4 School education

**CONTENTS**

4.1 Profile of school education 4.2

4.2 Framework of performance indicators 4.14

4.3 Key performance indicator results 4.17

4.4 Future directions in performance reporting 4.94

4.5 Jurisdictions’ comments 4.95

4.6 Definitions of key terms 4.105

4.7 List of attachment tables 4.108

4.8 References 4.115

|  |
| --- |
| **Attachment tables**  Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by a ‘4A’ prefix (for example, table 4A.1). A full list of attachment tables is provided at the end of this chapter, and the attachment tables are available from the Review website at www.pc.gov.au/gsp. |
|  |
|  |

This chapter focuses on performance information — equity, effectiveness and efficiency — for government funded school education in Australia. Reporting relates to government funding only, not to the full cost to the community of providing school education. Descriptive information and performance indicators are variously reported for:

* government primary and secondary schools
* non-government primary and secondary schools
* school education as a whole (government plus non-government primary and secondary schools).

Data in this chapter mostly relate to the 2012 calendar year and the 2011-12 financial year.

Schooling aims to provide education for all young people. The main purposes of school education are to assist students in:

* attaining knowledge, skills and understanding in key learning areas
* developing their talents, capacities, self-confidence, self-esteem and respect for others
* developing their capacity to contribute to Australia’s social, cultural and economic development.

Major improvements in reporting on school education this year include further developments in the ‘learning outcomes’ indicator:

* reporting outcomes of the year 6 Science literacy National Assessment Program (NAP) in 2012
* reporting outcomes of the 2012 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) for reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy performance. In PISA 2012, mathematical literacy was the major assessment domain
* reporting outcomes of the year 4 2011 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), for reading performance

expansion of time series data from five to ten years for aggregate expenditure and expenditure per full time equivalent student in the attachment tables.

* 1. **Profile of school education**

**Service overview**

Schools are the institutions within which organised school education takes place. They are differentiated by the type and level of education they provide, their ownership and management, and the characteristics of their student body. The formal statistical definition of schools used for this chapter is:

an establishment which satisfies all of the following criteria:

* its major activity is the provision of full time day primary or secondary education or the provision of primary or secondary distance education
* it is headed by a principal (or equivalent) responsible for its internal operation
* it is possible for students to enrol for a minimum of four continuous weeks, excluding breaks for school vacations (ABS 2013).

Student performance can be affected by factors that may be partly or totally outside the influence of the school system, such as student commitment, family environment (including socio-economic status and parents’ educational attainment and support for the child) and the proximity of the school to other educational facilities. It is beyond the scope of this Report to consider the effect of all such factors, but this section provides some context for the performance information presented later in the chapter. Further contextual information about population and household characteristics in each State and Territory is provided in chapter 2 ‘Statistical context’.

**Roles and responsibilities**

Under constitutional arrangements, the State and Territory governments have responsibility to ensure the delivery of schooling to all children of school age. They determine curricula, regulate school activities and provide most of the funding. State and Territory governments are directly responsible for the administration of government schools, for which they provide the majority of government funding. Non-government schools operate under conditions determined by State and Territory government registration authorities and also receive State and Territory government funding.

The major element of Australian Government funding is provided through the National Schools Specific Purpose Payment (SPP), which is associated with the National Education Agreement (NEA) under the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) on Federal Financial Relations. The non-government schools funding component of the National Schools SPP is determined by the *Schools Assistance Act 2008*. Both the NEA and the *Schools Assistance Act 2008* came into effect on 1 January 2009. The Australian Government also provides supplementary funding for government schools and non‑government schools through National Partnerships associated with the NEA. Other Australian Government payments of a smaller scale are made directly to school communities, students and other organisations to support schooling.

The Standing Council for School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC)[[1]](#footnote-1) — comprising Australian, State and Territory, and New Zealand education ministers — is the principal forum for developing national priorities and strategies for schooling.

**Funding**

Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure on school education was $47.1 billion in 2011-12 (table 4.1). Expenditure on government schools was $36.5 billion, or 77.6 per cent of total government recurrent expenditure on school education. Government schools account for most of the expenditure by State and Territory governments. These governments also contribute to the funding of non-government schools and provide services used by both government and non-government schools.

Nationally, State and Territory governments provided 87.5 per cent of total government recurrent expenditure on government schools in 2011-12, and the Australian Government provided 12.5 per cent. In contrast, government expenditure on non-government schools in that year was mainly provided by the Australian Government (73.4 per cent), with State and Territory governments providing 26.6 per cent (table 4.1).

More information on funding and expenditure can be found in tables 4A.7–9.

Table 4.1 **Government recurrent expenditure on school education, 2011-12 ($ million)**a, b, c, d

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Government schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian Government | 1 516 | 1 028 | 917 | 452 | 347 | 131 | 64 | 124 | 4 579 |
| State and Territory governments | 10 223 | 6 477 | 6 787 | 4 068 | 2 366 | 794 | 666 | 573 | 31 954 |
| **Total** | **11 739** | **7 504** | **7 704** | **4 520** | **2 713** | **925** | **731** | **697** | **36 533** |
| Non-government schools | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian Government | 2 384 | 1 997 | 1 568 | 787 | 626 | 159 | 146 | 85 | 7 751 |
| State and Territory governments | 899 | 580 | 600 | 418 | 165 | 54 | 48 | 51 | 2 814 |
| **Total** | **3 283** | **2 577** | **2 168** | **1 204** | **790** | **214** | **193** | **135** | **10 565** |
| All schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australian Government | 3 900 | 3 024 | 2 485 | 1 239 | 972 | 291 | 210 | 209 | 12 330 |
| State and Territory governments | 11 123 | 7 057 | 7 387 | 4 486 | 2 531 | 848 | 714 | 624 | 34 768 |
| **Total** | **15 022** | **10 081** | **9 872** | **5 724** | **3 503** | **1 139** | **924** | **832** | **47 098** |

a See notes to table 4A.7 for definitions and other data caveats. Data presented here include notional user cost of capital (UCC) and exclude capital grants. b Based on accrual accounting. c Totals may not add due to rounding. d Depreciation and user cost of capital expenses relating to government schools have been attributed to states/territories based on ownership of the underlying assets. A portion of these assets will have been acquired through Australian Government capital contributions, with states and territories responsible for maintenance costs. Australian Government expenditure data in this table include only Australian Government specific purpose payments. Other Australian Government funding for schools and students is not included.

*Source*: SCSEEC (unpublished) *National Schools Statistics Collection* (NSSC); Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 4A.7.

This chapter also reports on government funding of non-government schools. Caution should be taken when comparing data on the relative efficiency of government and non-government schools, because governments provide only part of the funding for non-government schools. Governments provided 57.3 per cent of non-government school funding in 2012, with the remaining 42.7 per cent sourced from private fees and fundraising (Australian Government Department of Education unpublished). Section 4.3 contains additional information on government expenditure per student. In 2011-12, State and Territory governments’ capital expenditure in government schools was $2.7 billion (SCSEEC unpublished). This includes funding from the Australian Government and State and Territory governments.

**Si**z**e and scope**

Descriptive information on the numbers of students, staff and schools can be found in tables 4A.1–6.

**Structure**

The structure of school education varies across states and territories. These differences can influence the comparability and interpretation of data presented under common classifications. Formal schooling consists of six to eight years of primary school education followed by five to six years of secondary school education, depending on the State or Territory (figure 4.1). All states and territories divide school education into compulsory and non-compulsory components based primarily on age. Schooling is generally full time, although an increasing proportion of part time study occurs in more senior years.

In 2012, the age at which a child’s attendance in school education became compulsory was 5 years of age in Tasmania and 6 years of age in all other states and territories (ABS 2013).

Children may commence school at an age younger than the statutory age at which they are required to attend school. Most children commence full time schooling in the year preceding Year 1 (pre-year 1) (figure 4.1). Generally, minimum starting ages restrict enrolment to children aged between four and a half and five years at the beginning of the pre-year 1 commencement year (ABS 2013).

As part of the Compact with Young Australians, COAG implemented a National Youth Participation Requirement (NYPR) (which commenced on 1 January 2010). The NYPR includes:

* a mandatory requirement for all young people to participate in schooling (in school or an approved equivalent) until they complete Year 10
* a mandatory requirement for all young people who have completed Year 10 to participate full time in education, training or employment, or a combination of these activities, until 17 years of age (COAG 2009).

For the purpose of the NYPR, education or training will be considered full time if the provider considers the course to be full time or if it includes 25 hours per week of formal course requirements.

Some exemptions from the NYPR continue in line with existing State and Territory practice.

Figure 4.1 Structure of primary and secondary schooling, 2012a, b

Figure 4.1 Structure of primary and secondary schooling, 2012

More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.

**a**Figure 4.1 refers to the structure utilised in *Schools Australia 2012* (ABS 2013), which is the source for a range of schools, students, participation and retention data in this chapter. **b** Figure 4.1 does not include pre‑school programs, otherwise known as Pre-pre-year 1, or Year 1 minus 2, some of which are an integral part of school programs, and some of which are offered by a range of providers in some jurisdictions. Table 3.1 in the Early childhood education and care chapter describes the entry points for the range of part and full time preschool services across states and territories. Box B.3 in the Child care, education and training sector overview describes the structure of education and training more generally. **c**  Most ACT students transition to a senior college for years 11 and 12. **d**In SA, children generally start school at the beginning of the school term following their fifth birthday.

*Source*: Adapted from ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0.

*Schools*

At the beginning of August 2012, there were 9427 schools in Australia (6290 primary schools, 1392 secondary schools, 1321 combined schools and 424 special schools). The majority of schools were government owned and managed (71.0 per cent) (table 4.2). Settlement patterns (population dispersion), the age distribution of the population and educational policy influence the distribution of schools by size and level in different jurisdictions. Nationally, 62.5 per cent of all secondary schools enrolled over 600 students (table 4A.26). A breakdown of primary and secondary schools by size for government, non-government and all schools is reported in tables 4A.24–26 respectively.

Table 4.2 Summary of school characteristics, August 2012

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Unit* | *NSW* | *Vic* | | *Qld* | | *WA* | | *SA* | | *Tas* | | *ACT* | | *NT* | | *Aust* | |
| Government schools | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Primary | no. | 1 623 | 1 136 | | 921 | | 513 | | 393 | | 128 | | 53 | | 60 | | 4 827 | |
| Secondary | no. | 370 | 244 | | 180 | | 96 | | 68 | | 38 | | 18 | | 15 | | 1 029 | |
| Combined**a** | no. | 66 | 79 | | 92 | | 90 | | 76 | | 26 | | 9 | | 73 | | 511 | |
| Special schools**b** | no. | 110 | 76 | | 46 | | 66 | | 18 | | 5 | | 4 | | 5 | | 330 | |
| **Total** | **no.** | **2 169** | **1 535** | | **1 239** | | **765** | | **555** | | **197** | | **84** | | **153** | | **6 697** | |
| Non-government schools (no.) | | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Primary | no. | 490 | 425 | | 232 | | 149 | | 103 | | 28 | | 25 | | 11 | | 1 463 | |
| Secondary | no. | 145 | 98 | | 73 | | 9 | | 19 | | 5 | | 5 | | 9 | | 363 | |
| Combined**a** | no. | 237 | 156 | | 154 | | 132 | | 70 | | 31 | | 13 | | 17 | | 810 | |
| Special schools**b** | no. | 41 | 19 | | 17 | | 11 | | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 94 | |
| **Total** | **no.** | **913** | **698** | | **476** | | **301** | | **195** | | **65** | | **44** | | **38** | | **2 730** | |
| All schools (no.) |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Primary | no. | 2 113 | 1 561 | | 1 153 | | 662 | | 496 | | 156 | | 78 | | 71 | | 6 290 | |
| Secondary | no. | 515 | 342 | | 253 | | 105 | | 87 | | 43 | | 23 | | 24 | | 1 392 | |
| Combined**a** | no. | 303 | 235 | | 246 | | 222 | | 146 | | 57 | | 22 | | 90 | | 1 321 | |
| Special schools**b** | no. | 151 | 95 | | 63 | | 77 | | 21 | | 6 | | 5 | | 6 | | 424 | |
| **Total** | **no.** | **3 082** | **2 233** | | **1 715** | | **1 066** | | **750** | | **262** | | **128** | | **191** | | **9 427** | |
| Proportion of schools that are government schools (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  |
| Primary | % | 76.8 | 72.8 | | 79.9 | | 77.5 | | 79.2 | | 82.1 | | 67.9 | | 84.5 | | 76.7 | |
| Secondary | % | 71.8 | 71.3 | | 71.1 | | 91.4 | | 78.2 | | 88.4 | | 78.3 | | 62.5 | | 73.9 | |
| Combined**a** | % | 21.8 | 33.6 | | 37.4 | | 40.5 | | 52.1 | | 45.6 | | 40.9 | | 81.1 | | 38.7 | |
| Special schools**b** | % | 72.8 | 80.0 | | 73.0 | | 85.7 | | 85.7 | | 83.3 | | 80.0 | | 83.3 | | 77.8 | |
| **All schools** | **%** | **70.4** | **68.7** | | **72.2** | | **71.8** | | **74.0** | | **75.2** | | **65.6** | | **80.1** | | **71.0** | |
| Proportion of schools that are primary schools (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government | % | 74.8 | 74.0 | | 74.3 | | 67.1 | | 70.8 | | 65.0 | | 63.1 | | 39.2 | | 72.1 | |
| Non-government | % | 53.7 | 60.9 | | 48.7 | | 49.5 | | 52.8 | | 43.1 | | 56.8 | | 28.9 | | 53.6 | |
| **All schools** | **%** | **68.6** | **69.9** | | **67.2** | | **62.1** | | **66.1** | | **59.5** | | **60.9** | | **37.2** | | **66.7** | |

**a** Combined primary and secondary schools. **b** Special schools provide special instruction for students with a physical and/or mental disability/impairment, or with social problems. Students must exhibit one or more of the following characteristics before enrolment is allowed: mental or physical disability or impairment, slow learning ability, social or emotional problems, and in custody, on remand or in hospital.

*Source*: ABS (2013 and unpublished) *Schools Australia 2012,* Cat. no. 4221.0; tables 4A.1–3.

*Student body*

There were 3.6 million full time equivalent (FTE) student enrolments in primary and secondary schools in August 2012 (see section 4.6 for a definition of FTE student). Nationally, 48.9 per cent of FTE students in all schools were female (table 4.3).

A higher proportion of FTE students was enrolled in primary schools (58.1 per cent) than in secondary schools (41.9 per cent) (table 4.3). Differences in schooling structures influence enrolment patterns. Primary school education in Queensland, WA and SA, for example, includes year 7, whereas all other jurisdictions include year 7 in secondary school (figure 4.1). The proportion of students enrolled in primary school education can be expected to be higher in jurisdictions that include year 7 in primary school (table 4.3).

Nationally, the proportion of FTE students enrolled in government schools was 65.1 per cent. A higher proportion of FTE students was enrolled in government schools at primary level (68.9 per cent) than at secondary level (60.0 per cent) (table 4.3).

Table 4.3 FTE student enrolments, August 2012a, b

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Unit* | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| Total FTE student enrolments at level of education | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Primary schools | (‘000) | 635.2 | 478.0 | 463.5 | 243.1 | 158.6 | 43.4 | 33.1 | 24.1 | 2 079.0 |
| Secondary schools | (‘000) | 503.8 | 390.3 | 287.0 | 131.8 | 101.9 | 38.0 | 29.1 | 15.9 | 1 497.8 |
| **All schools** | (‘000) | **1 139.0** | **868.3** | **750.5** | **375.0** | **260.5** | **81.4** | **62.2** | **40.0** | **3 576.8** |
| Proportion of FTE students who were enrolled in government schools | | | | | | | | |  |  |
| Primary schools | % | 69.4 | 67.4 | 70.0 | 69.7 | 66.2 | 73.4 | 60.4 | 78.1 | 68.9 |
| Secondary schools | % | 61.1 | 57.5 | 61.4 | 57.7 | 60.4 | 68.0 | 53.8 | 67.1 | 60.0 |
| **All schools** | % | **65.7** | **62.9** | **66.7** | **65.5** | **63.9** | **70.9** | **57.3** | **73.7** | **65.1** |
| Proportion of FTE students who were female (all schools) | | | | | | | | |  |  |
| Primary schools | % | 48.5 | 48.7 | 48.4 | 48.8 | 48.7 | 48.4 | 48.8 | 49.1 | 48.6 |
| Secondary schools | % | 49.4 | 49.4 | 49.6 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 49.6 | 49.3 | 48.4 | 49.4 |
| **All schools** | % | **48.9** | **49.0** | **48.8** | **48.8** | **49.1** | **49.0** | **49.0** | **48.9** | **48.9** |
| Proportion of FTE students who were enrolled in primary education, by sector | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Government schools | % | 58.9 | 58.9 | 64.8 | 69.0 | 63.0 | 55.2 | 56.1 | 63.8 | 61.5 |
| Non-government schools | % | 49.8 | 48.5 | 55.7 | 56.9 | 57.1 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 50.2 | 51.9 |
| **All schools** | % | **55.8** | **55.1** | **61.8** | **64.8** | **60.9** | **53.3** | **53.2** | **60.2** | **58.1** |

**a** Students enrolled in special schools are included, with special school students of primary school age and/or year level included in the primary figures and those of secondary school age and/or year level included in the secondary figures. **b** Results of calculations may vary from the table due to rounding differences.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; tables 4A.1–4.

Total full time student enrolments in schools in Australia were relatively stable from 2008 to 2012, increasing by 1.0 per cent each year (table 4A.28). Full time school students represented 15.6 per cent of the Australian population in 2012 (table 4A.5).

The proportion of full time students enrolled in non-government schools increased between 2008 and 2012 in all states and territories. Full time non-government school enrolments increased by 1.6 per cent per year, while full time government school enrolments increased by an average of 0.6 per cent per year (table 4A.28). The expansion of full time enrolments in non-government schools was from a lower base than that for government schools. In absolute terms, the number of full time students in government schools increased from 2 264 554 in 2008 to 2 321 217 in 2012. The number of full time students in non-government schools increased from 1 169 736 in 2008 to 1 245 848 in 2012 (table 4A.27).

Part time students form a significant proportion of secondary school enrolments in some jurisdictions (table 4.4). Part time courses are available to secondary students, including mature age students attending colleges and those studying years 11 or 12 or short courses (lasting five to 22 weeks). The proportion of secondary school students who were enrolled part time in 2012 varied considerably across jurisdictions, partly because jurisdictions’ education authorities have different policy and organisational arrangements for part time study, as well as different definitions of what constitutes part time study. The number of part time courses available also varied considerably across jurisdictions.

Table 4.4 Part time secondary school students in government schools

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| Part time secondary school students in government schools **a** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 2008 | no. | 2 045 | 2 324 | 2 843 | 1 747 | 6 226 | 1 503 | – | 338 | 17 026 |
| 2009 | no. | 1 857 | 2 839 | 2 926 | 952 | 6 330 | 1 955 | 6 | 211 | 17 076 |
| 2010 | no. | 1 956 | 2 701 | 3 155 | 2 089 | 6 135 | 2 143 | 6 | 42 | 18 227 |
| 2011 | no. | 1 915 | 2 252 | 3 385 | 2 000 | 4 059 | 2 463 | 46 | 228 | 16 348 |
| 2012 | no. | 2 288 | 2 382 | 3 901 | 1 871 | 2 804 | 2 344 | 47 | 207 | 15 844 |
| Proportion of secondary school students in government schools who were part time students**b** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 | % | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 9.8 | 5.7 | – | 3.1 | 1.9 |
| 2009 | % | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 9.7 | 7.4 | – | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| 2010 | % | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 9.3 | 7.9 | – | 0.4 | 2.0 |
| 2011 | % | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 6.3 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| 2012 | % | 0.7 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 8.7 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.7 |

**a**  Number of part time secondary students. **b** Number of part time secondary students divided by number of full time and part time secondary students. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: ABS (2013 and unpublished) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.1.

*Special needs groups*

Some groups of students in school education have been identified as having special needs. These special needs groups include:

* Indigenous students
* students from language backgrounds other than English (LBOTE)
* students with disability
* geographically remote students
* students from families of low socio-economic status.

