



# ***EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE***

## **Members present:**

Mrs LM Linard MP (Chair)  
Mr N Dametto MP (via teleconference)  
Mr MP Healy MP (via teleconference)  
Ms JC Pugh MP (via teleconference)  
Mrs JA Stuckey MP  
Mrs SM Wilson MP

## **Staff present:**

Ms L Manderson (Committee Secretary)  
Ms M Coorey (Assistant Committee Secretary)

## **PUBLIC BRIEFING—EDUCATION (OVERSEAS STUDENTS) BILL 2018**

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**THURSDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2018**

**Brisbane**

## WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2018

---

### **The committee met at 10.32 am.**

**CHAIR:** Good morning. I now declare open this public briefing for the Education, Employment and Small Business Committee's inquiry into the Education (Overseas Students) Bill 2018. I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we are meeting today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. My name is Leanne Linard. I am the chair of the committee and the member for Nudgee. The other members present with me today are Mrs Jann Stuckey, the member for Currumbin and the deputy chair, and Mrs Simone Wilson, the member for Pumicestone. On the phone we have: Mr Michael Healy, the member for Cairns; Mr Nick Dametto, the member for Hinchinbrook; and Ms Jessica Pugh, the member for Mount Ommaney, who is a substitute member today for the member for Maryborough, Bruce Saunders.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to the chair's direction at all times. The standard media rules and broadcast terms apply. I ask that everyone please ensure that mobile phones are switched off or turned to silent mode.

The purpose of today's briefing is to assist the committee with its examination of the Education (Overseas Students) Bill 2018. The bill was referred to the committee for consideration on 15 February, with a reporting date of 2 March. I remind committee members to ensure their questions are relevant to the committee's inquiry and focus on any factual or technical information departmental officers can provide to support the committee's examination of the bill. The program for today has been published on the committee's web page, and there are hard copies available from committee staff.

**FENSOM, Ms Vanessa, Manager, International Quality (Schools) Unit, Department of Education**

**HOPGOOD, Mr Mark, Principal Industrial Policy Officer, Industrial Relations Policy and Regulation, Office of Industrial Relations**

**MOLOMBY, Ms Kate, Principal Advisor, Legislative Services Unit, Department of Education**

**ROBINSON, Mrs Lesley, Acting Deputy Director-General, Policy Performance and Planning, Department of Education**

**SHEPHARD, Mr Michael, Director, Strategic Innovation, Department of Education**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome our departmental representatives. Thank you for coming and thank you also for the written brief you have provided to assist the committee in its consideration of the bill. The bill was considered in the previous parliament and we have the report and everything they had, but your information has been of great assistance. I now invite you to give a brief overview and then we will open up for questions.

**Mrs ROBINSON:** I would like to thank the committee for providing the department with the opportunity to give an overview of the bill. The current bill replicates the policy intent and content of the lapsed Education (Overseas Students) Bill 2017, which I will refer to as the 2017 bill. Therefore, my introductory statement that I provide today will be similar to that given by Annette Whitehead to the former Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee for its inquiry into the 2017 bill.

The bill does three main things. First, it replaces the existing Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996 with new legislation to regulate both school providers of courses for overseas students and international secondary student exchange organisations. Second, the bill amends the Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014 to support the implementation of the

new senior assessment and tertiary entrance systems. Third, the bill amends the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990 to ensure larger retailers in areas where there is no seven-day trading can trade on Easter Saturday. I note the committee has had access to the explanatory notes, the report of the former committee of the 2017 bill and the department's written briefing on the current bill. Today I will just provide a brief overview of the bill as well as highlight the differences from the 2017 bill and the government's consideration of the recommendations of the former committee.

Schools providing education to overseas students are regulated through a cooperative legislative model between the Commonwealth and states and territories. The cooperative model includes the Commonwealth legislation and a national code, the National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018, and Queensland's Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996. Currently, schools must meet requirements of the Commonwealth and the Queensland legislation and be registered on both the Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students—known as CRICOS—and the Queensland register. The Commonwealth legislation requires that the director-general of the Queensland Department of Education must approve schools against the criteria prescribed in the Commonwealth legislation as a prerequisite for CRICOS registration. In addition, the director-general also has responsibilities under the Commonwealth framework for monitoring and compliance.

