

Budget 2020 – Early Childhood Education and Care

Early Childhood Education and Care Overview

The focus of the 2020 Budget has been to support Victorian ECEC services to remain open and viable during the pandemic and allow families of essential workers and vulnerable children to access ECEC. While families across Australia are being supported until 4 April 2021 through an easing of the Child Care Subsidy activity test requirements, there are no other new measures to support families with the cost of ECEC, or to better remunerate early childhood educators.

Early Childhood Education and Care

The Budget

The Budget announced a COVID-19 response package of \$314.2 million to support Victorian Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) services to remain viable as COVID-19 restrictions ease in Victoria. The package includes a range of recovery payments and supports for child care services and is in addition to Child Care Subsidy (CCS) payments for vulnerable children and those of permitted workers who have been able to use care in metropolitan Melbourne until 27 September 2020. The package will extend from 28 September 2020 until 31 January 2021. The recovery payments follow \$51.7 million provided by the Australian Government in 2020-21 to assist Victorian services to stay operational and keep essential workers employed during the stage four lock-down restrictions (Budget Paper No.2, Budget Measures, Part 2, p.73, 2020).

COVID-19 Response Package — child care — Victorian recovery payments and other support measures

Payments (\$m)

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Department of Education, Skills and Employment	365.9	-	-	-
Services Australia	5.7	0.5	0.4	0.4
Total — Payments	371.6	0.5	0.4	0.4

Source: 2020 Budget Paper No. 2, Budget Measures, Part 2, Payment Measures – Education, Skills and Employment, p.73.

For all other families across Australia using approved care, the Government has confirmed that it will extend the easing of CCS activity test requirements until 4 April 2021. This will support

eligible families whose employment has been impacted by COVID-19 by allowing them to access up to 100 hours care per fortnight without having to meet the activity test requirements.

Under the *JobMaker – Deregulation Package*, the 2020 Budget also announced \$18.5 million over four years from 2020-21 (with \$2 million per year ongoing from 2024-25) to streamline ECEC provider approval processes into a single application across jurisdictions, allowing for faster establishment of new ECEC businesses and employment of their staff (Budget Paper No.2, p.56, 2020).

Overall, the Government will invest funding of \$10.3 billion in the child care system in 2020-21, as well as \$458.3 million over two years from 2020–21 to extend the National Partnership Agreement on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education for the 2021 calendar year. Funding will also be made available to undertake the National Early Childhood Education and Care collection in early 2022 (Budget Paper No.2, p.74, 2020).

Gender implications

Why is this an issue for women?

Access to affordable ECEC is vital for families as Australia works through the impacts of COVID-19. The Government acknowledges that women have been significantly affected by the pandemic and they will play a significant role in Australia’s recovery (Women’s Economic Security Statement, 2020, p.3).

Women’s workforce participation is closely linked to productivity. Australian Bureau of Statistics data indicate that while women’s workforce participation rate (ages 15+) rose gradually from 58.7% in September 2013 to 61.5% in January 2020, it fell to 57.5% in May 2020. There was an increase in women’s workforce participation rate between May and August 2020 of 2.4 percentage points to 60% (ABS Labour Force Australia, August 2020). However, this growth may only continue if the economy picks up and women’s workforce participation is supported through access to flexible and affordable ECEC.

What are the 2020 Budget impacts on women?

The 2020 Budget builds on earlier measures in 2020 to help the ECEC sector manage the impact of the pandemic: a Relief Package (6 April to 12 July) and a Transition Payment (13 July to 27 September). Together with the Recovery Package for Victorian services announced in the 2020 Budget, the measures have helped to ensure 99% of 13,400 ECEC services remained open and viable across Australia (Women’s Economic Security Statement, p. 39, 2020). These measures to ensure viability of the sector have been necessary and welcome.

On the demand-side, the viability of the ECEC sector will depend on the extent to which families, and women in particular, are able to enter or remain in the workforce, access and meet the cost of ECEC. The 2020 Budget’s ECEC measures only provide families with a reassurance that the activity test requirements will be eased until 4 April 2021. If the intention is to assist individuals to return to the level of work, study or training they were undertaking before the pandemic, early April may too soon to reimpose the activity test requirements. The activity test disproportionately affects women, including partnered or single women who tend to have fewer hours of approved activity than men and want to balance work and family life through part-time work. It also limits children’s access to subsidised ECEC where women are not able to work more

for various reasons, unless they have an exemption from the activity test or the family qualifies for the Additional Child Care Subsidy (ACCS).

The 2020 Budget did not promise any other support to families to meet the cost of ECEC in spite of calls to increase the subsidy by 10-15% (Early Childhood Australia, p.2, 2020). The hourly rate of CCS is linked to the Consumer Price Index, yet wage price growth is usually higher than inflation and wages make up a high proportion of the costs of delivering ECEC services. Over time, this will result in increasingly higher fees and out-of-pocket costs for families.

The NFAW acknowledges that the tension between reducing the cost of care for families and increasing wages for women working in ECEC. Better remuneration is needed in the sector – women comprise nearly 96% of the child care workforce and 87% of the preschool workforce, with a gender pay gap of nearly 28% (Workplace Gender Equality Agency, 2020). This is only likely to improve if the Government is prepared to increase the hourly subsidy rate cap to allow ECEC services to support wage rises, or provide other funding support in recognition of the importance of ECEC as an ‘essential service’ to the economy.

The Budget also did not respond to growing calls to raise the level of subsidy for the lowest income groups from 85 to 95% of the hourly rate cap paid by the Government, with a more gradually tapered subsidy for all families with income above \$68,000 (Grattan Institute, 2020; Equal Rights Alliance, 2020). Under the Grattan Institute’s proposal, modelling indicates that 60% of families would pay less than \$20 per day per child for childcare and no family would be worse off. They estimate that increasing the CCS to 95% with a gradual taper would cost \$5 billion and would deliver a GDP boost of \$11 billion per year (Grattan Institute, p.3, 2020).

In the medium to longer term, vulnerable and disadvantaged families are likely to need extra support with the cost of care, for example, through an expansion of eligibility for the ACCS and a simplified application process. [Participation by Indigenous children and vulnerable children in ECEC was boosted](#) during the period of the Government’s \$1.6 billion Relief Package period from 6 April to 12 July, when eligible families had access to free childcare and, in many cases, increased their days of care. This welcome support for vulnerable families and essential workers was wound back with recommencement of the CCS system on 13 July 2020.

