

INTEGRATED SCHOOLING: A DIRECTION OR A DIVERSION?

A review of the operation and relevance to Australia of integrated public-private schooling in New Zealand, England and Wales and Ontario

Background

School education in Australia is provided by public schools and government-funded private schools operating alongside each other, with some similar but also significantly different obligations and rules. What we have done over the last four decades, with our mishmash of state and federal deals and funding, is create and encourage the development of a private sector while giving little consideration to:

- The public obligations which should accompany the cash and
- The impact of an enlarged government-funded private sector on the public provider.

An ongoing bonus for private schools has been created by this neglect: they have been able to combine public funding and private resources (including from school fees) with a relative lack of regulation to compete against other schools, including other private schools. They can pick and choose, not only the extent of their public obligations, but the segment of the public they wish to serve. In this way the element of choice becomes choice of students by schools.

Like any school able to use enrolment discriminators, private schools have imported a substantial part of their own success, in the process associating, in the public mind at least, an alleged association of school success with private ownership. All school principals know, and study after study shows, that the clustering of students with advantageous socio-economic circumstances is a critical factor in explaining the performance and ‘success’ of a school. Many of the ‘best’ schools are those which are able to increase their density of such students.

Our landscape of schools is rife with this practice, with schools using whatever discriminators can be wheeled into place to capture aspirational families and students: admission by test, interviews, enrolment criteria, scholarships, enhancing school culture and most important, school fees. While there is considerable diversity amongst private schools, including the extent to which they assume any measure of public obligation, they are all able to employ enrolment discriminators.

Fees are the most significant discriminator. Even ‘low’ fees are high enough to ensure that the schools gather together those students and families with a capacity and willingness to pay, inevitably these are the most motivated and aspiring families in the district. So called low-fee Anglican and Christian schools, even in or near disadvantaged communities, have been very successful in harvesting these students.

In this situation it is almost impossible for the public provider to retain a full cross-section of families and students, triggering the process of marginalisation of public schools with impacts on community social capital and wellbeing for the majority of the population. While ever private schools are not subject to a comparable regulatory regime they’ll be able to accrue advantages at the expense of the local public school: one system is being set up for apparent achievement, the other set up for ongoing struggle. The fact that public schools are as good as they are is a tribute to the commitment of the principals and staff of these schools.

There is an increasing chorus of commentary which points to a growing problem of school equity in Australia. Credible international comparisons can now be made, placing each national schooling system under a global microscope. On an international level the PISA testing program shows that Australia has a worrying equity gap. Barry McGaw, Director of

the University of Melbourne Education Research Institute and former OECD Director for Education concludes that the schooling system in some countries, including Australia, largely reproduces the existing social arrangements, conferring privilege where it already exists and denying it where it does not¹.

Why does it matter? According to McGaw, disadvantaged students in Australia are a full year's schooling behind their counterparts in countries with more equitable outcomes such as Canada. Jenkins, Micklewright and Schnepf in the UK point to the impact of social and academic segregation on average achievement levels, later-life outcomes and social cohesion². Even those disinterested in equity might understand the possible downstream implications for national economic growth and competitiveness.

There are and always have been spatial, social and cultural reasons why differences emerge between communities and between schools. What many countries have done is to take the view that public policy should reduce or compensate for these differences. This has been one of the motivations behind moves to integrate private schools into public systems, creating a system of comparable obligations and modes of operation for them in the process.

The process of integration, which has taken various forms, has most commonly seen the private schools forego the collection of fees in exchange for public funding. New Zealand 'private' schools don't charge significant fees, they have the same rules and obligations as state schools, their dealings with staff and students are the same and all schools are funded according to the needs of their students. In the process their daily operation comes to resemble that of public schools and they are considered to be public schools with a special character, usually a commitment to a particular religious faith. In New Zealand and most OECD countries the remaining genuine private schools form a sector of around five per cent.

Some believe that this is the solution for Australia: to integrate government-funded private schools into an enlarged public sector, leaving the remnant (usually high-fee) private schools to be genuinely private under such arrangements. The integrated schools would not be allowed to charge fees or discriminate in any way, in effect operating under a public charter. This is the essence of a range of policy suggestions from many sources: Brian Caldwell, Alan Reid and Pat Thomson, The Education Foundation and others.

But it is a matter of controversy amongst some public education stakeholders: they point to the huge increase in funding which these schools might demand if they can't charge fees. Some private schools have already put their hand out for more funding if they are to take on the burden of disabled students. In addition, while most private schools represent mainstream faiths, some more fundamentalist schools insist on a pedagogy and set of beliefs which would make them very strange bedfellows in any education system regarded as "public".

Purpose and scope of this review

In any substantial debate about the future of schooling in Australia the various models of integrated schooling will increasingly come under scrutiny. Integrated schools are commonly required to accept a full range of legislated and regulated public obligations, for example in enrolments, staffing, curriculum and more. This project is a review of the operation of these

¹ Barry McGaw, *Achieving Quality and Equity Education* VASSP Annual Leadership Conference, Melbourne, September 2006

² Jenkins, Stephen P., Micklewright, John and Schnepf, Sylke V. (2006) *Social segregation in secondary schools: how does England compare with other countries?* Southampton, UK, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/19204/>

schools and integrated school systems, including the legislative and regulatory frameworks, the history and funding. The focus includes the impact of integrated systems on the local operation of government schools and the extent to which integrated schools should be considered to be 'public'.

The review focuses on New Zealand, England, Wales and Ontario (Canada), with reference to other systems. The methodology included background research, visits to countries with integrated schooling, interviews with education officials and principals, visits to schools and a scan of the issues arising in the media and in public discourse.

The review investigated such matters as:

1. the evolution of public education in each jurisdiction, including when and why private schools became significant.
2. when, why, how and the extent to which private providers became integrated into the state education. Which ones didn't and why.
3. general legislative and regulatory arrangements under which integrated schools are funded as part of a public system.
4. the operational frameworks which govern the day-to-day functioning of schools, including from the perspective of school principals.
5. the extent to which integration has:
 - a. reduced differentiation between schools
 - b. enabled integrated schools to gain an image/enrolment advantage
 - c. created any other inequities between schools and in the opportunities for students
6. the impact of faith schools on adherence to faith and the extent to which integration might be increasing or decreasing the distinctiveness of faith schools
7. whether integration may have compromised the purpose and charter of public education, including equity, curriculum, pedagogy
8. variations over time in government controls over integrated schools and the impact of these, including shifts in enrolment patterns and likely future trends.

The review had a different focus in each of the jurisdictions studied, mostly necessitated by the time available:

- in New Zealand the review was completed in 2004 in the context of the NSWSPC Role of the Principal Project and has also been informed by two previous reviews in 1992 and 1995.
- In England the focus was on the perspective of existing and previous school headteachers (principals) in nearby schools in Nottingham, as well as the perspective of the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust.
- In Wales the overview and perspective was contributed by officers of the Department for Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (DELLS), together with the perspective of a principal of an independent school.
- In Toronto the focus was on the view of the Ontario Principals' Council.

