

Investigations into Using Data to Improve Learning



MY SCHOOL AUSTRALIA CASE STUDY

Diana Engel Gerbase
Chiara Lawry
Sarah Lux-Lee
Surya Kiran Palukuri
Hannah Poquette
Vincent Lee Quan
Hans-Martin Boehmer

FEBRUARY 2017

Diana Engel Gerbase graduated with a master's degree in public administration with a specialization in management. She is launching a social venture in Brazil called Praxis in the field of civic education and youth civic engagement. She has a background in business development, management, and strategy consulting and has a bachelor's degree in economics from Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil. Email: dianagerbase@yahoo.com or deg2154@columbia.edu.

Chiara Lawry graduated with a master's degree in public administration, concentrating in urban policy. She has since returned to the Boston Consulting Group, where she is a core member in the Public Sector Practice. Earlier, she was a policy adviser at Australia's Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. She has bachelor of laws (with honors) and bachelor of arts degrees from the Australian National University. Email: chiaralawry@gmail.com or cl2166@columbia.edu.

Sarah Lux-Lee is an Australian lawyer and policy adviser that graduated with a master's degree in public administration as a Monash Scholar and Cummings Fellow. She previously advised the Australian state, territory, and federal Departments of Education on the impact of copyright policy on access to education. She was also an adjunct lecturer at the University of New South Wales, from which she has degrees in law (with honors) and mathematics. Email: lux.sarah@gmail.com or skl2151@columbia.edu.

Surya Kiran Palukuri graduated with a master's degree in public administration in urban policy. Earlier, he was a middle school teacher, and before that, a technology and strategy consultant. He has a bachelor's degree in economics from UCLA. Email: skp2135@columbia.edu.

Hannah Poquette graduated with a master of international affairs degree, concentrating in human rights and humanitarian policy with a management specialization. She has a background in education, having worked as a high school English teacher for six years in the United States with a bachelor's degree in secondary education from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Email: hannahepoquette@gmail.com.

Vincent Lee Quan graduated with a master's degree in public administration with a specialization in management and is now working as a policy manager at J-PAL at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has a background in education and social policy research and has a bachelor's degree in history from the University of California, Berkeley. Email: vquan44@gmail.com.

Hans-Martin Boehmer has worked in international development for more than 20 years. He received his undergraduate degree in economics from the University of Bonn, and his Ph.D. in economics with distinction from Georgetown University. Boehmer began his professional career at the Institute of International Finance Inc. before joining the World Bank. He has worked in countries in Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and Southeast Asia. He has also held corporate positions as head of the World Bank's Corporate Strategy and Integrated Risk Management Group and adviser to the managing directors. He is a visiting professor at Duke University's Sanford School of Public Policy and an adjunct professor at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. Email: hmb2154@columbia.edu.

Acknowledgments:

The Brookings Institution is a nonprofit organization devoted to independent research and policy solutions. Its mission is to conduct high-quality, independent research and, based on that research, to provide innovative, practical recommendations for policymakers and the public. The conclusions and recommendations of any Brookings publication are solely those of its author(s) and do not reflect the views of the Institution, its management, or its other scholars.

Brookings gratefully acknowledges the program support provided to the Center for Universal Education by the Government of Norway, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Brookings recognizes that the value it provides is in its absolute commitment to quality, independence, and impact. Activities supported by its donors reflect this commitment.

We would like to thank everyone who has supported this project. Thank you to our SIPA faculty adviser, Hans-Martin Boehmer, for sharing his guidance and deep expertise throughout the semester. Thank you also to the team at the Center for Universal Education at the Brookings Institution for the opportunity to contribute to the Information for Accountability Project. Finally, thank you to everyone who agreed to be interviewed. The interviews provided invaluable insights and played a major role in facilitating our understanding of the context and implementation of My School.

CONTENTS

Executive summary	1
1 Background	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Methodology	3
1.3 Australian education context.	4
2 What is My School?	5
2.1 Data	5
2.2 Functionality	6
3 Objectives	7
4 Enabling factors	9
4.1 Policy window	9
4.2 Structural advantages.	12
4.3 Access to technology	14
5 Challenges	15
5.1 Stakeholder opposition	15
5.2 Disagreement regarding inclusion of data types.	17
5.3 Disagreement regarding appropriate data protections	17
5.4 Coordination of state and territory interests.	18
5.5 Limited school choice in Australia	18
6 Implementation strategies	20
6.1 My School setup	20
6.2 Use of My School	21
6.3 Revising My School	25
7 Conclusions	27
Notes	27
Appendix A - Stakeholder Map	34
Appendix B - Interview Insights	38
Appendix C - ICSEA	44

Appendix D - Selected Early Evaluations45
Appendix E - Centralized Funding Legislation47
Appendix F - ACARA Data Request Process.49
References50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Information available on My School	5
Figure 2. Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage	16
Figure 3. My School’s objectives	8
Figure 4. My School’s key enabling factors	9
Figure 5. Governments during Rudd/Gillard/Rudd prime ministerships	11
Figure 6. My School’s operating costs	20
Figure 7. Full-time equivalent staffing	21

LIST OF BOXES

Box 1. Solving a policy problem: Lack of information about Australian schools.	7
Box 2. COAG negotiations: The support of a large state is critical	12
Box 3. Using funding as an incentive: An example from New South Wales	13
Box 4. My School’s impact on teaching and learning	16
Box 5. My School as an “open” data platform?	18
Box 6. School choice in Australia: Is it available to all families?	19
Box 7. Accessibility challenges for parents and teachers	21
Box 8. Use of My School by parents as a tool to hold schools accountable	24
Box 9. Use of My School by researchers	25

MY SCHOOL AUSTRALIA CASE STUDY

Diana Engel Gerbase

Chiara Lawry

Sarah Lux-Lee

Surya Kiran Palukuri

Hannah Poquette

Vincent Lee Quan

Hans-Martin Boehmer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2010, the Australian Commonwealth Government, in partnership with the Australian states and territories, created an online tool called My School. The objective of My School was to enable the collation and publication of data about the nearly 10,000 schools across the country. Effectively offering a report card for each Australian school,¹ My School was designed to “give parents and the wider community more information than they have ever had before about their local school and how it is performing.”²

My School is best understood within the broader Australian education context, in which the Australian states and territories have primary responsibility for the delivery of schooling. The Commonwealth Government can exercise considerable influence over education priorities since it provides funding to all Australian schools—both government and nongovernment.

My School was designed to enable a better understanding of school performance across Australia by collating and publishing comparative school data. The website

provides three categories of data on Australian schools: student performance, school finances and resources, and operational context. The platform enables stakeholders to compare these data across similar schools. An important element of My School is ICSEA (the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage), a score that enables fair comparisons among similar schools based on socio-educational factors. My School is accessed by a wide range of stakeholders including parents, policymakers, school leaders, and journalists. In 2013, approximately 1.45 million total users visited the website, of whom 0.79 million were unique visitors.

Many enabling factors led to the successful development and implementation of My School. It was developed as part of a broader suite of education reforms driven by Julia Gillard, who was then the deputy prime minister and education minister and subsequently became prime minister. There were strong relationships between the Commonwealth and states at the time of My School’s development, with Australian Labor Party governments at both the federal and state/territory levels across the country, and intergovernmental structures for education policy decisionmaking were

robust. Furthermore, much of the data published on My School were already being collected, and so the focus of the initiative was on how to centralize and publish the data, rather than how to create them. Since My School was a tool delivered online, high internet penetration in Australia was also critical to its success.

As with all policy initiatives, My School faced challenges. These included the need for coordination across school sectors and levels of government, limited school choice, and opposition from some stakeholder groups, primarily teachers unions. The unions were concerned that My School would be used to identify and shame poorly performing schools and that it would place undue pressure on teachers and create a high-stakes learning environment. There were also challenges around how to protect data on the site from republication in league tables.

My School was ultimately implemented following intense stakeholder engagement and communication, led by Gillard, to build consensus and support for the initiative. Its practical implementation was led by ACARA (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority), a central body established to oversee the collection of national education data and to operate the My School website, among other roles.

ACARA is a statutory authority, not a department, allowing the Commonwealth, state, and territory governments to collectively contribute to the management of My School.

My School has undergone several rounds of revisions since its launch. Between its first and second years in operation, the website's functionality was significantly improved. Key revisions included an improved search function, new menu items, and increased data protection measures to guard against misuse of data. In the years since, more data sets and broader contextual information have been added. Usability of the site has been continually improved as information on user experience has been captured and better understood.

My School has proved to be a useful tool for many parents, policymakers, education researchers, and the wider community. While there continue to be opportunities to strengthen and refine My School, there appears to be little risk of its being abolished. Stakeholders broadly agree that it is now "part of the furniture" of the Australian education system and is here to stay. Lessons from the Australian experience can assist in the understanding the applicability of similar information-based tools in other parts of the world.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The Center for Universal Education (CUE) at the Brookings Institution is investigating the adaptation of My School to improve learning outcomes in other countries, through increased access to school-level information. To better understand the processes that enabled the development and implementation of My School in Australia, CUE has engaged a team of graduate student consultants from the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) at Columbia University to develop a case study on My School, as part of SIPA's Capstone program.

The case study is built on a foundation of 24 interviews with diverse stakeholders representing parents, teachers, policymakers, education experts, and data specialists, as well as the key individuals directly involved in designing and implementing My School. It provides a 360-degree view of a policy that placed access to information at the heart of the education agenda.

The case study is organized to provide an overview of the development of My School. It commences with a brief discussion of the background and methodology in Part 1. Parts 2 and 3 provide an overview of My School's content, functionality, and objectives. Part 4 sets out the enabling factors that led to the successful implementation of My School, and key implementation challenges are discussed in Part 5. Part 6 maps the Commonwealth Government's implementation strategy and ongoing improvements to My School. The conclusion sets out lessons from the Australian experience that may be valuable to those implementing similar tools in other country contexts.

1.2 Methodology

As requested by CUE, the case study was developed in accordance with the methodology described in the World Bank's Science of Delivery manual. Central to the manual is the notion of revisiting past interventions to apply knowledge about the implementation process for future operations. The Capstone team was asked to describe the enabling factors that allowed My School to come to fruition in Australia and the challenges facing implementation. To do so, the team gathered research from two distinct sources: interviews and desktop research.

Interviews: The case study is informed by interviews with 24 stakeholders, from a wide range of relevant stakeholder groups (see Appendix A). Interviewees included the individuals and organizations responsible for developing and implementing My School, leaders of educational organizations, state and federal public servants, education researchers, education consultants, teachers, and parents, among others. Key insights gathered from the interviews are provided as Appendix B, and vignettes from interviews are interspersed throughout the report to provide more detailed insights. Interviews were conducted in confidence and direct quotes have been approved for inclusion.


Desktop research: Interview insights have been supplemented with desktop research from a variety of sources, where relevant. These include government reports, think tank publications, industry reports, official Australian government websites, media commentary, press releases, and surveys (see Bibliography). Some materials were also provided directly by interviewees for review by the team.

1.3 Australian education context

Australia's schools are organized by sector into government schools, which are managed by the Department of Education of each state and territory, and nongovernment schools, which are managed by the Catholic Church or are considered independent. Unlike in many other countries, the Commonwealth Government provides funding to all schools, government and nongovernment. In 2015, 9,404 schools were operating in Australia, enrolling a total of 3,750,973 students. Of these schools, 6,639 (70.6 percent) were government schools, 1,737 (18.5 percent) were Catholic schools, and 1,028 (10.9 percent) were independent schools³ Australia's schools are also divided into primary schools, which serve students aged approximately 5-12, and secondary schools, whose students are aged approximately 13-18. Some schools offer combined primary and secondary schooling.

The Commonwealth Government has a limited operational role in the Australian school system, with limited legislative authority over the way in which schools are run.⁴ Primary responsibility for the operation of schools rests with the states and territories.⁵ However, the individual state and territory education systems are broadly consistent and are becoming more so with the rollout of the Australian Curriculum.⁶ Furthermore, the Commonwealth Government provides overarching policy leadership by setting delivery standards for education, promoting and financing national education reform, and representing Australia in global school initiatives. Finally, by funding all Australian schools, the Commonwealth Government gains an important lever for influence over the nature and delivery of education in the states and territories.

Figure 1. Information available on My School



Source: Authors.

2. WHAT IS MY SCHOOL?

Launched in January 2010,⁷ My School is a website that provides access to information for approximately 10,000 schools across Australia.⁸ On My School, parents, educators, and other users can access a range of information about schools in their community and compare them with similar schools across Australia, including in relation to a school's mission, staffing, finances, resources, characteristics, and performance.

2.1 Data


As summarized in Figure 1, users can access three main categories of information on the My School website: student performance, school finances and resources, and operational context:⁹

- **Student performance:** Users can obtain information on performance as measured by the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy standardized tests. These national NAPLAN tests assess students in reading, writing, language (spelling, grammar, and punctuation), and numeracy.¹⁰ To facilitate meaningful

comparison of student performance across schools, the website uses an index of student and school characteristics to identify schools serving statistically similar communities (this tool is discussed further in section 3.2.2 below). The site also displays qualifications completed by students in schools with vocational and educational training courses.

- **School finances and resources:** The site provides a summary of a school's financial information, including the recurrent income available to support the operation of a school, as well as a school's annual capital expenditure. It also provides information on the number of teaching and non-teaching staff.
- **Operational context:** Users can access general school facts including the school type (for example, government, Catholic, or independent), school-level data about students' backgrounds, total student enrollment, and student attendance broken down for indigenous and non-indigenous students. Schools also have the option to provide a short profile that includes further contextual details.

Figure 2. Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage



Source: Adapted from ACARA. "What does the ICSEA value mean?," 2014. http://www.acara.edu.au/_resources/About_icsea_2014.pdf

2.2 Functionality

2.2.1 Search and navigation

Users can search for data by school location, sector, or name.¹¹ Once a school has been selected, the user is taken to the school profile page, which displays a basic school summary with information on staff, student background, and enrollment.¹² Users who seek more detailed information can click on tabs corresponding to school finances, NAPLAN, vocational education training in schools, local schools, and student attendance.¹³ Users can view changes over time, such as for the amount of government funding or student performance on national standardized tests.¹⁴ Data are displayed both numerically and graphically.¹⁵ In addition, the My School website maps other schools that are located near the selected school.

2.2.2 Comparison of similar schools: ICSEA

Crucial to My School's functionality is the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage. ICSEA was created to enable users to compare schools that serve students of similar socio-educational backgrounds, as summarized in Figure 2.¹⁶ Designed specifically for My School, ICSEA creates a value for each school that indicates the level of advantage of its students as defined by factors outside of a school's control.¹⁷ ICSEA takes into account a combination of student factors, such as parents' occupation and education, as well as contextual factors, such as the school's geographical location (metropolitan, regional, or remote), the proportion of indigenous students, and the proportion of students with language backgrounds other than English.¹⁸ ICSEA was designed to enable the isolation of a school's impact on student performance, as distinct from these socio-educational factors. Further details regarding ICSEA are included as Appendix C.

