

Group of Eight Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism (EACCA)

Report to the Group of Eight Board

Contents

Chair's foreword	4
Executive summary	6
Recommendations to Go8 universities	10
Introduction	14

Definition of antisemitism	32
----------------------------	----

Regulatory and operating environment	38
--------------------------------------	----

Educative and training approaches	51
-----------------------------------	----

Social media policies	62
-----------------------	----

Complaints and disclosures	67
----------------------------	----

Appendix A: List of consultations	77
Appendix B: Committee's terms of reference	80
Appendix C: Reference list	85

Go8 Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism

Dr Alan Finkel AC (CHAIR)

Former Chancellor,
Monash University

The Hon Dr Annabelle Bennett AC SC

Former Chancellor,
Bond University

Diane Smith-Gander AO

Chancellor,
University of Western Australia

Major General (Ret'd) Paul Symon AO

Senior Advisor,
University of Melbourne

Peter Varghese AO

Chancellor,
University of Queensland

Jeremy Suss

President,
Australasian Union of Jewish Students

Chair's foreword

After the 7 October 2023 attack by Hamas on Israel, antisemitism surged across Australia and within Australian universities. Jewish staff and students in Go8 universities were impacted. Antisemitism was a particular problem in these universities because they are the ones with the largest populations of Jewish students.

By the end of 2025, all Go8 universities had made progress in combatting antisemitism and other unrest on campus. However, the 14 December 2025 massacre of Jews and others at Bondi Beach reinforced for university leaders that more needed to be done.

The Go8 Vice-Chancellors agreed that the next phase in combatting antisemitism would benefit from external advice. They invited six persons with relevant experience in the university sector and security to convene as a committee to investigate options and provide recommendations. The members of the Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism are Annabelle Bennet AC SC, Diane Smith-Gander AO, Jeremy Suss, Paul Symon AO, Peter Varghese AO and myself.

I was honoured to be asked to be the chair of this distinguished group. Each of my fellow members engaged deeply throughout the review. I sincerely thank them individually and collectively. I also thank the capable and hardworking Go8 staff who assisted us in many ways.

We undertook consultations within and beyond the university sector, processed what we learned and developed the independent advice you will read in this report. I thank all the people with whom we consulted for their generosity of time and experienced advice, and I acknowledge the valuable insights of Australia's Special Envoy for Combatting Antisemitism during the course of our work.

Our goals were simple. First, learn about the scope of the problem from the many surveys, anecdotes, qualitative research, parliamentary inquiries, special-envoy reports, research studies and reviews that have already been undertaken, as well as from ongoing work such as the Antisemitism Education Taskforce chaired by David Gonski AC. Second, review the responses already implemented by Go8 universities. Third, develop recommendations to address remaining gaps and thereby support universities to respond swiftly, lawfully and proportionately to incidents when they arise. Our recommendations place particular emphasis on adoption and operationalisation of a definition of antisemitism, clear standards in relation to social media activities, fit-for-purpose complaints mechanisms, targeted and differentiated educative and training approaches, and strong leadership to anticipate and manage events that are outside normal university activities.

While the clear remit of the Committee was to address antisemitism in Go8 universities, we were mindful of the importance of mitigating against all forms of discrimination and intolerance. We have crafted our recommendations in the expectation that, when implemented, they will also contribute to wider behavioural change and standards across a range of problematic and concerning behaviours. To the extent possible, the committee has tried to craft its recommendations in a fashion that will make them of use to other Australian universities.

I thank the Go8 Vice-Chancellors for their confidence in us, and their willingness to share their domain knowledge. We commend this report to the Vice-Chancellors as a pragmatic framework to support continued leadership and accountability across the Australian university sector.



Dr Alan Finkel AC (Chair)

May 2026

Executive summary

The Go8 Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism (the Committee) was tasked with identifying practical, proportionate and implementable actions to strengthen how Australia’s research-intensive universities prevent, respond to and manage antisemitism within contemporary university settings.

The Go8 universities comprise Adelaide University, the Australian National University, The University of Melbourne, Monash University, the University of New South Wales, the University of Queensland, the University of Sydney and the University of Western Australia.

This executive summary distils the Committee’s key findings and recommendations, which collectively are intended to support decision-making by Vice-Chancellors and governing boards (Council or Senate) and to provide a clear line of sight from evidence to action.

Overall assessment

The Committee has reached three overarching conclusions.

First, **Go8 universities have already taken action to address antisemitism**, particularly following the events on campuses during 2024. These actions include changes to protest policies, security arrangements, complaints processes, executive-level engagement and training, and sector-wide collaboration. However, these efforts have not always been clearly articulated, contributing to a persistent gap between action taken and community confidence.

Second, **while universities operate within significant legal and regulatory constraints, improved preparedness, clarity and consistency would materially strengthen institutional responses.**

The absence of predetermined response frameworks increases uncertainty during incidents and places unnecessary pressure on executive decision-makers.

Third, **piecemeal or symbolic measures are insufficient.** Effective responses to antisemitism require a coherent framework that integrates clear standards, educative and training approaches, fit-for-purpose complaints mechanisms, digital-environment governance and visible leadership accountability.

The Committee emphasises that these findings do not call for broad regulatory expansion or disproportionate restrictions on lawful speech and protest. Rather, they point to the need for universities to act earlier and with greater clarity, demonstrating stronger institutional confidence.

Key findings by theme

1. Definitions and standards

The Committee found strong support across the sector for the adoption of a definition of antisemitism as a practical reference tool. However, there is also concern that definitions lacking operational clarity can create confusion or inconsistency in application.

The Committee concluded that any definition adopted by universities must be:

- capable of **practical implementation** within the Australian legal, academic freedom and regulatory context; and
- able to be operationalised through relevant staff and student codes of conduct and related policies.

On this basis, the Committee supports adoption of the **Universities Australia (UA) definition of antisemitism**, which is better suited to practical application within Australian universities than alternative models.

Executive summary

2. Regulatory and operating environment

The Committee found that universities face real and perceived constraints when responding to protests, encampments and other high-risk events. These constraints are compounded when institutions do not have **pre-established response frameworks**, defined escalation points or standing relationships with relevant authorities.

The Committee concluded that:

- universities are strongest when they act from **prepared positions**, not offering ad-hoc responses;
- freedom of speech and academic freedom are best protected when institutions clearly distinguish between lawful expression and harmful or disruptive conduct; and
- consistent, pre-communicated boundaries reduce the risk of escalation and improve decision-making under pressure.

3. Educative and training approaches

Consultations undertaken by the Committee indicated broad agreement that educative and training approaches are essential, but there was also widespread resistance to generic, compliance-driven approaches.

The Committee concluded that effective educative and training approaches must be:

- **differentiated for** students, student leaders, teaching staff, professional staff and senior executives;
- focused on **contemporary manifestations** of antisemitism in university environments; and
- explicitly linked to **behavioural expectations and accountability frameworks**.

The Committee has deliberately avoided prescribing specific training products, instead recommending principles that allow institutions to adapt delivery to their own contexts while maintaining consistency of purpose.

4. Complaints, disclosures and confidence

The Committee found that existing complaints mechanisms across the sector were perceived by students and staff as slow, opaque and insufficiently responsive. In some cases, these shortcomings intensified harm and undermined trust, irrespective of investigation outcomes.

The Committee concluded that universities should implement:

- safe and flexible **disclosure pathways**, including options that do not immediately trigger formal processes;
- **rapid triage** to identify risk, severity and appropriate response pathways;
- stepped, trauma-informed processes that enable early intervention where appropriate; and
- clearer communication, defined timeframes and visible senior oversight.

5. Social media and online harm

The Committee found that social media has materially altered the risk environment for universities, blurring the line between on-campus and online activities and resulting harm. Existing policies and practices vary significantly across institutions.

The Committee concludes that universities must articulate a clearer and more consistent approach to:

- social-media monitoring and escalation;
- online conduct that has a connection to the university community; and
- institutional duties of care in digital environments.

Recommendations to Go8 universities

The Committee's recommendations to the Go8 universities are designed to be implemented in stages, prioritised by urgency and feasibility, and reviewed regularly at governing board level.

In some cases these recommendations reinforce policies already partially or fully implemented.

Many of the recommendations are elaborated further in the relevant chapters.

Governance and implementation

Recommendation 1: Prioritise the recommendations contained in this report according to urgency and achievability, and review progress on implementation on a six-monthly basis, with a view to completing implementation by the end of 2027.

Recommendation 2: Each university should provide an annual report on progress on racism inclusive of antisemitism to its governing board, and this report should be publicly released.

Definitions

Recommendation 3: Adopt the Universities Australia definition of antisemitism and operationalise it through relevant staff and student codes of conduct and related policies.

Regulatory and operating environment

Recommendation 4: Work with the Federal Government to review the *French Model Code on Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom* to ensure it remains optimal in responding to contemporary manifestations of antisemitism, while continuing to uphold freedom of speech and academic freedom.

Recommendation 5: Vice-Chancellors should make principled and timely decisions in response to, and in prevention of, antisemitism.

Recommendation 6: Maintain clear behavioural boundaries, operational response plans, transparent disciplinary consequences and decision-making structures in advance of high-risk events.

Recommendation 7: Treat on-campus protests in the same way as other speaker-based events, including requirements for notification and risk assessment, while working within universities' obligations under state-specific human rights legislation.

Recommendation 8: Ensure that appropriate expert advice on antisemitism is incorporated into existing safety and critical-incident response groups, and periodically review the advice and its incorporation into procedures.

Recommendation 9: Ensure that staff and student codes of conduct and relevant policies are regularly reviewed, provide clear guidance on expected standards of behaviour, and support consistent, fair and proportionate responses to misconduct.

Recommendation 10: When approving and reviewing university courses, consistent with their role of promoting a culture of rigorous and scholarly debate and academic freedom, the academic board, directly or through its delegated authority to faculty boards, should ensure that appropriate balance and evidence-based information to support students in deepening their understanding of complex issues and forming their own views are built into the course curriculum design.