While this approach may have reduced the opportunity for more comparisons between jurisdictions it created valuable perspectives in each case, supplemented by online research.

Integrated schools: a note on the terminology

The need for consistent terminology becomes readily apparent when you consider the variation between countries and jurisdictions. Words such as government, non-government, public, public-authority, grant-aided, independent and private cannot easily be transferred from one jurisdiction to another. Even describing schools as state or government is confusing:

Catholic schools in New Zealand are part of the state system and Catholic schools in Ireland ARE the state system.

In England and Wales the publicly-funded schools include community schools, foundation schools, voluntary schools and community special schools, with differences partly linked to the extent of government funding and local control. Independent schools are private schools but for historical reasons are often called public. Generally schools which receive little or no public funding are called independent. They are usually subject to some government controls (as they are in Australia) in areas such as curriculum.

The descriptor “independent” is loosely used in Australia to describe any school not linked to a system. “Non-government” is more commonly used to describe any school which is privately owned and operated, again regardless of the extent of its government funding. The word “private” is incorrectly used to describe Australian private schools which are partly government funded, but the same word is used to describe schools in The Netherlands which are 100% government funded and are little different to government schools. The same word is also used to describe schools in the USA which don’t usually receive any public funding.

The extent of integration really links to the level of funding and it is generally possible to categorise countries accordingly³. On a sliding scale from greatest to least, funding might be made available for:

- all resource categories, including fixed assets – examples include Sweden, Finland, Poland
- all staffing and operational resources – examples include New Zealand, England and Wales, Ontario, France
- mainly staffing – examples include Austria, the Baltic states, Slovakia
- private schools not funded – examples generally include the USA, Scotland, Greece

It readily becomes apparent that it is difficult to locate Australia on such a scale, once more demonstrating the unusual funding situation in Australia.

The term “integrated schools” (the New Zealand terminology) is mainly used to describe those schools which are substantially publicly-funded and are considered to be part of the government’s delivery of schooling. Most commonly these schools are faith-based, with the properties owned by a church body and the government paying recurrent costs.

³ <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/eurydice/themes-home.cfm>

BACKGROUND TO EACH COUNTRY STUDIED

NEW ZEALAND

Origins of integration

From the early 1940s, public campaigns were occasionally mounted to pressure governments to provide more support for Catholic schools. By 1970, it was becoming increasingly apparent that Catholic schools in New Zealand were financially unviable and may have to close. The campaign to raise awareness of these issues, characterised by claims and counter claims, resembled the debate which had taken place in Australia a decade earlier.

The Private Schools Conditional Integration Act in 1975 made provision for the conditional and voluntary integration of private schools, especially Catholic schools, into the state education system, while allowing them to preserve and safeguard the special character of the education they provided⁴.

Current situation

The percentage of fully private schools in New Zealand is very small, around 4-5% of enrolments. Most non-government schools, such as systemic Catholic schools, are fully integrated into the state system and are considered state schools. Any school can apply to become an integrated school, subject to a feasibility study which considers the likely impact on existing state (including existing integrated) schools. In an effort to keep the system cost-effective as a whole the Ministry of Education is currently not encouraging the establishment of additional integrated schools. In this sense the New Zealand government readily accepts a role which is abrogated by both state and federal governments in Australia, although the restrictions on the establishment of new schools in New Zealand are not without controversy.

While they are part of the state system, integrated schools have the right and continue to reflect, through “teaching and conduct”, a special character. Religious instruction most commonly contributes to the special character of an integrated school.

Being part of the state system has significance for the operation of integrated schools. They receive the same operations grant as government schools, meaning that the state pays for salaries, utilities, maintenance and more. It doesn't pay for most establishment costs and improvement of fixed assets, which remain the property of the church. There is an obvious trade-off between church and state on this matter, with both gaining an advantage from integration. Some concessions apply to integrated schools through the “special character”.

Integrated schools are subject to exactly the same legislation and regulations as government schools, including in such matters as the enrolment, suspension and expulsion of students. Compliance is monitored by the Education Review Office (ERO) through school reviews. Integrated schools don't have zones but have some restrictions on enrolling students: Catholic schools, for example, must enrol some non-preference students but aren't allowed to enrol any more than five per cent non-Catholic students.

All schools in NZ are able to develop and operate enrolment schemes. However, enrolment schemes for integrated schools don't have to include a zone and they can enrol from a wider area, subject to the restriction on the percentage of non-preference (faith) students. School

⁴ A copy of the legislation is found at http://www.legislation.govt.nz/libraries/contents/om_isapi.dll?clientID=1697147502&infobase=pal_statutes.nfo&jump=a1975-129&softpage=DOC

enrolment schemes were loosened in 1989, arguably contributing to greater polarisation of schools, partly along racial lines, but have tightened again in more recent times, paralleling developments in England and Wales (see below). The recent changes reassert the right of students to attend their local school, reducing the discretion of schools over enrolments. Under current arrangements out-of-zone vacancies are filled by ballot. Schools in larger urban areas tend to operate enrolment schemes: the impact of parental anxiety about schooling and mobility between schools tending to be more pronounced in the cities (again reflecting the situation in some other countries).

Integrated schools collect voluntary parent financial contributions in much the same way as NZ government schools. There are some differences, however, with parents having to pay attendance dues, most commonly around \$NZ500. Certainly integrated schools are more likely to be more successful in collecting fees, partly because parents are committed to the school's special character and many still perceive the schools to provide a private advantage. The attendance dues, in the case of Catholic schools, go to the Catholic Education Office or diocese office and the funds are used to finance capital works/improvements in Catholic schools.

Impact on government schools

A number of changes to all state schools, especially since 1989 have further reduced the distinction between government-run and integrated schools. All schools select their staff through open advertisement and have considerable flexibility in establishing the management structure, budget and programs in the school. Each school is allocated resources based on student rolls (enrolment) and its decile ranking degree of disadvantage.

As far as government-run schools are concerned the integration of Catholic and other faith schools has created a far more level playing field in the way in which schools operate. Student welfare processes are common for all schools; there is certainly no dumping of students from integrated onto government schools. Practices in relation to school uniform are common across all schools and supported by the Ministry. General school contributions are not compulsory but subject fees are.

At the same time some accuse integrated schools of becoming private schools by stealth. The attendance dues for some schools are now quite high, negating the benefit created for all schools by the restriction on charging fees.

Despite this, the growth of schools tends not to be as sector-based as it has been in Australia. Larger or growing schools (both government and integrated) are able to capitalise on their advantages, for example in attracting overseas students, enticing students from out of zone, attracting funding for improvements, employing support staff and more. The system favours high demand schools, both government and integrated.

In other ways the equity distinction between government-run and integrated schools is not significant. Equity differences between schools tend to relate more to local control and differences between communities rather than any structural and resourcing differences between schools. NZ comprehensive state schools, including integrated schools, seem to represent a greater cross-section of the student population than is apparent in equivalent schools in Australia. The very small (fully) private sector and relative absence of selectivity has left comprehensive schools with a reasonably representative population, including middle class and aspiring students. While choice in schooling is now entrenched in NZ life, the choice has not significantly marginalised 'public education'.

