

**JOINT COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT**

**Wednesday, 12 September 2012**

Auditor-General's report No. 41 (2011-12)

DEEWR submits the following responses to questions taken on notice. The responses to Questions 1 and 2 have been sourced from the COAG Reform Council's, *National Partnership Agreement on Literacy and Numeracy: Performance Report for 2011*. Report to the Council of Australian Governments, 30 April 2012<sup>1</sup>.

Question 1

The Chair asked, have you got a state by state breakdown [of the withheld \$64 million in reward payments]

Reference: Page 3 of transcript.

**DEEWR response:**

***Breakdown of second year reward funding by state or territory***

	Reward funding allocation for second year*	Second year reward payment	Percentage of second year reward funding allocation**	Unspent reward funding (2010-2012)
NSW	\$48,384,596	\$12,902,945	26.67%	\$35,481,651
Vic	\$53,213,336	\$ 48,038,141	90.27%	\$5,175,195
QLD	\$48,521,695	\$41,202,484	84.92%	\$7,319,211
WA	\$32,019,895	\$27,390,710	85.54%	\$4,629,185
SA	\$14,136,370	\$6,393,144	45.22%	\$7,743,226
Tas	\$5,923,103	\$3,536,092	59.70%	\$2,387,011
ACT	\$2,328,082	\$2,188,397	94.00%	\$139,685
NT	\$7,011,207	\$5,681,088	81.03%	\$1,330,119
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$211,538,284</b>	<b>\$147,333,003</b>	<b>69.65%</b>	<b>\$64,205,281</b>

\* includes rollover from unclaimed first year reward funding

\*\* percentages have been rounded

<sup>1</sup> COAG Reform Council 2012, *National Partnership Agreement on Literacy and Numeracy: Performance report for 2011*, COAG Reform Council, Sydney.

**CONTACT:** Wenda Donaldson

**Date Prepared:** 27 September 2012

**PHONE:**

**CLEARED BY:** Tony Zanderigo

## Question 2

Senator Thistlethwaite asked, did any of the withholding of some of that reward funding specifically relate to non-achievement of results [related to indigenous targets]

Reference: Page 8 of transcript.

Table: State and territory specific second year assessment (Indigenous targets)

State	Mandated NAPLAN measure: The proportion of students at or above the national minimum standard (Indigenous) – Reading and Numeracy	CRC Assessment	Total Weighting of Indigenous Targets
NSW	Reading and Numeracy Year 3 and Year 5 (aggregated)	Progress not made	10.0%
Vic	Reading – Year 3 Reading – Year 5 Numeracy – Year 3 Numeracy – Year 5	Progress made (81.5%) Progress made (71.7%) Progress not made Progress made (81.2%)	10.0%
QLD	Reading – Year 3 Reading – Year 5 Numeracy – Year 3 Numeracy – Year 5	Met or Exceeded Progress made (58.3%) Progress made (87.3%) Met or Exceeded	31.5%
WA	Reading – Year 3 Reading – Year 5 Reading – Year 7 Numeracy – Year 3 Numeracy – Year 5 Numeracy – Year 7	Met or Exceeded Progress made (74.0%) Met or Exceeded Met or Exceeded Progress made (58.9%) Met or Exceeded	12.0%
SA			10.0%
NAPLAN measure: Gain in mean scale score (Indigenous)	Reading – Year 3-5 Reading – Year 5-7 Numeracy – Year 3-5 Numeracy – Year 5-7	Met or Exceeded Progress not made Progress made (63.0%) Met or Exceeded	
Tas	Reading and Numeracy (aggregated) Years 5, 7 and 9 (aggregated)	Met or Exceeded	10.0%
ACT	Reading – Year 3 Reading – Year 5 Numeracy – Year 3 Numeracy – Year 5	Met or Exceeded Met or Exceeded Met or Exceeded Met or Exceeded	4.0%
NT	Reading – Year 3 Reading – Year 5 Numeracy – Year 3 Numeracy – Year 5	Met or Exceeded Progress made (4.0%) Met or Exceeded Progress made (84.5%)	40.0%
Gain in mean scale score (Indigenous)	Reading – Year 3-5 Numeracy – Year 3-5	Met or Exceeded Met or Exceeded	

**CONTACT:** Wenda Donaldson

**PHONE:**

**CLEARED BY:** Tony Zanderigo

**Date Prepared:** 27 September 2012

Page 2

### Question 3

The Chair asked, regarding the difference between the best performing state and the worst performing state and the ability to reach national agreement in that context, are the states roughly in the same ballpark or do we have a pretty big gap in literacy and numeracy... Where are we now? Are we starting to harmonise?

Reference: Page 11 of transcript.

### DEEWR response:

The LNNP is not intended for the purposes of comparing states and territories. The CRC's report states that "across jurisdictions a jurisdiction receiving an 'A' has not necessarily achieved more than another jurisdiction which achieved a 'B' or even a 'C'. This is because the assessment takes no account of the level of ambition or degree of difficulty associated with achieving the benchmark.

### Additional information

The Chair and Mrs D'Ath raised local measures in their discussions (reference pages 3 and 4 of transcript). DEEWR did not have information on hand to clarify what local measures were specified by states and territories and provide this information below.

