canvass report

Primary Principals:

Perspectives on NAPLAN Testing & Assessment

COMMISSIONED BY:
THE AUSTRALIAN PRIMARY PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION >> APRIL 2013



canvass »
strategic opinion research
Sydney | www.canvass.net.au | enquiries@canvass.net.au

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

Canvass Strategic Opinion Research (Canvass) was retained by the Australian Primary Principals Association (APPA) in February 2013 to conduct public affairs research (research) with Australian primary school principals concerning various impacts of NAPLAN and to provide an indication of other assessment practices used by primary schools in Australia.

Research Objectives

APPA commissioned the research to obtain information from primary principals on the following issues:

- The observations of primary principals concerning:
    - the effects of NAPLAN testing on:
        - student wellbeing
        - Year 3 & 5 curricula
        - Year 3 & 5 classroom pedagogy
        - the school budget
    - the level of parent interest in NAPLAN results and its implications, and
    - how NAPLAN results are reported to school stakeholders.

- Details of current assessment practices in primary schools to:
    - ascertain student achievement in all aspects of learning, and
    - meet internal and external accountabilities.

Research Participants

APPA's membership consists of the state and territory peak groups in Australia for primary principals. Approximately 95 per cent of Australian primary school principals are members of their state or territory peak groups. The combined membership of the state and territory peak groups is 7,200 primary principals (hereafter, the combined membership).

Methodology

Canvass and APPA agreed that an online survey of primary principals would be the most cost-effective method of achieving the research objectives, given that all primary principals are contactable via their work email addresses.

Member databases are held by the state and territory peak groups. Accordingly, in March 2013 APPA prepared an email containing a link to the Canvass survey which explained the purpose of the research and encouraged every primary principal to participate. The state and territory peak groups then forwarded this email to their members. All primary principals who are members of their state or territory peak group were invited to participate in the research.

Follow up email reminders were sent to primary principals to encourage participation. No incentive was provided for participation in the research. In total, the survey was in field for three weeks (7 to 28 March, 2013). There were 1,353 primary principals (the respondents) who completed the survey, comprising almost one fifth (19.3 per cent) of the combined membership. The Canvass Questionnaire forms **Appendix One** to this report.

The findings from this quantitative research with primary principals should be prefaced with the following comments:

- **Not a random sample**: to enable all primary principals to participate, it was a self-selecting sample of respondents rather than a representative sample. However, the results from the survey were weighted (see below) to ensure the findings mirror the demographics of the combined membership of the state and territory peak groups.

- **Small sample sizes in some states and territories**: sample sizes for respondents in Tasmania, the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and for remote area primary schools are significantly smaller than from the larger states of Australia. Accordingly, some caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions from those findings. To this end, we report the specific state and territory results in **Appendix Two**. Where robust differences in findings among the states and territories exist, they are reported in the body of the report.

- **Margin of Error**: the margin of sampling error in the survey varies by a number of factors, including the sample size of the group concerned and whether the difference being considered is within a group or between two independent groups. As a rule-of-thumb, **within the same group**, the margins of error are:

Group sample size	95% confidence level	90% confidence level
1353	+/- 2.66%	+/- 2.24%
1000	+/- 3.1%	+/- 2.6%
500	+/- 4.38%	+/- 3.68%
200	+/- 6.93%	+/- 5.82%

By comparison, the margins of error **between similar sized groups** (eg. Catholic & Independent School Sectors) increase by about half (e.g. for n=500, +/- 7%).

- **Weighting of results to align with sector demographics by state**: To match the achieved sample to the parameters of the combined membership base, weighting was applied the matrix of Sector (Catholic/Government/Independent) by State. The following table shows the target and achieved sample across these two variables:

	Catholic Target (Achieved)	Government Target (Achieved)	Independent Target (Achieved)	TOTAL Target (Achieved)
ACT	0.8% (1%)	0.8% (1.2%)	0% (0.3%)	1.6% (2.4%)
NSW	6.1% (3.4%)	25.4% (13.4%)	1.7% (3%)	33.2% (19.7%)
NT	0.2% (0.2%)	0.8% (0.4%)	0.2% (0%)	1.3% (0.6%)
QLD	2.7% (1.3%)	15.7% (8.9%)	1.1% (1.7%)	19.5% (11.9%)
SA	1.7% (3.3%)	8.3% (9.3%)	0.5% (0.6%)	10.5% (13.2%)
TAS	0.5% (1%)	1.7% (0.1%)	0.2% (0.4%)	2.3% (1.6%)
VIC	3.8% (4.4%)	11.5% (25.4%)	1.3% (2.4%)	16.6% (32.2%)
WA	1.9% (5%)	12.4% (12%)	0.8% (1.5%)	15% (18.4%)
TOTAL	17.5% (19.6%)	76.6% (70.6%)	5.8% (9.8%)	100% (100%)

- **Reporting of ICSEA scores:** Respondents were asked to report their school's ICSEA score. Only 735 respondents (54 per cent) were able to supply a valid number within the range 500-1300. To facilitate a meaningful analysis, these valid scores were grouped into three - Low Scores (500- 931) Middle Scores (932 – 1073) and High Scores (1074 – 1221). These represent 20 per cent, 60 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, of the valid scores. The respondents who did not provide a valid ICSEA score could not be included in this analysis.

- **Quoting Respondents:** Throughout this report, italics are used to indicate direct quotes (also known as *verbatims*) from respondents in their answers to open-ended survey questions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OBSERVATIONS & CORRELATIONS

Throughout the results, there are a number of consistent trends. The most obvious is that **primary principals have differing views on most of the impacts of NAPLAN testing** according to the **location**, **size** and **sector** of their school. Broadly, around half observe NAPLAN impacts and half do not.

The negative impacts of NAPLAN appear to be felt the most by **remote area** and **small schools** around Australia. More **Independent sector** and **very large schools** report positive effects from NAPLAN testing. In terms of competitive stress and parental expectations, the **Independent sector** schools, along with **very large** and **metropolitan schools** are under considerably more pressure than their **government** or **non-metropolitan** counterparts.

Survey results were also analysed according to whether the respondent's school had an **ICSEA score** in the bottom 20 per cent, middle 60 per cent or top 20 per cent of the ICSEA score range. In many ways, the results for **low ICSEA score schools** mirrored findings for **remote area** and **small schools**.

There are a few differences in findings according to **number of years as a principal**. More of the respondents with several years of experience as a principal reported very negative impacts from NAPLAN on **student wellbeing** and more impact on **classroom pedagogy** generally (both positive and negative). However, they did not see greater impacts in relation to the curriculum. They see NAPLAN as changing *the way* students are taught more than *exactly what* is taught.

While there were few **differences between the states and territories** in relation to the impacts of NAPLAN (with the exception of curriculum impacts), different approaches exist in the **reporting of NAPLAN results**. There are slight differences in **levels of parent interest** as well. Accordingly, tables of state and territory results have been placed in **Appendix Two** rather than in the body of the report.

Finally, g**eneral questions** concerning the impacts of NAPLAN elicited more negative results than **specific questions** about impacts. Further research would be useful to understand the basis for differences in the responses to general and specific questions.

PART ONE: THE IMPACTS OF NAPLAN

According to respondents, the greatest impact of NAPLAN is on **student wellbeing**. Two-thirds of respondents say the impact of NAPLAN on student wellbeing is negative, albeit slightly so. For other NAPLAN impacts – on the **curriculum**, **classroom pedagogy** and the **school budget** - opinion is **more evenly divided**: half of respondents cite a negative impact. The other half sees no impact, or a slight, positive impact from the national testing of Years 3 & 5 students.

Stress, Fear of Failure, Withdrawal, Sickness

As a baseline result, **half of all respondents** *sometimes* see students display **signs of stress** or **sickness**, **express fear of failure** or **withdraw** when faced with the tests. High levels of stress and fear of failure relating to NAPLAN testing are a reality for **one quarter of respondents**; ten per cent see sickness and withdrawal from the tests. The negative impacts on wellbeing appear to fall hardest on **remote area** and **small schools**. More **large schools** and **Independent schools** report more positive impacts on wellbeing from NAPLAN, such as excitement and enthusiasm.

Year 3 vs. Year 5

Half the respondents observe that **the burden of NAPLAN testing is harder on Year 3** as opposed to Year 5 students, while 38 per cent see no difference in impact. Those who say NAPLAN is harder on Year 3 say that testing of that nature is unknown to them and different from their every day school work, and that Year 3 children have less emotional/developmental maturity. Respondents also say that parents experiencing NAPLAN testing for the first time with their child can add to the stress children feel. Fourteen per cent say Year 5 students feel the impacts of NAPLAN more.

Impact on Curriculum

In terms of impact on the **curriculum**, half of respondents say their school spends **more time on literacy and numeracy** in the run up to NAPLAN each year. Fifteen per cent of schools spend more than three additional hours per week on those subjects. The impact is slightly greater in terms of hours lost **teaching non-NAPLAN subjects**: 60 per cent say their school spends *less* time teaching these subjects in the run up to NAPLAN, but most of these say the impact is relatively slight (*viz*. 1-3 hours less each week).

Compared to **high ICSEA score**, **metropolitan** and **Independent schools** (which show little change in curriculum or classroom pedagogy) **remote area** and **low ICSEA score schools** alter their curriculum and pedagogy to a greater extent in the lead up to NAPLAN each year. Respondents also point to **high levels of teacher stress caused by NAPLAN** and expectations surrounding NAPLAN in the run up to the tests. Others see national testing as **inimical to the culture and philosophy** of their school.

Class Preparation for NAPLAN & Rote Learning

Two thirds of respondents say that their schools do **allocate class time to NAPLAN preparation**. In terms of the number of weeks' preparation, the amount of time spent varies widely. Of those who do prepare, most allocate between 1-3 hours per week to preparation and say they spend between one-to-five weeks prior to NAPLAN in preparation. Around ten per cent say they begin preparation **more than ten weeks prior** to the tests. This preparation does not necessarily translate to more rote learning. About one third of schools note a **slight increase in rote learning** in the run up to NAPLAN each year.

Impact on School Budget

Half the respondents say that, generally speaking, NAPLAN **does have an impact on the school budget**. Yet when asked about specific costs, one third of respondents reported additional expenditure on those items.

When viewed **according to ICSEA score**, results show that the *higher* the ICSEA score, the more schools report having their budget impacted by NAPLAN. Yet when asked about specific NAPLAN-related expenses, results show that more *low* ICSEA score schools spend additional budget funds on those items. It may be that principals are not directly or closely tracking additional, NAPLAN-related expenses.

PART TWO: REPORTING NAPLAN RESULTS & LEVELS OF PARENT INTEREST

Reporting NAPLAN Results

While all schools report NAPLAN results to teachers and parents, half of schools report school NAPLAN results **directly to students**. Here, there is considerable **variation by state and territory**. Many respondents said that their approach is to **ask parents to discuss NAPLAN results with their child**. While 68 per cent of **Independent schools** report the results directly to the children, some prefer to so individually with each child rather than in a class setting. More **small schools** and **remote area schools** take the approach of **communicating results to students during class**.

Respondents also reported different ways they engage with teachers concerning NAPLAN results, including via **NAPLAN data analysis sessions**, PD meetings and one-to-one meetings with the principal. A number commented that NAPLAN had resulted in **increased teacher skills** in data analysis.