Recommendation 11: Given the legal limits of their enforcement powers, universities should seek to strengthen partnerships with law enforcement agencies.

Recommendations to Go8 universities

Educative and training approaches

Recommendation 12: Awareness and code of conduct education programs should embed worked examples of antisemitism within a broader framework most relevant to the cohort.

Recommendation 13: Implement a differentiated approach to antisemitism awareness and code of conduct education programs for staff and student cohorts, reflecting their roles, responsibilities and levels of influence within the university community. These education programs should be undertaken by student leaders, all commencing students, professional staff, teaching staff and senior executives.

Social media

Recommendation 14: Adopt a clear, institution-wide social media policy that defines the purpose and limits of how online content is assessed against existing codes of conduct and disciplinary frameworks; when the university will respond to, escalate or take action in relation to harmful or unlawful online content; and social media monitoring of university-controlled and external social media platforms.

Recommendation 15: Actively promote appropriate and responsible social media use to students and staff, including the university's social media policy, expectations regarding acceptable behaviour on non-university social media platforms, and relevant codes of conduct.

Recommendation 16: Affiliation agreements with student associations and groups should include clear expectations regarding conduct, including online conduct, that are explicit, enforceable and subject to regular review.

Complaints and disclosures

Recommendation 17: Ensure that formal complaint and resolution processes are transparent and responsive to the needs of all parties, and are resolved, where practicable, within 45 working days from formal lodgement of a complaint.

Recommendation 18: Ensure that disclosure pathways are trauma-informed, culturally competent, appropriately triaged, offer appropriate support and information, and allow for anonymous disclosures.

Recommendation 19: Where disclosures progress to formal institutional action, ensure institutional processes and decision making are free from actual or reasonably perceived prejudice and conflicts of interest.

Recommendation 20: Maintain robust monitoring and oversight of antisemitism complaints and incidents to identify patterns and

address underlying causes, thereby strengthening the overall safety of the institutional environment.

Recommendation 21: Provide regular de-identified public reports that include analysis of trends and drivers of antisemitism and other forms of racism and hate speech, and institutional responses and prevention efforts. Share this analysis with the most senior responsible state police leader.

Concluding observation

The Committee emphasises that addressing antisemitism is not achieved through a single policy decision or symbolic gesture. It requires clear standards, institutional preparedness, sustained leadership and visible accountability.

Taken together, these recommendations provide Go8 universities with a coherent framework to act decisively, lawfully and proportionately; to support affected students and staff; and to restore confidence within their communities.

Introduction

The Go8 Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism (the Committee) was established at the request of the Group of Eight (Go8) Board of Directors following the horrific murder of Jewish people celebrating Hanukkah at Bondi Beach on 14 December 2025. This act of violence occurred against the backdrop of a marked and well-documented rise in antisemitism nationally, including within Australian universities.

Focus

In this context, Go8 Vice-Chancellors sought independent expert advice on how to advance and strengthen their responses. Given the urgency of this task, a reporting date was set for the end of May 2026, with the understanding that consideration of, and responses to, the report will be prioritised.

From the outset the Committee resolved to deliver practical, specific and implementable recommendations capable of making a tangible difference. Its work was guided by the following principles:

- Clear and purposeful, without adding unnecessary complexity or burden to an already demanding operating and regulatory environment.
- Strength combined with practicality.
- Avoidance of unintended or disproportionate consequences.
- Feasibility within a complex and sometimes misaligned legislative and regulatory environment.
- Recognition that Go8 universities enrol the majority of Jewish students and have Jewish staff who were impacted, and therefore have a responsibility to lead the sector in addressing this critical issue.

Accordingly, the Committee agreed that its work would be:

- Focused solely on antisemitism, as specified in the terms of reference (see Appendix B), noting this focus is not intended to diminish the seriousness or importance of addressing other forms of discrimination or intolerance. Rather, it reflects the step-change in antisemitic incidents across universities and Australian society more broadly. It is anticipated that efforts that prove to be effective in combatting antisemitism are likely to inform or have application to reducing other forms of prejudice and discrimination.
- Contemporary and forward-looking rather than retrospective.
- Directed to accountable university environments.
- Inclusive of both prevention and response strategies, together with mechanisms to evaluate and monitor the efficacy of these strategies across Go8 member universities.

The Committee did not interpret its scope to include grant-funded research that might inappropriately be used for activist purposes. The Committee agreed that such matters are unable to be adequately addressed within the scope of EACCA, not least because they involve the main government funding agencies such as the Australian Research Council (ARC), National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and the Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF). It was also our understanding that potentially inappropriate use of grant funding will be considered by the Department of Education Antisemitism Taskforce. However, it is expected that Go8 universities will ensure that management of all external funding will accord with the Universities Foreign Interference Taskforce (UFIT) *Guidelines to Counter Foreign Interference in the Australian University Sector*.¹

Introduction

Scope is accountable university environments

The terms of reference note that “The Committee will reinforce the Go8’s commitment to safe, inclusive and accountable university environments”.

The Committee recognises that Go8 universities range from single-campus entities to large, multinational and multi-campus institutions operating across physical and virtual spaces. This diversity increases the complexity of the settings in which members of the university community interact and in which concerning incidents may arise.

Given the compressed timeframe and the Committee’s focus on practical, implementable recommendations, the Committee has elected to concentrate on the most immediate and common university environments in which such incidents occur. For the purposes of this report, an “accountable university environment” is therefore taken to be a domestic environment within the university’s regulatory remit, being on campus or in relation to an off-campus university event or activity.

Context

The Bondi massacre on 14 December 2025 was a stark reminder of how dangerous hatred can become when it is allowed to fester. This extreme act of antisemitism was a wake-up call for the Australian community and a clear reminder that antisemitism of any kind has no place in our society, nor in our universities.

Universities are, by design, places of learning, research, contestation and debate. They must allow diverse intellectual views to be expressed and debated by students and staff in pursuit of deep and robust understanding across multiple domains, subject to legally and generally accepted limits. These include not permitting harassment and vilification based on national, racial or religious grounds, and not permitting incitement to violence or hatred.²

Universities must be places where protest and dissent are welcome, provided they are enacted respectfully and lawfully. Criticism of governments and policies is

legitimate, but hatred of people because of who they are is not, nor is the blame of a segment of Australian society for the actions of another country over which it has no control. These principles are embedded in codes of conduct and other policy documents in our universities.

Appropriate action to improve the safety of Jewish students and staff on university campuses will also strengthen freedom of speech and reinforce protections against other forms of racial vilification, prejudice and discrimination.

Evidence base and prior work

The Committee resolved to build on existing evidence and expertise to inform its work, rather than undertake a comprehensive review or duplicate material already available. To minimise the burden on the sector and maximise its practical impact, the Committee considered its work alongside recent and ongoing inquiries and reviews, including:

-
- The Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism's ***Plan to Combat Antisemitism***.
 - The Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights' ***Inquiry into Antisemitism at Australian Universities***.
 - The Monash Initiative for Rapid Research into Antisemitism (MIRRA) project at the Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation (ACJC) at Monash University, including its ***Framework for Addressing Antisemitism in Australian Universities***.³
 - The Australian Human Rights Commission's (AHRC) report ***Respect at Uni: Study into antisemitism, Islamophobia, racism and the experience of First Nations people***.⁴
 - The **Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion**, which commenced in early 2026.

Introduction

The Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion published an interim report on 30 April 2026. The recommendations that were publicly released addressed counter-terrorism and police- security procedures, the need to update and implement a nationally consistent firearms agreement, and heightened security at Jewish festivals and events. Although the letters patent that established the Royal Commission include universities and cultural institutions, these were not addressed in the interim report. The Committee is confident that the Vice-Chancellors and their universities will actively engage with the Royal Commission during its ongoing deliberations.

Targeted stakeholder consultations were undertaken to supplement this evidence base and enable the Committee to develop a well-grounded understanding of the challenges faced, impact of incidents, measures already in place and opportunities for further improvement. Most consultations were conducted under the Chatham House Rule, with some participants requesting complete anonymity. A list of contributing stakeholders who agreed to be named is provided at Appendix A.

The Committee observed a high degree of consistency across the evidence gathered, notwithstanding the diversity of stakeholders consulted. This coherence enabled the Committee to focus its recommendations on areas where gaps remained and where targeted intervention is most likely to deliver sustained, long-term benefit.

The Committee determined there was sufficient evidence to establish that antisemitism was present on Australian university campuses prior to the events of 7 October 2023 and increased markedly thereafter. While survey methodologies differ and may be subject to criticism, the consistency and strength of qualitative evidence across multiple sources point to a clear and sustained escalation. This is consistent with an increase in antisemitism seen across the broader community.

The Committee wishes to emphasise at the outset that this targeted focus on antisemitism, as requested in the terms of reference, is not intended to diminish the seriousness of other forms of discrimination. Rather, it reflects a response to an acute problem, with the expectation that

efforts to address a specific form of harm, such as antisemitism, are most effective when embedded within a wider commitment to civility, safety and respect – including the capacity for robust contestation of ideas without negative consequence, intimidation, exclusion or division.

The Committee recognises that addressing these challenges across society is beyond its remit. Nevertheless, the Committee considers that the approaches outlined in this report, if adopted more broadly across education settings, would contribute to strengthened social cohesion and may warrant consideration by the Department of Education's Antisemitism Education Taskforce.

Introduction

Key themes from prior processes

Despite differences in remit and stage of completion, two consistent themes emerged from the recent inquiries and reviews:

- **The need to strengthen complaints procedures for students and staff.** This includes simplifying and improving access to complaint mechanisms, streamlining processes and ensuring feedback to complainants, ensuring independent and impartial assessment of complaints without retribution against the complainant, increasing transparency through aggregated or otherwise de-identified public reporting, and making greater use of alternative dispute resolution processes.