While not acknowledged in the Budget, it is also likely that in the short to medium term, greater flexibility in care arrangements and ECEC fee structures may be needed to accommodate women’s (and men’s) changed work patterns as a result of the pandemic. The median length of a centre-based day care session is 11 hours, which quickly uses up available subsidised hours for families needing shorter sessions of care (Baxter et al., 2019). In light of the reinstatement of mutual obligations for every worker to take all work available, including part-time and casual work, the Government needs to consider mechanisms to increase flexibility for families around the length of care sessions, while maintaining the capacity of services to meet staffing costs (Equal Rights Alliance, 2020, p.2).

More wrap-around care arrangements are also needed for families using stand-alone preschool in the year before full-time school, similar to before and after-school care for school age children.

Finally, the Budget missed an opportunity to provide any assurance to services and families on the continuation of the National Partnership on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education beyond 2020-21. The \$458.3 million announced in the July 2020 Economic and Fiscal Update will

be provided over two years from 2020–21, although it will only extend the National Partnership for the 2021 calendar year (Budget Paper No. 2, Appendix A, p.235, 2020).

Access to 600 hours per year of preschool for all children in the year before full-time school has been funded through the National Partnership since 2008, with participation rates increasing from 12% in 2008 to 96% in 2018. The benefits of funding universal access to early childhood education have been demonstrated in the international and Australian research literature and in many reviews of successive National Partnerships, yet funding is still not assured going forward.

A cost-benefit analysis undertaken in 2019 found that universal access to early childhood education (preschool) produces a 1:2 return on investment in Australia, with \$4.75 billion worth of benefits to children, communities, government and business (The Front Project, 2019, pp.5-6). The latest review of the National Partnership in March 2020 for the Council of Australian Governments' Education Council recommended a new five year National Partnership Agreement, transitioning to a National Agreement from 2026 (The Nous Group, 2020, p.1).

While NFAW notes some pleasing developments in the provision of preschool for vulnerable and disadvantaged three year olds in some states and territories around Australia, it is disappointed that the 2020 Budget did not address future Australian Government funding for the National Partnership on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education beyond the 2021 calendar year.

Recommendations

The NFAW recommends:

1. The Government extends easing of the activity request requirements until at least June 2021 (Early Childhood Australia, Federal Budget 2020-21 Summary Analysis, October 2020).
2. Better remuneration for women employed in the sector through an increase above the CPI in the CCS hourly rate paid by the Australian Government for different ECEC service types.
3. An increase in the percentage of subsidy received by low income families, from 85 to 95% of the hourly rate cap and a more gradual taper for all families, up to a combined annual family income between \$69,690 and \$353,680 (indexed annually).
4. Broader ACCS eligibility (with a simplified application process), waiving of gap fees and/or no activity test requirements for lower income vulnerable families and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families, to boost children's participation in quality ECEC programs.
5. Flexible child care arrangements with access to shorter sessions of care to assist part-time, casual or shift workers with the cost of ECEC and flexible wrap-around care for families using standalone or government preschools (15 hours per week), to facilitate greater workforce participation.
6. Commitment of sufficient ongoing funding for the National Partnership on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education beyond the 2021 calendar year to increase participation in early childhood education by three and four year olds, in particular vulnerable children.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2020). *Labour Force Australia, August 2020*.
<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/labour/employment-and-unemployment/labour-force-australia/aug-2020>
- Australian Government. (2020). *Women's Economic Security Statement*.
<https://www.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/images/wess/wess-2020-report.pdf>
- Baxter, J., Bray, J.R., Carroll, M., Hand, K., Gray, M., Katz, I., Budinski, M., Rogers, C., Smart, J., Skattebol J., & Blaxland, M. (2019). *Child Care Package Evaluation: Early monitoring report*. (Research Report). Australian Institute of Family Studies.
<https://aifs.gov.au/publications/child-care-package-evaluation-early-monitoring-report>
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2020). *Budget Paper No.2: Part 2: Payment Measures*.
https://budget.gov.au/2020-21/content/bp2/download/bp2_complete.pdf
- Early Childhood Australia. (2020). *Federal Budget 2020-21 Summary Analysis*.
http://www.earlychildhoodaustralia.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020-21-ECA_Budget_Analysis_Final.pdf
- Equality Rights Alliance. (2020). *ERA Position Statement: Reimagining child care*.
<http://www.equalityrightsalliance.org.au/covid-19/era-position-statement-reimagining-child-care/>
- Hunter, F. (2020, June 12). They are thriving: Free child care boosted access for disadvantaged and Indigenous children, *Sydney Morning Herald*. <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/they-are-thriving-free-childcare-boosted-access-for-disadvantaged-and-indigenous-kids-20200611-p551ne.html>
- Nous Group. (2020). *UANP Review: Final Review Report*. Report prepared for the Council of Australian Governments' Education Council.
<http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/Reports%20and%20publications/UANP%20Review%20Report.pdf>
- The Front Project (2019). *A smart investment for a smarter Australia: An economic analysis of universal access early childhood education in the year before school in Australia*.
<https://www.thefrontproject.org.au/images/downloads/ECO%20ANALYSIS%20Full%20Report.pdf>
- Wood, D., Griffiths, K., and Emslie, O. (2020). *Cheaper childcare: A practical plan to boost female workforce participation*. The Grattan Institute.
<https://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Cheaper-Childcare-Grattan-Institute-Report.pdf>
- Workplace Gender Equality Agency. (2020). 'All Industries'. *WGEA Data Explorer: Industries*.
<https://data.wgea.gov.au/industries/1>.

Budget 2020 – Schools

Schools Overview

NFAW welcomes the overall increase in school spending. However, given the Budget had a 'jobs' focus it is surprising that schooling and the development of digital skills for both students and staff was not given more attention. School retention rates and skills determine entry to STEM jobs in the future so long-term planning and a national strategy is imperative for all young Australians to take their place in the 21st century workforce. Teachers too need continued professional development in the STEM skills if they are to deliver high quality education for all students. In addition, NFAW notes that program spending through the Department of Education, Skills and Employment in 2020-21 is significantly less than the previous year, which is disappointing.

Schools - The Budget

The budget measures for Schooling fall into two categories: (1) funding provided to states and territories to support school education and (2) additional funding for specific Australian Government education programs and policies.

Funding provided to states and territories to support school education

In 2020-21, the Australian government will provide \$22.5 billion to support education services in the states and territories. This large majority of this funding is provided through the Quality Schools policy.

- In 2020-21, Quality Schools funding will amount to \$21.9 billion. Of this, government schools will receive \$9.1 billion and non-government schools will receive \$12.8 billion. Funding for non-government schools includes funding from the [Choice and Affordability Fund](#), announced in 2018, which provides a further \$1.2 billion to these schools between 2020-2029. Quality Schools funding is set to increase each year to 2023-24.
- Australian Government funding for non-government schools will grow faster (growing 25.6% to \$16.1 billion by 2023-24) than its funding for government schools (growing by 21.6 per cent to \$11 billion by 2023-24). This undermines the needs-based funding principle for school funding.
- An additional \$544.8 million will be provided via various National Partnership payments, including \$61.4 million for the National school chaplaincy program (2020-2021 Budget Paper No. 3, p. 31-32).