Government schools provide education for a high proportion of students from special needs groups. In 2012, 84.7 per cent of Indigenous students and  
76.6 per cent of students with disability, attended government schools (tables 4A.29 and 4A.31). Further information on student body mix in government, non‑government and all schools is in tables 4A.32–34.

*Indigenous students*

The number and proportion of full time students who are Indigenous varies greatly across jurisdictions (table 4.5). In all jurisdictions, the proportion of full time Indigenous students was much higher in government schools than in non‑government schools. Nationally, the proportion of full time students who were Indigenous was 6.4 per cent in government schools and 2.1 per cent in non‑government schools in 2012 (table 4.5).

Table 4.5 Indigenous full time students, 2012

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| Indigenous full time students **a** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government schools | (‘000) | 47.0 | 9.7 | 43.2 | 20.0 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 13.1 | 147.9 |
| Non-government schools | (‘000) | 7.8 | 1.6 | 8.1 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 26.6 |
| **All schoolsb** | (‘000) | 54.8 | 11.3 | 51.3 | 23.8 | 10.1 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 16.1 | 174.5 |
| Indigenous full time students as a proportion of all full time students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government schools | % | 6.3 | 1.8 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 5.4 | 8.4 | 3.3 | 44.5 | 6.4 |
| Non-government schools | % | 2.0 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 28.9 | 2.1 |
| **All schools** | % | 4.8 | 1.3 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 3.9 | 7.0 | 2.4 | 40.4 | 4.9 |

**a**  Students counted as Indigenous are those who have identified as being of Indigenous origin. It is possible that the number of Indigenous students may be under-represented in some jurisdictions. **b** Totals may not add as a result of rounding.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.29.

*Students from language backgrounds other than English*

The proportion of LBOTE students is based on data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2011 Census of Population and Housing (Australian Government Department of Education, unpublished). Students are counted as having a LBOTE if their home language is not English or if they (or at least one parent) were born in a non-English speaking country.

The proportion of students with a LBOTE in government and non-government schools varied across jurisdictions in 2011 (figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2 Students from a language background other than English as a proportion of all students, 2011a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.2 Students from a language background other than English as a proportion of all students, 2011  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Numbers of LBOTE students are sourced from the 2011 Census of Population and Housing, whilst data on all full time students are sourced from the ABS Schools Australia collection. **b** See table 4A.30 for details of LBOTE definitions.

*Source*: Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished) based on the ABS 2011 Census of Population and Housing; ABS (2012) *Schools Australia 2011*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.30.

*Students with disability*

Students with disability are educated in both mainstream and special schools. Students with disability are those students who satisfy the criteria for enrolment in special education services or programs provided in the State or Territory in which they are enrolled. These criteria vary across jurisdictions.

Nationally in 2012, the proportion of students with disability for all schools was 5.1 per cent and almost twice as high in government schools (6.1 per cent), than in non-government schools (3.4 per cent) (figure 4.3). Information regarding attainment and participation for students with disability, based on the ABS 2009 Survey of Education and Training and the 2011 Census of Population and Housing, are included in the attachment to the Services for people with disability chapter of this Report (tables 14A.140–143).

Figure 4.3 Funded students with disability as a proportion of all students, 2012a, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.3 Funded students with disability as a proportion of all students, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a  The ABS total student data refer to the number of full time students (not FTE students). b To be an eligible student with disability, the student (among other things) must satisfy the criteria for enrolment in special education services or special education programs provided by the government of the State or Territory in which the student resides. Data should be used with caution as these criteria vary across jurisdictions; for example, SA data include a large number of students in the communication and language impairment category. This sub-set of students is not counted by other states and territories under funded students with disability, as these jurisdictions fund these students with other specific programs. c Excludes Full Fee Paying Overseas students and students on Christmas and Cocos Islands from both the government and non‑government sectors.

*Source*: Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.31.

*Geographically remote students*

Identification of geographically remote students is based on the school location according to the metropolitan zone, provincial zone, remote areas and very remote  
areas as defined in the former MCEETYA (now replaced by SCSEEC) agreed classification[[2]](#footnote-2) (see section 4.6 for a definition of the geographic classification used). The proportion of students enrolled in schools in remote areas varies greatly across jurisdictions (table 4.6).

Nationally in 2012, the proportion of students enrolled in schools in remote areas was 1.4 per cent, and more than twice as high in government schools (1.7 per cent) than in non-government schools (0.8 per cent). Nationally, the proportion of students enrolled in schools in very remote areas was 0.9 per cent, and over three times as high in government schools (1.0 per cent), than in non-government schools (0.3 per cent) (table 4.6).

Table 4A.35 includes data relating to students enrolled in primary and secondary schools located in metropolitan and provincial zones, as well as in remote and very remote areas.

Table 4.6 Students enrolled in schools in remote and very remote areas as a proportion of all students, 2012 (per cent)a, b

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| Remote areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government schools | 0.5 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 0.8 | .. | 17.0 | 1.7 |
| Non-government schools | 0.2 | – | 0.8 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 0.4 | .. | 29.0 | 0.8 |
| **All schools** | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 2.8 | 0.7 | .. | 20.0 | 1.4 |
| Very remote areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government schools | 0.1 | .. | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 0.4 | .. | 29.1 | 1.0 |
| Non-government schools | 0.1 | .. | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.1 | – | .. | 12.5 | 0.3 |
| **All schools** | 0.1 | .. | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | .. | 24.7 | 0.9 |

**a** Proportions are based on school sector (for example, students in government schools in remote areas as a proportion of all government school students). **b** Victoria has no very remote areas. The ACT has no remote or very remote areas. .. Not applicable. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); table 4A.35.

*Students from families of low socio-economic status*

A range of measures by socio-economic status, such as learning outcomes by parental occupation and parental education, are included in this Report. Approximately 1700 schools in Australia (over 17 per cent of all schools) have been identified to participate in the Smarter Schools National Partnership for Low Socio‑economic Status School Communities. These disadvantaged schools were identified using the ABS Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSD), based on student address or school location. Further measures of socio-economic status are being developed.

**4.2 Framework of performance indicators**

This chapter provides performance information on the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of government expenditure on all schools in Australia.

Governments own and operate government schools, and have a direct interest in the equity, efficiency and effectiveness of their operation. In addition, governments are committed to providing access to education for all students and contribute to the funding of non-government schools. However, this chapter does not report on non‑government sources of funding, and so does not compare the efficiency of government and non-government schools.

Box 4.1 describes the educational goals for young Australians, agreed by education Ministers in the Melbourne Declaration. Commitments to action by governments in eight inter-related areas are also included in the Melbourne Declaration (MCEETYA 2008).[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.1 **National goals for schooling in the 21st century** |
| In December 2008, the MCEETYA endorsed the following national goals for school education.  Improving educational outcomes for all young Australians is central to the nation’s social and economic prosperity and will position young people to live fulfilling, productive and responsible lives. Young Australians are therefore placed at the centre of the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals.  These goals are:  Goal 1: Australian schooling promotes equity and excellence  Goal 2: All young Australians become:   * successful learners * confident and creative individuals * active and informed citizens. |
| *Source*: Adapted from MCEETYA (2008). |
|  |
|  |

The performance of school education is reported against the indicator framework in figure 4.4. This framework reflects the objectives in box 4.1, and is aligned with the NEA and National Indigenous Reform Agreement (NIRA).

COAG has agreed six National Agreements to enhance accountability to the public for the outcomes achieved or outputs delivered by a range of government services (see chapter 1 for more detail on reforms to federal financial relations).

The NEA covers the area of school education, and education and training indicators in the NIRA establish specific outcomes for reducing the level of disadvantage experienced by Indigenous Australians. Both agreements include sets of performance indicators, for which the Steering Committee collates performance information for analysis by the COAG Reform Council (CRC). Performance indicators reported in this chapter are aligned with school education performance indicators in the NEA. The NEA was reviewed in 2011 and 2012, resulting in changes that have been reflected in this Report, as relevant.

The performance indicator framework provides information on equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and distinguishes the outputs and outcomes of school education services (figure 4.4). The performance indicator framework shows which data are complete and comparable in the 2014 Report. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

Different delivery contexts and locations influence the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of school education services. Results are also affected by the broader education environment (for example, availability of employment and further educational alternatives and population movements).

The Report’s Statistical context chapter contains data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural heritage (including Indigenous and ethnic status) (chapter 2).

Figure 4.4 School education performance indicator framework

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.4 School education performance indicator framework  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**4.3 Key performance indicator results**

The framework of performance indicators provides information on equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and distinguishes the outputs and outcomes of school education. This approach is consistent with the Steering Committee’s general performance indicator framework and service process diagram outlined in chapter 1 (see figures 1.2 and 1.3).

Data quality information (DQI) is being progressively introduced for all indicators in the Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators. DQI in this Report cover the seven dimensions in the ABS’ data quality framework (institutional environment, relevance, timeliness, accuracy, coherence, accessibility and interpretability) in addition to dimensions that define and describe performance indicators in a consistent manner, and note key data gaps and issues identified by the Steering Committee. All DQI for the 2014 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014.

**Outputs**

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

*Equity and effectiveness*

*Attendance and participation*

‘Attendance and participation’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to develop fully the talents and capacities of young people through equitable access to, and participation in, education and learning, to complete school education to year 12 or its equivalent (box 4.2). National and international research confirms a link between attendance and student achievement, although numerous interrelated factors influence attendance and achievement in complex ways.

In addition, attendance and participation rates for special needs groups are an indication of the equity of access to school education (box 4.2).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.2 Attendance and participation |
| ‘Attendance and participation’ is defined by four measures.  *Attendance*   * The number of actual full time equivalent ‘student days attended’ over the collection period as a percentage of the total number of possible student days attended over the collection period. A high student attendance rate is desirable.   Data on student attendance are collected for each State and Territory by school sector (government, Catholic and independent), sex, year level (1–10) and Indigenous status (Indigenous and non-Indigenous students).  Data reported for this measure are:   * not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   It is intended to measure student attendance over a single consistent time period (the first semester) for all schools. However, current reporting against the measure is transitional, with most jurisdictions providing government school data for the first semester, and non‑government schools providing data over a period including the last 20 days in May.  *Participation*   * The total number of children aged 6–15 years and enrolled in school (full time and part time enrolments) as a proportion of the estimated resident population of the same age. * The number of full time and part time school students of a particular age expressed as a proportion of the estimated resident population of the same age, for each year for 14–19 year olds.   A higher or increasing participation rate suggests an improvement in educational outcomes through greater access to school education. Participation rates in school education need to be interpreted with care, because rates are influenced by jurisdictional differences in age/grade structures, and the participation rate is an age-based rate. The rate is comparable over time within a jurisdiction, but may not be directly comparable across jurisdictions where there are differences in the age/grade structure. |
| (Continued next page) |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.2(continued) |
| Proportions that exceed 100 per cent may reflect disparities between the sources of data for students and residential population, multiple enrolments by individual students or students residing in one jurisdiction enrolling in schools in another jurisdiction.  These measures do not provide information on young people who develop their talents and capacities through other options for delivering post-compulsory education and training — for example, work-based training and enrolment in technical and further education (TAFE) delivered programs. A broader participation indicator that accounts for some of these factors is reported in the Child care, education and training sector overview.   * The proportion of 15–19 year olds who have successfully completed at least one unit of competency as part of a VET qualification at Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Certificate II or above.   Data reported for these three measures are   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2011 and 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Care should be exercised in relation to the data for Indigenous students, particularly in some jurisdictions and in the non-government sectors, due to small population sizes.  Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

*Attendance*

School attendance is measured in a specific collection period during the school year (see box 4.2 for details), and results may not be representative of school attendance throughout the school year.

For all students in 2012, attendance was relatively stable across years 1–5. In general, from year 6 attendance gradually declined to year 10 (typically the end of compulsory schooling) (tables 4A.130–135).

For government schools, the total student attendance rate ranged from 74 per cent to 94 per cent across year levels and jurisdictions (figure 4.5 and table 4A.130).

Figure 4.5 Student attendance rate, all students, government schools, 2012a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.5 Student attendance rate, all students, government schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Attendance rates are the number of actual full time equivalent ‘student days’ attended as a percentage of the total number of possible student days attended over the period. Student attendance data are reported for full time students in years 1–10, but are not collected uniformly across jurisdictions and schooling sectors and therefore are not comparable.

*Source*: Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority (ACARA) (unpublished); table 4A.130.

Data on student attendance rates for all school sectors, disaggregated by sex, are available in tables 4A.130, 4A.132 and 4A.134.

Non-Indigenous students in government schools had higher attendance rates than Indigenous students across all year levels in all jurisdictions (figure 4.6 and table 4A.131). The differences varied across states and territories. A similar pattern to the government schools was observed for non-government schools (independent and catholic schools) in most jurisdictions (tables 4A.133 and 4A.135).

Figure 4.6 Student attendance rate, Indigenous students, government schools, 2012a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.6 Student attendance rate, Indigenous students, government schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Attendance rates are the number of actual full time equivalent ‘student days’ attended as a percentage of the total number of possible student days attended over the period. Student attendance data are reported for full time students in years 1–10, but are not collected uniformly across jurisdictions and schooling sectors and therefore are not comparable.

*Source*: ACARA (unpublished); table 4A.131.

*Participation — proportion of children aged 6–15 years enrolled in school*

Nationally, 100.0 per cent of children aged 6–15 years were enrolled (either full or part time) in school in 2012 (figure 4.7). These proportions are determined using the number of students educated in the jurisdiction divided by the estimated residential population for the age group in the jurisdiction.

Figure 4.7 Proportion of children aged 6–15 years enrolled in schoola, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.7 Proportion of children aged 6–15 years enrolled in school  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are based on estimated residential population derived from the 2011 Census of Population and Housing. Earlier reports used data based on the 2006 Census. See footnotes to table 4A.118 for further information on derivations of population figures. b Earlier reports also presented data for Indigenous and non‑Indigenous students, for this measure. c Proportions are determined using the number of students enrolled in the jurisdiction divided by the estimated residential population for the jurisdiction, for the age group. In some cases students may be enrolled in a different jurisdiction to their place of residence. In particular, participation rates in the ACT exceed 100 per cent as a result of NSW residents from surrounding areas enrolling in ACT schools. See table 4A.118 for further details.

ABS (2013) *Schools Australia, 2012,* Cat. no. 4221.0;ABS (2013) *Population by Age and Sex, Australian States and Territories, June 2012,* Cat. no. 3101.0; table 4A.118.

*Participation — 14–19 year olds enrolled in school*

Nationally, 62.4 per cent of 14–19 year olds were enrolled in schools in 2012 (table 4A.119). School participation rates declined as students exceeded the maximum compulsory school age and varied by jurisdiction, age (figure 4.8) and sex (table 4A.119). School participation rates for females (63.1 per cent) were 1.3 percentage points higher than those for males (61.8 per cent) (table 4A.119). Data for 14–19 year olds from 2008 to 2012 are included in table 4A.120.

Figure 4.8 School participation rate of people aged 14–19 years in school education, all schools, 2012a, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.8 School participation rate of people aged 14–19 years in school education, all schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Proportion of the population who were enrolled as full time or part time students in August 2012.   
**b**Proportions are determined using the number of students enrolled in the jurisdiction divided by the estimated residential population for the jurisdiction, for the age group. In some cases students may be enrolled in a different jurisdiction to their place of residence. In particular, participation rates in the ACT exceed 100 per cent as a result of NSW residents from surrounding areas enrolling in ACT schools. **c** Different school commencement ages across some states and territories may affect comparisons between jurisdictions.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.119.

*Participation — achievement of VET competencies*

The number of young people undertaking VET in Schools programs in 2011 was 236 400 (NCVER 2012). The proportion of 15–19 year olds who had successfully completed at least one unit of competency as part of a VET qualification at AQF Certificate II or above was 27.5 per cent nationally in 2011 (figure 4.9). This proportion includes both VET in Schools students and school-aged students who have left school but are still engaged in education through a campus of TAFE or other VET Registered Training Organisation (RTO).

Figure 4.9 Proportion of 15–19 year olds who have successfully completed at least one unit of competency as part of a VET qualification at AQF Certificate II or above

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.9 Proportion of 15–19 year olds who have successfully completed at least one unit of competency as part of a VET qualification at AQF Certificate II or above   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: NCVER*, National VET Provider Collection* (various years); NCVER*, National VET in Schools Collection* *2011*; ABS *Population by Age and Sex, Australian States and Territories,* (various years) (Cat. no. 3201.0); table 4A.129.

*Retention*

‘Retention’ to the final years of schooling is an indicator of governments’ objective that all students have access to high quality education and training necessary to complete education to year 12 or its equivalent (box 4.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.3 Retention |
| ‘Retention’ (apparent retention rate) is defined as the number of full time school students in a designated level/year of education as a percentage of their respective cohort group (either at the commencement of their secondary schooling at year 7 or 8, or at year 10). Data are reported for:   * the proportion of students commencing secondary school at year 7 or 8 and continuing to year 10 * the proportion of students commencing secondary school at year 7 or 8 and continuing to year 12 * the proportion of year 10 students continuing to year 12.   Data are reported for all students, Indigenous and non-Indigenous students, and for students in government and non-government schools.  A higher or increasing apparent retention rate suggests that a larger proportion of students are continuing to participate in school education, which is likely to result in improved educational outcomes.  This indicator does not include part time students or provide information on students who pursue year 12 (or equivalent qualifications) through non-school pathways.  The term ‘apparent’ is used because the indicator is derived from total numbers of students in each of the relevant year levels, not by tracking the retention of individual students. Care needs be taken in interpretation because the apparent retention rate does not take account of factors such as:   * students repeating a year of education or returning to education after a period of absence * movement or migration of students between school sectors, between states/territories and between countries * the impact of full fee paying overseas students.   Data reported for all measures in this indicator are   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

In most jurisdictions, in 2012, apparent retention rates from the commencement of secondary school at year 7 or 8 (figure 4.1 shows the starting years across jurisdictions) to year 10, were 98 per cent to 104 per cent, with a national rate of 101.3 per cent (figure 4.10). High rates are to be expected, because normal year level progression means students in year 10 are generally of an age at which schooling is compulsory.

Retention rates for Indigenous students provide one measure of the equity of access to schooling. Retention rates to year 10 for Indigenous students were lower than those for non-Indigenous students and all students in most jurisdictions, with a national retention rate for Indigenous students of 98.4 per cent, 3.0 percentage points lower than that for non-Indigenous students and 2.9 percentage points lower than that for all students (figure 4.10).

Figure 4.10 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 10, full time secondary students, all schools, 2012a, b, c, d, e

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.10 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 10, full time secondary students, all schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions (see figure 4.11). **b** Retention rates can exceed 100 per cent for a variety of reasons, including student transfers between jurisdictions. **c** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **d** Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates. **e** Some students' Indigenous status is not stated. Consequently, the number of Indigenous students counted in the Indigenous rates may be under‑represented in some jurisdictions. Students for whom Indigenous status is not stated are included in the data for 'non-Indigenous students', and are included in the data for 'all students'.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.121.

The national apparent retention rate from the commencement of secondary schooling at year 7 or year 8 (figure 4.1 shows the differences across jurisdictions) to year 10 for all full time students was 98.1 per cent in 2004, rising to 99.4 per cent in 2008 and 101.3 per cent in 2012 (figure 4.11). Data for intervening years and by Indigenous status are in table 4A.123. Data for government schools and non‑government schools are in tables 4A.124 and 4A.125.

Figure 4.11 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 10, full time secondary students, all schoolsa, b, c, d

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.11 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 10, full time secondary students, all schools  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions. **b** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **c** Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates. This exclusion has particular implications for the NT, (which has a high proportion of Indigenous students) prior to 2008, where 10.9 per cent of Indigenous secondary students were ungraded in 2007 (compared with an average of 4.2 per cent for the rest of Australia, but since 2008 the NT proportion of ungraded students has substantially reduced) and this should be considered when interpreting the data. **d** Retention rates can exceed 100 per cent for a variety of reasons, including student transfers between jurisdictions.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.123.

The national apparent retention rate, from the commencement of secondary school at year 7 or 8 (figure 4.1 shows the differences across jurisdictions) to year 12, for all full time students was 75.7 per cent in 2004, rising to 79.9 per cent in 2012 (figure 4.12). Data for intervening years and by Indigenous status are in table 4A.123. Data for government schools and non-government schools are in tables 4A.124 and 4A.125.