Box 1. Solving a policy problem: Lack of information about Australian schools

Prior to the introduction of My School, state and territory governments collected and reported different information in different formats, making it almost impossible to meaningfully compare data for Australian schools. Victoria and New South Wales had existing school reporting systems, but these states' systems were different and were not available to the general public. Tom Bentley, a former senior policy adviser to Gillard, characterized being unable to obtain consistent data on Australian schools as challenging and frustrating. My School's objective, he said, was enabling the public sharing of consistent school-level data in order to facilitate informed conversations on effectiveness and need: "My School was intended to be a tool to start and support conversations about Australian schools."

Source: Stakeholder interview.

3. OBJECTIVES

My School was developed to address a clearly defined policy problem: lack of clear and consistent public information on Australian schools.¹⁹ Before the creation of My School in 2009, public information was limited to what schools chose to make available, and even state, territory, and federal governments (let alone the general public) had difficulties accessing comparable information about school performance and resources (see Box 1).²⁰ As Australia's then deputy prime minister and minister of education, Julia Gillard aimed "to make sure that everything we did in education better responded to need."²¹ My School was a tool to help meet that goal, enabling the Australian government to centralize and publish data that would enable stakeholders to understand the needs of schools and better address them.²² The My School website describes itself as "a resource for parents, educators and the community to give readily accessible information about each of Australia's just over 10,000 schools and campuses."²³


In addition to this core purpose of increasing access to information about schools, various wider objectives and audiences have been articulated. In a press

release announcing the launch of My School, Gillard described the site as "an important step in the Government's Education Revolution—providing unprecedented transparency and helping drive vital improvements in school education."²⁴

In agreeing to the implementation of My School in September 2008, the then-Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs identified three key purposes for My School: to enable evaluation of school performance by governments and researchers; to increase transparency and accountability of schools in order to support school improvement; and to facilitate better resource allocation to schools in need.²⁵ The My School website identifies additional objectives of enabling educators to share information about school achievements and helping parents to make informed decisions about their children's education.²⁶

The key objectives that have been identified in interviews and research for this case study are set out in Figure 3. As My School evolves, different stakeholder groups will continue to utilize the website to meet different objectives. It is too early to comprehensively assess My School for causal impacts on educational

Figure 3. My School’s objectives



Source: Authors.

outcomes. This is particularly the case since 2016 is the first year in which there will be a full set of NAPLAN performance data for students who have undergone the complete span of testing from grade three to grade nine.²⁷ There have been some early qualitative evaluations of My School, as well as two Senate committee reviews, which are summarized in Appendix D.

4. ENABLING FACTORS

After years of strategic planning, collaboration, and negotiation among Australia’s education leaders, the Commonwealth Government officially launched the My School website on Jan. 28, 2010. Stakeholders point to several enabling factors that led to the creation of My School. These included consistency with a broad policy agenda, strong top-down political leadership, positive intergovernmental relations, policy alignment in the education sphere, well-functioning governance structures, and relatively high access to technological infrastructure across the country. A discussion of the key enablers follows and is summarized in Figure 4.

4.1 Policy window

4.1.1 Consistency with a broad policy agenda

My School was created amid significant policy reforms that were taking place around the country in the late 2000s. Its introduction was made more politically

feasible by its consistency with two major policy platforms of the Commonwealth Government at the time: the education revolution, which would involve sweeping reforms from early childhood education through the tertiary level, and a move to increase transparency and accountability across all levels of government and policy areas.²⁸

The most visible elements of the education revolution for the school sector were Building the Education Revolution,²⁹ a policy designed to provide new and refurbished infrastructure to all eligible Australian schools, and the Digital Education Revolution, which provided laptops, broadband connectivity, and other information and communications technologies to schools across the country.³⁰ The implementation of standardized testing through NAPLAN and the publication of results on My School was a third key element of this system-level reform of Australian education.

My School also reflected the Commonwealth’s broader push toward transparency and accountability across

Figure 4. My School’s key enabling factors

Area	Essential	Helpful	Potential obstacles
Policy window	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency with broad policy agenda Strong top-down political leadership Strong Commonwealth-state relations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some support from parents and schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder resistance Coordination of state and territory policy interests Limited school choice
Structural advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing intergovernmental structures for education decisions Centralized funding mechanism Availability of existing data sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to disaggregate school-level data Access to growth data Early support from a large state within the Council of Australian Governments process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decentralized governance of education
Access to technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internet connectivity Access to computers and information and communications technology Digital literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government-led initiatives to expand internet access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low computer or data literacy among some communities

Source: Authors.

policy areas. In the health sector, the Commonwealth unveiled My Hospitals, an online scheme similar to My School intended to enable communities to rate their local health outlets and access funding information to increase transparency and accountability.³¹ Similarly, there was a push in the not-for-profit sector to increase transparency through the creation of the Australian Charities and Not-for-Profits Commission and tightening of tax concessions for unrelated business profits.³² In 2011, the Gillard government established transparency in free trade negotiations as one of its five key principles driving trade.³³

It is worth noting that although the Commonwealth's primary focus was on transparency as a tool for better policymaking, this transparency and accountability agenda, including in the context of My School, was perceived by some stakeholders as an attempt to increase control by the Commonwealth over policy areas traditionally within the purview of the states and territories.³⁴

4.1.2 Strong top-down political leadership


The development of My School benefited from the strong support of highly influential policy leaders of national stature. My School had a powerful advocate in Julia Gillard, who transitioned from deputy prime minister and education minister to prime minister during My School's implementation and is widely

acknowledged as the driving force behind the initiative.³⁵ Gillard later stated: "I fought a ferocious battle as Education Minister to create My School and to get each of us, all of us, more information than we have ever had before on the education of our children."³⁶ Gillard is consistently identified by stakeholders as the "face of My School," with many crediting the successful passing and implementation of the policy to her unflinching leadership and commitment.³⁷ Gillard had a strong and focused goal for education in Australia: "By 2025, Australia should be ranked as a top 5 country in the world in Reading, Science and Mathematics—and for providing our children with a high-quality and high-equity education system."³⁸ My School was one piece of the plan to achieve this goal.

4.1.3 Strong Commonwealth-state relations

The advancement of the Commonwealth agenda for education reform and increased transparency, with My School at their intersection, also benefited from a time of particularly strong Commonwealth-state relations. During 2007-2010, when My School was first negotiated and implemented, the federal Labor government enjoyed the support of Labor governments in five of six states and the two territories, an unusual scenario in Australian politics that provided a unique window for policies dependent on strong Commonwealth-state collaboration.³⁹ This consistent political landscape is reflected in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Governments during Rudd/Gillard/Rudd prime ministerships



The 2008 Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians reflected this unique period of consensus.⁴⁰ Agreed upon by state, territory, and ministers of the Commonwealth, the declaration established the goals and directions for Australian schooling and called for a Commitment to Action in eight inter-related reform areas, which included strengthening transparency and accountability.

This period of consensus also built upon an earlier architecture for collaboration established by the Council of Australian Governments—the country’s peak intergovernmental body—in December 2007, which improved funding arrangements and established support in principle for greater transparency and accountability in education through sharing and publication of school-level information.⁴¹

4.1.4 Some support from parents and schools

Initial support from some of the intended users of My School also facilitated the successful launch of the website. Early commentary notes that “[p]arent groups

were highly supportive of the initiative, expressing a desire to be provided with more information.”⁴² The results of a government survey of parents showed 96.9 percent of parents were in favor of being provided with more information on school performance.⁴³ This early support from parents was important as a starting point in the push for increased transparency. It should be noted, however, that parents were not uniformly in support of My School. Some parent councils expressed concern regarding the potential impact on students of making school performance results available to the general public, suggesting that only those directly involved in the process such as teachers, principals, and parents should have access to NAPLAN results.⁴⁴

The Catholic school sector was also an early supporter of My School. Dan White, executive director of Catholic schools for the Archdiocese of Sydney, supported the website as “providing rich, meaningful data about schools’ achievements that would generate constructive dialogue between schools and parents.” More recently, Ross Fox, executive director of the National Catholic Education Commission, reaffirmed My

School's importance, saying that a recent update in NAPLAN scores show that "schools of all sizes...are providing quality teaching and learning that is making a real difference in student care."⁴⁵

4.2 Structural advantages

4.2.1 Existing intergovernmental structures

The existence of intergovernmental structures through which to coordinate national education decisions assisted the Commonwealth Government to build consensus around My School. Two intergovernmental bodies provide the formal mechanisms for collaboration between the Commonwealth Government and the states and territories in national education reform. As Australia's primary intergovernmental body, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) initiates, develops, and monitors the implementation of nationally significant policy reforms. COAG is composed of Australia's prime minister, the state and territory premiers, chief ministers, and the president of the Australian Local Government Association. Situated within COAG is the Education Council,⁴⁶ which coordinates strategic policy on early childhood, school education, and higher education and draws its membership from state, territory, the Commonwealth, and New Zealand ministers with portfolio responsibility for education (see Box 2). These intergovernmental structures

facilitated the sharing of information and the collaborative use of resources, mitigating the decentralized nature of the Australian education system to enable relatively swift progress in securing the cooperation necessary to make the initiative work.

4.2.2 Centralized funding mechanism

The centralized nature of education funding in Australia was an important enabling factor for My School. As noted, primary responsibility for the delivery of education in Australia rests with the states and territories. However, their revenue-raising capacity is limited.⁴⁹ Both government and nongovernment schools are reliant to varying degrees on the Commonwealth Government to provide funding for the operation of schools.⁵⁰ In past years, up to 50 percent of total funding for public schools has come from the Commonwealth Government, with the share reaching as high as 65 percent for nongovernment schools.⁵¹

The Commonwealth Government was able to use this considerable funding as leverage, by tying the provision of data for My School to the continued allocation of education funding. This financial influence was derived from a series of funding laws, including the Schools Assistance Act 2008 (Cth), the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations 2008 (Cth), and the National Education Agreement 2009 (Cth)

Box 2. COAG negotiations: The support of a large state is critical

COAG negotiations typically require the early support of a large state to be successful. In her autobiography "My Story," Julia Gillard notes with regard to National Disability Insurance Scheme negotiations at COAG that "everyone knew that the most populous state signing on meant the only way this was going to end was with everyone signing on."⁴⁷ With regard to My School, early support from the Victorian government was critical to COAG negotiations: "Bronwyn Pike, Victoria's Education Minister, and Peter Dawkins, the secretary of her department, were outstanding in their support at the Ministerial Council meetings and associated discussions between public service officials...state Ministers [accepted] that school funding would be tied to transparency and the teaching of a national curriculum."⁴⁸

(see Appendix E). These financial agreements required that government and nongovernment schools report on school enrollment, school demographics, school finances, and school performance among other indicators as a condition of continued federal funding (see Box 3).

4.2.3 Availability of existing data sources

To facilitate the development of My School, the Commonwealth Government relied on the ready availability of reliable data sources. Most of the data to be made available on the My School website were already being compiled by schools or state and territory governments. The focus of My School was how to centralize the data and ensure consistency and comparability.⁵³

Key sources of existing information were:

- **Australian census:** The Commonwealth Government runs a census every five years, data from which are used as a basis for part of the ICSEA calculations. Relevant data for My School included socio-economic status, geographic remoteness, and information about indigeneity.
- **Schools:** The states and territories already collected directly from schools much of the data that are used in My School, including attendance,

disability data, the school profile, senior secondary outcomes, student progress after graduation, and vocational education information.

- **NAPLAN:** The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority has administered NAPLAN directly in schools since 2010, and it collects and analyzes the data from these tests. These data did not need to be created for My School, as they existed independently since 2010. The states, territories, the Commonwealth, and ACARA were all partners in administering NAPLAN and collecting relevant data during NAPLAN's first two years in existence, after which ACARA took exclusive ownership of NAPLAN.⁵⁴

In addition to these existing sources, some data sets needed to be developed specifically for My School. For example, schools asked parents to provide information regarding their occupation, school education level, and other proxy data for education in order to facilitate socio-educational comparisons through ICSEA.⁵⁵

My School is constantly evolving and has regularly incorporated new data sets. For example, My School was updated in 2015 to include more consistent school attendance data and average student attendance rates

Box 3. Using funding as an incentive: An example from New South Wales

In 2009, the New South Wales Parliament proposed a bill to permit the public reporting of school results from new national student tests. The bill was in direct response to the National Education Agreement of 2009 (NEA), which required states to report data on school results for publication on the My School website. Under the NEA, the Commonwealth would provide New South Wales with \$4.8 billion in education funding over the next four years, so long as the state complied with national reporting requirements. This funding would cover approximately 20 percent of the annual cost of employing public school teachers and other school staff. Parliament members in New South Wales emphasized the significance of this arrangement, stating that “If the state does not provide the data in accordance with the agreed time line, it will not satisfy the conditions for receipt of the funding. In short, failure to pass this bill would place this funding in jeopardy.”⁵²

for indigenous and non-indigenous students.⁵⁶ More recently, it was agreed that students' disability data would be included in My School,⁵⁷ after a recent Senate inquiry found that students with disabilities are severely underserved and recommended that parents be better informed about schools' abilities to effectively include children with disabilities.⁵⁸

4.3 Access to technology

4.3.1 Internet connectivity

Without the ability of the public to easily access the internet, My School would have been limited in its reach and efficacy. When My School went live in 2010, approximately 79 percent of Australian households had access to the internet at home,⁵⁹ with an even higher proportion of connected homes in capital cities and in households with children under the age of 15.⁶⁰ Data from 2015 show that approximately 86 percent of

Australians had home internet access.⁶¹ Among those without internet access, 63 percent of those surveyed stated they had "no need" for internet connectivity.⁶² According to the International Telecommunication Union, Australia ranks high in terms of account speed, bandwidth, internet subscriptions, and household connections.⁶³

4.3.2 Digital literacy

Relatively high digital literacy was another key enabling factor. In a 2013 report, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and Australian Bureau of Statistics compared the level of computer skills of adults across OECD countries and concluded that 38 percent of adults in Australia were highly proficient with computers and that almost 70 percent of adults in Australia had at least a basic understanding of internet and computer applications.⁶⁴ This ranked Australia sixth of the 19 OECD countries that were reviewed.⁶⁵

5. CHALLENGES

In addition to a host of enabling factors that facilitated the launch of My School, the Commonwealth Government faced several challenges that threatened to undermine the successful development of the initiative. These included opposition from vocal stakeholder groups, disagreements regarding the types of data to be included and the protections to be applied to that data, coordination of state and territory interests, and limited school choice in Australia.