Table 2.4: Payments to support state education services

\$million	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Quality Schools funding	21,913.8	24,406.7	25,898.8	27,160.2
National Partnership payments				
MoneySmart teaching	1.3	-	-	-
National school chaplaincy program	61.4	61.4	61.4	61.4
Northern Territory Remote Aboriginal investment(a)				
Children and schooling component	30.2	29.3	-	-
School pathways program	1.2	1.2	-	-
Universal access to early childhood education	450.6	317.2	-	-
Total National Partnership payments	544.8	409.1	61.4	61.4
Total	22,458.6	24,815.8	25,960.3	27,221.6
<i>Memorandum item – payments for non-government schools included in payments above</i>				
Quality Schools funding	12,844.4	14,656.8	15,450.1	16,131.7

(a) Includes funding for non-government representative bodies.

Source: 2020-2021 Budget Paper No. 3, p 31, Table 2.4: Payments to support state education services.

Quality Schools funding

\$million	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	ACT	NT	Total
2020-21									
Government schools(a)	2,807.6	2,126.2	2,034.3	920.3	616.5	217.1	130.1	217.3	9,069.4
Non-government schools(b)(c)(d)	3,852.7	3,485.2	2,788.7	1,263.4	789.0	290.0	224.8	150.4	12,844.4
Total	6,660.4	5,611.5	4,823.0	2,183.7	1,405.5	507.1	354.9	367.7	21,913.8
2021-22									
Government schools(a)	2,993.3	2,307.0	2,168.7	1,016.6	671.4	226.0	142.6	224.2	9,749.9
Non-government schools(b)(c)(d)	4,464.0	3,803.5	3,118.7	1,486.0	1,043.5	312.3	236.5	192.3	14,656.8
Total	7,457.3	6,110.5	5,287.4	2,502.6	1,714.9	538.3	379.1	416.6	24,406.7
2022-23									
Government schools(a)	3,184.6	2,494.3	2,303.8	1,118.1	728.9	235.5	155.6	227.9	10,448.7
Non-government schools(b)(c)(d)	4,719.3	4,018.2	3,278.7	1,560.1	1,098.9	327.7	245.2	201.9	15,450.1
Total	7,904.0	6,512.6	5,582.4	2,678.2	1,827.8	563.2	400.8	429.8	25,898.8
2023-24									
Government schools(a)	3,348.9	2,652.7	2,419.4	1,196.5	769.6	243.8	166.5	231.1	11,028.5
Non-government schools(b)(c)(d)	4,933.6	4,205.2	3,417.7	1,624.3	1,146.5	341.0	253.7	209.7	16,131.7
Total	8,282.5	6,857.9	5,837.1	2,820.8	1,916.1	584.8	420.2	440.7	27,160.2

(a) Includes funding for the Northern Territory to accelerate evidence-based reforms to improve outcomes for vulnerable students and includes Literacy Support for Tasmanian Students.

(b) Includes capital funding.

(c) Includes prescribed circumstances funding.

(d) Includes funding for non-government school reform support and the Choice and Affordability Fund.

Source: 2020-2021 Budget Paper No. 3, p 32, Quality Schools Funding.

Additional Australian Government funding to support school programs and policies

The 2020-21 budget allocation for the Department of Education, Skills and Employment's Early Learning and Schools Support (Program 1.5) is \$128 million, down 25 per cent from an estimated \$172 million in 2019-20. This reduction in funding is disappointing, given the challenges schools and school children face particularly as a result of the current pandemic.

Program expenses 1.5 Early Learning and Schools Support

	2019-20 Estimated actual \$'000	2020-21 Budget \$'000	2021-22 Forward estimate \$'000	2022-23 Forward estimate \$'000	2023-24 Forward estimate \$'000
Annual administered expenses:					
Ordinary annual services (Appropriation Bill No. 1)					
Australian Early Development Census	4,393	12,196	12,315	4,493	12,508
Boost the Learning for Life Program	21,400	-	-	-	-
Early Learning Languages Australia (ELLA)	5,021	1,470	-	-	-
English Language Learning for Indigenous Children (ELLIC)	2,030	-	1,084	-	-
Flexible Literacy Learning for Remote Primary Schools	1,740	750	-	-	-
Grants and Awards	1,339	1,393	1,402	1,422	1,443
Helping Children with Autism	5,982	6,072	6,115	6,200	6,293
High Achieving Teachers Program and Future Leaders Program	6,000	9,650	15,900	2,250	-
Inspiring all Australians in Digital Literacy and STEM	16,371	-	-	-	-
Mental Health Support for School Communities and Early Childhood Services	4,000	-	-	-	-
National Assessment Reform	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
National Schools Reform	17,233	22,279	25,859	9,841	9,840
National School Resourcing Board	512	1,374	958	968	982
Quality Outcomes	37,961	35,842	34,466	33,809	33,807
Quality Schools Communication	(31)	-	-	-	-
Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)	625	617	550	550	700
Students Support Package	-	15,345	24,060	41,336	43,264
Teach for Australia	2,145	2,145	-	-	-
Universal Access	1,797	5,080	2,050	-	-
Delivering Respect Matters	363	500	500	-	-
Life Education - Being Healthy, Being Active	3,100	1,200	700	-	-
Attendance Strategies For Early Learning	642	275	-	-	-
Mathematics Massive Open Online Courses	1,046	1,732	2,825	2,824	-
Rural Inspire Initiative	500	1,000	500	-	-
National Phonics Check	2,200	4,300	4,300	-	-
Respectful Interfaith School Education	500	1,000	1,000	500	-
Other services (Appropriation Bill No. 2)					
Literacy Support for Tasmanian Students	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Local School Community Fund	30,200	-	-	-	-
Special account expenses:					
SOETM - Students with Disabilities	203	-	-	-	-
SOETM - NSRA State Contributions	416	-	-	-	-
Total program expenses	171,888	128,420	138,784	108,393	113,037

Source: 2020-2021 Department of Education, Skills and Employment Budget Statements, p 42.

The 2020-2021 funding includes a package of measures for disadvantaged students. While these are worthy in themselves, they are not part of an overall strategic plan and the government remains dependent on NGOs to deliver for them. It is also important to note that the package to be delivered by the Clontarf Foundation is only for young men. NFAW would argue that young Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander women are also in need of specific attention to enhance their educational opportunities. Overall the money is small to address serious disadvantage not only in remote communities but also across Australia.

