

- L.C. Romney, G. Bogen, and S.S. Micek, 'Assessing Institutional Performance: the Importance of Being Careful', *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 3, 1, 1979, pp. 79-90.
15. W. Toombs, *Productivity: Burden of Success*, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, 1973.
 16. R.A. Wallhaus, (ed.) *Measuring and Increasing Academic Productivity*, New Directions for Institutional Research No 8, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1975.
 17. Z. Cowen, 'Problems in assessing efficiency'. Paper presented at the Symposium 'How efficient are Australian universities?' held at the University of NSW on November 7th, 1969.
 18. R.A. Layton, 'Problems in assessing efficiency'. Paper presented at the Symposium 'How efficient are Australian universities?' held at the University of NSW on November 7th, 1969.
 19. A.W. Lindsay, 'Institutional performance in higher education: the efficiency dimension', *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 2, 1982.
 20. M.B. Cohen, and J.G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.
 21. K.E. Weick, 'Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1976, pp. 1-19.
 22. A.W. Lindsay and M. Bailey, 'A Convex Polytope Technique for Analysing the Performance of Universities', *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 14, 1, 1980, p. 37.
 23. B. Lawrence, 'The Outcomes of Higher Education: To Measure or not to Measure', in R.H. Fenske, and P.J. Staskey, (eds.) *Research and Planning for Higher Education*, Association for Institutional Research, Tallahassee, Florida, 1978.
 24. R.E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1962; C.F. Carter, 'Can We Get British Higher Education Cheaper?' in M. Blaug, (ed.) *Economics of Education 2*, Penguin, 1969; W. Toombs, op cit.; J.E. Cantlon, 'The Threat of Efficiency', *Planning for Higher Education*, 3, 5, 1974; pp. 9-12; I.R. Hoos, op. cit.
 25. C.R. Pace, "Institutional Instruments for Standardized Assessment", in M.W. Peterson, (ed.) *Benefiting from Interinstitutional Research*, New Directions for Institutional Research, No 12, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.
 26. J.N. Johnstone, 'Education Systems: Approaches and Methods in their Evaluation', in B.H. Choppin, and T.N. Postlethwaite, (eds.), *Evaluation in Education*, Volume 2, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1979, p. 205.
 27. J.N. Johnstone, op. cit.
 28. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Indicators of Performance of Education Systems*, OECD, Paris, 1973.
 29. R.J. Rossi and K.J. Gilmartin, 'Social Indicators of Youth Development and Education Performance: Programmatic Statement', *Social Indicators Research*, 7, 1980, pp. 157-191.
 30. B.R. Williams, op. cit, p. 30.
 31. M. Woodhall, and M. Blaug, 'Productivity Trends in British University Education, 1938-1962', *Minerva*, 2, 4, 1965, pp. 483-498.
 32. J. O'Neill, *Resource Use in Higher Education — Trends in Outputs and Inputs, 1930-1967*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1972.
 33. W. Hettich, *Expenditures, Output and Productivity in Canadian University Education*, Economic Council of Canada, Ottawa, 1971.
 34. S.W. Harris, *A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.
 35. B.R. Williams, 'Resources per Student 1957-75', *The Australian University*, 14, 1, 1976, pp. 7-14.
 36. P.L. Dressel, *Handbook of Academic Evaluation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.
 37. R.I. Miller, *The Assessment of College Performance*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1979.
 38. R.I. Miller, op. cit., p. 306.
 39. H.B. Sagen, 'Evaluation of Performance within Institutions', in H.R. Bowen, (ed.) *Evaluating Institutions for Accountability*, New Directions for Institutional Research, No 1, 1974; C.R. Pace, op. cit.; W.H. Bergquist, and W.A. Shoemaker, (eds.), *A Comprehensive Approach to Institutional Development*, New Directions for Higher Education, No 15, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976; P.L. Dressel, op. cit; R.I. Miller, op. cit; R.H. Moos, *Evaluating Educational Environments*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1979; C.R. Pace, *Measuring Outcomes of College*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1979.
 40. M.W. Peterson, op. cit.
 41. J. Sizer, 'Assessing Institutional Performance — An Overview', *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 3, 1, 1979, pp. 49-75.