ONTARIO, CANADA

Origins of integration

In Canada school education is the responsibility of the provinces and the federal government plays little role, not even insisting on flagpoles, the correct teaching of history or even A to E reporting. Each provincial system, while similar to the others, reflects its particular region, history and culture. The provincial departments of education - headed by an elected minister - set standards, draw up curricula, and give grants to educational institutions.

The status of private schools was determined at Confederation in 1867. The protestant minority in Quebec, the Catholic minority in Ontario and both minorities in Alberta were guaranteed their own schools and that these schools would be fully funded. As indicated later this has created controversy, especially in Ontario, as more denominations have tried to achieve equal status with what are in effect state-approved religions.

Current situation

Ontario has two fully publicly-funded school systems (public and Catholic) further complicated by the need to provide schools for both English and French speaking communities. Unlike in England and Wales the public schools are fully secular. The last few decades has seen other faith schools lobbying for funding. In 2001 a Conservative government in Ontario introduced a tax credit for parents whose children attend independent schools. This was generally unpopular and was repealed following a change of government in 2004. The Ontario Conservative Party has signaled that it will restore financial aid for private schools.

Parallel with this has been improvements in public schools in Ontario. They are emerging from a period of crisis, created by nearly a decade in the 1990s of under-funding and instability. Advocacy by parents, trustees, teachers, and others resulted in two significant reports published in 2002–03. These were instrumental in calling for a complete reversal of the budget cuts. The current school year is the third year of the government's multi-year plan to make a significant re-investment in publicly funded education, with more than \$C2.7billion in new funding since 2002-03. The significant influence of the teachers union has meant that the focus of much of the investment has been on reducing class sizes.

Current policy to fund only Catholic schools in addition to public schools comes under siege from time to time. The United Nations Human Rights Committee has demanded that the government of Canada eliminate discrimination on the basis of religion in the funding of schools in Ontario. Private schools representing other religions in Canada seek to use the UN ruling to their advantage. Other groups such as Education Equality in Ontario seek the elimination of all religious discrimination and duplication through the establishment of a single publicly-funded school system for each official language (English and French). They argue that the elimination of denominational separate schools is essential to the creation of a just and equitable school system in Ontario. Others seek the re-establishment of tax credits as one way to make the current system less discriminatory toward other religious schools. This is not a problem that has an easy solution.

Impact on government schools

Of all the jurisdictions studied in this review the inclusion of faith schools as part of the state system in Ontario seems to have the least impact on public schooling. This is most likely due to considerable central oversight of the operation of schools and control of key policies and practices which might otherwise create inequity between schools. The district school boards,

which in some cases oversight as many schools as are found in some Australian states, have remained as the schools' management authority. The immediate contrast is with England where the Local Education Authorities have lost a considerable amount of their authority. Individual schools in Ontario have school councils, but with nowhere near the authority of the school-level boards found in New Zealand and England/Wales.

In Ontario the school boards retain control over those operations which in more fully devolved systems have increased the differences between schools. This critically includes the admission of students but also employment of staff and maintenance of the school site. The boards play a significant role in supporting struggling schools, something which also contributes to reducing the differences between schools. While there are separate boards for Catholic and for public schools, they operate in similar ways and under the same legislation. The Ontario government also is willing to intervene in the operation of boards: in the week of the review the government took over a Catholic school board which faced financial difficulties.

The other significance of this is that it has tended to avoid what has emerged in England as an often manic obsession with school choice, an obsession partly created by serial government interference in schools and by devolution. In Ontario there are no league tables and not much public interest in ranking schools. Schools have enrolment catchment areas but these are loosely enforced: there is little movement of students away from their local schools. Public policy is focused on improving schools, rather than labeling them and encouraging parents to look elsewhere. Ontario's Education Quality and Accountability Office certainly makes school performance information available but carefully contextualises this with a focus on "statistical neighbours", comparing like with like. It should also be noted that the public and Catholic systems do not include any selective schools.

These arrangements help to explain why Canada has, by international standards, a relatively small gap between the highest and lowest achieving students, something which is the envy of other countries. There are considerable differences between some communities and unresolved issues for Aboriginal communities, but public policy strives to reduce and not exacerbate these differences.

Some other structural and policy frameworks have an impact. The Catholic schools can only enrol Catholic students and this is more strictly enforced than, for example, in New Zealand. This avoids the situation which, in other jurisdictions (especially England), enables faith schools to package faith and values in a way which can attract middle class families, irrespective of their religion. Catholic students in Ontario are also able to enrol in public schools. Catholic teachers can also work in both systems, but public school teachers are restricted to public schools. While this creates an employment equity issue it at least tends to ensure that the faith sector caters for the faith and not just for the middle class.

This 'quarantining' of the faith sector is not absolute - some students who might be more loosely described as being Catholic might still be able to enrol in Catholic schools. There is also a tendency for some Catholic schools to shift problem students towards public schools but this is minimised by board control over such matters as student expulsions. In effect the extent of centralised control of Ontario's schools has softened the extent to which the faith schools are able to accrue advantages at the expense of public schools in the same system.

ENGLAND AND WALES⁵

Origins of integration

The evolution of school ownership and operation in England and Wales has reflected familiar battles of control between church and state over provision of schooling. The years since 1944 especially have seen alternate imposition and relaxing of controls over church schools according to which government is in power.

Attempts to establish a national system of education in the early Nineteenth century ran up against the churches, especially the Church of England and the Catholic Church over the issue of control. A national system with schools operated by a variety of providers was established after 1870. The 1944 Education Act gave responsibility for implementing education to Local Education Authorities (LEAs) which most notably divided secondary students into two streams represented by grammar and secondary modern schools. Most church schools agreed to join the state-maintained sector and were categorised according to the degree of LEA control. In common with other countries they were relatively weak financially and saw little option but to agree.

Amongst the terms that they agreed to was acceptance of 25% of pupils on free places mainly financed by LEAs, with other students on bursaries. By the late 1960s half the enrolments in church schools were free places but most of the schools were academically selective. In effect they served the function of the grammar school under the 1944 Act. This lasted until comprehensive schools, which included students of all ability levels, replaced the grammar and secondary moderns in 1975. Most Catholic schools became comprehensive but many other church schools chose to become private. By 1979 about 75% of secondary students were in state schools, 17% in integrated schools and 8% in fully private schools.

Current situation

More recent years have seen the state-church ebb and flow continue. Legislation in the 1980s added parents and teachers to school governing bodies and created fairer admissions policies. In 1988 schools which were known as voluntary-aided (see below) could opt to become grant-maintained, releasing churches from the need to fund 15% of capital expenditure. This was somewhat reversed in 1998: the more regulated voluntary-controlled schools could choose to become voluntary aided and subject to fewer controls, with the position of the church strengthened in the operation of the schools.

There are now six categories of schools:

Community schools are run by local authorities. The local authority employs the staff, owns the land and buildings and draws up the admissions criteria.

Foundation schools are managed by their own governing body. The governing body employs the staff and sets the admissions criteria. Land and buildings are usually owned by either the governing body or by a charitable foundation.