The current Queensland act does not reflect the current role of the director-general or the expectations under the Commonwealth framework for shared responsibility for regulation of schools providing education to overseas students. For example, the criteria in the Queensland act does not accurately reflect the matters the director-general must consider when deciding whether to recommend a school provider be registered on CRICOS, nor does the Queensland act provide the director-general with any powers to monitor compliance with the Commonwealth legislation or the national code.

Therefore, the bill modernises Queensland's legislation to achieve closer alignment with the national framework. In particular, the bill removes the duplicated requirement for separate Queensland registration, better reflects the matters the director-general needs to consider under the national framework when considering whether to approve a school for CRICOS, and enhances the director-general's powers for monitoring and compliance.

I now turn to the international secondary student exchange programs. These international programs are reciprocal exchange programs that offer Australian secondary school students the opportunity to attend high school in another country and, under similar conditions, students from other countries to undertake studies in Australia. The reciprocal nature of the exchange is accepted in lieu of payment of school tuition fees. All Australian jurisdictions have adopted a consistent approach to the regulation of student exchange programs based on the national guidelines. The bill transitions the current administrative regime to a legislative regime. The legislative regime established by the bill will continue to reflect the consistent national approach to regulation of student exchange organisations. In addition, the guidelines that the director-general is required to make under the bill will be based on the national guidelines, with modifications to reflect Queensland specific laws, such as blue card requirements.

The bill will also provide additional powers of oversight and enforcement, including the power for the director-general to appoint authorised officers to undertake investigations. Many of the students participating in student exchange are minors and travel to Australia unaccompanied. The introduction of a legislative regime will provide the level of regulatory oversight commensurate with the level of risk associated with international student exchanges.

I now turn to the amendments for the new senior assessment and tertiary entrance systems, which the Palaszczuk government committed to introduce for students entering year 11 in 2019. To support the introduction of these new systems, the bill ensures that the Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, the QCAA, has the functions necessary to implement the new systems. The new functions for the QCAA include the endorsement of school based assessment tasks and the development, administration and marking of external senior assessments. The QCAA will continue to moderate student assessments to ensure that results awarded in a given subject are comparable across Queensland schools.

From 2020, Queensland will move from the current Overall Position, OP, tertiary entrance rank to the Australian Tertiary Admission Rank, ATAR, which all other states and territories use to rank eligible year 12 students on the basis for university entrance. The calculation of the territory entrance score will transfer from the QCAA to the Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre, QTAC. The bill gives effect to this transfer of responsibility.

I will now briefly discuss the two substantive changes in this bill when compared to the 2017 bill. The first change relates to clause 66. Clause 66 of the bill provides that an authorised person may ask a person to produce a document or provide information and that a person must comply with this request unless the person has a reasonable excuse. It is a reasonable excuse to not comply with the request if complying would incriminate the person. However, this protection does not apply if the document or information is required to be kept for the purposes of the regulatory regime. The types of documents providers are required to keep under the regime include: policies and procedures for ensuring the safety and wellbeing of participating students, blue card details of relevant staff members, details of host families and financial records.

The former committee recommended that the 2017 bill be amended to limit the further use of information or documents required to be provided under this provision to proceedings relating to the false or misleading nature of the document. However, as a regulator, the director-general must be able to access these documents to effectively monitor compliance. The effectiveness of the regulation and the protections available to participating students could be reduced if the department was prevented from using the documents to prosecute offences created under the regime. However, the former committee's concerns have been acknowledged and the bill has been amended to limit the use of the document or information for the purposes of the prosecuting of offences under the regulatory regime and proceedings about the false or misleading nature of the information or documents.

The second substantive change is the inclusion of the amendments to the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990. Amendments to the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act overhauling Queensland's retail trading hours arrangements commenced on 31 August 2017. In the course of transferring unchanged provisions from the now rescinded trading hours order into the amended legislation, a provision permitting non-exempt shops to continue to trade on the Easter Saturday public holiday in those regional areas without seven-day trading was inadvertently omitted. As a consequence of the omission, all non-exempt shops in the areas without seven-day trading must be closed on the four consecutive Easter public holidays—Good Friday, Easter Saturday, Easter Sunday and Easter Monday. Areas affected are Mount Isa, Goondiwindi, Chinchilla, Kingaroy, Roma, Childers, Bowen, Ayr, Charters Towers, Proserpine, Mission Beach, Cloncurry, Weipa, Nanango, Oakey, Home Hill, Pittsworth, Blackwater, Charleville and Longreach.