ONE IN ALL IN: FAUSA AND THE ORIGINS OF THE ACADEMIC SALARIES TRIBUNAL

Origins

In 1974 the Academic Salaries Tribunal was established under the Commonwealth Government's Remuneration Tribunals Act. It was founded as a Commonwealth agency with no state representation to attempt to resolve two issues: first, whether differences in the character and function of CAEs and universities implied a difference in the level of salaries to be paid to academic staff working at institutions in either sector; and second, the need to institute a mechanism to provide national guidelines for regular and equitable adjustments to academic salaries. At its inception the Tribunal was empowered to determine the salary rates for academic staff at the Australian National University and Canberra College of Advanced Education and to report to the Commonwealth Minister for Administrative Services in relation to academic salary rates for State universities and advanced education institutions. Since that time, while State Governments and State-based tertiary institutions have not been legally bound by the Tribunal's recommendations, they have generally adhered to the academic salary rates suggested. As a result, the salaries of various categories of academic staff have remained uniform across Australia.

This was not always the case. It was a series of discordant and ad hoc arrangements in the 1960s which led to the establishment of the Academic Salaries Tribunal as a Commonwealth agency. During that period public policy-making on academic salaries did not have the coherence and definition of a programme, particularly as the Commonwealth Government was sensitive to a possible accusation from the States that it was becoming involved in 'wage-fixing' in universities.

Throughout the 1960s, with considerable reluctance, the predecessor to the Universities Council of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission the Australian Universities Commission (AUC), found itself inextricably involved in attempts to resolve the academic salaries issue. Despite its moves to adopt a disinterested stance, the AUC had to take part, particularly as the component of the recurrent grants devoted to academic and non-academic salaries by each university was so large.

In some ways, similar paths were followed in Britain and Australia, although parallel developments occurred a decade earlier in Britain, and the British University Grants Committee (UGC) played a more active and sustained role than its Australian counterpart, the AUC. Early in the post-war years Britain

A.P. Gallagher

Commonwealth Joint Parliamentary
Public Accounts Committee

established a rough uniformity of academic salaries. In the 1950s the British Association of University Teachers (AUT) sought to negotiate academic salaries with the UGC and the Treasury by direct bargaining on a trade union model. During that time the UGC maintained a unique and important role in the process of reviewing academic salaries. There was no workable pattern of negotiation between employers and employees and the UGC did not act on behalf of universities but in its own right.

The AUT put up to the government successive 'claims' based on the comparability principle used by the Civil Service Commission and specifically on an attempted direct comparison with civil service salaries, arguing that the chief alternative employment for academics was the administrative or scientific class of the civil service. But this comparison was never specifically accepted by the UGC or Treasury. A 'stately minuet' developed whereby the UGC listened to the AUT, listened to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals and then made its own confidential recommendations to the government¹.

In 1963 the UGC's role was significantly diminished when academic salaries were made the subject of an independent review by the National Incomes Commission. There was then a brief reversion in 1966 to the arrangement whereby the government made a decision after consultations with the UGC, which in turn consulted the AUT and the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. As this reversion was not satisfactory, in 1968 and again in 1970 an independent review was conducted by the National Board for Prices and Incomes. During that time much of the role previously undertaken by the UGC was gradually supplanted by the Department of Education and Science.

The sequence of events now to be described in Australia reflects the general direction taken in Britain, particularly the prominent role played by university staff associations and the vice chancellors' committees in both countries. Another similarity was the establishment by the respective governments of a permanent formal review mechanism outside the area of responsibility of the co-ordinating agency for universities in each country. In Australia, however, there was an added element. The tensions between Commonwealth and State levels of government complicated the evolutionary process. The States were wary of consenting to the establishment of a national agency capable of mak-

ing decisions which would influence the level of funding and institutional autonomy of universities based in the States, and the Commonwealth was anxious to avoid the accusation of usurping traditional state powers.