Voluntary-aided schools are mainly religious or faith-based schools, although anyone can apply for a place. As with foundation schools, the governing body employs the staff and sets the admissions criteria. School buildings and land are normally owned by a charitable foundation, often a religious organisation. The governing body contributes to building and maintenance costs.

Voluntary-controlled schools are similar to voluntary aided schools, but are run by the local authority. As with community schools, the local authority employs the school's staff and sets

⁵ An additional section is devoted to Wales.

the admissions criteria. School land and buildings are normally owned by a charity, often a religious organisation, which appoints some of the members of the governing body. The above schools may also be **specialist schools** with a focus on a particular subject area, such as sports, technology or visual arts, as well as offering a broad and balanced education through the National Curriculum. They are central to the government's stated goal of increasing choice and improving standards for secondary students.

They are all considered to form part of the state education sector and are collectively known as 'maintained schools'. Most are funded by the government through Local Education Authorities (LEA's) but enjoy a high level of autonomy, with staff usually employed by the governors rather than by the LEA. Faith schools may fall under the jurisdiction of a Diocesan Board (usually Church of England or Catholic) and these schools may have access to additional grant funding.

Voluntary aided schools, which represent around 20 per cent of all maintained schools, receive 100 per cent funding for recurrent costs and are eligible for 85 per cent funding for capital expenditure, the remainder being the responsibility of the founding body, usually a religious organisation. Foundation and voluntary-aided schools are exempt charities. This gives them certain financial advantages as well as being able to employ their own staff, including some committed to the faith of the school. The higher funded voluntary-controlled schools can't discriminate in employment.

Unlike the situation in Ontario other faiths were not legally excluded from joining the state-maintained sector. Small Muslim and evangelical Christian schools first appeared in the 1980s. The appearance of Muslim schools raised the issue of potential ethnic division, reflecting some of the ironies involved in funding any faith schools. Some smaller faith schools have not applied for funding, fearing a weakening of their independence, especially in controversial curriculum areas, employment of staff and student discipline.

The trend in England and Wales over the last half century is for integrated schools to be increasingly state funded, regulated and controlled. While one in three state schools has a religious character the price they have apparently paid for state funding is a loss of much of their distinctiveness to the point where some say they have become increasingly secularised. This is also the experience in some other countries, for example the Netherlands. Such secularisation might become a source of comfort to public education advocates concerned about integration but a source of alarm to existing faith schools. It partly explains the growth of fundamentalist faith schools and the choice of these schools to remain independent. Such schools in Australia have *both* the public money and independence.

Recent changes in England and to a lesser extent in Wales have come over the top of this structure. Schools have become more specialised, driven by the government and the Specialist Schools Trust⁶. Under these arrangements schools are sponsored by private organisations and supported by additional government funding to establish distinctive identities through their chosen specialisation. Most maintained secondary schools in England have applied for specialist status⁷. Specialist schools work with partner schools with the aim of creating a diverse network of secondary provision through the sharing of good practice and expertise. They now represent over 75% of all secondary schools.

⁶ The Specialist Schools and Academies Trust is one of a number of "third sector" organisations set up to deliver public services. There is increasing debate over the role of these organisations, not helped in the case of the SSAT by the fact that it is currently involved in a police investigation into whether honours were 'sold' for private sponsorship of city academies.

⁷ Two significant discriminators impacted on this process. Schools initially had to raise GBP 50,000 in order to receive sponsorship and 'underperforming schools were not eligible. It is hardly surprising that specialist schools could be (and were) demonstrated to be more 'successful', allegedly as a result of specialisation.

Specialist schools are also encouraged to take on foundation status, in effect giving them greater autonomy. The current Education and Inspections Bill will enable all schools to become trust schools by forming links with external partners such as universities, companies, parent groups and voluntary sector organisations. Trust schools will own their own assets, employ their own staff and set their own admissions arrangements (within limits). LEAs will no longer be the direct provider of education, only intervening when things go wrong ... thus continuing the erosion of the authority of LEAs begun in the 1980s.

The Bill aims at tightening the school admissions framework to ensure fair access, including a ban on interviewing and selection by ability. This provision was added after fierce debate earlier in 2006. The Bill also outlines 'framework powers' for Wales to develop policy, as required, in a number of areas including school admissions, school organisation and attendance.

The extent to which these changes will be implemented is partly linked to the Blair-Brown (?) succession. Blair has described the core of this bill the "defining" moment of his vision for schools, replacing comprehensive schools with a range of schools with distinctive badges: city academies, specialist colleges, city technology colleges, foundation schools and trust schools. Gordon Brown has never been closely involved in this agenda. Comprehensive schools are the norm in his native Scotland and he is probably less committed to finding business sponsors, faith groups and charities to run schools.

Impact on government schools

Most important amongst all other issues is the question: to what extent has the integration of faith schools in England and Wales reduced or minimised class-based differentiation of schools? Has integration provided a structure of choice on a level playing field, or has it merely masked the type of SES-based stratification of schools which is becoming an increasing concern in Australia?

Differences certainly remain between schools. Faith schools are perceived to endorse middle class values of discipline, order and family commitment, and have an image made up of attention to values and good academic results. It is hardly surprising that many have grown. The Church of England has always had a large number of primary schools but has recently increased or planned to increase its number of secondary schools by around 25%. In the process their advocates are keen to assert that they are not middle class havens. In the words of one school head: "the glib assumption that faith schools have more to do with social selection than religion is based on prejudice rather than fact", going on to say that the faith schools in his area "face some of the toughest socio-economic challenges in the land".⁸

Such claims don't necessarily stand up to closer scrutiny. In 2005 The Sutton Trust looked at the proportion of students in England's top 200 comprehensive schools who were eligible for free school meals. Free meals provide a useful indicator as they are available to children of parents who receive income support. The research showed that the top 200 comprehensives in England have a higher middle class intake than their catchment areas might suggest⁹ and that there was a much higher proportion of faith schools in the top 200 than found nationwide.

The successful faith schools were located in areas with free school meal rates close to the national average, seemingly supporting the claim made by the school head quoted above. But

⁸ Dennis Richards, head of StAiden's Church of England School, in the *Times Educational Supplement*, March 2004. Reprinted by the Secondary Heads Association.

⁹ The Sutton Trust *The Social Composition of Top Comprehensive Schools*, January 2003

the take-up rate of free school meals in the actual schools was much lower than in their neighbourhoods, indicating that the actual enrolment of students was not strictly representative of the neighbourhood. The scenario of schools choosing their enrolments is not exclusively a faith school issue, all oversubscribed schools have this advantage. However the significance in this context is that even the integration of faith schools into a state system has not resolved the equity issues.

It is interesting that the whole issue of student admissions (enrolment) policy has gained considerably more public attention in England than in Australia, a debate informed by the findings of other research. London University's Institute of Education has shown that religious comprehensives have a more advantaged intake than the average for their surrounding areas. Researcher Rebecca Allen compared the existing situation with a simulation in which all pupils went to their nearest school and found that schools were more socially segregated under the present arrangements. Researchers at the universities of Southampton and Essex found that giving schools greater powers to select their own pupils will lead to more segregation, especially if this was coupled with any move towards separate academic and vocational school tracks¹⁰.