-
- **Educative and training approaches** for staff, students and senior leadership focused on recognising and addressing antisemitism. Recommendations ranged from basic foundational training for all staff to deal with antisemitism to more integrated approaches that embed awareness across programs and curricula, including content that builds cultural, racial and religious literacy and addresses race and racism.

Beyond these core themes, a consistent set of secondary recommendations emerged across multiple reviews:

- **Adoption of a definition of antisemitism.** While most processes recommended adopting a definition, there was variation as to which definition should be used. Notably, the Respect at Uni report underscored the complexity of definitional approaches and encouraged prioritising racial and religious literacy alongside, or in place of, formal definitions.

- **Clearer institutional communication and community engagement.**

Several reviews emphasised the need for universities to communicate action taken to address antisemitism more clearly, alongside deeper, sustained engagement with Jewish communities.

- **Stronger leadership capability and accountability.**

There was a recurring emphasis on strengthening leadership capability and accountability to ensure responses to antisemitism are decisive, timely, consistent, trusted and effective.

- **Improved safety, reporting and inclusion across physical and digital environments.**

Multiple processes highlighted the need to strengthen safety, reporting mechanisms and inclusion across both campus-based and online environments.

Alignment with related processes

The Committee Chair engaged with David Gonski AC in his capacity as Chair of the Department of Education Antisemitism Education Taskforce to support practical alignment, where appropriate.

It is important to note that the Taskforce is considering approaches to combatting antisemitism across the broader education sector, not just universities. The Committee therefore sought to shape its recommendations to contribute to a coherent whole-of-sector approach that builds on work occurring elsewhere and avoids duplication. Taskforce communiques note it is observing trials of the UNESCO *Addressing Antisemitism in Schools* curriculum, incorporating Holocaust education across multiple topics. In this context, the Committee focused its recommendations relating to educative and training approaches on the immediate, practical needs of students and staff within universities, consistent with its focus and remit.

Introduction

Actions taken by the Go8 universities prior to the establishment of the Committee

The Committee was convened to advise Go8 Vice-Chancellors on additional actions that can be taken to address antisemitism on campus. This does not imply that no action had been taken prior to the Committee's establishment.

As outlined in the "Regulatory and Operating Environment" chapter, Australian universities operate within a complex and sometimes misaligned mix of state, federal and sector-specific laws and regulations. These frameworks vary across jurisdictions, and have contributed to uncertainty about the scope of actions reasonably available to address emerging behaviours.

An example was the response to the encampments that occurred on some campuses in 2024. In some instances, decisions taken by universities were subsequently overturned on appeal, reflecting these legal and regulatory complexities.

Notwithstanding these constraints, Go8 universities took a range of actions in the period prior to the Committee's establishment.

These actions included:

- Implementing measures to prohibit future encampments on university premises.
- Reviewing and strengthening complaints and reporting processes.
- Delivering targeted antisemitism training at senior executive level.

- Developing a definition of antisemitism specifically crafted for application within a university context. Given that some universities did not support adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s (IHRA) definition of antisemitism recommended by Australia’s Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism, Jillian Segal, the Envoy asked the Go8 to develop an alternative definition reflecting the essential intentions of the IHRA definition. Developing a suitable definition of antisemitism for use in the university context was also consistent with the recommendations of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights’ Inquiry into Antisemitism at Australian Universities.

-
- Implementing enhanced security measures and protocols; and
 - Working collaboratively with Australia’s Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism following her appointment.⁵

The Committee was therefore tasked with identifying further strategies and actions that could be taken in addition to these measures.

Introduction

Stakeholder engagement and evidence

The Committee first met in January 2026 and convened fortnightly until the report was delivered to the Go8 board of directors on 4 June 2026. It gathered evidence through a structured program of stakeholder engagement, aimed at capturing a wide range of perspectives to inform its consideration of the issues.

Stakeholder engagement included:

- Current and former Australian Vice-Chancellors.
- Current international Vice-Chancellors.
- Current and former Australian university Chancellors.
- Jewish and non-Jewish community groups.
- Jewish university student groups.

-
- Government security agencies and departments.
 - Current and former parliamentarians.
 - Jewish academics.
 - The Australian Human Rights Commission.
 - Go8 university general counsels.

The consultations informed the Committee's focus on five key areas:

- Adoption and operationalisation of a definition of antisemitism.
- The regulatory and operating environment.
- Educative and training approaches.
- Effect and influence of social media.
- Complaints mechanisms.

These areas are examined in detail in the chapters that follow.

The question of foreign interference

The Committee considered whether foreign interference may have contributed to the encampment and protest activity that took place on some campuses during 2024.

Internationally, concerns regarding foreign interference in university settings have increased, with briefings provided to UK Vice-Chancellors by the director-general of MI5 (the domestic counter-intelligence and security agency), reports of international students and academics being targeted by foreign governments in the United States, and findings from the Scholars at Risk Network indicating a global decline in academic freedom.⁶

In Australia, the Universities Foreign Interference Taskforce (UFIT), established in 2019, provides the primary mechanism for coordination between universities and the federal government on countering foreign interference.

The Committee engaged with the Chair of UFIT and relevant government agencies, including the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO), to consider whether foreign interference may have contributed to activity on campuses in 2024 and 2025.

The advice received was that there was no evidence of such foreign interference. The Committee therefore decided not to make a recommendation on this topic. We note that the issues identified in this report need to be dealt with irrespective of whether there was foreign interference.

Introduction

The regulatory environment

In parallel with its consultations, the Committee gave careful consideration to the regulatory environment in which Go8 universities operate.

Each Go8 university was established by a State Act of Parliament except for the Australian National University, which was established by a Commonwealth Act of Parliament. These Acts provide universities with general control over their campuses and establish Vice-Chancellors as the chief executive officers of their institutions. They confer powers to make subordinate regulations and

bylaws, including rules governing student discipline and misconduct.

Go8 universities also maintain policies and procedures, typically given effect through regulations or bylaws, including student complaint processes and standards of conduct. Under the *Higher Education Support Act 2003* (Cth) universities are required to maintain policies that uphold freedom of speech and academic freedom. Each Go8 university has adopted such policies, reflecting the *Model Code for the Protection of Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom* developed by former High Court Chief Justice Robert French AC in 2019.

Often referred to simply as the “French Model Code” after its author, it positions freedom of lawful speech for students, staff and visitors as a paramount value. It recognises academic freedom as a defining characteristic of a university that should not be unnecessarily restricted. Its principles specifically state that lawful speech on university land or in connection with a university activity does not constitute misconduct nor attract any penalty or adverse action.⁷ It notes the only restrictions are those imposed by law, or by reasonable and appropriate regulations necessary for the university’s teaching and research activities, the discharge of the university’s duty to foster the wellbeing

of students and staff, and reasonable requirements over the content and means of delivery of courses.

Universities and their communities are subject to a range of civil and criminal laws, including those addressing racial and religious discrimination, hateful or threatening speech, occupational health and safety, privacy and, in some jurisdictions, human rights protections. In Queensland, legislation has been enacted to prohibit certain expressions – specifically the slogans “from the river to the sea” and “globalise the intifada” – when used in a manner reasonably expected to cause a person to feel menaced, harassed or offended.⁸ Similar legislation has been proposed for New South Wales.

Introduction

In overseeing staff conduct, universities are also bound by employment law, including individual employment contracts, the *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) and enterprise agreements, which commonly contain protections for academic or intellectual freedom.

Finally, the Committee considered the *Inclosed Lands Protection Act 1901* (NSW), which is relevant to all universities in NSW. This Act applies to a range of prescribed premises,

including schools and hospitals, but it does not specifically reference universities. As a result, there has been uncertainty whether a person who refuses to abide by a request from a university in NSW to leave the campus is trespassing. In other states, university campuses are private land, and the rules of trespass are clearly applicable. The Committee considers this uncertainty in NSW is best resolved through amending the NSW legislation to explicitly include universities.

This Act applies to a range of prescribed premises, including schools and hospitals, but it does not specifically reference universities. As a result, there has been uncertainty whether a person who refuses to abide by a request from a university in NSW to leave the campus is trespassing.

In addition to the above, Australia's university sector has faced a significant and rapid expansion of regulatory and compliance requirements in recent years. These include but are not limited to:

- The **National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence (National Code)**. This code, which came into effect 1 January 2026, contains seven legally enforceable standards that providers must meet to effectively prevent and respond to gender-based violence.⁹
- **University Governance Principles:** to be written into Commonwealth regulation through the Threshold Standards regulated by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). Universities will be required to report annually on their compliance with these principles.¹⁰

-
- Establishment of new sector bodies such as the **Australian Tertiary Education Commission (ATEC)** and **National Student Ombudsman**, and expansion of the powers of the **TEQSA**.

In developing its recommendations, the Committee has sought to focus its suggested compliance measures on those most likely to achieve effective outcomes while minimising unnecessary administrative burdens. It has focused on measures that can be implemented within existing governance, legal and operational frameworks, and that reinforce institutional clarity, accountability and confidence.

Introduction

Implementation timeline

While Go8 universities have demonstrated strong commitment through their engagement with this process, the Committee emphasises that timely implementation of the recommendations is critical to achieve tangible and sustained outcomes. For this reason, the Committee considers that clear prioritisation, board-level oversight and transparent reporting are essential to the credibility and effectiveness of their response.

Recommendation 1:
Prioritise the recommendations contained in this report according to urgency and achievability, and review progress on implementation on a six-monthly basis, with a view to completing implementation by the end of 2027.

Communication of progress

The encampments and protest activity that began in April 2024 presented senior university leaders with operational, governance and safety challenges unprecedented in recent decades. In their responses prior to the Committee's establishment, the Go8 and other universities took substantive and significant steps aimed at strengthening preparedness against campus disruption, minimising antisemitism and racism, and maximising campus cohesion.

Despite taking these actions, universities did not always communicate them effectively.

