July 2026

Working Group on Higher Education Costing and Pricing

summary of progress to date

Contents

Introduction

The Working Group on Higher Education Costing and Pricing (the Working Group) was convened to provide expert advice to the Australian Tertiary Education Commission (ATEC) on methods and approaches for the efficient and effective estimation of costs to inform pricing of core higher education activities. The Working Group brings together senior university leaders, finance experts and policy specialists to consider how approaches to costing and pricing could be improved to better reflect delivery costs.

The Working Group was established in recognition of the limitations of existing approaches to costing and pricing higher education, namely that they are based on data which:

- are highly aggregated
- are burdensome to collect
- vary in consistency across institutions
- provide limited transparency about underlying cost drivers.

This report documents the Working Group's progress, including its terms of reference and membership, costing and pricing principles it has endorsed, a summary of meetings to date, emerging themes, insights from sector engagement and a pilot pricing exercise.

This progress report provides an update to the ATEC and the sector about the Working Group's deliberations. The conclusions expressed herein are the Working Group's and have not been endorsed by the ATEC or government.

Purpose of the Working Group – Terms of reference

The Working Group was established by the ATEC to provide expert advice on the efficient cost of higher education delivery, as described in the Universities Accord (Australian Tertiary Education Commission) Act 2026.

The Working Group endorsed the terms of reference listed in Attachment A at its first meeting and identified a number of areas of focus, including:

- Reviewing and evaluating existing data collections and pricing models.
- Exploring the potential for activity-based costing methods to improve price setting.
- Examining international approaches to higher education costing and pricing.
- Identifying key drivers of higher education delivery costs, including teaching, research, infrastructure, and student support services.
- Developing recommendations for a costing framework, including piloting approaches.

Costing and pricing principles

The Working Group developed and endorsed a set of six principles to inform a proposed new approach to costing and pricing. These were endorsed by the Working Group at its first meeting, and are listed below:

1. **Outcome focused**: Any pricing and costing advice should be in the context of clear government objectives for higher education – recognising the unique role of universities and the funding mechanisms in supporting these aims. Achievement of a world-class higher education system is likely to require a diverse range of institutions, with their own unique missions, specialisations and offerings.

2. **Transparent**: The new approach should be clear in intent and transparent in method.

3. **Comprehensive**: The new approach should aim to estimate the total costs of university functions; that is, the data set should include costs such as teaching and learning, research, broader regulatory requirements and intermediate services. Costing and pricing advice needs to explicitly consider all elements required to achieve the intended outcomes of a world-class higher education system.
4. **Evidence-based**: Recognising the heterogeneity of the higher education sector, the new approach should reflect (average) existing internal resource allocation relativities as applied by universities including costs of space and equipment. The quantum of each systemic funding element (i.e. excluding one-off grants for a particular purpose/project) should be based on empirical evidence.
5. **Stable**: The price relativities should aim to be consistent and predictable over time. Prices may be updated at agreed intervals to take account of new information or approaches to teaching, including new technologies.
6. **Administrative ease**: Funding arrangements should not unduly increase the administrative burden on universities. Some complexity and administrative burden are unavoidable, but this should be minimised.

These principles form the foundation of the Working Group's proposed approach to higher education costing and pricing.

Working Group meetings

At time of writing, the Working Group had met five times between October 2025 to June 2026. These meetings were preceded by a Vice Chancellor forum intended to inform the direction of the Working Group meetings and establish a program of work. A breakout meeting of university Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and finance professionals was also conducted between meetings one and two. This section provides a summary of those meetings.

Vice Chancellor forum

16 October 2025

A Vice Chancellor forum (the forum) was convened to explore threshold issues relating to costing and pricing and help shape the agenda of the future Working Group.

Discussion focused on the need to better understand the total cost of higher education delivery with participants noting that current funding arrangements do not always align with actual delivery costs and can create unintended incentives. There was agreement among participants that research, including research training, is integral to university operations and that this should be acknowledged in costing work. It was also clarified that the forum was not intended to consider the balance between Commonwealth and student contribution amounts, or to revisit the Job Ready Graduates (JRGs) package, but to focus on understanding costs.

Vice Chancellors highlighted the importance of recognising institutional context, including regional location, institutional scale and mission, when analysing teaching and learning costs. Members emphasised that pricing advice should align with clear government objectives, support institutional diversity and avoid compensating for poor governance. The forum also discussed the relationship between funding, growth and sustainability, noting that continued expansion may not be appropriate for all institutions and that funding settings influence institutional behaviour and long-term viability.