5.1 Stakeholder opposition

The most visible challenge to My School was the significant opposition it drew from stakeholders. Despite some support from parents and educators, the announcement of My School was not uniformly welcomed by the education sector. Strong resistance to the publication of school-level data came in particular from teachers and principals and their unions and associations, as well as independent schools. According to the OECD, “the My School story shows the importance of policy makers considering conflicting stakeholder interests and views regarding empowering parents with potentially sensitive information.”⁶⁶

5.1.1 Teachers and unions

Among stakeholder groups, teachers unions have been the most opposed to My School, with the “most vehement opponent of My School” being the Australian Education Union (AEU), which represents teachers at government schools.⁶⁷ While unions agreed that school performance data are a useful internal diagnostic tool, they strongly disputed that it should be made available to the general public.⁶⁸ In its submission to the 2010 Senate inquiry, the AEU argued that My School would “unfairly stigmatize schools”⁶⁹ and that publication of performance data would create a high-stakes learning environment, with negative impacts on curriculum

choices, pedagogy, collaboration, and student-teacher relationships.⁷⁰

The AEU reacted with “extreme hostility”⁷¹ to My School, lobbying complaints soon after the website launched.⁷² The release of My School rekindled many of the same criticisms that accompanied the launch of NAPLAN in 2008. Both the AEU and the New South Wales Teachers Federation voted to boycott NAPLAN testing, effectively threatening to shut down My School, which is heavily dependent on NAPLAN data.⁷³

Concerns among teachers beyond the AEU centered on the need to teach to the test and achieve strong results, as well as the risk that this would lead to a distorted curriculum and superficial learning experiences (see Box 4).⁷⁴ Publication of performance data may make classrooms more competitive, less inclusive, and less able to cope with a diversity of students and performance levels.⁷⁵ Teachers were also concerned about potential negative impacts on students’ confidence and self-esteem as a result of the pressure to do better than students at other schools.⁷⁶ There have also been equity concerns, as the negative impacts of testing are likely to be most pronounced in marginalized schools and schools where English is a second language for many students.⁷⁷

Ultimately, Julia Gillard successfully persuaded the AEU and other vocal opponents to back down despite early opposition: “[T]he strike and boycott were averted in exchange for a commitment...to include the AEU in consultations about what would be added to My School.”⁷⁸ Gillard wrote publicly to Angelo Gavriellatos, who at the time was president of the AEU, noting the commitment of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd’s government to stakeholder consultation and offering to incorporate the concerns of the AEU and other stakeholders. A working party was established by ACARA, which comprised nominees from the AEU, teachers, principals and parents associations, and independent

Box 4. My School's impact on teaching and learning

Anticipating the public scrutiny of school performance that would come with the launch of My School, some schools made changes to instruction and curriculum in an attempt to mitigate negative public opinion. Marianne Scholem, a high school English teacher at a struggling school during the time of My School's release, experienced this response. Scholem's school served 60 different migrant communities and included many students who lacked strong English skills.

During the lead-up to My School's launch, Scholem noted an increase in pressure on the school and its teachers to raise the anticipated low NAPLAN scores. Teachers were instructed to use one of their three 90-minute classes per week for test preparation and were given lesson plans and worksheets to use for this purpose. Scholem noted that her students experienced test fatigue and that she saw some buckle under the pressure, storming out of the room and crumpling their papers. She reflected, "[I]t was awful for them to be told that what they should be achieving is beyond what they could do."

experts, to capture and respond to stakeholder concerns. The working party's findings were used to inform modifications to the site's content and functionality in 2011.⁷⁹ The Commonwealth also addressed the strike and boycott through legal means, with an application to the industrial court at the time arguing that to supervise NAPLAN was part of a teacher's duties.⁸⁰

5.1.2 Independent schools

The independent school sector was another early opponent of My School.⁸¹ The independent schools were primarily concerned about the publication of NAPLAN and financial data.⁸² However, the negotiation of My School coincided with the renewal of independent school funding from the Commonwealth Government.⁸³ As such, the Commonwealth Government had significant leverage over the independent school sector and was able to bundle My School within the broader agreement.

5.1.3 School leadership

Principals expressed mixed views on the publication of school-level information on My School.⁸⁴ Some saw the

website as a useful source of information for parents and the community.⁸⁵ For high-performing schools, My School comparisons could provide a positive marketing message. However, principals and principals associations also expressed concerns about My School. For example, in its submission to the Senate inquiry, the Australian Primary Principals Association voiced its concern that decontextualized NAPLAN scores were being used to create league tables to crudely rank schools,⁸⁶ which could then have harmful effects on the learning environment and processes in schools.⁸⁷ They also echoed the unions' concerns that publication of NAPLAN results on My School could create a high-stakes learning environment with further negative effects on teaching and learning.⁸⁸

Principals also pointed to potential for misinterpretation or misuse of My School by parents, such as comparison of NAPLAN results without an understanding of the broader context in which a school is operating, or the interpretation of financial data without a full and accurate view of school finances. My School results could also cause low morale at marginalized schools, which often do not perform well in rankings with other schools.⁸⁹ Principals also noted the need for more

information than what is available on My School, including school assessments, performance relative to the curriculum, and professional development.⁹⁰ Some saw My School as not particularly relevant as other, more comprehensive information is available.⁹¹ They also noted that other accountability systems are in place, limiting the value added by My School.⁹² Opposition of principals to My School was managed through the inclusion of principals associations and representatives in the ACARA working party.⁹³

5.2 Disagreement regarding inclusion of data types

From the inception of My School, disagreements arose regarding the type of information that should be included on the site. Parents wanted information such as details about teaching staff, final year student results,⁹⁴ and special programming offered by schools,⁹⁵ while principals called for the addition of school size and location, characteristics of the student body, whether a school is selective in admitting students based on academic performance or other criteria, and other information along these lines.⁹⁶ Some of these indicators, specifically those addressing areas of learning disadvantage or teacher quality, have been highly controversial.⁹⁷

My School's reporting of school finance data has also been contentious.⁹⁸ Unions have argued that to accurately calculate school-level financial resources, My School should include information regarding trusts, foundations, bequests, and share of property portfolios. Similarly, principals associations have supported the inclusion of school assets such as real estate in the financial data on My School.⁹⁹ The independent schools sector has strongly resisted such inclusions, however, arguing that this information would be difficult to compare across schools and would not be relevant in measuring school resources used in the education

process.¹⁰⁰ In particular, leaders of nongovernment schools have argued that measuring the ownership of assets would be too complex given varied accounting standards across jurisdictions. Other stakeholders have added that a plausible solution to professionally value assets would have been far too costly for more than 10,000 schools and campuses.

Two additional types of data, longitudinal studies across grades and indigenous performance data, have been proposed but face challenges. Providing information regarding student progress across school levels would require student-identifier data, which is unlikely to gain consensus across sectors and jurisdictions.¹⁰¹ Additionally, while data on indigenous student performance would aid in measuring progress in closing the gap in access to high-quality educational opportunities between indigenous and non-indigenous students, including such sensitive information is likely to raise opposition.¹⁰²

Efforts to include new indicators on My School can be challenging and time-consuming because they need to be applied across all states and territories. Since ACARA reports to the Education Council, each new indicator must be approved by all state and territory ministers and the Commonwealth minister. Building consensus around the type of indicator and how to measure it can be a large undertaking, even for less controversial indicators.

5.3 Disagreement regarding appropriate data protections

Throughout My School's development and continued revision, stakeholders have strongly debated the extent to which the website's data should be protected from unauthorized or undesired uses. Much of the stakeholder opposition to My School was related to potential misuse of data by media outlets and other third parties;

Box 5. My School as an “open” data platform?

When it was introduced, My School was welcomed by researchers who regard transparency and openness as a critical element of good policymaking. However, restrictions subsequently implemented to address concerns about potential misuse of data have led some open data advocates to query whether this is a genuinely open platform. Baden Appleyard, who has advised Australian governments on implementing open data practices through the Australian Governments Open Access and Licensing Framework (AusGOAL), said that the site does not reflect open data principles: “The Prime Minister made it very clear in her speeches that this was to be open data. However, it is locked up. . . . It is not open. It doesn’t permit individuals to draw their own conclusions using their own analysis of raw data, and it doesn’t foster innovation.”

schools and teachers feared they would use My School to create crude league tables that unfairly compared schools without contextualizing their performance.¹⁰⁴ In response, the Commonwealth Government agreed to implement tight controls to prevent such misuse of the data. These included technical controls, such as preventing data scraping on the site; legal controls, such as legislation prohibiting the use of My School for the purpose of creating league tables and the use of copyright restrictions to prevent unauthorized use of content; and bureaucratic controls, such as the complex process required to obtain the underlying data behind My School.¹⁰⁵ Although these restrictions mitigated some of the concerns of teachers and unions,¹⁰⁶ they led others, especially in the open data community, to criticize My School for being unduly restrictive. Critics suggested that these strict data controls contravene My School’s stated objective of opening up data about Australian schools for use by the general community (see Box 5).¹⁰⁷

5.4 Coordination of state and territory interests

For My School to be established, the Commonwealth Government needed agreement from all state and territory governments to share school-level data. Several of the enabling factors identified previously—such as

the commonwealth’s ability to use funding as an incentive, the leadership of an influential state, and existing intergovernmental frameworks such as the Education Council—helped to manage this. Nevertheless, the decentralized nature of the Australian education system meant that an unusually high level of coordination and consensus was required to establish a national education policy such as My School in Australia.

5.5 Limited school choice in Australia

In many cases, Australian parents have no alternative than to send their children to one of the local public schools due to the cost of nongovernment schools and restricted catchment areas for public schools (see Box 6). School choice may be particularly limited in low-density rural areas with only one public school. Where school choice is limited in this way, the utility of a performance monitoring and comparison tool like My School decreases. However, for the one-third of all students who attend nongovernment (Catholic or independent) schools, My School may be of greater value. In addition, net interstate migration figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicate that in 2013 more than 50,000 school-age children moved interstate, requiring decisions to be made regarding schooling.

Box 6. School choice in Australia: Is it available to all families?

One of the intended purposes of My School is to assist parents in choosing the best schools for their children. However, there is a question about the extent to which school choice is available to all parents.

Interviewees indicated that families of lower socio-economic status have a different school selection process than those in higher socio-economic brackets. Families with lower education and socio-economic levels generally choose schools based on proximity and connection to the school community, whereas families of higher education and socio-economic levels generally select schools based on performance and pedagogy. This difference means that families of higher education and socio-economic levels are more likely than those who are more disadvantaged to use the information provided by My School for school choice purposes.

Where school choice does exist, it is informed by a range of factors, not all of which are captured by My School. These include the “feel” of a school, relationships and behavior management, extracurricular activities, and other qualitative factors that are best determined by visiting a school and talking to teachers and other parents. Parents have indicated that they need

more contextual information than is available on My School to help them form a rounded, holistic view of a given school.¹¹⁰ In a 2010 survey, only 8.2 percent of parents cited My School among the three sources of information most likely to influence their choice of school.¹¹¹ The site was ranked eighth of 14 factors in a list of the most influential sources used by parents.¹¹²

6. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

6.1 My School setup

6.1.1 Creation of ACARA

The Commonwealth Government needed a central body to oversee the collection of national education data and to operate the My School website. During the October 2008 COAG meeting, the Commonwealth, state and territory governments agreed to create the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). Established under an Act of federal parliament in 2008, ACARA is an independent statutory authority that operates My School, administers NAPLAN, and has developed the national curriculum.¹¹³ As an independent authority, ACARA has a clear and consistent mandate, as outlined in its authorizing act and charter, which provides for its longevity: this clarity and independence enabled ACARA to maintain focus even as governments and policies have changed.¹¹⁴

Funding of ACARA is shared between the Commonwealth Government (50 percent) and the states and territories (50 percent).¹¹⁵ The budget for ACARA approved by ministers in 2011 totaled AU\$109.2 million and covered the years 2012 through 2016.¹¹⁶ The total ACARA budget for 2015-2016 is estimated at AU\$25.220 million,¹¹⁷ with staffing of 93 employees.¹¹⁸ Total expenses for the national data collection and reporting arm of ACARA, which houses My School, are estimated for 2015-2016 to be AU\$2.525 million.¹¹⁹

6.1.2 Costs

To finance the first version of My School, ACARA spent a total of AU\$2.1 million in 2010 for website development and maintenance, security testing, legal services, focus groups, and staffing costs.¹²⁰

As an example of the breakdown of My School costs, in 2012-2013, the largest proportion of My School expenditures covered staff salaries and superannuation. During this time period, total national data collection and reporting costs were budgeted at AU\$6.66 million, with My School totaling AU\$2.363 million.¹²¹ Of the total My School cost, staff salaries and superannuation made up 63.43 percent. This segment included an allocated proportion of reporting and information technology (IT) staff incorporating web developers and data analysts, totaling AU\$1,498,790.¹²² A smaller proportion of the total My School costs, 36.57 percent, covered project expenses. These expenditures totaled AU\$864,000 and included web hosting and infrastructure, IT contractors, travel, meeting costs, financial data assurance, website testing, and staffing the help desk for user support.¹²³

The operating costs of My School have decreased since the site's initial release. These costs comprise the main site and disaster recovery site hosting, financial assurance, web development, maintenance, and testing provided by external suppliers.¹²⁴ Annual operating costs are shown in Figure 6.¹²⁵

Figure 6. My School's operating costs

Year	Total operating costs (AU\$)
2010-2011	\$1,577,907
2011-2011	\$747,000
2012-2013	\$705,000
2013-2014	\$726,000

Web development and maintenance were brought in-house in 2011, which contributed to the reduction in costs between 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.¹²⁶

The number of staff required to support My School fluctuates throughout the year according to site needs, with more needed from January to March and from

August to December when data are published.¹²⁷ The annualized full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing required to support My School is shown in Figure 7.¹²⁸

Figure 7. Full-time equivalent staffing

Role	Staffing
Policy and data collection, analysis and management (not including NAPLAN work stream)	5.4 x FTE
IT design, development, and testing framework	1.9 x FTE
Communications	0.6 x FTE
Total My School staffing needs	7.9 x FTE

The staffing levels do not include external website hosting by a third-party provider or the work of the general manager for assessment and reporting, chief executive officer, the board secretariat, and the ACARA board in advising the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood before the release of My School every year.¹²⁹

6.2 Use of My School

In 2013, approximately 1.45 million total users visited the My School website, of whom 0.79 million were unique visitors.¹³⁰ Disaggregated data give some insight as to who is using the information and who may find it valuable. Initially, the site was used by states and territories with performance levels below the national average, but over time usage has shifted such that

there is no substantial difference across states.¹³¹ Some qualitative evidence indicates that parents in the independent schools sector use My School more frequently than those in the government school sector.¹³² Due to limitations of the publicly available data,¹³³ the level of usage among different stakeholder groups (parents, policymakers, principals, those with lower socio-economic status, rural) remains unclear. However, it appears likely that parents remain the primary user group.¹³⁴

Early evaluations of My School have found that usage has been limited by unnecessarily complex presentation of content and navigation tools (see Box 7).¹³⁵ This was reiterated by several stakeholders interviewed for this case study who indicated that, in light of this complexity, typically only highly educated and well-informed stakeholders use the site.¹³⁶ Meaningful access may be particularly difficult for those with disabilities, or those for whom English is a second language.¹³⁷ Parents and other stakeholders have noted particular difficulties in understanding and using ICSEA due to its technical complexity.¹³⁸ Some NAPLAN data are also identified by users as difficult to interpret,¹³⁹ and the financial data require an understanding of how the education sector is financed in order to fully utilize the information presented.¹⁴⁰ To understand school performance over time or to compare types of schools, the user must manually navigate between pages and manipulate the data by hand.¹⁴¹

Box 7. Accessibility challenges for parents and teachers

Sarah Goss, an education researcher who has also used My School in the school selection process for her own children, considers the site valuable for educated parents, particularly as a tool to shortlist potential schools. However, she notes that the information is sometimes presented in a complex format that may be challenging to understand for those without strong data and computer literacy. In Goss' view, the value of the data available on My School is limited by the data's presentation. Continuing to refine and simplify data presentation, she notes, would strengthen My School as a tool for parents.