Parent Interest in NAPLAN Results

While there is parental emphasis and pressure on schools in terms of NAPLAN results in highly competitive contexts in the **Independent sector**, **very large** and **metropolitan schools**, generally parent interest in NAPLAN results is fairly muted and focused on their own child's results.

According to primary principals, for around one third of parents there is a '**baseline' medium level of interest** in their child's NAPLAN results, the school's results and teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results. However the focus is really on their own child's results.

Around **half of all parents** have high/very high levels of interest in **their own child's NAPLAN results**. This figure rises to 70 per cent of parents of children at **Independent schools**. Parents of children in **very large schools** also express higher than average interest. By comparison, **small** and **remote area schools** recorded more low/very low parental interest levels. Similar trends are evident for interest in **school NAPLAN results** and **teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results**, albeit at lower levels (school's results: 25 per cent, teacher performance: 16 per cent).

Some parents do consider NAPLAN results relevant and influential in competitive enrolment contexts. **School NAPLAN results** are a drawcard according to **one third of respondents**, who say parents seek to enrol their child on that basis. In the **Independent sector** and for **very large** and **metro schools**, **half of principals** say parents cite their school's NAPLAN results as a reason for seeking enrolment for their child. **A child's NAPLAN results** are also influential in obtaining enrolment, at least in the minds of some parents. Around **one fifth of respondents** say that parents have **cited their child's NAPLAN results** in seeking enrolment. This competitive behaviour occurs more at Independent, very large and metro areas schools.

PART THREE: ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

Principals cite many different types of assessment practices used by their school, some of which are able to be aggregated. These include **commercial/standardised tests, commercial scales** and **Inventories, School-based Tests** and other **School-based Assessments**. Around ten per cent specifically named NAPLAN as a part of this type of assessment for their school.

When asked what types of assessment they would recommend to provide aggregated results for all Australian schools, again principals provided many different types and examples of assessments.

However, the results revealed some opposing views: those who object to the very basis of NAPLAN and those who agree with it. **Sixteen per cent said no aggregable assessment practices were suitable**, many on the basis that 'one size does not fit all'.

Five per cent took the opposite view that **just about any of the assessment practices they listed would be useful** for Australian schools. A small percentage (2 per cent) of respondents was explicitly positive about NAPLAN. They said that NAPLAN results, if used in the right context, provided raw data which could be usefully compared between schools, providing a 'big picture' perspective.

Primary principals are clearly engaged by this issue of assessment; ten per cent of respondents volunteered their contact details for follow up regarding their school's approach to assessment. It is likely that further qualitative research on this topic would yield greater depth and understanding of this broad issue.

*****

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

- **Member Engagement:** In an encouraging sign of member engagement, almost 20 per cent of the combined membership participated in the survey; ten per cent of respondents volunteered their contact details for follow up regarding assessment practices.
- **Impacts of NAPLAN Testing on Wellbeing:** There are impacts flowing from NAPLAN, particularly on the wellbeing of students as a result of stress and fear of failure and particularly on Year 3 students. More serious psychological impacts on wellbeing fall on one quarter of students. In addition to student stress, teacher and parent stress were also impacts reported by respondents.
- **Contextual Issues surrounding NAPLAN:** There are three broad, contextual 'phases' where students engage with NAPLAN testing and where stress may be felt: preparation, testing & reporting results. Correlations in the results suggest that the way school NAPLAN results are communicated to students could be contributing to the wellbeing impacts noted by respondents. As school leaders, some principals may need to more actively manage these contexts. Working in collaboration with teachers and parent groups on this issue could help manage expectations and lower stress for all school stakeholder groups.
- **Impacts of NAPLAN on Curriculum/Pedagogy:** Some schools are experiencing a skewing of the curriculum/pedagogy, along with significant teacher stress, by devoting class time to NAPLAN preparation. The research found there is no standard amount of time that schools spend in preparation: schools vary widely on this issue. Recognising this, formal guidelines for NAPLAN preparation would help to reduce teacher stress and curriculum/pedagogical impacts, particularly in smaller and more remote schools.
- **Impacts of NAPLAN on School Budget:** Peak bodies could usefully encourage their members to more closely and clearly track expenditure that is directly related to NAPLAN testing.
- **Parent Interest:** While larger and Independent schools are clearly under pressure to perform, teacher stress may be reduced by the research finding that only a small proportion of parents are interested in teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results.
- **NAPLAN Results & Enrolment:** In the competitive context of larger/Independent/metro schools, a student's and the school's NAPLAN results are clearly a factor in parent decision-making regarding enrolment or withdrawal of their child from primary school. Conversely, in low ICSEA score schools, a student's or a school's poor NAPLAN results are also a factor in withdrawing the student. Both scenarios place additional pressure on schools and students.
- **Objection to Aggregated Assessment:** Around 15 per cent of respondents are opposed to the concept of aggregated assessment. This may be influencing responses to general questions concerning the impacts of NAPLAN testing.
- **ICSEA Scores, Government Funding & Assessment Practices:** Responses reveal confusion among some respondents on certain issues. Only half the respondents provided a valid ICSEA score; when asked about the impact of NAPLAN on their school budget, a few respondents stated that it decreased their government funding; others said NAPLAN was for the benefit of the government, not students. Some of the responses to questions concerning aggregated assessment practices also suggest confusion on this issue. There may be a role for peak bodies to clarify these issues in member communications. These issues could also be pursued with those principals who volunteered further contact.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: PART ONE

THE IMPACT OF NAPLAN

Primary principals were asked a series of questions concerning the impact of NAPLAN testing on student wellbeing, the curriculum, classroom pedagogy and their school budget.

Impacts of NAPLAN: on Student Wellbeing

Two-thirds of respondents say that NAPLAN testing has a negative impact on the wellbeing of students.

The majority (59 per cent) say NAPLAN testing has a **somewhat negative** impact on **student wellbeing**. A further seven per cent say the impact of NAPLAN testing is **very negative** on wellbeing of students.

	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	VLarge	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Q1 NAPLAN impact on student wellbeing												
A very negative impact	7%	5%	8%	4%	9%	7%	7%	5%	5%	10%	6%	18%
A somewhat negative impact	59%	69%	57%	57%	56%	62%	58%	58%	59%	62%	57%	55%
No impact	24%	16%	26%	27%	29%	22%	25%	23%	26%	20%	27%	22%
A somewhat positive impact	9%	10%	9%	12%	5%	9%	9%	14%	10%	9%	9%	4%
A very positive impact	1%		1%	1%	0%	0%	1%		0%		1%	1%

Student wellbeing appears to suffer most in **Catholic** and **remote area** schools. Almost one fifth of principals at remote schools say NAPLAN testing has a **very negative effect** on the wellbeing of their students. Likewise 69 per cent of Catholic sector schools say it has a **somewhat negative** impact on student wellbeing, ten points higher than the average.

However one third of respondents say NAPLAN testing doesn't harm student wellbeing: one quarter say NAPLAN testing has **no impact at all** and a further ten per cent say it has a **somewhat/very positive** impact. Respondents from **very large schools** are more positive about NAPLAN's impact on students; 14 per cent say it has a somewhat positive impact on their wellbeing, five points higher than the average.

The survey then probed for **specific behaviours and impacts relating to wellbeing**, as observed by respondents.

Stress, Fear of Failure, Withdrawal from Tests & Sickness

There is a clear pattern of approximately half of respondents **sometimes** seeing students **stressed**, **expressing fear of failure**, being **sick** around the time of the tests or **withdrawing from the tests**.

However, high levels of stress and fear of failure are considerably more prevalent than sickness or withdrawal from the tests. **One quarter** say students often/very often show signs of stress and around **one third** often/very often express fear of failure, but **less than ten per cent of respondents** say physical sickness or withdrawal of students happens often/very often.

Q2 Students exhibit signs of stress	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	3%	1%	4%	1%	7%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	5%	6%
Rarely	17%	12%	18%	20%	16%	18%	18%	10%	18%	15%	18%	18%
Sometimes	55%	59%	54%	58%	49%	53%	57%	63%	57%	55%	55%	40%
Often	22%	26%	21%	17%	25%	23%	19%	22%	20%	24%	20%	28%
Very often	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	9%

Q2 Students express fear of failure	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	2%	3%	2%		3%	2%	2%	0%	1%	3%	2%	6%
Rarely	14%	9%	15%	24%	15%	14%	15%	13%	15%	10%	19%	14%
Sometimes	49%	48%	49%	45%	40%	50%	49%	58%	53%	49%	43%	37%
Often	28%	33%	27%	24%	31%	27%	27%	27%	27%	30%	30%	18%
Very often	7%	7%	7%	7%	11%	7%	7%	3%	5%	8%	7%	26%

Remote area and **small schools** feel the impacts more. Stress is seen often/very often in remote schools (37 per cent) and small schools (29 per cent), compared to an average of one quarter. Almost half (44 per cent) of principals at remote schools say fear of failure is expressed often/very often by the students, with a similar figure (42 per cent) for small schools, compared to an average of 35 per cent. This trend is seen below, with **higher levels of withdrawal and physical sickness** among children in small and remote area schools.

Q2 Parents/carers withdraw students	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	12%	8%	13%	15%	24%	14%	7%	5%	9%	10%	20%	20%
Rarely	37%	41%	35%	46%	26%	37%	40%	44%	42%	30%	33%	36%
Sometimes	46%	48%	47%	35%	44%	44%	49%	46%	44%	55%	43%	36%
Often	4%	3%	5%	3%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%	2%	7%
Very often	1%		1%	1%	2%	1%	0%		1%	1%	2%	

Q2 Students gets physically sick prior	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	11%	10%	12%	13%	19%	11%	10%	5%	10%	9%	15%	15%
Rarely	37%	32%	38%	37%	36%	37%	35%	43%	37%	35%	40%	35%
Sometimes	46%	53%	44%	43%	36%	47%	48%	49%	48%	49%	39%	36%
Often	6%	4%	6%	7%	8%	4%	7%	3%	5%	7%	5%	8%
Very often	1%	1%	1%		2%	1%	0%		1%	0%	0%	6%

The results **among the states and territories** are largely consistent. Bearing in mind small sample sizes from the smaller states and territories, respondents from the **A.C.T.** report higher than average levels of stress etc.

Enthusiasm & Excitement

While students do not often express **enthusiasm** or **excitement** about sitting the NAPLAN tests with children of their age across the country, around 20-25 per cent do so sometimes.

Q2 Students express enthusiasm	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	28%	28%	29%	14%	39%	29%	25%	19%	25%	28%	33%	34%
Rarely	40%	42%	40%	42%	35%	41%	41%	45%	41%	42%	37%	39%
Sometimes	28%	28%	27%	36%	21%	27%	31%	30%	29%	27%	26%	24%
Often	4%	2%	4%	7%	5%	3%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%
Very often	0%		0%	1%		0%	1%		0%	1%		1%

Q2 Students show signs of excitement	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Never	36%	40%	36%	25%	50%	36%	30%	32%	34%	35%	39%	48%
Rarely	40%	39%	40%	42%	31%	41%	42%	42%	40%	43%	39%	30%
Sometimes	21%	18%	21%	28%	18%	19%	24%	21%	23%	18%	20%	20%
Often	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%
Very often	0%	0%	0%	2%		0%	0%		0%	0%		1%

Almost half (44 per cent) of students at **Independent schools** express some enthusiasm about NAPLAN (sometimes/often/very often), 12 points above the average. Slightly more students in **larger schools** also do so.