Retention rates from year 7/8 to year 12 for Indigenous students in all schools were lower than those for non-Indigenous students and all students in all jurisdictions in 2012, with a national retention rate for Indigenous students of 51.1 per cent, 30.2 percentage points lower than that for non-Indigenous students and 28.8 percentage points lower than that for all students (table 4A.123).

**This page has changed since the Report release in January 2014. See errata at http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp/rogs/childcare-education-training.**

Figure 4.12 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 12, full time secondary students, all schoolsa, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.12 Apparent retention rate from year 7 or 8 to year 12, full time secondary students, all schools  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions. **b** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **c** Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates. This exclusion has particular implications for the NT, (which has a high proportion of Indigenous students) prior to 2008, where 10.9 per cent of Indigenous secondary students were ungraded in 2007 (compared with an average of 4.2 per cent for the rest of Australia, but since 2008 the NT proportion of ungraded students has substantially reduced) and this should be considered when interpreting the data.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.123.

The apparent rate of retention from year 10 to year 12 has been derived by expressing the number of full time school students enrolled in year 12 in 2012 as a proportion of the number of full time school students enrolled in year 10 in 2010.

Factors affecting apparent retention can combine to result in a year 12 cohort that is substantially different in composition from the corresponding year 10 cohort — for example:

* in SA, if part time students for all schools are included in the 2012 year 12 total, then the apparent retention rate becomes 93.2 per cent, compared with 86.3 per cent for full time students only (table 4A.122)
* young people may choose to complete their post compulsory education in the TAFE system rather than continue at school, and may do so after periods of time spent away from the formal education system.

Nationally, the apparent retention rate from year 10 to year 12 for all schools was 79.3 per cent in 2012. The rate for government schools was 74.8 per cent, and for non-government schools was 86.4 per cent. The apparent retention rates for both government schools and non‑government schools varied across jurisdictions (figure 4.13).

Figure 4.13 Apparent retention rate from year 10 to year 12, full time secondary students, 2012a, b, c, d

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.13 Apparent retention rate from year 10 to year 12, full time secondary students, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions (figure 4.15). **b** Retention rates can exceed 100 per cent for a variety of reasons, including student transfers between jurisdictions and government and non-government schools after the base year. **c** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **d** Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.122.

For government and non-government schools, apparent rates of retention from year 10 to year 12 for Indigenous students in 2012 were consistently lower than rates for all students but varied across jurisdictions (figures 4.13 and 4.14). In interpreting Indigenous apparent retention rates, it should be noted that, nationally, 1.6 per cent of Indigenous students left school before year 10 (figure 4.10 and table 4A.121), and so are not included in the base year for retention from year 10 to year 12. Further, Indigenous students made up 6.4 per cent of all students in government schools compared with 2.1 per cent in non-government schools and some jurisdictions have very low numbers of Indigenous students (table 4.5).

Nationally, Indigenous retention from year 10 to year 12 for all schools in 2012 was 53.3 per cent (figure 4.14), compared with 80.4 per cent for non-Indigenous students (table 4A.123). However, Indigenous retention from year 10 to year 12 for all schools has risen from 46.0 per cent in 2004, with the gap between Indigenous students and non-Indigenous students decreasing from 32.1 percentage points in 2004 to 27.1 percentage points in 2012 (table 4A.123).

Figure 4.14 Apparent retention rates from year 10 to year 12, Indigenous full time secondary students, 2012a, b, c, d

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.14 Apparent retention rates from year 10 to year 12, Indigenous full time secondary students, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions (see tables 4A.123–125). **b** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **c**Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates. **d** Some students' Indigenous status is not stated. Consequently, the number of Indigenous students counted in these rates may be under‑represented in some jurisdictions.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; tables 4A.123–125.

Nationally, apparent rates of retention for all full time students from year 10 to year 12 rose slightly from 77.2 per cent in 2004 to 79.3 per cent in 2012 (figure 4.15). Data for intervening years and by Indigenous status are in table 4A.123. Data for government schools and non-government schools are in tables 4A.124 and 4A.125.

Figure 4.15 Apparent rates of retention from year 10 to year 12, full time secondary students, all schoolsa, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.15 Apparent rates of retention from year 10 to year 12, full time secondary students, all schools  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Apparent retention rates are affected by factors that vary across jurisdictions. For this reason, variations in apparent retention rates over time within jurisdictions may be more useful than comparisons across jurisdictions. **b** The standard apparent retention rate calculation excludes part time students, which has implications for the interpretation of results for all jurisdictions (table 4.4). **c** Ungraded students are not included in the calculation of apparent retention rates. This exclusion has particular implications for the NT, (which has a high proportion of Indigenous students) prior to 2008, where 10.9 per cent of Indigenous secondary students were ungraded in 2007 (compared with an average of 4.2 per cent for the rest of Australia, but since 2008 the NT proportion of ungraded students has substantially reduced) and this should be considered when interpreting the data.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.123.

*Efficiency*

Governments have an interest in achieving the best results from their expenditure on schooling, both as owners and operators of government schools, and as major providers of funds to the non-government school sector. An objective of the Steering Committee is to publish comparable estimates of costs. Ideally, such comparison should include the full range of costs to government. Where the full costs cannot be measured, estimating costs on a consistent basis is the best approach. Table 4A.21 shows the treatment of assets by school education agencies. Table 4A.11 shows information on the comparability of the source expenditure data for government schools used for this chapter. Box 4.4 includes information on identification and allocation of funding for the Report.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.4 School expenditure data reported in this chapter |
| Efficiency indicators in this chapter (years 2007-08 to 2011-12) are based on financial year recurrent expenditure on government and non‑government schools by the Australian Government and State and Territory governments. Capital expenditure is generally excluded, but as the National Schools Specific Purpose Payment (SPP) cannot be separated into capital and recurrent expenditure, the SPP is treated as recurrent expenditure in this chapter. Expenditure relating to funding sources other than government (such as parent contributions and fees) are excluded.  Sources of data — government recurrent expenditure on government schools  Total recurrent expenditure on government schools is unpublished data sourced from the National Schools Statistical Collection, under the auspices of the SCSEEC:   * Each State and Territory government reports to the SCSEEC on its expenditure on government schools (see table 4A.10). * The Australian Government reports its allocation to each State and Territory for government schools, consistent with Treasury Final Budget Outcomes (including the National Schools SPP and a range of National Partnerships (NP) payments (see table 4A.9). * To avoid double counting, Australian Government allocations are subtracted from the State and Territory expenditure to identify ‘net’ State and Territory government expenditure (tables 4A.7 and 4A.8).   The SCSEEC provides unpublished data on the user cost of capital for government schools, imputed as 8 per cent of the written down value of assets (table 4A.19).  Sources of data — government recurrent expenditure on non-government schools.  Total recurrent expenditure on non-government schools is a combination of unpublished data from the NSSC and unpublished data sourced directly from State and Territory governments:   * Each State and Territory government provides unpublished data on its contributions to non-government schools (tables 4A.7 and 4A.8). * The Australian Government reports its allocation to each State and Territory for non‑government schools, consistent with Treasury Final Budget Outcomes (including the National Schools SPP and a range of National Partnerships [NP] payments [see table 4A.9]). * Together these comprise total government recurrent expenditure on non‑government schools (tables 4A.7 and 4A.8).   Tables 4A.7–8 also include expenditure data from government sources for all schools.  *Derivation of performance indicators*  Expenditure in the various categories identified above is divided by the numbers of FTE students to derive measures of cost per FTE student (tables 4A.12–18 and figures 4.16–19). The numbers of FTE students (table 4A.6) are drawn from the ABS publication *Schools Australia 2012* (ABS 2013) and averaged over two calendar years to match the financial year expenditure data. |
| (Continued next page) |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.4 (continued) |
| Legislative framework  In 2009 COAG agreed to a new framework for federal financial relations. The major element of Australian Government funding is provided through the National Schools SPP under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations, and State and Territory governments have discretion as to how to apply the National Schools SPP to achieve the agreed outcomes. The non-government schools funding component of the National Schools SPP is determined by the *Schools Assistance Act 2008.* States and territories fund school education under their own legislation.  Changes in recurrent expenditure between years — Australian Government  Average Government School Recurrent Costs (AGSRC) is the benchmark for Australian Government recurrent funding levels for both government and non-government schools.  The primary and secondary AGSRC amounts are the national averages based on total recurrent State and Territory expenditure per government student, for expenditure data submitted to SCSEEC. Capital-related costs such as user cost of capital and depreciation are excluded from AGSRC, and accrual expenses are also adjusted to a cash basis. These AGSRC amounts are changed annually to reflect movements in the data.  For government schools, annual changes in Australian Government recurrent payments reflect the changes to the AGSRC and the changes in full time equivalent enrolments in government schools. These payments are included in the National Schools SPP allocated to states and territories.  For non-government schools, Australian Government recurrent payments are also based on enrolments and a proportion of AGSRC calculated for each school (taking account of the school’s socio-economic status based on student location and other funding arrangements). These payments are included in the National Schools SPP and are paid to non-government schools and systems through the states and territories.  For both government and non-government schools, Australian Government National Partnership allocations are also used to calculate expenditure in this Report.  Changes in recurrent expenditure between years — State and Territory governments  In general, state and territory government schools systems are funded based on a variety of formulas to determine a school’s recurrent or base allocation, with weightings and multipliers added for students facing disadvantage. For non-government schools, State and Territory governments also provide funding for recurrent and targeted purposes, usually through per capita allocations. Indexation of costs is normally applied to these funding arrangements for both the government and non-government school sectors. Changes in overall funding by State and Territory governments across years is affected by all these factors, including enrolment numbers, school size and location and staffing profiles. |
| *Source*: ACARA (2012a); Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished). |

*Recurrent expenditure per student*

‘Recurrent expenditure per student’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to fund and/or provide education in an efficient manner (box 4.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.5 Recurrent expenditure per student |
| ‘Recurrent expenditure per student’ is defined by two measures:   * government recurrent expenditure per FTE student, reported for government schools and disaggregated by in‑school primary, in-school secondary, out-of-school services; and for non-government schools * government recurrent staff expenditure per FTE student in government schools. Expenditure on staff is the major component of spending on schools.   Both of these measures include user cost of capital for government schools (box 4.6).  Holding other factors constant, a low or decreasing government recurrent expenditure or staff expenditure per FTE student may represent better or improved efficiency.  Care should be taken in interpretation of efficiency data as:   * a number of factors beyond the control of governments, such as economies of scale, a high proportion of geographically remote students and/or a dispersed population, and migration across states and territories, may influence expenditure (see Commonwealth Grants Commission reference in chapter 1, section 1.5 for further details). This Report does not make any cost adjustments based on these or other factors * efficiency data should be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators to derive an holistic view of performance. While high or increasing expenditure per student may reflect deteriorating efficiency, it may also reflect changes in aspects of schooling (increasing school leaving age, improving outcomes for Indigenous students and students from low socio-economic backgrounds, broader curricula or enhancing teacher quality), or the characteristics of the education environment (such as population dispersion) * the staff expenditure per student measure is partial in nature, as it does not reflect the full cost per student. The basis for allocation of numbers of staff between teaching and non-teaching roles and the allocation of staff expenditure may differ. While high or increasing government expenditure on staff per student may reflect lower efficiency, it may also reflect improvements in teacher quality.   Data reported for all measures in this indicator are   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2011-12 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2011-12, in-school government expenditure per FTE student in government primary schools was $13 734 and in government secondary schools was $16 965. Out‑of‑school government expenditure per FTE student in all government schools was $781 in 2011-12 (figure 4.16).

Figure 4.16 Government recurrent expenditure per FTE student, government schools, 2011-12a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.16 Government recurrent expenditure per FTE student, government schools, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** See notes to table 4A.14 for definitions and data caveats. **b** Payroll tax estimates include notional payroll tax for WA and the ACT, which are payroll tax exempt.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; SCSEEC (unpublished) NSSC; table 4A.14.

Nationally, in 2011-12, government expenditure per FTE student in all government schools was $15 768. It increased in average annual real terms between 2007-08 and 2011-12 by 2.4 per cent per year (figure 4.17). Data for years 2002-03 to   
2011-12 are included in tables 4A.12 (real values) and 4A.13 (nominal values).

Figure 4.17 Government real recurrent expenditure per FTE student, government schools (2011-12 dollars)a, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.17 Government real recurrent expenditure per FTE student, government schools (2011-12 dollars)  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** See notes to table 4A.12 for definitions and data caveats. **b** Data for 2007-08 to 2010-11 are adjusted to 2011-12 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2011-12 = 100) (table 2A.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details. **c** Payroll tax estimates include notional payroll tax for WA and the ACT, which are payroll tax exempt.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; SCSEEC (unpublished) NSSC; table 4A.12.

Nationally, in 2011-12, government expenditure per FTE student in all non‑government schools was $8546. It has increased in average annual real terms between 2007-08 and 2011-12 by 3.4 per cent per year (figure 4.18). Data for years 2002-03 to 2011-12 are included in table 4A.15 (real values) and 4A.16 (nominal values).

Figure 4.18 Government real recurrent expenditure per FTE student, non‑government schools (2011-12 dollars)a, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.18 Government real recurrent expenditure per FTE student, non government schools (2011-12 dollars)  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** See notes to table 4A.15 for definitions and data caveats. **b** Data for 2007-08 to 2010-11 are adjusted to 2011-12 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2011-12 = 100) (table 2A.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details. **c** Data are the sum of Australian Government specific purpose payments for non-government schools, and State and Territory government payments to non-government schools. Data on State and Territory government payments to non-government schools are not fully comparable across jurisdictions.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 4A.15.

Nationally, in 2011-12, government real recurrent expenditure per FTE student in all schools (government plus non-government) was $13 255. It increased in average annual real terms between 2007-08 and 2011-12 by 2.5 per cent per year (table 4A.17). Data for years 2002-03 to 2011-12 are included in table 4A.17 (real values) and 4A.18 (nominal values).

Government recurrent expenditure on staff in government schools accounted for $23.2 billion (63.6 per cent) of total recurrent expenditure in 2011-12 (table 4A.10). Nationally, expenditure on staff per FTE student was $8776 for in-school primary, $10 746 for in-school secondary and $482 for out-of-school (figure 4.19).

Figure 4.19 Government recurrent expenditure on staff in government schools, per FTE student, 2011-12a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.19 Government recurrent expenditure on staff in government schools, per FTE student, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  See notes to table 4A.14 for definitions and data caveats. **b** Expenditure on staff includes teaching staff and other staff, and includes expenditure on redundancy payments.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; SCSEEC (unpublished) NSSC; table 4A.14.

*User cost of capital per student*

‘User cost of capital (UCC) per student’ is an indicator of governments’ use of capital assets to provide education (box 4.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.6 User cost of capital per student |
| ‘UCC per student’ is defined as the notional costs to governments of the funds tied up in capital (for example, land and buildings owned by government schools) used to produce services, per FTE student. The notional UCC makes explicit the opportunity cost of using the funds to provide services rather than investing elsewhere or retiring debt. When comparing the costs of government services, it is important to account for the notional UCC because it is:   * often a significant component of the cost of services * often treated inconsistently (that is, included in the costs of services delivered by most non-government service providers, but effectively costed at zero for many government service providers).   Notional UCC reflects the annual UCC per FTE student, and is set at 8 per cent of the value of non-current physical assets, which are re-valued over time.  Holding other factors constant, a low or decreasing UCC per student may represent better or improved efficiency.  Efficiency data are difficult to interpret and this indicator in particular is only partial in nature, as it does not reflect the full cost per student. While high or increasing UCC per student may reflect deteriorating efficiency, it may also reflect changes in aspects of schooling (broader curricula, enhanced facilities), or the characteristics of the education environment (such as population dispersion and/or rapid growth and more geographically remote students). Similarly, low or decreasing UCC per student may reflect improving efficiency or lower quality (less effective education) or fewer facilities or reduced capital maintenance.  Fluctuations in asset values such as land market values, the varying proportions of the written down value of assets which relates to land and the interval between revaluations (which vary from annual to five yearly), may affect the outcomes across jurisdictions and within jurisdictions over time. Values also fluctuate across jurisdictions due to variations in accounting policies.  Efficiency data need to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators to derive an holistic view of performance.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2011-12 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |
|  |

The notional UCC per FTE government school student in 2011-12 averaged $2439 nationally (table 4A.20). Data from 2002-03 to 2011-12 showing the various components of the written down value of assets are included in table 4A.19. Information on the treatment of assets for each State and Territory, including the most recent year of revaluation, is in table 4A.21.

*Student-to-staff ratio*

‘Student-to-staff ratio’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide education in an efficient manner (box 4.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.7 Student-to-staff ratio |
| The ‘student-to-staff ratio’ is defined as the number of FTE students per FTE staff. Data are reported for primary, secondary and all schools, and for teaching and  non-teaching staff. The student-to-staff ratio presents the number of students  per teacher, where teachers are classified in a way that can be compared across jurisdictions. However, the ratio is not a measure of class size.  A low ratio means there are a small number of students per teacher. Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing student‑to‑teacher ratio represents better or improved efficiency. While a low or decreasing student-to-teacher ratio may reflect decreasing efficiency, it may also reflect a higher quality education system, if a lower ratio leads to better student outcomes.  Care should be taken in interpretation of efficiency data:   * efficiency data should be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators to derive an holistic view of performance. The student-to-staff ratio is aggregated across all subjects and year levels, and does not distinguish between subjects and/or year levels where different ratios may be appropriate * the student-to-staff ratio is affected by factors that may differ across the states and territories, including population dispersion (leading to a larger proportion of small schools), the proportion of special needs students, the degree to which administrative work is undertaken by people classified as teachers (such as principals, deputy principals and senior teachers), and the level of other inputs to school education (for example, non-teaching staff, computers, books and laboratory equipment).   Data reported for this indicator are   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012, the student-to-teacher ratio for government primary schools was 15.2 and for non-government primary schools was 16.2. For all primary schools, the student-to-teacher ratio was 15.5 (figure 4.20).

Figure 4.20 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, primary schools, 2012a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.20 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, primary schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  See notes to table 4A.22 for definitions and data caveats.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.22.

Nationally in 2012, the student-to-teacher ratio for government secondary schools was 12.3 and for non-government secondary schools, was 11.5. For all secondary schools, the student-to-teacher ratio was 12.0 (figure 4.21).

Figure 4.21 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, secondary schools, 2012a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.21 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, secondary schools, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  See notes to table 4A.22 for definitions and data caveats.

*Source*: ABS (2013) *Schools Australia 2012*, Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.22.

Nationally in 2012, the student-to-teacher ratio for all government schools was 13.9 and for all non-government schools was 13.6. For all schools, the student-to-teacher ratio was 13.8 (table 4A.22).

Table 4A.22 provides further detail on student-to-staff ratios in 2012, including those for non-teaching school staff and all staff, for all jurisdictions.

The student-to-teacher ratio for all schools (government and non-government primary and secondary combined) has decreased from 14.3 in 2004 to 13.8 in 2012 (figure 4.22). Data for intervening years and for government and non-government schools are in table 4A.23.

Figure 4.22 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, all schoolsa, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.22 Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching staff, all schools  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Includes primary and secondary schools. **b** See notes to table 4A.23 for definitions and data caveats.

*Source*: ABS (2012) *Schools Australia 2011* Cat. no. 4221.0; table 4A.23.

**Outcomes**

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the actual services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

*Nationally comparable learning outcomes*

Learning outcomes measure students’ attainment of a range of skills, in literacy and numeracy, and in areas such as science literacy, information and communication technology, and civics and citizenship.

The ‘learning outcomes’ indicator examines outcomes in these areas and draws on two main sources of information:

* the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN), and NAP sample assessments. These are SCSEEC‑endorsed tests developed to measure student performance in relation to the National Goals for Schooling
* Australia’s participation in three international tests — the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA); the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS); and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)*.*

*National Assessment Program*

This chapter reports proportions of students undertaking NAPLAN testing in years 3, 5, 7 and 9 achieving the national minimum standard, and mean scale score learning outcomes, for reading, persuasive writing and numeracy performance in 2012, including by Indigenous status and geolocation. Data comparing a range of outcomes from 2008 to 2012 and 2011 to 2012 for reading and numeracy and from 2011 to 2012 for persuasive writing are also included in the chapter.