6.2.1 Communications strategy

In the lead-up to the launch of My School, ACARA was tasked with developing and implementing a communications strategy to inform stakeholders about the purpose and functionality of the site.¹⁴² This process included appointing a public relations adviser, identifying audience groups and their key messaging needs, developing timelines, key activities, and an issues and risks register, and utilizing appropriate communication methods and channels.¹⁴³

The initial communications strategy for parents and the broader community included the development of TV and radio commercials,¹⁴⁴ online fact sheets, brochures, and FAQ documents.¹⁴⁵ The My School landing page was also shared prior to release, and e-alerts with site information were disseminated through a registration facility on the ACARA website.¹⁴⁶ Media attention and advocacy also played a large role in informing potential users about My School: ACARA utilized media interviews with key spokespeople and media conferences and school tours with the deputy prime minister and the chair of ACARA to further inform the public about the site.¹⁴⁷ Introductory information sessions on the My School website were also planned during February and March 2010.¹⁴⁸

To assist in preparing the education sector, including teachers, for the launch of My School in 2010, ACARA provided website information to state and territory jurisdictions to foster better connection, preparation, and assistance for schools.¹⁴⁹ Communication materials were also sent to state and territory education authorities ahead of release.¹⁵⁰ At the school level, communications included a presentation on My School by the deputy prime minister delivered at a forum for principals, as well as information packets and supporting materials, including a DVD, that were sent to principals, primarily to explain the purpose of ICSEA.¹⁵¹

Additionally, principals were granted access to their school's page 24 hours before the site launched.¹⁵²

The communications campaign addressing subsequent improvements to the site was also extensive. The updated site was publicly previewed by Prime Minister Julia Gillard, Minister for School Education Peter Garrett, and Chair of ACARA Barry McGaw to demonstrate the changes.¹⁵³ Fact sheets and presentation slides providing information on site changes such as those in the school profile, school finances, NAPLAN results, student progress, ICSEA, and security features were also used.¹⁵⁴

ACARA's role in communicating My School information to the general public has continued through the work of ACARA's communications and strategic relations team.¹⁵⁵ During 2014-2015, ACARA released a video on My School 2015, which was among its most viewed videos. ACARA also sent letters to principals explaining updates and utilized social media posts and newsletter articles to hosting media and stakeholder briefings to communicate information about the 2015 My School release, the independent evaluation of the site and the subsequent government report.¹⁵⁶

6.2.2 Parents

Parents' usage of My School as an informational tool has been mixed. Consumer research undertaken on behalf of ACARA showed that of the 1,001 people in the quantitative sample, 83 percent were aware of the My School website and 42 percent had visited the site.¹⁵⁷ Parents interviewed for the purpose of this case study, as well as those canvassed for earlier reviews of My School, indicate a variety of perspectives on the website's usefulness. The site is used most by parents who are in the process of making decisions about schooling, such as when students are first commencing school, moving from primary to secondary school, or changing

Box 8. Use of My School by parents as a tool to hold schools accountable

Interviews conducted for this case study revealed early anecdotal stories of parents using My School to hold school leaders accountable for performance. At a primary school in Victoria, parents have brought My School data from comparable schools to Parent Council meetings, asking school leaders why results aren't higher at their child's school.

The value of My School can be seen even in areas where connectivity and data literacy levels may be low. In remote indigenous communities, for example, there have been some reports of community leaders sharing school profiles from My School with parents, who have subsequently asked school leaders why their child's school isn't performing as well as statistically similar schools.

schools or neighborhoods.¹⁵⁸ It is particularly useful as a monitoring tool for parents who have chosen a nongovernment school with high fees.¹⁵⁹ Some parents use it to follow the progress of their children's school scores over time or to contextualize their children's scores.¹⁶⁰ Some have said that My School empowers them by providing information they can take to school meetings to demand answers about poor performance (see Box 8).¹⁶¹

6.2.3 Teachers

Interviews for this case study and other early evaluations of My School indicate that individual teachers do not use My School extensively.¹⁶² Some administrators have suggested that teachers could use the site to identify similar schools with strong performance and seek guidance on practice and pedagogy.¹⁶³ However, although there is a strong culture of shared practice within the Australian teaching community, this practice is not typically facilitated through My School.¹⁶⁴ The data provided on My School are generally regarded by teachers as too high level to be able to inform classroom practice.¹⁶⁵ Rather, teachers tend to use the more detailed student-level data that NAPLAN provides to schools.¹⁶⁶

6.2.4 Policymakers

My School data are being used by policymakers to varying degrees to generate evidence for analysis and public discussion of school funding. For example, My School data have been used to confirm assertions made by communities regarding unequal investment in capital and infrastructure in schools.¹⁶⁷ The data also have been helpful in identifying possible inequities in school funding. Data from 2009-2013, for example, show funding increases were greater for more advantaged schools.¹⁶⁸ These data have also helped to facilitate the allocation of extra funding to schools that have not been performing as well as expected. Soon after the release of My School, certain schools identified as having below-average student outcomes were allocated additional funding of \$11 million in total to aid in improving their performance.¹⁶⁹ It is worth noting, however, that efforts to change funding based on My School data may be constrained by the rigidity of the school funding formula, which prescribes funding based on number of students, school type, and capacity of the school community, and loading for factors such as disability and low socio-economic backgrounds.¹⁷⁰

Importantly, My School data have aided in the development of school finance reform in the “Review of Funding for Schooling” (commonly known as the Gonski Review). My School data informed this review, which helped to facilitate the creation of the schooling resource standard, a tool that would allow policymakers to develop school funding mechanisms that allocate funding based on need.¹⁷¹ My School data were very important to this process, as school-level data must be comparable.¹⁷² Tom Bentley, Gillard’s former policy adviser, describes these changes in school financing as “the biggest achievement of My School,” on the basis that this funding reform would not have been possible without the centralized and transparent publication of data provided by My School.¹⁷³ My School enabled comparison and investigation of school funding across states and sectors.

6.2.5 Education researchers

My School has also become a helpful tool for education researchers. It is particularly beneficial for those looking to identify the types or characteristics of individual schools, or as a tool to verify the impacts of interventions in schools (see Box 9).¹⁷⁴ Bentley noted that research such as the Data in Schools report published in March 2016 by the Grattan Institute “is exactly the type of conversation we hoped My School would enable.”¹⁷⁵

Without My School, such stakeholders would not have access to nationally consistent data at the school level.

However, there are limitations to use of My School as a research tool. The infrequency of NAPLAN makes it difficult to discern gains quickly, and the depth of research is limited by the data, which will become richer with time.¹⁷⁶ Many researchers find insufficient access to data and comparison functionality on the site and consequently seek access to the raw data that underlie My School.¹⁷⁷ This involves submission of a data request to ACARA, which can be a lengthy and complex process with no guarantees that the required data will be provided (see Appendix F). Researchers have remarked that easier access to the information sitting behind the site would be valuable.¹⁷⁸ The data access protocols are being revised to facilitate better and more timely access to My School information for researchers.¹⁷⁹

6.3 Revising My School

The My School website has undergone several rounds of revisions since its launch. Between its first and second year in operation, the website’s functionality was significantly improved. Key revisions included an improved search function, new menu items, and increased security measures to guard against misuse of information.

Box 9. Use of My School by researchers

Comparing school-level data allows researchers to analyze the education system at many levels and across several areas such as finance, demographics, and performance. Education researchers Jennifer Buckingham and Trisha Jha at the Center for Independent Studies utilize the data sets behind My School for such purposes. In their publication, “One School Does Not Fit All,” the researchers identified several individual schools to look at more closely, including two schools with disproportionately high ICSEA scores. Jha notes that “we were able to use the My School website to dig a bit deeper to see how that’s changed over time. Now it has five years of data; as My School continues to be updated, it will become stronger as a tool.”

Perhaps the most significant improvement to My School during this stage was an enhancement to ICSEA that improved the accuracy of the index.¹⁸⁰

In September 2015, the Education Council agreed to implement some usability improvements.¹⁸¹ These planned changes are in response to recommendations made by an independent consultant engaged by the Australian government to review My School.¹⁸² Several of the planned changes relate to the usability and readability of the site, including:¹⁸³

- Clarification of the site's purpose, with an increased focus on student progress.
- The inclusion of animated videos explaining the site's general purpose.
- Simplification of content on the home page and in introductory sections.

- Refinement of tools explaining the data, including explanatory fact sheets, a clearer glossary, and a video providing a better visual explanation of ICSEA.
- Improved site accessibility on mobile devices.
- Improved access to data for researchers.

The functionality of the site will also be enhanced. Agreed changes include real-time updates of information as well as improvements in the school comparison function to allow users more choice in comparing schools.¹⁸⁴ Additionally, a broader set of school-level information will be included, moving beyond data on literacy and numeracy and allowing schools to add more information relevant to their school communities.¹⁸⁵ Along with these changes, My School's 2016 release will include eight years of performance data and an additional measure of student attendance.¹⁸⁶ Moving forward, ACARA plans to incorporate disability data at the school level as well.¹⁸⁷

7. CONCLUSIONS

My School was created as a central repository of information about Australian schools, and in this sense it has succeeded. The extent to which it has met broader goals of fostering a culture of transparency and accountability, affected funding decisions about schools, empowered parents to make better decisions about their children’s education, and ultimately improved learning outcomes for Australia’s children is still a matter of debate, according to the various stakeholder and user groups interviewed for this case study.

One thing about which stakeholders agree is that My School is here to stay. The site has been described as “part of the furniture” of the Australian education system.¹⁸⁸ Although at the 2013 federal election the Liberal Party’s policy was to abolish My School,¹⁸⁹ the site has survived the transition through to two Liberal-National Coalition governments. Stakeholders have suggested that this is because there is little demand for change—at least some parents are effectively using My School to keep track of school performance, and operating costs are low in the context of Commonwealth Government and state education budgets.

In the six years since My School’s launch, ACARA has worked hard to improve the platform, regarding it as a “living site”¹⁹⁰ that can constantly be made more useful to parents, schools, and communities through improved functionality, usability, and access to data.

With each iteration of NAPLAN, My School becomes a richer data source that can assist not only parent decisionmaking, but also broader analyses of the Australian school system by policymakers and researchers. Further improvements can continue to be made to open up the data for more sophisticated analysis and research and to make it more user-friendly for parents, schools, researchers, and other stakeholders.

In Australia, My School was a key component of a systemwide approach to improving the performance of Australian schools. Its development was enabled by several factors, including strong political leadership, positive intergovernmental relations, a consistent policy approach, access to technology, and the availability of existing, well-organized data sets. These enabling factors helped to overcome challenges to the site’s implementation, including school choice limitations in Australia, vocal stakeholder opposition, and disagreements regarding the data. Deliberate decisions within the Australian context eased the implementation of My School to ensure that it became “part of the furniture,” and similar considerations will have to be made if thinking of translating the Australian experience to other country contexts around the globe, especially in the absence of comparable enabling conditions. Broadly, in transferring the My School concept, care should be taken to ensure that data are fair and meaningful, as seen with the creation of the ICSEA, and that the differing, and sometimes oppositional, goals of stakeholders are taken into consideration from the outset.

NOTES

1. Gillard, Julia, "My School website to go live tomorrow," press release, January 27, 2010, <<https://ministers.employment.gov.au/gillard/my-school-website-go-live-tomorrow>>.
2. Ibid.
3. Australia Bureau of Statistics, "Number of Schools, Students and Staff," 2015. <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4221.0>>.
4. Australian Constitution, Financial Assistance to the States, § 96.
5. Australian Constitution, Legislative Powers of the Commonwealth, § 51.
6. ACARA (website), April 10, 2016, <<http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum/curriculum.html>>.
7. My School (website), April 10, 2016, <<https://www.myschool.edu.au/>>.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. ACARA, About NAPLAN Fact Sheet, 2015, April 10, 2016, <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/About_NAPLAN_2014_file.pdf>.
11. ACARA, My School Fact Sheet, 2015, April 10, 2016, <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/About_My_School_website.pdf>.
12. My School (website), April 10, 2016, <https://www.myschool.edu.au/>.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. ACARA, About ICSEA Fact Sheet, 2015, April 10, 2016, <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/About_ICSEA_2014.pdf>.
18. Ibid.
19. My School (website), April 10, 2016, <<https://www.myschool.edu.au/>>.
20. See Appendix B.
21. Gillard, Julia, My Story (London: Bantam Press, 2014), 227.
22. See Appendix B.
23. My School (website), April 10, 2016, <<https://www.myschool.edu.au/>>.
24. Gillard, Julia, "My School website to go live tomorrow," press release, January 27, 2010, <<https://ministers.employment.gov.au/gillard/my-school-website-go-live-tomorrow>>.
25. Cook, Grahame, "Review of My School Website: Final Report to the Australian Government Department of Education." Report. Grahame Cook Consulting, 2014, 15.
26. My School (website), April 10, 2016, <<https://www.myschool.edu.au/>>.
27. ACARA, "Interpreting NAPLAN Results, 2016," April 10, 2016, <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Interpreting_NAPLAN_results_file.pdf>.
28. Gillard, Julia, "A National Plan for School Improvement," speech, Parliament of Australia. September 3, 2012. <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/media/pressrel/1891718/upload_binary/1891718.pdf>.
29. National Partnership Agreement on the Nation Building and Jobs Plan: Building Prosperity for the Future and Supporting Jobs Now. Schedule D, Council of Australian Governments (2009), April 10, 2016, <http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/npa/infrastructure/nation_building_and_jobs_plan/national_partnership.pdf>.
30. National Partnership Agreement on the Digital Education Revolution, Australian Government and all State and Territory Governments (2011),

- April 10, 2016, < <https://docs.education.gov.au/node/266>>.
31. My Hospitals (website), April 10, 2016, <<http://www.myhospitals.gov.au/>>.
 32. 2011-12 Australian Government Budget—Budget Paper No. 2, Commonwealth of Australia (2011), April 10, 2016, <<http://www.budget.gov.au/2011-12/content/bp2/download/bp2.pdf>>, 322.
 33. Emerson, Craig, “Gillard Government Reforms Australia’s Trade Policy,” press release, April 12, 2011 <http://trademinister.gov.au/releases/2011/ce_mr_110412.html>.
 34. See Appendix B.
 35. Ibid.
 36. Gillard, “A National Plan for School Improvement.”
 37. See Appendix B.
 38. Gillard, “A National Plan for School Improvement.”
 39. It is worth noting that although the creation of My School was aided by the alignment of interests in light of the predominance of the Labor party across governments, the two major Australian political parties—the Liberal and Labor parties—are more closely aligned than their counterparts in other countries such as the United States. Although My School was conceived and introduced by a federal Labor government, it has survived the transition to two subsequent Liberal Coalition governments and a politically mixed landscape of State and Territory governments.
 40. Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, December 2008. <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf>
 41. COAG, “20 December 2007 Communique,” 2007. <<https://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/Communique%2020%20December%202007.pdf>>.
 42. Cornell-Farrow, Sarah, “Concerning Learning: A Review of My School and Its Potential Applications to Improving Educational Standards in Developing Countries.” Report. 2014, 13.
 43. Ibid.
 44. Senate Education and Employment References Committee, “Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy.” Final Report. 2014, 36.
 45. National Catholic Education Commission, “My School just one reference for quality schools and learning.” News release, March 2015.
 46. The Education Council was formerly known as the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC) and before that the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEEDYA).
 47. Gillard, *My Story*, 421.
 48. Gillard, *My Story*, 249-250.
 49. Australian Government: National Commission of Audit (website), “*Addressing Vertical Fiscal Imbalance*,” <<http://www.ncoa.gov.au/report/appendix-vol-1/8-3-addressing-vertical-fiscal-imbalance.html>>.
 50. See Appendix E.
 51. Harrington, Marilyn, “Australian Government Funding for Schools Explained,” The Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, Background Note, 2011, 16.
 52. New South Wales Government, “Education Amendment (Publication of School Results),” John Hatzistergos Second Reading Speech. 2009. <[http://parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parliament/nswbills.nsf/0/13bb217d82816f6bca2575d8001b5e22/\\$FILE/LC%205709.pdf](http://parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parliament/nswbills.nsf/0/13bb217d82816f6bca2575d8001b5e22/$FILE/LC%205709.pdf)>.
 53. ACARA, “Data Catalogue.” Report. 1st ed. Sydney: 2013.