Impacts of NAPLAN Testing: Year 3 versus Year 5

Respondents were divided on the issue of whether **NAPLAN impacts Year 3 students or Year 5 students more**. Around half (48 per cent) of respondents say the impact of NAPLAN testing on the wellbeing of students is more pronounced on Year 3 students than Year 5 students.

Q3 Differing impact on wellbeing	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
No difference	38%	33%	40%	35%	45%	40%	35%	34%	38%	36%	41%	42%
More impact on Year 3	48%	51%	46%	58%	39%	47%	51%	54%	49%	50%	43%	46%
More impact on Year 5	14%	16%	14%	8%	16%	14%	15%	12%	13%	15%	16%	12%

A further third (38 per cent) say there is **no difference in the impact of NAPLAN** testing on the wellbeing of Year 3 as compared to Year 5 students, while 14 per cent say Year 5 feel the impact of NAPLAN more than Year 3.

In terms of results from the different states and territories, considerably more (about 10-12 per cent above the average) **A.C.T.** and **South Australian** respondents say the impact of NAPLAN falls harder on Year 3 students. In contrast, one fifth of **West Australian** respondents feel the impact is greater on Year 5 students, six points above the average.

Respondents say the main factor for Year 3 students regarding NAPLAN is 'the unknown'. Year 3 students have no prior experience with tests, are unsure what to expect – even despite practice - and lack developmental/emotional maturity compared to Year 5 students. Another factor adding to stress is the unfamiliarity of Year 3 *parents* with testing of this nature.

Year 3 have never undergone such rigorous testing as this before and get quite uptight. Multiple choice questions are not the norm in primary schools and hence students have to be taught about them. Parents get quite anxious – some even take their children to courses outside of school for intensive work.

Some Year 3 parents can inadvertently cause stress to their child because they are worried about the testing and focus on it, especially if it is their first child involved.

Those who see the impact of NAPLAN as heavier on **Year 5 students** cite stress-inducing reasons such as:

- Older students feel pressure from parents and teachers to do better than last time
- Some Year 5 students are fearful of the NAPLAN tests based on their previous experience in Year 3
- Developmentally, Year 5 students are more able to understand the importance of the tests and have an awareness of their own ranking and what it means
- Year 5 students have more at stake, viz. entry to high school
- Year 5 students are more exposed to school correspondence and media regarding NAPLAN testing.

For Year 5 students, the prospect of imminent secondary school entry and the pressure placed on parents to provide NAPLAN results, especially by independent schools, makes the stakes much higher.

Year 5 already have an awareness of what the testing entails, despite our very low-key approach to the preparation for the test. I guess this tends to heighten the stress in those children who are generally anxious anyway.

Other Impacts on Wellbeing

One quarter (26 per cent) of respondents indicated **further impacts on student wellbeing**, including:

- Pressures surrounding NAPLAN trigger self-esteem issues and anxiety, leading to disengagement, absenteeism, apathy and behavioural problems e.g. playground fights
- Particular logistical difficulties for disabled students sitting the tests
- The demands of extra-curricular tutoring for NAPLAN impacting on student welfare
- Student boredom and a lack of enjoyment in the NAPLAN preparation.

The testing does not help those with learning difficulties or disorders; in fact it reinforces they are struggling and below their peers. The school then spends a considerable amount of time demonstrating to parents it is about the learning growth. Parents are seeking tutors in Year 3.

On the plus side, a few respondents noted that NAPLAN testing was very 'affirming' to good students. Other comments on **positive wellbeing impacts** of NAPLAN testing included:

[NAPLAN] has a positive impact on confident students who enjoy the process.

The children can learn a new skill: that of being 'exam smart' not just content or process smart. A lot of my kids like that. We also use the criteria provided for marking writing and make reference to the job of the examiner. The children like the idea that someone is an audience for their work.

How Results Differ According to Years' Experience as a Principal

Survey responses differed in a few key ways according to the respondent's years' of experience as a principal, mainly in relation to the impacts of NAPLAN on student wellbeing:

- More of the experienced respondents reported 'very negative' impacts from NAPLAN testing generally on student wellbeing, by a margin of about ten points.
- More of the experienced respondents reported that the impacts of NAPLAN on student wellbeing are felt more by Year 3 students than Year 5 students.
- More of the experienced respondents reported an impact on classroom pedagogy in the lead up to NAPLAN each year – both positive and negative.
- Based on number of years as a principal, there is no discernible difference in respondent views on the impact of NAPLAN on the curriculum.

Impacts of NAPLAN: on Curriculum

Most principals (81 per cent) believe that NAPLAN is having an impact on their school's Year 3 & 5 curricula. However, while the majority (60 per cent) say the impact is **slight**, they are somewhat divided on whether the impact is **positive** or **negative**.

Around half (52 per cent) say it's having a slightly or significantly **negative impact**, but 29 per cent say the impact is slightly or significantly **positive**.

Q5 Impact on curriculum	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
significant negative impact	14%	13%	15%	10%	13%	16%	14%	10%	13%	13%	15%	22%
slight negative impact	38%	35%	38%	41%	40%	35%	38%	41%	38%	36%	38%	42%
not impacted curriculum	19%	17%	19%	21%	22%	17%	19%	20%	18%	21%	19%	12%
slight positive impact	22%	28%	20%	27%	19%	25%	21%	21%	25%	21%	20%	14%
significant positive impact	7%	6%	8%	2%	7%	8%	7%	8%	6%	8%	8%	11%

Respondents from the **Catholic** and **Independent** sectors report slightly more positive impacts from NAPLAN on their curriculum. The impact of NAPLAN on the curriculum of **remote area schools** seems to vary, from significantly negative to significantly positive, albeit from a small sample base.

In the Run-Up: Time Spent Teaching Literacy & Numeracy

Looking at specific impacts on the curriculum, in the lead up to NAPLAN testing each year almost half (44 per cent) say their schools spend **more time teaching literacy and numeracy each week** to Years 3 & 5. Around 29 per cent spend an additional 1-3 hours a week. Fifteen per cent spend more than three additional hours per week on those subjects.

However almost the same number (42 per cent) say the time spent teaching literacy and numeracy each week at their school in the run-up to NAPLAN **does not change**. Around 14 per cent say they teach **less** literacy and numeracy during this time.

Q6 Time spent teaching lit+num/ week	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
significantly less time	3%	4%	3%	2%	2%	5%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%
slightly less time	11%	11%	11%	7%	8%	11%	11%	12%	10%	13%	9%	10%
no change to time spent	42%	44%	41%	51%	47%	45%	39%	41%	42%	40%	45%	43%
slightly more time	29%	30%	28%	33%	28%	27%	30%	33%	29%	30%	29%	21%
significantly more time	15%	11%	16%	7%	15%	13%	18%	11%	15%	14%	14%	21%

The results show that **Independent schools** report less change to their curricula, while **remote area schools** seem to have more change to their curricula, and are **impacted to a greater extent** in the run-up to the NAPLAN testing period.

Teachers, despite knowing that they should not be teaching to the tests, do alter the regular curriculum delivery to 'train' the students in the peculiarities of the tests. Much time is given over even in the previous year to NAPLAN, to enable the students to have the best opportunity to demonstrate their skills and knowledge.

In the Run-Up: Time Spent Teaching non-NAPLAN subjects

The impact of NAPLAN testing on **time spent teaching non-NAPLAN-assessed subjects** seems to be stronger. Almost six in ten principals (57 per cent) say that their schools spend **less time** on those subjects in the run-up to NAPLAN tests each year. Of those, 40 per cent spend **slightly less time**

(between one-three hours less) on non-NAPLAN subjects and 17 per cent spend **significantly less time** (i.e. more than three hours) on them each week.

Q7 Time teaching non-NAPLAN/week	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
significantly less time	17%	17%	17%	11%	15%	15%	20%	14%	17%	18%	14%	19%
slightly less time	40%	40%	40%	38%	35%	41%	42%	40%	39%	43%	40%	30%
no change to time spent	39%	37%	39%	45%	43%	40%	35%	40%	39%	35%	41%	44%
slightly more time	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%	3%	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%
significantly more time	1%	2%	1%		3%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	4%

However, four in ten (39 per cent) report **no change** to the amount of time spent teaching non-NAPLAN subjects at their school in the lead up to NAPLAN testing each year and five per cent spend **more time** on non-NAPLAN subjects.

In the lead up to NAPLAN, it becomes 'all about academia' and the social/emotional/spiritual aspects of learning seem to take a back seat….NAPLAN limits our capacity to develop the non-NAPLAN aspects of holistic education.

The impact of NAPLAN on curricula in the various **states and territories** varies widely and the results are sometimes inconsistent within the one state or territory.

Speaking generally, Queensland, and to a lesser extent Victorian respondents report **more negative impacts** on their Year 3 & 5 curricula compared to the average. The Northern Territory, and to a lesser extent South Australia report **more positive impacts** on NAPLAN on curriculum than the average. Slightly more New South Wales and Tasmanian respondents than the average say their curricula **do not change** due to NAPLAN testing.

When pressed as to what those impacts on curricula are, for **Queensland** this is seen in more of a drop in the amount of time they spend on non-NAPLAN subjects than the average. But **Victoria** does not report impacts on amount of time spent on literacy and numeracy or non-NAPLAN subjects much different to the average, despite reporting a greater negative impact generally on their curricula. **Western Australia** also reports that more time is spent on literacy and numeracy than the average. It is likely that these discrepancies are explained by the other impacts on curriculum, reported below.

Other Impacts on Curriculum

A third of respondents (35 per cent) say that NAPLAN testing does cause **other impacts on the school curriculum** at this time of year, the main one being **increased stress on teachers**.

Teachers worry about covering all the other areas. They try to integrate as much as possible.

With the stress of NAPLAN and the results for teachers, they spend a lot of time getting ready for the test and the curriculum suffers because of this, let alone the stress placed on teachers afterwards by trying to catch up. When this happens the curriculum is not taught to its full potential.
Despite my insistence, staff are spending time teaching in a manner which will have an impact on NAPLAN results. They do more testing, longer periods of work time, all designed as preparation for the three days of NAPLAN.

There is a degree of finger pointing at teachers of previous year levels if students achieve poorly or appear to lack preparation for the tests. This has a huge impact on staff teamwork and morale. The level of stress amongst the teachers in the term leading up to NAPLAN week is immense and directly impacts on many other more positive and constructive initiatives we have in place.

NAPLAN testing can also be seen as **inimical to the culture and philosophy** of some schools.

The testing environment is so different to the collaborative processes encouraged at our school. It is very unusual practice for our students.

On the positive side, comments included:
NAPLAN has sharpened teachers' skills. The Writing Marking Guide is really helpful. It has provided good PD focus across the whole school.

Staff capacity to analyse data has improved and using the information gained has resulted in closer questioning of teaching and learning.