This contributed to a widespread and persistent perception that very little had been done (a perception not supported by the information available to the Committee). This gap between action and understanding underscores the importance of transparency, clarity and confidence in institutional responses.

The Committee therefore considers that the Go8 should increase the visibility and transparency of their response to the findings and recommendations of this report.

Recommendation 2:
Each university should provide an annual report on progress on racism inclusive of antisemitism to its governing board, and this report should be publicly released.

Definition of antisemitism

Recent inquiries have specifically recommended that universities adopt a definition of antisemitism to assist in minimising antisemitism on campus (noting the AHRC’s Respect at Uni report as an exception).

In considering this issue, the Committee identified three threshold questions:

- Whether universities should adopt a definition of antisemitism;
- If so, which definition should be adopted; and
- How any definition should be operationalised to effect meaningful and practical change.

The case for universities adopting a definition of antisemitism

The Committee noted the recommendations from recent inquiries to adopt a consistent definition and agreed the matter did not warrant further review. This decision is consistent with the Committee’s resolution to avoid revisiting issues already subject to extensive consideration.

Through stakeholder consultations, the Committee considered where a definition should appropriately sit. The preferred position of the sector, as articulated by peak body Universities Australia (UA), is for a single, sector-wide definition within the Threshold Standards regulated by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). Such an approach would ensure consistency across institutions.

In 2025, UA formally requested that TEQSA adopt this approach. TEQSA declined. In light of this, the Committee concluded that the most practical and immediately actionable approach is to proceed through recommendations at the institutional level, unless and until TEQSA revisits its position.

Preferred definition for adoption by universities

Multiple definitions of antisemitism have been developed internationally. None have achieved universal acceptance.

The most widely referenced is the definition adopted in 2016 by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), the intergovernmental organisation founded in 1998 by the then prime minister of Sweden, Göran Persson, dedicated to strengthening global commitment to Holocaust remembrance and combatting antisemitism.¹¹

The IHRA definition is a non-legally binding working definition, accompanied by illustrative examples intended to assist users to identify antisemitism in context. It has been used as an educational and awareness-raising tool in a range of settings, including administration, education, policing and the media. It is the definition recommended by Australia's Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism.¹²

In October 2021, the Australian Government adopted the IHRA definition as a policy reference tool. It was not, however, incorporated into Commonwealth legislation, regulations or delegated legislation, and therefore does not have legal force. The Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion has also adopted the IHRA definition to guide its inquiry.

In October 2021, the Australian Government adopted the IHRA definition as a policy reference tool. It was not, however, incorporated into Commonwealth legislation, regulations or delegated legislation, and therefore does not have legal force.

Definition of antisemitism

Following events on campus in 2024 and in the light of universities deciding the IHRA definition could not be operationalised within the Australian university context, the Australia's Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism asked the Go8 to develop an alternative definition suitable for university settings. To do this, the Go8 established an Antisemitism Definition Working Group.

The purpose of the working group was to consider whether a definition of antisemitism could be developed that was not only capable of adoption by all universities but also could be operationalised and implemented within the complex legal, regulatory and academic-freedom environment in which Australian universities operate.

The working group comprised experts in academic policy and regulatory frameworks, history, hate speech and discrimination law, antisemitism and social cohesion.

Following detailed consideration, the working group confirmed the IHRA definition was not appropriate for the Australian university context, particularly when applied alongside existing legislative obligations and protections for academic freedom and lawful expression. While some Go8 universities have incorporated the IHRA definition as reference material, others have found this approach challenging to implement.

The Committee was aware of the following key concerns regarding the IHRA definition:

- 1.** The difficulty of achieving consistent interpretation, given the definition comprises a brief statement supported by explanatory text and 11 illustrative examples that do not cover all the scenarios that have emerged in university settings.
- 2.** Concerns that some examples may be interpreted as protecting Israel from legitimate criticism.

-
3. Ambiguity in the application of examples.
 4. The absence of any explicit reference to Zionism. Given the centrality of the concept to Jewish identity, and the arguably inappropriate use of the words “Zionist” and “Zionism” in ways that have caused distress within the Jewish community, it is important for any adopted definition to include an explicit reference to Zionism.

Recommendation 3:
Adopt the Universities Australia definition of antisemitism and operationalise it through relevant staff and student codes of conduct and related policies.

To address these concerns, the working group developed a tailored approach designed to provide an alternative definition. Following endorsement by the Go8 Board in December 2024, this definition was endorsed without amendment by the Universities Australia (UA) plenary in February 2025 for broad use across the sector. It is now referred to as the *UA definition of antisemitism* (see box). The Committee considers the UA definition of antisemitism to be the most suitable for adoption.

Definition of antisemitism

Universities Australia Definition of Antisemitism

Definition

Antisemitism is discrimination, prejudice, harassment, exclusion, vilification, intimidation or violence that impedes Jews' ability to participate as equals in educational, political, religious, cultural, economic or social life. It can manifest in a range of ways including negative, dehumanising, or stereotypical narratives about Jews. Further, it includes hate speech, epithets, caricatures, stereotypes, tropes, Holocaust denial, and antisemitic symbols. Targeting Jews based on their Jewish identities alone is discriminatory and antisemitic.

Criticism of the policies and practices of the Israeli government or state is not in and of itself antisemitic. However, criticism of Israel can be antisemitic when it is grounded in harmful tropes, stereotypes or assumptions and when it calls for the elimination of the State of Israel or all Jews or when it holds Jewish individuals or communities responsible for Israel's actions. It can be antisemitic to make assumptions about what Jewish individuals think based only on the fact that they are Jewish.

All peoples, including Jews, have the right to self-determination. For most, but not all Jewish Australians, Zionism is a core part of their Jewish identity. Substituting the word "Zionist" for "Jew" does not eliminate the possibility of speech being antisemitic.

Universities Australia **Definition of Antisemitism** *(continued)*

Context

This definition draws from a range of definitions. It draws particularly on the working definition developed by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) and recommendations of Antisemitism Taskforces at Columbia University, Stanford University, Harvard University, and New York University.

Regulatory and operating environment

The Committee's consultations elicited a consistently held view that universities face significant constraints on their capacity to respond rapidly and effectively to protests and other high-risk events on campus.

The Committee considers these constraints to be both real and perceived, and that both require attention.

Real Constraints

Real constraints arise from the legal and regulatory frameworks within which universities operate. These include state legislation, enterprise bargaining agreements, and federal and state human-rights regimes. These frameworks appropriately protect fundamental freedoms, but also limit the scope for discretionary action by universities when those freedoms are inappropriately exploited to harm, intimidate or disrupt. In some circumstances they may create conflicting or contradictory obligations that make swift executive decisions more difficult.

In this context, the Committee considered the operation of the French Model Code, developed to provide shared "umbrella principles" for universities. All Go8 universities have policies that reflect the French Model Code or incorporate its principles.

However, the Committee notes the French Model Code was developed in a materially different political and social context. While upholding core principles, its drafting did not anticipate challenges now confronting universities, including:

- Prolonged encampments and occupations of university spaces.
- Racial and religious vilification such as antisemitism.
- Coercive or exclusionary political demands.
- Conduct that, while framed as political expression, undermines the safety, dignity or inclusion of all members of the university community.

A consistent theme emerging from the Committee's consultations was the need for the French Model Code to provide clearer authority for proportionate institutional action, including support for the duty to balance freedom of speech and academic freedom against actual or potential harm.

The Committee also considered the impact of enterprise bargaining agreements, which outline the binding employment conditions for professional and academic staff at each university. Requirements contained in such agreements can limit the actions available to be taken in response to incidents that occur during a protest or other high-risk event. Understanding the full scope of university industrial relations was considered outside the scope of this report, but the Committee suggests that Vice Chancellors work to align future enterprise bargaining agreements more closely with the provisions of the French Model Code.

Recommendation 4:
Work with the Federal Government to review the *French Model Code on Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom* to ensure it remains optimal in responding to contemporary manifestations of antisemitism, while continuing to uphold freedom of speech and academic freedom.

Regulatory and operating environment

The Committee emphasises that this recommendation is not intended to weaken protections for lawful expression or academic freedom. Rather, it reflects the need for the French Model Code to provide clearer guidance and authority for proportionate institutional action in circumstances not contemplated at the time of its development.

Specifically, the Committee suggests clarifying the Code's duty to foster the wellbeing of staff and students through a single word change:

*"The duty to foster the wellbeing of staff and students ... supports reasonable and proportionate measures to prevent any person from using lawful speech which a reasonable person would regard, in the circumstances, as likely to humiliate or intimidate the other person **and or** which is intended to have either or both of those effects."*

Such clarification would strengthen institutional confidence in applying the Code in practice, support consistent executive decision-making, and better align protections for freedom of speech with universities' responsibilities to provide safe, respectful and inclusive learning environments.

Furthermore, the Code allows for reasonable and proportionate regulation of conduct for legitimate purposes. Reflecting the principle of proportionality, the Go8 universities should adopt clear operating principles to guide decisions about how to respond to situations that may involve breaches of university policy or of the law.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 5: Vice-Chancellors should make principled and timely decisions in response to, and in prevention of, antisemitism.

Elaborations:

- 5.1 Offence and harm:** Under the French Model Code, offence alone is not a sufficient basis to restrict speech. Speech that is merely offensive, and not unlawful, should not of itself attract intervention. However, speech or conduct that causes harm or is detrimental to the wellbeing of individuals or communities, including humiliation, vilification, harassment and other forms of unlawful prejudice, should not be tolerated. Where intervention is warranted, decisions must be proportionate to the harm or risk posed, and directed toward upholding the law, university policy and the university's role as a learning community grounded in human dignity.
- 5.2 Assessment of context and impact:** Decisions should take into account the peacefulness of incidents, the likelihood of policy or legal breaches, the actual or potential harm caused, and the scale and nature of disruption to university operations.
- 5.3 Responses consistent with lawful speech:** Where multiple effective responses are available, none should infringe on lawful speech.
- 5.4 Targeted intervention:** Responses should, where practicable, be directed towards specific individuals responsible for harmful conduct, rather than applied to entire groups.
- 5.5 Calling for police assistance:** Police responses should be requested only as necessary, particularly where protests are peaceful and risks of serious harm or operational disruption are minor.
- 5.6 Support:** Vice-Chancellors should be supported by appropriate deliberative structures and advice; however, they must retain ultimate executive authority and responsibility for decisions taken under these principles.