The AUC's First Advice on Academic Salaries

The Commonwealth Government's first involvement with academic salaries was the adoption in November 1957 of the recommendations of the Murray Committee, which felt that periodic reviews were necessary and ought to be 'the function of the permanent university grants committee'.² As a consequence of the Commonwealth Government's adoption of the Murray Committee's recommendations, funds were made available to allow a minimum professorial salary of £3500 and for appropriate adjustments in other academic salary scales throughout Australia with effect from 1 January 1958. Nevertheless, after the Murray Report as before it, actual salaries paid and the salary scales agreed upon continued to be a matter between staff associations, governing bodies of universities and the respective State Governments. In these circumstances, the decisions on academic salaries continued to be tardy and the uncoordinated timing and diversity of rates selected still engendered a state of recurring confusion and discontent.

Not long afterwards (February 1960), at a meeting with the newly established AUC, the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee (AVCC), requested that the AUC advise the Commonwealth Government on a minimum salary scale for university professors. The Chairman of the AUC, Sir Leslie Martin, was reluctant to do so, especially as such a move could be misinterpreted as a desire by the AUC to become a salary-fixing body. But the Vice-Chancellors continued to press their case and eventually, Martin was persuaded.

On 13 April 1960, the Prime Minister, Mr Menzies, approved of the AUC's recommendation for an interim increase in the basic professorial salary to £4000 in State universities from 1 July 1960. When this was made public there was an adverse reaction, particularly from university staff associations in New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT, as the proposals implied a reduction in increases proposed by the respective university senates.

Having made these recommendations, Martin turned his attention to the establishment of the first national committee to conduct an inquiry into academic salaries. Martin felt that it would not be easy to appoint a suitable committee with the necessary stature from sources outside the AUC and the Commonwealth Government. Eventually, Menzies approved the establishment of the Committee and, sensitive to the need for representation, from the States asked that Mr Seaman, Under Secretary, South Australian State Treasury, be included.³

In the absence of Menzies overseas, the establishment and terms of reference of the committee to advise the AUC on university salaries were announced by the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr John McEwen, on 27 May 1960. The statement had to be carefully phrased so that it defended the right of the Commonwealth to concern itself with movements in university salaries and yet not give the impression that the Commonwealth was either moving into an area of State responsibility or could be blamed if the recommendations of the Committee went awry.

The acceptance of the salaries committee was particularly low in Canberra where both the University Staff Association and some senior administrators at the Australian National University (ANU) disapproved both of its existence and of its composition as they felt the AUC was assuming the powers of a salary-fixing tribunal. Elsewhere in Australia, university senates and university councils were concerned with the possible implications of the establishment of a salaries review committee as they felt that the level of academic salaries should remain as their responsibility.

The First National Enquiry into Academic Salaries

In its First Report on Australian universities in mid-1960 the AUC justified its establishment of an academic salaries committee in terms of the need for triennial recommendations to take into account an appropriate general level of academic salaries. At the same time, the AUC firmly stated that the final determination of salary scales was a responsibility of individual universities.

... absolute determination of salary scales is not implied in this mandate. This is properly the responsibility of each university governing body. In determining such salary scales each university will undoubtedly take into account a number of circumstances, including availability of finance in its State and the salaries paid in other Australian universities.⁵

Some of the universities were concerned that the AUC salaries committee might decide to make an extensive inquiry into matters such as terms and conditions of employment which could adversely affect the autonomy of universities. However, the salaries committee, careful to avoid entanglements with such issues, limited itself to salaries only.

The Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia (FCUSAA) wrote to Martin objecting the existence of the committee. The Council felt that neither university staffs nor university governing bodies had been adequately consulted, that the committee's membership was not broad enough and hence would not be able to present a balanced report, and that public invitation had been sought for submissions in what the FCUSAA felt was a matter for universities and staff associations alone. They went on to ask for representation on the com-

mittee. Martin replied to the FCUSAA justifying the existence and work of the committee in its proposed form. FCUSAA representation was considered by the committee at its first meeting and it was decided not to accept any further members. Later FCUSAA relaxed its attitude.