Achieving (but not exceeding) the national minimum standard represents achievement of the basic elements of literacy or numeracy for the year level. Students who have not achieved the national minimum standard for that year need focused intervention and additional support to help them achieve the skills they require to progress in schooling (ACARA 2012b). The chapter and attachment tables also include additional data on NAPLAN mean scale scores for 2012.

Detailed NAPLAN data for 2012, including outcomes by socio-economic status, are included in the attachment tables (tables 4A.36–43 for reading performance, tables 4A.54–61 for persuasive writing performance and tables 4A.71–78 for numeracy performance). More detailed NAPLAN time series data for 2008–2011 and 2011–2012 are included in tables 4A.44–52 for reading performance and tables 4A.79–87 for numeracy performance. Time series data for 2011–2012 for persuasive writing are included in tables 4A.62–70. In 2011, NAPLAN writing testing changed from narrative to persuasive writing, leading to a break in the time series. Data for narrative writing (for 2008, 2009 and 2010) are included in the 2010–2012 Reports.

The NAP also undertakes triennial national sample assessments on a rotating basis. This chapter reports year 6 science literacy performance data for 2006, 2009 and 2012 (2012 data are available for the first time in this Report). The attachment tables include additional data on science literacy performance for 2006, 2009 and 2012 (tables 4A.89–91); year 6 and year 10 civics and citizenship literacy performance for 2004, 2007 and 2010 (tables 4A.92–94) and year 6 and year 10 information and communication technologies literacy performance for 2005, 2008 and 2011 (tables 4A.95-96).

*International tests*

This chapter reports outcomes of:

* triennial PISA assessments in reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy for 15 year old students. Data from the 2012 assessments are included for the first time in this Report, as well as data from 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009 (tables 4A.97–109)
* the four-yearly TIMSS assessments on mathematics and science achievement for year 4 and year 8. The attachment tables include additional information on the 2011 test, as well as data from 2003 and 2007 (tables 4A.110–115)
* the five-yearly PIRLS test for year 4, conducted in 2011, on reading literacy performance (tables 4A.116-117)

*Interpreting learning outcomes data*

To assist with making comparisons between jurisdictions, where appropriate,   
95 per cent confidence intervals are presented in charts and attachment tables. Confidence intervals are a standard way of expressing the degree of uncertainty associated with survey estimates or performance measurement. An estimate of 80 per cent with a confidence interval of ± 2.0, for example, means that if another sample had been drawn, or if another combination of test items had been used, there is a 95 per cent chance that the result would lie between 78 per cent and 82 per cent. Each learning outcomes proportion can be thought of in terms of a range. If one jurisdiction’s rate ranges from 78–82 per cent and another’s from 77–81 per cent, then it is not possible to say with confidence that one differs from the other (because there is unlikely to be a statistically significant difference). Where ranges do not overlap, there is a high likelihood that there is a statistically significant difference. A statistically significant difference means there is a high probability that there is an actual difference; it does not imply that the difference is necessarily large or important.

*Participation in NAPLAN testing*

NAPLAN testing reports the number of assessed, exempt, absent and withdrawn students in years 3, 5, 7 and 9. Assessed students include all students who attempt the test and exempt students. Students with a language background other than English who arrived from overseas less than a year before the test, and students with significant intellectual disabilities may be exempted from testing. Participating students are those who were assessed or deemed exempt — other students were either absent or withdrawn. A higher or increasing proportion of students participating in NAPLAN testing suggests an improvement in that aspect of educational participation. The proportion of assessed, exempt, absent and withdrawn students in years 3, 5, 7 and 9 for reading, persuasive writing and numeracy in 2012 are in tables 4A.43, 4A.61 and 4A.78 respectively. Participation in the 2012 NAPLAN tests, by Indigenous status, for reading, writing and numeracy are included in tables 4A.42, 4A.60 and 4A.77 respectively. In all domains and year levels, a lower proportion of Indigenous students than non-Indigenous or all students participated in NAPLAN testing.

*Learning outcomes*

‘Learning outcomes’ is an indicator of governments’ objective that all students should attain a range of skills, including: English literacy, such that every student should be able to read, write, spell and communicate at an appropriate level; skills in numeracy; and skills and becoming informed in areas such as science literacy, information and communications technologies and civics and citizenship (box 4.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.8 Learning outcomes |
| ‘Learning outcomes’ is defined by six measures:   * the proportion of years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students achieving at or above the national minimum standard in NAPLAN testing for reading, persuasive writing and numeracy for a given year, reported by Indigenous status, sex, LBOTE, socio-economic status and MCEECDYA categories of geolocation (section 4.1 identifies the profile of equity groups in each State and Territory). * the mean scale score (on the common national scale for Years 3, 5, 7 and 9, ranging from 0 to 1000) achieved by years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students in NAPLAN assessment for reading, persuasive writing and numeracy for a given year, reported by Indigenous status. This Report also includes a time series for student ‘gain’ for the cohort (for example, between year 3 in 2010 and year 5 in 2012) based on the mean scale score outcomes for reading and numeracy. * the proportion of sampled year 6 and year 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in civics and citizenship, information and communication technologies and science literacy (year 6 only). National data from the triennial National Assessment Program tests are reported by sex, Indigenous status, LBOTE status, MCEECDYA categories of geolocation and socio-economic status * the proportion of sampled 15 year old students achieving at or above the proficient standard on the OECD PISA combined reading, mathematical literacy and science literacy scales in a triennial international assessment. National data are also reported by sex, Indigenous status, socio-economic status and geolocation. * the proportion of sampled year 4 students achieving at or above the proficient standard on the 5 yearly PIRLS reading literacy test. National data are also reported by sex, Indigenous status and MCEECDYA categories of geolocation * the proportion of sampled students achieving at or above the proficient standard on the TIMSS mathematical literacy and science literacy scales in a quadrennial assessment (assessed year 4 and year 8 students who achieve at or above the proficient standard on the TIMSS mathematical literacy scale for a given year). National data are also reported by sex, Indigenous status and MCEECDYA categories of geolocation   A high or increasing proportion of students achieving at or above the national minimum standard or proficient standard, or a high or increasing mean scale score for learning outcomes is desirable.  Data reported for all measures in this indicator are   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

***NAPLAN Reading***

This section of the learning outcomes indicator provides key outcomes for NAPLAN testing (years 3, 5, 7 and 9) in the reading domain. Indigenous outcomes are highlighted, but outcomes for a range of other equity groups including male, female, LBOTE, geolocation and socio-economic status (parental education and parental occupation) are included in tables 4A.36–53.

*All students and Indigenous students*

The proportion of year 3 students who achieved at or above the reading national minimum standard in 2012 was 93.4–93.8 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (72.6–75.8 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.5–94.9 per cent) (figure 4.23). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.23 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.23 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.36.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.36.

The mean scale score for year 3 reading in 2012 for all students was 418.5–420.7 nationally. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (329.2–337.4) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (423.2–425.2) (figure 4.24). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.24 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, reading, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.24 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, reading, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.39.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.39.

The proportion of year 5 students who achieved at or above the reading national minimum standard in 2012 was 91.3–91.9 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (62.8–66.6 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (92.9–93.3 per cent) (figure 4.25). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.25 Proportion of year 5 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.25 Proportion of year 5 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.36.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.36.

The mean scale score for year 5 reading in 2012 for all students was 492.5–494.7 nationally. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (403.5–414.5) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (497.0–499.0) (figure 4.26). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.26 Mean scale scores for year 5 students, reading, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.26 Mean scale scores for year 5 students, reading, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.39.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.39.

The proportion of year 7 students who achieved at or above the reading national minimum standard in 2011 was 93.9–94.3 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (73.8–77.0 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.9–95.3 per cent) (figure 4.27). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.27 Proportion of year 7 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.27 Proportion of year 7 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.36.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.36.

The mean scale score for year 7 reading in 2012 for all students was 540.2–542.8 nationally. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (471.4–478.2) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (543.7–546.3) (figure 4.28). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.28 Mean scale scores for year 7 students, reading, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.28 Mean scale scores for year 7 students, reading, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.39.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.39.

The proportion of year 9 students who achieved at or above the reading national minimum standard in 2012 was 91.0–91.8 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (65.3–69.1 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (92.4–93.0 per cent) (figure 4.29). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.29 Proportion of year 9 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.29 Proportion of year 9 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.36.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.36.

The mean scale score for year 9 reading in 2012 for all students was 573.3–576.3 nationally. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (506.6–513.0) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (576.5–579.5) (figure 4.30). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.30 Mean scale scores for year 9 students, reading, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.30 Mean scale scores for year 9 students, reading, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.39.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.39.

*Geolocation*

Nationally, in 2012, reading outcomes tended to decline with remoteness. In year 3, for example, 94.6–95.0 per cent of students in metropolitan areas achieved at or above the reading national minimum standard, significantly higher than the proportions of provincial students (91.9–92.7 per cent), remote students   
(81.7–86.9 per cent) and very remote students (52.1–63.1 per cent) (figure 4.31).

For all geolocation categories across years 3, 5, 7 and 9, reading outcomes nationally for Indigenous students were lower than those for non-Indigenous students. Nationally, outcomes for Indigenous students generally declined as remoteness increased, and the gap in learning outcomes between Indigenous students and non-Indigenous students was generally greater in remote and very remote areas than in metropolitan and provincial areas.

State and Territory results by Indigenous status and geolocation for years 3, 5, 7 and 9 reading literacy are in table 4A.37. The general pattern in jurisdictions appears similar to the national results. However, due to relatively large confidence intervals, caution should be exercised when making comparisons for some data. Mean scale score results by Indigenous status and geolocation are provided in table 4A.40.

Figure 4.31 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.31 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the reading national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** Data for year 3 students are shown and may not be representative of students in years 5, 7 and 9 which are detailed in table 4A.37.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.37.

*Socio-economic status*

State and Territory data on the proportions of students achieving at or above the national minimum standard and mean scale scores in reading assessment for years 3, 5, 7 and 9 by parental education and parental occupation for 2012 are included in tables 4A.38 and 4A.41. Data for 2010 and 2011 were included in the 2012 and 2013 Reports.

*Time series analysis of NAPLAN reading outcomes*

The following time series outcomes are reported*:*

* The difference between two given years for a level (for example, year 5 reading from 2011 to 2012), for both the proportion at and above the national minimum standard and mean scale scores.
* The gain in mean scale score by a cohort of students as they move between year levels (for example year 3 reading in 2010 to year 5 reading in 2012).

*Statistical significance of differences between years*

Table 4.7 provides a summary of differences in achievement at year 5 for mean scale score and proportions at and above national minimum standard, by Indigenous status, on a national basis across various years. Data for states and territories are in tables 4A.44–51. These data are not comparable across jurisdictions and can only be used for a comparison across time for a jurisdiction, or nationally.

Nationally, there was no statistically significant difference in the proportions of all year 5 students achieving at or above the national minimum standard, for reading, from 2008 to 2012 or from 2011 to 2012. There was a statistically significant increase in the mean scale score for all year 5 students from 2008 to 2012 but no statistically significant difference from 2011 to 2012 (table 4.7).

There was no statistically significant difference in the proportions at and above national minimum standard, or in mean scale scores, for Indigenous students from 2008 to 2012 and 2011 to 2012. There was a statistically significant increase in the mean scale score for non-Indigenous students from 2008 to 2012, but no statistically significant difference from 2011 to 2012. There was no statistically significant difference in the proportions of year 5 non-Indigenous students achieving at or above the national minimum standard, from 2008 to 2012 or from 2011 to 2012 (table 4.7).

Data for years 3, 7 and 9 and proportions at or above national minimum standard for LBOTE students and by sex are included separately for each State and Territory and nationally in tables 4A.44–52.

Table 4.7 Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for year 5 reading, and statistical significance of differences, Australia**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Statistical significance of difference in average achievement | |
|  | *2008* | *2011* | *2012* | *2008 to 2012* | *2011 to 2012* |
| Indigenous students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 403.4 ± 4.1 | 409.8 ± 4.1 | 409.0 ± 5.5 | ● | ● |
| At or above NMS | 63.4 ± 1.8 | 66.4 ± 1.7 | 64.7 ± 1.9 | ● | ● |
| Non-Indigenous students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 488.7 ± 1.0 | 492.3 ± 1.0 | 498.0 ± 1.0 | ↑ | ● |
| At or above NMS | 92.6 ± 0.2 | 92.9 ± 0.2 | 93.1 ± 0.2 | ● | ● |
| All students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 484.4 ± 1.1 | 488.1 ± 1.1 | 493.6 ± 1.1 | ↑ | ● |
| At or above NMS | 91.0 ± 0.3 | 91.5 ± 0.3 | 91.6 ± 0.3 | ● | ● |

NMS = National Minimum Standard. **↑**= Average achievement significantly higher, statistically. ● = No significant difference, statistically.

**a** The mean scale scores and proportions at or above national minimum standard reported in this table include 95 per cent confidence intervals (for example, a mean scale score of 400.0 ± 2.7). The confidence intervals in this table are for the specific year applicable and do not provide an indication of statistically significant differences between years. See section 2.5 of the statistical context chapter for more information on confidence intervals. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.52.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*, ACARA, Sydney; table 4A.52.

##### Cohort gain

Analysis of NAPLAN mean scale score data for the years 2008 to 2010 and 2010 to 2012 enables comparisons of outcomes for the same cohort of students over time (box 4.9). This chapter reports on gains in reading and numeracy from year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010 and year 7 in 2012. Student gain for other cohorts (year 5 in 2008 to year 7 in 2010 and year 9 in 2012; and year 3 in 2010 to year 5 in 2012) are included in attachment tables. Data for cohort gain from 2009 to 2011 were included in the 2013 Report.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.9 Achievement and gain |
| For national reporting purposes, gain is the difference in mean scale scores in a domain for the same cohort of students between two testing years, for example between 2010 and 2012. The cohorts between the two years are not matched — that is, there will be differences between the exact composition of the student body in any given State or Territory.  A feature of gain in NAPLAN performance is that the size of the gain tends to be associated with the level of prior performance: the lower the prior performance, the more likely the possibility of greater gain. Further, for literacy and numeracy, student gain is greater in the early years. Few of the differences across states and territories in the gains made between 2008 and 2010 and between 2010 and 2012 are statistically significant. This report includes confidence intervals, which provide an indication of the level of uncertainty of the gain over the two year period. |
| *Source*: ACARA (2012b). |
|  |
|  |

From year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010, the gain in reading mean scale score (on the common national scale for Years 3, 5, 7 and 9, ranging from 0 to 1000) was between 79.0 and 94.8 points nationally. For the same cohort, from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the mean scale score gain was between 47.0 and 61.2 points nationally.

For Indigenous students, year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010 the mean scale score gain was between 85.9 and 105.9 points and from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the mean scale score gain was between 56.6 and 73.8 points nationally. For non‑Indigenous students, year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010 the mean scale score gain was between 78.5 and 94.3 points and from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the mean scale score was between 46.5 and 60.7 points nationally.

These mean scale score gains varied across jurisdictions (table 4.8). Data for other cohorts from 2008–2010 and 2010-2012 are in table 4A.53.

Table 4.8 Gain in mean scale score for reading: year 3 (2008) to year 5 (2010) to year 7 (2012)a, b

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| **Indigenous students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 347.5  ± 3.6 | 368.9  ± 6.3 | 309.5  ± 7.6 | 292.7  ± 7.1 | 329.7  ± 8.7 | 376.6  ± 9.4 | 359.5  ± 17.6 | 208.1  ± 19.5 | 313.7  ± 4.9 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 433.3  ± 3.4 | 454.4  ± 6.5 | 411.3  ± 4.7 | 387.3  ± 6.1 | 408.8  ± 7.5 | 451.9  ± 8.8 | 430.6  ± 14.7 | 326.7  ± 18.8 | 409.6  ± 3.8 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 489.9  ± 3.2 | 504.3  ± 5.5 | 478.0  ± 4.0 | 462.0  ± 5.2 | 478.4  ± 7.6 | 505.0  ± 7.9 | 507.4  ± 14.2 | 397.3  ± 22.7 | 474.8  ± 3.4 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 85.8  ± 9.2 | 85.5  ± 11.9 | 101.8  ± 11.8 | 94.6  ± 12.2 | 79.1  ± 13.9 | 75.3  ± 15.0 | 71.1  ± 24.1 | 118.6  ± 28.2 | 95.9  ± 10.0 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 56.6  ± 8.4 | 49.9  ± 11.0 | 66.7  ± 9.3 | 74.7  ± 10.6 | 69.6  ± 12.8 | 53.1  ± 13.7 | 76.8  ± 21.6 | 70.6  ± 30.3 | 65.2  ± 8.6 |
| **Non-Indigenous students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 414.9  ± 1.7 | 420.6  ± 1.6 | 375.9  ± 2.4 | 394.5  ± 2.7 | 403.9  ± 3.1 | 403.4  ± 5.2 | 422.8  ± 5.7 | 382.5  ± 8.1 | 405.0  ± 1.1 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 498.7  ± 1.9 | 502.7  ± 1.7 | 473.4  ± 1.9 | 484.5  ± 2.6 | 479.1  ± 2.9 | 488.0  ± 5.3 | 510.4  ± 5.4 | 475.4  ± 6.1 | 491.4  ± 1.0 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 548.7  ± 2.9 | 549.1  ± 2.6 | 536.8  ± 1.9 | 543.3  ± 2.9 | 539.5  ± 2.8 | 542.8  ± 6.8 | 559.8  ± 8.3 | 530.8  ± 13.2 | 545.0  ± 1.3 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 83.8  ± 8.2 | 82.1  ± 8.1 | 97.5  ± 8.4 | 90.0  ± 8.6 | 75.2  ± 8.9 | 84.6  ± 10.7 | 87.6  ± 11.0 | 92.9  ± 12.8 | 86.4  ± 7.9 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 50.0  ± 7.8 | 46.4  ± 7.6 | 63.4  ± 7.4 | 58.8  ± 7.9 | 60.4  ± 8.0 | 54.8  ± 11.1 | 49.4  ± 12.1 | 55.4  ± 16.1 | 53.6  ± 7.1 |
| **All students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 412.3  ± 1.8 | 419.9  ± 1.6 | 371.1  ± 2.6 | 386.7  ± 3.1 | 400.5  ± 3.3 | 401.2  ± 4.9 | 421.0  ± 5.9 | 306.6  ± 19.9 | 400.5  ± 1.2 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 496.2  ± 1.9 | 502.2  ± 1.7 | 468.7  ± 2.1 | 477.5  ± 2.8 | 476.5  ± 3.0 | 484.6  ± 5.5 | 508.6  ± 5.5 | 412.1  ± 18.1 | 487.4  ± 1.1 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 546.1  ± 2.9 | 548.3  ± 2.6 | 532.7  ± 2.0 | 537.8  ± 3.0 | 537.0  ± 2.9 | 540.6  ± 7.4 | 558.6  ± 8.3 | 474.3  ± 22.2 | 541.5  ± 1.3 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 83.9  ± 8.2 | 82.3  ± 8.1 | 97.6  ± 8.4 | 90.8  ± 8.8 | 76.0  ± 9.0 | 83.4  ± 10.7 | 87.6  ± 11.1 | 105.5  ± 27.7 | 86.9  ± 7.9 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 49.9  ± 7.8 | 46.1  ± 7.6 | 64.0  ± 7.5 | 60.3  ± 8.1 | 60.5  ± 8.1 | 56.0  ± 11.6 | 50.0  ± 12.1 | 62.2  ± 29.5 | 54.1  ± 7.1 |

**a** The mean scale scores for 2008, 2010 and 2012 reported in this table include 95 per cent confidence intervals (for example, a mean scale score of 400.0 ± 2.7, or a gain from 2010 to 2012 of 80.1 ± 2.7). Confidence intervals for the gain provide an indication of the level of uncertainty of the gain over the two year period. b The confidence interval provided is for the specific jurisdictional gain and should not be used for comparisons between jurisdictions or between subgroups.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *2012 National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy: Achievement in Numeracy, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy*; table 4A.53.

***NAPLAN Numeracy***

This section of the learning outcomes indicator provides key outcomes for NAPLAN testing (years 3, 5, 7 and 9) in the numeracy domain. Indigenous outcomes are highlighted, but outcomes for a range of other equity groups, including male, female, LBOTE, geolocation and socio-economic status (parental education and parental occupation) are included in tables 4A.71–88.

