

SUBMISSION TO THE
SENATE EMPLOYMENT, WORKPLACE RELATIONS, SMALL BUSINESS
AND EDUCATION LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

BY

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS' ASSOCIATIONS
ON THE

STATES GRANTS (PRIMARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION ASSISTANCE) BILL 2000

This submission is made by the National Council of Independent Schools' Associations on behalf of its member Associations of Independent Schools in each State and Territory.

NCISA regards the Socio Economic Status (SES) index scheme that the Bill proposes to use for distribution of general recurrent grants to non-government schools on a needs basis as a major improvement on the present Education Resources Index (ERI) system.

The ERI funding system currently in use was shown, by inquiries initiated by the Labor Government in 1995 and the present government in 1997, to provide an unsatisfactory assessment of need.

NCISA was closely involved in the lead up to, and subsequent investigation of, the SES scheme in 1997 and 1998.

The SES scheme is a logical development, based on improvements in technology, of methodology first employed in the early 1970's to use socio-economic indicators for special purpose funding of school education.

The scheme will assist in giving substance to the right of parents, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children, whether based in metropolitan or regional areas.

Executive Summary

i NCISA regards the SES-linked funding arrangements as a much fairer and more equitable means of allocating Commonwealth funding for schooling than the existing outdated Education Resources Index-based arrangements. Like the ERI, the SES contains a basic entitlement complemented by a needs-based component. However, unlike the ERI, the SES scheme uses an assessment of needs which is related to the resources of the community the school serves.

ii There is a long history of the use in Australia of an index of socio-economic status to determine relative need.

iii SES indicators as a measure of need have been, and are being, extensively used by a succession of Commonwealth and State Governments and by State Catholic Education Offices for funds-allocation purposes. Non-government school Block Grant Authorities use SES indicators to rank schools in order of socio-economic need for the allocation of Commonwealth Capital Grants.

iv NCISA recognises that one purpose of the new arrangements and funding is to redress previous inequities and imbalances in the old ERI-based scheme which were exacerbated by some aspects of the New Schools Policy. At the same time, NCISA notes that Commonwealth funding of students at non-government schools will still represent only a fraction (13.7% to 70%) of overall government recurrent funding for students at government schools.

v It is essential that this Bill be passed by the Parliament at the earliest possible time, so that schools preparing next year's budget, and subsequent years' budgets, can know with certainty the amount of Commonwealth funding that will be paid in respect of their students. Such certainty is also needed by parents in planning their household budgets so as to take account of school fees and charges.

vi An essential element of the Bill is that it guarantees financial stability in Commonwealth funding for all schools and that no school will have its funding reduced below its current allocation by the "maintained status" provision. It is vital that no part of the non-government sector be destabilised by loss of Commonwealth funding.

vii NCISA strongly supports the maintained status guarantee and regards it as an essential element of the consensus regarding the new arrangements within the non-government sector.

viii In the matter of targeted funding (other than general recurrent grants) NCISA strongly supports the maintaining of the current practice under which the Commonwealth allocates each sector's Commonwealth funding entitlement direct to each sector (government, independent and Catholic) in each State for administration by a single entity in each sector, eg the Association of Independent Schools in the State.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 NCISA is the national peak body representing independent schooling in Australia. In 1999 its eight member State and Territory Associations of Independent Schools represented a growing sector of 916 schools with approximately 40,000 staff, and an annual turnover of about \$2.5 billion.

1.2 The 343,000 students in independent schools, including 14,774 boarders, are some 10.6% of Australian school enrolments and 35.1% of enrolments in non-government schools. Students in independent secondary schools comprised 40.7% of non-government secondary students, the latter being 35.2% of total secondary school enrolments.

1.3 Independent schools, both regular and special, include those affiliated with the larger and the smaller Christian denominations, and with the Islamic and Jewish faiths; schools with varying interpretations of mainstream school education; and schools which promote a particular philosophy of education such as Montessori or Steiner schools. Other independent schools, such as Aboriginal community schools or co-operative schools, cater for particular community groups.

1.4 Students at independent schools include students drawn from families located in rural and remote regions of Australia as well as in the capital cities. The Socio Economic Status (SES) funding model proposed in the Bill provides a realistic measure of the needs of families in rural and remote areas. The current Education Resources Index (ERI) has been incapable of recognising the particular situation of schools catering to families in those areas.