54. National Assessment Program, "Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy." Report. 2008.
55. ACARA, *Calculating ICSEA Values*. 2014.
56. The Department of Education and Training, "My School updated with improved school attendance data," (December 2014). Media release.
57. Senate Community Affairs References Committee, "Violence, abuse, and neglect against people with disability." Report. 2015.
58. Ibid.
59. Australia Bureau of Statistics / Household Use of Information Technology (object name 8146.0 - Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2012-13), <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/8146.0Chapter12012-13>>.
60. Ibid. In 2012-2013, 96% of households with children under 15 years of age had internet at home.
61. Australia Bureau of Statistics / Household Use of Information Technology (object name 8146.0 - Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2014-15) <<http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/ACC2D18CC958BC7BCA2568A9001393AE?opendocument>>.
62. Ibid.
63. International Telecommunications Union (website), "ICT Development Index 2015," <<http://www.itu.int/net4/ITU-D/idi/2015/>>.
64. OECD, "Skills Outlook 2013: First Results From the Survey of Adult Skills," Report. 2013, 97.
65. Ibid, 87.
66. OECD, *Delivering School Transparency in Australia: National Reporting Through My School*, OECD Publishing, 2012, 10.
67. Gillard, *My Story*, 263.
68. OECD, *Delivering School Transparency*, 16.
69. Australian Education Union Submission, as cited in Senate Education and Employment References Committee, "Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy." Final Report. 2014, 23.
70. Senate Education and Employment References Committee, "Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy," 21.
71. Gillard, *My Story*, 253.
72. Australian Education Union. South Australian Branch. "My School and League Tables—an AEU Proposal." News release, September 02, 2010. Accessed April 18, 2016. <http://www.aeusa.asn.au/465341_465341_14.html>.
73. Gillard, Julia, "Education Union Executives Vote to Shut Down My School," press release, April 12, 2010.
74. Thompson, Greg, "NAPLAN, MySchool and Accountability: Teacher Perceptions of the Effects of Testing," *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 12(2), 2013: 69. <<http://www.iejcomparative.org>>. See also Appendix B.
75. Ibid, 74. See also Appendix B.
76. Ibid.
77. See Appendix B. See also Thompson, Greg, and Allen G. Harbaugh, "The Effects of NAPLAN: Teacher Perceptions of the Impact of NAPLAN on Pedagogy and Curriculum. Effects of Testing," Joint AARE/APERA Conference, Sydney (2012), 17.
78. Gillard, *My Story*, 254.
79. ACARA, "Frequently asked questions about My School," 2009. <http://www.liverpool-h.schools.nsw.edu.au/documents/6391984/6404187/1318053325835_19eb9eec2dddd2dd012e6a90b34b6054.pdf>.
80. See, for example, Australian Capital Territory v Australian Education Union [2010] FWA 3454 (29 April 2010).

81. See Appendix B.
82. Ibid.
83. See Appendix B. See also Australian Government: Department of Education and Training (website), Schools Assistance Act 2008, 2008. <<https://www.education.gov.au/schools-assistance-act-2008>>.
84. Taig, Carolyn, and Cathy North. "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website." Report. Melbourne: Colmar Brunton, 2014, 4.
85. Ibid, 6.
86. Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (EEWRRC), "Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing," 2010, 35.
87. Ibid, 39.
88. Ibid, 42.
89. Ibid, 40.
90. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 16.
91. Ibid.
92. Taig and North, "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website," 41.
93. ACARA, "Frequently asked questions about My School."
94. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 66.
95. Taig and North, "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website."
96. Taig and North, "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website."
97. See Appendix B.
98. "Information for Schools, "School Finances Data—Frequently Asked Questions," 2015.
99. EEWRRC, "Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing," 90.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid, 67.
102. Ibid, 68.
103. See Appendix B.
104. EEWRRC, "Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing," 35-38.
105. See Appendix F.
106. See Appendix B.
107. See Appendix B.
108. Australian Bureau of Statistics (website), 4221.0—Schools, Australia, 2015, <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats%5Cabs@.nsf/o/9448F2F814FA0311CA2579C700118E2D?Opendocument>>.
109. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 16.
110. Taig, Carolyn. *ACARA. Perspectives on the My School Website*. Report. Melbourne: Colmar Brunton, 2014, 7.
111. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 31.
112. The Association of Independent Schools of Queensland, "What Parents Want: An Independent Schools Queensland Survey Key Findings." Report. 2011. 10.
113. ACARA (website), April 10, 2016. <<http://www.acara.edu.au/default.asp>>.
114. See Appendix B.
115. Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, "Questions on Notice Budget Estimates 2013-2014." Report. 2014.
116. Commonwealth of Australia, Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, "Budget 2015-16: Portfolio Budget Statements 2015-16 Budget Related Paper No. 1.5 Education and Training Portfolio," 2015, 103.
117. Ibid, 97.
118. bid, 95.
119. Ibid.

120. Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. "Questions on Notice Supplementary Budget Estimates 2012-13."
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid.
123. Ibid.
124. Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. "Questions on Notice Budget Estimates 2013-14."
125. Ibid.
126. Ibid.
127. Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. "Questions on Notice—My School Website Number of Staff." Report. N.d.
128. Ibid.
129. Ibid.
130. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 25.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid.
133. It is possible to get more detailed usage data from ACARA, but the process of request for the data takes time not compatible with the time period for our report. Refer to Appendix F for more details.
134. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 26.
135. Ibid, 11.
136. See Appendix B.
137. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 11.
138. Taig and North, "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website," 27.
139. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 43.
140. Ibid, 49.
141. Ibid, 53.
142. OECD, *Delivering School Transparency*, 34.
143. Ibid.
144. ACARA, "Annual Report 2009-2010," Report. 2010. 27.
145. OECD, *Delivering School Transparency*, 34.
146. Ibid.
147. Ibid.
148. ACARA, "My School and Beyond," ACARA Update, Issue 2, December 14, 2009. <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_14122009.html>.
149. Ibid.
150. OECD, *Delivering School Transparency*, 134.
151. Ibid.
152. Ibid.
153. ACARA, "Welcome to the ACARA Update," *ACARA Update*, Issue 13 (November 19, 2010). <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_19112010.html>.
154. "ACARA, "What is new in My School Version 2.0," *My School Fact Sheet*, (November 11, 2010). <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_11112010.html>.
155. ACARA, "ACARA Annual Report 2014-2015," Report. 2015. 36.
156. Ibid.
157. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 30.
158. Cook, "Review of My School Website," 31.
159. Ibid, 30.
160. Ibid, 31; See also Taig and North, "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website," 44.
161. See Appendix B.
162. Ross, Mailee. "Teaching & Learning Coach Interview." Capstone team interview. February 19 2016; and Scholem, Marianne, Capstone team interview. February 16, 2016.

163. See Appendix B.
164. See Appendix B.
165. Ibid.
166. Ibid.
167. Gonski, David, Ken Boston, Kathryn Greiner, Carmen Lawrence, Bill Scales, and Peter Tannock, "Review of Funding for Schooling Final Report." Report. 2011, 87.
168. Shepherd, Bernie, and David Gonski, "My School and the Education Market—updated." Report. 2015. 9.
169. EEWRRC, "Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing," 33.
170. Australian Government, "Commonwealth Recurrent Funding Frequently Asked Questions," 2013. <<https://aeaguide.education.gov.au/content/commonwealth-recurrent-funding-frequently-asked-questions#faq3-1>>.
171. Gonski et al., "Review of Funding for Schooling," 156.
172. Ibid, 258.
173. See Appendix B.
174. Ibid.
175. Ibid.
176. Ibid.
177. Ibid.
178. Ibid.
179. ACARA, "Annual Report 2014-2015," 30.
180. ACARA, "My School Version 2," N.d. <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/My_School_Version_2.pdf>.
181. Pyne, Christopher, "My School Website Improvements Agreed," press release, September 18, 2015. See also Australian Government Department of Education, "My School Updated with Improved School Attendance Data," press release, December 2014.
182. Cook, "Review of My School Website."
183. Pyne, Christopher, "My School Website Improvements Agreed." See also Australian Government Department of Education, "My School Updated with Improved School Attendance Data."
184. Ibid.
185. Ibid.
186. Ibid.
187. Nationally Consistent Collection of Data: School Students with Disability. <https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/150420_-_factsheet_-_schools_o.pdf>.
188. See Appendix B.
189. The Nationals for Regional Australia, "The Coalition's Policy for Schools: Students First," August 2013. Report, 2013. <<http://lpaweb-static.s3.amazonaws.com/13-08-29%20The%20Coalition%27s%20Policy%20for%20Schools%20-%20policy%20document.pdf>>.
190. Garrett, Peter, "My School Website to Provide Unprecedented School Performance Data," press release, November 17, 2010.

APPENDIX A. STAKEHOLDER MAP

The following is a list of organizations and individuals whose views have been incorporated into the development of this case study. It represents stakeholders along the full range of the site's life cycle including those involved in its creation, development, or use. The list has been compiled from stakeholders

interviewed for this case study as well as those who contributed submissions and testimony to the 2010 and 2014 Senate inquiry on the administration and reporting of NAPLAN testing.

Please note that the titles included relate to the capacity in which the interviewee spoke with the Capstone team—in some cases, these are former titles if the interviewee has since moved out of the role relevant to My School.

Policy-makers

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
AusGOAL	Baden Appleyard	National program director	Interviewed
Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA)	Anthony Mackay	Inaugural deputy chair	Interviewed
	Barry McGaw	Inaugural Foundation chair	Interviewed
	Peter Hill	Inaugural CEO	Senate inquiry
	Peter Adams	Former general manager, Assessment and Reporting (now senior manager of PISA at OECD)	Interviewed
	Rob Randall	Current CEO	Interviewed
	Stanley Rabinowitz	General manager, Assessment and Reporting	Interviewed
Commonwealth Government	Amanda Lampe	Former chief of staff to Julia Gillard	Interviewed
	Christopher Pyne	Former minister of education (Liberal Party)	Senate inquiry
	Peter Garrett	Former minister of education (Australian Labor Party)	Senate inquiry
	Tom Bentley	Former senior policy adviser to Julia Gillard	Interviewed
Council of Australian Governments (COAG)			Senate inquiry
Australian Department of Education	Gabrielle Phillips	Branch manager for National Data Reform Evidence and Assessment Group	Interviewed
	Lisa Paul	Former department secretary	Interviewed
	Peter Stanistreet	Director of Performance Reform and Measurement team	Interviewed
Department of Education, Tasmania	Sharyn Lidster	General manager, Strategic Policy and Performance	Senate inquiry
Department of Education, New South Wales		Policy-makers	Interviewed

Teachers and unions

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Australian Association for the Teaching of English			Senate inquiry
Australian College of Educators			Senate inquiry
Australian Education Union	Angelo Gavrielatos	Former president	Interviewed
New South Wales Teachers Federation	Robert Lipscombe	Former president	Senate inquiry
Independent Education Union of Australia	Chris Watt	Federal secretary	Senate inquiry
Junee Teachers Association			Senate inquiry
Kandos Public School	Rosey Nelson	Teacher representative	Senate inquiry
New South Wales Teachers Federation			Senate inquiry
Pomona State School	Sharon Melink	Teacher representative	Senate inquiry
Queensland Teachers Union			Senate inquiry
Teach for Australia	Teachers	Teachers	Interviewed
Victorian Association for the Teaching of English			Senate inquiry
Individual teachers	Helen Stearman	Teacher	Senate inquiry
	Jenny Cullen	Teacher	Senate inquiry
	Marianne Scholem	Teacher	Interviewed
	Mailee Ross	Teacher	Interviewed

Schools and associations

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Bouldercombe State School	Dianne Stace	School representative	Senate inquiry
Canley Vale Public School		School representative	Senate inquiry
Cape York Aboriginal Australian Academy			Senate inquiry
Australian Association for the Teaching of English	Danielle Toon	CEO	Interviewed
Chatswood Hills State School	Christine Turner	School representative	Senate inquiry
Eastern Creek Public School		School representative	Senate inquiry
Girraween Public School		School representative	Senate inquiry
Moggill State School		School representative	Senate inquiry
Spensley Street Primary School		School representative	Senate inquiry
Association of Independent Schools, New South Wales	Geoff Newcombe	Executive director	Senate inquiry
Lutheran Education Australia			Senate inquiry

Principals and school leadership

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (AHISA)	Phillip Heath	Director and incoming chair	Senate inquiry
Australian Primary Principals Association	Leonie Trimper	Former president	Senate inquiry
	Norm Hart	Former president	Senate inquiry
Australian Secondary Principals Association			Senate inquiry
New South Wales Primary Principals' Association			Senate inquiry
New South Wales Secondary Principals Council			Senate inquiry
Queensland Association of State School Principals			Senate inquiry
Western Australia Primary Principals Association	Stephen Breen	President	Senate inquiry
Mount Druitt Campus of Chifley College			Senate inquiry
Australian Council for Educational Leaders			Senate inquiry

Education Researchers

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Brookings Institution	Joshua Muskin	Researcher	Interviewed
Centre for Independent Studies	Trisha Jha	Researcher	Interviewed
Grattan Institute	Ben Jensen	Director of school education	Senate inquiry
	Pete Goss	Strategy consultant/ school education program director	Interviewed
Whitlam Institute	John Polesel	Researcher	Senate inquiry
	Nicky Dulfer	Researcher	Senate inquiry
	Suzanne Rice	Researcher	Senate inquiry
Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)	Geoff Masters	Director and incoming chair	Senate inquiry
	Glenn Rowley	Director and incoming chair	Senate inquiry
	John Ainley	Director and incoming chair	Senate inquiry
	Siek Toon Khoo	Director and incoming chair	Senate inquiry
	Ray Adams	Director, Centre for Education Monitoring	Interviewed
	Sara Goss	Independent education consultant	Interviewed
Need to Succeed	Chris Bonnor	Researcher	Interviewed
Grahame Cook Consulting	Grahame Cook	Director	Interviewed

Parents and parent associations

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Associations	Elizabeth Singer	President	Senate inquiry
	Megan Bagworth	Policy officer	Senate inquiry
	Warren Muller	Parents and Citizens delegate	Senate inquiry
Australian Parents Council Inc.		Researcher	Senate inquiry
New South Wales Parents' Council			Senate inquiry
Queensland Council for Parents and Citizens' Associations			Senate inquiry

Education commentators

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Sydney Morning Herald	Anna Patty	Journalist	Senate inquiry
	Amy McNeilage	Journalist	Senate inquiry
	Alexandra Smith	Journalist	Senate inquiry
The West Australian	Andrew Tillett	Journalist	Senate inquiry

Teacher education

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
School of Education, Deakin University			Senate inquiry
University of Western Australia	David Andrich	Professor	Senate inquiry
James Cook University	Peter Ridd	Professor	Senate inquiry

International organizations

Role	Individual	Title (as relevant)	Type of engagement
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)			Senate inquiry

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW INSIGHTS

The following are the main insights from 24 interviews conducted for the case study. The thoughts included represent views from a variety of stakeholders who were involved in the establishment of My School, in its ongoing operation, or as users. Stakeholders include parents, teachers, researchers, government officials, union officials, and administrative officials.