Working Group Meeting 1

31 October 2025

The first meeting of the Working Group was attended by representatives from universities, ATEC interim commissioners and ATEC staff. The Working Group reviewed and endorsed the proposed costing and pricing principles with several refinements. The Working Group also endorsed its terms of reference.

Members considered the approach used to collect cost data for the Transparency in Higher Education Expenditure project[1] and agreed it did not adequately distinguish between teaching and research workloads, limiting its usefulness for detailed analysis. While compliance with current arrangements was not considered particularly burdensome, and many institutions had established internal systems to support the process, members identified opportunities to improve the method's underlying assumptions, exclusions, specificity and timeliness. There was broad support for the ATEC to bring cost collection and analysis in-house to strengthen consistency and oversight.

The Working Group observed that internal costing models vary considerably between institutions. While greater standardisation was seen as desirable, members emphasised that efforts to achieve it should avoid imposing unnecessary administrative burden on universities.

Finance sub-group meeting

17 November 2025

A finance sub-group meeting followed the inaugural Working Group meeting, bringing together CFOs and other finance professionals for a more technical discussion of university costing issues. Participants considered the suitability of the costing model used in the Transparency in Higher Education Expenditure work. There was broad agreement that the model is insufficient for future needs.

Participants explored options for a potential future costing model. There was tentative support for acquiring activity-based costing data from an appropriate external provider. They agreed that an initial costing approach based on a sample of universities would be a pragmatic first step, with the option to expand the sample to the full sector if required. Should expansion be pursued, data provision could be voluntary or compulsory, with some suggesting that beginning on a voluntary basis could help build trust between the ATEC and the sector, while compulsory participation would ensure representation.

Participants also discussed whether costing should occur at the campus level. No consensus was reached, though participants noted that if campus-level costing were adopted, it would need to take account of campus-specific characteristics, such as the proportion of international students or whether facilities are owned or leased.

Working Group Meeting 2

1 December 2025

An external party presented to the Working Group on international costing and pricing models across several jurisdictions, including New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom and various European systems. While the Irish activity-based model generated particular interest, members observed that most international approaches face similar challenges, especially the administrative burden associated with obtaining granular cost data and the general absence of robust, comprehensive costing frameworks. The Working Group agreed that while international insights were valuable, they would remain limited by the complexity of local delivery contexts and the evolution of each jurisdiction's model.

---

[1] https://www.education.gov.au/higher-education-publications/transparency-higher-education-expenditure

A presentation on cost-categorisation options outlined three illustrative models: staff versus non-staff costs, traditional accounting categories, and an activity-based grouping encompassing teaching, research, infrastructure and student support. Members emphasised the need for a coherent framework capable of combining data from multiple sources and applying consistent allocation rules. The Working Group also discussed the complexities of cross-subsidisation between teaching and research, and between domestic and international cohorts. The preferred approach was an activity-based model with further refinement to more clearly distinguish teaching from research while capturing enabling activities and infrastructure.

The Working Group also received a summary of the discussion and findings from the earlier finance sub-group meeting.

Working Group Meeting 3

27 February 2026

The third meeting of the Working Group focused on practical costing methodologies, cross-sector learnings, and early insights from the ATEC's pilot pricing analysis.

The Working Group received a presentation on activity-based costing and pricing in the health and aged-care sectors, drawing on the experience of the Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA). Members discussed how elements of IHACPA's approach, particularly its use of detailed classification systems, consistent data standards, and mixed funding models, could inform future higher education costing frameworks. The Working Group noted the potential for block-funding arrangements to address regional and remote service provision. Members agreed on the need to examine whether such an approach could be considered for higher education offerings that are not well suited to standard pricing models, noting that this would lead to separate funding models for regional and non-regional delivery. Members emphasised that any efficiency-focused approach must avoid compromising quality and must recognise legitimate institutional variation.

The Working Group considered alternative costing approaches, including top-down apportionment and bottom-up activity-based methods. Discussion highlighted the trade-offs between administrative simplicity and analytical precision. While apportionment approaches were recognised as lower burden and easier to implement using existing financial systems, members noted their reliance on assumptions. Activity-based approaches were viewed as offering greater insight into cost drivers, but with higher implementation complexity and challenges for consistency across institutions. There was tentative support for exploring mixed or staged approaches that balance these considerations.