*All students and Indigenous students*

The proportion of year 3 students who achieved at or above the numeracy national minimum standard in 2012 was 93.7–94.1 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (71.1–74.3 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.9–95.3 per cent) (figure 4.32). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.32 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.32 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.71.

*Source*: ACARA (2011 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.71.

Nationally in 2012, the mean scale score for year 3 numeracy for all students was 394.5–396.5. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (316.9–323.3) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (398.6–400.4). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions (figure 4.33).

Figure 4.33 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, numeracy, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.33 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, numeracy, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.74.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *2012 National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy: Achievement in Numeracy, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy*; table 4A.74.

The proportion of year 5 students who achieved at or above the numeracy national minimum standard in 2012 was 93.1–93.5 per cent nationally. The proportion for Indigenous students (67.3–71.1 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.4–94.8 per cent) (figure 4.34). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.34 Proportion of year 5 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.34 Proportion of year 5 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.71.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.71.

Nationally in 2012, the mean scale score for year 5 numeracy for all students was 487.7–489.7. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (410.3–417.7) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (491.6–493.6) (figure 4.35). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.35 Mean scale scores for year 5 students, numeracy, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.35 Mean scale scores for year 5 students, numeracy, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.74.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.74.

The proportion of year 7 students who achieved at or above the numeracy national minimum standard in 2012 was 93.5–94.1 per cent nationally. The proportion of Indigenous students (72.9–75.9 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.7–95.1 per cent) (figure 4.36). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.36 Proportion of year 7 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.36 Proportion of year 7 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.71.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.71.

Nationally in 2012, the mean scale score for year 7 numeracy for all students was 536.5–539.7. The mean scale score Indigenous students (466.8–472.0) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (540.2–543.4) (figure 4.37). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.37 Mean scale scores for year 7 students, numeracy, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.37 Mean scale scores for year 7 students, numeracy, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.74.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.74.

The proportion of year 9 students who achieved at or above the numeracy national minimum standard in 2012 was 93.4–94.0 per cent nationally. The proportion of Indigenous students (72.6–75.8 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (94.4–95.0 per cent) (figure 4.38). These proportions varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.38 Proportion of year 9 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.38 Proportion of year 9 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.71.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.71.

Nationally in 2012, the mean scale score for year 9 numeracy for all students was 582.3–586.1. The mean scale score for Indigenous students (515.8–520.6) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students (585.6–589.4) (figure 4.39). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions.

Figure 4.39 Mean scale scores for year 9 students, numeracy, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.39 Mean scale scores for year 9 students, numeracy, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.74.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.74.

*Geolocation*

Across all year levels, numeracy outcomes tended to decline with remoteness. For year 3, for example, 94.9–95.3 per cent of students in metropolitan areas achieved at or above the national minimum standard, higher than the proportion for provincial students 92.2–93.0 per cent), remote students (82.0–87.2 per cent) and very remote students (50.9–62.5 per cent) (figure 4.40).

For all geolocation categories across years 3, 5, 7 and 9, the numeracy outcomes nationally for Indigenous students were lower than those for non-Indigenous students. Nationally, outcomes for Indigenous students generally declined as remoteness increased, and the gap in learning outcomes between Indigenous students and non-Indigenous students was generally greater in remote and very remote areas than in metropolitan and provincial areas.

State and Territory results by Indigenous status and geolocation for years 3, 5, 7 and 9 numeracy literacy are in table 4A.72. The general pattern in jurisdictions appears similar to the national results. However, due to relatively large confidence intervals, caution should be exercised when making comparisons for some data. Mean scale score results by Indigenous status and geolocation are provided in table 4A.75.

Figure 4.40 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.40 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the numeracy national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** Data for year 3 students are shown and may not be representative of students in years 5, 7 and 9 which are detailed in table 4A.72.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.72.

*Socio-economic status*

State and Territory data on the proportions of students achieving at or above the national minimum standard and mean scale scores in numeracy assessment for years 3, 5, 7 and 9 by parental education and parental occupation for 2012 are included in tables 4A.73 and 4A.76. Data for 2011 and 2012 were included in the 2012 Report and the 2013 Report.

*Time series analysis of NAPLAN numeracy outcomes*

The following time series outcomes are reported*:*

* The difference between two given years for a level (for example, year 5 numeracy from 2011 to 2012), for both the proportion at and above the national minimum standard and mean scale scores.
* The gain in mean scale score by a cohort of students as they move between year levels (for example year 3 numeracy in 2010 to year 5 numeracy in 2012).

*Statistical significance of differences between years*

Nationally, there was no statistically significant difference in the proportions of year 5 students achieving at or above the national minimum standard, for numeracy, from 2008 to 2012 but a statistically significant decrease from 2011 to 2012. There was a statistically significant increase in the mean scale score for year 5 students from 2008 to 2012 but no statistically significant difference from 2011 to 2012 (table 4.9).

There was no statistically significant difference in the proportions at and above national minimum standard, or in mean scale scores, for Indigenous students from 2008 to 2012, but there was a statistically significant decrease in both from 2011 to 2012. There was a statistically significant increase in the mean scale score for non‑Indigenous students from 2008 to 2012, but no statistically significant difference from 2011 to 2012. There was no statistically significant difference in the proportions of year 5 non-Indigenous students achieving at or above the national minimum standard, from 2008 to 2012, but a statistically significant decrease from 2011 to 2012 (table 4.9).

Table 4.9 provides a summary of differences in achievement at year 5 for mean scale score and proportions at and above national minimum standard, by Indigenous status, on a national basis across various years. Data for states and territories are in tables 4A.79–86. These data are not comparable across jurisdictions and can only be used for a comparison across time for a jurisdiction, or nationally.

Data for years 3, 7 and 9 and proportions at or above national minimum standard for LBOTE students and by sex are included separately for each State and Territory and nationally in tables 4A.79–87.

Table 4.9 Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for year 5 numeracy, and statistical significance of differences, Australia**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Statistical significance of difference in average achievement | |
|  | *2008* | *2011* | *2012* | *2008 & 2012* | *2011 & 2012* |
| Indigenous students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 408.0 ± 2.8 | 421.1 ± 2.7 | 414.0 ± 3.7 | ● | ↓ |
| At or above NMS | 69.2 ± 1.7 | 75.2 ± 1.5 | 69.2 ± 1.9 | ● | ↓ |
| Non-Indigenous students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 479.5 ± 1.0 | 491.3 ± 1.0 | 492.6 ± 1.0 | ↑ | ● |
| At or above NMS | 94.0 ± 0.2 | 95.5 ± 0.2 | 94.6 ± 0.2 | ● | ↓ |
| All students | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean scale score | 475.9 ± 1.1 | 487.8 ± 1.1 | 488.7 ± 1.0 | ↑ | ● |
| At or above NMS | 92.7 ± 0.2 | 94.4 ± 0.2 | 93.3 ± 0.2 | ● | ↓ |

NMS = National Minimum Standard. **↑**= Average achievement significantly higher, statistically ● = No significant difference, statistically. ↓= Average achievement significantly lower, statistically.

**a** The mean scale scores and proportions at or above national minimum standard reported in this table include 95 per cent confidence intervals (for example, a mean scale score of 400.0 ± 2.7). The confidence intervals in this table are for the specific year applicable and do not provide an indication of statistically significant differences between years. See section 2.5 of the ‘statistical context’ chapter for more information on confidence intervals. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.87.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*, ACARA, Sydney; table 4A.87.

##### Cohort gain

Analysis of NAPLAN mean scale score data for the years 2008 to 2010 and 2010 to 2012 enables comparisons of outcomes for the same cohort of students over time (box 4.9). From year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010, the gain in numeracy mean scale score (on the common national scale for Years 3, 5, 7 and 9, ranging from 0 to 1000) was between 83.6 and 100.2 points nationally. For the same cohort, from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the mean scale score gain was between 43.3 and 55.3 points nationally.

For Indigenous students, year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010 the mean scale score gain was between 80.0 and 98.6 points and from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the mean scale score gain was between 45.4 and 59.6 points nationally. For non‑Indigenous students, year 3 in 2008 to year 5 in 2010 the mean scale score gain was between 83.8 and 100.4 points and from year 5 in 2010 to year 7 in 2012, the gain was between 43.2 and 55.2 points nationally.

These mean scale score gains varied across jurisdictions (table 4.10). Data for other cohorts from 2008–2010 and 2010-2012 are in table 4A.88.

Table 4.10 Gain in mean scale score for numeracy: year 3 (2008) to year 5 (2010) to year 7 (2012)a, b

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| **Indigenous students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 350.3  ± 3.1 | 376.9  ± 5.5 | 316.2  ± 6.4 | 313.9  ± 5.1 | 330.7  ± 6.5 | 377.1  ± 8.2 | 355.1  ± 16.2 | 275.0  ± 11.0 | 327.6  ± 3.3 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 435.8  ± 3.0 | 457.0  ± 5.8 | 419.5  ± 4.5 | 398.0  ± 6.0 | 406.9  ± 6.8 | 450.0  ± 8.0 | 434.7  ± 12.8 | 351.6  ± 13.0 | 416.9  ± 3.1 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 477.4  ± 3.2 | 494.6  ± 5.2 | 475.9  ± 3.7 | 461.0  ± 5.0 | 464.8  ± 6.3 | 491.0  ± 7.3 | 493.1  ± 12.2 | 410.1  ± 15.0 | 469.4  ± 2.6 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 85.5  ± 9.2 | 80.1  ± 11.4 | 103.3  ± 11.3 | 84.1  ± 11.3 | 76.2  ± 12.4 | 72.9  ± 14.1 | 79.6  ± 22.1 | 76.6  ± 18.9 | 89.3  ± 9.3 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 41.6  ± 7.2 | 37.6  ± 9.7 | 56.4  ± 8.2 | 63.0  ± 9.7 | 57.9  ± 10.9 | 41.0  ± 12.3 | 58.4  ± 18.6 | 58.5  ± 20.6 | 52.5  ± 7.1 |
| **Non-Indigenous students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 411.3  ± 1.6 | 417.5  ± 1.4 | 371.9  ± 2.1 | 387.4  ± 2.2 | 391.7  ± 2.5 | 401.6  ± 4.5 | 413.1  ± 5.0 | 386.9  ± 5.9 | 400.5  ± 1.0 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 501.0  ± 1.9 | 503.2  ± 1.6 | 478.5  ± 1.8 | 483.0  ± 2.4 | 475.2  ± 2.7 | 482.8  ± 4.6 | 500.2  ± 5.0 | 472.7  ± 5.0 | 492.6  ± 1.0 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 546.6  ± 3.8 | 545.3  ± 3.1 | 536.1  ± 2.0 | 540.3  ± 3.2 | 531.8  ± 3.1 | 528.6  ± 6.6 | 547.2  ± 9.7 | 522.7  ± 13.2 | 541.8  ± 1.6 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 89.7  ± 8.5 | 85.7  ± 8.4 | 106.6  ± 8.6 | 95.6  ± 8.8 | 83.5  ± 9.0 | 81.2  ± 10.4 | 87.1  ± 10.7 | 85.8  ± 11.2 | 92.1  ± 8.3 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 45.6  ± 7.2 | 42.1  ± 6.7 | 57.6  ± 6.3 | 57.3  ± 7.0 | 56.6  ± 7.1 | 45.8  ± 9.9 | 47.0  ± 12.3 | 50.0  ± 15.2 | 49.2  ± 6.0 |
| **All students** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2008 Year 3 | 408.9  ± 1.6 | 416.9  ± 1.4 | 367.9  ± 2.2 | 381.9  ± 2.4 | 388.8  ± 2.7 | 399.9  ± 4.2 | 411.5  ± 5.1 | 338.4  ± 12.4 | 396.9  ± 1.0 |
| 2010 Year 5 | 498.4  ± 2.0 | 502.7  ± 1.6 | 474.1  ± 1.9 | 476.8  ± 2.6 | 472.6  ± 2.8 | 479.4  ± 4.8 | 498.7  ± 5.1 | 421.5  ± 14.4 | 488.8  ± 1.0 |
| 2012 Year 7 | 543.4  ± 3.8 | 544.3  ± 3.1 | 532.0  ± 2.1 | 534.9  ± 3.3 | 529.1  ± 3.1 | 526.0  ± 7.1 | 545.9  ± 9.7 | 474.7  ± 18.4 | 538.1  ± 1.6 |
| Gain 2008-2010 | 89.5  ± 8.5 | 85.8  ± 8.4 | 106.2  ± 8.6 | 94.9  ± 8.9 | 83.8  ± 9.0 | 79.5  ± 10.3 | 87.2  ± 10.8 | 83.1  ± 20.5 | 91.9  ± 8.3 |
| Gain 2010-2012 | 45.0  ± 7.2 | 41.6  ± 6.7 | 57.9  ± 6.4 | 58.1  ± 7.1 | 56.5  ± 7.1 | 46.6  ± 10.3 | 47.2  ± 12.4 | 53.2  ± 24.1 | 49.3  ± 6.0 |

**a** The mean scale scores for 2008, 2010 and 2012 reported in this table include 95 per cent confidence intervals (for example, a mean scale score of 400.0 ± 2.7, or a gain from 2010 to 2012 of 80.1 ± 2.7). Confidence intervals for the gain provide an indication of the level of uncertainty of the gain over the two year period. b The confidence interval provided is for the specific jurisdictional gain and should not be used for comparisons between jurisdictions or between subgroups.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *2012 National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy: Achievement in Numeracy, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy*; table 4A.88.

***NAPLAN Persuasive Writing***

This section of the learning outcomes indicator provides key outcomes for NAPLAN testing (years 3, 5, 7 and 9) in the persuasive writing domain. Indigenous outcomes are highlighted, but outcomes for a range of other equity groups including male, female, LBOTE, geolocation and socio-economic status (parental education and parental occupation) for 2012 are included in tables 4A.54–70.

The proportion of year 3 students who achieved at or above the persuasive writing national minimum standard in 2012 was 95.1–95.5 per cent nationally. The proportion of Indigenous students (76.6–80.0 per cent) was significantly lower than for non‑Indigenous students (96.3–96.5 per cent). These proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 4.41).

Figure 4.41 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the persuasive writing national minimum standard, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.41 Proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the persuasive writing national minimum standard, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.54.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.54.

Nationally in 2012, the mean scale score for year 3 persuasive writing for all students was 414.9–416.7. The mean scale score for Indigenous students   
(335.0–344.6) was significantly lower than for non-Indigenous students   
(419.3–420.9). Mean scale scores varied across jurisdictions (figure 4.42).

Figure 4.42 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, persuasive writing, 2012a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.42 Mean scale scores for year 3 students, persuasive writing, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** For further information and caveats see table 4A.57.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.57.

*Geolocation*

Across all year levels, persuasive writing outcomes tended to decline with remoteness. For year 3, for example, 96.0–96.4 per cent of students in metropolitan areas achieved at or above the national minimum standard, higher than the proportion for provincial students (94.3–94.9 per cent), remote students   
(85.2–90.2 per cent) and very remote students (52.8–65.6 per cent) (figure 4.43).

For all geolocation categories across years 3, 5, 7 and 9, the persuasive writing outcomes nationally for Indigenous students were lower than those for non‑Indigenous students. Nationally, outcomes for Indigenous students generally declined as remoteness increased, and the gap in learning outcomes between Indigenous students and non-Indigenous students was generally greater in remote and very remote areas than in metropolitan and provincial areas.

State and Territory results by Indigenous status and geolocation for years 3, 5, 7   
and 9 persuasive writing are in table 4A.55. The general pattern in jurisdictions appears similar to the national results. However, due to relatively large confidence intervals, caution should be exercised when making comparisons for some data. Mean scale score results by Indigenous status and geolocation are provided in table 4A.58.

Figure 4.43 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the persuasive writing national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.43 National proportion of year 3 students achieving at or above the persuasive writing national minimum standard, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**  Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. **b** Data for year 3 students are shown and may not be representative of students in years 5, 7 and 9 which are detailed in table 4A.55.

*Source*: ACARA (2012 and unpublished) *NAPLAN Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy: National Report for 2012*; table 4A.55.

Data for years 5, 7 and 9, and outcomes by equity group, parental education and parental occupation for 2012 are in tables 4A.54–59.

Statistical significance of differences for persuasive writing between 2011 and 2012 for years 3, 5, 7 and 9 for mean scale scores and proportions at and above national minimum standard are included separately for each state and territory and nationally in tables 4A.62–70. These tables also include proportions at or above national minimum standard for LBOTE students and by sex.

***National Assessment Program***

*National Assessment Program — Science literacy*

The National Year 6 Science literacy assessment was conducted for the first time in 2003 and is repeated triennially. In 2012, 13 236 year 6 students from 617 government and non‑government schools from all states and territories participated in the assessment (ACARA 2013a).

Nationally in 2012, the proportion of participating year 6 students who achieved at or above the proficient standard in science literacy performance was   
49.4–53.4 per cent, not a statistically significant difference from 2006 or 2009. These proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 4.44).

Figure 4.44 Proportion of year 6 students achieving at or above the proficient standard, science literacy performance **a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.44 Proportion of year 6 students achieving at or above the proficient standard, science literacy performance   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a**Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b**National minimum standards such as those set in literacy and numeracy have not been set for science literacy performance. The proficient standard for year 6 science literacy performance is set at proficiency level 3.2, a challenging but reasonable level of performance, with students needing to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills expected at that year level to be regarded as reaching it. Data represent the proportion of students at or above the proficient standard.

*Source*: ACARA (2013), *National Assessment Program Science Literacy Year 6 Report 2012,* Sydney; table 4A.89.

Nationally in 2012, 14.3–25.9 per cent of Indigenous year 6 students achieved at the proficient standard or above in science literacy performance, significantly lower than the proportion for non‑Indigenous students (50.8–54.8 per cent) (table 4A.91)

Science literacy performance by geolocation and sex are summarised in tables 4A.90–91. Further details, including data by country of birth, and mean scores for all categories are reported in ACARA (2013a).

*National Assessment Program — ICT performance*

The National Years 6 and 10 ICT performance assessment was conducted for the first time in 2005, and repeated in 2008 and 2011. Nationally, in 2011,   
60.0–64.0 per cent of year 6 students achieved at the proficient standard or above, a statistically significant increase from 54.2–59.8 per cent in 2008. Nationally, in 2011, 62.7–67.3 per cent of year 10 students achieved at the proficient standard or above, not a statistically significant difference from 2008 (63.0–69.0 per cent). Detailed outcomes of the 2011 assessment were included in the 2013 Report. Relevant data are reported in tables 4A.95–96.

*National Assessment Program – Civics and citizenship performance*

The National Years 6 and 10 Civics and citizenship performance assessment was conducted for the first time in 2004, and was repeated in 2007 and 2010. Nationally, in 2010, 49.6–54.4 per cent of year 6 students achieved at the proficient standard or above, not a statistically significant difference from 50.6–56.2 per cent in 2007. Nationally, in 2010, 45.3–52.7 per cent of year 10 students achieved at the proficient standard or above, a statistically significant increase from 2007 (38.9–44.1 per cent). Detailed outcomes of the 2010 assessment were included in the 2012 Report. Relevant data are reported in tables 4A.92–94.

***PISA assessment***

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a sample assessment undertaken every three years (box 4.10). Data from PISA 2012 are included for the first time in this Report.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.10 Programme for International Student Assessment |
| PISA provides learning outcomes data for 15 year olds in three core assessment domains: reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy. In 2012, around 510 000 students from 65 countries and economies participated in the PISA assessment. From Australia, this included 14 481 students from 775 schools. Mathematical literacy was the major domain tested in PISA 2012.  Time series comparisons can only be made across PISA data once a subject has been a major assessment domain. All domains have now been the subject of a major assessment, but in different cycles.  The national proficient standard is set at Proficiency level 3.  Further information on PISA is available at the PISA website: www.acer.edu.au/ozpisa/reports. |
| *Source*: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) (2013). |
|  |
|  |

##### PISA reading literacy

Reading literacy was the major domain tested in the PISA 2000 and 2009 cycles. Reading literacy results from subsequent cycles may be compared with the 2000 cycle. In PISA 2012 the proportion of Australian 15 year old students who achieved at or above the national proficient standard of level 3 in reading literacy nationally was 62.9–65.5 per cent. The proportion of students achieving at level 5 and 6 (the highest levels) was 10.7–12.7 per cent and the proportion of students achieving at level 1 and below was 13.3–15.1 per cent (figure 4.45).