- \$39.8 million over four years from 2020-21 for the Clontarf Foundation to expand and extend its existing program, for young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men
- \$38.2 million over four years from 2020-21 for The Smith Family to support around 76,000 disadvantaged young Australians
- \$5.8 million over four years from 2020-21 for Good to Great Schools Australia to develop a pilot program to support up to 10 remote and very remote schools to expand their Direct Instruction literacy program to include numeracy and science
- \$3.0 million over four years from 2020-21 to the Islamic Museum of Australia to develop educational resources and online learning platforms to support social cohesion, multiculturalism and community harmony
- \$3.0 million over four years from 2020-21 to the Anti-Defamation Commission to create a Holocaust education platform to support inclusiveness, civility and respect.

Source: Budget Paper 2, pp. 81-82.

The second package of measures is to address the issue of STEM skills for students and teachers. (See the STEM paper for a discussion of Women in STEM in higher education and VET). The measures here are inadequate, not only in quantum but with no national plan. The organisations chosen to deliver the packages are only able to reach a small number of Australians even if they have five years. While the government has acknowledged the need to upskill teachers the resources offered mean it will be only limited numbers. If the issue of STEM skills in schools is to be addressed, it needs a fully funded national plan to which resources are allocated and the government maintains a commitment to such a priority.

The government itself has put aside \$25 million for Covid-related emergencies but there is no indication of how or where this money will be spent.

- \$25.0 million over five years from 2020-21 to establish a fund to enable the Government to respond flexibly and quickly to emerging priorities and educational challenges presented by COVID-19.
- \$9.6 million over five years from 2020-21 to the Australian Academy of Science to deliver curriculum resources and professional learning for Foundation to Year 10 teachers
- \$5.7 million over five years from 2020-21 to expand the *Early Learning STEM Australia* program to Foundation to Year 2 classrooms
- \$4.8 million over five years from 2020-21 to enhance teaching practices through partnering teachers with STEM professionals

- \$4.4 million over five years from 2020-21 to support approximately 120,000 disadvantaged 3 to 5-year olds through The Smith Family’s *Let’s Count* program
- \$2.8 million over five years from 2020-21 to Froebel Australia to build the skills of early learning educators to deliver STEM learning in preschool and childcare settings.

Source: Budget Paper 2, p. 82.

Students Support Package

Payments (\$m)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Department of Education, Skills and Employment	16.6	25.0	42.0	44.0
National Indigenous Australians Agency	1.3	3.8	2.6	-
Total — Payments	17.9	28.8	44.6	44.0

Source: Budget Paper 2, p. 81, Students Support Package.

Gender implications

Why is this an issue for women?

Women make up 71.9 per cent of the workforce in the schooling sector (ABS 2019). Any changes, such as Covid, has a significant impact on their working conditions and their ability to deliver high quality education. The demands of the digital age and new skills directly affects them and their workplace. Hence, they need support to ensure they are properly trained and skilled in the changing demands of education.

Women are still the major care givers in the family, spending 8 hours 33 minutes compared to the 3 hours 55 minutes that men spend caring for children under 14 years of age (ABS 2019). Hence, inadequate and short-term funding has serious consequences for Australian women teachers in relation to accessing professional development and work in the medium term. This directly impacts on their ability to access professional development and respond to changing needs of the school environment.

What are the 2020 Budget impacts on women?

The 2020 Budget has some serious implications for women, not just for those working in the schooling sector but also for women caring for and educating their own children. The lack of a national plan and the short-term nature of funding means women have difficulty planning and accessing what limited professional development is available.

While the enhancement of STEM skills remains an objective of the Budget there is a need for a national strategy to be developed which ensures the majority of the workforce, women , are involved and able to participate fully , not only in the development of such a plan but to bring their expertise from the classroom to enrich and enhance the teaching of STEM skills during the years of schooling. This would provide a solid basis on which to prepare the Australian community for all the challenges of the 21st century.

Recommendations

1. NFAW recommends that the STEM skills of all Australians can only be enhanced by a national policy which is fully funded and supported by the government.
2. NFAW recommends that young women be included in the work of the Clontarf Foundation or some similar Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisation to enhance their educational opportunities.
3. NFAW recommends that all classroom teachers have an opportunity to enhance their knowledge of digital technologies to enhance the quality of their teaching.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2019). *Gender Indicators Australia*. Retrieved from <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/gender-indicators-australia/latest-release>.

Commonwealth of Australia (2020). *Budget Paper No 2, Budget Measures 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://budget.gov.au/2020-21/content/bp2/index.htm>.

Commonwealth of Australia (2020). *Budget Paper No. 3, Federal Financial Relations 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://budget.gov.au/2020-21/content/bp3/index.htm>.

Department of Education, Skills and Employment (2020). *What is the Choice and Affordability Fund?* Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.au/what-choice-and-affordability-fund>.

Budget 2020 – Vocational Education and Training

Overview

In the current economic circumstances – resulting from the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 job losses on women in hospitality, retail, arts and tourism – the government’s vocational education and training measures fail to respond to the need for VET reforms, including a more targeted approach to funding to increase women’s participation in a greater diversity of vocational fields of study. Women’s concentration in certain industries has made them exceptionally vulnerable to job losses at this time.

The Productivity Commission’s [Interim Report](#) May 2020, reviews the National Agreement for Skills and Workforce Development and indicates a range of problems, describing the VET system as “byzantine” (p. 4), particularly in the area of employer incentives for apprenticeships. Nonetheless the government has chosen to fund two major initiatives which rely heavily on financial incentives for employers: the [Australian Apprenticeships Incentives Program \(AAIP\)](#) with a \$3.159 billion allocation, and the one-off [JobTrainer Fund](#) of \$500 million to be matched by states. The aim of this Fund is to provide an additional 340,700 training places to help school leavers and job seekers.

The Productivity Commission’s Interim Report cites evidence that financial incentives are the least likely government intervention to result in employers taking on an apprentice or trainee (p. 164). NFAW is concerned that these much publicised and promoted initiatives, similarly to the [Skilling Australians Fund](#), are unlikely to meet their targets.