NAPLAN testing has triggered staff to think more about the type of language they use, e.g. ensuring students understand the mathematical terminology used in testing which may vary from what our school would use. This I believe to be a positive in that the students' knowledge is broadened. Our staff have learnt to program accordingly, e.g. currently focus persuasive writing in Term 1 and then move onto other genre. The other impact has been that staff spend time exposing students to these type of tests... this is probably an area the teachers feels adds additional pressure to their load, however it does not hurt students to learn to experience and decipher different ways of testing as they will undoubtedly encounter this at some stage in life.

Impacts of NAPLAN: on Classroom Pedagogy

Most principals (78 per cent) say NAPLAN testing does have a slight impact **classroom pedagogy** for Years 3 & 5, but they're **somewhat divided** on whether the impact is positive or negative.

While 45 per cent say it's had a **negative impact**, 33 per cent say it's had a **positive impact** on pedagogy. About one fifth (22 per cent) reports **no impact**.

Q9 Impact on classroom pedagogy	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
significant negative impact	9%	10%	9%	5%	11%	11%	7%	7%	8%	9%	8%	21%
slight negative impact	36%	39%	35%	44%	38%	36%	36%	37%	39%	36%	30%	40%
no impact on classroom pedagogy	22%	17%	23%	25%	29%	18%	21%	23%	22%	18%	28%	19%
slight positive impact	27%	31%	27%	23%	20%	30%	30%	25%	26%	31%	30%	14%
significant positive impact	6%	3%	6%	4%	3%	5%	6%	9%	6%	6%	4%	6%

In the Run-Up: Time Spent Rote Learning

Respondents were asked about changes to the amount of **rote learning** in class in the run-up to NAPLAN testing each year. The majority of principals (62 per cent) say that since NAPLAN data became available on the My School website, there has been **no change** in the amount of class time spent rote learning at their schools.

Q10 Class time spent rote learning	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
much less class time	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	5%
slightly less class time	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	5%	2%	2%	2%	
no change	62%	62%	62%	64%	60%	62%	64%	59%	61%	66%	64%	49%
slightly more class time	27%	28%	27%	29%	24%	28%	26%	32%	30%	23%	26%	26%
much more class time	7%	5%	7%	3%	10%	6%	7%	2%	5%	6%	6%	21%

One third say that Year 3 & 5 classes now spend **more** time rote learning, but most say only slightly more.

More **remote area schools** – more than double the average - report significant negative impacts on pedagogy in their classrooms in the run up to NAPLAN. Compared to the average, **three times as many remote area schools spend much more time rote learning** during that period.

In the Run-Up: Class Time Spent Preparing for NAPLAN

Two-thirds of respondents reported that Year 3 & 5 class time is allocated towards preparation for the tests in the lead-up to NAPLAN each year.

We don't allocate time for test preparation but classes do it anyway – and to excess. Staff and students are anxious about the results.

When asked **how many hours per week** they allocate in the run-up to NAPLAN testing, **half** of the respondents said their schools allocate between **1-3 hours of class time per week**. A further 12 per cent allocate 4-5 hours per week on preparation. Very few allocate more time than that.

In terms of **weeks of preparation prior to NAPLAN testing**, there is no commonly adhered to starting date for preparations. Likewise, there is no common trend among the various states and territories.

For the 58 per cent of schools which do spend class time preparing for NAPLAN, results were spread fairly evenly between one week and ten weeks. More than a quarter (28 per cent) allocates preparation time in the **1-5 weeks prior** to the NAPLAN tests.

Around ten per cent allocate time for NAPLAN preparation beginning **6-9 weeks before the tests** and a further nine per cent start allocating time for preparation **ten weeks out**. Around one tenth (11 per cent) allocate preparation time **more than ten weeks** prior to the tests, but very few allocate time more than 15 weeks out.

Prep	Time	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
		1353	265	955	133	200	496	494	163	717	316	261	59
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Hours p	None	35.0	36.5	34.7	34.5	32.1	33.6	37.0	37.4	37.7	36.6	28.4	31.8
	1.0	16.1	12.5	16.3	25.2	15.0	14.1	16.3	22.8	16.6	14.4	19.9	5.3
	2.0	22.1	21.4	22.4	21.5	24.6	23.8	20.1	19.6	22.2	18.4	22.8	36.3
	3.0	10.6	11.6	10.7	6.4	10.0	12.5	9.5	9.7	8.8	12.4	12.9	8.7
	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.9	5.8	5.0	3.3	2.7	4.3	3.1	4.8	7.2
	5.0	7.6	8.9	7.6	4.1	7.7	6.8	9.6	4.0	5.8	11.6	7.7	3.5
	6.0	0.9	1.3	0.8	0.7	1.6	0.6	0.9	0.4	0.9	0.6	1.4	0.0
Weeks	None	42.0	43.1	41.5	45.1	39.0	41.3	43.7	43.3	45.7	44.6	32.0	38.5
	1.0	1.1	1.6	0.9	1.9	0.2	0.8	1.2	2.9	1.3	1.4	0.5	0.0
	2.0	6.6	8.6	5.9	10.4	4.6	7.6	6.6	6.9	7.3	7.2	5.0	4.6
	3.0	5.7	4.8	5.9	6.7	5.2	6.6	4.2	8.3	6.9	4.8	5.8	0.0
	4.0	8.5	11.8	7.7	8.7	10.5	9.5	6.7	8.2	9.1	6.7	9.3	9.0
	5.0	5.9	7.5	5.4	7.9	4.2	6.6	6.6	4.6	5.4	6.1	7.6	3.0
	6.0	4.2	4.7	4.3	1.5	5.6	3.4	4.7	3.1	3.7	3.9	5.0	7.2
	7.0	1.3	0.9	1.4	0.7	1.1	0.9	2.1	0.3	0.9	1.8	1.6	0.0
	8.0	3.9	1.1	4.8	0.7	6.3	3.5	2.2	6.0	4.8	1.5	5.3	2.3
	9.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
	10.0	9.1	7.7	9.6	6.5	8.6	6.5	11.9	9.0	5.7	11.0	11.4	18.3

Other Impacts on Classroom Pedagogy

One quarter (23 per cent) of respondents point to **further, additional pedagogical impacts** since the NAPLAN data began being published online. The main one noted by respondents is a **greater focus on explicit, specific teaching** and learning and **more structured, formalised**, teacher directed learning.

There is greater emphasis on teacher directed teaching rather than student self-directed learning.

There is a tendency to employ old-fashioned chalk and talk strategies, rather than child-centred inquiry.

It's both positive and negative – more explicit teaching but less integrated learning i.e. a lot more skills taught out of context.

On the plus side:

Pedagogy now better reflects the application of knowledge and skills.

Probably the analysis of deeper thinking items has made teachers think.

But on the downside:

[NAPLAN] limits the students' involvement in their education in a personalised and integrated way. There is less time for individual assistance. Some teachers are concerned that it limits their abilities to be creative and innovative in the manner in which they facilitate and implement literacy and numeracy programs.

Co-operative learning, student-centred learning and higher order thinking is put on the back burner to cram in all the loose ends that may have been missed but which may be in the test.

As an inquiry school we find that the NAPLAN structure compromises our pedagogical approach. The actual testing procedure works in opposition to our regular classroom practice of open and shared questioning and learning.

Impacts of NAPLAN: on School Budget

Almost **half** (47 per cent) of principals say that NAPLAN has had an impact on the school budget, with greater numbers at **Independent schools** (57 per cent) and in **Victorian schools** (57 per cent) (ten points higher than the average).

Q15 No NAPLAN impact school budget	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	53%	52%	54%	43%	53%	56%	50%	53%	48%	59%	55%	60%
yes	47%	48%	46%	57%	47%	44%	50%	47%	52%	41%	45%	40%

However, when asked about specific expenditure items, fewer principals reported allocating additional funds as a result of NAPLAN: about **a third of principals** say they have allocated funding for **preparation materials** (29 per cent) and **teacher professional development** (33 per cent) for NAPLAN. It appears from these differing results that respondents may not be completely clear on the financial impact that NAPLAN testing is having on their school.

Q15 Allocated funding for prep materials	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	71%	71%	71%	76%	72%	71%	72%	69%	74%	70%	69%	63%
yes	29%	29%	29%	24%	28%	29%	28%	31%	26%	30%	31%	37%

Q15 Allocated funding for teacher PD	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	67%	67%	66%	73%	71%	66%	66%	67%	70%	63%	67%	64%
yes	33%	33%	34%	27%	29%	35%	34%	34%	31%	37%	33%	36%

The **Victorian** results do not show expenditure greater than the average in relation to specific items. In contrast, more principals in **Queensland** report expenditure on preparation materials (47 per cent) and teacher PD (44 per cent). In a continuation of this pattern, 34 per cent of Queensland principals have allocated funding for additional teacher hours surrounding NAPLAN, almost double the national average.

Q15 More funding for extra teacher hrs	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	83%	87%	81%	89%	81%	82%	85%	79%	84%	79%	86%	75%
yes	18%	13%	19%	11%	19%	18%	15%	21%	16%	21%	14%	25%

The findings are very similar for expenditure relating to funds for **additional supervision** and **administration** during NAPLAN periods, although there is considerable variance between different states on this.

Q15 More $ for s/vision+admin in tests	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	82%	83%	81%	86%	81%	81%	84%	78%	84%	79%	81%	75%
yes	19%	18%	19%	14%	19%	19%	16%	22%	16%	22%	19%	25%

When asked about *other* areas of expenditure concerning NAPLAN, almost all respondents (95 per cent) said there were no further expenses relating to NAPLAN. The five per cent who nominated additional expenses named:

- SSO time
- Funding to pay for the test papers
- Funding to analyse NAPLAN data
- Breakfast/food for students on NAPLAN days
- Funding for families to travel to sit NAPLAN tests.

Significantly, principals also pointed to the impact of the school's NAPLAN results on government funding received by that school.

How Results Differ According to ICSEA Score

For the purposes of analysis, survey results were analysed according to whether the respondent's school had an ICSEA score in the bottom 20 per cent, middle 60 per cent or top 20 per cent of the ICSEA score range.

In terms of impacts of NAPLAN testing, results differ according to a school's ICSEA score in the following ways.

Impact on Student Wellbeing:

- Middle ICSEA score school students are the least impacted by NAPLAN.
- As ICSEA scores increase, more schools experience instances of moderate impacts on student wellbeing. As ICSEA scores decrease, more schools experience extremes of NAPLAN impacts on student wellbeing.
- In relation to stress, fear of failure and sickness, the high and low ICSEA score bands tend to report higher impacts than schools in the middle band of ICSEA scores.
- Schools with low ICSEA scores had more negative impacts from NAPLAN testing, while schools with high ICSEA scores reported more positive impacts.
- More schools with a high ICSEA score say that the impacts of NAPLAN on student wellbeing fall harder on Year 3 versus Year 5 students.

Withdrawing Students from NAPLAN Tests:

- Schools with low ICSEA scores report more incidences of parents withdrawing their child from the NAPLAN tests.

Impact on Curriculum:

- The lower the ICSEA score, the more impact NAPLAN has on the curriculum, both positive and negative. High ICSEA score schools report fewer impacts on, and changes to, the curriculum in the run up to NAPLAN testing each year.

Impact on Classroom Pedagogy:

- As per impact on curriculum.