The omission of the provision was brought to the attention of the government by the National Retail Association. There was never an intention by government to stop trading by non-exempt shops on the Easter Saturday public holiday in those areas without seven-day trading. The bill will achieve its objectives by amending the act to allow non-exempt shops in areas without seven-day trading to open on Easter Saturday. The amendment will commence on 30 March 2018.

The department's written briefing explains the government's position on the two other recommendations of the former committee for the amendments to the bill and why these recommendations have not been adopted. To avoid repetition, I do not propose to speak to those but I am happy to answer any questions on them. The explanatory notes also detail a number of minor amendments contained in the bill, including amendments related to home education and notification of state schools offering education to mature age students. I thank the committee for your time and we would be pleased to take questions in relation to the bill.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much for that opening statement. I invite the deputy chair to open with questions.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Thanks so much for all coming along this morning. As you understand, we are a new committee. The bill might be an old, refreshed one, but we are a new committee, so we appreciate the opportunity. My first question is in relation to changes around the senior assessment and tertiary entrance systems. Could you outline the transition process for those new changes and perhaps explain why there has been a delay?

**Mrs Robinson:** I will hand over to Michael Shephard from our strategic policy area to answer that question.

**Mr Shephard:** Briefly, in relation to the transition process, the first thing to note is that the two systems are very large and complex systems. The changes originate from an independent review that was done by the Australian Council for Educational Research back in 2014. They found that the present system was still working well but would require some changes over time.

The review provided some high-level recommendations that provided a very useful framework. However, quite a lot of work is required to translate those high-level recommendations and principles into an operable system that will work across several hundred schools that provide senior education

across both state and non-state sectors. Also the recommendations relate to both senior assessment in schools and the derivation of a tertiary entrance rank. Those processes, by nature, tend to be very complex. In any senior assessment process you have the challenge of ensuring that results are comparable across schools and also that results in one subject can be compared and, in fact, ranked against results in another subject. These things tend to involve very complex processes which, by extension, then tend to involve a lengthy transition period.

As you are aware, the initial announcement for the reforms was that they be implemented for students commencing year 11 in 2018. It transpired that because of the complexity involved in translating those reforms into operational systems, all of the relevant stakeholders within the schooling and tertiary sectors endorsed a change to that timetable where, instead, the reforms will commence for students entering year 11 in 2019. As I say, it was felt by all stakeholders that schools and students would benefit from that additional time to be able to familiarise themselves with the details of the new system. Particularly, say, if you were a year 10 student who is looking to select their senior subjects for 2019, it was useful that those students had some further advanced information about how the new systems would operate. That was the primary rationale of the revised time frame commencing in 2019.

In terms of that transition process, as I say, it is a lengthy process. It is also one that will necessarily involve schools and practitioners quite closely. The QCAA have been, for example, redeveloping the senior syllabuses. That is being done in conjunction with senior teachers as drafts are progressively released. There has been some extensive trialling processes undertaken, which has involved over 300 schools. In 2016 and 2017 schools have been able to volunteer to do trial external assessments to give them some experience with external assessment and also to trial the processes for administering those assessments. That transition has involved some of those trial activities. Also in about July last year the Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, who are implementing the new senior assessment arrangements, commenced a very extensive series of professional development workshops with teachers. It is expected that something like 24,000 teachers will go through those workshops to be informed about the new syllabuses and the new processes that are involved. Those transition processes are quite lengthy but also involve quite a high level of interaction with teachers and schools to make sure that everyone is well prepared for the new system.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** You would be suggesting that, in the transition to this, the impact would not be so great on the traditional role that teachers have played in terms of marking in the classroom?