Skills and Workforce Development

The Budget

Program 3.1 Building Skills and Capability

	2019–20 Estimated actual \$'000	2020–21 Budget \$'000	2021–22 Forward estimate \$'000	2022–23 Forward estimate \$'000	2023–24 Forward estimate \$'000
<i>Sub-program 3.1.1: Skills Development</i>					
Annual administered expenses:					
Ordinary annual services (Appropriation Bill No. 1)					
Australian Apprenticeship Support Network	141,471	277,739	232,354	193,896	193,896
Australian Apprenticeships Incentives Program	725,891	3,159,485	1,341,973	520,106	555,073
Industry Specialist Mentoring for Australian Apprentices	(295)	-	-	-	-
Commonwealth Scholarships Program for South Australia	2,059	4,113	100	-	-
Commonwealth Scholarships Program for Young Australians	1,662	3,868	2,648	-	-
Mid-Career Checkpoint	129	22,370	26,250	26,250	-
Skills Checkpoint for Older Workers Program	4,202	3,984	4,020	4,069	4,126
National Rugby League's VET Apprenticeship Awareness Program	350	-	-	-	-
Trades Recognition Australia	20,338	31,344	35,351	35,351	35,351
Special appropriations:					
<i>Trade Support Loans Act 2014</i>					
Trade Support Loans	46,674	42,268	37,785	36,240	57,413
Special account expenses:					
Growth Fund Skills and Training Special Account 2015	1,484	-	-	-	-
Total component 3.1.1 expenses	943,965	3,545,171	1,680,481	815,912	845,859
<i>Sub-program 3.1.2: Access to Training</i>					
Annual administered expenses:					
Ordinary annual services (Appropriation Bill No. 1)					
Adult Migrant English Program (a)	(1,471)	-	-	-	-
Skills for Education and Employment	83,874	116,976	116,628	123,347	125,074
Foundation Skills for Your Future Program	-	14,283	14,283	14,283	7,139
Foundation Skills for Your Future - Remote Community Pilots	-	1,622	3,284	3,323	-
Total component 3.1.2 expenses	82,403	132,881	134,195	140,953	132,213

Program 3.1 Building Skills and Capability (continued)

	2019–20 Estimated actual \$'000	2020–21 Budget \$'000	2021–22 Forward estimate \$'000	2022–23 Forward estimate \$'000	2023–24 Forward estimate \$'000
<i>Sub-program 3.1.3: Support for the National Training System</i>					
Annual administered expenses:					
Ordinary annual services (Appropriation Bill No. 1)					
Australian Industry and Skills Committee	1,513	1,532	1,548	1,566	1,588
Industry Training Hubs	13	15,469	14,722	16,735	-
Industry Workforce Training	28,226	50,532	40,062	48,779	49,462
Integrated Information Service	1,271	1,799	1,818	1,840	1,866
Licensing of International Vocational Education and Training (VET) courses					
My Skills Website	213	1,193	1,193	1,193	1,193
National Career Education Strategy	586	577	584	590	599
National Career Education Strategy	500	-	-	-	-
National Careers Institute and Ambassador	401	6,312	5,489	5,408	1,019
National Centre for Vocational Education Research					
National Skills Commission	696	706	714	722	732
National Skills Commission	3,718	7,804	5,100	2,365	2,400
National Training System COPE	31,948	38,591	37,611	34,752	34,122
Skills Communication Campaign	222	6,865	-	-	-
Skills Organisation Pilots	9,875	13,641	26,223	23,480	3,925
VET Information Strategy	1,537	1,591	922	832	546
Special account expenses:					
SOETM - National Training System COPE VET employer survey	3	-	-	-	-
Total component 3.1.3 expenses	80,722	146,612	135,986	138,262	97,452
Total program expenses	1,107,090	3,824,664	1,950,662	1,095,127	1,075,524

Source: Portfolio Budget Statements 2020-21, Budget Related Paper No. 1.4, Program 3.1 . [Portfolio Budget Statements 2020–21 Budget Related Paper](#)

Gender implications

- Women earn less than men. The full-time total remuneration gender pay gap based on WGEA data is 20.8%, meaning men working full-time earn nearly \$25,679 a year more than women working full-time.
- Women are over-represented as part-time workers in low paid industries and in insecure work. Diversification of their occupational choices and expansion of opportunities is enabled when they receive adequate and unbiased career advice and the possibilities of tertiary education through TAFE or a VET provider are presented to them at various stages: post-school, during their early employment years and when returning to work after a period of child-raising (see the [Victorian GenVic and WAVE submission](#) to the Productivity Commission’s Inquiry).
- More women than men have lost their jobs during the COVID health crisis. Their re-entry in a changed working environment will depend on their augmenting their skills, improving their qualifications or retraining or training into an emerging occupation.
- The gender or sex-segregated labour market contributes to women’s economic insecurity by perpetuating the gender pay gap (see the [Victorian GenVic and WAVE submission](#) to the Productivity Commission’s Inquiry). The VET system with its extensive course offerings across a range of occupations and accompanied by an appropriate range of training support can facilitate women pursuing work opportunities through apprenticeships and traineeships

provided they are linked to a welcoming employer committed to long term staff retention and upskilling.

- Women, through a range of organisations and involvement in many pilot programs targeted at encouraging women into male dominated occupations, have lobbied over many years for funding initiatives to support female students wishing to enter male dominated trades and other occupations, where wages and conditions are better, job security is assured and there are opportunities for establishing small businesses.
- The VET sector, through the public TAFE system, had a reputation for providing affordable and targeted programs for women. These need to be re-established.
- Women are not a homogenous group and the VET sector must recognise that Indigenous women, CALD women and women with a disability face particular challenges in training environments shared with their male counterparts. These women require specialized support which is culturally sensitive and responsive to their needs and priorities. In a properly resourced VET learning context such support is negotiated with the student and customised to address their learning requirements.

What are the 2020 Budget impacts on women?

While the government continues its policy and funding commitment to an industry-led VET system in a contestable training market with private providers competing with each other and TAFE to supply training products and services, as set out in the [Heads of Agreement for Skills Reform](#), the system dysfunctionality complained of by industry and governments will continue.

This Budget could have been used as an opportunity to re-set policies which have led to market failures and extensive robbing of government funds. The industry-led system is criticised by those who are leading it. The role of the public provider – TAFE – is critical to the economic and social well-being of the Australian community at this time of economic recession. The new program [Revitalising TAFE Campuses Across Australia Initiative](#), which has been introduced under payments for specific purposes, should be significantly expanded. The current allocation is derisory.

The public TAFE system should be re-funded as essential social infrastructure for recovery. It is a national asset with a wide geographical distribution. It needs to serve all in the community, particularly those hardest hit by job losses and business shut-downs. The return on this investment needs to be measured over time in enhanced community prosperity and industry innovation and growth. According to the Centre for Future Work report [An Investment in Productivity and Inclusion](#), the TAFE system supports \$92.5 billion in annual economic benefits through the direct operation of TAFE institutes, higher incomes and productivity generated by the TAFE-credentialed workforce, and reduced social benefits costs.

Apart from the two main program initiatives, there is little change in the overall allocations when compared to 2019/2020. There is a modest increase in the [Commonwealth Scholarships Program for Young Australians](#). To be eligible, you must live in one of ten nominated regions. There are no figures on the number of recipients let alone a gender breakdown.