Regulatory and operating environment

Perceived constraints

Perceived constraints arise when ambiguities in internal policies or the law leave university officials uncertain over issues that external stakeholders and the broader community would see as straightforward.

In circumstances where behavioural boundaries are unclear or enforcement pathways lack credibility, unlawful or harmful conduct has persisted and escalated. Uncertainty about institutional thresholds for intervention has further compounded risk, particularly during fast-moving situations. Experiences shared with the Committee indicate that overly accommodating approaches to protest activity were often ineffective.

By contrast, the Committee heard that clearly articulated behavioural expectations, communicated in advance and enforced consistently, provided decision-makers with a defensible and timely basis for intervention. This included communicating that a process of engagement and notification to university administrators be followed for planned on-campus protests (with narrowly defined exceptions).

Any conditions imposed must be grounded in the university's stated values. They must clearly communicate the process for notifying the university of a protest's time, manner and location. Conditions must be consistent with free speech, academic freedom, and safety of staff and students.

Clearly articulating the university's expectations when protests occur on-campus, guidelines for acceptable posters, and allowing for lawful activity while reducing exposure for vulnerable groups are all important considerations. Such clarity reduces uncertainty during rapidly evolving situations and supports proportionate executive action where necessary.

The Committee notes that measures already adopted by some universities – for example, clarifying that encampments will not be permitted or requiring protests to occur in specific, designated areas – have not met with significant criticism and appear to have been broadly accepted by university communities. These experiences underscore the value of setting clear, prospective rules rather than responding ad-hoc once risks have materialised.

Clearly articulating the university's expectations when protests occur on-campus, guidelines for acceptable posters, and allowing for lawful activity while reducing exposure for vulnerable groups are all important considerations.

Regulatory and operating environment

For these reasons, the Committee considers it important for Go8 universities to enable Vice-Chancellors to act decisively, lawfully and proportionately when serious risks arise on campus. Such actions will be enabled by:

- Clear and accessible policies defining the boundaries between protected and unprotected speech, and protected and unprotected conduct, equivalent to the clear policies the Go8 universities have relating to freedom of speech and academic freedom, and to behavioural matters such as sexual violence or sexual harassment.
- Consideration of the consequences for crossing those boundaries in disciplinary procedures that might arise following a complaint, and taking steps to inform the university community of those consequences.
- Operational plans across a range of foreseeable scenarios that are immediately implementable by university administrations and, where necessary, by police.

-
- Decision-making structures that support rapid, deliberative and accountable executive action.

Such an approach is consistent with responsible management of known and foreseeable risks, and with universities' broader duties to safeguard students, staff and institutional integrity.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 6:
Maintain clear behavioural boundaries, operational response plans, transparent disciplinary consequences and decision-making structures in advance of high-risk events.

Recommendation 7: Treat on-campus protests in the same way as other speaker-based events, including requirements for notification and risk assessment, while working within universities' obligations under state-specific human rights legislation.

Elaborations: Take measures to ensure that:

- 7.1** Protests do not materially disrupt the university's core operations.
- 7.2** Protest posters that are hateful, racist or otherwise unacceptable are removed.
- 7.3** Political expression is carefully managed within the classroom, including the application of protocols that prevent students from making non-course-related announcements prior-to or during lectures. This could include establishing clear principles around "safe classrooms".
- 7.4** University administrators are notified of protests sufficiently in advance to allow risk assessment by the organisers and the university, and relevant planning by the university.
- 7.5** Appropriate security arrangements are in place to maintain a safe on-campus environment, with associated costs to be borne by the university.

Regulatory and operating environment

Recommendation 8: Ensure that appropriate expert advice on antisemitism is incorporated into existing safety and critical-incident response groups, and periodically review the advice and its incorporation into procedures.

Elaborations: At a minimum, such plans should provide for:

- 8.1** Clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- 8.2** Clear triggers for escalating matters to Vice-Chancellor-level decision making, including during emerging or rapidly evolving situations.
- 8.3** Advance engagement with protest organisers, where appropriate, through designated and trusted administrators.
- 8.4** Defined monitoring arrangements and communication lines, including internal reporting and escalation pathways.
- 8.5** A pre-defined response ladder, ranging from engagement and negotiation through to enforcement and, where necessary, policing.
- 8.6** Lawful and proportionate surveillance arrangements, consistent with privacy and other legal obligations.
- 8.7** Regular scenario planning and training exercises with police and relevant agencies to test readiness and coordination.
- 8.8** Rapid access to trusted legal advice to support timely, lawful and defensible executive decisions.

Recommendation 9: Ensure that staff and student codes of conduct and relevant policies are regularly reviewed, provide clear guidance on expected standards of behaviour, and support consistent, fair and proportionate responses to misconduct.

Elaborations:

- 9.1** Reassessment of codes and policies should not be less frequent than every five years.
- 9.2** Reviews should ensure codes of conduct clearly state expected standards of behaviour and align with all relevant policies and legal obligations.

Regulatory and operating environment

Balanced teaching and learning

A concern expressed to the Committee is that some courses do not cover topics with appropriate balance and evidence-based information that enable students to develop a nuanced understanding of complex issues and form their own views. Academic freedom does not absolve academics from presenting different perspectives. The Committee's view is that ensuring appropriate balance in the design and delivery of courses is the responsibility of academic boards.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 10:

When approving and reviewing university courses, consistent with their role of promoting a culture of rigorous and scholarly debate and academic freedom, the academic board, directly or through its delegated authority to faculty boards, should ensure that appropriate balance and evidence-based information to support students in deepening their understanding of complex issues and forming their own views are built into the course curriculum design.

Relationships with police and other agencies

Universities reported that, even where internal policies had been updated in response to encampments and protest activity, effective enforcement often depended on police cooperation, over which universities do not have unilateral control. This reality underscores the importance of pre-existing relationships with local police and other relevant agencies (including between the Vice-Chancellor and senior commanders at the level of deputy commissioner or equivalent), rather than ad-hoc engagement during crises. Ongoing relationships should assist in a police presence on campus when circumstances warrant it.

The recommendation outlined below supports rapid, measured and appropriate responses to campus disruptions by ensuring Go8 university responses are clear, consistent, actionable and proportionate, and that institutional frameworks effectively support safety, dignity and trust across the university community.

Regulatory and operating environment

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 11: Given the legal limits of their enforcement powers, universities should seek to strengthen partnerships with law enforcement agencies.

Elaborations:

- 11.1** Ensure ongoing relationships and regular communication with local police and intelligence agencies to support effective responses if university core operations are disrupted, or the safety of students and staff is compromised.
- 11.2** Ensure that Vice-Chancellors or their senior delegates have ongoing relationships and are able to work cooperatively with police of appropriate seniority, including the deputy commissioner of police or equivalent, to support effective responses to campus incidents.
- 11.3** Prioritise police responses aimed at diffusing unlawful conduct without force.
- 11.4** Provide the police with aggregate, de-identified reports of hate-related incidents on campus to improve understanding, data sharing and to assist in addressing identified risks.

Educative and training approaches

Antisemitism does not fit neatly into the contemporary categorisation of prejudice towards groups, which draws clear distinctions between religious and racial or ethnic discrimination. Stakeholder consultations consistently highlighted that even well-intentioned individuals can struggle to recognise and respond to antisemitic tropes compared with other clearly defined forms of discrimination. As one Jewish student observed, even “people who are well versed in racism don’t recognise antisemitism”. For this reason the Committee found that adopting and operationalising a definition of antisemitism is, on its own, insufficient to tackle antisemitism.

The Committee determined early in its deliberations that some form of education or training is needed to support effective mitigation within university environments. Consultations underscored that these approaches would need to be carefully designed if they were to be effective, rather than symbolic and compliance driven. Several key considerations emerged, as outlined below.

The Committee does not recommend specific products. Instead, it provides examples of approaches that have been tested and well received within the university sector, allowing institutions flexibility in implementation while maintaining consistency of purpose.

Educative and training approaches

Training focus

One approach to combatting antisemitism, exemplified by the focus of the International Holocaust Remembrance Association, is to raise awareness about the Holocaust and the preconditions that led to it. Australia's Special Envoy's Plan to Combat Antisemitism has echoed this approach in calling for Holocaust education to be embedded into school curricula.¹³

While acknowledging the importance of these broader educational debates, the Committee remained focused on its core remit to provide practical, implementable advice to address antisemitism within Australian universities. In considering suitable responses, the Committee

was mindful of the time-poor nature of university students, the constraints of already crowded curricula, and the risk that broad, long-term training programs could be perceived as overreach, leading to disengagement or resistance.

The Committee also noted that other aligned processes, including the Department of Education's *Antisemitism Education Taskforce*, may be better placed to consider broader educational strategies that encompass Jewish history and the Holocaust, in school settings.

Accordingly, the Committee resolved to prioritise training approaches that make effective use of limited time, focus on contemporary expressions of antisemitism and have tangible outcomes.

The need to target the whole university community

Our consultations made it clear that effective training should apply across the entire university community of staff and students to support the cultural change required to meaningfully address antisemitism. Some university Chancellors recommended that training should extend to members of university governing boards, reflecting their governance and oversight responsibilities.

Consequently, the Committee recommends incorporating antisemitism awareness into existing orientation and training obligations for staff and students.

The extent of training and the delivery mode should reflect differing roles, responsibilities and levels of influence within the university community.