Figure 4.45 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below level 1, at or above level 3, and level 5 or level 6 on the overall reading literacy scale, PISA 2012**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.45 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below level 1, at or above level 3, and level 5 or level 6 on the overall reading literacy scale, PISA 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it. Level 6 is the highest attainable level and Level 1 is the lowest proficiency level. Students who fail to reach the lowest proficiency level are referred to as being below Level 1.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.100.

The proportion of students achieving at level 3 and above in the overall reading literacy scale for 2012 can be compared to outcomes for earlier years —   
66.6–71.4 per cent in PISA 2000, 68.0–71.8 per cent in PISA 2003,  
63.8–67.4 per cent in PISA 2006 and 63.5–67.1 per cent in PISA 2009 (figure 4.46).

Figure 4.46 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA reading literacy scalea, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.46 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA reading literacy scale   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** For PISA 2000, PISA 2003 and PISA 2006, the PISA overall reading literacy scale has six defined proficiency levels, from level 6 (the highest) to level 1 (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1’ which covers those students who are unable to reach even the first threshold of the skills that PISA seeks to measure. For PISA 2009 and PISA 2012, level 1 is reported as level 1a and level 1b (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1b’. Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.97.

The proportion by equity group who achieved level 3 or above for reading literacy in 2012 was:

* 55.6–59.2 per cent for male students, lower than for female students   
  (69.7–73.1 per cent)
* 27.3–33.9 per cent for Indigenous students, compared with 64.1–66.7 per cent for non-Indigenous students
* 31.0–55.2 per cent for geographically remote students
* 43.9–48.9 per cent for students from low socio-economic status families (table 4A.98).

These outcomes varied across jurisdictions. Data relating to outcomes for the PISA 2006, 2009 and 2012 reading surveys by socio-economic status are in table 4A.99 and for each achievement level for PISA 2012, including statistical significance of differences in mean scores are in table 4A.100. Data comparing outcomes for PISA surveys for the reading domain in 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2012 are in table 4A.97 and table 4A.98 and significance of differences in mean scores between PISA 2000 and PISA 2012 are in table 4A.109.

Results of the PISA 2009 Digital Reading Literacy Assessment were released in 2012. Students in every State and Territory performed significantly higher in digital than print reading literacy (ACER 2012a).

##### PISA mathematical literacy

Mathematical literacy was the major domain tested in the PISA 2003 and 2012 surveys. Mathematical literacy results from subsequent cycles may be compared with the 2003 cycle. In PISA 2012 the proportion of Australian 15 year old students who achieved at or above the national proficient standard of level 3 in mathematical literacy was 56.9–59.9 per cent. The proportion of students achieving at level 5 and 6 (the highest levels) was 13.5–16.1 per cent and the proportion of students achieving at level 1 and below was 18.5–20.9 per cent (figure 4.47).

Figure 4.47 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below level 1, at or above level 3, and level 5 or level 6 on the overall mathematical literacy scale, PISA 2012**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.47 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below level 1, at or above level 3, and level 5 or level 6 on the overall mathematical literacy scale, PISA 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it. Level 6 is the highest attainable proficiency level and Level 1 is the lowest proficiency level. Students who fail to reach the lowest proficiency level are referred to as being below Level 1.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.104.

The proportion of students achieving at level 3 and above in the overall mathematical literacy scale for 2012 can be compared to outcomes for earlier   
years — 65.3–68.9 per cent in PISA 2003, 64.7–68.3 per cent in PISA 2006 and 61.9–65.9 per cent in PISA 2009 (figure 4.48).

Figure 4.48 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA mathematical literacy scalea, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.48 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA mathematical literacy scale  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** For PISA 2003 and PISA 2006, the PISA overall mathematical literacy scale has six defined proficiency levels, from level 6 (the highest) to level 1 (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1’ which covers those students who are unable to reach even the first threshold of the skills that PISA seeks to measure. For PISA 2009 and PISA 2012, level 1 is reported as level 1a and level 1b (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1b’. Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.101.

The proportion by equity group who achieved level 3 or above for mathematical literacy in PISA 2012 was:

* 58.1–62.3 per cent for male students, not significantly different to 54.5–58.5 per cent for female students
* 20.1–26.3 per cent for Indigenous students, compared to 58.2–61.2 per cent for non-Indigenous students
* 23.4–51.6 per cent for geographically remote students
* 59.6–63.0 per cent for students from low socio-economic status families (table 4A.102).

These outcomes varied across jurisdictions. Data relating to outcomes for the 2006, 2009 and 2012 PISA mathematical literacy survey by socio-economic status are in table 4A.103 and for each achievement level for PISA 2012, including statistical significance of differences in mean scores are in table 4A.104. Data comparing outcomes for PISA surveys for the mathematical literacy domain in 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2012 are in tables 4A.101–102 and significance of differences in mean scores between PISA 2003 and PISA 2012 are in table 4A.109.

##### PISA scientific literacy

Scientific literacy was the major domain tested in the PISA 2006 cycle. Scientific literacy results from subsequent cycles may be compared with the 2006 cycle. In PISA 2012, the proportion of Australian 15 year old students who achieved at or above the national proficient standard of Level 3 in scientific literacy nationally was 63.5–66.3 per cent. The proportion of students achieving at level 5 and 6 (the highest levels) was 12.5–14.7 per cent and the proportion of students achieving at level 1 and below was 13.0–14.2 per cent (figure 4.49).

Figure 4.49 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below Level 1, at or above Level 3, and at Level 5 or Level 6 on the overall scientific literacy scale, PISA 2012**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.49 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving at or below Level 1, at or above Level 3, and at Level 5 or Level 6 on the overall scientific literacy scale, PISA 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it. Level 6 is the highest attainable proficiency level and Level 1 is the lowest proficiency level. Students who fail to reach the lowest proficiency level are referred to as being below Level 1.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.108.

The proportion of students achieving at level 3 and above in the overall scientific literacy scale for 2012 can be compared to outcomes for earlier years — 65.3–68.7 per cent in PISA 2006 and 65.8–69.2 per cent in PISA 2009 (figure 4.50).

Figure 4.50 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA scientific literacy scalea, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.50 Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above, overall PISA scientific literacy scale  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence intervals associated with each point estimate. **b** For PISA 2006, the PISA overall scientific literacy scale has six defined proficiency levels, from level 6 (the highest) to level 1 (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1’ which covers those students who are unable to reach even the first threshold of the skills that PISA seeks to measure. For PISA 2009 and PISA 2012, level 1 is reported as level 1a and level 1b (the lowest) with an additional level referred to as ‘Below level 1b’. Level 3 or above (which is the national proficient standard) can be described as a level of achievement that is reasonably challenging and which requires students to demonstrate more than minimal or elementary skills to be regarded as reaching it.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished); table 4A.105.

The proportion by equity group who achieved level 3 or above for scientific literacy in PISA 2012 was:

* 63.4–67.0 per cent for male students, not significantly different to 62.7–66.3 per cent for female students
* 29.6–36.4 per cent for Indigenous students, compared to 64.6–67.4 per cent for non-Indigenous students
* 32.7–63.5 per cent for geographically remote students
* 45.0–49.6 per cent for students from low socio-economic status families (table 4A.106).

These outcomes varied across jurisdictions. Data relating to outcomes for the 2006, 2009 and 2012 PISA scientific literacy survey by socio-economic status are in table 4A.107 and for each achievement level for PISA 2012, including statistical significance of differences in mean scores are in table 4A.108. Data comparing outcomes for PISA surveys in 2006, 2009 and 2012 for the scientific literacy domain are in tables 4A.105–107 and significance of differences in mean scores between PISA 2006 and PISA 2012 are in table 4A.109.

***PIRLS assessment***

The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) assessments are undertaken every five years (box 4.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.11 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study |
| PIRLS provides learning outcomes data for year 4 students in reading literacy performance. This international test is conducted every five years but was first undertaken by students in Australian schools in 2011. Students from 45 countries or economies participated in the 2011 PIRLS assessment, including over 6000 Australian students from 280 schools.  PIRLS uses two organising dimensions for the assessment, referred to as the *purposes for reading* and the *reading processes.* Each of the reading processes — focus on and retrieve explicitly stated information, make straightforward inferences, interpret and integrate ideas and information and examine and evaluate content, language and textual elements — is assessed within each purpose for reading (reading for literacy experience and reading to gain information). The PIRLS 2011 assessment was based on 10 different texts, five for the literary purpose and five for the informational purpose.  PIRLS is assessed on a different basis to NAPLAN testing and its results are not comparable to NAPLAN results. Whereas NAPLAN measures against a national minimum standard, PIRLS measures against a series of achievement levels. PIRLS may provide additional information on reading that is not available in NAPLAN. |
| *Source*: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) (2012b) |
|  |
|  |

In PIRLS 2011 the proportion of tested Australian year 4 students who achieved at or above the intermediate international benchmark (a score of 475) was   
73.6–77.6 per cent (figure 4.51). This was a lower proportion than 26 other participating countries or economies. Australian students achieved an average reading score of 527 points (table 4A.116), which was lower than the average reading score of 21 other participating countries or economies.

National proportions of year 4 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark by equity group, and the mean scores for these equity groups, are included in table 4A.117.

Figure 4.51 Proportion of year 4 students at or above the intermediate international benchmark in reading, PIRLS, 2011**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.51 Proportion of year 4 students at or above the intermediate international benchmark in reading, PIRLS, 2011  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a The intermediate international benchmark is set at a score of 475 points.

*Source*: ACER (unpublished) Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS); table 4A.116.

***TIMSS assessment***

The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) assessments are conducted each four years and provide learning outcomes data for students in year 4 and year 8 in the assessment domains of mathematics achievement and science achievement. Data from the 2011 TIMSS were included in the 2013 Report. Attachment tables 4A.110–113 contain detailed results for the 2003, 2007 and 2011 TIMSS assessments, by achievement level. Table 4A.114 contains 2011 TIMSS outcomes by equity group and table 4A.115 contains comparisons of significance of difference between the 2011 TIMSS and earlier rounds.

*Other outcomes*

*Completion*

‘Completion’ is an indicator of governments’ objective that all students have access to high quality education and training to year 12 or equivalent, that provides clear and recognised pathways to further education, training and employment (box 4.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.12 Completion |
| ‘Completion’ (completion rate) is defined as the number of students who meet the requirements of a year 12 certificate or equivalent expressed as a percentage of the estimated potential year 12 population. The estimated potential year 12 population is an estimate of a single year age group that could have attended year 12 that year, calculated as the estimated resident population aged 15–19 divided by five. The completion rate is reported by socio-economic status, geolocation and sex.   * The criteria for obtaining a year 12 or equivalent certificate vary across jurisdictions. * The aggregation of all postcode locations into three socio-economic status categories — high, medium and low deciles — means there may be significant variation within the categories. Low deciles, for example, will include locations ranging from those of extreme disadvantage to those of moderate disadvantage.   Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within some jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions (see caveats in attachment tables for specific jurisdictions) * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012 data are available for all jurisdictions providing the service:   A high or increasing completion rate suggests an improvement in educational outcomes.  Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Completion rates are primarily used as indicators of trends and are used, in part, because information on participation and retention rates is generally not available by socio-economic background or geographic location. Comparisons across jurisdictions need to be made with care, for the following reasons:

* assessment, reporting and requirements for obtaining year 12 certificates or equivalent vary across states and territories — for example, from moderated school-based assessment to a mix including external and internal assessment, and from completion of a pattern of study to a prescribed level of attainment
* inaccuracies arise from using both home postal address and school location address in compiling completion rates data
* small changes in population or completions can affect the estimates of completion rates, particularly for states and territories with smaller populations
* students completing their secondary education in TAFE institutes are included in reporting for some jurisdictions and not in others, and the proportion of such students varies across jurisdictions.

Nationally in 2012, the year 12 completion rate for all students was 73 per cent. The completion rate for males was 69 per cent compared with 78 per cent for females (table 4A.126).

Socio-economic status is determined according to the ABS Postal Area Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage, on the basis of postcode of students’ home addresses. Low socio-economic status is the average of the 3 lowest deciles, medium socio-economic status is the average of the 4 middle deciles and high socio-economic status is the average of the 3 highest deciles.

Nationally in 2012, year 12 completion rates for students from low (67 per cent) and medium (73 per cent) socio-economic backgrounds were below those for students from a high socio-economic background (80 per cent) (figure 4.52). Nationally, completion rates were higher for female students than for male students in all socio‑economic categories (table 4A.126).

Figure 4.52 Completion rates, year 12, by socio-economic status, 2012 (per cent)a, b, c, d, e

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.52 Completion rates, year 12, by socio-economic status, 2012 (per cent)  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

**a** Completion rates are estimated by calculating the number of students who meet the requirements of a year 12 certificate or equivalent expressed as a percentage of the potential year 12 population. The potential year 12 population is an estimate of a single year age group which could have attended year 12 that year, calculated as the estimated resident population aged 15–19 years divided by 5. **b** The ABS Postal Area Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage has been used to calculate socio-economic status, on the basis of postcode of students’ home addresses. **c** Low socio-economic status is the average of the 3 lowest deciles, medium socio-economic status is the average of the 4 middle deciles and high socio-economic status is the average of the 3 highest deciles. **d** A common total for socio-economic status and geolocation is selected for reporting all students' rates and this may mean totals for socio-economic status differ slightly to those in other publications. **e** The populations for the low and medium socio-economic status deciles in the ACT and the high socio-economic status deciles in the NT are not published due to small numbers.

*Source*: Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); table 4A.126.

Geographic isolation is determined using the MCEECDYA (now SCSEEC) Geographic Location Classification.

Nationally, the completion rate was highest in the metropolitan zone (76 per cent) in 2012. The completion rate was lower in the provincial zone (68 per cent), remote areas (66 per cent) and very remote areas (38 per cent) (figure 4.53).

Nationally, completion rates were higher for females in all geographic zones. In the metropolitan zone, the female completion rate was 79 per cent, compared with 72 per cent for males in 2012. In the remote zone, the female completion rate was 75 per cent, compared with 59 per cent for males (table 4A.127). Time series data on national completion rates are reported in tables 4A.126–127.

Figure 4.53 Completion rates, year 12, by geolocation, 2012 (per cent)a, b, c, d, e

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.53 Completion rates, year 12, by geolocation, 2012 (per cent)  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Completion rates are estimated by calculating the number of students who meet the requirements of a year 12 certificate or equivalent expressed as a percentage of the potential year 12 population. The potential year 12 population is an estimate of a single year age group which could have attended year 12 that year, calculated as the estimated resident population aged 15–19 divided by 5. b Definitions are based on the MCEECDYA (now SCSEEC) Geographic Location Classification. c All of the ACT is included in the metropolitan zone. d There are no metropolitan areas in the NT. There are no very remote areas in Victoria. e Remote data for Victoria are not published due to small numbers. The very remote population in Tasmania is too small to give meaningful results and are not published.

*Source*: Australian Government Department of Education (unpublished); table 4A.127.

The Child care, education and training sector overview includes data on the proportions of the population aged 20–24 and 20–64 years having attained at least a year 12 or equivalent or AQF Certificate II; and the proportions of the 20–24 and 20–64 year old Indigenous and low socio-economic status populations having attained at least a year 12 or equivalent or AQF Certificate II (tables BA.33–36).

*Destination*

‘Destination’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of ensuring that school leavers make successful transitions from school and continue to improve their skills through further post-school education, training and/or employment. It is an indicator of students’ post-school transitions into education, training and employment (box 4.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.13 Destination |
| ‘Destination’ (school leaver destination rate) is defined as the estimated number of school students who left school in a given year and who, in May the following year, were participating in post-school education, training or full time employment, as a percentage of the estimated number of all school leavers in that given year, and is reported by highest level of schooling completed (year 12 or year 11 and below). Data are sourced from the ABS Survey of Education and Work.  A higher or increasing estimated proportion of school leavers participating in further education, training or full time employment is likely to result in improved educational and employment outcomes in the longer term.  The data reported for this measure relate to the jurisdiction in which the young person was resident the year after they left school and not necessarily the jurisdiction in which they attended school.  The small number of young people included in this sample survey means that disaggregation of destination estimates by jurisdiction can be unreliable, particularly for states and territories with smaller populations.  Data reported for this measure are   * not comparable across jurisdictions * incomplete for the current reporting period. All required 2012 data were not available for the Northern Territory.   Information about data quality for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014 |
|  |
|  |

School leaver destination data disaggregated by jurisdiction need to be used with caution, especially for jurisdictions with smaller populations, due to the large confidence intervals associated with these survey data.

Nationally, in 2012, 66.9 per cent of year 12 school leavers were enrolled in further study (46.6 per cent attending higher education and 20.4 per cent attending TAFE courses or other study) and a further 12.0 per cent were employed full time. Around one third were not studying, and either employed part time, unemployed or not in the labour force (figure 4.54 and table 4A.128).

For year 11 and below school leavers, 41.1 per cent were attending further education, almost all in TAFE or other study (table 4A.128). Approximately 9.2 per cent were working full time. the remaining 49.7 per cent were not studying and either employed part time, unemployed or not in the labour force (table 4A.128).

Figure 4.54 Destination of year 12 students, 2012a, b, c, d

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4.54 Destination of year 12 students, 2012  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for year 12 students who left school in 2012. b Error bars represent the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with each point estimate. c Data for Northern Territory are not published due to small sample numbers. d The ABS Survey of Education and Work is not conducted in Indigenous communities in very remote areas. This has a minor impact on national and jurisdictional estimates, but affects the comparability of the NT results, as people from Indigenous communities in very remote areas account for around 15 per cent of the NT population.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Survey of Education and Work 2012, Australia*; table 4A.128.

Detailed information relating to year 12, year 11 and below and all school leavers across jurisdictions is in table 4A.128.

The Child care, education and training sector overview of this Report includes 2012 national school leaver destination data for those who attended school at any time previously, and examines the proportions of male and female students attending other educational institutions in 2012 after leaving school (table BA.20–22).