Impact on School Budget:

- As ICSEA scores decrease, fewer respondents say NAPLAN testing impacts on the school budget generally.
- Yet as ICSEA scores decrease, more respondents report additional spending on specific budgetary items (preparation materials, teacher PD etc.) in the run up to NAPLAN testing.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: PART TWO

REPORTING NAPLAN & PARENT INTEREST IN NAPLAN RESULTS

Respondents were asked whether, and if so how, their school reports the school's NAPLAN results to teachers, Year 3 & 5 students and the parents of those students.

To Teachers

Across the board, principals say that they communicate NAPLAN results to teachers. The results are communicated in a number of ways, the most popular being **via letter** (98 per cent), at the **staff meeting** (95 per cent) and **via email** (85 per cent).

Around one fifth (22 per cent) of principals also report the following contexts for reporting NAPLAN results to teachers:

- NAPLAN data analysis sessions
- Level, curriculum and literacy/numeracy teacher meetings
- Professional Development meetings
- One to one meetings with the principal
- Annual Report, Staff Bulletin, NAPLAN Newsletter
- Accessing the SMART data directly via the website.

To Students

In contrast, half of respondents say they report the school's NAPLAN results to students directly. More **Independent schools** (68 per cent) report the school's NAPLAN results to the students themselves. Fewer **remote area schools** (31 per cent) report results to students.

There is great variation between the states and territories: three quarters of **A.C.T. schools** report school NAPLAN results to students, compared to 30 per cent of **Queensland schools**.

Q17 Results not reported to students	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	50%	48%	52%	32%	57%	49%	49%	47%	45%	52%	53%	69%
yes	50%	52%	48%	68%	43%	51%	51%	53%	55%	48%	47%	31%

Around one quarter of schools communicate the school's NAPLAN results to students **in class**, with more **Northern Territory schools** (63 per cent), **Queensland schools** (40 per cent), **remote schools** (32 per cent) and **smaller schools** (30 per cent) taking this approach in particular. Three per cent of **Independent schools** report NAPLAN results to students in this way.

Given the divergence in the research findings, it may be that respondents interpreted this question in different ways: some responding that individual results are given to students in class and others responding that school and class results (but not individual results) are given to students in class. This could be clarified with further research.

Almost one quarter (22 per cent) of respondents report alternate means of communicating results to students, including **individually with each child** via one-on-one interviews. However many schools take an **indirect approach** to reporting NAPLAN results to students, sending results to parents to discuss with their child.

Email and the school assembly are not common ways of communicating NAPLAN results to students. Only one per cent of schools report results to students via email and only six per cent do so at assembly.

To Parents

Almost all schools (95 per cent) report NAPLAN results to the parents of students, with the exception of 15 per cent of A.C.T. and 11 per cent of Victorian schools, which do not communicate results directly to parents.

Communication with parents is done in a number of ways, the most popular of which are **by letter** (42 per cent), on the **school website** (38 per cent) and at **Parent/Teacher night** (27 per cent). Three per cent report NAPLAN results to parents **by email** (cf. **Independent schools**: 10 per cent, **very large schools**: 8 per cent).

In relation to communicating NAPLAN results, it seems that principals regard **the school website** as a more appropriate tool for informing parents (38 per cent) than with teachers (13 per cent) or students (15 per cent). Almost half of all **Catholic**, **Independent** and **very large schools** communicate NAPLAN results to parents in this way, among other methods of communication.

Q18 Results to parents via school websit	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
no	62%	52%	65%	53%	78%	64%	55%	51%	59%	61%	68%	67%
yes	38%	48%	35%	47%	22%	36%	45%	49%	41%	40%	32%	33%

Other ways that NAPLAN results are reported to parents include: Newsletter, Annual Report, School Council/P&C Meetings and Parent Interviews. Overall, there is considerable variance between the **states and territories** in their use of email and the school website to communicate NAPLAN results.

How Results Differ According to ICSEA Score

For the purposes of analysis, survey results were analysed according to whether the respondent's school had an ICSEA score in the bottom 20 per cent, middle 60 per cent or top 20 per cent of the ICSEA score range.

In terms of reporting NAPLAN results, results differ according to a school's ICSEA score in the following ways:

- As ICSEA scores increase, fewer schools report NAPLAN results directly to students and fewer schools report NAPLAN results directly to students in class.
- More low ICSEA score schools use the school website to report NAPLAN results to teachers, among other methods.
- More low ICSEA score schools report NAPLAN results to parent by letter and at Parent/Teacher night, by a margin of around ten points.

Levels of Parent Interest in NAPLAN Results

The questionnaire asked primary principals to indicate, on the basis of their interactions with parents, **levels of parent interest** in their child's NAPLAN results, the school's overall NAPLAN results and teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results.

Across the board, there is **a 'baseline' medium level of interest** in these issues for between a **quarter** and a **third of parents**.

Interest in Their Child's Results

Predictably, parents are most interested in **their own child's NAPLAN performance**. **Half of parents** have **high or very high** levels of interest in their child's NAPLAN results, while 32 per cent have a medium level of interest.

Q13 Parent interest in child's results	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Very low	4%	2%	5%	2%	9%	4%	2%	5%	4%	4%	4%	15%
Low	12%	14%	12%	6%	14%	14%	11%	6%	11%	14%	11%	15%
Medium	32%	32%	33%	22%	34%	32%	32%	30%	28%	34%	39%	26%
High	33%	34%	33%	40%	31%	34%	36%	29%	35%	34%	29%	38%
Very high	18%	17%	17%	29%	12%	16%	19%	30%	22%	14%	17%	6%

Parents of children attending **Independent schools** expressed higher levels of interest than the average, with 69 per cent showing high/very high levels of interest in their child's NAPLAN results. Fifty-nine per cent of parents whose children attended **very large schools** also expressed high/very high levels of interest in their child's results. Principals in **remote areas** reported that 30 per cent of parents there had low/very low levels of interest in their child's performance, almost double the national average. Low levels of parent interest were also reported by respondents from **small schools**.

The level of parent interest was about eight points higher than the average in the **A.C.T.** and about five points higher in **New South Wales**, but lower in the **Northern Territory** and **Tasmania**, even allowing for small sample sizes in those areas.

Interest in the School's Results

By comparison, **one quarter** (24 per cent) of parents have a **high/very high** level of interest in **the school's NAPLAN results**, with 35 per cent showing a medium level of interest.

Q13 Parent interest in school's results	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Very low	11%	12%	12%	6%	22%	10%	8%	5%	8%	10%	14%	30%
Low	30%	28%	32%	13%	28%	32%	30%	26%	28%	33%	31%	27%
Medium	35%	34%	36%	34%	33%	35%	38%	34%	35%	37%	35%	30%
High	18%	20%	16%	32%	12%	18%	18%	27%	21%	16%	15%	10%
Very high	6%	6%	5%	15%	5%	5%	6%	8%	7%	4%	6%	3%

Again, parents of children attending **Independent schools** expressed higher levels of interest than the average, with almost half (47 per cent) showing high/very high levels of interest in the school's NAPLAN results. More than a quarter (27 per cent) of parents with children at **very large schools** expressed a high level of interest in the school's results, compared to an average of 18 per cent. Fifty-seven per cent of parents with children in **remote area schools** and half of those with children in **small schools** had low/very low levels of interest in the school's results, compared to an average of 41 per cent.

From a geographical perspective, parent interest in school results is six points higher than the average in **Western Australia**, but a little lower than average in **Queensland**, **Victoria** and the **Northern Territory**.

Interest in Teacher Performance

Sixteen per cent of parents have a **high/very high** level of interest in **teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results**, with one quarter expressing a **medium** level of interest. These results were largely consistent across sectors, school size and location, with similar but smaller trends to those noted above. There were no major differences by state and territory.

Q13 Parent interest in teacher perform	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Very low	25%	19%	27%	19%	30%	25%	23%	21%	22%	25%	28%	31%
Low	34%	36%	33%	32%	26%	32%	39%	34%	35%	37%	29%	26%
Medium	26%	29%	25%	26%	26%	28%	23%	28%	25%	24%	29%	26%
High	12%	13%	11%	17%	11%	12%	11%	13%	14%	11%	9%	12%
Very high	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	3%	4%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%

Influences of NAPLAN Results on Certain Parent Behaviours

Principals were asked whether, since NAPLAN testing began, parents had re**moved or enrolled children** from their school based on the child's or the school's NAPLAN results; and whether parents sought to enrol their child based on the child's or the school's NAPLAN results.

Around 10 per cent of **respondents were not sure** whether these behaviours had occurred, suggesting that removal and enrolment in a school is often due to a complex set of factors.

The majority of respondents (80 per cent) said that parents **had not removed their child** from the school based on NAPLAN results, whether their child's or the school's. However ten per cent of principals had experienced this behaviour.

Q14 Child out citing child's poor results	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Yes	11%	9%	11%	8%	9%	13%	9%	12%	11%	13%	8%	10%
No	79%	79%	78%	84%	77%	75%	82%	84%	78%	78%	81%	75%
Not sure	11%	12%	11%	8%	14%	13%	9%	4%	11%	10%	10%	16%
Q14 Child out citing school's poor results												
Yes	10%	10%	10%	7%	5%	14%	8%	10%	11%	10%	9%	9%
No	81%	82%	80%	89%	82%	76%	84%	84%	80%	80%	84%	76%
Not sure	9%	8%	10%	5%	13%	10%	8%	6%	9%	10%	7%	16%

Generally, respondents say parents do not cite their child's NAPLAN results **to obtain enrolment** in primary schools (cf. secondary schools). Three quarters (73 per cent) of principals said that this does not occur, but 19 per cent had experienced this kind of parent behaviour.

Q14 Enrol child citing child's good results												
Yes	19%	19%	16%	48%	3%	16%	24%	33%	24%	22%	7%	4%
No	73%	72%	75%	43%	83%	77%	68%	59%	69%	70%	84%	76%
Not sure	9%	9%	9%	9%	14%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	9%	20%

However, almost half (48 per cent) of principals at **Independent schools** see parents behave this way. Generally, as school size increases, parents are more likely to cite their child's results to gain entry, with one third (33 per cent) of principals from **very large schools** confirming that this occurs.

Likewise, principals report that parents in **metropolitan** (24 per cent) schools are more likely to behave this way, but this rarely occurs in **small**, **rural** and **remote** schools. Geographically, this sort of behaviour is reported to happen marginally more in **New South Wales**.

A school's NAPLAN results appear to be a relevant factor in some parents' decisions about selecting a primary school for their child.

Q14 Enrol child citing school good results	TOTAL	Cath	Govt	Indep	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	Metro	Region	Rural	Remote
Yes	32%	36%	30%	50%	9%	28%	43%	46%	40%	35%	19%	11%
No	59%	54%	62%	39%	76%	63%	50%	49%	54%	57%	70%	72%
Not sure	9%	10%	9%	11%	15%	9%	7%	5%	7%	9%	12%	17%

While around two thirds (59 per cent) of principals say parents don't express a desire to enrol their child on the basis of the school's NAPLAN results, 32 per cent say that they do.

This figure rises to half for **Independent schools**. As before, the larger the school the more this behaviour is seen, with principals from **very large schools** (46 per cent) and **large schools** (43 per cent) saying this occurs, compared to nine per cent from **small schools**.

This sort of parent behaviour is seen much more in **metropolitan** area schools (40 per cent) than **rural** (19 per cent) and **remote** (11 per cent) areas, possibly reflecting greater choice of schooling in the area.