Antisemitism education should be embedded in orientation programs for all commencing students, and be part of the training provided to all students taking on leadership roles in the university community. It should be embedded in training for all teaching staff, all non-academic staff who interact with students, and for executives responsible for managing staff and enforcing university rules and regulations. The Committee notes that this approach is likely to have wider benefits, contributing to improved responses to all forms of discrimination and intolerance and strengthening trust across university communities.

Educative and training approaches

The need for differentiation

Stakeholder consultations clearly indicated that training for staff and students should be fit for purpose. To be effective, and to avoid devolving into “tick-box” compliance, training should be targeted to the specific needs of each cohort, grounded as much as possible in examples relevant to individual roles and lived experience on campus.

A differentiated approach recognises that a single, uniform training model is unlikely to be effective across all cohorts.

The Committee was also mindful of the need for training that is practical, time-effective and situates antisemitism within contemporary university settings, rather than treating it as an abstract or stand-alone concept. Embedding worked examples of antisemitism within a broader framework targeted to the specific cohort is regarded as the most meaningful way to achieve these objectives.

Training should be tied to accountability

The Committee considers it essential to clearly link educative and training approaches to accountability frameworks.

For all commencing students, the compulsory education modules they must complete as part of their orientation should be explicitly linked to relevant codes of conduct and the disciplinary processes that may result if they breach those codes. Making this connection clear will reinforce the relevance of training and the consequences of non-compliance.

For students who take on leadership positions within the university community, be it as office bearers within clubs, societies or student government, there are expectations that they perform their roles according to the ethos and codes of the institution, modelling and promoting appropriate conduct within their sphere of influence.

Similarly, staff should understand the training is linked to behavioural expectations and codes of conduct, as articulated in relevant university policies, ensuring alignment between education, performance expectations and institutional accountability.

It is recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 12:

Awareness and code of conduct education programs should embed worked examples of antisemitism within a broader framework most relevant to the cohort.

Student training

The Committee first considered whether approaches applied to other important regulatory standards could be adapted to support antisemitism education. In particular, it examined the **National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence**, introduced in August 2025, which requires all providers to deliver comprehensive prevention education and training to staff and students as part of a broader accountability framework. This requirement is typically implemented through a compulsory online module for commencing students during orientation, setting out behavioural expectations.

Educative and training approaches

The Committee tested the idea of a similar model for antisemitism education through its consultation with Jewish students from across Go8 universities, facilitated through the Australasian Union of Jewish Students (AUJS). Participants acknowledged that compulsory online modules were better than nothing, but cautioned that such approaches may do little to foster genuine understanding or behavioural change.

Instead, they pointed to the “single most effective method”, being “through moments of genuine human connection”. On this basis, they suggested in-person training be prioritised wherever possible, ideally embedded within broader orientation programs to minimise time burdens. They nominated as a successful example the *Brave Conversations* module developed by cognitive psychologist Farid Zaid and historian Daniel Heller at the Monash Centre for Consciousness and Contemplative Studies, at Monash University.

Recognising that many students are time-poor and that in-person delivery is likely to be impractical across the entire student body, the Committee proposes that student leaders receive in-person training, with online modules the default for all commencing students.

Brave Conversations draws on insights from psychology, neuroscience and philosophy to equip students with the skills to engage in respectful, civil dialogue on contentious and sensitive issues, and provides educators with the confidence to navigate sensitive issues in the classroom without avoiding complexity or suppressing constructive disagreement.

Recognising that many students are time-poor and that in-person delivery is likely to be impractical across the entire student body, the Committee proposes that student leaders receive in-person training, with online modules the default for all commencing students.

Student leaders include those elected or appointed to student unions and councils, office holders in clubs, societies and residences, and editors of student media.

Antisemitism training for student leaders should be situated within a broader framework of accountabilities, including financial and ethical obligations. It should encourage critical reasoning and analysis, ethical judgement and the ability to engage in complex and contested conversations without exacerbating polarisation. These responsibilities should be seen as part of the duty of care owed by leaders to their community.

For commencing students, the Committee considers that training modules should focus primarily on behavioural expectations, including how to engage in constructive disagreement and how to recognise and respond to intolerance and discrimination. Within this framework, antisemitism and other forms of prejudice would be included as worked examples.

Educative and training approaches

Staff training

Senior executives expressed strong support for programs that provide a contemporary, practical understanding of antisemitism as it manifests in Australia, noting that such training has enhanced both their awareness and leadership confidence, and was consistent with their governance, oversight and leadership responsibilities. Many reported benefiting from training developed through the Monash Initiative for Rapid Research into Antisemitism (MIRRA) at the Australian Centre

for Jewish Civilisation. This training uses tools such as case studies and testimonies to equip university staff to recognise, understand and respond to antisemitism. Stakeholders regarded such training as appropriate for non-teaching staff in areas such as campus security, complaints and counselling. Council members could also be encouraged to undertake such training.

Academic staff emphasised the need for practically oriented modules for lecturers and tutors, aimed at enabling them to recognise and manage incidents of antisemitism as they

unfold. In particular, they supported training focused on fostering classroom environments that allow for rigorous academic discourse while maintaining civility, professionalism and respect. Within this approach, education about antisemitism would be integrated into broader contextual training through case studies or worked examples, potentially alongside other forms of discrimination or problematic behaviour. Monash University's *Brave Conversations* module was frequently cited as an effective example of this kind.

Similar skills to navigate difficult conversations were regarded by stakeholders as important for student-facing staff, such as in complaints handling, counselling and campus security. Universities should provide specialised, role-relevant training for any professional staff who regularly engage with students, including those in wellbeing, equity, residential, security and student services roles as well as staff who assess complaints coming from across the university community.

Educative and training approaches

It is recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 13: Implement a differentiated approach to antisemitism awareness and code of conduct education programs for staff and student cohorts, reflecting their roles, responsibilities and levels of influence within the university community. These education programs should be undertaken by student leaders, all commencing students, professional staff, teaching staff and senior executives.

Elaborations:

13.1 Student leaders: Should receive training that places antisemitism as a worked example within a broader framework of critical analysis, reasoning, ethical judgement and the ability to engage in complex and contested conversations without exacerbating polarisation. The *Brave Conversations* module was suggested as an appropriate model.

13.2 All commencing students: All students should receive baseline education as part of broader student induction and wellbeing frameworks. For example, positioning antisemitism as worked examples within existing compulsory modules that provide practical guidance on gender-based violence, consent and respectful relationships would situate the issue within a broader educational context. An example of this would be the University of Queensland's *Respect at UQ*.

13.3 Professional staff: Should receive evidence-based awareness training that equips university staff to recognise, understand and respond to antisemitism in higher education contexts. The training developed through the Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation was an example frequently cited by stakeholders for this purpose.

13.4 Teaching staff: Should receive training that supports them to manage antisemitism risks within teaching, assessment and classroom discussions. The *Brave Conversations* module was suggested as an appropriate model.

13.5 Senior executives: Should receive tailored training that recognises their governance, oversight and leadership responsibilities. The training developed through the Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation was an example frequently cited by stakeholders for this purpose.

Social media policies

Social media platforms are now integral to university operating environments. Universities use social media channels such as LinkedIn, Facebook and Instagram to engage with students and staff, communicate institutional activity, and disseminate research, events and public information. At the same time, social media platforms may be used to promote attitudes and conduct that affect campus safety, the wellbeing of staff and students, community cohesion and the institution's reputation. This includes conduct that occurs off campus and is seen as connected to the university community.

All Go8 universities have established policies governing the use of social media, although there are significant variations in their scope and application. At their core, these policies typically require staff and students to comply with codes of conduct. Advice on best practice indicates the importance of maintaining a single, authoritative statement of university policy on social media use, supported by clear guidance.

Go8 universities undertake social media monitoring as a routine risk-management activity, supported by a combination of internal capability and third-party services. Official university channels are actively moderated in accordance with agreed processes.

Monitoring of university-maintained social media platforms typically includes direct review by staff, use of social media management tools, and keyword-based searches in response to emerging issues or complaints.

The duration and frequency of this monitoring varies.

Monitoring of non-university social media platforms typically involves the use of third parties to identify publicly available content that references the university or is connected to university-related keywords, and indicates behaviour inconsistent with university guidelines. Staff and students are generally required to comply with university codes of conduct when referencing the university or linking their online activity to it. This monitoring may be supported through internal capability.

Such arrangements should be sufficient to identify risks to community safety, serious policy breaches and material reputational harm as they arise.

Consistent with legal and ethical obligations, all monitoring should be limited to publicly available content

and undertaken for legitimate institutional purposes. These include understanding sentiment within the university community, identifying emerging risks to safety or operations, managing reputational issues, and responding to harmful or unlawful conduct.

Universities may also become aware of disturbing online content through reports or complaints from students, staff or members of the public, which are then assessed under existing policies and procedures.

Where content is identified as potentially breaching university policy or platform standards, responses may include moderation or reporting within the platform itself, escalation for internal review, or referral to conduct and integrity processes. Conduct on social media platforms should be assessed consistently with other forms of alleged misconduct.

Social media policies

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 14: Adopt a clear, institution-wide social media policy that defines the purpose and limits of how online content is assessed against existing codes of conduct and disciplinary frameworks; when the university will respond to, escalate or take action in relation to harmful or unlawful online content; and social media monitoring of university-controlled and external social media platforms.

Elaborations:

- 14.1** Maintain proportionate, lawful and transparent social media monitoring arrangements across university-controlled and external social media platforms and channels to support timely and appropriate institutional action.
- 14.2** Clearly articulate within the social media policy for students and staff the circumstances in which action may be taken in response to online conduct that has visible and material relationship to the university community, campus safety or institutional integrity.
- 14.3** Clearly define escalation pathways, access to timely advice, and established decision-making support relating to online media matters.

The Committee considered the appropriate scope of university responsibility for online conduct relating to antisemitism and harmful behaviours more broadly, and whether university responses should be confined to university-owned platforms or extend further.