None of this is surprising: the anxiety created by choosing schools in England is endemic, especially in London and other large centres. It is even possible for parents to engage the services of private firms to manage their appeals if not accepted into their school of choice.

Most recent proposals include new guidelines for schools which prevent a school giving a higher enrolment priority to children:

- whose parents are more willing to support the ethos of the school or support the school financially;
- according to the occupation or financial status of their parents;
- according to the educational or social group or background of parents;
- who (or whose parents) have particular interests, specialist knowledge or hobbies¹¹.

In one sense the strengthening of enrolment guidelines is an inevitable reaction to the inequities created by loosening of previous controls and by devolution dating back to the Thatcher era. It really points to the continuing problem where a market-driven culture has underpinned the growth in foundation and specialist schools, including local control, fewer limits on school growth and more.

The schools visited as part of this review readily revealed a gentle hierarchy of schools. The two schools visited in near Nottingham, while both being government funded, were noticeably different. The professionalism and goodwill of the principals of the schools is not in doubt and it is unlikely that they set out to create a hierarchy of schools: it evolves for many structural and social reasons. The faith school enjoyed the enrolment advantage which happens when a school is oversubscribed. The community school drew some aspirational students out of the inner city but also was losing some enrolments to the faith school. The principals identified two other schools which joined the hierarchy at either end: one was a more rural faith school which enrolled from a much wider area and the other a Nottingham inner city school serving a lower income area. The significance of this is that integration has certainly not meant that all schools operate under the same circumstances. Inevitably some schools are able use their circumstances to their advantage.

¹⁰ Donald MacLeod "Choice increases segregation, schools research shows" EducationGuardian.co.uk, Wednesday January 25, 2006

¹¹ Guidelines ban covert pupil selection *The Guardian*, September 9th, 2006

At the same time the differences between the schools was demonstrably less than is apparent between public and private schools in Australia. Both schools had many ageing buildings, although the faith school had some relatively new ones. Both will be specialist schools, both have trouble attracting senior executive - in fact the accountability of the faith school's principal to the church in part explains the low fields of candidates for executive positions in these schools.

The distinctions between schools were created by shifting reputations and enrolment, reflecting the apparent links between religion and values, some physical differences, issues of mobility, aspirations, networks and access to information about how to get into a school of choice all were important. Many of these differences were subtle yet perceived by parents. As is the case in Australia there was little difference between the results produced by the schools which could not be explained by the student intake¹².

A NOTE ON SOME OTHER SYSTEMS

1. Wales

Wales is significant for a number of reasons and it is important to note the increasing differences between England and Wales: generalisations about the structure of schooling in England become less relevant in the context of Wales. For some time Wales has had discretionary powers in relation to legislation and regulation of schools. The differences include:

- Schools are local and non-selective (comprehensive). A significantly higher proportion of students in Wales are able to be admitted to the school of their choice.
- In comparison to England a smaller proportion of faith schools in the maintained sector, with the Welsh Assembly not actively promoting the establishment of new faith schools. The existing small number of foundation schools are a legacy of the Thatcher era.
- Far more significance and power for the Local Education Authorities (LEAs), in some contrast to England and similar to Ontario.
- Neither community schools nor voluntary controlled faith schools have direct control over student admissions.
- There is a diversity of schools in a non-competitive framework. There are no league tables and students in Wales are not subject to the plethora of statutory national tests faced by their counterparts in England.

As in England parents are able to apply for any school. Faith schools which are oversubscribed are able to give admission priority to students of the relevant faith. Families tend to gravitate towards faith schools, however, demographic decline has meant that very few schools are oversubscribed and most schools have vacancies, including faith schools. This tends to reduce the angst generated by the school choice process, with a very high percentage of students gaining first preference entry. Curiously for a jurisdiction which has abolished league tables, Wales insists that parents are able to know which schools are oversubscribed and this tends to influence the direction of demand.

The context of Wales includes the collapse of traditional employment combined with considerable poverty and the need to extend education and skills well beyond the compulsory years. The focus of 'the learning country' is on raising the bar and narrowing the gap between students. Considerable investment has been made in vocational education with care taken to

¹² Some evidence for this can be found at:

http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performance/tables/schools_02.shtml

<http://education.guardian.co.uk/schools/specialreport/page/0,,1719371,00.html>

promote parity of esteem between academic and vocational pathways. There is evidence that recent improvements have improved standards in both primary and secondary years. What is less evident at this stage is the extent to which different approaches in England and Wales are reflected in comparative data on student achievement. Based on what PISA reveals about achievement and equity in a variety of countries the frameworks being established in Wales would seem to be very sound.

The significance of the Welsh experience for this review is that the issues which have consumed so much public debate, media column space and public anxiety simply don't resonate to the same extent as is readily apparent in England. It is also interesting that more than one interviewed official pointed to better (if sometimes prolonged) consultation frameworks which operate in Wales.

2. The Netherlands

The situation in the Netherlands is interesting to the extent that it illustrates different origins yet some common trends in integrated schooling.

All schools in the Netherlands are funded on the same basis as public-authority schools. Over 70% of secondary students are taught in what are officially known as private schools but are actually integrated schools. Fully private schools are almost non-existent. Unlike many other integrated systems all school buildings are owned by the state. Integration began 200 years ago and schooling has almost always been in a religious-based system. This is largely due to the Netherlands diversity of religions and historical need for consensus.

All schools must pay sufficient attention to different religions and specific religious teaching is capped at 120 hours each year. Churches have little influence on curriculum. Trends include declining school student numbers and increasing secularisation. Despite this faith base to schooling the importance of religion in Dutch society has waned.

All state funded schools are governed by a participation council, have the same curriculum, subject hours and inspections. The government pays for teachers, buildings, school costs. Teacher conditions are regulated but schools can use religion and lifestyle criteria in employing teachers. Private (integrated) schools cannot charge top-up fees. The only additional resources available to educational institutions are voluntary parental contributions, course and tuition fees, extra funding from the Municipal Authorities for special projects and sponsoring.

Private (integrated) schools can impose criteria on admission, but must admit a child if there is no public authority school within a reasonable distance. Many schools accept students of any religion although they can refuse entry on religious grounds. Religious affiliation of the school is not really a factor in choice; there is more interest in proximity and status. Ethnic segregation between schools is growing - parents increasingly seek a safe haven by choosing a school predominantly of the same class/ethnic composition.

There are strict controls on the establishment of new schools and these must be a viable size. The government can merge (even across religious boundaries) or close schools. New schools must show that they are of a different type to those existing nearby. Ironically this has made it easier for Islamic and harder for evangelical Christian schools to be established.

The staff establishment budget accounts for around 85% of total funding. Other running expenses such as furniture, teaching materials and maintenance costs are funded on the basis of the number of pupils and classes. Funding for accommodation is made by the Municipal

Authorities. Secondary schools receive block grants from which all staff and running costs are to be met, based on a fixed amount per pupil and a fixed amount per school.