**Mr Shephard:** Sure, yes. As you are probably aware, traditionally Queensland has had what they call the school based assessment process for years 11 and 12. That is where assessments are designed, administered and marked by classroom teachers. The new system will retain that school based assessment. It will complement it with a central external assessment as well. One of the key objectives is to really maintain the benefits of that school based assessment process. One of the really strong benefits we believe—and it was certainly confirmed by the ACER review—is that that school based assessment process really values, supports and enhances teacher professionalism and experience in terms of assessment and assessment expertise. The new system is very much designed to keep supporting that school based assessment process and, in fact, to strengthen it, retain teachers' involvement and allow teachers to exercise their professional judgement in the assessment of their students. While it has been complemented by some external assessment, the idea is to make sure that that only complements school based assessment; it does not unnecessarily privilege that external component, so the practitioners really are still a central component of the assessment process. I hope that—

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Yes, thanks. Just quickly, because I am mindful of time and sharing as well, there were a number of recommendations from the last report. Recommendation No. 4 relates to clause 66. I notice in the report that you kindly supplied for us that you say that the limitation proposed by the former committee is too restrictive and would reduce the effectiveness of the regulatory regime. Would somebody like to briefly address that for me?

**Ms Molomby:** The new regulatory regime has a number of offences in it. The important one is an offence for operating without having an approval. There are also compliance procedures that we can take if the providers are not complying with conditions. If we are not able to take action against providers using the information that we have obtained through the use of the authorised persons, there will be no repercussion for a provider who is not complying with the scheme. We need to make sure that if we are giving ourselves the powers to go in and monitor compliance with the scheme, we can follow up and take action if it is required.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Do you keep a list of people who do not comply? Would the committee be able to get some idea of how many people have not complied or who have had issues against them?

**Ms Molomby:** This might be a question better directed to Vanessa. However, at the moment we do not have concerns with providers not complying, but we do want to be able to have stronger regulatory oversight.

**Ms Fensom:** Our compliance action is linked to specific clients' activities. We would look at an application for a new provider or we would look at a renewal or a compliance audit. Whatever findings we have in the scope of that particular activity—we would take regulatory actions at that point. We do not maintain a list of organisations that we feel have breached those compliances. It is very much a regime whereby we identify compliance—if there are grounds to take further actions from a compliance perspective, we will deal with those at that point in time. That would be things like imposing conditions or looking to suspend or cancel a registration if we felt there were sufficient grounds for that type of action. Once that compliance action has been completed and that compliance has been addressed, we would move on in terms of the registration.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Madam Chair, would it be helpful for our committee to perhaps get an idea of how many breaches there are around this? Sometimes it is really good to get some—

**CHAIR:** Do you have any sense of that?

**Ms Fensom:** We do not. Under the old—

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I do not want to create more work for them, but if they had it at their fingertips it would be handy.

**Ms Fensom:** Sorry, we do not. Under the old legislation that we have been working under breaches were handled in a very different way. We have not maintained a register of those things. It is very much the new legislative regime that would allow us then over time to provide that type of data to you.

**CHAIR:** There you go, Deputy Chair. In a future hearing they will be able to provide that. I invite the member for Cairns. Do you have any questions that you want to ask?

**Mr HEALY:** I have heard that. It is all good. I just want to say that I thought the explanatory notes were sufficient. I have had a look through the document. I want to thank whoever prepared that because I felt it summarised the changes appropriately. I have no issues with what is proposed.

**CHAIR:** I come now to the member for Pumicestone. Would you like to ask any questions?

**Mrs WILSON:** Can you explain briefly why no amendment is needed to the existing modification function under the QCAA?

**Mr Shephard:** That would be to the existing moderation function of the—

**Mrs WILSON:** Yes.

**Mr Shephard:** At the moment Queensland uses a process known as social moderation. They use panels of expert teachers who will look at completed student work and ensure that that work is comparable across teachers and schools. That moderation function will actually continue under the new system. It will continue in a slightly strengthened form. There will be some changes there and the school based assessments—they will do a common type of assessment and they will have a common marking scale. The QCAA will actually select samples of work that are to be looked at by the moderation panels. Effectively, that moderation process will continue, albeit in a strengthened form under the new process. We felt that that still fitted quite well with the existing moderation function.

**Mrs WILSON:** The bill is reducing some red tape for school councils. Were there any other red-tape opportunities considered during this process?

**Ms Molomby:** In terms of the development of this bill, it was really focused on establishing a new regime for overseas students. The other miscellaneous ones were amendments that were highlighted in the year, but we were not specifically looking for red-tape reduction initiatives.

**CHAIR:** Member for Mount Ommaney, is there any clarification or questions you would like to ask of witnesses?

**Ms PUGH:** No, thank you very much.

**CHAIR:** Member for Hinchinbrook? Do you have any questions you would like to ask before I jump in?

**Mr DAMETTO:** Likewise, I do not have any questions. I have been listening very carefully to it all and learning as much as I can about it as we are going through this process.