The Committee recognises that harmful content may originate from individuals, student organisations or affiliated bodies using platforms not directly controlled by the university. Consultations confirmed that, in practice, students often follow their tutors and lecturers on non-university platforms, and that student associations and clubs often operate channels on external platforms. This creates a degree of permeability between university-controlled and non-university controlled digital environments, of which both students and staff would be aware.

While universities ordinarily have no power to control content published on external platforms, they do have the latitude to use affiliation agreements with student associations and clubs and codes of conduct and contracts affecting staff to set expectations and enforce standards. Regular review of these agreements is therefore an essential component of effective social media governance.

The Committee acknowledges the complexity of disciplinary responses where conduct occurs off-campus or through unaffiliated student groups. In such circumstances institutions must carefully distinguish between individual conduct and the actions of representative organisations, and assess responses with regard to proportionality, institutional authority and the risk of unintended consequences.

Social media policies

Notwithstanding these complexities, universities have a broad duty of care to support student and staff safety and wellbeing, and to set standards for behaviour where there is a demonstrable or reasonably perceived connection to the university community.

For these reasons, the Committee considers it important that, where they do not already exist, the Go8 universities adopt clear social media policies and escalation arrangements that give effect to universities' duty of care to student and staff safety and wellbeing. These arrangements should enable universities to act decisively, lawfully and proportionately where serious online harm, threats to safety, or significant reputational risks arise and there is a demonstrable or reasonably perceived connection to the university community.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 15: Actively promote appropriate and responsible social media use to students and staff, including the university's social media policy, expectations regarding acceptable behaviour on non-university social media platforms, and relevant codes of conduct.

Recommendation 16: Affiliation agreements with student associations and groups should include clear expectations regarding conduct, including online conduct, that are explicit, enforceable and subject to regular review.

Complaints and disclosures

The Committee's consultations revealed significant concerns around institutional complaint procedures. Further concerns were expressed around disclosures, through which an individual may seek some form of acknowledgement and support without necessarily activating a formal procedure. Consultation noted improvements since 2024, but insufficient to resolve concerns.

Stakeholders consistently emphasised the importance of complaint mechanisms that are clear, responsive, transparent, objective, unbiased and capable of addressing issues in a timely and credible manner.

Consultations revealed considerable frustration among students, staff and senior executives with the operation of systems during 2024, particularly in relation to timeliness, communication and satisfaction with outcomes.

Consultations revealed considerable frustration among students, staff and senior executives with the operation of systems during 2024, particularly in relation to timeliness, communication and satisfaction with outcomes.

Complaints and disclosures

Student experiences

Students identified the following recurring concerns:

- **Complaint systems were often considered opaque and difficult to navigate**, with many unsure of how or where to lodge a complaint.
- **Confidentiality and privacy considerations** could constrain the ability to access external support, including legal or pastoral assistance, during the complaints process.
- **Length of investigations:** in some instances, cases were reported to have taken more than a year to resolve, creating ongoing stress for complainants.
- **Lack of transparency and communication:** frustrations with the slowness of investigations were compounded by poor communication of progress and outcomes. In one case a complainant learnt of the outcome through social media rather than being directly informed.
- **Absence of interim measures during the complaints process:** there were cases where no temporary arrangements were made to mitigate complainant concerns, such as the option to transfer to an alternative class when the complaint was about teaching staff.
- **Complaints were sometimes dealt with by persons who were biased** or where there was a reasonable apprehension of bias, or a fear of retribution from staff.

Staff experiences

Staff also expressed concern about complaints systems being slow and insufficiently transparent, or that they were not always elevated beyond normal reporting lines where there was actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest. From their perspective, confidentiality and privacy considerations were often applied rigidly, resulting in limited notification of outcomes. In some cases, this gave rise to actual or perceived bias or misleading impressions about whether concerns had been addressed, which undermined confidence in the process. Staff also reported that confidentiality and privacy considerations could constrain the ability to access external support. Further, staff reported concern that, in some cases, promotion panels were constituted with members having actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest.

Clear communication, predictable timeframes and appropriate support throughout the process are critical to maintaining trust and ensuring procedural fairness. Timelines used in the complaints process should align with those outlined in the *National Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender Based Violence* (see Standards 5.15, 5.23 and 7.1).

From their perspective, confidentiality and privacy considerations were often applied rigidly, resulting in limited notification of outcomes.

Complaints and disclosures

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 17: Ensure that formal complaint and resolution processes are transparent and responsive to the needs of all parties, and are resolved, where practicable, within 45 working days from formal lodgement of a complaint.

Elaborations:

17.1 Acknowledge formal complaints or reports that meet disciplinary thresholds within 10 calendar days.

17.2 Adopt trauma-informed conciliation for early resolution where appropriate. Such matters should be escalated to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and then, if appropriate, delegated to a senior executive with relevant authority and expertise (for example, a Pro Vice-Chancellor or a Faculty Dean) to promote timely resolution and institutional accountability.

- 17.3** Require regular, clear communication with all parties throughout the process, including updates on progress, delays and next steps.
- 17.4** Ensure all parties receive appropriate support throughout the process.
- 17.5** Communicate outcomes in a clear, respectful and legally compliant manner, balancing transparency with privacy obligations; and, where appropriate, outlining any broader institutional actions taken.
- 17.6** Ensure that any person responsible for handling a complaint is, and is reasonably perceived to be, independent and without prejudice.
- 17.7** Respect and respond appropriately to external legal or regulatory processes, including pausing or adapting internal processes if required, while maintaining the ability to act on immediate safety risks and to continue supporting affected individuals.

Complaints and disclosures

Institutional constraints

University executives emphasised that complaints handling must comply with the requirements of institutions' enterprise bargaining agreements and relevant industrial relations legislation. While straightforward matters can be resolved relatively quickly, universities have limited discretion to expedite timeframes where external due-process requirements apply. The involvement of legal representatives has, in some cases, added significantly to the time taken.

While straightforward matters can be resolved relatively quickly, universities have limited discretion to expedite timeframes where external due-process requirements apply.

Steps taken by Go8 universities

Go8 Vice-Chancellors reported making a number of changes to complaints systems following the issues that arose on campus in 2024. These included:

- **Enhancing the accessibility of complaints reporting systems**, such as providing prominent links to complaints mechanisms on university websites, and drafting policies and procedures in plain English.
- **Implementing preventative measures** to reduce opportunities for conflict in settings where individuals cannot easily disengage, such as prohibiting students from addressing peers or making announcements at the start of a lecture or tutorial.
- **Introducing a triage system** to enable the rapid resolution of straightforward complaints, alongside appropriate escalation and management of more complex matters.

-
- **Adopting a trauma-informed approach to complaints resolution**, capable of being initiated pending a formal due process where a complaint is assessed as *prima facie bona fide* and classroom-level intervention is required. This has allowed for earlier intervention to address and halt problematic behaviour, including escalation to senior leadership, often to a Deputy Vice-Chancellor who then can delegate to an appropriate senior person (such as a Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor).
 - **Including an “immediate corrective action”** provision within complaints processes, enabling universities to take prompt action where there is an identified risk to staff or student safety. That is, where a complaint is assessed as *prima facie bona fide*, the respondent to the complaint is suspended pending the outcome of the investigation of the complaint.

Disclosures and formal institutional processes

A disclosure represents the initial point of engagement. While a disclosure may progress to a formal complaint, in some cases it does not.

A disclosure is the starting point for the university to provide support, advice and assistance that does not necessarily trigger a formal complaint mechanism.

Disclosures can be an important source of information for institutions, offering insight into individual experiences, emerging risks and broader patterns of harm. Disclosure pathways should be accessible and trusted to encourage individuals to come forward and enable more informed and coordinated institutional responses.

There is benefit in centralising the management of disclosures, with appropriately trained specialist staff. This can help ensure trauma-informed and culturally competent responses.

Complaints and disclosures

It also supports more consistent risk assessment and decision-making, reducing the risk of inconsistent data collection, perceptions of conflicts of interest or bias, and misjudgements that lead to responses being either too light or too heavy-handed.

It is important that universities provide accessible, trauma-informed pathways for individuals to disclose incidents without automatically activating formal complaint procedures, ensuring they retain agency and are supported to make informed decisions about next steps. These pathways should not automatically trigger formal processes but instead provide clear options, appropriate support and the flexibility to respond to varying levels of risk and complexity.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 18:
Ensure that disclosure pathways are trauma-informed, culturally competent, appropriately triaged, offer appropriate support and information, and allow for anonymous disclosures.

Recommendation 19: Where disclosures progress to formal institutional action, ensure institutional processes and decision making are free from actual or reasonably perceived prejudice and conflicts of interest.

Elaborations

- 19.1** Clearly articulate how disclosures transition into formal processes, including criteria for progression, the process stages, and decision-making authority;
- 19.2** Ensure any person charged with investigating or determining a formal process is, and reasonably perceived to be, independent and without prejudice;
- 19.3** Include mechanisms to identify and manage actual or perceived conflicts of interest, including separation from local reporting lines where appropriate; and
- 19.4** Ensure academic promotion panels are independent, and actively manage actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Complaints and disclosures

Disclosures, formal complaints and disciplinary processes provide insights into the experiences of university community members, as well as data to manage systemic risks and identify opportunities for preventative measures. When effectively captured and analysed, this information can inform institutional strategy and support continuous improvement in both policy and practice.

It is therefore recommended that Go8 universities adopt the following where they have not already done so:

Recommendation 20:
Maintain robust monitoring and oversight of antisemitism complaints and incidents to identify patterns and address underlying causes, thereby strengthening the overall safety of the institutional environment.

Recommendation 21:
Provide regular de-identified public reports that include analysis of trends and drivers of antisemitism and other forms of racism and hate speech, and institutional responses and prevention efforts. Share this analysis with the most senior responsible state police leader.