At that time the staff of the University of New South Wales had their salaries periodically determined by the New South Wales Industrial Commission. This procedure had arisen as a result of a step taken in 1951 when the staff association of the university (known at that time as the New South Wales University of Technology) sought and obtained membership of the NSW Teachers' Federation. As a consequence they gained access to the State Industrial Commission for the application of awards to staff up to, but not including, those of professorial rank. The decisions of the Industrial Commission for the staff of the University of New South Wales became a pace-setter in the academic salaries area, together with changes in salaries provided by the periodic judgements of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, particularly under the Engineer's Award, and changes in the salaries of government employed professional groups (for example, those in CSIRO and the Commonwealth Public Service.)

The AUC's salaries committee saw a clear difference between their work and that of an arbitration tribunal. As their concern was with the salaries component of the matching grants which the AUC would recommend to the Commonwealth, they wanted to produce a report without delay. Their report was ready by November 1961 and in it the committee expressed the view that the AUC should review university salaries before the beginning of each triennium and at any other time if abnormal circumstances arose.

Despite the alacrity with which the committee discharged its task, there was a long delay of six months before the Commonwealth Government came to a decision. That no action was taken was probably due to financial difficulties associated with the credit squeeze. Nevertheless, the absence of a decision created uncertainty in the universities. Finally, in the pre-budget session (July 1961) the Government considered the proposals and decided to accept them in full.

The salary increases were small but they had the long-term effect of creating greater uniformity between university salaries in Australia as the Commonwealth Government provided additional money only to states which accepted the salary recommendations. But the immediate reaction of university staff associations was one of dismay, particularly among academics at some universities where salaries were already higher than those proposed. University staff associations were frustrated to have it

brought home to them that the problem of setting levels of salaries was not going to be easily solved. It seemed to academics that they would have to live with the situation for some time and that they would have to seek the answers through other channels.

In view of the events just described, Martin decided (in December 1961) to withdraw the AUC from any further attempts to resolve the salaries issue. He felt that despite the AUC's good intentions, it was evident that university staff associations and the AVCC lacked confidence in the AUC's methods of dealing with salary problems. Nevertheless, much had been achieved, as for the first time academic salaries were beginning to achieve a degree of uniformity throughout Australia.

An Independent Inquiry Proposed

The FCUSAA and AVCC met in Melbourne on 13 February 1962 and agreed to a proposal which they hoped would provide for periodic reviews of academic salaries in universities in Australia. They suggested that a presidential member of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission should act as an arbitrator and that such reviews as would take place should fit in with the timing of the AUC's triennial recommendations. They saw this form of arbitration as voluntary and that the Commonwealth and State Governments, university governing bodies and university staff associations would need to agree to accept the findings.⁶

Soon after their joint meeting, representatives of the AVCC and FCUSAA met with Martin to seek his reaction. Martin gave them clearly to understand that the AUC did not wish to be involved, even to the extent of giving an opinion on what was the best path to follow.

In June 1962 the AUC began to prepare for its triennial visits to the universities. At that time the AVCC informed the AUC that sufficient objections to the joint AVCC/FCUSAA proposals had been put forward to make it unworkable and that as a result both parties were backing away from their original intentions. This change in direction did not make the AUC any more prepared to discuss salaries issues.

Despite this, once the round of visits commenced the AUC was asked to state its position. During discussions with the staff association at Monash University, Martin said that the AUC could again draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the significant changes in salaries and other areas of the economy; however, the Commission was most reluctant to do this as it did not consider itself a salary-fixing body. Martin suggested that the universities might:

... wish to have their case considered by some tribunal but he emphasised that personally he was not concerned about this procedure as he felt that the universities could lose a

great deal if university salaries and conditions were equated to those of other groups in the community.⁷

At this time a decision was made by a NSW Arbitration Commissioner which was to change the direction of events. The University of New South Wales Staff Association which alone among university staff associations had the legal right as a registered trade union to appeal to the Arbitration Courts, had secured a hearing from the Industrial Commission of New South Wales. Mr Commissioner Gorman granted salary increases to members of the association ranging from £256 to £1036. The generosity of Mr Gorman's decision so embarrassed the State Labor Government that the NSW Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr J.J. Moloney, referred the award decision to the Full Bench of the State Industrial Commission for a hearing on 18 November. As *The Bulletin* so aptly observed, the reason for concern by NSW State Government was that:

The real issue involved in the case... is that if the University of New South Wales Staff Association members get their pay rises almost anyone who is among the growing army of white collar workers will receive a rise. It is a question of one in all in.⁸

Mr Gorman's decision and the subsequent referral to the NSW Full Bench immediately affected the academic salaries issue. It strengthened Martin's decision not to have the AUC participate for as at that moment the matter was out of everybody's hands except the NSW Industrial Commission.