**CHAIR:** I only have one minor point. I found the information you provided has been really good. The questions I have are more in relation to the recommendations of the former committee. I was unsure of two of them and really want to understand. Obviously, we have not had a chance to talk to them and understand where they might have come from. I am certainly very supportive of what you have said in not necessarily supporting those. I think we did not need amendments in that regard. Your written brief is very good. I just want to give you the opportunity in clarify with regard to recommendation 2, and that was clause 23. You make the point here that it is clear that clause 23 is not intended to be, and cannot be used as, a means of unilaterally taking compliance action against a holder of an approval. It would seem, obviously, that is the crux of the concern of the former committee. Can you just speak to that to provide that additional confidence that that is just not an issue?

**Ms Molomby:** Yes. In relation to clause 23 and the parameters that clause 23 has, it is really a question of statutory interpretation. A bill needs to be read as a whole. There are other sections in the bill that deal with compliance action and outline very specific processes that the department has to take if we are going down the compliance pathway. Clause 23, on the other hand, allows for amendments to be made without prior notification of the approval holder. Clause 23 has a number of benefits. Because of the interaction between the Commonwealth CRICOS registration and the Queensland approval, we might want to be reflecting changes that have been made at a Commonwealth level on the Queensland approval as well. Also there might be approvals that have been put on at a state level—for example, we may have limited the number of students that a provider can take for a period of time and then a site visit has indicated that the provider is very capable of taking on additional students. We can just take that condition off without the provider having to apply to us to say, ‘You came out and inspected. You saw the place was okay. Can you now remove that restriction?’ We will just be able to do that unilaterally. If we wanted to do that without that clause, we would have to go down a show cause process, which means we would have to write to them and ask them to respond as to why we should not be taking that action. It is a lot more—

**CHAIR:** It is largely administrative in nature?

**Ms Molomby:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** On reading it, and having previously worked with one of the Commonwealth regulators in the VET space, it did seem to me that it is really just cleaning up some of those issues around having a co-regulatory system, so from my point of view it made sense. I do not have any further questions, but I will give the deputy chair a final opportunity to ask questions because we do have a little bit of time left.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** We do have a bit of time left, and because we do and because some of us did travel up today, we are going to make the most of this time together. I want to ask you for a couple of examples of authorised persons. I am always fascinated with different pieces of legislation and authorised persons, so can you give me some examples of that? I also notice that the explanatory notes say that authorised persons must be appropriately qualified, which of course is different in every field. For the benefit of the committee can you tell us perhaps what those qualifications would be and who fits into that?

**Ms Fensom:** Authorised officers under this bill will be the senior education officers who are employed within the International Quality (Schools) Unit to conduct audits and compliance activities. Their field of expertise is very much the Commonwealth ESOS legislation and the regulatory regime that comes through that process. We would use the authorised officer powers when we are looking at not so much the day-to-day routine regulatory activities, but when we are looking at stronger compliance actions. We would be sending those officers in on the basis of their experience with the legislation and the sector as a whole.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** The other thing that really puzzled me was the title of this bill, because normally this would be called the Education of Overseas Students and Other Legislation Bill. Is this is a new trend? Is there a reason for this? Because it does help when you are looking up lots of different bills to know when there are other pieces of legislation in it.

**Ms Molomby:** As I mentioned before, when we originally started this process we were focusing mainly on this bill being about overseas students. The long title for the bill also lists all the other acts that are going to be amended. What will happen when this bill is passed and the proclamation is made that commences various sections is that those amendments to the other parts of legislation will come away. As I understand it, once the proclamation has been made and it commences, the first reprint of the Education (Overseas Students) Act will just have the provisions around overseas students because the other bits will be amending those other pieces of legislation and will go into those pieces of legislation.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Is that going to be the way forward?

**CHAIR:** I do not think it is a new approach. It is not an omnibus bill.

**Ms Molomby:** We take advice from OQPC about how we name legislation.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** That is a first for me and I have been here a few years. I have a couple of questions with regard to industrial relations. Why was that Easter Saturday missed for the regions when this act was changed last year?