1.5 Independent schools include a number of indigenous schools. Indigenous students in independent schools represent 32.7% of indigenous enrolments in all non-government schools. Many independent schools in Western Australia, Queensland and, particularly, the Northern Territory have a significant proportion of indigenous enrolments. Here, again, the SES provides a much more suitable recognition of their needs than does the ERI.

1.6 On average one third of the cost of educating a student in an independent school comes from government and the balance from parental and community sources. The parental and community contribution represents a very considerable saving to government, and will continue to do so under the new funding arrangements. Further information on financial aspects of independent schools is given in Appendix A.

1.7 There has been extensive consultation by the Commonwealth Department of Education and Training (DETYA) with all elements of the non-government school sector in the development of the proposed SES-based recurrent funding model. This has resulted in strong support across the sector for the intent and underlying policy of the Bill.

1.8 NCISA regards the SES-linked funding arrangements as a much fairer and more equitable means of allocating Commonwealth funding for schooling than the existing outdated Education Resources Index-based arrangements. Like the ERI, the SES contains a basic entitlement complemented by a needs-based component. However, unlike the ERI, the SES scheme uses an assessment of needs which is related to the resources of the school community.

1.9 In particular, NCISA recognises that one purpose of the new arrangements and funding is to redress previous inequities and imbalances in the old ERI-based scheme some of which were further exacerbated by some aspects of the New Schools Policy. At the same time, NCISA notes that Commonwealth funding of students at non-government schools will still represent only a fraction of overall government funding of students at government schools (see para 5.15ff).

1.10 An essential element of the Bill is that it guarantees financial stability in Commonwealth funding for all schools and that no school will have its funding reduced below its current allocation simply by the move to the SES scheme. It is vital that no part of any school sector be destabilised by loss of Commonwealth funding.

1.11 NCISA therefore welcomes and strongly supports the Government's undertaking that no school or system will be financially disadvantaged by the move to the new SES funding system (the "funding maintenance guarantee").

1.12 It is essential that this Bill be passed by the Parliament at the earliest possible time, so that schools preparing next year's budget, and subsequent years' budgets, can know with certainty the amount of Commonwealth funding that will be paid in respect of their students. Such certainty is also needed by parents in planning their household budgets so as to take account of school fees and charges.

1.13 NCISA understands that this Bill is effectively a "money bill" and so by convention must be passed by the Senate. NCISA supports early passage of the Bill.

2 BACKGROUND

General Recurrent Grants to Schools

2.1 Since 1973 Commonwealth financial assistance to the operating costs of non-government schools has been provided using a formula based on the Education Resources Index (ERI), or its precursor the Schools Recurrent Resources Index.

2.2 The ERI compares the income a school obtains from sources other than government with a standard level of resources, based on average government school recurrent costs (the AGSRC).

2.3 The present recurrent grant funding system for non-government schools has undergone many alterations but it has not changed fundamentally from its primary emphasis of the early 1970's on "*the resources used in the schools and not with the financial situation of the parents of the pupils*" ⁽¹⁾. This funding system began with eight categories in 1974, changed to six in 1976, then three in 1982, and then to the current twelve in 1985. In fact, a series of changes to the funding arrangements has resulted in there being effectively some thirty categories.

3 EDUCATION RESOURCES INDEX (ERI)

3.1. The ERI was developed by the Commonwealth Schools Commission as the principal tool for allocating a funding category to non-government schools and systems.

3.2. For many years the validity and usefulness of the ERI as a true measure of need was challenged on the basis of –

- *inequity* – schools serving the same community could be funded at very different levels;
- *disincentive* – schools raising additional income, eg through school fetes, could have their Commonwealth funding reduced as a consequence;
- *inflexibility* – schools could be “locked in” to a particular funding level, regardless of changes in their community;
- *complexity* – the formula had been added to and varied over the years.

3.3 In 1996 KPMG Management Consulting Pty Ltd reviewed the ERI system of categorising non-government schools for DETYA ⁽²⁾. The ERI was assessed against a framework of attributes which a good needs indicator should possess: *acceptability, transparency, robustness, sensitivity, efficiency and implementation*.

3.4 KPMG concluded:

In summary, the ERI fails to meet most of the tests of an effective indicator of need. Given these findings, the review of the method of allocating Commonwealth Government funding to schools foreshadowed by the Minister is supported ⁽³⁾.