[Trade Support Loans](#) were underspent casting doubt on the confidence and hype surrounding the two large programs. The data on these loans is not gender disaggregated. For the [reporting period 2017-2018](#), there were 51,920 apprentices in receipt of payments. The Compulsory Repayment Threshold are earnings of \$46,620.

The allocation for [VET Student Loans](#) is \$171,193 million. The new rules governing these loans have reduced the number of eligible providers and courses. There is no gender disaggregated data in the [Annual Statistical Report for 2019](#) (p. 7). VSL-assisted students were charged a total of \$296,687,590 in course tuition fees. They paid \$20,611,812 of their tuition fees upfront in addition to the amounts paid in VET Student Loans.

Although the [AAIP](#) overspent its 2019/2020 allocation, it is now the flagship program for increasing apprenticeships and saving those on the unemployment queues. Of major concern to women with respect to this program, is the failure to include them in the Equity Groups meriting special assistance in the [Australian Apprenticeships Incentives Program Guidelines](#) (p. 8).

The newly established [National Skills Commission](#) under-spent its allocation, but has received an increase for 20/21 tapering off in the forward years. This Commission could be harnessed to bring more cohesion and leadership to the sector. It has the responsibility *to identify current and emerging skill needs and developing “nowcasting” (?) capability to understand the state of the labour market in almost real-time*. It has no particular brief to look at gender segregation. Indeed, its brief cements the [government’s commitment to the failed VET market](#).

Two further programs to receive funding include: the [Skills for Education and Employment program](#), with \$49.5 million over two years for up to an additional 14,485 places. This will give new job seekers access to foundation level language, literacy and numeracy skills training; and \$29.6 million for the ongoing work of the [National Careers Institute](#) (NCI). The NCI will promote partnerships between industry and education and training providers through activities such as its Partnerships Grant Program. Both of these programs have potential to provide support for women and girls.

Recommendations

1. The brief of the National Skills Commission should be expanded to include the identification of occupational areas into which women may be attracted to diversify their occupational choices aiming for more economic security and closing the gender pay gap.
2. Women should be added to the list of Equity Groups in the **AAIP Guidelines**.
3. The National Skill Needs List and the Occupational Skill Shortage Information should be kept under constant review and the responsibility for the compilation of these two lists brought under one jurisdiction. There should be data accompanying the lists showing numbers of males and females employed in the occupations as a guide to employers and potential trainees and apprentices as well as VET providers planning courses provision and establishing priorities.
4. **Revitalising TAFE campuses across Australia** program should be adequately funded so that the public VET provider can fulfil its community service obligations and provide the targeted programs for women of diverse backgrounds with appropriate specialist student support.
5. Women and girls needs should be explicit in all VET funding policy, with all VET-related legislation and programs being accompanied by a requirement for women’s impact statement to ensure that programs are equitable and inclusive. The data should be annually published in the **Women’s Economic Security Statement**.
6. VET Student Loans Statistical report should include gender disaggregated data.

Budget 2020 – Education: Higher Education

Higher Education Overview

As in 2017, the government has chosen to institute major changes to higher education funding outside of the budget process, most notably through the Jobs Ready Package announced on 19 June 2020. The budget itself is disappointing. It ignores the particular needs of women in higher education, as staff and as students. While the 2020 budget does promise an additional \$1 billion for research, this does not adequately compensate for the revenue lost through COVID-19 restrictions, the Jobs Ready legislation and the ongoing impact of changes made in previous years.

Higher Education

The Budget

The [2020-21 Budget](#) proposes an investment of over \$1.0 billion to safeguard Australia's research sector against the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. New investments in university research and key research infrastructure include:

- an additional \$1 billion in 2020–21 through the Research Support Program to support universities to continue the delivery of world class research
- \$41.6 million over four years from 2020–21 to establish a Strategic University Reform Fund to bring together universities and local industries to partner on innovative reform projects
- \$20.0 million over four years from 2020–21 to establish a Centre for Augmented Reasoning at the University of Adelaide to improve the application of machine learning in Australia
- \$5.8 million in 2020–21 to undertake a scoping study of potential options to accelerate the translation and commercialisation of research, including through new partnerships between universities and industry and opportunities for investments (2020 Budget Paper No 2, p 79).

The Government will also deliver the 2020 Research Infrastructure Investment Plan (RIIP 2020) to continue implementation of the 2016 National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy Roadmap. This will maintain the Government's 12-year funding envelope for national research infrastructure (NRI) and provide funding for four new NRI projects in national research priority areas.

In addition, the Government will provide \$903.5 million over four years from 2020–21 to provide more places and support for students.

JobMaker Plan — higher education — additional support for students and education providers

Payments (\$m)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Department of Education, Skills and Employment	171.2	231.0	173.3	324.9
Services Australia	4.2
Total — Payments	175.3	231.0	173.3	324.9
<i>Related receipts (\$m)</i>				
Department of Education, Skills and Employment	-3.0	4.5	1.1	1.6

The government asserts that these measures will establish new quality protections for the higher education system as it recovers from the impacts of COVID-19. The funding includes measures such as:

- creating disciplines of Professional Pathway Psychology and Professional Pathway Social Work to reduce the student contribution amounts for students studying units as part of a pathway to professional qualifications
- \$251.9 million over two years from 2020–21 for an additional 50,000 subsidised higher education short course places across a range of discipline areas
- \$298.5 million over four years from 2020–21 for an additional 12,000 Commonwealth supported places in national priority areas to further meet demand for higher education
- \$19.2 million over four years from 2020–21 (and \$45.1 million over ten years to 2029–30), including service delivery, to revise the allocation method for the \$5,000 Tertiary Access Payment and to enable universities to administer the payment to eligible outer regional, rural and remote commencing students who relocate for their studies
- \$0.4 million over four years from 2020–21 (including \$0.3 million in capital funding and \$1.2 million over 10 years to 2029–30) to ensure students maintain a reasonable completion rate and do not take on excessive study loads and Higher Education Loan Program (HELP) debt
- extending exemptions for eligible students from paying loan fees under the FEE-HELP and VET Student Loans (VSL) programs to 30 June 2021
- expanding the Tuition Protection Service from 1 January 2021 to provide services to full fee paying domestic higher education students.

The budget confirms that universities are guaranteed their original estimated funding under the Commonwealth Grant Scheme (CGS) rather than their legal entitlement, a measure first announced in April as part of the [Higher Education Relief Package](#). The government has guaranteed CGS payments from 2021 to 2023 as the universities transition to new funding arrangements as part of the Job Ready package. They will maintain CGS funding caps at or above previous years' levels from 2025 at a cost of \$238.9 million over four years from 2020–21 (\$2.0 billion over 10 years to 2029–30).