In December 1962 before the NSW Full Bench decision was known, FCUSAA approached Martin and suggested an independent national *ad hoc* inquiry to investigate the present salary situation. Martin suggested to FCUSAA that their best way forward was not through the AUC but to write to the Prime Minister with their case. Subsequently, in March 1963 FCUSAA wrote to the Prime Minister declaring dissatisfaction with the makeshift procedures for determining academic salaries. FCUSAA expressed the belief that the level of academic salaries paid should be largely uniform across Australia and that proposals for review of these salaries should be decided on a national and not a local basis. They proposed that a national inquiry be established.

Meanwhile, in mid-1963 the long-awaited judgement by the Industrial Commission of New South Wales was handed down. The Full Bench reversed Mr Gorman's decision and gave much smaller salary increases. This judgement dashed the hopes held by university staff associations of making progress with academic salaries through the channel of the state arbitration courts and added strength to the judgement of many people at the time that the only solution was to set up an independent inquiry at national level.

The First Eggleston Inquiry

The Commonwealth Government, after some delay, as it wished to weigh up the consequences of the NSW judgement, eventually agreed to seek out a suitable person to conduct an independent inquiry into academic salaries. It took longer than initially anticipated for the inquiry to get under way as a suitable member of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission had to complete scheduled hearings before being available. Sir Richard (then Mr Justice) Eggleston was appointed in May 1964 and commenced his work in mid-July.

Eggleston approached his task conscious that the need for the inquiry had arisen as a result of the lack of any national authority with power to determine salaries in all academic disciplines. He was sensitive to the request of Menzies that the inquiry should proceed in an informal way without such legal procedures as sworn evidence, verbatim records and public hearings. Eggleston conducted his inquiry in this spirit by making his hearings 'administrative rather than quasi-judicial in character'. He had as assessors Professor (now Sir David) Derham, then Dean of the Faculty of Law at Monash University and Mr M.C. Timbs from the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.

Universities and staff associations were invited to make submissions to the inquiry and Mr Justice Eggleston with his assessors visited each university for discussions. The findings of the inquiry were adopted by the Commonwealth Government in November 1964, the new rates being retrospective to 1 January 1964. The recommendations established, for the purposes of university grants, a basic salary for Professors, a salary for Readers, the maximum point for Senior Lecturers and the minimum for Lecturers.

After conducting the inquiry, Eggleston was in favour of continuing the practice of what he termed 'periodic reviews' of academic salaries in times of need rather than in step with the triennial recommendations of the AUC. As he acknowledged, any decision on whether they should continue, and if so in what form, was exclusively a matter for the Commonwealth Government.

As the Eggleston judgements did not include consideration of salary increases for part-time academic staff, the AUC found itself again involved as the Minister for Education and Science, Mr (now Sir John) Gorton, asked Martin to provide a recommendation on appropriate increases. The AUC forwarded its recommendations on 6 May 1965 and on 19 May Gorton informed the AUC that the rates of pay for part-time lecturing staff were to be increased as it had recommended. In the letter of 6 May to Gorton, Martin raised another matter which had arisen from the implementation of the Eggleston

judgements. This was that as academic salaries had risen, so, perhaps, should administrative salaries. In the past it had been difficult to dissociate the two groups, particularly as the majority of staff receiving these related salaries were not covered by industrial awards. Martin felt this traditional practice was undesirable and suggested a separate review in due course for administrative salaries. Gorton agreed with Martin that the practice should not be permitted to continue and promised to try and work out a solution. In the interim, university governing councils construed sets of salary scales for small groups of senior administrative and library staff customarily associated with academic salary changes.