Almost half of parents (46 per cent) with children in schools in the **A.C.T.** cite the school's good NAPLAN results as a basis for enrolment, 14 points above the national average.

How Results Differ According to ICSEA Score

For the purposes of analysis, survey results were analysed according to whether the respondent's school had an ICSEA score in the bottom 20 per cent, middle 60 per cent or top 20 per cent of the ICSEA score range.

In terms of levels of parent interest in NAPLAN results, results differ according to a school's ICSEA score in the following ways:

- As ICSEA scores increase, respondents report higher levels of parent interest their own child's results, the school's overall result and teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results.
- As ICSEA scores increase, more schools report parents seeking to enrol their child on the basis of their child's and/or the school's good NAPLAN results.
- As ICSEA scores increase, fewer schools report parents removing their child from the school on the basis of their child's and/or the school's poor NAPLAN results.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: PART THREE

OTHER ASSESSMENT PRACTICES USED BY AUSTRALIAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Primary principals were asked a series of questions regarding assessment practices:

- Which assessment practices used by your school provide aggregated data for your school?
- Of those, which (if any) would you recommend for use across Australians schools, and why?
- If you would like APPA to contact you to discuss the approach your school takes to such assessments, please provide contact details.

The first two questions resulted in voluminous amounts of information from respondents. These are outlined below and can be perused in detail from the Excel tables of survey results.

Almost **ten per cent of respondents** volunteered their contact details for further discussion with APPA about assessment practices.

IN CURRENT USE: Assessment Practices Providing Aggregated Data

In terms of the assessment practices used by primary schools, the leading categories were:

- Commercial/Standardised Tests
- Commercial Scales/Inventories
- School-based Tests
- Other School-based Assessments
- Unattributed

Commercial/Standardised Tests	Probe Envision, PAT R, PAT Maths, Westwood Spelling, SA Spelling Test, MTS Maths, Phase Spelling, Torch Reading, Easy Mark Reading & spelling, Waddingtons Spelling, Conquista Tests in ICT, Reading Recovery Tests, ACER Tests – Reading, Vocab, Spelling, Maths, MTS Maths, Single Word Spelling Tests, Early Numeracy Test, Edwards Quick Word Reading Test, Fitzgerald Diagnostic Spelling Test, Schonnel Spelling Test, Oxford Maths Plus Progression Tests, BURT, Middle Years Mental Computations, peters dictation, Morrison & McCall Spelling Scale and Tests, Holbourn, Fry's sight word testing, Dalwood Spelling Assessment, St Lucia, Brigance, AGAT (ACER), Sutherland (SPAT-R), WIAT, Count Me In Too-SENA, On Demand Testing, Numeracy online Interview, English online interview, JEMM and EMM (ACER), Robert Allwell testing
Commercial Scales/Inventories	PM Benchmark, BEE Spelling inventory, First Steps, Concepts of Print, Maths Interviews GiRN, Lexile Levels, PIPS Observation Survey, Best Start, Oxford Word Lists, ACER G & T, Student Performance Analyser (SPA), MSE Monitoring Standards in Education. Schedule for Early Number Assessment SENA, Screen of Communication Skills, MAI, NEALE, Middle Infant Screening Test, Peabody, AEDI, Assessment of Student Competencies, Marie Clay, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarking, VELS assessments, I can do maths, International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, Words Their Way WTW, mathletics, Prep Entry Assessment PEA, ESL Scopes and Scales, Commonly

	Used Words Checklist, McCalls Crabbs Comprehension Tests, Nelson Assessment Tasks, Diana Rigg, Phoneme Awareness, Talk the Talk Speech Pathology Screening, Jolly Phonics research project data, PAK maths, ABC reading eggs, Carmel Crevola Oral Language, Johnson Word list, NSW K-6 Numeracy continua, Ravens, Reading Misque Analysis, George Booker Numeracy Assessments, Munro assessments, NZ Poze Inventory, Year 2 Diagnostic Net, C2C Assessment, QCAT , Sunscreener, RENFREW Picture Tests, ENRP, ICAS, Talking Namba, ASC (NT), CARS and STARS, WRAP, ALPOS/ARCOTS (Melbourne University), DRA 2, SINE, Literacy Assessment Project, Literacy Advance, MICUPS, Allwell, Scaffold Maths, Bishop's RE Assessment Screening, EALD (ACARA), TEN, Big Idea in Number (SA), Trust the Count (VIC), CTJ, Quicksmart, EMSAD, EMU Maths (Catholic VIC), Prep PEAP Entry Assessment (Catholic)
School Based Tests	Annual Pre Tests, Phonics Tests, whole school testing, online testing, diagnostic testing maths, mastery placement, corrective reading, Testing on computer sites, teacher designed tests, weekly spelling and maths tests, Auditory Processing, Hearing Recording Sounds, Cloze Tests, criteria reference testing, unit assessments, grammar and punctuation testing, explicit 5 questions test in numeracy, Auswim – type grading for swimming, age tests, end of term and unit tests
School Based Other Assessments	Observations, Self Assessments, Running Records, Moderated Assessments, Teacher judgement, sight word assessment, whole school PBS Assessment, Writing Analysis, Australian Maths Competition, Projects, Interest, Tracking systems, rubrics, personal goal setting, Assessment maps, digital portfolios, moderated writing samples, work samples, presentations, reading and writing interviews, General work samples and photos, description summary sheets, individual student portfolios, Measuring social acceptance, self assessments – subject rating – co-operative learning evaluation, formal reports, K/P Speech Screening, video , writing audit, Literacy and Numeracy continua, fluency assessments, Exposition writing, three way conferences, parent meetings, attendance records, Newcastle Permanent Maths Comp, Work samples and portfolios in English, Maths, Inquiry, ICT and the Arts, counsellor assessment , contractions assessment, text orientation, Magic 100 words, Regional Maths Tests, individual learning plans, problem solving samples, peer assessment, conferencing, journals, letter sound association, self assessment interpersonal skills friendship, School nurse assessment, Data Wall (Records), Student Tracker, PIPS Observation survey, SMART Analysis tool, Mathematical Clinical Interviews, Most frequently used words, Setting Targets

Unattributed	SAIS, Sunlander, ENI, ART assessments, Easy Mark Literacy and Numeracy, First cut, Monster spelling, EYNI Rich Assessment Task, Assess Now P-2, DNPS, SREAMS Student Performance Analyser, VCE exams, Blitz Number maths tests, MPAST, Callinghan and Macintosh, DMT Measurement, EYA, EYInd, Skillband, Duncan Work Task, SEA, Wrap Analysis, Grade Expert, TIC tests, TOWN, Watts Holburn, EARS, CAP

Almost ten per cent of respondents named NAPLAN as one of their aggregated assessment practices. Respondents were not asked to comment, but a few chose to do so, saying:

NAPLAN results arrive too late. Nobody takes much notice of the results because they arrive too late to critically affect the teaching program for that year. We do look at trends, but they don't have a huge impact on our priorities. We know what our priorities are from our other data.

Our focus is not on aggregated data, this only assists governments, not children. Test scores, as long as they are standardised (with the same thing applying to everyone) do NOT reflect teacher ability, school quality or a student's future.

NAPLAN is used to highlight the trend rather than to drive instruction.

NAPLAN is everybody's business in this school. It is viewed as a point in time test of good teaching and positive learning. Teachers collect a significant range of data, both regionally required and school required, to track students as they go through this school. There is a whole of school assessment plan which is comprehensive and detailed. It has also been approved by the auditor.

We are a school for students with moderate and severe intellectual disabilities, whose parents withdraw them from NAPLAN. Consultation with parents occurs prior to this and our assessment practices are most formative and curriculum based and linked to individual programs.

RECOMMENDED: Assessment Practices Providing Aggregated Data

As with the previous question, respondents provided voluminous numbers of different assessment practices when asked which they would recommend for use across Australian schools. Again, these can be perused in detail from the Excel tables of survey results.

Notably, a proportion of respondents said:

I don't recommend any aggregated assessment practice	16%
I recommend any/all aggregated assessment practices	5%
Specifically named NAPLAN as a recommended aggregated assessment practice	2%

It is apparent from some responses that **not all respondents fully understood the nature of the question**. Qualitative research into this area would help to clarify principal views on this issue and categorise the different assessment practices.

Despite this, there is **a small minority who fundamentally do not support aggregated assessment practices**, for reasons stated below.

Respondents who did not recommend any aggregated assessment practices commented in the following ways:

None. Schools need freedom to choose data collection tools for their own specific site and circumstances. We do not need more national testing demands. Each school situation is different and schools use a variety of different assessment tools as best fits their situation. While many of these are widely used already, I don't think there is 'one size fits all'.

None - they are out dated and do not give a full picture of a child's ability. Need to be based on school needs and stakeholders. There is too much site specific background information that needs to be used when looking at data. General comparisons to other schools or states is pointless

None. We need more up to date tests and these are expensive and we have to do NAPLAN and the children are over-tested. "Weighing the pig each day does not make it fatter."

I don't have a huge objection to national testing, not even the NAPLAN (except that to expect children to write a persuasive text 'cold' in the given time is not good teaching or assessment practice) but I do object to the status of the results. Yes, give the results to schools and expect them to respond to the information, but don't judge, don't make it the be-all and end-all of how well a school's doing, don't put it on the web, don't beat teachers up about the results. There are much better ways of bringing about improvement. (See the Grattan Reports)

None. As long as such results are allowed to be hijacked to provide lists of 'well-performed' or 'poorly performed' schools/teachers, they will always be open to rorting of the system and as such lack any genuine validity or accuracy as a measure.

None - one size does not fit all. Schools need to choose assessment strategies that suit their community. I don't totally believe such a philosophy is appropriate at this age if we have a clear Australian Outcome based curriculum. The purpose is for what?????

None. We should not be trying to compare our students. It should be used for collecting of own site data for directional improvement and goal setting within the site!!

None. We are a unique school and they wouldn't be relevant to others. I believe school specific assessment meets the needs of your culture and setting. *NAPLAN creates a culture of unhealthy competition.*

It is not up to our school to recommend anything. Our schedule suits us. The use of NAPLAN as a national testing schedule is flawed, as schools like ours are being forced to teach to the test. This will provide skewed results. If the NAPLAN results were available only to the staff and parents of each school individually and not to the whole world via My School, the pressure would be lessened for schools and more reliable results would be available to politicians and statisticians.

Everyone in this school is on the same page philosophically and therefore, the team has built the assessment regime and the team follows through with regional input. What happens in this school may not work in others. We can share the details, but many school s would be doing things as regional requirements as well, I suspect.

Those who recommended NAPLAN commented as follows:

NAPLAN - if used in the correct context. Raw data provides schools with useful comparative data, is *linked to the Australian Curriculum. Needs to be used without political interference and with relevant departmental support. The current 'big stick' approach is not useful and opens the door for potential narrowing of the curriculum and undue pressure on schools, teachers and students.*

NAPLAN because it gives a "big picture" view of the Nation. It provides nationwide consistency.

NAPLAN allows individual school data to be compared to a national 'average'. School performance data gives individual schools a snapshot of current year and allows comparison to previous years therefore trend data can be used for planning and staffing.