Rationale for My School

- My School was part of a broader national agenda of education reform; its power comes from being part of a coherent approach to systemwide reform.
- Transparency and nationally consistent data supported the Commonwealth Government's policy goal to create an education system that fosters equity and provides a productive workforce.
 - Transparency was an explicit objective behind the conceptualization of My School.
- My School was designed to address a clear problem: lack of access to consistent information on Australian schools.
- My School was designed to help start the conversation on issues in education.
- My School was established to provide increased access to information in a consistent format to foster a shared understanding of the issues facing Australian schools and the broader education system.
- Public reporting about schools on My School serves as an important component of account-

ability in the Australian educational context both at the school and the system level.

- However, accountability in the Australian context must be understood differently than in other countries such as the United States, since there is no practice of closing schools that are poorly performing.
- My School was part of the broader school choice movement that sought to raise education quality and address the needs of parents.

Stakeholder Perspectives

Teachers and unions

- Teachers generally do not talk about or use My School because the information is too high level to provide meaningful, classroom-level analysis. There are alternative ways for teachers and school leaders to get information such as student-level NAPLAN data.
- While there is a strong practice of sharing pedagogical best practices between schools, this is primarily facilitated by relationships and networks rather than by My School.
- While My School cannot inform detailed practice at the classroom level, it may be able to provide comparative snapshots that foster important conversations.
- Teachers may have difficulty accessing the information on the site due to insufficient levels of data literacy and the presentation of data on the site, which at times can be confusing.
- The publication of NAPLAN results raised concerns among schools and teachers about the

creation of league tables and the inappropriate use of aggregated NAPLAN scores as a measure of school performance.

- Teachers and unions expressed concern that publication of school-level results on My School could result in a high-stakes learning environment, placing undue pressure on students.
- The boycott of the NAPLAN test by the Australian Education Union, which arose because of these concerns, resulted in the creation of a working group to review the site. From this work, My School was revised, limiting the site's information, functionality, and data accessibility. The process was successful in addressing the union's key concerns.
- A key component that brought stakeholders to the negotiating table was limiting school comparisons on the site to those between statistically similar schools.
- My School places pressure on schools with low standardized test scores to try to limit negative perceptions of the school that result from the publication of NAPLAN scores. There is anecdotal evidence of schools including more test preparation during instruction and negative effects of testing burnout and stress on students.
- Concerns have been raised about low morale of students, parents, and teachers resulting from the publication of low NAPLAN scores.

Parents and community leaders

- My School is useful to parents who possess the literacy and numeracy skills to understand the information. These tend to be parents who are informed and educated, often from a high

socio-economic background, and often parents in nongovernment school communities.

- Parents of higher performing students seem to use My School more frequently than parents of lower performing students to monitor the progress of their child's school and identify alternative schools for their children if necessary.
- Parents who pay higher school fees are more interested in My School as a tool to aid in accountability.
- The site is inaccessible to disadvantaged parents who do not possess the skills necessary to interpret the data. As a result, some teachers at marginalized schools report having had no conversations with parents about My School.
- Indigenous communities in particular have low levels of internet access and education, likely limiting their ability to use the website.
- For those parents who are able to use the site, it is useful as one of several tools in the school choice process, for example, to compare schools in the area. Visiting possible schools to gain a better sense of the school culture is still seen as highly necessary and valuable in the process.
- If a family can't afford to move or pay for independent school fees, school choice is limited to two or three schools in Australia. This limits My School's usefulness as a tool for school choice.
- Some parents have used My School to push for accountability by using information comparing a school's performance to that of similar schools, in order to call for improvements from school leadership.

- Some community leaders, especially in remote areas, have used information from My School about similar schools achieving better educational outcomes to push school leaders for improvements.
- My School is not a stand-alone guide to school quality; it is just one of several sources.

Researchers

- Some education researchers have used the site for fact-checking; however, they found that the data provided on the site are usually not strong enough to cite as conclusive.
- ICSEA is a key feature of My School, which allows researchers to compare different groups of schools and the performance of their students.
- The information on My School has been used by education researchers to analyze levels of school funding. Issues such as unequal funding between school sectors and inefficiencies in funding models have been identified through this research.
- Many education researchers would like greater access to the raw data sets that underlie My School, so that they can run their own analyses on the data rather than being restricted to the way in which it is presented on the site.
- Members of the open data community have expressed concern that the restrictions on data access introduced to mitigate the concerns of teachers and unions undermine the objectives of transparency and openness that My School was intended to address.

Policymakers

- My School enables more informed policymaking.
- My School fosters debates on school funding, and one of its greatest contributions was providing the centralized information necessary to enable the Gonski reforms to school funding.
- Some policymakers perceived My School as a strategy of the Commonwealth Government to increase visibility and control over policy areas traditionally in the purview of the states and territories.
- Although state-level policymakers previously had reasonable access to data on schools in their own states, My School enabled meaningful comparisons across states, which was a helpful tool for policymaking.

Journalists

- Journalists use My School to highlight good and poor performance in schools, particularly those that receive more or less funding than average.

Enabling factors

Policy window

- My School resulted from the strong leadership of Julia Gillard, who made a personal commitment toward promoting My School as a tool to increase transparency about the performance of Australian schools.
- The unique time of political alignment among the Commonwealth, states, and territories helped to pave the way for My School's implementation.

- It should be noted, however, that since My School was poorly received by the teachers unions, which are influential stakeholders in Australian Labor Party politics, the strong Labor alignment across all states and territories and the Commonwealth was also in some ways a challenge.
- Differences between political parties are less acute than in other country contexts, which may also have allowed for My School's negotiation and continuation.
- However, although My School was an Australian Labor Party policy, it angered the unions and did not reflect the traditional liberal approach to education; as a result, the nationwide alignment of Labor governments was in some ways a challenge as well as an enabler.
- Education was a policy focus when My School was developed, and a significant amount of energy and money was poured into the sector.
- Accountability and transparency were being promoted across all sectors by the states, territories, and the Commonwealth at the time of My School's development.
- The structure and legal nature of ACARA was important in fostering state buy-in of My School. The statutory authority includes state representatives and representatives from Independent and Catholic school sectors.
- Delivery of My School is made easier by ACARA's establishment as an independent agency whose responsibilities are prescribed by legislation rather than as a government department.
- It was helpful but not a precondition that NAPLAN had been set up under the previous government and did not have to be created along with My School.
- A long history of the government developing and sharing data predated My School and helped make it acceptable.
- The data used by My School are information schools already produce from their daily operations, which helped to facilitate development of the site.

Structural factors

- Implementation of My School depended largely on the centralized education funding structure that exists in Australia.
 - Involvement of states and territories was ensured by predating federal funding on their participation in NAPLAN and reporting of My School data. Without this leverage, it is unlikely the Commonwealth would have been able to persuade independent schools and state governments to participate.
- ### **Technical Considerations**
- For most schools, there is a centralized data system that is able to process the necessary information. A small group of schools do not have the necessary technological capacity; for these schools, support is provided through, for example, help desks.
 - Connections with software companies also enable the development and management of the data.
 - To assist in data management and indicator development for My School, there is cross-over between ACARA and the Australian government within working groups and committees.

- ICSEA relies heavily on the parental background variables, which may not be available in other countries.

Transferability of My School to other country contexts

- My School was a unique Australian creation; however, the concept behind it regarding educational performance is transferable in its basic components. The tool would need to be carefully calibrated to the circumstances in each individual country.
- The issues in the Australian educational context for which My School was designed differ from those in developing countries, and the relevance of a system such as My School may be limited in a different context.
- In transferring the My School concept to other country contexts, care should be taken to ensure fairness of the data and functions provided.
- A tool such as ICSEA to enable comparisons of statistically similar schools should be a priority feature to ensure meaningful information is provided when transferring the My School concept to other contexts.
- Good management and expertise are critical to a My School setup. The platform design and data analytics can be outsourced if necessary.

Opportunities for improvement

- Discussion and engagement on potential indicators to include on the site continues, as, for example, with disability data. Ministers have raised concerns regarding privacy issues with the inclusion of this information.

- The process for including additional data on the site can take a large amount of time and stakeholder involvement due to an expectation in the Australian context that to be a fair measure, an indicator must be applied to all jurisdictions. Thus all indicators must be universal and reach full agreement.
- ACARA has shifted its focus on My School to being one of gain and growth of schools rather than focusing only on achievement. This highlights schools that show improvements, providing the opportunity for more “winners” in the education system and for more constructive conversations.
- The debate around My School has quieted as the site has been revised over time and priorities have shifted to other areas.
- My School does not provide a holistic view of how schools are doing or their efforts to support students. Adding more information to provide a more holistic view of the school would improve My School’s relevance. This could include information on school culture and satisfaction, or further testing data such as the OECD’s PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) testing or science testing.
- My School could provide information on value added and how much a school improves the lives of its students over the course of several years rather than a single year’s results (although this would, of course, raise its own set of challenges).
- My School could be better adapted for teachers’ needs as a tool to improve classroom-level practice.
- Making the data easier to understand and more accessible would improve My School’s usability.

- My School could be improved for research by enabling greater access to the underlying data.
- Nevertheless, My School is now part of the furniture of the Australian education system and is unlikely to be dismantled in the future.

APPENDIX C. ICSEA

Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage values are calculated on a scale that has a median of 1000 and a standard deviation of 100.¹ A value on the index corresponds to the average level of socio-educational advantage of the school's student population relative to that of other schools. This captures and separates out the likely benefits to a child of coming from a well-educated family, in order to better isolate the distinct causal effect of the school on the child's academic performance.

On My School, a school's ICSEA value is used to select a comparison group of up to 60 schools serving

students from statistically similar backgrounds. The schools may be geographically diverse and may have different facilities and resources. The important thing is that, on average, the students have a similar level of socio-educational advantage.

ACARA has put substantial effort into improving ICSEA over time to make it more robust and stable. Various stakeholders were sensitive to unfair comparisons of schools through league tables. ICSEA was developed to help ensure fair comparisons between schools. In 2010, the construction of the index was based on two data sources: student enrollment records and Australian Bureau of Statistics census data.

¹ OECD, *Delivering School Transparency*, 28.

APPENDIX D. SELECTED EARLY EVALUATIONS

Several reviews and studies of My School have been conducted in recent years. Below is a list of select key publications with a brief summary of their findings.

Formal reviews and assessments

Cook, Grahame. (2014). “Review of My School Website: Final Report to the Australian Government Department of Education.” Grahame Cook Consulting.

Commissioned by the Australian Department of Education, this review was drafted to determine the effectiveness of the site’s usability and its ability to address the needs of the education reform agenda. The review found the usability of the site to be constrained because of the need to limit the creation of league tables from its data as well as because of the complex nature of the data the site provides. The level of contextual information about schools as desired by parents was also found to be limited. Regarding site usage, the review identified declining but still substantial utilization of the site. The school profile page, NAPLAN results in numbers, and NAPLAN results in graphs garnered the most page views. The review also indicates that some parents use the site to assist in school selection or to contextualize their child’s NAPLAN scores, but that only a minority of parents use the site. Recommendations emanating from the review include refocusing the site on the parent/school accountability relationship, making steps to increase the usability of the site, and broadening the amount of contextual information the site provides.

Taig, Carolyn, and Cathy North. (2014). “ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website.” Colmar Brunton.

This review was commissioned by ACARA to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of the My School website in serving its target audience and enhancing transparency and accountability. The researchers facilitated 10 focus groups including parents, principals, and ACARA partners. The researchers found mixed responses to questions assessing My School’s effectiveness, both within and among stakeholder groups. Regarding parents, the findings suggest parents view the availability of information on My School positively and use the site as a starting point when choosing schools for their children, in addition to other sources of information. Concerns were raised by a variety of focus group members about the accuracy of the information on the site in depicting school-level realities in areas of finance and learning. Regarding school-level transparency, there was agreement that having information in one place made it more accessible. My School was also generally not seen to facilitate student performance evaluation within schools or parent engagement with schools.

Senate inquiries

Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee. (2010). “Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing.”

This document is a compilation of submissions and testimony from the Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee hearing on the administration and reporting of NAPLAN testing in response to allegations of cheating and manipulating test results in May 2010. The documentation contains background information on NAPLAN testing and the concerns surrounding its administration; stakeholder perspectives regarding the publication of test results on the My School website are also included. Focal topics addressed in the report cover the quality of student and school information provid-

ed on the website as well as how teaching quality and students' educational experiences are affected by publication of test results on My School. Also included is discussion of possible safeguards and protocols that may be utilized to mitigate negative effects as well as recommendations from the committee for each topic area. Finally, international approaches to publishing similar types of information is explored.

Senate Education and Employment References Committee. (2014). "Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy," Final Report.

This document includes submissions and testimony from the Senate Education and Employment References Committee hearing in 2013 on the effectiveness of NAPLAN testing. An update on the recommendations from the 2010 hearing on the administration of NAPLAN is included as well as discussion of NAPLAN's objectives, whether they have been achieved, and unintended consequences. The effects of NAPLAN testing on students, teachers, and schools are also explored, including the impact of publishing test results on My School. The report closes with consideration of possible improvements for NAPLAN testing as well as international best practice of standardized testing.

Academic studies

Thompson, Greg. (2013). "NAPLAN, MySchool and Accountability: Teacher perceptions of the effects of testing." *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 12(2), 62-84.

This paper discusses results of a teacher survey conducted in Western Australia and South Australia that sought educators' views on the impact of NAPLAN on learning, the impact of NAPLAN on relationships

with parents, and any negative impacts of the testing. The study found that NAPLAN and the publication of results on My School fostered more focus on and cohesive approaches to literacy and numeracy and pedagogies in schools. Also, increases in student stress and anxiety in addition to less inclusive pedagogies were reported because of the need for schools to be regarded as doing well or improving on My School. Survey results also found a negative change in teacher-parent relationships in part because of comparisons on My School.

International reports

OECD. (2012). *Delivering School Transparency in Australia: National Reporting Through My School*. OECD Publishing.