DETYA Review of the ERI

3.5 In 1997 DETYA reviewed the ERI through nationwide consultations with key groups and members of the non-government schools community, including NCISA and its member Associations. The resulting DETYA Report ⁽⁴⁾ stated that the conclusion by KPMG Consulting on the inadequacy of the ERI “... *has generally been reaffirmed ...*”.

3.6 A subsequent Government paper stated that the “DETYA review has found that (the ERI) is no longer sustainable as a basis for assessing need for Commonwealth funding of non-government schools” ⁽⁵⁾.

3.7 The DETYA *review* canvassed alternative approaches to the ERI for assessing the relative need of non-government schools for funding, one of which was based on the relative socio-economic status (SES) of the school community. This was investigated by DETYA in 1998 through the *SES Simulation Project* ⁽⁶⁾.

4 SES SIMULATION PROJECT

4.1 The background to this DETYA SES Simulation Project, the investigation and selection of an appropriate SES indicator and its results, are described in detail in the Report ⁽⁷⁾.

4.2 The selected index has four components determined for each Census Collector District in the 1996 Census of Population and Housing. The components are:

- household income,
- income of families with children,
- education qualifications,
- occupational situation.

4.3 This index was shown to enable greater differentiation between schools than other indices investigated. A comparison of each participating school’s SES score with its ERI funding category showed that while there was some correlation there were also many divergences. Many schools with similar SES scores were spread across a number of ERI funding categories and therefore received different levels of Commonwealth funding. For example, in Ballarat, 8 of the 9 schools in funding categories 3 to 11 had SES scores within a range of 5 points ⁽⁸⁾.

4.4 The Commonwealth Government then proposed adoption of an SES-based model for the funding period 2001-2004⁽⁹⁾. The SES-based funding arrangements form part of the *States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000*.

5 KEY POINTS

The New Funding Scheme

5.1 Under the new SES- based funding arrangements –

“general recurrent funding will be distributed according to need and schools serving the neediest communities will receive the greatest financial support”⁽¹⁰⁾.

5.2 NCISA believes that the SES measure meets the essential criteria of a sound funding scheme for non-government schools. It maintains a basic entitlement complemented by a needs-based component and provides –

- *equity* – schools serving similar communities will generally be funded at similar levels;
- *incentive* – the SES methodology removes disincentives to private investment, as there is no longer the threat of loss of Commonwealth funding resulting from school fundraising activities, such as the school fete;
- *flexibility* – schools are not locked in to a particular funding level and can respond to changes in their school community;
- *simplicity* – the SES methodology is based on independent and reliable data supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and is simple to administer;
- *predictability* – schools will have a high degree of certainty about future funding, for planning and management decisions.

SES as a Measure of Need in Australian Schools

5.3 There is a long history of the use in Australia of an index of socio-economic status to determine relative need.

5.4 *Schools in Australia*, the May 1973 report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, described the development and validation of a Socio-Economic Scale for disadvantaged schools based on computer analysis of data from the 1971 Census of Population⁽¹¹⁾. Three elements of disadvantage were studied, including the social and economic characteristics of a school community likely to be associated with educational disadvantage.

5.5 Since then there have been many studies of indicators of socio-economic disadvantage suitable for guiding resource allocation decisions. In 1986, the Commonwealth Schools Commission provided support for a project by Deakin University, on indicators of socio-economic disadvantage for Australian schools⁽¹²⁾.

5.6 In 1995, DETYA obtained a report⁽¹³⁾ on behalf of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) which examined the use of SES indicators in allocation of funding for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the State and Territory government school systems, Catholic systems and independent schools.

5.7 SES indicators as a measure of need have been and are being extensively used by a succession of Commonwealth Governments, and State Governments and by State Catholic Education Offices for funds-allocation purposes. Non-government school Block Grant Authorities use SES indicators to rank schools for the allocation of Commonwealth Capital Grants.

Funding Maintenance Guarantee

5.8 It is extremely important for schools, and in particular for students and their families, that there be funding stability for their operations, and this is provided for by the legislative guarantee of ongoing government funding levels.

5.9 This need for funding stability has been recognised by a series of Commonwealth Governments. The then Labor Education Minister, Mr John Dawkins, stated in 1990⁽¹⁴⁾ -

... (the Commonwealth Government) considers that the funding arrangements ... will provide non-government schools with the ongoing stability and security necessary to plan their operations in the future. Secure in the knowledge of the level of funding they will receive from the Commonwealth, all non-government schools will be able to provide a stable and productive learning environment for the students (para 13).