Are you suggesting standards assessment tasks of a more specific nature than NAPLAN? If so then assessment tasks directly relating to the Literacy and Numeracy continuums would be a bonus as now every school/and or Teacher is having to design their own. E.g. I am currently pulling on Count Me In assessment tasks to measure achievement in numeracy. My concern is the time I am taking to assemble these assessment tasks/resources, we are continuing to reinvent the wheel, massively time consuming.

NAPLAN as it provides whole school information that allows us to make decisions about student progress. Teacher Judgements as it allows teachers to have a better understanding of the student.

NAPLAN already does this and the comparison to like schools is helpful, also the trend data of the cohorts and across time in the academic areas.

Those who recommended all or any of the assessment practices commented:
All are sound ways for teachers to determine grades. Educative, valid, comprehensive and relevant.

All provide the school with student data across all years and allow the school to validate teacher judgement. All assessments have some element of teacher judgement. I believe by triangulating data using different sources is the only way to ensure consistency.

All provide a cross section of all aspects of literacy and numeracy and give teachers excellent information about the needs of the students in their class.

All provide diagnostic assessment, results are immediately available so can be utilised for program planning in group and individual situations.

All. Meet the particular needs of the students in our care. Focus on where they need to go- NOT WHAT THEY DONT KNOW!

All of these are useful to help teachers make informed decisions about student achievement and planning for their future growth. Together the aggregated data can be triangulated so they have clear evidence of a student's progress.

All - part of the teaching and learning and not seen by anyone as a major test more weighted than any other. Seen as a way to inform teaching and learning for improved outcomes, not as a summative assessment which is maybe how parents see NAPLAN results - too weighted.

APPENDIX ONE – Canvass Questionnaire

canvass»
strategic opinion research

Level 6, 432 Kent Street, Sydney 2000 >> GPO Box 5395 Sydney NSW 2001 Australia
www.canvass.net.au T 0448 094 899 ABN 351 447 90873

Instructions to respondents: ***While recognising that several Australian states include Year 7 students in the primary years, this survey is conducted in relation to Years 3 and 5 only so as to provide a clear and unambiguous national picture of the impact/s of NAPLAN testing on primary-aged students. Accordingly, please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.***

Q1. Based on your observations, what impact has NAPLAN testing had on the wellbeing of students in your school?

- A very negative impact
- A somewhat negative impact
- No impact
- A somewhat positive impact
- A very positive impact

Q2. Based on your observations, please indicate how often the following behaviours occur at your school:

never/rarely/sometimes/often/very often

- Students express enthusiasm about the challenge of NAPLAN testing
- Students show signs of excitement about participating in a national event with other children their age
- Students exhibit signs of stress (eg. sleeplessness etc.) prior to/during the NAPLAN tests
- Parents or carers withdraw students from the NAPLAN tests
- Students express a fear of failure prior to/during the NAPLAN tests
- Students gets physically sick prior to/during the NAPLAN tests

Q3.

a. Based on your observations, what difference (if any) is there in the impact of NAPLAN testing on the wellbeing of Year 3 as compared to Year 5 students?

- There is no difference
- There is more of an impact on Year 3
- There is more of an impact on Year 5.

b. If you feel there is a difference in the impact on wellbeing of Year 3 and Year 5 students as a result of NAPLAN testing, please indicate in what way the impact differs
(eg. type of impact or severity of impact, etc.)

Please specify:

Please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.

Q4. Have you observed any other impacts of NAPLAN testing on the wellbeing of students?

Yes/No/Not sure

If yes, please specify:

Q5. What impact, if any, has NAPLAN testing had <u>on the curriculum</u> offered at your school?

NAPLAN testing has:

- had a **significant negative impact** on the curriculum offered at my school
- had a **slight negative impact** on the curriculum offered at my school
- **not impacted** on the curriculum offered at my school
- had a **slight positive impact** on the curriculum offered at my school
- had a **significant positive impact** on the curriculum offered at my school

Q6. <u>In the lead-up to NAPLAN testing of Years 3 & 5 each year</u>, what impact has NAPLAN had <u>on the amount of time spent teaching literacy and numeracy each week</u> in those year levels?

- We spend **significantly less time** (more than 3 hours less per week) teaching literacy and numeracy
- We spend **slightly less time** (between 1-3 hours less per week) teaching literacy and numeracy
- The amount of time we spend teaching literacy and numeracy has **not changed**
- We spend **slightly more time** (between 1-3 hours more per week) teaching literacy and numeracy
- We spend **significantly more time** (more than 3 hours more per week) teaching literacy and numeracy.

Q7. <u>In the lead-up to NAPLAN testing of Years 3 & 5 each year</u>, what impact has NAPLAN had <u>on the amount of time spent teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects each week</u> in those year levels?

- We spend **significantly less time** (more than 3 hours less per week) teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects
- We spend **slightly less time** (between 1-3 hours less per week) teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects
- The amount of time we spend teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects has **not changed**
- We spend **slightly more time** (between 1-3 hours more per week) teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects
- We spend **significantly more time** (more than 3 hours more per week) teaching non-NAPLAN assessed subjects

Q8. Have you observed <u>any other impacts</u> of NAPLAN testing <u>on the curriculum</u> offered at your school?

Yes/No/Not sure

If yes, please specify:

Please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.

Q9. What impact, if any, has NAPLAN testing had on classroom pedagogy at your school?

NAPLAN testing has:

- had a **significant negative impact** on classroom pedagogy at my school
- had a **slight negative impact** on classroom pedagogy at my school
- **not impacted** on classroom pedagogy at my school
- had a **slight positive impact** on classroom pedagogy at my school
- had a **significant positive impact** on classroom pedagogy at my school

Q10. Since the publication of NAPLAN data on the My School website was introduced, has there been any change in the amount of class time spent rote learning material in preparation for NAPLAN testing at your school?

- There is **much less class time** spent rote learning now
- There is **slightly less class time** spent rote learning now
- There has been **no change to class time** spent rote learning
- There is **slightly more class time** spent rote learning now
- There is **much more class time** spent rote learning now

Q11. In the lead-up to NAPLAN testing of Years 3 & 5 each year, how much school time, if any, is directed towards preparation for NAPLAN in those year levels?

- We **do not** allocate school time to NAPLAN preparation
- We **do** allocate school time to NAPLAN preparation

If time is allocated, please specify hours allocated per week_____ over _____ weeks.

Q12. Have you observed any other impacts of NAPLAN testing on classroom pedagogy at your school?

Yes/No/Not sure

If yes, please specify:

Please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.

Q13. Based on your interactions with the parents of students at your school, what is their level of interest in:
Very low/low/medium/high/very high

- Their own child's NAPLAN results
- The school's overall NAPLAN results
- Teacher performance as it impacts on NAPLAN results.

Q14. Since NAPLAN testing began in 2008, have any parents:
Yes/No/Not sure

- taken their child out of your school, citing their child's poor NAPLAN results?
- taken their child out of your school, citing your school's poor NAPLAN results?
- sought to enrol their child in your school, citing your school's good NAPLAN results?
- sought to enrol their child in your school, citing their child's good NAPLAN results?

Q15. Since NAPLAN testing began, what impact, if any, has it had on the school budget? Please select as many as are relevant:

- There has been **no impact** on the school budget
- We have allocated funding for **NAPLAN preparation materials**
- We have allocated funding for **NAPLAN-related teacher professional development**
- We have allocated funding for **additional teacher hours**
- We have allocated funding for **additional supervision and administration during NAPLAN test periods**
- Other: *please specify*

Q16. How are your school NAPLAN results reported to teachers? Please select as many as are relevant.

- They are not reported to teachers
- Email
- Letter
- Staff meeting
- School website
- Other: *please specify*

Please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.

Q17. How are your school NAPLAN results reported to students? Please select as many as are relevant.

- They are not reported to students
- Email
- In class
- School assembly
- School website
- Other: *please specify*

Q18. How are your school NAPLAN results reported to parents? Please select as many as are relevant.

- They are not reported to parents
- Email
- Letter
- Parent/Teacher night
- School website
- Other: *please specify*

Q19.

a. Which assessment practices used by your school provide aggregated data for your school?

Please list:

b. Of those assessment practices which provide aggregated data for your school, which (if any) would you recommend for use across Australian schools, and why?

Please write 'none' or list, with reason/s:

*APPA is interested in understanding **different and innovative approaches to student assessment** which provide **aggregated data** and which are currently used by Australian primary schools.*

If you would like APPA to contact you to discuss the approach your school takes to such assessments, please provide contact details below.
NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____
TELEPHONE: _____EMAIL ADDRESS: _____

Many thanks.

And finally, some demographic questions to help us in our analysis:

Q20. To which sector does your school belong?

- Catholic
- Government
- Independent

Please answer the following questions only in relation to classes in Years 3 & 5 at your own school.

Q21. In terms of size, which of these descriptions best fits your school?

- Small (<100 students)
- Medium (100-300 students)
- Large (300-600 students)
- Very Large (600+ students)

Q22. In which state/territory is your school located?

• Australian Capital Territory • New South Wales • Northern Territory • Queensland	• South Australia • Tasmania • Victoria • Western Australia

Q23. What is your geographic designation?

- Metropolitan
- Regional
- Rural
- Remote

Q24. What is your ICSEA score (as designated by My School)?

Please specify: _____

Q25. How many years have you been a principal?

Please specify:_____

OPTIONAL:

Q26. Please indicate your age range.

• 21-25 • 26-30 • 31-35 • 36-40 • 41-45 • 46-50	• 51-55 • 56-60 • 61-65 • 66-70 • 70+

Q27. Please specify your gender.

- Male
- Female

THANK YOU

APPENDIX TWO – State & Territory Findings

Survey results as they relate to the different states and territories are reported as an Appendix for direct comparison.