The Working Group considered early findings from a pilot pricing exercise analysing unit-level cost and revenue data. Initial results indicated substantial variation in costs across fields of education, particularly for low-EFTSL units. Members discussed the implications of these findings for funding categories and pricing relativities, noting that some distortions may arise from current field of education groupings. The Working Group agreed that low-EFTSL units should initially be retained in analyses to better understand their impact, and emphasised the importance of accounting for institutional mission, community need (particularly for regional universities), and broader social and economic outcomes when interpreting cost data.

The Working Group also discussed treatment of non-Commonwealth supported places, cross-subsidisation between teaching and research, and the need to avoid unintended behavioural incentives. Members reiterated that universities should retain autonomy to subsidise courses aligned with their mission, while pricing advice should remain transparent and evidence based.

Working Group Meeting 4

24 April 2026

The fourth meeting of the Working Group focused on refining the emerging pricing framework, considering initial analyses from the pilot pricing exercise, and reviewing the draft progress report.

The Working Group discussed the draft higher education pricing framework, which outlined objectives for higher education pricing, a set of pricing principles and a proposed methodology for how the ATEC intends to develop its pricing advice. The Working Group emphasised that the definition of “efficient cost” in the framework should be constructed with an explicit consideration of quality standards and the diverse missions of universities, rather than focus on minimising expenditure. Members agreed that any pricing objectives should be framed to support a diverse system of institutions and to recognise the specialised facilities and program offerings across different types of universities. The Working Group also identified emerging issues such as the appropriate handling for regional or remote campuses and outliers in cost and price modelling.

The Working Group discussed the draft progress report. Members recommended that the progress report should reflect key themes from earlier meetings, such as fixed and variable pricing models, the importance of providing a comprehensive view of the full cost base of university costing and consideration of research and campus-specific costs.

The meeting also featured an update on the ATEC’s pilot pricing exercise. Initial analysis, based on detailed cost data from five participating universities, compared direct and indirect costs, suggesting differences in cost structures and impact of scale across institutions. Preliminary findings suggested that current funding bands may not accurately reflect these cost variations, reinforcing the potential need to tailor pricing settings (such as discipline funding clusters) more closely to underlying cost drivers. Working Group members discussed how universities classify expenses differently, noting that variations in accounting practices - for example, what is deemed a “discretionary” cost - can complicate comparisons of efficiency across institutions. The Working Group acknowledged that current spending patterns of universities are often constrained by existing funding levels and may not fully capture the costs of high-quality provision. The Working Group agreed that expanding the pilot to additional universities and refining data definitions would be essential next steps.

Working Group Meeting 5

12 June 2026

The fifth meeting of the Working Group continued discussion on the development of the pricing framework, identifying the key cost drivers for higher education costing and pricing, and a further update on the ATEC’s pilot pricing exercise.

The Working Group discussed new sections of the draft pricing framework clarifying efficient cost, baseline cost and price, as well as discussion regarding how to incorporate quality considerations into pricing. The Working Group emphasised that efficient cost should not be defined as the lowest possible cost; rather, it must reflect a reasonable standard of quality, the differing circumstances of institutions (such as their size, mission and obligations), and the broader public purposes of universities. Members noted the significance of economies and diseconomies of scale in higher education delivery and considered whether funding models might need to include a fixed base or “flag fall” component alongside per-student funding to sustain small but nationally important programs or high-cost specialist facilities. The Working Group also agreed that while performance-contingent funding could be explored in future, it should not be introduced prematurely, as past experience suggested it is prudent to first establish a well-calibrated basic funding level, given that institutions do not all start from equivalent resource positions.

The Working Group were presented with various cost drivers for higher education teaching and learning, outlining those most relevant for an exploration phase of price modelling. It was discussed that universities are autonomous institutions and a variation in approaches to delivering teaching and learning are expected. Accordingly, the design of a new pricing approach should distinguish structural cost drivers and should not reflect university-specific choices. Members discussed a wide range of endogenous and exogenous factors[2], including field of education, student volume, location (e.g., regional delivery), mode of delivery, specialised infrastructure needs, student-to-staff ratios, and the breadth of institutional offerings. The discussion also

[2] Factors that are within the control of the university and those out of the control of university.

considered how cost drivers and price settings can affect institutional behaviour, reinforcing the need to avoid incentives, or disincentives, which might undermine diversity or discourage innovation.