This publication discusses the process of creating and implementing My School, including components essential for the policy's success. The educational context of Australia leading up to My School is described, including the challenges of achievement and equity. The report then highlights the development of the NAPLAN testing regime and the subsequent government commitment to greater transparency and accountability that led to public debate around publishing school-level data on My School. In this process, the report enumerates various challenges the site's implementation faced and how they were managed. Moving into the creation of My School itself, the report highlights the construction of the policy and its technical details as developed by the working group. Key factors to the policy's success are distilled, including strong leadership, preparedness to manage opposition, marshaling the evidence, effective decisionmaking, and long-term planning. To conclude, the report discusses the launch of My School and the development of version 2.0.

APPENDIX E. CENTRALIZED FUNDING LEGISLATION

Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations (November 2008)²

The Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations (IGAFFR) established a new financial framework for federal relations with the states and territories and is often described as the most significant reform of Australia's federal financial relations in decades.³ The IGAFFR sought to improve the well-being of all Australians through collaborative working arrangements that clearly defined roles and responsibilities as well as fair and sustainable financial arrangements; focused on long-term policy development and enhanced government service delivery; enhanced public accountability through simpler, standardized, and more transparent performance reporting by all jurisdictions; and equalized fiscal capacities between states and territories. Under the IGAFFR, the Commonwealth's Treasury processes all payments centrally and then distributes the funds directly to each state. The state treasuries are then responsible for distributing funds within their respective jurisdictions. The IGAFFR also established National Agreements with the states and territories, which defined the objectives, outcomes, outputs, and performance indicators of specific policy areas, and clarified the roles and responsibilities that would guide the Commonwealth and the states and territories in the delivery of services across a particular sector. One of the National Agreements es-

tablished under IGAFFR was the National Education Agreement, a plan for all Australian students to acquire the knowledge and skills to participate effectively in society and employment in a globalized economy.

National Education Agreement (January 2009)⁴

The National Education Agreement put forth education reporting requirements as a condition of funding for government schools. The NEA sets out nationally agreed-upon objectives, outcomes, and performance benchmarks and also provides a performance reporting framework that is designed to measure achievements of objectives and outcomes. Through the NEA, the Australian government would provide states with \$18 billion in funding to meet the costs of delivering schooling. As a condition of funding, states and territories were required to provide the Commonwealth with the school data underpinning My School. To secure funding under the NEA, states and territories were required to produce the following: streamlined and consistent reports on national progress, including an annual national report on the outcomes of schooling in Australia; national reporting on performance of individual schools to inform parents and caregivers and for evaluation by governments of school performance; plain language student reports to parents and caregivers; and an annual report made publicly available to the school community on the school's achievements and other contextual information. The NEA prioritized accountability and reporting for three specific reasons:

² COAG, *Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations*. Report. 2011. <http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/intergovernmental_agreements.aspx>.

³ Australian Government, Federal Register of Legislation. Schools Assistance Act 2008. <<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2014C00004>>.

⁴ COAG, *The National Education Agreement*, Report. 2008. <https://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/20081129_national_education_agreement_factsheet.pdf>

- 1) To increase accountability to students, parents, caregivers, and community.
- 2) To provide public accountability in support of outcomes by the Council of Australian Governments.
- 3) To improve the evidence base to support future policy reforms and system improvements.

Schools Assistance Act/Schools Assistance Regulations 2009^{5 6}

The Schools Assistance Act 2008 granted financial assistance for independent and Catholic primary and

secondary schools from 2009 to 2013. Its accompanying School Assistance Regulations 2009 set out school performance and transparency requirements for independent and Catholic schools as a condition of this funding. These reporting requirements mirrored those of the NEA and addressed reporting on student assessments, schooling outcomes, and school information. The Schools Assistance Act also set out how this information was to be publicized to parents and the broader community.

⁵ Australian Government, Federal Register of Legislation. Schools Assistance Act 2008.

⁶ Australian Government, Federal Register of Legislation Schools Assistance Regulations 2009. <<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2013C00864>>.

APPENDIX F. ACARA DATA REQUEST PROCESS

The process of acquiring data from ACARA has several steps.

Application

Applicants must review the data protocols and accurately fill out the data acquisition application (http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_data_access_application_process.html). This may require that the applicant become familiar with names of data sets used by ACARA and the availability of specific data sets. Data requests can be submitted at any point and may be changed by the applicant. However, amended applications are treated as a new application.

Review

The data request application will then be reviewed by the ACARA Data Request Panel if it is a general request or by the ACARA Research and Data Committee if it is a request for unpublished data.

Elements considered in the approval process include:

- The applicant having institutional ethics clearance
- The amount of resources ACARA would need to commit to complete the request
- Whether the research would benefit students, schools, and the Australian community
- The ability of the project to maintain confidentiality of the data
- Whether the list of data requested is specified in sufficient detail

- There is sufficient information about the intended use of the data
- Whether ACARA has the technical ability to execute the request
- Possible outcomes of the research
- How the information may be published (in aggregated, de-identified form)
- An applicant's previous history of adherence to data acquisition agreements

This process generally takes four to eight weeks; however, this time frame may be extended if the application is incomplete and must be amended by the applicant, in which case the application is treated as a new application.

Agreement

Upon approval of the data request, a legal agreement between the applicant and ACARA must be completed and signed. This agreement stipulates the data to be delivered, the permitted use of the data, any fees involved in preparation (if the data require extraction and quality assurance services by ACARA, a fee will be levied to cover this cost), responsibilities of those authorized to use the data, and legal recourse ACARA will follow if the agreement is broken.

Once the legal agreement has been sent, the applicant has three to four weeks to respond and return a signed copy of the agreement to ACARA. If changes are made to the approved application that involve requesting new data or changing the use of data planned by the project, the application must be revised and resubmitted. It will then be treated as a new application. ACARA's work on the data request will not begin until the legal agreement is signed and all fees are collected.

Delivery

Once all of the previously outlined steps are completed, ACARA will begin completing the data request and will deliver it through a secured FTP (File Transfer Protocol).

Time frame

The time frame established for delivering the data to the applicant is established on a case-by-case basis.

Elements impacting the delivery timetable include how large or complicated the data request is, finalization of the agreement, availability of the data, the number of applicants waiting for data, ACARA's available resources (for example, there can be significant delays between September and April, which coincides with ACARA's peak period for release of My School).

My School Data Acquisition Timetable

- Process can begin **six months** after the data is published on My School.
- **Four to eight** weeks for ACARA to process the data request
 - This can be extended if the application is not accepted and must be revised.
- **Three to four weeks** for legal agreement signing window
 - Changes made at this point may extend the process if the application needs to be reconsidered.
- **ACARA begins work** on the data request once fees are received and the legal agreement is signed.
- **Delivery** time frame of the data is dependent upon the request and the availability of ACARA's resources

REFERENCES

- ACARA (website). "Promoting world-class curriculum and assessment." April 10, 2016. <http://www.acara.edu.au/reporting/national_report_on_schooling_2009/national_initiatives_and_achievements/curriculum_and_assessment.html>.
- ACARA. "Frequently asked questions about My School," 2009. <http://www.liverpool-h.schools.nsw.edu.au/documents/6391984/6404187/1318053325835_19eb9eec2ddd2dd012e6a90b34b6054.pdf>.
- ACARA. "My School and Beyond," ACARA Update, Issue 2, December 14, 2009. <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_14122009.html>.
- ACARA. "Welcome to the ACARA Update," ACARA Update, Issue 13, November 19, 2010. <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_19112010.html>.
- ACARA. "What is new in My School Version 2.0," My School Fact Sheet, November 11, 2010. <http://www.acara.edu.au/acara_update_11112010.html>.
- ACARA. "Data Catalogue." Report. 1st ed. Sydney: 2013.
- ACARA. "Fair Comparisons: My School Website Released for 2015." News release, March 5, 2015.
- ACARA. "Latest Performance of My School Puts Performance in Spotlight." News release, March 13, 2013.
- ACARA. "My School Updated and Improved for 2016." News release, March 9, 2016.
- ACARA. "My School Website Launched Today." News release, January 28, 2010.
- ACARA. "Release of My School 2014." News release, March 5, 2014.
- ACARA. "Understanding ICSEA." YouTube. 2015. Accessed April 15, 2016. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J5wCfuJrS84>>.
- ACARA. About ICSEA. 2015.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2008-2009. Report. 2009.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2009-2010. Report. 2010.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2010-2011. Report. 2011.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2011-2012. Report. 2012.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2012-2013. Report. 2013.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2013-2014. Report. 2014.
- ACARA. Annual Report 2014-2015. Report. 2015.
- ACARA. Data Access Program Guidelines. Report. 2013.
- ACARA. Interpreting NAPLAN Results. 2016.
- ACARA. My School Fact Sheet. 2015.
- ACARA. My School FAQs. 2015.
- ACARA. My School Version 2. PDF. <http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/My_School_Version_2.pdf>.
- ACARA. Summary of Data Access Process; Report. 2013.
- Adams, Peter. "General Manager, Assessment (now Head of PISA) Interview." Capstone team interview. March 30 2016.
- Adams, Ray. "Director, Centre for Education Monitoring Interview." Capstone team interview. April 12, 2016.
- Appleyard, Baden. "National Program Director Interview." Capstone team interview. February 1, 2016.
- The Association of Independent Schools of Queensland. What Parents Want: An Independent Schools Queensland Survey. Report. Independent Schools Queensland, 2015.
- Australia Bureau of Statistics / Household Use of Information Technology (object name 8146.0 - Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2012-13), <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/8146.0Chapter12012-13>>.

- Australian Education Union Submission as cited in Senate Education and Employment References Committee, "Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy," Final Report. 2014, 23.
- Australian Education Union. South Australian Branch. "My School and League Tables - an AEU Proposal." News release, September 02, 2010. Accessed April 18, 2016. <http://www.aeusa.asn.au/465341_465341_14.html>.
- Australian Government Department of Education and Training. "Making My School Better." <<https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/makingmyschoolbetteronepage.pdf>>.
- Australian Government Department of Education and Training, "My School updated with improved school attendance data," News release, December 2014.
- Australian Government Department of Education and Training. Reporting to the Community on School Programs and Performance. Report. 2006.
- Australian Government Department of Education and Training. Review of the Australian Curriculum. Assessment and Reporting Authority. Report. 2015.
- Australian Government. "Commonwealth Recurrent Funding Frequently Asked Questions," 2013. <<https://aeaguide.education.gov.au/content/commonwealth-recurrent-funding-frequently-asked-questions#faq3-1>>.
- Australian Government. "Study in Australia," <<https://www.studyinaustralia.gov.au/global/australian-education/schools>>.
- Australian Government, Federal Register of Legislation Schools Assistance Regulations 2009. <<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2013C00864>>.
- Australian Government, Federal Register of Legislation. Schools Assistance Act 2008. <<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2014C00004>>.
- Australian Government. Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Report. 2012.
- Australian Government. The Effectiveness of NAPLAN—My School Website Number and Staff. Transcript.
- Australian Government. "Report on the Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing." Report. 2011.
- Australian Government: National Commission of Audit (web-site). "Addressing Vertical Fiscal Imbalance." April 12 2016. <<http://www.ncoa.gov.au/report/appendix-vol-1/8-3-addressing-vertical-fiscal-imbalance.html>>.
- Australian National Audit Office. Digital Education Revolution Program—National Secondary Schools Computer Fund. Report. 2011. Beamish, Peter and Morey, Peter. (2013). "School Choice: What Parents Choose," *TEACH Journal of Christian Education* 7, no. 1, Article 7.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (web-site), 4221.0 - Schools, Australia, 2015. <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats%5Cabs@.nsf/0/9448F2F814FA0311CA2579C700118E2D?Opendocument>>
- Beamish, Peter and Morey, Peter. (2013). "School Choice: What Parents Choose," *TEACH Journal of Christian Education* 7, no. 1, Article 7.
- Beavis, Adrian. (2004). "Why Parents Choose Public or Private Schools," *Research Developments* 12, Article 3.
- Bentley, Tom. "Former Senior Policy Advisor to Julia Gillard Interview." Capstone team interview. March 22, 2016.
- Bilmoria, Gool. "Leader of National and Cross-Sectoral Policy, NSW Department of Education Interview." Capstone team interview. February 4, 2016.
- Bonnor, Chris, and Bernie Shepherd. "School Daze: What My School Really Says About Our Schools." Working paper. 2016.

- Bonnor, Chris, and Bernie Shepherd. "School Funding and Achievement: Following the Money Trail." Report. 2015.
- Bonnor, Chris, and Bernie Shepherd. "Equity in Australian Schooling: An Update." Report. 2014.
- Bonnor, Chris, and Bernie Shepherd. "Gonski, My School, and the Education Market." Report. 2015.
- Bonnor, Chris. "Researcher at Need to Succeed Interview." Capstone team interview. February 23, 2016.
- Buckingham, Jennifer, and Trisha Jha. "One School Does Not Fit All." Report. Vol. 9. Center for Independent Studies. 2016.
- COAG. Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations. Report. 2011. <http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/intergovernmental_agreements.aspx>.
- COAG. National Education Agreement Fact Sheet. 2008.
- COAG. The National Education Agreement, Report. 2008. <https://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/20081129_national_education_agreement_factsheet.pdf>
- Cobbold, Trevor. "Higher Funding Loadings Are Needed for Schools with Greater Concentrations of Disadvantaged Students." Policy brief. Save Our Schools, 2014.
- Commonwealth of Australia, Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. Budget 2015-16: Portfolio Budget Statements 2015-16 Budget Related Paper No. 1.5 Education and Training Portfolio, (2015), 103.
- Cook, Grahame. "Director of Grahame Cook Consulting Interview." Capstone team interview. February 24, 2016.
- Cook, Grahame. "Review of My School Website: Final Report to the Australian Government Department of Education." Report. Grahame Cook Consulting, 2014.
- Cornell-Farrow, Sarah. "Concerning Learning: A Review of My School and Its Potential Applications to Improving Educational Standards in Developing Countries." Report. 2014.
- Cumming, J. Joy. *Valuing Students with Impairment: International Comparisons of Practice in Educational Accountability*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012.
- Dawkins, Peter. "Australian Perspectives on Benchmarking: The Case of School Education." Benchmarking in Federal Systems Roundtable Proceedings. Melbourne. December 19-20, 2010.
- Dulfer, Nicky, John Polesel, and Suzanne Rice. "The Experience of Education: The Impacts of High Stakes Testing on School Students and Their Families." Report. Whitlam Institute, 2012.
- Education Amendment (Publication of School Results) Bill 2009. New South Wales Parliament. June 24, 2009. <[http://parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/nswbills.nsf/0/13bb217d82816f6bca2575d8001b5e22/\\$FILE/LC5709.pdf](http://parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/nswbills.nsf/0/13bb217d82816f6bca2575d8001b5e22/$FILE/LC5709.pdf)>.
- Educational Council. "Fifth Education Council Meeting Communique." News release, May 29, 2015.
- Egan, Sarah. "Leader of National and Cross-Sectoral Policy, NSW Department of Education Interview." Capstone team interview. February 4, 2016.
- Emerson, Craig, Minister for Trade and Competitiveness, Australia. "Gillard Government Reforms Australia's Trade Policy." News release, April 12, 2011. <http://trademinister.gov.au/releases/2011/ce_mr_110412.html>.
- "Families Lack of Access to Home Computer and Internet a Challenge for National Curriculum—The Smith Family." The Smith Family. April 1, 2014. <<https://www.thesmithfamily.com.au/media-centre/2014/04/01/11/03/010414-Families-lack-of-access-to-home-computer-and-internet-a-challenge-for-national-curriculum>>.