With the Eggleston judgements and the subsequent follow-up work by the AUC, a corner had been turned. The Eggleston Report, which encompassed a work value assessment, was a major development in academic salary fixation. Although the type of permanent review mechanism for appraising the need for increasing academic salaries was as yet unclear, national interest in attempting to solve the academic salaries issue was now openly acknowledged.

The AUC Review of Academic Salaries

In September 1966, nearly two years after the Eggleston Inquiry, the FCUSAA, which had now become the Federation of Australian University Staff Associations (FAUSA), asked Gorton to see if he could persuade the Commonwealth Government to agree to initiate regular reviews of academic salaries coinciding with the determination of triennial grants to universities. But Gorton was not prepared to agree to this proposal as, at the time, particularly as a result of a Commonwealth Cabinet directive, he was making a strong attempt to avoid any form of supplementation of recurrent grants during the triennium, especially those connected with salaries. Gorton's attitude applied to any proposed increases in salaries whether at university or CAE level and whether they were for academic or non-academic salaries.

In December 1966 FAUSA wrote to the incoming Chairman of the AUC, Mr (now Sir Lenox) Hewitt, and asked for an opportunity to discuss, among other things, the salaries issue. With the concurrence of Gorton, Hewitt decided to agree and in February 1967 the meeting between Gorton, Hewitt and FAUSA took place. At the meeting Gorton asked whether the question was one of variations in salaries or of the appointment of an inquiry to consider the adjustments. Gorton wished to know too, whether the Federation, if there was room for agreement on adjustments, would still press for the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry. FAUSA made it known that if agreement could be reached they would not do so. Gorton then committed the Commonwealth to look at ways of considering an equitable adjustment to academic salaries. Under

the direction of Gorton, Hewitt then conducted a review.

Hewitt felt that although the AUC had refrained from considering the question of academic salaries since the publication of its Second Report, the question was very much a part of the AUC's responsibility. He requested that FAUSA submit additional information to support its case, after which he began to consult with the states to see if they felt FAUSA's proposals were reasonable. Should the States have disagreed, Hewitt thought that the AUC would find it necessary to appoint another Eggleston-type committee.

Six months earlier (August 1966), and independent of FAUSA's actions, the AVCC had become concerned at the adverse influence the lack of regular machinery for adjusting salary scales was having on academic salaries and the marked effect this was beginning to have on recruitment and retention of academic staff. By that time the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, which had previously been prepared to make annual adjustments for the Australian wage and salaries community on the basis of adjustments in the basic wage, had instituted a total wage concept. This produced a situation whereby almost the entire wage and salary earning community received percentage adjustments in their total remuneration according to the decision of the Commission. These were known as the National Wage Case decisions. The AVCC felt that it was anomalous that (except for a few salaries fixed by the Commonwealth and State Parliaments) academic salaries alone were virtually precluded by law from these general increases. Consequently, in September 1966, the AVCC wrote to Gorton suggesting an investigation be made into academic salaries in 1967.

In April 1967, almost a month after Hewitt had begun his review, all the governing bodies of universities agreed to an approach by the AVCC to the Commonwealth Government and simultaneously by each university to its State government, to suggest the establishment of machinery for a periodic review of academic salaries. Sir Louis Matheson, Chairman of the AVCC, wrote to Gorton on 27 April with this request and on 10 May Gorton replied saying he was not prepared to agree to set up such machinery and that a review was already being made on the basis of submissions from FAUSA.¹⁰

By mid-June 1967, Hewitt, after considerable negotiation, had obtained a final reaction from the States and was ready to summarize his proposals and recommendations. Throughout the review Hewitt did not consult with AUC Commissioners as a committee. Nevertheless, it needs to be said that Hewitt saw the AUC's role as one of only offering advice and that if a formal inquiry was called for, the AUC would not take part.