### OPTIONAL LOCAL MEASURES

Local measures are designed to provide additional indicators of the effectiveness of interventions within a jurisdiction and reflect the emphasis of different groups of schools and/or states and territories.

### ***NSW (2010 and 2011)***

#### Mean scale score of all students

- A state-wide standardised assessment in reading and numeracy to measure progress of a larger group of students than those covered by NAPLAN.
- The tests were administered to Years 2, 3 and 4 in 2009 and follow the progress of each group into 2011

#### Data analysis assessment – proportion per phase

- An online self-assessment of teachers' and principals' use of data to improve pedagogy.
- The target for the end of term 3, 2011 was for all schools to lower the percentage of staff in phase 1 in a minimum of 3 of the domains which will reduce the average to 50.0% in phase 1 across all 7 domains.

#### Leadership capacity – the proportion of schools leading improvement in teaching

- Assessment of school practice in literacy and numeracy using the Analytical Framework for Effective Leadership and School Improvement in Literacy and Numeracy. This Framework has 25 statements of best practice in literacy and numeracy at levels (bands).
- In 2010, 77% of participating schools improved at least one level (band), in at least 50.0% of the 25 individual statements of the Analytical Framework.

---

**CONTACT:** Wenda Donaldson

**Date Prepared:** 27 September 2012

**PHONE:**

**CLEARED BY:** Tony Zanderigo

Page 3

### ***Victoria (2010 and 2011)***

#### Teaching and Learning Index

- A composite measure of student's perceptions from the Attitudes to School Survey conducted in the government and Catholic school sectors.
- Students in Years 5 & 6 in primary schools and Years 7-12 in secondary schools complete the survey. The questions are grouped into major factors covering teaching and learning and student relationships.

#### Learning Environment Factor

- A measure drawn from the Staff Opinion Survey conducted annually in all Victorian government schools.
- It consists of over 100 questions grouped into 20 factors, one of which is the Learning Environment Factor comprising four questions examining staff perceptions about the school's learning environment and overall climate and has been empirically linked to improved student learning outcomes in Victoria.

### ***Queensland (2010 and 2011)***

Queensland's local measures are based on two state reading assessments – the Progressive Achievement Test – Reading Comprehension and the Development Reading Assessment 2. These assessments measure student gain using a standardised reading age.

- A random sample of between 10 and 20 participating schools is reported for each local measure

#### Progressive Achievement Test – Reading Comprehension - Year 3, Year 5, Indigenous

#### Developmental Reading Assessment 2 - Year 5

- A local diagnostic test of reading tracked over 12 months. This test assists teachers in assessing and documenting primary student's development over time and identifying issues to guide interventions.

### ***South Australia (2011 only)***

- South Australia elected to use the 'mandated' NAPLAN measures only in 2010.

#### Gain in Mean Scale Score – Reading & Numeracy

- Gain measures are calculated from individual students' change in means scale score over the last two test years. Students were included if they attended the same schooling sector and participated in NAPLAN in the previous test (2 years prior).
- **Target Calculation:** *A proxy baseline of the 2008-10 gain for all South Australian students is used for this measure. The target for 2009-11 was for an improvement of 0.5 scale points over the gain for students in participating schools for 2008-10.*  
*The Year 3 to Year 5 Numeracy target is set equal to the 2008-10 gain, due to high gains achieved by participating schools for 2008-10.*

---

**CONTACT:** Wenda Donaldson

**Date Prepared:** 27 September 2012

**PHONE:**

**CLEARED BY:** Tony Zanderigo

Page 4

### ***Tasmania (2010)***

#### Student Attendance in Year 6 & 7

- Reported the student attendance rate for Year 6 and Year 7 as two data items, aggregated over participating schools.

#### NAPLAN Writing in Year 5 and Year 7

- Reported the proportion of students at or above the national minimum standard.

#### Teacher ratings of Indigenous student achievement

- Reported teacher ratings of Indigenous student's performance in English and Mathematics in participating government schools.

### ***Tasmania (2011)***

#### Student Attendance Rate

- Reports the Student Attendance Rate for Year 6, Year 7 and Year 8, aggregated over participating schools.

### ***Western Australia (2010 only)***

- Western Australia elected to use the 'mandated' NAPLAN measures only in 2011.

#### Student Attendance

- Student attendance measure in participating schools. Participation data was student numbers.

#### Growth in Reading and Numeracy Achievement

- No data was provided therefore no observations were made.

### ***Australian Capital Territory***

- ACT elected to use the 'mandated' NAPLAN measures only in 2010 and 2011.

### ***Northern Territory (2010 only)***

- Northern Territory elected to use the 'mandated' NAPLAN measures only in 2011.

#### NAPLAN mean scale scores

- Focused on mean scale score gains for matched student cohorts moving from Year 3 to Year 5. This applied to a matched cohort of up to 136 Indigenous students and a matched cohort of up to 298 Indigenous students in both Reading and Numeracy.

#### NAPLAN participation rates

- Reported percentage point gains in NAPLAN participation rates for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students in all participating schools.