Box 4.14 summarises school leaver destination survey results from six jurisdictions. each jurisdiction uses different research methods and data collection instruments, and the surveys were not designed for comparative national reporting. These data are presented as supplementary information to the Survey of Education and Work data, providing some context, until nationally comparable data become available (box 4.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.14 School leaver destination survey results |
| Victoria  In Victoria, a survey of post-school destinations (*On Track*) has been conducted annually since 2003. Consenting year 12 or equivalent completers and early leavers (from years 10, 11 and 12) from all Victorian schools participate in a telephone survey early in the year after they leave school.  The 2013 On Track Survey contacted 33 771 (75.1 per cent) of the eligible 2012 year 12 or equivalent cohort from 550 schools, both government and non‑government, as well as TAFE and Adult Community Education providers. Of these students, 76.1 per cent were in further education and training (53.2 per cent were enrolled at university, 15.8 per cent were TAFE enrolled and 7.1 per cent had taken up apprenticeships or traineeships). Of the 23.9 per cent who were not in further education and training, 10.2 per cent were in full or part time employment, 9.7 per cent had deferred a tertiary place and 3.6 per cent were looking for work.  Queensland  The annual Queensland *Next Step* survey, first conducted in 2005, targets all students who completed Year 12 in government and non-government schools approximately six months after the completion of Year 12.  The 2013 *Next Step* survey collected responses from 39 482 Year 12 completers, an 81.9 per cent response rate. The results showed that 61.6 per cent were in some recognised form of education or training in the year after completing Year 12. This comprised 39.4 per cent undertaking a Bachelor Degree, 12.3 per cent undertaking campus-based vocational education and training (VET), with 7.1 per cent studying at Certificate IV level or higher. A further 10.0 per cent were in employment-based VET, either as an apprentice (6.9 per cent) or trainee (3.1 per cent). The remaining 38.4 per cent did not enter post-school education or training and were either employed (25.9 per cent), seeking work (10.4 per cent), or not in the labour force, education or training (2.0 per cent). Young people who deferred a university offer represented 7.0 per cent of the total cohort, most of whom were working (79.4 per cent).  Western Australia  The WA School Leaver Destinations telephone survey has been conducted annually since 1996, collecting data about the post-school destinations of Year 12 completers. In 2013 the survey included former students from all government, most Catholic and some independent schools. Information was collected from 17,248 students representing 74.3 per cent of the total Year 12 student population as at Semester 2, 2012.  Of the responses, 81.7 per cent were in either education or training, with 50.7 per cent enrolled in university studies, 15.8 per cent in TAFE studies, 3.2 per cent having taken up an apprenticeship or a traineeship, 1.6 per cent either repeating Year 12 studies or engaged in other training and 10.4 per cent having deferred study or training. In addition, 6.2 per cent were engaged in full time employment, 6.8 per cent in part time employment, 4.1 per cent were looking for a work or a study opportunity, and 1.2 per cent were neither working nor seeking work. |
| (Continued next page) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4.14(continued) |
| Tasmania  Since 2007, all Year 10 students lodge a participation plan with the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority in the year they complete this final year of compulsory school. Students are required to be in an eligible option (education, training or employment) until they turn 17. Since 2008, the Authority has collected attainment data from all providers of post year 10 education and training and conducted early leavers/destination surveys for persons aged 15–19 years. Of the Year 10 cohort in 2010, 68.6 per cent continued in education or training at half time or better in 2011 and 55.6 per cent continued at half time or better in 2012. Of the 2011 Year 10 cohort, 71.3 per cent continued in education or training at half time or better in 2012. A telephone survey of Year 10 and 11 leavers (persons not recorded as continuing in education and training from the previous year) and all Year 12 leavers was conducted in 2011 and 2012. An analysis of the 2010 survey data was released in mid 2011.  Australian Capital Territory  Since 2007, the ACT has conducted a telephone-based survey of government and non-government students who successfully completed an ACT Year 12 Certificate in the preceding year. The survey seeks information on the destinations of students six months after completion of year 12 and satisfaction with their experience in year 11 and 12. In 2012, responses were received from 77 per cent of the 2011 graduates who were contacted. The 2012 survey found that 94 per cent of 2011 graduates were employed or studying in 2012 and overall 97 per cent found year 11 and 12 worthwhile. Of the 57 per cent of 2011 graduates studying in 2012, 68 per cent reported that they were studying at a Bachelor level or higher, 14 per cent at Certificate III level, 6 per cent at Certificate IV level, 5 per cent at Diploma or Associate Diploma level, 3 per cent at Advanced Diploma or Associate Degree level and 5 per cent at other levels. Students who speak a language other than English at home were more likely to be studying (77 per cent) than those who did not (54 per cent).  Northern Territory  Post school destination surveys of the Year 12 Northern Territory Certificate of Education and Training (NTCET) completers were carried out from late April to early May 2013, some five to six months after the NTCET students had completed school. The 2013 survey had a 28.3 per cent response rate from a total cohort of 1210 students. From the responses collected, 64.3 per cent of the young people were in employment (55.45 per cent were employed fulltime, and 44.6 per cent in part time or casual employment). Amongst respondents, 64.5 per cent of NTCET completers applied for University/TAFE, of which 90.9 per cent received an offer. Of those students who received an offer, 62.3 per cent accepted the offer, 34.7 per cent deferred and 3.0 per cent either declined or entered another study option. Of those who entered into further education or training, 74.8 per cent were studying a University degree. The remainder were undertaking Certificate and Diploma courses. |
| *Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished). |

* 1. **Future directions in performance reporting**

**COAG developments**

*SCSEEC review of Key Performance Measurement Framework*

Future revisions may occur as a result of ongoing SCSEEC review of its Key Performance Measurement Framework relating to the Melbourne Declaration and COAG agreed measures. The Steering Committee will consider any implications of this review for future reports.

**Attendance rates, completion rates, participation, retention and destination data**

New nationally comparable attendance data are expected to be available for 2014, for inclusion in the 2016 Report.

The year 12 completion rate included in this Report are under review and a nationally comparable measure is anticipated to be included in future Reports.

The participation rate for 14–19 year old students includes part time students. However, the traditional year 7/8 to year 12 apparent retention rate, and the year 10–12 apparent retention rate, are based on full time school students only. These measures are under examination, and additional participation measures are reported in the Child care, education and training sector overview.

The outcome indicator ‘destination’ will be reviewed for the 2015 Report.

**Nationally comparable reporting of learning outcomes**

The National Summary Report of results from the 2013 NAPLAN was released in September 2013 (ACARA 2013b). Results from a second report with more detailed information (including disaggregation by Indigenous status and geolocation) will be included in the 2015 Report.

*Nationally consistent definitions*

Nationally consistent definitions of most student background characteristics have been adopted for national reporting on students’ educational achievement and outcomes. Ministers have endorsed standard definitions of sex, Indigenous status, disability, socio-economic background, language background and geographic location. Nationally consistent data on students with disability for students’ outcomes reporting is under development.

Student background information collected from parents through the enrolment process using the agreed data collection specifications and methodology is linked to student assessment results.

**4.5 Jurisdictions’ comments**

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Australian Government comments | **”** |
| The Australian Government is committed to ensuring all young Australians are able to reach their potential and gain the skills they need to become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and informed citizens.  In partnership with state and territory governments and the non-government schooling sector, the Australian Government works to improve the quality of education for all students. The Australian Education Act 2013 was passed by Parliament in June 2013 and Australian Government funding will be made available under this Act for government and non-government schools from 2014.  A national reform agenda continues to be progressed through frameworks and agreements. Key reforms build on the substantial work undertaken collaboratively by all governments over recent years through the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood, such as the development and implementation of the National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy and the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010–2014.  Under the Improving Teacher Quality National Partnership, more than 148 Centres of Excellence were established across Australia to facilitate collaborative professional development and improve student learning outcomes. $60 million was invested to implement the Australian Teacher Performance and Development Framework and a nationally consistent certification process for highly accomplished and lead teachers in schools across Australia from January 2013.  The Trade Training Centres in Schools Program enables eligible secondary schools to seek funding for trade training facilities for their Year 9 to 12 students. A total of 843 schools have had access to a completed trade training centre, through 312 projects.  Investment in information and communications technology (ICT) infrastructure in Australian schools has facilitated positive change in schools by creating momentum for integrating ICT in teaching and learning and promoting innovative classroom practice.  The More Support for Students with Disabilities initiative provides funding to government and non-government education authorities to build the capacity of their schools and teachers to provide additional support to students with disability. In 2012–13, the initiative provided $78.72 million to education authorities to undertake activities to benefit students according to the needs of their jurisdiction.  In May 2013, education ministers endorsed the model for the Nationally Consistent Collection of Data on School Students with Disability. The model will be implemented using a phased approach between 2013 and 2015. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | New South Wales Government comments | **”** |
| *NSW 2021*, the NSW Government’s 10 year strategic business plan, is aligned to COAG targets and provides the overall direction and priorities for education and training in NSW.  In the 2013 NAPLAN tests, NSW students improved substantially in Reading in Year 5 and Year 9, in Spelling and Numeracy in Year 7 and Year 9 and in Grammar and Punctuation in Year 5. NSW was ranked ahead of all other jurisdictions in Spelling at all Year levels for mean score and percentage of students in the highest band. In 2013, the participation rates for NSW increased from the previous year, and once again, were the highest of all jurisdictions for every test and every Year level.  The NSW Government continued to support a five year *Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan* in 205 targeted government, Catholic and independent schools. All targeted schools are using an evidence-based three-tiered approach to drive a whole school approach to lifting the literacy and numeracy performance of students, especially those at risk of not achieving expected outcomes.  *Great Teaching, Inspired Learning* is the NSW Government’s blueprint for improving the quality of teaching and learning in NSW schools. It provides a set of 16 reforms across a teacher’s career cycle, from initial teacher training and induction for beginning teachers, through to how to best recognise and value experienced teachers and support potential school leaders. The blueprint has been informed by a significant body of current research, as well as broad consultation with stakeholders over a three-month period.  Through *Every Student, Every School*, the NSW Government’s strategy for strengthening support for students with disability, significant work has been undertaken in 2013 to develop a new tool for teachers to profile the additional learning and support needs of individual students. An extensive range of professional learning courses are also being delivered to teachers and support staff to strengthen their knowledge and understanding of the educational needs of students with disability and obligations under the *Commonwealth Disability Standards for Education 2005*.  NSW remains committed to closing the gap in educational outcomes between Aboriginal students and other students. The *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan* and the Department’s Partnership Agreement with the NSW Aboriginal Education Consultative Group Inc. are key drivers of the approach employed in NSW to meet this commitment.  The Local Schools, Local Decisions reform continues to be implemented in NSW public schools and places students at the centre of school decision making. This gives principals and their school communities a greater say over how they allocate and use their available resources to best meet the needs of their students. The new resource allocation model allocates resources based on student need. On full implementation, NSW public schools will manage more than 70 per cent of the NSW public school education budget. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Victorian Government comments** | **”** |
| The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development *2013-17 Strategic Plan* outlines a 10-year goal to make Victoria a world leader in learning and development, to contribute to a vibrant economy and society and to deliver on outcomes of achievement, engagement, wellbeing and productivity.  In 2012-13, Victoria has continued to implement its ambitious reform agenda. The *Towards Victoria as a Learning Community* statement outlines major reforms that will help enable Victoria to meet its goal as a world leader in education. These reforms are underpinned by professional trust, autonomy, and accountability and support.  *The Compact: Roles and responsibilities in Victorian government school education (The Compact)* supports these reforms by clearly articulating the respective roles and responsibilities in the Victorian government school system. *The Compact* forms an agreement between Victorian government schools and the Department and seeks to improve the learning and development outcomes of Victoria’s children and young people.  *From New Directions to Action: World class teaching and school leadership* outlines the Victorian Government’s vision for excellence in school leadership and a high performance teaching profession. It sets out 26 initiatives that will be pursued across three priority areas: attract great people into teaching, create a high performance profession, and provide strong direction and support. The Victorian Government has committed an additional $15.7 million over two years in the 2013-14 Budget to help deliver these initiatives.  Victoria also signed an historic agreement with the Commonwealth Government which will deliver an additional investment of $12.2 billion in extra funding above 2013 levels over the six years from 2014 to 2019. The individual needs of students will determine the funding each school gets and Victoria will continue to work with all school sectors to continue to refine our needs based funding system to make it even better. The funding will also support principals and school leaders to implement initiatives to ensure there are highly effective leaders and teachers.  *The Languages - expanding your world: Plan to implement the Victorian Government's Vision for Languages Education 2013-2025* paper (the Plan) outlines how Victoria’s commitment to improve and extend languages education will be supported. The Plan also re-confirms Victoria’s commitment that all government school students from Prep to Year 10 will be learning a language by 2025, starting with Prep in 2015. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Queensland Government comments** | **”** |
| The Queensland Government is committed to providing high quality learning and skilling, focused on preparing Queenslanders with the knowledge, skills and confidence to participate effectively in the community and the economy.  Queensland students continue to demonstrate positive outcomes in 2013, with the latest NAPLAN results showing a continued broad pattern of improvement. Queensland students are the most improved since testing began in 2008, achieving their highest result on record for mean scale score in 10 of the 20 test areas.  The 2013 *Next Step Survey* indicates that the vast majority of young Queenslanders who completed Year 12 in 2012 were engaged in study or work approximately six months after completing school.  Throughout 2013, Queensland implemented initiatives and continued reforms in line with the state’s approach to driving improved student outcomes. Key initiatives include:   * *Great teachers = Great results* — improving the quality and capacity of teachers and school leadership, and boosting school autonomy to increase parental engagement and local decision-making. * *Independent Public Schools* — enabling the first 26 Independent Public Schools to embrace additional autonomy and decision-making to achieve the best possible outcomes for students and local communities, and announcing the next 54 schools for 2014. * *A Fresh Start* — improving the preparation and quality of teachers through a suite of interconnected strategies focused on teacher supply, initial teacher education, effective supervision and mentoring, and induction. * *Solid Partners: Solid Futures* — supporting early childhood, education, training and employment opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people in Queensland. * *Getting the basics right* — flexible grants to enable schools to design and deliver literacy and numeracy interventions targeted to their specific needs. * *Step up into education* — delivering school readiness and transition programs for the local community that encourage parents to become involved in their child’s learning journey and help children from disadvantaged areas prepare for school. * *Curriculum into the Classroom* (C2C) — a comprehensive set of school and classroom planning materials supporting Queensland state schools in the continued implementation of the Australian Curriculum. * Continuing to provide state and non-state school students with disability access to a quality education through additional speech-language pathologists (SLPs) to support students who face learning challenges and eLearning initiatives using tablet devices for special needs students. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Western Australian Government comments** | **”** |
| The Western Australian Government is committed to ensuring all students receive a high quality school education irrespective of where they live or their personal background circumstances.  Through its strategic plan, *Excellence and Equity: 2012–2015*, the Department of Education continues to focus on its four priority areas of ensuring every student has the opportunity to achieve success; creating distinctive schools that have the autonomy, flexibility and diversity required to respond to the needs of students; providing high quality teaching and leadership; and developing a capable and responsive organisation.  The Western Australian Government’s reforms towards a more empowered public education system saw an additional 84 public schools become Independent Public Schools in 2013, taking the total number to 255. The success of this approach to school autonomy was confirmed with the release of the University of Melbourne’s evaluation of the Independent Public Schools initiative which found that the greater flexibilities in the areas of curriculum, student services, human resources, financial management, and facilities have delivered positive effects for schools, for communities and for the system as a whole and that it is creating a strong foundation for enhancing student achievement, behaviour and attendance. Many of the flexibilities first offered to Independent Public Schools have now been extended to all Western Australian public schools.  Early childhood education continues to be a priority area. In 2013, Pre-primary became the first year of compulsory education across schools in Western Australia, all public primary schools now provide children with access to a minimum of 15 hours a week of Kindergarten, and the first 10 of the State Government’s Child and Parent Centres began operating on public school sites, providing parents with easier access to a range of local services.  Achieving and sustaining improved educational outcomes for all Aboriginal students remains a major challenge. As part of a suite of strategies, the Department began implementing the Commonwealth funded Investing in Focus Schools project in 2013, which focuses on school attendance, academic achievement and increased student and parent engagement. The program supports selected schools to accelerate implementation of local level actions in the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010–2014*.  In August 2013, the Western Australian Government announced a new *Student-Centred Funding Model.* To be implemented from 2015, the model represents a fundamental change to how resources are distributed to public schools and will result in resources being better directed to schools where they are most required based on student need. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **South Australian Government comments** | **”** |
| The Department for Education and Child Development's (DECD) core purpose is to provide early childhood development, health and child protection services, as well as public education and care, to South Australians. We have a special focus on ensuring our most vulnerable children and young people at risk of disadvantage are supported to stay engaged as learners.  In South Australia we aim to create a public education system that is characterised by high achievement, growth, challenge, engagement, equity and high public credibility so that it becomes a system of choice for an increasing proportion of South Australian families.  South Australia is the domain lead for “Readiness for School” under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010-2014 (ATSIEAP). Schools in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands have been designated focus schools and have been identified to undertake specific actions to improve the education outcomes of Aboriginal students, with selection based on Aboriginal enrolments and NAPLAN results.  The ongoing Implementation of the Australian Curriculum provides an opportunity to focus on the quality of teaching and learning offered to all students. The Teaching for Effective Learning (TfEL) Framework describes well researched, effective pedagogy and is being used by schools across the state. Government schools are implementing the Australian Curriculum Phase 1 (English, History, Mathematics and Science) learning areas/subjects.  The "Keeping Safe: Child Protection" Curriculum and the "Aboriginal Cultural Studies" resource are required to be used by teachers as they design quality teaching and learning within the eight learning areas of the curriculum.  The "Student Pathways" strategy’s two major initiatives, "Trade Schools for the Future" and "Industry Skills Program", enable young people to begin a Certificate III qualification whilst at school, and to be funded beyond school in an apprenticeship or traineeship. The strategy supports effective transitions from school to training for young people completing the South Australian Certificate of Education via a school based apprenticeship, traineeship or Training Guarantee.  In 2012 the "Primary Mathematics and Science Strategy" (PMSS) transitioned to the Primary Australian Curriculum strategy (PACS). According to local needs, schools were able to continue to access support for mathematics and science, with the flexibility to apply the funding and structures of the PMSS to the implementation of further Australian Curriculum learning areas.   * From 2011, Year 3 students will spend a minimum of 90 minutes per week on science and a minimum 300 minutes per week on mathematics and numeracy * From 2013, Reception to Year 2 students will spend a minimum of 300 minutes per week on mathematics and up to 90 minutes per week on science. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Tasmanian Government comments** | **”** |
| The Tasmanian education department offers a comprehensive and lifelong approach to learning for all people regardless of age. Our mission is to provide every Tasmanian with the opportunity to continue to learn and reach their potential, to lead fulfilling and productive lives and contribute positively to their community. Inherent in this mission are the core values of learning, excellence, equity, respect and relationships.  The department continues to foster partnerships with parents in the years preceding compulsory schooling. Launching into Learning programs in Tasmanian government schools provide opportunities for parents, their pre‑school children and teachers to play and learn together. Child and Family Centres situated across Tasmania offer high quality education integrated with a range of complementary services aimed at giving our youngest children the best start in life.  Improving literacy and numeracy outcomes of Tasmanian students continues to be a major focus. Lead teachers work in networks of schools supporting leaders to use school data to identify strengths and areas for growth and to implement effective teaching and learning strategies. This work is enhanced through a research project with the University of Tasmania exploring literacy and numeracy provision across Years 5 to 8 to improve transition.  The Student Support System, introduced in 2013, is a secure web-based resource where observations, actions and strategies around student support are recorded. An example of contemporary best practice, the Student Support System enables key staff to monitor the individual support needs of students as they move through the education system.  The Professional Learning Institute delivers and brokers professional learning for Department of Education staff. Inspired leadership is one of the department’s key strategic drivers. The importance of strong leadership in improving student learning outcomes has been recognised through the provision of targeted professional learning opportunities to develop principals as literacy leaders.  Encouraging students to complete Year 12 or attain equivalent qualifications remains an important department priority. A range of strategies are in place to support students to make an informed and successful transition from Year 10 to Years 11 and 12. These include the strengthening of networks of secondary and senior secondary schools across the state which particularly assists those students in rural and regional communities to engage in learning in the post‑secondary years.  TasTAFE is the new single entity for Tasmania’s public sector post-compulsory vocational education and training.  Tasmania’s 26TEN strategy connects adults with literacy programs and services. This is a far-reaching, long-term strategy aimed at raising awareness of adult literacy issues while reducing the stigma often associated with poor literacy skills. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Australian Capital Territory Government comments** | **”** |
| The 2012-13 year has been a significant period for education and training in the ACT, and for Australia. In May 2013 the ACT Government signed the National Education Reform Agreement with the Australian Government. The agreement incorporates the National Plan for School Improvement and facilitates the implementation of national and local initiatives to improve educational outcomes for children and young people. We continue to make progress in implementing reform in early childhood education and care, schools and vocational education and training.  The work of empowering local schools continued throughout 2012-13 in order to further enable principals to make informed decisions about the best use of available resources, support and infrastructure that will deliver the best outcomes for students. The ACT has a growing and vibrant public education and training system, and one that continues to provide support in a wide variety of ways. In 2013, for the first time, all ACT K-10 public schools assessed and reported student progress using the Australian Curriculum Achievement Standards associated with each of the phase 1 learning areas.  The ACT continued to have the highest retention rate to year 12 and the highest proportion of 20-24 year olds who attained a year 12 or equivalent qualification. These results reflected our commitment to the Directorate’s vision that all young people in the ACT learn, thrive and are equipped with the skills to lead fulfilling, productive and responsible lives.  ACT students continued to be among the highest performing students in Australia, with mean scores placing our students top or equal top across 16 of the 20 areas tested in the 2012 National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN).  Throughout 2012-13 the Directorate continued implementation of strategies to support all students, particularly those students from low socio-economic and English as a second language or dialect backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and students with a disability. Strong relationships with parents and carers and other members of school communities, through workshops and networks, contributed to sharing of information and the development of responses for the children and young people in our schools.  The establishment in August 2012 of the Minister’s Student Congress provided opportunities for students to network and develop their leadership skills. The overall aim of the Congress is to give students a voice in their education and to provide their point of view directly to the Minister.  In 2012, the Directorate commenced the first year of implementation of the teaching staff Enterprise Agreement. Under this agreement, classroom teachers in their first year of teaching had reduced teaching hours to allow for the provision of enhanced coaching and mentoring support. In 2013, the Directorate successfully completed the public service Enterprise Agreement 2011-2013 which covered all Directorate staff other than teachers. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Northern Territory Government comments** | **”** |
| The role of the department is to deliver services to children and young people to maximise their educational outcomes, safety and wellbeing from their early years through to senior years of schooling.  The Department of Education’s Strategic Plan, participation in national partnerships and implementation of the national reform agenda continue to drive a range of strategic initiatives that focus on achieving the best possible outcomes and pathways for children and young people in the Northern Territory.  An updated Principal Performance and Development Framework has been implemented, which aligns to the Australian Professional Standards for Principals and complements a revised school review process. Implementation of these new frameworks is assisting schools to target their efforts aimed at improving student outcomes.  A focus on early years prior to schooling is paramount to ensure young people enter the schooling system ready to participate in learning. Child and family services established in remote and very remote communities engaged 1284 children and 1155 adults in programs of early learning, literacy and numeracy at home, parent capacity building and transition to preschool in 2012.  Following a review of literacy and numeracy approaches by the Australian Council of Education Research in 2011-12, there has been a strong focus on developing evidence based planning and program delivery. Whole School Curriculum and Assessment Plans have been introduced to provide a framework for planning literacy and numeracy teaching, meeting the needs of individual student cohorts and allowing for the delivery of English and mathematics curriculum content.  The Vocational Education and Training in Schools program is another important strategic priority of the department and in 2012, 41 per cent of students successfully completed a full VET qualification which was more than double the strategic plan target of 20 per cent. The department continues to work to develop and maintain partnerships with industry groups and individual businesses to provide pathways for school leavers.  The Every Child, Every Day strategy continued a focus on increasing enrolment, attendance and participation of young Territorians. In 2012, a range of services were delivered including regionally based officers working with students and their families to develop student attendance plans and support the successful re-engagement of students in schooling. Despite these efforts our attendance rates for remote Indigenous students remain of huge concern and are very low compared to other jurisdictions.  NT NAPLAN results showed that there is still much work to do to close the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous student attainment and improve the performance of all Northern Territory students. NAPLAN results for 2012 showed stable performance. In seven out of eight possible measures, the Northern Territory’s gain was above the average Australian gain. |