5.10 As well, previous Commonwealth Governments have recognised the need for schools not to be adversely affected by significant changes to funding arrangements. For example, the table in the explanation of clause 8 in the Bill's Explanatory Memorandum shows that certain schools have had their funding maintained at a guaranteed level, notwithstanding changes to funding arrangements, since 1993.

5.11 The vital need for continuity of funding has been emphasised to reinforce the underlying policy basis for the provision in the Bill that *guarantees financial security for all schools. No school will be disadvantaged by the move to the new SES funding system.*⁽¹⁰⁾

5.12 Under that guarantee, schools that would otherwise have their funding reduced will have their year 2000 per capita entitlements maintained in accordance with movements in the AGSRC (see para 5.15ff).

5.13 The earlier changes in funding arrangements, although significant, were a good deal less fundamental than the move to the SES-based scheme, which justifies a more extensive guarantee of ongoing funding levels.

5.14 NCISA strongly supports that guarantee and regards it as an essential element of the consensus regarding the new arrangements within the non-government sector.

Average Government School Recurrent Cost (AGSRC)

5.15 The basic scheme of the Bill is to provide recurrent funding for non-government schools at a level which is determined by the average SES score of the families of the students at the school and is between 13.7% and 70% of the AGSRC. The AGSRC is a measure of the national average recurrent expenditure by governments on educating a student in a government school. It is the standard against which the relative needs of non-government schools are measured. Recurrent grant levels are adjusted annually against movements in the AGSRC.

5.16 The AGSRC does not represent the true cost of educating a student in a government school. This is because it excludes some costs of government school operations such as rent, superannuation and workers compensation costs.

5.17 The AGSRC also ignores private income generated by government schools. It follows that Commonwealth funding of non-government schools should not take into account private income generated by those schools when assessing relative need.

5.18 It should be noted that, while the Bill provides some additional funding to remedy prior inequities in the ERI-based Commonwealth funding assistance to non-government schools, (which in many cases caused serious financial problems) students at those schools attract and *will continue to attract* only a percentage of the AGSRC or what it would cost to educate a child in a government school.

Sector Targeted Program Funding Allocation

5.19 The efficiency and stability of school operations in each sector – government, independent and Catholic – are enhanced when Commonwealth funding is allocated by the Commonwealth direct to each sector in each State. This is a well established practice that also streamlines the funding flow to schools.

5.20 It has been demonstrated over a number of years that it is also administratively efficient and economic for the often limited targeted program funds to continue to be allocated to a single point in each sector for administering and distribution to schools – eg, in the independent sector, to the Association of Independent Schools in each State and Territory.

5.21 NCISA strongly supports the maintaining of the current practice under which the Commonwealth allocates each sector's Commonwealth targeted funding entitlement direct to each sector (government, independent and Catholic) in each State, for administration by a single point in each sector, eg the Association of Independent Schools in the State.

Broadbanding of Targeted Programmes

5.22 NCISA acknowledges that the amount of funding under the targeted programs will be variable depending on current government policy reflecting specific community needs. This funding, although not a fundamental element of school operating costs, is important to meet specific educational needs.

5.23 Broadbanding is a convenient way of increasing the flexibility of application of targeted funds. However, it is most effective when the flexibility can be available at a point closer to the eligible student, rather than centrally.

Strategic Assistance Programme

5.24 Commonwealth funding is vital to particular programmes because of the lack of State funding. The provision of \$522 per student in the Bill under the Strategic Assistance Programme is a first step on the way to a more suitable method of funding for students with disabilities but will be perceived as a reduction in overall special education support.

5.25 Commonwealth funding assistance for students with disabilities is critical in providing effective choice for their parents. Suitable funding needs to recognise two distinct areas: recurrent funding and specific strategic assistance programs for particular children. Adequate assistance is needed under the Students with a Disability component of the Strategic Assistance Program.

Accountability

5.26 The Bill introduces reforms in accountability for Commonwealth grants to schools. New accountability requirements are designed to strengthen the links between Commonwealth funding and student outcomes.

5.27 The Commonwealth will be requiring all education authorities – government and non-government – to commit to achieving performance targets against the National Goals for Schooling and to report publicly on their achievements.