Prompted by COVID-19

Travel restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic have had a devastating impact on the financial position of Australian universities. According to [the Australian Bureau of Statistics](#), 143,810 international students arrived in July 2019; in 2020 fewer than 40 arrived. Australian universities depend on fees paid by international students to fund research, teaching and other projects. Almost one third of all students in Australia are international enrolments and more than 40 per cent of the sector's annual student revenue now comes from their fees.

Commonwealth funding per domestic student has not increased in real terms over the past decade; consequently, universities have sought to solve their budgetary problems by enrolling more international students and by increasing their fees. Andrew Norton estimates that in 2018, Australian universities made around \$4 billion in profits from international students by charging them 80 per cent more than their teaching costs. The higher education sector could lose around \$19 billion over the next three years. Prestigious metropolitan universities that have attracted larger numbers of international students will be severely affected, but smaller universities and universities in regional areas that have limited resources are likely to experience longer term financial damage.

Faced with a sudden drop in revenue and increased COVID-19 related costs including additional cleaning, student support and transition to on-line teaching, the universities have looked for ways to cut expenditure. To begin with, they cut discretionary spending, paused infrastructure investment and recruitment and froze wage increases. Then they began to shed contract staff and embarked on redundancy campaigns. [Universities Australia](#) has forecast 21,000 jobs will go by the end of the year. NTEU president Alison Barnes has suggested that the true figure is closer to 30,000. Thousands of permanent positions have already been cut and that number is likely to increase significantly in the near future.

Research

Forgone revenue from international student fees will have a particularly sharp impact on research. Most Australian universities have increased their research outputs substantially since 2010 and direct government spending on research has increased, but not by nearly enough to finance the huge expansion in outlays. In 2017-18, Australia invested just 1.79 per cent of GDP; the OECD average is 2.38 per cent. Consequently, the universities have used profits from student fees. In 2008, every \$100 of external research funding was being matched by about \$70 of university own-source revenue; by 2018 that figure had increased to \$103. [Larkins and Walker](#) predict that lost revenue will result in a loss of 5,100 to 6,100 research positions, or approximately 11 per cent of the current research workforce including graduate students and/or staff. Australia's Chief Scientist [Dr Alan Finkel](#), is more pessimistic, predicting job losses of 7,700 related to COVID-19 alone.

According to Larkins and Walker, the amount of discretionary funding available throughout the sector will be reduced from the current 51 per cent to less than 30 per cent of external funding for 2020 and beyond. They have identified thirteen universities as extremely vulnerable. These include the Group of 8 universities, which account for 70 per cent of the research funding and staffing shortfalls. Five others account for 18 per cent. The remaining 25 universities share just

12 per cent cent of the impact. If they are not able to find alternative sources of funding, around one third of jobs lost will be research-related.

Such losses could stall research momentum across the entire sector, damaging the national reputation and derailing careers. Early and mid-career researchers and recent graduates will be disproportionately affected due to the highly casualised and fixed-term nature of the university research workforce. Postgraduate research students work in research while earning their higher degree. They make up 57 per cent of the university workforce. Half are employed in medical research. Many international postgraduate students who cannot resume their studies in Australia and some local research students may look for positions overseas, but others may be forced to abandon plans to work in academia.

The government's response prior to the Budget

The the sharp and sudden decline in the number of international students arriving and the ensuing financial difficulties led the Minister for Education to announce a Higher Education Relief Package in April. The package offered guarantees that:

- the Commonwealth Grants Scheme and HELP funding would be maintained at current levels for the rest of 2020 regardless of enrolment targets
- performance-based funding amounts would not be altered
- new cost recovery arrangements for the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, the Australian Skills Quality Authority and for the Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students would be deferred to 1 July 2021
- full-fee paying students would receive a six-month exemption from the loan fees associated with FEE-HELP and VET Student Loans in a bid to encourage them to continue their studies, and
- funding would be made available for short courses that would enable students to acquire a qualification leading to employment quickly.

In spite of their perilous financial position, public universities were deliberately excluded from the \$130 billion wage subsidy package designed to the economic impact of COVID-19-related restrictions. Between March 2020, when JobKeeper was announced, and May a total of six changes were made to the program to ensure that public universities remained ineligible. Plans to reduce expenditure by cutting staff led the NTEU to propose a job protection job plan which was ultimately unsuccessful.

On 19 June 2020, the Minister announced the *Higher Education Support Amendment (Job-Ready Graduates and Supporting Regional and Remote Students) Bill 2020* and published a discussion paper. The exposure draft legislation was released for consultation soon after. The government framed its arguments in terms of efficiency, economic growth and better outcomes for students, industry and the wider community. In essence, the changes are a continuation of the government's 2017 planned changes that cut funding and began the process of uncoupling funding for research and teaching.

The most obvious change is the reclassification of degrees into economically desirable, 'job-ready' courses and others. Fees for degrees deemed job-ready will decrease as the Government

increases its contribution to the cost, while fees for degrees that do not have a clear vocational objective will rise significantly while at the same time the Government contribution decreases.

Band	Discipline	Annual cost
1	Teaching, clinical psychology, English, maths, nursing, languages, agriculture	\$3,700
2	Allied health, other health, architecture, IT, creative arts, engineering, environmental studies, science	\$7,700
3	Medical, dental, veterinary science	\$11,300
4	Law & economics, management & commerce, society & culture, humanities, communications, behavioural science	\$14,500

The cost of agriculture and maths degrees will decrease by 62 per cent; teaching, nursing, clinical psychology, English and languages degrees will decrease by 46 per cent; and science, health, architecture, environmental science, IT and engineering degrees will decrease by 20 per cent. The cost of completing a humanities degree will increase by 113 per cent. Law and commerce degrees will increase by 28 per cent, but the cost of medicine, dental and veterinary science degrees will not change. Fee increases will apply to new enrolments only.