3. France

France has three categories of private school. What are called non-contract (private) schools are few in number, receive no funding and are subject to regulation only in areas such as student attendance and staff qualifications. Most private secondary schools are subject to a contract of association which imposes strict requirements in curriculum, staffing (appointed by a local schools authority), admissions policies, inspections and audits. They cannot charge admission fees but do have fees to meet building costs, not unlike New Zealand.

4. Other Europe

In some countries, schools in the grant-aided private sector receive the same funding as those in the public sector, in terms of the amounts involved. In the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland and Poland, there is no difference between the subsidy for schools administered by the public authorities and the amount allocated to grant-aided private schools.

Some EU countries (e.g. Denmark, Germany, Spain) offer subsidies to grant-aided private schools. The amounts of these subsidies and the methods of calculation differ from those applicable to public-sector schools, regardless of the resource category involved. In certain cases, the subsidy is equivalent to a fixed percentage of the allocation for public-sector schools.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL CONDITIONS OF OPERATION OF INTEGRATED SCHOOLS

	New Zealand	England and Wales	Ontario
Name and origins	Known as integrated schools. Set up in 1975 following financial difficulties for catholic schools.	Mostly known as voluntary aided/ voluntary controlled schools. Existed as public providers almost from the beginning of mass education.	Status determined at Confederation in 1867. Existing private systems given public funding.
Legislative framework	Subject to all the provisions of the Education Act as amended and of all the regulations made under any of those acts. Schools have an Integration Agreement with the government.	Subject to all the provisions of the Education Act as amended and of all the regulations made under any of those acts.	Similar to England and Wales. Note that there are in effect four systems because of the need to operate French language schools in both Catholic and public systems.
Sector sizes	State government schools 86% state integrated (mainly Catholic) schools 10%, private schools 4%	About one third of all state maintained schools have a faith character.	Public schools enrol around two thirds, Catholic schools one third with about 2% in private (independent) schools.
Affiliation	Most commonly Catholic Church	Mainly Church of England and Catholic churches	Only Catholic schools are funded as part of the state system.
Criteria for integration	Enrolment size, compliance with legislation and regulations	Compliance with legislation etc. In effect, schools were given the option to integrate from 1944	Faith school groups which existed in 1867.
School Governance	Boards of Trustees	Boards of Governors, representation depends on extent of govt funding.	School councils but considerable power remaining with (district) school boards
Accountability	To Ministry and statutory authorities. The Education Review Office (ERO) inspects all schools of all types	To LEA. All schools are subject to OFSTED inspections.	School boards are highly accountable
Resources	The same funding and staff entitlement as for government schools (based on enrolment and needs). Land and buildings privately owned.	Fully funded for recurrent and capital expenditure in line with other mainstream schools. 80% funding on enrolment, balance mainly on needs. Some additional funding from churches.	Catholic schools fully funded and receive a foundation grant based on enrolment and needs
Property	Owned by the school proprietors and improved using attendance fee revenue. Maintained and sometimes improved by the government	Land and buildings owned by a charitable foundation. The schools contribute 10% towards capital improvements. (20% in the case of City Technical Colleges which are privately sponsored)	Pupil Accommodation Grant funds the operation and maintenance of buildings, plus new schools or additions.
General and course fees	Same terms and conditions as all state schools. Course fees set at the same level.	Schools may seek voluntary fees	Schools may seek voluntary fees
Additional fees	Attendance dues (around \$400 but often higher) can be charged by integrated schools for land and buildings to match standard of government schools	Additional fees cannot be charged	Additional fees cannot be charged
Enrolment of students	Preference to students of the school's faith, some space for non-preference students. No other grounds for discrimination in enrolments. An enrolment ceiling is set. Not zoned, although government schools are zoned.	Usually based on proximity, siblings, or special needs which may be best met by the school. Faith schools often give preference to members of a particular faith. Banding (enrolment of an academic cross-section) is used in some urban schools.	Catholic schools can only enrol Catholic students. There are some loose interpretations of Catholicism but the restriction is far more strictly enforced than in other integrated systems.

Obligations on students	To participate in general activities which reflect the school's special character. Need not participate in specific religious observances	Similar to NZ. Note that community (LEA) schools are not strictly secular: religious studies are taught in all schools and all schools are supposed to start the day with a "collective act of worship"	Catholic schools enrol Catholic students so the obligations are set accordingly.
Enrolment profile	Catholic schools reflect a slightly lower proportion of Maori pupils and a significantly higher proportion of Pasifika pupils.	Varies considerably according to nature of immediate area. Research indicates that faith schools tend to enrol from higher income families. The differences are often subtle but significant in some areas.	Generally understood to reflect drawing area without any significant distinction between public and Catholic schools. Some slight advantage accrues to Catholic schools but it is not regarded as an issue.
Selective entry?	Not included in 2004 review.	Most schools in England and all schools in Wales are comprehensive.	All public and Catholic schools are comprehensive
Distinctiveness	Every school has its particular special character defined in its integration agreement.	Derived from links with the particular church. May have lost much distinctiveness over the last few decades.	Distinctiveness of Catholic schools is probably helped by enforced policy of only enrolling catholic students.
Curriculum	Same curriculum followed by all schools.	All schools follow national curriculum, with religious studies decided locally	Same curriculum followed by all schools.
Employment of staff	Ads for some staff (tagged positions) may specify a willingness and ability to teach religious instruction.	Must appoint fully trained staff. Lesser controlled schools may use religious and other discriminator to employ staff.	Staff are employed by school boards for the schools in the area.
Staff salaries and conditions	Teachers shall not be employed at a more favourable rate or have more favourable conditions than in the state system	Paid according to national salary scale	Paid according to agreed salary scale. There might be short-term variations between school boards but certainly not between Catholic and public schools.
Closing schools	Not included in review in 2004	The LEA can, in extreme cases (usually for financial reasons), close a school even against its will.	A local (district) board decision made especially for financial reasons, in consultation.
Trends and issues	Increasingly popular – some see them as a cheaper private school. Are they losing their character, becoming more values-based? NZ govt restricts the establishment of new schools. Concern that attendance dues are re-creating a differentiated system.	Increasingly regulated over a long period of time. Regarded by some as losing their distinctiveness – increasingly 'secularised'	The main issue is the increasing pressure to fund other faith schools currently locked out across Canada. The Conservative party in the provinces favours introducing this funding through tax concessions.
What about private (independent) schools?	They must be registered, receive about 25% (and falling) of funding from government	Don't receive general government subsidies. Some funding for special needs students, some tax relief	Independently operated and don't receive government funding. Exempt from most controls.

IDEAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING OUT OF THIS REVIEW

The extension of government funding to private schools in the reviewed countries has certainly created frameworks of schooling quite different to those which have evolved in Australia. Leaving aside the advantages or disadvantages of integrated systems, there is clear evidence that frequent attention in the reviewed countries was given to equity, access and opportunities for families. Even the current legislation in England sparked a fierce debate about student admissions and equity issues from the moment it first appeared as a white paper. While education policy in the reviewed countries has been characterised by familiar political swings and favours, there has been general acceptance that the state has an obligation to resource education for all students in as equitable a framework as possible.