5.28 The independent school sector is accountable to Commonwealth and State education and other authorities as well as to the parents of students. It is essential that the broad diversity of the pedagogy used in the sector be appreciated and recognised through flexibility of the assessment and reporting requirements.

5.29 Through NCISA, the sector is, and has been, involved along with the government and independent sectors in the development by MCEETYA of national goals, benchmarks and performance measures.

5.30 It is expected also that in accordance with usual practice, NCISA's member Associations will be closely involved in discussions with DETYA about the specific content and detail of the resource agreements between school authorities and the Commonwealth regarding assessment and reporting. This will help ensure balance within the Commonwealth's requirements.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 As mentioned above (section 1), the independent school sector reflects a wide diversity of communities, ethos, religious affiliations, ethnic and cultural groupings and socio-economic circumstances.

6.2 Extensive consultation by DETYA with all elements of the non-government school sector has resulted in strong support across the sector for the intent and underlying policy of the Bill now before the Parliament.

6.3 One purpose of the new funding arrangements is to redress previous inequities and imbalances in the old scheme, which has been demonstrated by KPMG and others to be inadequate.

6.4 NCISA recognises and supports this need to redress prior inequities, and notes that Commonwealth funding of students at non-government schools will still represent only a fraction of the expenditure necessary if those children were funded at the Average Government School Recurrent Cost.

6.5 NCISA regards the new SES-linked funding arrangements as a much fairer and more equitable system of allocating Commonwealth funding for schooling, and strongly supports early passage of the Bill through the Parliament.

NCISA
August 2000

APPENDIX A -PROFILE OF THE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS SECTOR

A.1 The average recurrent cost of educating a student in an independent school is about the same as the average recurrent cost of a student in a government school. On average one third of independent school operating costs comes from government and the balance from parental and community sources.

A.2 There is a popular misconception that independent schools predominantly cater for an exclusive, wealthy sub-group of Australian society. This is not so as was recognised by Professor Ken McKinnon in his *Review of the New Schools Policy* ⁽¹⁵⁾.

A.3 The 1996 Census of Population and Housing provided data on the family income of students attending government, Catholic and independent schools. The figures show that families of all income levels have children in each school sector. Even at the highest annual family income range, $\geq \$104,000$, many more students attend government schools (48.3%) than independent schools (28.6%). At the second highest income range, \$78,000 to \$103,999, more students attend government schools (59.1%) than independent schools (15.2%).

A.4 Independent schools cover the full range of the current Commonwealth funding categories from 1 (the lowest government funding of 11.9%, primary; and 13.9%, secondary AGSRC) to 12 (highest funding at about 55% primary, and 59.7% AGSRC). More than 51% of enrolments are in categories 6 to 10, which are the categories that displayed no significant difference in ranking on the basis of SES scores in the *SES Simulation Project Report*.

Current recurrent funding of independent schools

A.5 This funding comes from three sources:

- fees, donations, contributed services and other private effort,
- Commonwealth government,
- State/Territory government.

A.6 Current Commonwealth funding is the ERI-based system of school categories which provides, in principle, a uniform sum for each category throughout Australia. For the quadrennium 1997 – 2000, the funding levels are as shown in the table below. The funding levels, and their adjustment for increases in costs, are linked to the AGSRC which significantly underestimates actual average government school recurrent costs (see Sections 5.16 and 5.17).

ERI Funding Category	Percentage of AGSRC Primary Funding Level	Percentage of AGSRC Secondary Funding Level
1	11.9	13.9
2	15.8	18.5
3	19.8	21.4
4	24.0	28.1
5	29.0	31.4
6	32.0	34.7
7	35.1	38.0
8	38.7	42.0
9	43.4	47.2
10	47.0	51.0
11	50.9	55.1
12	55.0	59.7

A.7 State/Territory funding varies substantially across Australia. Some States and the ACT follow the ERI categories; others use different methods of allocating funds. The range of support is shown for 1998 in the accompanying extract from the *National Report on Schooling in Australia 1998*.

Table A2 – page 215 the *National Report on Schooling in Australia 1998*.