Appendix A:

List of consultations

The Committee's deliberations were informed by extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders within and beyond the higher-education sector. A number of participants requested that their contributions remain confidential. The individuals and organisations listed below consented to being acknowledged in this report.

The Committee extends its sincere thanks to all individuals and organisations who contributed to its work, whether acknowledged here or not. Their insights and experience were integral to shaping the analysis and recommendations contained herein.

- Dr Michael Abrahams-Sprod, Special Advisor to the Vice Chancellor and President, The University of Sydney
- The Australian Academic Alliance Against Antisemitism (5As)
- The Australian Security Intelligence Organisation
- The Hon Julie Bishop, former Chancellor, Australian National University
- Tahli Blicblau, Chief Executive Officer, The Dor Foundation
- Board of Directors, Group of Eight, Australia
- Mr Josh Burns MP, Member for Macnamara
- Ms Pauline Carr, Chancellor, Adelaide University
- Dr Megan Clark AC, Chancellor, Monash University
- Commonwealth Department of Home Affairs
- Commonwealth eSafety Commission

Appendix A: List of consultations

- Tony Cook PSM, Secretary, Commonwealth Department of Education
- Executive Council of Australian Jewry
- Dr Breann Fallon, Chief Executive Officer, Melbourne Holocaust Museum
- Ms Holly Feldman, Australasian Union of Jewish Students
- Ms Lorraine Finlay, Human Rights Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission
- Representatives from the General Counsels, Group of Eight, Australia
- Professor Kath Gelber, Deputy Executive Dean and Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, University of Queensland
- Dr Helen Gniel, Monash University
- Ms Liat Granot, Australasian Union of Jewish Students
- Dr Daniel Heller, Senior Lecturer and Co-Director, Brave Conversations Project, Monash University
- Professor Peter Høj AC FAA FTSE FNAI(US), former Vice-Chancellor, University of Adelaide
- Ms Judith Lawrence, Director of Education, Holocaust Institute of Western Australia
- Mr Noah Loven, Australasian Union of Jewish Students
- Dr Andy Marks, Executive Director, Australian Technology Network of Universities
- Mr Warwick Negus, Chancellor, University of New South Wales

-
- Emeritus Professor Mary O’Kane AC
 - Professor Steven Pinker, Johnstone Family Professor of Psychology, Harvard University
 - Professor John Pollaers OAM, Chair, University Chancellors Council; Chancellor, Swinburne University of Technology
 - Professor Steven Praver FAA, University of Melbourne
 - Associate Professor Josh Roose, Director, Research and Policy, The Dor Foundation
 - Professor H. Deep Saini, President and Vice-Chancellor, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
 - Mr Luke Sheehy, Chief Executive Officer, Universities Australia
 - Associate Professor David Slucki, Director, Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation, Monash University
 - Ms Allegra Spender MP, Federal Member for Wentworth
 - Mr Kevin Sumption, PSM, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Jewish Museum
 - Mr David Thodey AO FTSE FAICD, Chancellor, University of Sydney
 - Professor Jennifer Westacott AC, Chancellor, Western Sydney University
 - Professor Alex Zelinsky, Vice-Chancellor and President, The University of Newcastle; Chair, Australian Technology Network of Universities
 - Mr Mike Zervos OAM, Chief Executive Officer, Courage to Care (Victoria) Inc
 - The Zionist Federation of Australia

Appendix B: Committee's terms of reference

Group of Eight Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism

Purpose

The Group of Eight (Go8) Expert Advisory Committee on Combatting Antisemitism ('the Committee') is established to provide expert guidance, advice and recommendations to the Go8 universities in their response to antisemitism, ensuring consideration of the recommendations of the report of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights Inquiry into Antisemitism at Australian Universities and the Special Envoy's Plan to Combat Antisemitism produced by Australia's Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism (ASECA). The Committee will reinforce the Go8's commitment to safe, inclusive, and accountable university environments.

The Committee operates under the authority of the Go8 Board.

Objectives

- Review and assess the recommendations from the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights Inquiry and the ASECA Report relevant to universities.
- Advise on the Go8 member universities policy, governance and engagement strategies to address antisemitism.
- Recommend frameworks for effective implementation of response strategies.
- Recommend procedures for evaluating and monitoring the efficacy of these strategies across Go8 member universities.
- Ensure transparency and accountability in Go8's actions and reporting.

Appendix B: Committee's terms of reference

Term and deliverables

- The Committee will operate from January to June 2026.
- A comprehensive report, including recommendations and a sector-leading roadmap, will be delivered to the Go8 Board by May 2026.
- The Committee's term may be extended only with explicit approval from both the Committee and the Go8 Board to complete outstanding work.

Scope of work

- Assess current Go8 policies and practices for alignment with sector recommendations.
- Identify gaps and propose actionable measures to address antisemitism.
- Develop a roadmap positioning the Go8 as a sector leader in developing and implementing best practice antisemitism prevention and response strategies.
- Monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the roadmap and related actions.

Membership and support

- The Committee will be supported by a dedicated full-time equivalent (FTE) resource, provided by the Go8 Directorate, to ensure timely delivery of all workstreams and reporting requirements.
- The Committee will report through the Chair directly to the Go8 Board.
- Secretariat support will be provided by the Go8 Directorate.

Membership will comprise the following:

- **Dr Alan Finkel AC** – former Chief Scientist and former Chancellor of Monash University.
- **Dr Annabelle Bennett AC SC** – former Federal Court Judge and former Chancellor of Bond University.
- **Diane Smith-Gander AO** – Chancellor of University of Western Australia.
- **Jeremy Suss** – President of the Australasian Union of Jewish Students.
- **Major General Paul Symon AO (Ret'd)** – former Director-General of the Australian Secret Intelligence Service, Co-Chair of the Group of Eight Defence and Security Committee, Strategic Adviser, University of Melbourne.
- **Peter Varghese AO** – former Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Chancellor of the University of Queensland.

Appendix B: Committee's terms of reference

Governance and operations

- The Committee will have a Chair appointed by the Go8 Board.
- Decisions will be made by consensus wherever possible.
If a vote is required, it will be determined by a simple majority.
- Meetings will require a quorum of a simple majority of members for decision-making.
- The Committee will undertake out-of-session work as required to meet deliverable deadlines.

Appendix C:

Reference list

1. Commonwealth of Australia, Department of Education, *Guidelines to Counter Foreign Interference in the Australian University Sector*, <https://www.education.gov.au/countering-foreign-interference-australian-university-sector/guidelines-counter-foreign-interference-australian-university-sector> [PAGE 15]
 2. Smith-Gander, D., and Chakma, A. (2025), “As Leaders of Universities, We Demand an Antisemitism Royal Commission”, *Australian Financial Review*, <https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/as-leaders-of-universities-we-demand-an-antisemitism-royal-commission-20251229-p5nqjn> [PAGE 16]
 3. Slucki, D., Rezaei, M., and Harsel, N., (2025), *A Framework for Addressing Antisemitism in Australian Universities*, Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation, Monash University, p9, https://www.monash.edu/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/4193408/Antisemitism-at-Australian-Universities-MIRRA-Report.pdf [PAGE 17]
 4. Australian Human Rights Commission (2026), *Respect at Uni: Study into Antisemitism, Islamophobia, Racism and the Experience of First Nations People*, <https://humanrights.gov.au/media/documents-files-PDFs/strategic-communications/Racism-at-Uni-Report.pdf> [PAGE 17]
 5. Group of Eight (2025). *Media Release: Go8 Expert Oversight and Implementation Committee on Antisemitism*, <https://go8.edu.au/media-release-go8-expert-oversight-and-implementation-committee-on-antisemitism>
- Group of Eight (2026). *Media Release: Go8 Supports Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion*, <https://go8.edu.au/media-release-go8-supports-royal-commission-into-antisemitism-and-social-cohesion> [PAGE 23]

Appendix C: Reference list

6. Williams, T (2026). "OfS to Publish 'Expectations' Amid Foreign Interference Fears", *Times Higher Education*, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ofs-publish-expectations-amid-foreign-interference-fears>

Gorokhovskaia, Y., and Vaughan, G., (2024), Addressing Transnational Repression on Campuses in the United States, Freedom House, https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2024-02/TNR_UniversityReport_2024F.pdf

Scholars at Risk Network (2024). *Free to Think: Report of the Scholars at Risk Academic Freedom Monitoring Project*, <https://www.scholarsatrisk.org/resources/free-to-think-2024/> [PAGE 25]
7. French, RS AC (2019). *Report of the Independent Review of Freedom of Speech in Australian Higher Education providers*, <https://www.education.gov.au/download/4532/report-independent-review-freedom-speech-australian-higher-education-providers-march-2019/6744/document/pdf> [PAGE 27]
8. *Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Act 2026, s7*, inserting s 52DA to the Queensland Criminal Code, <https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/html/bill.first/bill-2026-003/lh> [PAGE 27]

-
9. Commonwealth of Australia, Department of Education, *National Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence (National Code)*, <https://www.education.gov.au/highereducationgbvregulator/nationalcodedevelopment> [PAGE 29]
 10. Clare, J. (2025). *Media Release: Improving the Governance of our Universities*, <https://ministers.education.gov.au/clare/improving-governance-our-universities> [PAGE 29]
 11. International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, Working Definition of Antisemitism, <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definition-antisemitism> [PAGE 33]
 12. Kummerfeld, R., (2022). Gandel Survey Finds a Quarter of Australians Don't Know about the Holocaust, <https://sydneyjewishmuseum.com.au/news/gandel-survey-finds-a-quarter-of-australians-dont-know-about-the-holocaust/> [PAGE 33]
 13. Australia's Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism (2024) *Special Envoy's Plan to Combat Antisemitism: A Policy Oriented Framework for Government and the Australian Community*, <https://www.aseca.gov.au/sites/default/files/2025-07/2025-aseca-plan.pdf> [PAGE 52]