By way of contrast the evolving provision and funding of private schools in Australia has not reflected any such sustained commitment. Each decision was made in a piecemeal fashion, reflecting campaigns of interest groups and special deals. In contrast to Canada our federal system has seen both commonwealth and the states making critical and often conflicting decisions affecting schools. Each decision was made without sufficient consideration being given to the way in which it would alter equity and access. No thought was given to even the rudimentary regulation needed to protect those who could only have access to the public system.

In the drive to cater for individual choices political leadership in Australia showed little concern about the cost to the community. There was seemingly no appreciation that education was and is part of the "commons", the resources which are held in common by the whole community, freely accessed and shared, in the same way as is the natural environment, shared spaces, public schools, hospitals, public transport and more.

As a consequence and by default or by design, the public system has been increasingly set up to struggle and in some judgements to fail. The processes by which this is occurring should not come as any great surprise. Amongst others, Ryan and Watson¹³ expressed some of the issues in this way:

... families most sensitive to changes in relative quality have been attracted to private schools, a group which might be expected to be more concentrated in the top half of the SES background distribution. Not surprisingly, we found that the top half of the SES distribution was where most of the shift in students from the government sector to the private sector had taken place.

... In documenting changes in the government policy framework for private schools over the past three decades, we found consequences that were never explicitly stated as either the objectives or the anticipated outcomes of government policy. These included the rise in private school fees from the mid-1980s and the actions of private schools to use government subsidies to improve quality while maintaining fee levels, rather than to reduce fees. This latter phenomenon, an outcome principally of the subsidies of one level of government, influenced directly the social composition of the student bodies at schools run by another level of government and the effective costs of educating students at those schools.

It is curious that government funding for private schools has been provided on the basis of "need" (variously defined) with little explicit consideration of the impact of private school subsidies on the government school system and the "needs" of the students who attend those schools. With the exception of the Commonwealth *New Schools Policy* between 1985 and 1995, there has been no interest at the state or federal level in properly defining the role and purpose of private schools in a subsidised system, nor in regulating the private sector to maximise student outcomes overall. This inadequate policy framework has permitted – and possibly encouraged – private schools to use public subsidies to position

¹³ Chris Ryan and Louise Watson *The Drift to Private Schools in Australia: Understanding its Features* The Australian National University Centre for Economic Policy Research, DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 479 September 2004

themselves in the market for high-SES students. A better-designed framework may have fashioned the subsidies to contribute to the public policy goal of achieving higher quality schooling for all.

If this situation continues, we are likely to see a continuing drift of above average SES students into the private school sector with the support of government subsidies. The problems posed for government secondary schooling of catering predominantly for students from lower-SES backgrounds will need to be addressed. The future viability of government secondary schooling, especially in relatively affluent metropolitan areas, must be questionable in these circumstances.

Professor Denise Bradley puts it another way¹⁴

“...under the banner of choice and with the underlying value position that those of us who can afford to do so should be able to buy greater access to what were once public goods, we have supported policies and funding arrangements which move pupils out of state schools which are secular and inclusive of all races and creeds into schools which are publicly funded but operate on a religious base.

The long term consequences of this for social cohesion and for the maintenance of any shared understanding of foundation values in an increasingly diverse society have not been adequately assessed.

If Australians had reached agreement about underpinning values and principles for setting the policy agenda for education it is unlikely we would have had the decisions of the last couple of decades. These decisions position education as a cost rather than an investment in our shared future and ignore its role as the fundamental building block of a vibrant mature democracy.

Even if we had made such decisions we would see them as experiments and be seriously assessing their impact on school participation and retention, on patterns of success in schools, on the ability of our community to live in peace and understanding with people of all races and creeds, and on participation in higher education.”

These local views of Australian schooling are reinforced by views from the outside. Australia stands out in most comparisons as having one of the highest funded yet least regulated private school sectors. This is even illustrated by research completed by, or sympathetic to, private schools and by conservative think tanks. They warn countries such as the USA that substantial regulation comes in the same bag as public funding. The Centre on Education Policy in the USA, for example, listed countries such as France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway and Spain as examples of where regulation matches the level of funding. Greece and Italy have more regulation than funding. The country with the biggest gap between high funding and low regulation is Australia¹⁵. The principals and education officers interviewed as part of this review uniformly could not believe that Australia had created a system with so little alignment between funding and regulation/obligation.

There has been substantial academic commentary about these issues in Australia but for many reasons little has filtered its way into the popular media and into anything that might pass as public debate. It is also worth noting that researchers and commentators often fall short of making recommendations which might help to restore the balance.

Most commonly those that do are pushing for a wider definition of what constitutes “public” in education, with a view towards integration. Brian Caldwell identifies a set of values which he believes determines a ‘public’ identity: choice, equity, access, efficiency, economic growth and harmony. Alan Reid and Pat Thomson explore different ways of thinking about the ‘public-ness’ of public education, saying curriculum lies at the heart of the education enterprise. Reid argues that in order to receive public funds, private schools be required to

¹⁴ Bradley, Denise Revaluing Education *New Matilda* June 16th 2006

¹⁵ Kober, Nancy *Lessons from other countries about private school aid* Centre on Education Policy www.ctredpol.org

demonstrate the ways in which they contribute to the agreed public principles¹⁶. Such ideas make a contribution but simply don't reflect a complete understanding of how such solutions might work on the ground in each and every school community. The solutions offered by people such as Caldwell, Reid and Thomson still carry significant risks for equity and access.

Others are able to articulate the problems but are less forthcoming when it comes to answers. The writers who argue strongly to protect the "commons" represented by public education, for example, fall well short of offering any solution which resonates in any practical way. James Arvanitakis writing in *New Matilda* (April 26th) even states that the commons should be accepted, not enforced. Barry McGaw's very influential PISA tests have created radical policy shifts to restore equity and education achievement in some countries but not in Australia. His most recent solutions for Australia also fall well short, resting on co-operation between education providers in newly establishing communities.¹⁷

There is also the array of panaceas created and disseminated by various conservative "think tanks". These most commonly lean towards charter schools and vouchers, amongst other suggestions. What they seem to have in common is a surplus of ideology and a deficit of verifiable evidence. On the other side of the divide some public education advocates summarily dismiss any solution which even remotely acknowledges the right of private schools to exist at all. For over four decades this thinking has stood in the way of the development of effective regulations which might have some chance of restoring the balance.

What many of these people seem to have in common is a reluctance to propose policy which matches appropriate regulation of private schools, as a minimum, to the extent of their public funding. It is as if they are seduced by the language of 'freedom' and 'choice' so successfully hijacked by advocates for private education.

INTEGRATION: AN OPTION FOR AUSTRALIA?

What can we learn from the experience of integrated systems? To the outsider integrated schooling seems initially attractive in the way it appears to level the playing field in the competition between schools, in the process creating or restoring some equity of provision. Closer examination in this review, however, has indicated that the apparent advantages which might be created by integration can easily erode, with faith schools along with many others accruing significant and unforeseen advantages.