As there was unease within the AVCC about the lack of consultation with governing bodies of universities, a delegation from the AVCC met with Hewitt to discuss the proposed academic salary increases. Hewitt explained to the delegation that the review was completed and it was not an interim one. Nevertheless Hewitt assured the delegation that Commonwealth Government policy remained unchanged and that an Eggleston-type inquiry would be considered whenever 'prima facie data seemed to suggest its timeliness'.¹¹

At their August 1967 meeting the AVCC expressed considerable disquiet at the way in which the determination and announcement of the new salary scales had been handled by the Commonwealth Government. They were particularly concerned that the Commonwealth had chosen not to consult with the AVCC or with university governing bodies who, the AVCC felt, should have been considered as principals in all salary negotiations. They felt it was an 'unhappy story' particularly as the salaries of tutors and demonstrators, part-time, library and administrative staff had not been considered in the review and it was now left to the universities to resolve these issues.

On 2 July Gorton made a public statement indicating the Commonwealth Government's willingness to support an increase of 15% for all academic salaries, with the exception of Lecturers, the level of which was increased by 12%. The salary increases were granted retrospectively to 1 July 1967. As the Commonwealth Minister announced these increases, the Commonwealth got the kudos. The Commonwealth Government stated that it would pay increases in full to the university in its own Territory (the ANU), but would support them in the States on the recurrent expenditure formula, provided the States agreed to participate on that basis. The States had little choice but to do so and with interesting tax implications. The increases in academic salaries in turn increased the average taxable income of academics to the point where the return to the Commonwealth Treasury was greater than the Commonwealth's contribution to the proportionate increases. For the States, the university salary increases only worsened their position.

The Second Eggleston Inquiry

After Hewitt's 1967 review the level of academic salaries had remained generally acceptable to university academics. As considerable discontent was expressed by their counterparts in CAEs, in June 1968 the Commonwealth Government appointed Mr Justice Sweeney to advise on salaries of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in CAE's. On 1 May 1969 Sweeney presented his report recommending that Lecturers and Senior Lecturers whose qualifications were consonant with the criteria he had established should receive the same remuneration as their university counterparts. Responsibility for fix-

ing salaries and other conditions of employment for staff in CAE's remained with the States.¹²

During early 1969 there had been large increases in the salaries of Commonwealth employees with whom academics claimed some salary parity — professional officers in the Second and Third Division of the Public Service, Commonwealth Government employed Engineers, Architects and Research Scientists and the professional staff of the CSIRO. The AVCC felt that the increases were of sufficient magnitude to warrant prompt adjustment of academic salaries and as a consequence, the AVCC, in conjunction with FAUSA, produced a study paper in October 1969 suggesting a review. Not long afterwards, the Chairman of the AUC, Sir Henry Basten, replied saying that he had been invited by the Minister to open negotiations and in a subsequent discussion Basten pointed out that the Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) had not decided as to whether an inquiry or a negotiated settlement was appropriate. The AUC then obtained the views of the States. Each State gave full support to a similar inquiry to that of Mr Justice Eggleston in 1964 and the Commonwealth Government then agreed to support the proposal. Both the Commonwealth and the States agreed that any salary increases resulting from the inquiry needed to be retrospective to 1 January 1970.

Early in 1970 Sir Richard Eggleston was called upon for the second time by the Commonwealth Government to inquire into academic salaries. His terms of reference were identical to those of the 1964 inquiry, the same two assessors assisted him and he was asked to produce a report quickly in order to bring up to date the existing university academic salary levels. As Eggleston observed, the purpose of the inquiry was as follows:

There is no body in Australia that has the power to determine academic salaries in all disciplines for the whole of Australia. The solution was accordingly adopted of asking me to make a recommendation which could be used by the AUC for the purpose of recommending grants to be made to universities by the Commonwealth... with the concurrence of the States.¹³

Eggleston's recommendation that professorial, associate professorial and reader's salaries be increased by 20% and the commencing salary of a lecturer by 17% were accepted by the Commonwealth and the State Governments as was his recommendation that, from January 1971, academic salaries be subject to National Wage Case decisions.

