part-time. I wish to question this.

There will always be a place for some part-time teachers, especially in professional disciplines. My own experience as a law Dean in two medium size universities is that part-time staff have benefits, but because, almost by definition, they are busy professionals, many (with some notable exceptions) are highly unreliable because their practice commitments require them to miss classes and prevent them from being available to students.

The other class of part-time teachers are recent graduates and postgraduate students. It is good that they have an opportunity to gain experience, under the guidance of experienced teachers. However, they must not be given undue responsibility for course preparation, marking etc.

My submission is that the number of hours (including both lectures and tutorials, as well as on-line assistance to students) taught by part-time teachers should be limited to 20% in any undergraduate course or subject, except those which require or benefit from relevant and specialised professional expertise

The question of academic tenure also needs to be addressed. Limited term appointments may be useful where continuing staff members are absent for a fixed period (e.g. where they obtain research fellowships or secondments.) They may also have a place in new courses or programs where future demand is uncertain, or where fluctuations in demand suggest that demand may reduce. Otherwise they are outside the tradition of British and Australian universities and should continue to be so. If flexibility is desired, the answer may be to establish a quota of fixed-term positions across the institution or a division of it.

However, granting of tenure should not be virtually automatic, as once it was; (my understanding that it is granted less freely now than was the case 10 years ago), and should be more rigorous. However, once granted, a staff member should be assured of continuing appointment, subject to regular performance reviews. This may sound contradictory, but some protection is required against the very small proportion of staff that fails to maintain proper scholarly standards after obtaining tenure.

My observation is that the centralisation of “human resources” issues within Australian universities has been detrimental and led to bad relationships. I do not think that in general, the US/Canadian model of a university is what we should aspire to in this country (mostly because I do not believe that the levels of philanthropic and alumni support are achievable here, even if they were desirable, which I doubt. The devolution of staff matters to Deans (who are, in North America, almost universally elected by Faculties, rather than appointed by central administration, a course which it would benefit Australian institutions to re-apply) in my submission has a greater probability of ensuring proper relative remuneration and better relationships among staff.

Financial support for students

By 1997, when I left the university, it was already the case that many students were working full-time for at least 2 0r 3 days per week in order to maintain themselves. Having studied law myself as a part-time student, I am fully aware of both the advantages and disadvantages of part-time study. The disadvantages outweigh the advantages by a significant margin, even though, if the work is in a relevant area, the insights gained may be of great benefit to studies. At least in the later years of courses leading to a professional qualification, there is a lot to be said for requiring students to undertake relevant professional work, provided this is balanced with the demands of study. My own preference is for "sandwich" courses, where students spend an intensive period of 3-4 months in an approved work environment, immediately followed by a similar period in full-time study, over 1 1/2 to 2 years. Such courses are logistically difficult and tend not to be popular with Australian employers.

Whatever arrangements are made for exposure of students to a practical environment, while they are studying full-time it is important that they do have access to sufficient financial support to accommodate and feed them. While there are great advantages, from educational point of view, where students leave the parental home to study (as is the case in the UK and North America,) in Australia it is probably too late to establish this as the norm, and students will either wish to live with their parents or to live in rented accommodation. It is reasonable to give them sufficient support to do so, and to allow them to earn a reasonable amount before disentitling them to government support. I am no longer close to the needs of students, but I can appreciate that urgent attention needs to be paid to the question of student support, and I am not certain that the Discussion Paper raises this question adequately.

3 July 2008.

Appendix A

JOHN LESTER GOLDRING

Date and Place of Birth: 14 April 1943, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
Address: Judges' Chambers
District Court of NSW
GPO Box K1026, Haymarket,
NSW, AUSTRALIA 2000.
Phone: (02) 9377 5633 (b.h.)
FAX : (02) 9377 5777
E-mail: jgoldring@courts.nsw.gov.au

Academic Qualifications

B A (Sydney) 1963
Ll B (Hons II) (Sydney) 1967
Ll M (Columbia) 1969

Professional Qualifications

Solicitor, Supreme Court of NSW 1967-1982
Practitioner, High Court of Australia, 1967-
Barrister and Solicitor, Supreme Court of Papua New Guinea, 1970-
Barrister and Solicitor, Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory, 1972-
Barrister, Supreme Court of NSW, 1982-

Present Position

Feb 1998 - Judge, District Court of NSW

Previous Positions

1964-1968 Articled Law Clerk and Employed Solicitor, Sly & Russell, Sydney
1968-1969 Australian-American Educational Foundation Fellow, Columbia University School of Law, New York
1969-1970 Attorney, Legal Department (Investments) Teachers' Insurance & Annuity Association of America, New York
1970-1972 Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Papua New Guinea
1972-1973 Lecturer in Law, Australian National University, Canberra
1973-1979 Senior Lecturer in Law, Australian National University*
1977 Visiting Fellow, International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT), Rome, Italy
1977 Visiting Fellow, School of Law, University of Warwick
1977 Norwegian Government Travelling Fellow, Institute of Maritime Law, University of Oslo, Norway

1978-1980	College Fellow in Law, Canberra College of Advanced Education, Canberra (now The University of Canberra) [seconded from Australian National University.]
1980	Reader in Law, Australian National University*
1981-1989	Professor of Law, Macquarie University, North Ryde, NSW, 2109 (Head of School, 1982-1986) is an is going when she is
1983-1984	Chairman, Committee of Review of Private Overseas Student Policy
1984	Visiting Professor, Faculty of Law, University of NSW
1986	Association of Commonwealth Universities, Senior Travelling Fellow
1987	Visiting Fellow, Faculty of Law, University of NSW
1988	The Commonwealth Foundation, Senior Fellow
1987-90	Full-time member, Australian Law Reform Commission, Sydney
1989-90	Visiting Professor of Law, University of Technology, Sydney.
1990-1998	Professor of Law, the University of Wollongong, NSW,.
1990-95	Foundation Dean of Law, the University of Wollongong.
1995	Visiting Professor of Law, University of Alberta (Canada)
1996	Visiting Professor of Law, Benjamin N Cardozo Law School, Yeshiva University, New York.
1997-Feb 1998	Full-time Member, Law Reform Commission of NSW.

Judge Goldring is the author or editor (either alone or jointly) of 27 published books/monographs and over 220 articles in established academic and professional journals.