



Ranking our NSW Universities on Equal Employment Opportunity Outcomes for General Staff 1985-2007

Compiled by: Blake Stephens, Higher Education Organiser
© Copyright 2008, Public Service Association of NSW

Introduction

Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) legislation has been in force throughout the NSW Public Sector for over 25 years. NSW universities were included through a NSW State Government Proclamation in December 1983 and has since worked towards ensuring a diverse workforce that is reflective of our community.

The objectives of the EEO legislation is to ensure diversity in public employment which is reflective of the diversity of the community and to address the inherent disadvantage in employment among women, people from non English speaking backgrounds, aboriginal people and people with a disability.

In November 2007, the NSW State Government decided to remove the requirement to produce separate annual plans and reports on EEO and only require authorities to report through their existing annual reports.¹

This report utilises the last annual EEO reports made to the Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment for 2006-2007 from each of the reporting universities and ranks each university on their performance in meeting the benchmarks set 22 years before.

Equal Employment Opportunity provisions are found in the Anti Discrimination Act (AD Act) 1977, Part 9A², Equal Opportunity in Public Employment. The objects of these provisions are set out in Section 122C and are:

- (a) to eliminate and ensure the absence of discrimination in employment on the grounds of race, sex, marital status and disability, and
- (b) to promote equal employment opportunity for women, members of racial minorities and persons who have a disability.

These recommendations were made by Professor Peter Wilenski³ who argued that diversity at all levels of the workforce, including management, increases the responsiveness of decision makers to the needs of the larger society, particularly those of ethnic minority groups, women and people with a disability.

Part 9A, Section 122B (1) (d) of the Anti Discrimination Act 1997 allows for Authorities to become Declared Authorities to which this Part applies. Declaration is required to be done through the NSW Government Gazette.

Universities in NSW have been required to comply with Part 9A of the Anti Discrimination Act from the 1st June 1985 with Southern Cross University from 1st June 1994.⁴

The original proclamation on 19 December 1983 does not actually set out a list of universities to which Part 9A applies but refers instead to New South Wales institutions listed in Schedules 1 and 2 to the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission Act 1977. With the repeal of that Act, the new Proclamation sets out a revised list as a schedule to the new proclamation itself.⁵

With the exception of Southern Cross University, NSW universities have been required to implement Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plans and produce annual reports on meeting these benchmarks since 1985.

These benchmarks were not time bound however after 22 years we could expect public authorities to have been able to meet and exceed them.

¹ Anti Discrimination Amendment (Equal Opportunity in Public Employment) Bill 2007 Explanatory Notes (www.austlii.edu.au as of 18th June 2008)

² www.austlii.edu.au as of 18th June 2008

³ History of EEO Legislation in New South Wales, www.eeo.nsw.gov.au as of 23 June 2008

⁴ Government Gazette of the State of New South Wales, Number 60 Friday, 22 April 1994, P. 1693

⁵ Ibid

Women in 2007

Benchmark or Target General Staff	Charles Sturt University	Macquarie University	Southern Cross University	University of Newcastle	University of New England	University of New South Wales	University of Sydney	University of Technology, Sydney	University of Western Sydney	University of Wollongong	TOTAL (Ave)
50%	65%	64%	65%	68.4%	60%	59%	62%	57%	67%	59%	62.64%
Distribution 100	85	94	88	95	84	92	92	92	89	87	89.8
Ranking	9	2	7	1	10	4	3	5	6	8	

Women have historically dominated amongst general staff in higher education and these statistics reflect that historic dominance. In spite of this, however, no university has promoted women equally or managed to achieve a distribution index of 100 or above. In spite of EEO legislation having been in place now for over 22 years, NSW higher education institutions has continued to promote men over women.

NSW Higher Education Ranking for Women

Name	Rank
University of Newcastle	1
Macquarie University	2
University of Sydney	3
University of NSW	4
University of Technology, Sydney	5
University of Western Sydney	6
Southern Cross University	7
University of Wollongong	8
Charles Sturt University	9
University of New England	10

Aboriginal People and Torres Strait Islanders in 2007

Benchmark or Target General Staff	Charles Sturt University	Macquarie University	Southern Cross University	University of Newcastle	University of New England	University of New South Wales	University of Sydney	University of Technology, Sydney	University of Western Sydney	University of Wollongong	TOTAL (Ave)
2%	2%	1.6%	4.1%	2.8%	2%	1%	0.6%	1.4%	1%	2.3%	1.88%
Distribution 100	91	n/a	71	67	n/a	67	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	69.2 ¹
Ranking	2	6	1	3	5	7	10	8	9	4	

Much more work is clearly needed in this area with institutions needing to look beyond "Aboriginal Units" to other areas of employment and decision making bodies for inclusion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

