



Inquiry into the CIT CEO recruitment process

Answer to question on notice

Asked by: Mr Thomas Emerson MLA

Addressed to: CIT Board Chair

Reference: CMTEDD - EcoDev

Hearing: 30 March 2026

In relation to: Board Support of Dr McNeill

Question received: 03 April 2026

Answer Due: 14 April 2026

- (1) Why did you – and do you – continue to support and endorse Dr McNeill’s appointment after allegations of misconduct in her previous role were formally substantiated?
- (2) Why, in your letter to the Minister in December 2025, did you state that “misconduct can be minor and it may have little bearing on [Dr McNeill’s] work at CIT”, despite allegations having already been provided to you, and to the Minister, outlining “over 40 categories of wrongdoing”, including substantial waste of public money and misleading parliament?
- (3) What level of deception during a CEO recruitment process would necessitate standing down the CEO, once revealed?
- (4) If Dr McNeill’s Supreme Court appeal is unsuccessful, should she be dismissed from her role as CEO of CIT?
- (5) Have you raised concerns with the recruitment firm about their use of a generic question about breaching the APS Code of Conduct, rather than a broader question about misconduct, in the CEO recruitment process?
- (6) Is it an appropriate use of \$38,500 of public funds to hire a recruitment firm for the CEO search that used a generic misconduct question that was not relevant to the specifics of the role?
- (7) Did you have any level of personal relationship with Dr McNeill prior to her appointment as CEO? Have you developed such a relationship since her appointment?

Tom Rogers: The answer to the Member’s question is as follows:

- (1) The previous Board Chair has indicated satisfaction with Dr McNeill’s performance and leadership as CEO. In addition, the Board has been advised that the CEO has initiated legal challenge to the process and findings and the Board has been guided by legal advice.

OFFICIAL

(2) I am advised that the previous Board Chair had received verbal information from Dr McNeill which indicated that the findings related mainly to perceptions of conflicts of interest.

(3) The previous Board Chair has indicated satisfaction with Dr McNeill's performance and leadership as CEO. The outcome of the Committee inquiry, review, legal process and legal advice will guide the next steps.

(4) As above.

(5) I am advised that the previous Board Chair has raised this matter with the recruitment firm.

(6) I am advised that the misconduct question was not the only opportunity for people interviewed to provide this specific information.

(7) I am advised that the previous Board Chair did not know Dr McNeill prior to appointment and that she does not have a personal relationship with Dr McNeill.

Approved for circulation to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Administration

Signature:



Date: 8 April 2026

By the CIT Board Chair, Tom Rogers