- Figlio, David, and Susanna Loeb, "School Accountability." In Eric A. Hanushek, Stephen Machin, and Ludger Woessmann, eds., *Handbooks in Economics*, Vol. 3, The Netherlands: North-Holland, 2011.
- Gable, Alison, and Bob Lingard. "NAPLAN and the Performance Regime in Australian Schooling: A Review of the Policy Context." Report. 5th paper. University of Queensland Social Policy Unit, 2013.
- Garrett, Peter. "Ministers Agree to Nationwide Data Collection to Support Students with Disability." News release, May 10, 2013.
- Garrett, Peter. "My School Website to Provide Unprecedented School Performance Data." News release, November 17, 2010.
- Garrett, Peter. "School Funding Review—Have Your Say." News release, December 16, 2010.
- Gavrielatos, Angelo. "Former President of Australian Education Union Interview." Capstone team interview. March 3, 2016.
- "Gillard Government Reforms Australia's Trade Policy." Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. April 12, 2011. <http://trademinister.gov.au/releases/2011/ce_mr_110412.html>.
- Gillard, Julia (Prime Minister, Australia). "Address to the 4th Annual Australian National Schools Network Forum." Minister's Media Centre. Speech, November 17, 2009. <<https://ministers.employment.gov.au/>>.
- Gillard, Julia (Prime Minister, Australia). "A Future Fair for All—School Funding in Australia." Media Centre. Speech, April 15, 2010. <<https://ministers.employment.gov.au/>>.
- Gillard, Julia (Prime Minister, Australia). "A National Plan for School Improvement." Speech, September 3, 2012. <<https://pmtranscripts.dpmc.gov.au/release/transcript-18913>>.
- Gillard, Julia. "ABS Release: Australian Schools 2007." News release, February 29, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Address to the 4th Annual Australian National Schools Network Forum." News release, November 17, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority." News release, June 3, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Australian Education Bill Passes the Parliament." News release, June 26, 2013.
- Gillard, Julia. "Better Schools: A National Plan for School Improvement." News release, September 3, 2012.
- Gillard, Julia. "CEO Australian Curriculum, Assessment & Reporting Authority." News release, September 9, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "COAG Agrees on New National Education Authority." News release, October 2, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "Delivering the Education Revolution." News release, February 24, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "An Education Revolution to Secure Our Economic Future." News release, March 13, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "Education Revolution in Our Schools." News release, August 27, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "Education Union Executive Votes to Shut Down My School." News release, April 12, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Extra Support for 40 Queensland Schools." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Extra Support for Tasmanian Schools." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Fairer School Funding and Higher Standards under Australian Education Bill." News release, June 4, 2013.
- Gillard, Julia. "Government to Introduce 'My University' Website." News release, March 3, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "High Quality Education for Every Australian Child." News release, November 28, 2012.

- Gillard, Julia. "Historic Education Reform Agreement." News release, November 30, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "Improving Teacher Quality, Literacy and Numeracy and Support for Disadvantaged Students." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Literacy and Numeracy Pilots Forum." News release, March 18, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "My School Gives Parents More Information than Ever." News release, February 24, 2012.
- Gillard, Julia. "My School Shows Targeted Investment Is Lifting Student Results." News release, March 13, 2013.
- Gillard, Julia. "My School Stops Schools Being Left Behind." News release, February 7, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "My School Website Launched." News release, January 28, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "My School Website to Go Live Tomorrow." News release, January 27, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "NAPLAN National Report Released." News release, December 19, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "NAPLAN Tests to Go Ahead." News release, May 6, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "A National Conversation with Principals." News release, October 25, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "New Figures Detail Extra Funding for Queensland Government Schools." News release, June 11, 2013.
- Gillard, Julia. "A New Progressive Consensus for Australian Schools." Lecture, Washington DC. Lecture, June 19, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "9 Million Hits on First Day of My School." News release, January 29, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "OECD Education at a Glance Report." News release, September 8, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Parent School Quality Surveys Added to My School." News release, January 31, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Parliament Passes Legislation to Create New National Education Authority." News release, November 27, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "Principals Descend on Nation's Capital for Conversation." News release, November 9, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Resourcing All Our Kids, Classrooms and Teachers for the Future." News release, April 14, 2013.
- Gillard, Julia. "Rudd Government Committed to Greater Transparency in Schools." News release, May 26, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "\$17 Million for Smarter Schools in the Australian Capital Territory." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Support for Schools Leading up to the Launch of My School." News release, January 21, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "2006 National Benchmark Results." News release, February 1, 2008.
- Gillard, Julia. "2009 NAPLAN Report Released." News release, December 18, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "2009 NAPLAN Results Released." News release, September 11, 2009.
- Gillard, Julia. "Up to \$134.7 Million for Smarter Schools in the Northern Territory." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Up to \$203.4 Million for Smarter Schools in Western Australia." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Up to \$232.5 Million for Smarter Schools in South Australia." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Up to \$477 Million for Smarter Schools in Victoria." News release, February 11, 2010.
- Gillard, Julia. "Up to \$871.4 Million for Smarter Schools in New South Wales." News release, February 11, 2010.

- Gonski, David. "Review of Funding for Schooling—Final Report." Report. Australian Government, 2011.
- Gillard, Julia. "National School Literacy and Numeracy Tests Begin Today." News release, May 11, 2010.
- Goss, Pete. "Strategy Consultant / School Education Programme Director at Grattan Institute Interview." Capstone team interview. February 3, 2016.
- Goss, Sara. "Independent Education Consultant Interview." Capstone team interview. February 11, 2016.
- Hardy, Ian, and Christopher Boyle. "My School? Critiquing the Abstraction and Quantification of Education," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(3), 2011: 220.
- Harrington, Marilyn. Australian Government Funding for Schools Explained, The Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, Background Note, 2011.
- Hogan, Anna. "NAPLAN and the Role of Edu-business: New Governance, New Privatisations and New Partnerships in Australian Education Policy." The Australian Association for Research in Education, November 26, 2014.
- "Household Use of Information Technology, Australia, 2012-13." Australian Bureau of Statistics. February 25, 2014. <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/8146.0Chapter32012-13>>.
- The Information Access Group. "Literacy in Australia." Report. 2014.
- International Telecommunications Union (web-site). "ICT Development Index 2015." 2015. <<http://www.itu.int/net4/ITU-D/idi/2015/>>.
- IT News. "New Details of Australian Broadband Guarantee," April 13, 2016. <<http://www.itnews.com.au/news/new-details-of-australian-broadband-guarantee-76191>>.
- Jensen, Ben. "The Myth of Markets in School Education." Report. Grattan Institute, 2013.
- Jha, Trisha. "Researcher at The Centre for Independent Studies Interview." Capstone team interview. February 18, 2016.
- Bousfield, Kellie, and Angela T. Ragusa. A sociological analysis of Australia's NAPLAN and My School Senate Inquiry submissions: The Adulthood of Childhood. *Critical Studies in Education*, 55(2), 2014: 170-185.
- Lampe, Amanda. "Former Chief of Staff to Julia Gillard Interview." Capstone team interview. March 22, 2016.
- Lingard, Bob. "Policy as numbers: ac/counting for educational research," *Australian Educational Researcher* 38(4), 2011: 356.
- "Making My School Better." Report. Students First, 2015.
- Masters, Geoff. "Reporting and Comparing School Performances." Report. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2008.
- McDermott, Kathryn A. *High-Stakes Reform: The Politics of Educational Accountability*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press: 2011.
- McGaw, Barry. "Inaugural Foundation Chair of ACARA Interview." Capstone team interview. March 15, 2016.
- McGaw, Barry. "National Assessment: Literacy and Numeracy." PPT. Education Policy and Reform in Australia, March 19, 2016.
- McGaw, Barry. "The First Australian Curriculum." Report. Australian National Museum of Education, 2013.
- McKay, Tony. "Inaugural Deputy Chair of ACARA Interview." Capstone team interview. February 19, 2016.
- McKinsey and KPMG. "NBN Implementation Study." Report. 2010.
- Muskin, Joshua. "Researcher at Brookings Interview." Capstone team interview. March 3, 2016.

- My Hospitals. February 24, 2016. <<http://www.myhospitals.gov.au/>>.
- “My School—NAPLAN Discussion Paper.” Report. Australian Primary Principals Association, 2014.
- “My School: A Guide for Parents.” Report. Australian Parents Council, 2013.
- “My School Damage Could Stop Immediately If Piccoli Serious.” John Kaye. March 7, 2014. <<http://www.johnkaye.org.au/my-school-damage-could-stop-immediately-if-piccoli-serious/>>.
- National Assessment Program. “Achievement in Reading, Writing, Language Conventions and Numeracy.” Report. 2008.
- National Catholic Education Commission. “My School just one reference for quality schools and learning.” News release, March 2015.
- National Partnership Agreement on the Digital Education Revolution. Australian Government and All State and Territory Governments (2011), April 10, 2016, <<https://docs.education.gov.au/node/266>>.
- National Partnership Agreement on the Nation Building and Jobs Plan: Building Prosperity for the Future and Supporting Jobs Now. Schedule D, Council of Australian Governments (2009), April 10, 2016, <http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/npa/infrastructure/nation_building_and_jobs_plan/national_partnership.pdf>.
- Nationally Consistent Collection of Data: School Students with Disability. <https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/150420_-_factsheet_-_schools_o.pdf>.
- The Nationals for Regional Australia. “The Coalition’s Policy for Schools: Students First,” August 2013. Report. 2013. <<http://lpaweb-static.s3.amazonaws.com/13-08-29%20The%20Coalition%27s%20Policy%20for%20Schools%20-%20policy%20document.pdf>>.
- Need to Succeed. “Equity, Funding, and the ‘Education State.’” Report. 2015.
- New South Wales Department of Education and Training. “Australian Government Requirements for Reporting to Parents.” 2004.
- New South Wales Government. “Education Amendment (Publication of School Results),” John Hatzistergos Second Reading Speech. 2009.
- New South Wales Government. “Gonski Funding Agreement Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).” April 23, 2013.
- OECD. *Delivering School Transparency in Australia: National Reporting through My School*, OECD Publishing, 2012. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264096660-en>>.
- OECD. “Skills Outlook 2013: First Results From the Survey of Adult Skills.” Report. 2013.
- OECD. “Students, Computers, and Learning.” Report. 2015.
- Paul, Lisa. “Former Department Secretary at Australian Department of Education Interview.” Capstone team interview. March 31, 2016.
- Phillips, Gabrielle. “Branch Manager for National Data Reform Evidence and Assessment Group Interview.” Capstone team interview. April 12, 2016.
- Pyne, Christopher. “Early NAPLAN Results Better for Parents and Students and Schools.” News release, August 5, 2015.
- Pyne, Christopher. “My School Improvements Better for Parents and Schools.” News release, March 22, 2015.
- Pyne, Christopher. “My School Updated with Improved School Attendance Data.” News release, December 14, 2014.
- Pyne, Christopher. “My School Website Improvements Agreed.” News release, September 18, 2015.

- Pyne, Christopher. "New Chair for ACARA." News release, June 24, 2015.
- Rabinowitz, Stanley. "General Manager of Assessment and Reporting at ACARA Interview." Capstone team interview. February 29, 2016.
- Rabinowitz, Stanley. "The Move to NAPLAN Online: The Advantages and the Road Ahead." PPT. ACARA, August 18, 2015.
- Randall, Robert. "CEO of ACARA Interview." Capstone team interview. March 9, 2016.
- Redden, Guy, and Remy Low. "My School, Education, and Cultures of Rating and Ranking," *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 34(1), 2012: 36.
- Ross, Mailee. "Teaching & Learning Coach Interview." Capstone team interview. February 19 2016.
- Rudd, Kevin. "Joint Media Release with the Deputy Prime Minister, Julia Gilliard, An Education Revolution in Our Schools." News release, August 27, 2008.
- Rudd, Kevin. "Parent School Quality Surveys Added to My School." News release, January 31, 2010.
- Scholem, Marianne. "Teacher at Woodridge School Interview." Capstone team interview. February 16, 2016.
- "Schools in Australia." Study in Australia. April 12 2016. <<https://www.studyinaustralia.gov.au/global/australian-education/schools>>.
- Senate Community Affairs References Committee. "Violence, abuse, and neglect against people with disability." Report. 2015.
- Senate Education and Employment References Committee. "Effectiveness of the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy." Final Report. Commonwealth of Australia, 2014.
- Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee. "Administration and Reporting of NAPLAN Testing." Report. Commonwealth of Australia, 2010.
- Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, "Questions on Notice Budget Estimates 2013-2014." Report. 2014.
- Senate Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. "Questions on Notice Supplementary Budget Estimates 2012-13." Report. 2013.
- "Sixth Education Council Meeting." September 15, 2015.
- Smith, Alexandra. "My School Should Be Scrapped, Says Piccoli." *Sydney Morning Herald*. March 6, 2014. <<http://www.smh.com.au/national/education/my-school-should-be-scrapped-says-piccoli-20140306-34adf.html>>.
- Smith, Alexandra. "My School: State's Big Improvers Revealed." *Sydney Morning Herald*. March 5, 2015. <<http://www.smh.com.au/national/education/my-school-states-big-improvers-revealed-20150302-13tf6s.html>>.
- "Social Accountability in the Education Sector." Social Accountability Sourcebook. World Bank, 2007.
- Stanistreet, Peter. "Director of Performance Reform and Measurement Team at Australian Department of Education Interview." Capstone team interview. April 12, 2016.
- Taig, Carolyn, and Cathy North. "ACARA: Perspectives on the My School Website." Report. Melbourne: Colmar Brunton, 2014.
- Thompson, Greg, and Allen G. Harbaugh. "The Effects of NAPLAN: Teacher Perceptions of the Impact of NAPLAN on Pedagogy and Curriculum." Report. Perth: School of Education, Murdoch University, 2012.

- Thompson, Greg. "NAPLAN, MySchool and Accountability: Teacher Perceptions of the Effects of Testing." *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 12(2), 2013: 62-84.
- Toon, Danielle. "Former CEO at Cape York Aboriginal Australian Academy." Capstone team interview. February 14, 2016.
- Tucker, Rodney S. "The Rise and Fall of Australia's \$44 Billion Broadband Project." *IEEE Spectrum*. November 26, 2013. <<http://spectrum.ieee.org/telecom/internet/the-rise-and-fall-of-australias-44-billion-broadband-project/>>.
- 2011-12 Australian Government Budget—Budget Paper No. 2, Commonwealth of Australia (2011), April 10, 2016, <<http://www.budget.gov.au/2011-12/content/bp2/download/bp2.pdf>>, 322.
- "Types of Access Connection." Australian Bureau of Statistics. June 10, 2014. <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/8153.0/>>.
- West, Deakin. "Factors Affecting School Choice." Report. Independent School Council of Australia, 2008.

The views expressed in this working paper do not necessarily reflect the official position of Brookings, its board or the advisory council members.

© 2017 The Brookings Institution

BROOKINGS

1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-797-6000
www.brookings.edu/global