



STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY INCLUSION

MICHAEL PETTERSSON MLA (CHAIR), JOHNATHAN DAVIS MLA (DEPUTY CHAIR), PETER CAIN MLA

**Inquiry into referred 2019–20 Annual and Financial Reports
ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE**

Asked by Mr Hanson MLA:

In relation to:

Strategic Objectives (Education AR Page 25)

1. The Strategic Objective 1: Equity in learning outcomes was met for Reading, but not for Numeracy. Why was this Strategic Objective only partially met?
2. The Strategic Objective 2: Literacy and Numeracy Gains was not met. Why was this Strategic Objective not met?
3. The Strategic Objective 3: Centre Teaching and Learning around Students as Individuals was not met. Why was this Strategic Objective not met?

Minister Berry MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

1. Strategic objectives are designed to measure progress over strategic timeframes, where slight year-on-year variations are not as significant as the long-term trends. Slight year-on-year variation in apparent outcomes are caused by the national scaling processes used in the NAPLAN tests, which create small, non-significant, measurement uncertainty in both national and in jurisdiction means over time.

Allowing for this measurement uncertainty the Numeracy Equity target can be considered to be met as there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target as the confidence intervals for the Numeracy Equity result (40-48 points) contain the 2019 numeracy target (42 points);

2. Similarly, the literacy and numeracy gain strategic objectives are designed to measure progress over strategic timeframes, where slight year-on-year variations are not as significant as the long-term trends. The variation in gain over time in the ACT reflects the national pattern. Each NAPLAN cycle, student scores are equated to a common scale. The scaling processes used in the NAPLAN tests create small, non-significant, measurement uncertainty (variation) in national means and in jurisdiction means over time, causing insignificant variation in the gain results. In 2018 and 2019, NAPLAN scaling has needed to take account of the differences between paper NAPLAN testing and online NAPLAN testing. As the ACT has been a leading jurisdiction in the implementation of online NAPLAN testing, the scaling process has had a larger impact on ACT scores than on those in most other jurisdictions. Allowing for measurement uncertainty the Literacy and Numeracy gain targets were met.

Year 3-5 reading gain: Between 2016 & 2017, the ACT year 3 reading means increased from 440 to 446 points, while the year 5 reading means between the same years decreased from 526 to 520 points. This had the effect of reducing the apparent ACT



STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY INCLUSION

MICHAEL PETERSSON MLA (CHAIR), JOHNATHAN DAVIS MLA (DEPUTY CHAIR), PETER CAIN MLA

reading gain in 2019 from 86 points to 74 points.

The ACT cohort gain changed from 86 ± 13 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 74 ± 13 points for the 2017-19 cohort. Similar changes occurred nationally, with the Australian cohort gain changing from 84 ± 10 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 75 ± 11 points for the 2017-19 cohort. The 2017-19 ACT result (61-87 points) contained the Strategic Objective 2 target (84 points); hence there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target.

Year 7-9 Reading gain: The ACT cohort gain changed from 42 ± 12 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 33 ± 14 points for the 2017-19 cohort. Similar changes occurred nationally, with Australian cohort gain changing from 43 ± 5 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 36 ± 6 points for the 2017-19 cohort. The 2017-19 ACT result (19-47 points) contained the Strategic Objective 2 target (40 points); hence there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target.

Year 3-5 Numeracy gain: The ACT cohort gain changed from 87 ± 10 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 79 ± 13 points for the 2017-19 cohort. Similar changes occurred nationally, with the Australian cohort gain changing from 92 ± 10 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 87 ± 7 points for the 2017-19 cohort. The 2017-19 ACT result (58-92 points) contained the Strategic Objective 2 target (90 points); hence there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target.

Year 7-9 Numeracy gain: The ACT cohort gain changed from 48 ± 11 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 38 ± 13 points for the 2017-19 cohort. Similar changes occurred nationally, with Australian cohort gain changing from 46 ± 5 points for the 2016-18 cohort to 38 ± 5 points for the 2017-19 cohort. The 2017-19 ACT result (25-51 points) contained the Strategic Objective 2 target (47 points); hence there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target.

3. This is a new strategic indicator and it will take some time to understand its behaviour. Ideally, the target would remain at the same level until the behaviour of the indicator is better understood. The confidence interval for the 2019 indicator for Students contains the target (Proportion of students with strong school identification lies between 59.7% and 61.0%); hence there is no statistically significant difference between the result and the target.

The 2019 indicator for Staff was given a target of 92%, following an actual score of 91% in 2018. This is a new strategic indicator and it will take some time to understand its behaviour. Ideally, the target would remain at the same level until the behaviour of the indicator is better understood. In the event, the confidence interval for the 2019 indicator for Students contains the actual result for 2018, meaning that there is no statistically significant difference between the results for the two years.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

QON No. 19 ECI

STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY INCLUSION

MICHAEL PETERSSON MLA (CHAIR), JOHNATHAN DAVIS MLA (DEPUTY CHAIR), PETER CAIN MLA

For Parents and Carers, the apparent decline in the strategic indicator was the result of a change in the measurement of School Identification for this group. In 2019 an extra item was added to the measure, meaning that the 2018 and 2019 figures are not directly comparable.

Approved for circulation to the Standing Committee on Community Inclusion

Signature:

Date: 01/04/21

By the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Yvette Berry MLA