**Mr Hoppood:** The only answer I can give is that it was just missed. There are more than a few provisions in that old trading hours order. You actually get up to nearly 100 of them. Some of them were basically axed and gotten rid of, some were transferred over and others had minor changes to them. In the course of doing all that work—and there were changes in policy during the development of the bill—that particular provision was simply missed.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Consultation is always very important on all of these bills and Queensland is a very disparate state, as we know. The trading hours debate has been going on for many, many years. Was there enough consultation? Was there adequate consultation? Was that not the reason for missing it?

**Mr Hoppood:** I cannot comment on what consultation was done: I only know the part that I played in it. Whether or not it was adequate I cannot really judge because I was not party to the consultation that did go on. There was consultation about the changes to the bill all the way through. There was a long period where there was a committee formed under the former Speaker, John Mickel, and stakeholders had an opportunity to make contributions and look at the bill as it was constructed at that time, or a draft bill in any event, so there was consultation in the development of the bill.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** That bit was genuinely missed?

**Mr Hoppood:** Yes, it really is as simple as that.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I am sure that with Easter coming up people are going to be very happy to have it back in now.

**CHAIR:** There being no further questions from the member for Pumicestone, is there anyone on the line?

**Mr DAMETTO:** It is all good.

**Mr HEALY:** All good.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I have another question.

**CHAIR:** We will have one last question from the deputy chair.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** If other members had had questions I would not have asked so many but, as I said, we are making the most of this and I am learning. I am looking at the explanatory notes concerning the abrogation of the right against self-incrimination. I realise that this has been debated a little bit, but could someone from the department be kind enough to give an example of how that might happen?

**Ms Molomby:** Abrogating the privilege; is that what you mean?

**Mrs STUCKEY:** 'The bill abrogates the protection against self-incrimination if the document or information is required to be held or kept under a relevant law ...' Can you provide a general example of that?

**Ms Molomby:** Generally, if you are asked a question and that question might incriminate you, you can claim that you are not going to answer the question on the grounds that answering the question might incriminate you.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Any question?

**Ms Molomby:** It depends under which legislative scheme the person is asking the question, but it is a general principle that you have the right not to incriminate yourself or provide evidence—

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I understand the general principle. I was wondering if there was anything specific in this.

**CHAIR:** Are you asking for an example under this act?

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Yes.

**Ms Molomby:** An example might be where they say that all of their employees have blue cards, we might ask them to produce evidence of that. If we want them to show us that they have evidence that all of their employees have blue cards they cannot say, 'I will not show you because I might incriminate myself.'



**Mrs STUCKEY:** That is exactly what I was asking.

**Ms Molomby:** That is where we have abrogated that protection, so they will have to show us. Then we can only use the information that they have provided to us for offences under the act.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** If it is appropriate, Madam Chair, can we get a list of how many overseas students are enrolled in Queensland schools or through providers for 2018?

**Ms Fensom:** The most recent data that has been published by the Commonwealth Department of Education, which oversees the regime, is that in November of last year there were 5,678 students under that full-fee paying scheme. Under the student exchange side there are 144 inbound and 158 outbound students in that reciprocal exchange arrangement.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** Is there a breakdown of which schools?

**Ms Fensom:** There is not, no. It tends to work on pure data across the scope. The Commonwealth release data based on various sectors. They will then tease out the various jurisdictions within that overall data, but they do not take it down to the provider level to identify individual schools. The data around how many students are enrolled at a school tends to be considered commercial-in-confidence, so they do tend to not publish at that level.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** That is interesting, because having gone to—as I am sure other members have—all of our school leaders' induction ceremonies, they have Indigenous and overseas student leaders as well. Some of my schools have 30 or 40 or more overseas students, and apparently on the Gold Coast there are several hundred.

**Ms Fensom:** There are.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** There is obviously a great tourism aspect as well as an education aspect.

**Ms Fensom:** Individual schools do occasionally publish, but that decision tends to be at the school level rather than the regulator coming across and releasing that data across all schools.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** It is not a secret if I want to talk about it in the bill?

**Mrs Robinson:** No.

**Ms Fensom:** No. Each individual school, depending on their program, is usually more than happy to describe the scope of their international student program.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** They list off the countries and do the greetings in different ways.

**CHAIR:** There being no further questions that concludes the briefing for today. I thank each of you for coming today and being available for the committee. No matters have been taken on notice, so I declare this public briefing on the Education (Overseas Students) Bill 2018 closed.

**The committee adjourned at 11.10 am.**