Impacts on Student Wellbeing

	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
	1353	33	267	8	161	178	21	436	249
Q1 NAPLAN impact on student wellbeing									
A very negative impact	7%	6%	6%		8%	6%	5%	9%	8%
A somewhat negative impact	59%	73%	57%	54%	64%	58%	52%	62%	54%
No impact	24%	15%	28%	23%	17%	27%	24%	21%	27%
A somewhat positive impact	9%	3%	9%	23%	9%	8%	19%	7%	11%
A very positive impact	1%	3%	0%		1%	1%		1%	

Q2 Students exhibit signs of stress	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	3%		5%		3%	2%		2%	2%
Rarely	17%	12%	16%	23%	11%	20%	19%	20%	22%
Sometimes	55%	61%	57%	46%	52%	59%	57%	55%	53%
Often	22%	24%	20%	16%	30%	19%	24%	19%	19%
Very often	3%	3%	2%	16%	4%			5%	4%

Q2 Students express fear of failure	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	2%		3%		3%	2%		2%	1%
Rarely	14%	15%	15%		10%	13%	29%	15%	21%
Sometimes	49%	51%	52%	61%	47%	52%	43%	45%	44%
Often	28%	28%	24%	23%	33%	30%	29%	29%	25%
Very often	7%	6%	6%	16%	8%	4%		9%	9%

Q2 Parents/carers withdraw students	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	12%	6%	18%		10%	6%	14%	7%	12%
Rarely	37%	35%	38%	46%	30%	38%	43%	37%	39%
Sometimes	46%	51%	39%	54%	54%	54%	43%	47%	45%
Often	4%	9%	3%		6%	3%		6%	3%
Very often	1%		1%					2%	1%

Q2 Students gets physically sick prior	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	11%	6%	11%	7%	11%	16%	19%	11%	10%
Rarely	37%	25%	37%	63%	33%	38%	43%	38%	38%
Sometimes	46%	66%	46%	23%	47%	43%	33%	44%	46%
Often	6%	3%	5%	7%	8%	3%	5%	7%	6%
Very often	1%		0%		1%			1%	1%

Q2 Students express enthusiasm	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	28%	19%	32%	16%	24%	25%	29%	31%	27%
Rarely	40%	46%	39%	23%	42%	37%	48%	42%	40%
Sometimes	28%	30%	26%	54%	30%	29%	19%	23%	30%
Often	4%	6%	3%	7%	4%	8%	5%	3%	3%
Very often	0%				0%	1%		1%	1%

Q2 Students show signs of excitement	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Never	36%	43%	39%	16%	30%	36%	34%	40%	36%
Rarely	40%	33%	39%	23%	41%	39%	48%	39%	43%
Sometimes	21%	19%	20%	47%	26%	22%	14%	18%	18%
Often	3%	6%	3%	14%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%
Very often	0%				0%			1%	0%

Q3 Differing impact on wellbeing	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
No difference	38%	35%	42%	54%	34%	27%	43%	44%	35%
More impact on Year 3	48%	58%	45%	46%	52%	60%	52%	42%	45%
More impact on Year 5	14%	7%	13%		14%	13%	5%	15%	20%

Impacts on Curriculum

Q5 Impact on curriculum	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
significant negative impact	14%	15%	11%		20%	10%	5%	14%	19%
slight negative impact	38%	39%	33%	16%	45%	38%	43%	44%	34%
not impacted curriculum	19%	22%	28%		9%	16%	33%	20%	13%
slight positive impact	22%	21%	22%	61%	17%	30%	19%	18%	23%
significant positive impact	7%	3%	6%	23%	9%	7%		4%	12%

Q6 Time spent teaching lit+num/ week	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
significantly less time	3%	3%	2%		5%	2%	5%	5%	4%
slightly less time	11%	3%	7%		20%	8%	10%	15%	4%
no change to time spent	42%	48%	48%	61%	28%	48%	47%	48%	36%
slightly more time	29%	34%	31%	7%	28%	32%	24%	23%	30%
significantly more time	15%	11%	11%	32%	19%	11%	15%	9%	26%

Q7 Time teaching non-NAPLAN/week	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
significantly less time	17%	12%	12%	7%	22%	11%	29%	18%	23%
slightly less time	40%	40%	37%	23%	50%	42%	29%	38%	34%
no change to time spent	39%	39%	47%	70%	24%	42%	38%	37%	39%
slightly more time	4%	6%	3%		3%	4%	5%	5%	3%
significantly more time	1%	3%	0%		1%	1%		2%	2%

Impacts on Classroom Pedagogy

Q9 Impact on classroom pedagogy	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
significant negative impact	9%	3%	6%		12%	7%	10%	11%	12%
slight negative impact	36%	43%	35%	7%	36%	43%	43%	41%	32%
no impact on classroom pedagogy	22%	18%	23%	16%	21%	18%	29%	27%	18%
slight positive impact	27%	34%	31%	54%	24%	29%	14%	19%	29%
significant positive impact	6%	3%	4%	23%	7%	4%	5%	3%	9%

Q10 Class time spent rote learning	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
much less class time	2%	3%	2%		3%	2%		2%	3%
slightly less class time	2%		2%		2%	3%		2%	1%
no change	62%	73%	70%	77%	51%	65%	61%	63%	56%
slightly more class time	27%	22%	23%	23%	31%	26%	24%	27%	33%
much more class time	7%	3%	3%		14%	4%	15%	6%	8%

Q11	b	A.C.T.	N.S.W	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Prep	Time	33	267	8	161	178	21	436	249
Hours	None	26.5	33.0	22.8	26.9	42.5	42.7	26.9	55.2
	1.0	18.0	22.2	7.1	15.8	13.7	4.6	15.1	6.8
	2.0	21.3	20.5	31.5	29.0	21.8	19.1	23.6	15.0
	3.0	11.8	10.0	15.7	12.3	10.5	19.1	15.3	3.8
	4.0	6.7	5.3	7.1	3.4	2.0	9.7	4.8	3.5
	5.0	12.3	6.6	15.7	7.8	8.2	4.8	9.5	6.0
	6.0	3.4	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.2
	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5
	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.1	0.6	0.0	2.1	3.2
Weeks	None	34.9	41.1	22.8	32.4	51.2	61.8	36.3	57.6
	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.1	1.2	0.0	1.6	0.5
	2.0	12.3	7.9	15.7	3.9	7.1	4.6	10.7	1.1
	3.0	9.0	5.6	15.7	3.0	11.1	0.0	9.0	1.3
	4.0	3.4	7.7	7.1	9.2	8.0	4.8	16.3	1.9
	5.0	10.1	6.5	15.7	4.1	5.5	0.0	9.2	2.8
	6.0	9.5	4.5	0.0	5.6	2.6	9.7	5.2	1.5
	7.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	2.0	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.2
	8.0	3.4	3.9	15.7	4.7	3.5	4.8	2.2	3.9
	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10.0	8.5	9.4	7.1	11.6	4.2	4.6	5.7	12.8
	11.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	4.8	0.0	1.5
	12.0	2.8	4.1	0.0	2.4	2.2	0.0	1.7	5.9
	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	3.4
	14.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
	15.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	4.3	0.4	0.0	0.8	1.9
	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	20.0	3.4	1.2	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.4	1.0

Impact on School Budget

Q15 No NAPLAN impact school budget	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	53%	54%	49%	77%	70%	47%	67%	43%	55%
yes	47%	46%	52%	23%	30%	53%	33%	57%	45%

Q15 Allocated funding for prep materials	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	71%	67%	78%	93%	53%	82%	76%	79%	63%
yes	29%	33%	22%	7%	47%	18%	24%	21%	37%

Q15 Allocated funding for teacher PD	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	67%	74%	66%	70%	57%	77%	81%	73%	67%
yes	33%	27%	34%	30%	44%	23%	19%	27%	33%

Q15 More funding for extra teacher hrs	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	83%	83%	87%	93%	66%	91%	76%	87%	82%
yes	18%	17%	13%	7%	34%	9%	24%	14%	18%

Q15 More $ for s/vision+admin in tests	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	82%	76%	84%	69%	77%	73%	71%	87%	84%
yes	19%	24%	16%	32%	23%	27%	29%	13%	17%

Parent Interest in NAPLAN Results

Q13 Parent interest in child's results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Very low	4%	3%	4%		5%	5%		5%	4%
Low	12%	6%	12%	32%	13%	11%	19%	13%	9%
Medium	32%	38%	26%	47%	41%	38%	52%	32%	28%
High	33%	41%	38%	7%	29%	30%	24%	31%	36%
Very high	18%	12%	21%	14%	12%	16%	5%	18%	22%

Q13 Parent interest in school's results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Very low	11%	12%	10%		11%	13%	5%	17%	8%
Low	30%	31%	25%	54%	35%	33%	29%	33%	27%
Medium	35%	34%	39%	46%	34%	37%	48%	28%	34%
High	18%	20%	21%		14%	15%	19%	15%	23%
Very high	6%	3%	5%		6%	2%		7%	7%

Q13 Parent interest in teacher perform	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Very low	25%	12%	23%		30%	27%	33%	32%	17%
Low	34%	49%	34%	32%	31%	36%	34%	33%	34%
Medium	26%	30%	26%	69%	26%	24%	33%	22%	27%
High	12%	9%	12%		10%	11%		9%	19%
Very high	4%		5%		4%	3%		5%	5%

Reporting of NAPLAN Results

Q16 They are not reported to teachers	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	99%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%
yes	1%	3%	1%					1%	0%

Q16 Email	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	85%	100%	94%	69%	71%	94%	72%	84%	77%
yes	15%		6%	32%	29%	7%	28%	16%	23%

Q16 Letter	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	97%	95%	99%	98%
yes	2%		2%		2%	3%	5%	1%	2%

Q16 Staff meeting	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	5%	3%	4%		6%	4%	5%	6%	4%
yes	95%	97%	96%	100%	94%	96%	95%	94%	96%

Q16 School website	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	87%	93%	91%	86%	79%	89%	76%	94%	82%
yes	13%	7%	9%	14%	22%	11%	24%	6%	18%

Q17 Results not reported to students	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	50%	27%	45%	86%	70%	41%	57%	44%	49%
yes	50%	74%	55%	14%	30%	59%	43%	56%	52%

Q17 Email	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	99%	100%	99%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%
yes	1%		1%		4%				0%

Q17 In class	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	76%	83%	84%	37%	60%	82%	76%	78%	78%
yes	24%	17%	16%	63%	40%	18%	24%	23%	22%

Q17 School assembly	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	94%	94%	94%	100%	88%	99%	90%	98%	93%
yes	6%	6%	6%		12%	1%	10%	2%	8%

Q17 School website	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	85%	97%	87%	93%	76%	90%	76%	94%	80%
yes	15%	3%	13%	7%	24%	11%	24%	6%	20%

Q18 They are not reported to parents	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	95%	85%	96%	100%	98%	94%	95%	89%	97%
yes	5%	15%	4%		2%	6%	5%	11%	3%

Q18 Email	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	97%	100%	98%	100%	92%	100%	91%	99%	95%
yes	3%		2%		8%	0%	9%	1%	5%

Q18 Letter	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	58%	60%	58%	37%	57%	56%	38%	49%	72%
yes	42%	40%	42%	63%	43%	44%	62%	51%	28%

Q18 Parent/Teacher night	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	73%	64%	71%	69%	66%	79%	76%	84%	74%
yes	27%	37%	29%	32%	34%	21%	24%	17%	27%

Q18 Results to parents via school websit	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
no	62%	76%	62%	63%	51%	62%	62%	79%	57%
yes	38%	24%	38%	37%	49%	38%	38%	21%	43%

Influence of NAPLAN on Certain Parent Behaviours

Q14 Child out citing child's poor results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Yes	11%		11%	7%	10%	9%	15%	12%	13%
No	79%	82%	76%	93%	81%	81%	76%	80%	77%
Not sure	11%	18%	13%		9%	10%	9%	9%	10%

Q14 Child out citing school's poor results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Yes	10%	3%	14%	7%	5%	9%	5%	9%	11%
No	81%	85%	74%	93%	87%	84%	86%	83%	81%
Not sure	9%	12%	12%		8%	8%	9%	8%	8%

Q14 Enrol child citing school good results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Yes	32%	46%	34%	23%	30%	29%	33%	32%	31%
No	59%	51%	56%	70%	62%	64%	43%	59%	59%
Not sure	9%	3%	10%	7%	8%	7%	24%	9%	10%

Q14 Enrol child citing child's good results	TOTAL	A.C.T.	N.S.W.	N.T.	QLD	S.A.	TAS	VIC	W.A.
Yes	19%	22%	24%	14%	14%	9%	28%	17%	20%
No	73%	75%	66%	79%	76%	84%	62%	75%	72%
Not sure	9%	3%	9%	7%	10%	7%	10%	8%	9%