* 1. **Definitions of key terms**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Apparent retention rates** | The number of full time students in a designated year of schooling, expressed as a percentage of their respective cohort group at an earlier base year. For example, the year 12 retention rate is calculated by dividing the total number of full time students in year 12 in the target year by the total number of full time students in year 10 two years before the target year. |
| **Full time equivalent student** | The FTE of a full time student is 1.0. The method of converting part time student numbers into FTEs is based on the student’s workload compared with the workload usually undertaken by a full time student. |
| **Full time student** | A person who satisfies the definition of a student and undertakes a workload equivalent to, or greater than, that usually undertaken by a student of that year level. The definition of full time student varies across jurisdictions. |
| **Geographic classification** | Geographic categorisation is based on the agreed MCEECDYA Geographic Location Classification which, at the highest level, divides Australia into three zones (the metropolitan, provincial and remote zones). A further disaggregation comprises five categories: metropolitan and provincial zones each subdivided into two categories, and the remote zone. Further subdivisions of the two provincial zone categories and the remote zone category provide additional, more detailed, classification options. When data permit, a separate very remote zone can be reported along with the metropolitan, provincial and remote zones, as follows.  A. Metropolitan zone   * Mainland State capital city regions (Statistical Divisions (SDs)): Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth SDs. * Major urban Statistical Districts (100 000 or more population): ACT–Queanbeyan, Cairns, Gold Coast–Tweed, Geelong, Hobart, Newcastle, Sunshine Coast, Townsville, Wollongong.   B. Provincial zone (non-remote)   * Provincial city Statistical Districts plus Darwin SD. * Provincial city statistical districts and Darwin statistical division (50 000–99 999 population): Albury–Wodonga, Ballarat, Bathurst–Orange, Burnie-Devonport, Bundaberg, Bendigo, Darwin, Launceston, La Trobe Valley, Mackay, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Wagga Wagga. * Provincial City Statistical Districts (25 000–49 999 population): Bunbury, Coffs Harbour, Dubbo, Geraldton, Gladstone, Shepparton, Hervey Bay, Kalgoorlie–Boulder, Lismore, Mandurah, Mildura, Nowra–Bomaderry, Port Macquarie, Tamworth, Warrnambool. * Other provincial areas (CD ARIA Plus score < 5.92) * Inner provincial areas (CD ARIA Plus score < 2.4) * Outer provincial areas (CD ARIA Plus score > 2.4 and < 5.92)   C. Remote zone   * Remote zone (CD ARIA Plus score > 5.92) * Remote areas (CD ARIA Plus score > 5.92 and < 10.53) * Very remote areas (CD ARIA Plus score > 10.53) |
| **Government recurrent expenditure per full time equivalent student** | Total government recurrent expenditure divided by the total number of FTE students. Expenditure is based on the National School Statistics Collection (SCSEEC unpublished), with adjustments for notional UCC charges and payroll tax. Notional UCC is included for all jurisdictions and payroll tax estimates are included for those jurisdictions not subject to it (WA and the ACT). Expenditure figures are in financial years and student numbers are in calendar years, so the total number of students is taken as the average of the two years spanned by the calendar year. When calculating the 2011-12 average expenditure per student, for example, the total expenditure figure is at 2011-12 but the total student number figure is the average of student numbers from 2011 and 2012. |
| **Indigenous student** | A student of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin who identifies as being an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander or from an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background. Administrative processes for determining Indigenous status vary across jurisdictions. For NAPLAN data, a student is considered to be 'Indigenous' if he or she identifies as being of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin. |
| **In-school costs** | Costs relating directly to schools. Staff, for example, are categorised as being either in-school or out-of-school. They are categorised as  in-school if they usually spend more than half of their time actively engaged in duties at one or more schools or ancillary education establishments. In-school employee related expenses, for example, represent all salaries, wages awards, allowances and related on costs paid to in-school staff. |
| **Language background other than English (LBOTE) student** | A status that is determined by administrative processes that vary across jurisdictions. For NAPLAN data, a student is considered to be 'LBOTE' if either the student or parents/guardians speak a language other than English at home. Separately, data are also sourced from the 2011 Census of Population and Housing. |
| **Out-of-school costs** | Costs relating indirectly to schools. Staff, for example, are categorised as being either in-school or out-of-school. They are categorised as out-of-school if they do not usually spend more than half of their time actively engaged in duties at one or more schools or ancillary education establishments. Out-of-school employee related expenses, for example, represent all salaries, wages awards, allowances and related on costs paid to out-of-school staff. |
| **Part time student** | A student undertaking a workload that is less than that specified as being full time in the jurisdiction |
| **Participation rate** | The number of full time and part time school students of a particular age (as at 1 July), expressed as a proportion of the estimated resident population of the same age (as at 30 June). |
| **Potential year 12 population** | An estimate of a single-year age group that could have participated in year 12 that year, defined as the estimated resident population aged 15–19 years, divided by 5. |
| **Real expenditure** | Nominal expenditure adjusted for changes in prices, using the GDP price deflator and expressed in terms of final year prices. |
| **Science literacy** | Science literacy and scientific literacy: the application of broad conceptual understandings of science to make sense of the world, understand natural phenomena, and interpret media reports about scientific issues. It also includes asking investigable questions, conducting investigations, collecting and interpreting data and making decisions. |
| **Socio-economic status** | As identified in footnotes to specific tables. |
| **Source of income** | In this chapter, income from either the Australian Government or State and Territory governments. Australian Government expenditure is derived from specific purpose payments (current and capital) for schools. This funding indicates the level of monies allocated, not necessarily the level of expenditure incurred in any given financial year. The data therefore provide only a broad indication of the level of Australian Government funding. |
| **Student-to-staff ratios** | The number of FTE students per FTE teaching staff. Students at special schools are allocated to primary and secondary (see below). The FTE of staff includes those who are generally active in schools and ancillary education establishments. |
| **Student** | A person who is formally (officially) enrolled or registered at a school, and is also active in a primary, secondary or special education program at that school. Students at special schools are allocated to primary and secondary on the basis of their actual grade (if assigned); whether or not they are receiving primary or secondary curriculum instruction; or, as a last resort, whether they are of primary or secondary school age. |
| **Student, primary** | A student in primary education, which covers pre-year 1 to year 6 in NSW, Victoria, Tasmania, ACT and the NT, pre-year 1 to year 7 in Qld, WA and SA. |
| **Student, secondary** | A student in secondary education, which commences at year 7 in NSW, Victoria, Tasmania, ACT and the NT, and at year 8 in Queensland, WA, and SA. |
| **Students with a disability** | Students included in the annual system reports to the Department of Education. The definitions of students with disabilities are based on individual State and Territory criteria, so data are not comparable across jurisdictions. |
| **Teacher** | Teaching staff have teaching duties (that is, they are engaged to impart the school curriculum) and spend the majority of their time in contact with students. They support students, either by direct class contact or on an individual basis. Teaching staff include principals, deputy principals and senior teachers mainly involved in administrative duties, but not specialist support staff (who may spend the majority of their time in contact with students but are not engaged to impart the school curriculum). For the Northern Territory, Assistant Teachers in Homeland Learning Centres and community school are included as teaching staff. |
| **Ungraded student** | A student in ungraded classes who cannot readily be allocated to a year of education. These students are included as either ungraded primary or ungraded secondary, according to the typical age level in each jurisdiction. |
| **VET in Schools** | VET in Schools is a program which allows students to combine vocational studies with their general education curriculum. Students participating in VET in Schools continue to work towards their senior secondary school certificate, while the VET component of their studies gives them credit towards a nationally recognised VET qualification. The program may involve structured work placements and includes the options of a school-based apprenticeship and traineeship or VET subjects and courses. |

**4.7 List of attachment tables**

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by an ‘4A’ prefix (for example, table 4A.1). Attachment tables are available on the Review website (www.pc.gov.au/gsp).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Table 4A.1** | Government schools: students, staff and school numbers | |
| **Table 4A.2** | Non-government schools: students, staff and school numbers | |
| **Table 4A.3** | All schools: students, staff and school numbers | |
| **Table 4A.4** | All schools: students time series, by sex | |
| **Table 4A.5** | Students as a proportion of the population, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.6** | Average FTE student population, by school sector | |
| **Table 4A.7** | Real Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure (2011-12 dollars) ($'000) | |
| **Table 4A.8** | Nominal Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure ($'000) | |
| **Table 4A.9** | Australian Government specific purpose payments for schools, 2011-12 | |
| **Table 4A.10** | Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure on government schools, 2011-12 | |
| **Table 4A.11** | Comparability of government expenditure on government schools — items included, 2011-12 | |
| **Table 4A.12** | Real Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, government schools (2011-12 dollars) ($ per FTE student) 9b) | |
| **Table 4A.13** | Nominal Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, government schools ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.14** | Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student on government schools, 2011-12 ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.15** | Real Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, non-government schools (2011-12 dollars) ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.16** | Nominal Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, non-government schools ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.17** | Real Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, all schools (2011-12 dollars) ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.18** | Nominal Australian, State and Territory government recurrent expenditure per student, all schools ($ per FTE student) | |
| **Table 4A.19** | Value of capital stock, government schools ($’000) | |
| **Table 4A.20** | Notional UCC per FTE student, government schools | |
| **Table 4A.21** | Treatment of assets by school education agencies | |
| **Table 4A.22** | Students-to-staff ratios, 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.23** | Students-to-staff ratios, teaching staff, all students | |
| **Table 4A.24** | Distribution of school sizes — government schools, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.25** | Distribution of school sizes — non-government schools, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.26** | Distribution of school sizes — all schools, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.27** | Full time student enrolments and schools (number) | |
| **Table 4A.28** | Change in number of schools and number of full time students, 2008–12 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.29** | Indigenous full time students, 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.30** | Students from language backgrounds other than English as a proportion of all students (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.31** | Funded students with disability, 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.32** | Student body mix, government schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.33** | Student body mix, non-government schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.34** | Student body mix, all schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.35** | Proportion of students enrolled in schools in metropolitan, provincial, remote and very remote zones, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.36** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.37** | Proportion of year 3, 5, 7 and 9 students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.38** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.39** | Mean scale scores for reading, years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students, by Indigenous status, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.40** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for reading, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.41** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for reading, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.42** | Participation rate in reading assessment, 2012, by Indigenous status (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.43** | Exempt, absent and withdrawn, and assessed students in reading assessment, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.44** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, NSW | |
| **Table 4A.45** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Victoria | |
| **Table 4A.46** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Queensland | |
| **Table 4A.47** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Western Australia | |
| **Table 4A.48** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, South Australia | |
| **Table 4A.49** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Tasmania | |
| **Table 4A.50** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Australian Capital Territory | |
| **Table 4A.51** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Northern Territory | |
| **Table 4A.52** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for reading, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Australia | |
| **Table 4A.53** | Mean scale score gain for reading, years 3-5, 5-7 and 7-9, 2008-2010-2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.54** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.55** | Proportion of year 3, 5, 7 and 9 students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.56** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.57** | Mean scale scores for persuasive writing, years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students, by Indigenous status, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.58** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for persuasive writing, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.59** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for persuasive writing, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.60** | Participation rate in persuasive writing assessment, 2012, by Indigenous status (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.61** | Exempt, absent and withdrawn, and assessed students in persuasive writing assessment, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.62** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, NSW | |
| **Table 4A.63** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Victoria | |
| **Table 4A.64** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Queensland | |
| **Table 4A.65** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Western Australia | |
| **Table 4A.66** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, South Australia | |
| **Table 4A.67** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Tasmania | |
| **Table 4A.68** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Australian Capital Territory | |
| **Table 4A.69** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Northern Territory | |
| **Table 4A.70** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for persuasive writing, and statistical significance of differences 2011 and 2012, Australia | |
| **Table 4A.71** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.72** | Proportion of year 3, 5, 7 and 9 students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.73** | Proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.74** | Mean scale scores for numeracy, years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students, by Indigenous status, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.75** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for numeracy, by Indigenous status and geolocation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.76** | NAPLAN Mean scale scores for numeracy, by State and Territory, by parental education and parental occupation, 2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.77** | Participation rate in numeracy assessment, 2012, by Indigenous status (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.78** | Exempt, absent and withdrawn, and assessed students in numeracy assessment, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.79** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, NSW | |
| **Table 4A.80** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Victoria | |
| **Table 4A.81** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Queensland | |
| **Table 4A.82** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Western Australia | |
| **Table 4A.83** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, South Australia | |
| **Table 4A.84** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Tasmania | |
| **Table 4A.85** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Australian Capital Territory | |
| **Table 4A.86** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Northern Territory | |
| **Table 4A.87** | Mean scale scores and proportion of students who achieved at or above the national minimum standard for numeracy, and statistical significance of differences 2008, 2011 and 2012, Australia | |
| **Table 4A.88** | Mean scale score gain for numeracy, years 3-5, 5-7 and 7-9, 2008-2010-2012 (score points) | |
| **Table 4A.89** | Proportion of year 6 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in science literacy in the National Assessment Program (per cent) DN: 2012 data not yet received | |
| **Table 4A.90** | Proportion of year 6 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in science literacy in the National Assessment Program, by geolocation (per cent) DN: 2012 data not yet received | |
| **Table 4A.91** | Proportion of year 6 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in science literacy in the National Assessment Program, by equity group (per cent) DN: 2012 data not yet received | |
| **Table 4A.92** | Proportion of years 6 and 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in civics and citizenship performance in the National Assessment Program (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.93** | Proportion of years 6 and 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in civics and citizenship performance in the National Assessment Program, by geolocation, Australia (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.94** | Proportion of years 6 and 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in civics and citizenship performance in the National Assessment Program, by equity group, Australia (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.95** | Proportion of years 6 and 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in information and communication technology literacy performance in the National Assessment Program (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.96** | Proportion of years 6 and 10 students achieving at or above the proficient standard in information and communication technology literacy performance in the National Assessment Program, by student characteristics, Australia, 2005, 2008 and 2011 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.97** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall reading literacy scale in PISA assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.98** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall reading literacy scale in PISA assessments, by equity group, (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.99** | Proportion of 15 year old secondary students achieving at or above level 3 of the overall reading literacy scale in PISA assessments, Australia, by SES (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.100** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above and in the highest and lowest levels in the overall reading literacy scale (per cent), mean scores and statistical difference of mean score performance in PISA assessment, 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.101** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall mathematical literacy scale in PISA assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.102** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall mathematical literacy scale in PISA assessments, by equity group (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.103** | Proportion of 15 year old secondary students achieving at or above level 3 of the overall mathematical literacy scale in PISA assessments, Australia, by SES (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.104** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above and in the highest and lowest levels in the overall mathematical literacy scale (per cent), mean scores and statistical difference of mean score performance in PISA assessment, 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.105** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall scientific literacy scale in PISA assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.106** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above in the overall scientific literacy scale in PISA assessments, by equity group (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.107** | Proportion of 15 year old secondary students achieving at or above level 3 of the overall scientific literacy scale in PISA assessment, Australia, by SES (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.108** | Proportion of 15 year old students achieving level 3 or above and in the highest and lowest levels in the overall scientific literacy scale in PISA assessment (per cent), mean scores and statistical difference of mean score performance, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.109** | Mean scores for 15 year old students in PISA reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy in PISA 2012 and earlier PISA rounds; and comparisons of significant differences between PISA rounds | |
| **Table 4A.110** | Proportion of year 4 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark (per cent) and mean scores for 2011 TIMSS in mathematics achievement in TIMSS assessments | |
| **Table 4A.111** | Proportion of year 8 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark in mathematics achievement in TIMSS assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.112** | Proportion of year 4 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark in science achievement in TIMSS assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.113** | Proportion of year 8 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark in science achievement in TIMSS assessments (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.114** | Proportion of year 4 and year 8 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark (per cent); and mean scores in mathematics achievement and science achievement in TIMSS 2011 assessments by equity group, Australia (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.115** | Mean scores in year 4 and year 8 mathematics achievement and science achievement for TIMSS and comparison to TIMSS 2011 assessments | |
| **Table 4A.116** | Proportion of year 4 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark (per cent) and mean scores for 2011 PIRLS reading assessments | |
| **Table 4A.117** | Proportion of year 4 students achieving at or above the intermediate international benchmark (per cent) and mean scores for 2011 PIRLS reading assessments by equity group, Australia | |
| **Table 4A.118** | Proportion of children aged 6–15 years enrolled in school | |
| **Table 4A.119** | School participation rates by age and sex of students, all schools, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.120** | School participation rates by age of students, all students, all schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.121** | Apparent retention rates of full time secondary students from year 7/8 to years 10, 11 and 12, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.122** | Apparent retention rates of secondary students from years 10–12 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.123** | Apparent retention rates of full time secondary students, all schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.124** | Apparent retention rates of full time secondary students, government schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.125** | Apparent retention rates of full time secondary students, non-government schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.126** | Completion rates, year 12, by socio-economic status and sex, all schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.127** | Completion rates, year 12, by locality and sex, all schools (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.128** | School leaver destination by highest level of school completed and labour force status (15-24 year olds), 2012 | |
| **Table 4A.129** | 15 to 19-year-olds successfully completing at least one unit of competency at AQF II or above | |
| **Table 4A.130** | Student attendance rates, government schools, by sex, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.131** | Student attendance rates, government schools, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.132** | Student attendance rates, independent schools, by sex, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.133** | Student attendance rates, independent schools, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.134** | Student attendance rates, Catholic schools, by sex, 2012 (per cent) | |
| **Table 4A.135** | Student attendance rates, Catholic schools, by Indigenous status, 2012 (per cent) | |
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1. Following agreement by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), the Standing Council for School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC) replaced the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA) in January 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. To investigate the possibility that these data may understate the proportion of students in remote areas as a result of relying on school location rather than students’ home location, the 2001 MCEETYA data were compared with data derived from the 2001 Census. The two data sets were found to be similar, except that Tasmania had about one third more remote area students in the Census data. This result may be indicative for the data in this Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Melbourne Declaration replaced the Adelaide Declaration (MCEETYA 1999), released in 1999. Some years of data reported in this chapter coincide with the operation of the Adelaide Declaration. However, the performance indicators reported are consistent with both the Adelaide and Melbourne Declarations. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)