The meeting also received an update on the progress of the pilot and the continued development of an analytical model for estimating costs. Members were informed that an initial regression-based costing model is being formulated to explore relationships between identified cost drivers and actual delivery costs, with the model expected to evolve iteratively as more data is gathered. The Working Group noted that early pilot data from five universities revealed inconsistencies in how direct and indirect costs are reported and in the units of analysis used, underlining the need for a more standardised approach to data collection. The Working Group were open to the potential need of a new cost collection and standardisation process, should this be required through a new approach to higher education costing and pricing.

The Working Group stated that any prospective pricing model must be carefully tested to ensure it does not create unintended consequences, such as discouraging universities from offering high-cost disciplines that are of national importance or encouraging them to focus only on lower-cost, higher-margin courses.

Emerging themes

This section outlines the key themes that have emerged from the Working Group meetings to date, including the Vice-Chancellor forum and Working Group meetings. While the Working Group's efforts are ongoing, these themes provide important direction for the development of a future higher education costing and pricing framework.

Comprehensive view of university costs

During the discussions, the Working Group identified limitations in past approaches and their inability to fully capture the costs associated with delivering higher education. Members observed that existing data collections tend to focus narrowly on teaching and learning activities, with insufficient treatment of research, capital investment, and other services. The Working Group noted that consideration of broader teaching-related costs, such as internships and student services, may be important in supporting high-quality teaching and learning.

The Working Group emphasised that universities operate as complex, integrated institutions. Attempts to isolate individual activities (such as teaching, research, student support) without recognising their interdependence risks producing misleading cost estimates. Members noted that research activities, along with research training and research infrastructure, are core components of university operations and should be treated as such within any comprehensive costing framework. Most academic staff undertake both teaching and research and the joint and integrated nature of the academic endeavour needs to be recognised in costing and pricing.

There was broad agreement among members that future costing approaches should therefore estimate the total cost of university functions, even where individual elements are subsequently analysed or reported separately.

Granularity and consistency

The Working Group consistently identified a lack of granularity as a major limitation of previous approaches to costing and pricing. The Transparency in Higher Education Expenditure collection operated at a level that was too aggregated to comprehensively identify reasons for differences in delivery costs.

Members noted that cost structures vary materially across institutions due to factors such as size, disciplinary mix, and regional context. As a result, averages derived from highly aggregated data increases the risk of obscuring important cost drivers.

While recognising the administrative burden associated with more granular collections, the Working Group reached a consensus that future approaches must move in this direction if pricing advice is to be credible and robust. This includes a clearer separation of teaching and research workloads and improved representation of capital and infrastructure costs.

Alongside the need for greater detail, the Working Group emphasised the importance of consistency across institutions. Existing internal costing models vary significantly between universities, reflecting differences in accounting practices, allocation rules, and system maturity. While this diversity is to some extent unavoidable, it imposes limitations on the generalisability of sector-wide analyses.

Precision and administrative burden

A recurring theme in the Working Group's discussions was the inherent trade-off between analytical precision and administrative burden. The Working Group explored both top-down (apportionment-based) and bottom-up (activity-based) costing approaches, noting that each presents distinct advantages and challenges.

Members observed that top-down approaches typically leverage existing general-ledger structures and impose a relatively low reporting burden but rely heavily on assumptions and allocations that can obscure underlying cost drivers. In contrast, members noted that activity-based approaches offer richer insights but require substantial data collection effort and present challenges in achieving consistency across institutions. However, the Working Group recognised that many universities undertake activity-based costing to inform decision making.

Rather than endorsing a single approach at this stage, members expressed interest in hybrid or mixed models that balance accuracy and feasibility. This was noted in the context of conducting a pilot pricing exercise with a subset of universities to test methodologies and approaches before potential broader application.

Cross-subsidisation

The Working Group devoted considerable discussion to the role of cross-subsidisation within universities, particularly between teaching and research, and between domestic and international cohorts. Members noted that cross-subsidisation is a longstanding feature of the system. The Working Group agreed that explicit acknowledgement of this practice would recognise the operational realities of universities and reflect a more realistic understanding of how universities operate in practice.

In this context, members also discussed the extent to which research and scholarship-related costs might be reflected in the pricing framework. Some members noted that research-informed teaching is a distinguishing feature of universities and that elements of these costs may need to be considered to appropriately reflect the full cost of delivery. However, members observed that limited transparency around these flows complicates efforts to understand their effect. Members cautioned that pricing advice must avoid creating incentives that undermine quality and distort course offerings.