NSW Higher Education Ranking for IA & TSI

Name	Rank
Southern Cross University	1
Charles Sturt University	2
University of Newcastle	3
University of Wollongong	4
University of New England	5
Macquarie University	6
University of NSW	7
University of Technology, Sydney	8
University of Western Sydney	9
University of Sydney	10

¹ This figure is higher than reality due to lack of reporting by a number of universities

People whose first language was not English in 2007

Benchmark or Target General Staff	Charles Sturt University	Macquarie University	Southern Cross University	University of Newcastle	University of New England	University of New South Wales	University of Sydney	University of Technology, Sydney	University of Western Sydney	University of Wollongong	TOTAL (Ave)
19%	4%	27%	5%	4.2%	5%	30%	10%	34%	15%	18%	15.2%
Distribution 100	99	95	106	111	92	94	88	93	92	94	96.4
Ranking	7	3	9	10	8	2	6	1	5	4	

Metropolitan universities generally performed well in this category where there is a higher number of people whose first language was not English. Regional universities have a greater difficulty in achieving the benchmarks with a lower prevalence of people whose first language was not English.

Interestingly, distribution among universities is quite high, however more work needs to be done to maintain this with only two universities above the benchmark of 19%.

NSW Higher Education Ranking for NESB

Name	Rank
University of Technology, Sydney	1
University of NSW	2
Macquarie University	3
University of Wollongong	4
University of Western Sydney	5
University of Sydney	6
Charles Sturt University	7
University of New England	8
Southern Cross University	9
University of Newcastle	10

People with a Disability in 2007

Benchmark or Target General Staff	Charles Sturt University	Macquarie University	Southern Cross University	University of Newcastle	University of New England	University of New South Wales	University of Sydney	University of Technology, Sydney	University of Western Sydney	University of Wollongong	TOTAL (Ave)
12%	5%	7%	6%	3.9%	6%	4%	2%	9%	8%	7%	5.79%
Distribution 100	88	101	95	95	91	101	106	95	98	102	97.2
Ranking	8	4	5	9	6	7	10	1	2	3	

People with a disability make up a significant 12% of our population and universities have performed extremely poorly in this area, with an average rate below half of the expected benchmark.

Interestingly, distribution rate are high in some areas when considering the low number of people involved.

NSW Higher Education Ranking for IA & TSI

Name	Rank
University of Technology, Sydney	1
University of Western Sydney	2
University of Wollongong	3
Macquarie University	4
Southern Cross University	5
University of New England	6
University of NSW	7
Charles Sturt University	8
University of Newcastle	9
University of Sydney	10

People with a Disability requiring work related adjustment in 2007

Benchmark or Target General Staff	Charles Sturt University	Macquarie University	Southern Cross University	University of Newcastle	University of New England	University of New South Wales	University of Sydney	University of Technology, Sydney	University of Western Sydney	University of Wollongong	TOTAL (Ave)
7%	1.7%	1.3%	0.4%	1%	2%	1%	0.3%	2.1%	2%	2%	1.38%
Distribution 100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	105	n/a	100	98	n/a	101
Ranking	5	6	9	8	=3/4	7	10	1	2	=3/4	

The number of staff who identify as people with a disability requiring work related adjustment is so small that Distribution here is not indicative of an effective EEO program. Universities are ranked according to the Benchmark first with distribution taken into account only slightly.

All universities have performed extremely poorly in this area with urgent attention needed to improve. This significant resource is effectively untapped and institutions could benefit from investing in this area from the skills, expertise and diverse life experience.

NSW Higher Education Ranking for IA & TSI

Name	Rank
University of Technology, Sydney	1
University of Western Sydney	2
University of New England & University of Wollongong	3
University of Wollongong & University of New England	4
Charles Sturt University	5
Macquarie University	6
University of NSW	7
University of Newcastle	8
Southern Cross University	9
University of Sydney	10

The General Staff Sector Score-Card

How They Went...	Benchmark	NSW Higher Education Sector Result	ABOVE Benchmark or FAILED Benchmark
Women	50%	62.64%	ABOVE
	100 Dist	89.8	FAILED
Aboriginal People and Torres Strait Islanders	2%	1.88%	FAILED
	100 Dist	69.2	FAILED
People whose first language was not English	19%	15.2%	FAILED
	100 Dist	96.4	FAILED
People with a Disability	12%	5.79%	FAILED
	100 Dist	97.2	FAILED
People with a Disability who require work related adjustment	7%	1.38%	FAILED
	100 Dist	101	ABOVE¹

¹ This achievement is meaningless due to the lack of reporting by universities who failed to report due to such low numbers.