The Jobs Ready Package specified funding for [regional universities and students, and Indigenous students](#) including:

- \$159.1 million over four years from 2020-21 to provide a Tertiary Access Payment of \$5,000 to eligible school-leavers from outer regional or remote areas to assist with the cost of moving closer to their tertiary education institution
- \$145 million over four years to increase *Commonwealth Grant Scheme* funding for regional university campuses by 3.5 per cent a year
- \$17.1 million over four years from 2020-21 (including \$0.5 million in capital funding and \$13.9 million per year ongoing) to ensure all Indigenous students from regional and remote communities who meet admissions standards can gain access to a Commonwealth supported place at a higher education provider
- \$0.7 million over four years from 2020-21 to gain access to Fares Allowance so eligible students can visit their homes and families more often
- \$21 million over four years from 2020-21 (and \$79.4 million over 10 years to 2030-31) to strengthen the Regional University Centres program by establishing a central support network, evaluation program and additional centres throughout regional Australia
- \$7.1 million over four years from 2020-21 (and \$1.8 million per year ongoing) to refocus the *Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program* (HEPPP) to provide more support to Indigenous students and students from regional and remote areas, including supporting more projects in regional areas to encourage students into higher education
- \$48.8 million over four years from 2020-21 (and \$195.4 million by 2030-31) to establish new partnerships between regional universities and other higher education providers or industry to undertake innovative research projects, and

- \$6 million over four years from 2020-21 (and \$14.7 million over 10 years to 2030-31) to appoint a dedicated Regional Education Commissioner to monitor implementation of the reforms and encourage increased participation in higher education throughout regional Australia.

Little if any of this is new money. It has been repurposed from other areas including the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program, teaching and learning and research.

The [government asserts](#) that its decision to manage enrolments was based on pre-pandemic modelling showing 62 per cent of employment growth in the next five years will be in health care, science and technology, education and construction and it must ensure a supply of appropriately trained graduates. He also announced an extra 39,000 university places for Australian students by 2023; however, the Job Ready package will reduce the main source of funding for teaching, the Commonwealth Grant Scheme, by \$500 million in 2022-2023 compared with the 2019 budget estimate. Total higher education expenditure will be almost \$200 million less than in the 2019 budget forecasts and in 2023-24 funding will fall by a further \$124 million.

Cuts in funding will coincide with a marked increase in the number of domestic applications, driven in part by rising unemployment. The net result is likely to be a reduction in the quality of university education, both in breadth and depth.

Gender implications

Why is this an issue for women?

This Budget does little for women overall, and even less to compensate for the cuts resulting from the Jobs Ready legislation. Australian higher education is a feminised industry that relies upon insecure forms of employment. In 2020 total employment is 57 per cent women and 43 per cent men. In 2019 the [Department of Education, Skills and Employment](#) reported that 48.4 per cent of academic staff were women. Women are concentrated at the lowest level making them especially vulnerable - 54.4 per cent of Associate Lecturers are women.

The reasons for this are a complex mix of internal policies relating to recruitment and promotion and external social factors including childcare and other family commitments (Vu and Doughney, 2007), but casual and sessional staff are usually appointed at this level. Victoria is the only state requiring universities to report the number of staff employed on a casual basis, but regardless of their location universities report numbers based on their own internal figures. There is no agreed definition of a casual academic position and it includes short-term replacement appointments, exam markers as well as teaching staff employed on a series of revolving contracts. The NTEU believes that there are 100,000 casual staff employed in higher education, but this is probably an underestimate - it is possible that there may be as many as seven or eight casual staff making up one FTE position (May, 2011).

Across all disciplines, women are over-represented in insecure modes of employment, being [1.5 times as likely to be in insecure employment](#), but the difference is most evident in science, engineering and IT. As the [NTEU](#) indicated in its submission to the Senate Finance and Public Administration References Committee 'insecure employment is not only about there being uncertainty in on-going university employment; for those employed on serial fixed term contracts there are issues around professional development and many benefits, such as receiving

additional pay for overtime or promotion or appointment at a higher level, are virtually non-existent. Furthermore, staff on fixed term contracts may not be able to access all gender equity and family leave policies, and casual staff and agency staff usually fall outside of these policies altogether’.

Universities also employ thousands of women in professional and general roles – [64.4 per cent of non-academic/professional staff are women](#). Here too, women are concentrated in lower paid administrative positions that are vulnerable to cost cutting measures. Like academic staff, they are ineligible for the JobKeeper subsidy and a substantial number will struggle to find new jobs – some may face difficulties because they lack access to affordable childcare, but older women may find that ageism excludes them from the workforce. This budget ignores the reality [of where women work and the age of women in work](#).

What are the 2020 Budget impacts on women?

The budget’s impact on women in higher education are profound. Female students will be adversely affected; female staff, including postgraduate students employed in teaching and research and non-academic staff, even more so. There is a genuine concern that budget cuts and job losses will be used to [performance manage staff or block career progression](#). Fewer jobs mean that there will be fewer opportunities for junior staff to progress in their chosen fields and those opportunities that do exist may be precarious. Women in STEM fields where men outnumber women, particularly women from diverse backgrounds are likely to face additional barriers to entry, retention, and progression.

Job losses also have [workload implications](#) for both the academic and professional or general staff who remain. Teaching only staff, who are predominantly women, are being asked to take larger classes while academic staff whose workload includes research as well as teaching have had their research capacity reduced. [Larkins and Walker](#) report that journals are already seeing that since the COVID-19 crisis began, submissions from women are underrepresented, especially articles authored solely by women.

The Budget, and the Job Ready legislation, have implications for girls and young women who are planning future careers. Funding cuts have led to the cancellation of hundreds of subjects and in some cases whole courses. In 2021, Macquarie University will discontinue the Bachelor of Mathematical Sciences and several other degree programs. The Gender Studies program will run in the 2021 year, but remains at risk of being discontinued in following years. Monash will no longer offer some subjects in musicology, theatre, business, economics, religious studies, some engineering subjects and some management subjects.

University education will be impoverished for all students, but the impact is likely to be felt more keenly by young women. Around half of the Band 4 courses, the most expensive courses, are ones that have attracted more female than male students. It is likely that many potential applicants--particularly young women from low socio-economic backgrounds, mature age women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander girls and women and women with disabilities--will be faced with a choice between high levels of tuition-related debt and the subsequent effects this will have on their career choices and ability to afford a home and have children or taking Band 1 courses leading to traditional female occupations such as teaching and nursing.

Recommendations

NFAW recommends that the government:

- rescind the Higher Education Support Amendment (Job-Ready Graduates and Supporting Regional and Remote Students) Bill 2020
- provide sufficient funding for transition and enabling programs to meet the needs of all students, not just students in rural and regional areas
- restore per capita funding through the Commonwealth Grants Scheme to a level that enables universities to provide quality teaching and end their dependency on casual staff, and
- fund research and research development to end reliance on international student fees.

References

May, R. (2011). *Casualisation; here to stay? The modern university and its divided workforce*. In R. Markey (Ed.), Proceedings of the 25th Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand Conference. Auckland, New Zealand.

Vu, J. (Chau), & Doughney, J. (2007). Unequal Outcomes for Women Academics in Australian Universities: Reflections on Belinda Probert's 'I Just Couldn't Fit In'. *Journal of Law and Governance*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.15209/jbsge.v2i4.119>.