Cohort and institutional cost pressures

The Working Group considered how delivery costs vary across student cohorts and institutional contexts, including additional costs associated with serving students with higher levels of need. Members noted that characteristics such as socioeconomic background, First Nations identity, regional location and mode of study can materially influence the cost of delivering higher education. While the Working Group has not sought to assess existing needs-based funding settings, there was broad agreement among members that a more comprehensive understanding of these cost drivers is necessary to inform robust pricing advice.

The Working Group also considered how institutional characteristics can affect cost structures. Regional campuses, in particular, were identified by members as facing higher costs associated with smaller cohorts, broader course offerings driven by community needs, and the provision of enabling and support services.

Members emphasised that any future costing and pricing approach should be capable of identifying such variations without assuming uniform delivery models across the sector.

Other sectors and jurisdictions

The Working Group identified value in examining costing and pricing approaches used in other sectors and international higher education systems. The Working Group received information about costing and pricing approaches used in other countries, and in the health and aged care sector in Australia.

In these discussions, members noted that no international higher education model was seen as fully replicable, given the varying financial, governance and cultural contexts of these systems. However, members considered that these comparisons reinforced the importance of robust data standards and governance arrangements.

The Working Group noted that hospital and aged-care sector comparisons reinforced the importance of clear definitions and classifications. Additionally, members noted the hospital system highlighted the potential value of employing a mixed model to accommodate services not necessarily suited to standard pricing models (such as regional or low-volume provision). The Working Group expressed interest in exploring mixed model pricing options to support regional universities by incorporating an element of block-funding.

Quality benchmarking

An emerging issue raised by the Working Group is the role an efficient price, tied to quality benchmarks, will play in a future higher education pricing framework. Members noted that pricing based solely on cost of delivery risks overlooking the relationship between funding and quality. Some members suggested that linking pricing to quality benchmarks could provide a clearer articulation of what government expects the system to deliver and ensure that pricing supports those outcomes.

The Working Group also observed that linking pricing to quality would be a significant challenge and require careful design. Members noted that further exploration would be needed to determine the feasibility of this approach, with the Working Group agreeing that further consideration be given to determining how benchmarks are defined, measured and applied to costing data to establish an efficient price.

Pilot Costing and Pricing Exercise

Consideration of the emerging themes outlined above prompted the Working Group to explore a revised approach to informing pricing, driven by the following:

- Consistent with the principle of *evidence-based,* new prices should be informed by an analysis of the actual costs of teaching and scholarship as reflected in university data.
- Consistent with the principle of *administrative ease,* where possible leverage existing data collected by universities for their internal management.

To better understand the data required to develop a pricing approach, the ATEC has partnered with selected members of the Working Group to conduct a pilot costing and pricing exercise (the Pilot) with a subset of universities. The ATEC has collected financial information on the estimated costs of these universities to deliver all unit/subject offerings, with results examined for accuracy, consistency and completeness. The data collected has been drawn from the universities' existing internal systems.

Where shortcomings are identified, further data can be requested and analytical approaches refined, with the objective of identifying a minimum dataset capable of supporting robust pricing analysis. Conducting the Pilot with the cooperation and involvement of the Working Group has helped ensure that future data requirements are sufficiently comprehensive while minimising unnecessary burden on participating universities.

The Working Group noted that:

- a number of universities have robust internal cost allocation models, and some contribute their information to commercial organisations for benchmarking of their data against their peers.
- not all universities have such systems but that, provided the participating universities represent a significant proportion of activity distributed across all types of universities, this approach is reasonable.

Following data collation, analysis will examine the alignment between delivery costs and pricing for these units of study. Subsequent stages will look to expand the number of participating universities, course levels and student types, and potentially examine the effects of student cohort and university types on university costs.

Next steps and future work

This progress report summarises the Working Group’s activities, discussions and expert perspectives as of June 2026. Building on this work, the Working Group’s principles and emerging themes, the Working Group will continue meeting through its scheduled conclusion in October 2026. It was agreed between the interim ATEC Chief Commissioner and the Working Group that the progress and final reports will not follow the original timeline of the Terms of Reference, to allow for more comprehensive pilot analyses for Working Group deliberation.

The next phase of the Working Group’s activities will be focused on providing advice and guidance for and arising from the pilot pricing exercise, which is being undertaken by the ATEC.