Recurrent funding

Table 28 State government per capita grants to non-government schools, by category, Australia, 1998 (\$)

<i>Commonwealth funding category</i>	<i>NSW (a)</i>	<i>Vic (b)</i>	<i>WA (c)</i>	<i>ACT (d)</i>	<i>Rates for other States</i>	
	PRIMARY					
1	416	295/353	758	241	Tasmania	
2	541	411	758	321	Primary	890
3	624	529	758	399	Junior secondary	1,157
4	665	568	832	485	Senior secondary	1,674
5	707	570	832	562		
6	748	593	860	623	Northern Territory	
7	790	596	860	684	Primary	1,087
8	832	616	902	750	Secondary	1,641
9	873	677	902	801		
10	915	681	940	851	South Australia (g)	
11	956	685	940	903	Primary	395
12	1,085	687	972	956	Secondary	549
	SECONDARY					
1	623	434/518	1,152	381	Queensland (h)	
2	810	607	1,152	505	Primary	684
3	935	781	1,152	584	Secondary	1,047
4	997	896	1,348	764		
5	1,060	898	1,348	817		
6	1,122	934	1,420	908		
7	1,184	938	1,420	999		
8	1,247	969	1,482	1,098		
9	1,309	1,064	1,482	1,173		
10	1,371	1,066	1,532	1,243		
11	1,434	1,068	1,532	1,317		
12	1,539	1,070	1,586	1,396		

Note: All amounts rounded to the nearest dollar. Rates are expressed in 1998 prices. Rates for some States may be subject to cost supplementation.

(a) Calendar-year figures for NSW are calculated by adding two payments which are made each half-year for each category, each payment falling in a different financial year. Special schools and children with disabilities (in terms of the Commonwealth's definition) are paid category 12 rates.

(b) Victoria splits category 1 into 1A and 1B for schools with an Education Resources Index over 100.

(c) Includes pre-primary rates of \$568 (cat. 1-3), \$624 (cat. 4-5), \$646 (cat. 6-7), \$676 (cat. 8-9), \$706 (cat. 10-11) and \$730 (cat. 12), for each full-time equivalent student.

(d) ACT figures represent the average of two distinct half-yearly payments across financial years 1997-98 and 1998-99.

(g) SA also pays a needs component which constitutes 52.5 per cent of total grants available in 1998. Total amount of needs component is distributed among schools using 35 per cent allocation according to a number of needs of schools and 65 per cent allocation according to a number of needs of students.

(h) In addition to these base rates, Queensland pays a needs component constituting 22.5 per cent of the total grants available in 1998. The total needs component is disbursed according to school needs (80 per cent) and student needs (20 per cent).

Source: State departments of education

Sources of Capital and Capital Expenditure

A.8 The Commonwealth and the States/Territories assists non-government schools with a small proportion of the costs of capital. In 1998, the Commonwealth provided the independent sector with capital support of \$30.5 million while the States/Territories provided about \$28 million in capital and interest support. Total expenditure on capital by the sector was \$450 million. Direct capital contributions by parents (donations and levies) amounted to at least \$230 million with the balance raised mainly through borrowings.

Footnotes

1. Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, AGPS, May 1973, p4 (S1.4).
2. Evaluation of the Administration of the General Recurrent Grants for Schools Program, KPMG Management Consulting Pty Ltd, DEETYA, August 1996.
3. See (2), p3.
4. Schools Funding: Consultation Report, DEETYA, October 1997, p26 (S.3.13).
5. Choice and Equity: Funding Arrangements for Non-Government Schools 2001 – 2004, Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, May 1999, p4.
6. Schools Funding: SES Simulation Project Report, DEETYA, December 1998, Chapter 4.
7. See the Report of (6).
8. See the Report of (6), p32.
9. Choice and Equity: Funding Arrangements for Non-Government Schools 2001 – 2004, Statement by the Honourable David Kemp, Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 11 May 1999.
10. States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000, Second Reading Speech, House of Representatives Hansard 29th June 2000, p17067.
11. See Report of (1), Appendix E, p163ff.
12. KN Ross, S Farish and M Plunkett, Indicators of Socio-economic Disadvantage for Australian Schools, Deakin Institute for Studies in Education, 1988.
13. J Ainley, B Graetz, M Long and M Batten Socio-economic Status and School Education, ACER, June 1995.
14. Funding Arrangements for Non-Government Schools to the Year 2000, Policy Statement by the Hon JS Dawkins, Minister for Employment, Education and Training, February 19, 1990.
15. Final Report: Review of the New Schools Policy, McKinnon – Walker Pty Ltd, DEETYA, April 1996, para 1.6.

Ref: Common:Papers:Senate Submissionrev4