Sensing the mood in academic circles, Eggleston recommended a more thoroughgoing review of the structure of academic salaries as a whole. At that time New South Wales and Tasmania expressed

support for the idea of establishing permanent machinery for periodic reviews. They were later supported by the other States. Consequently, in 1972 another major inquiry into academic salaries was instituted. The Hon. Mr Justice W.B. Campbell was asked by the then Minister for Education and Science, Mr Malcolm Fraser, to examine the work value of university academic staff and recommend new salaries for them and to advise on the establishment of permanent machinery for future salary reviews. On 16 May 1973, Campbell presented his report to the then Minister for Education, Mr Kim E. Beazley, and his recommendations as to salary levels were adopted by the Commonwealth and the State Governments. As a consequence of the Campbell Inquiry, the Academic Salaries Tribunal was established in October 1974.

Conclusion

Policy-making on academic salaries in Australia in the 1960s was haphazard, complex and subject to considerable change. Until the late 1960s the specific role of government in the issue was surrounded by uncertainty. The resolution of the academic salaries issue by the establishment of a permanent review mechanism at national level took so long because of the tensions between preservation of institutional autonomy and 'States' rights' on the one hand and the need for the Commonwealth Government to try to account for its expenditure on salaries on the other. The increasing influence of the Commonwealth Government in shaping policy occurred in a series of fits and starts; the movement towards a national resolution was steady but gradual from the mid-1960s onwards. From 1968, with the tremendous growth in the CAE sector and the considerable differences in size and scope between tertiary institutions in the CAE and university sectors, it was necessary for the Commonwealth to attempt to establish and maintain a work-value parity between academic salaries in both sectors.

Throughout the 1960s, the AUC was intermittently involved in the academic salaries issue. Unlike the UGC in Great Britain, the AUC was never happy to accept the role of a reviewing agency for any length of time. The AUC played a key role in keeping the issue evenly poised. As governments, the AVCC, university governing bodies and university staff associations worked towards a solution, sometimes in conflict and at other times in co-operation, the presence of the AUC allowed a fallback position to be adopted before further attempts were resumed.

It is important to point out that in terms of the tension between institutional autonomy and public responsibility, the establishment of the Academic Salaries Tribunal greatly limited the autonomy of universities in the area of wages and salaries as academic salary rates became largely determined by a national tribunal. Yet it was the underlying egalitarian approach adopted by the university staff associations and the AVCC, at times collectively and at times separately, which led to this solution. Through many years of persuasion these bodies exerted strong pressure to establish a national system to provide for similar salaries and similar conditions of work for academics.

References

1. Sir Robert Aitken, The Vice-Chancellors' Committee and the UGC, *Universities Quarterly*, 23, 2, Spring 1969, p. 167.
2. *Report of the Committee on Australian Universities* (Murray Report), Government Printer, Canberra, 1957, para. 213.
3. The committee consisted of Sir Leslie Martin, Dr Coombs (Governor, Reserve Bank), Mr L.B. Hamilton (Commonwealth Treasury), Professor Sir George Paton, Chairman, AVCC, Mr G.F. Seaman, Under-Treasurer, South Australia, and Mr C.W. Weickhardt, Technical Director, Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI).
4. Commonwealth Archives. *File 10/3/1. Salaries 1961-63 General*. Letter of Secretary of AUC to Permanent Head, Department of Prime Minister, 7 June 1960.
5. *Report of the Australian Universities Commission on Australian Universities 1958-1963*, Government Printer, Canberra, 1960, p. 16.
6. Files of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC): *AUC 62/11*. Joint proposal by AVCC and FCUSAA to Academic Salaries Determination; agreed to at a joint meeting of AVCC/FCUSAA in Melbourne on Tuesday, 13 February 1962.
7. CTEC. *AUC 62/170*, Meeting 33, 25 July 1962, p. 3.
8. Commonwealth of Australia, *Report of the Inquiry into Academic Salaries*, 30 October 1964, AGPS, Canberra, p. 8.
9. CTEC. *AUC 67/58*, Meeting 92, 2 June 1967, paras. 16, 18.
10. CTEC. *AUC 67/65*, Meeting 93, 19 June 1967.
11. *Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee*. Meetings of 16, 17 August 1967.
12. *Report of the Inquiry into Salaries of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in Colleges of Advanced Education*, AGPS, Canberra, 1969.
13. *Report of the Inquiry into Academic Salaries*, May 1970, Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra, 1970, p. 2.