The Working Group will also continue to explore several substantive issues identified in this report, including the treatment of indirect and shared costs, the balance between analytical precision and administrative burden, and how an ‘efficient cost’ may be operationalised. Where appropriate, the Working Group will draw on external expertise and cross-sector experience to inform this work.

A final report from the Working Group and its advice will be published at a later date.

Attachment A: Working Group Terms of Reference and membership (October 2025)

Terms of reference

1. Purpose

The Working Group is established to provide expert advice to the Interim Australian Tertiary Education Commission (interim Commissioners) on methodologies and approaches for the efficient and effective estimation of price of core higher education activities, focusing in the first phase on provision of education activities. It will include providing advice on the collection of relevant cost and expenditure information down to discipline level, Needs-based Funding cohort and cost estimation methodologies for the delivery of Higher Education teaching and learning Australia. The Working Group will review existing cost and expenditure collection models, review existing Activity-Based Costing (ABC) approaches used in the sector, provide advice on data collection frameworks, and benchmark against international and domestic data and best practices.

The Working Group will deliver a report outlining a proposed approach to cost estimation based on a revised cost and expenditure data collection, including analysis of existing provider and sector level cost data, to support sustainable and transparent funding arrangements for Australian higher education.

2. Scope

The Working Group will:

- Review existing cost and expenditure data collection and pricing models used by Australian universities, including strengths, limitations, and sector-wide consistency.
- Evaluate data collection processes related to program delivery costs, including direct and indirect cost allocation methodologies.
- Assess the funding design approaches in the higher education context.
- Examine international best practices in costing and pricing higher education, drawing comparisons with systems in comparable jurisdictions (e.g., UK, Canada, NZ).
- Identify and analyse key cost drivers in higher education delivery, including teaching, research, infrastructure, and student support services.
- Develop recommendations for a costing framework, including any required modelling or piloting approaches.

3. Membership

The Working Group will comprise:

- A nominee of the Interim ATEC Commissioners to serve as Chair or Co-Chair.
- Nominated persons from Australian universities with expertise in financial management, costing, and pricing.
- Experts in Activity-Based Costing and cost modelling from other sectors (e.g., health, infrastructure, professional services).

- Economists or policy specialists with experience in higher education funding.

Members will be appointed based on their expertise, with consideration given to institutional diversity and pricing expertise (e.g. Go8, regional universities, and private providers where appropriate).

4. Deliverables and Timeframe

The Working Group will provide input into:

- An interim progress report at three months, outlining key findings from the review of existing models and international benchmarks.
- A final report within six months, providing recommendations on a new costing and pricing framework for Australian higher education, including:
    - Proposed methodologies for cost and expenditure data collection.
    - Data requirements and collection processes.
    - Implementation considerations and transitional arrangements.
    - Any necessary modelling or sensitivity analysis.

5. Governance and Reporting

- The Working Group will report directly to the Interim ATEC.
- Meetings will be held at least monthly, with additional sub-group work as required.
- The Chair will provide regular updates to interim Commissioners on progress and seek guidance as needed.
- Secretariat support will be provided by the ATEC.

6. Resources

The Working Group may:

- Engage with stakeholders (e.g., Universities Australia, TEQSA, AHEGS) for input.
- Access existing data from government and university sources.
- Make recommendations to the interim Commissioners to commission external research or analysis.

7. Confidentiality and Transparency

- Draft reports and deliberations are treated as confidential until finalised.
- The final report may be made publicly available, subject to interim Commissioners' approval.

8. Review and Amendment

These Terms of Reference may be amended in consultation with the Working Group and interim Commissioners.

This draft provides a structured framework for the Working Group's operations while allowing flexibility for adjustments based on stakeholder feedback.

Membership

Chair – Prof. Stephen Duckett

Members

Prof. Atilla Brungs, Vice-Chancellor, University of New South Wales

Prof. Liz Burd, Provost, Griffith University

Prof. Tyrone Carlin, Vice-Chancellor, Southern Cross University

Mr. Brad Francis, Chief Financial Officer, Edith Cowan University

Ms. Lucy Franzmann, Chief Financial Officer, University of Melbourne

Mr. Michael O'Shea, Chief Financial Officer, Swinburne University of Technology

Prof. Andrew Parfitt, Vice-Chancellor, University of Technology Sydney

Dr. Narelle Pearse, Vice-President and Chief Financial Officer, Central Queensland University

Mr. Luke Sheehy, Chief Executive Officer, Universities Australia

Ms. Sarah Wenham, Director, Financial Strategy and Planning, Queensland University of Technology