The integration of Australia's private schools into the state systems, along the lines found in other countries, would also require a massive injection of public funds into private schools to compensate for the abolition of private school fees and charges. Even if the array of private school groups agreed to this it would not be acceptable to public school advocates. They would also be concerned at what would be the further intrusion of faith schooling, threatening the identity and integrity of public and secular schooling. In short, integration along the lines found overseas is not an option.

This doesn't mean that co-operative ventures and even integrated provision can't proceed in areas and circumstances where it might make considerable sense and lead to the efficient use of public funds. Examples already exist and others are proposed from time to time. The Victorian based Education Foundation proposes greater integration of provision in a trial basis

¹⁶ Reid, Alan Values and Australian Schools: Towards an inclusive and respectful society *New Matilda* June 7th 2006

¹⁷ Barry McGaw, *Achieving Quality and Equity Education* VASSP Annual Leadership Conference, Melbourne, September 2006

in smaller communities¹⁸ and the President of the Australian Secondary Principals' Association has flagged the need to rethink the way we define public education.¹⁹

What we can do is use the experiences and the debates which have been prominent in and about integrated systems to inform renewed efforts to try to address our legacy of four decades of regressive funding policy. What issues were considered overseas when integrated systems were established? Which of these issues remain important? Are there elements of integrated systems which might be feasible in Australia? Should we assess and fund schooling arrangements according to their contribution to 'public' or 'community' value'; rather than equating 'public' with one particular vehicle for service delivery – the 'government school'?

Is part of the answer found in tentative moves in Australia towards the development of a public or community charter²⁰ for all schools which receive public funding? Is it possible to define what is meant by 'public' in the area of education? If so, what changes have to be made to ensure that schools receiving public funds make a sufficient contribution to a public or community charter of obligations and operation?

One of the initial needs is to clarify understandings about the purpose of public funding in a democratic and civil society, in the process confronting and dismissing the arguments commonly made to use public funding in ways that undermine the common good. For example:

- access to public funds is not an entitlement to those who choose private schools. Taxes are not payments into some trust fund for people to draw down on to fund individual choice,
- it is doubtful, as is often claimed, that public funding of private schools represents a significant saving to governments. Even if this were the case, the purpose of funding education in a civil society is not to save money by pushing costs onto individuals. The related argument that private schools take pressure off the public system ignores both the amounts paid to private schools and the historical 23% of students who have always attended private schools, and
- the alleged sacrifices made by some to pay for private school fees might be admirable but it doesn't amount to a case for the whole community to provide additional support.

The issue of taxes is worth pursuing because deliberate confusion over the purpose and use of taxation revenue often gets in the way of good policy. It may well be that education has changed from being a common or public good to becoming a private and positional good. But that doesn't mean that the uses of taxation revenue should change accordingly. The roles and functions of government which are dedicated to creating a civil society should not be hijacked to serve private purposes. If that happens, the common wealth of a nation, with all that it contributes in social, economic and cultural terms, will inevitably deteriorate. This has considerable implications for social harmony, equity, economic progress and the sustainability of a democratic system.

The logical extension of this is that governments should not fund any private service or infrastructure: hospitals, child care, transport and of course schools. But when funding is provided the issue is not so much the ownership of the service (public or private), but in the extent to which the provider serves the whole community and takes on all the obligations which should come with the funding.

¹⁸ Education Foundation *Equity, Excellence and Effectiveness, a discussion paper from the Education Foundation's Case for Change Working Party*, 2005

¹⁹ <http://www.aspa.asn.au/Confs/vassp2006/blair.ppt>

²⁰ Tentative moves in this direction were made by the ALP in 2004. Amidst (and buried by) the election controversy over rich schools was a proposal for greater alignment of the operation and obligations of public and catholic schools.

For this reason it is possible for governments to support private schools, but the public funding should be linked to the extent to which the school serves a common or public, rather than a private good. A choice to serve a preferred and already advantaged portion of the community should not be rewarded with public funding. This suggests a new approach is needed to funding schools, one which is suggested later in this review.

The common policy in integrated systems is that schools must not charge fees, fees being a discriminator and selection mechanism, enabling schools to choose students. If equity and access is regarded as important in an education system then the charging of fees is not compatible with government funding; the fact that it is allowed alongside public funding in Australia explains many of our current problems.

Regulating fees is very difficult, even in integrated systems. Schools find a way to increase their privately-funded resources to add to their public funding. Whenever some charges are allowed in integrated schools (for example in New Zealand) it simply starts to replicate the equity and access problems allegedly resolved by integration.

Rather than abolish fees (at considerable public expense) a better option is to focus instead on the conditions that should accompany government funding alongside these fees, particularly conditions linked to existing resources, private sources of income, enrolment practices and compliance with public obligations, legislation and regulations.

Restoring a resources index

There certainly needs to be a better nexus between public funding and the existing resources of the school, including income from fees, if for no other reason to address the issue of over-resourcing, duplication and waste. The NSWSPC goes further to argue for a benchmark of standards, the exceeding of which results in a reduction of public funding. In the words of the NSWSPC public charter draft principles:

“... to the extent that these fees provide general educational resources or opportunities beyond those available in the public schools in the community, the public funding will be reduced or re-allocated among the schools in the community”²¹.

As a minimum this requires a restoration of the Education Resources Index (ERI) or an equivalent measure. This index was previously used to determine the level of Commonwealth general recurrent funding provided to private schools. This index is still used in NSW but at the national level has been replaced by an SES funding formula, topped up with a guarantee that no school would lose funding in the change from one system to another. In effect the application of the SES formula, deficient enough as it was, was corrupted from the beginning.

The removal of the resources index for Commonwealth funding has encouraged a fee and resources auction, especially amongst high fee schools. Without the equivalent of a salaries cap for resources (including salaries) the schools have escalated their fees, using these along with government grants, to engage in an escalating resources competition with other schools. There is little evidence to suggest that this improves student outcomes but there is reason to believe that it is dragging other schools, including public schools, into the auction. In many cases the ‘bang for the buck’ is simply not proven and there are few attempts to assess the benefits of the ever-increasing number of bottomless pits for educational expenditure. Some educators argue that the provision of information technology is a good example.

²¹ Reference in this section is made to draft principles and assumptions for a charter being developed as part of the NSWSPC Sustaining Quality Schools Project and particularly by Bernie Shepherd, executive officer for that project.

Linking funding to enrolment profile

From the outset, most integrating systems realised that the type of students a school was permitted to enrol was going to largely determine the profile and status (and to some extent the success) of that school and other schools. Hence funding and integration has mostly been accompanied by strict rules to prevent schools harvesting particular students at the expense of other students and schools. Even the 1944 Act in England required church schools to provide 25% of their enrolments as free places, mainly financed by LEAs. New Zealand's integrated schools must enrol some non-preference (non-faith) students with a ceiling placed on their numbers. Integrated schools in the Netherlands must enrol a student if there is no local alternative available.

There are no such controls in Australia, partly a legacy of political culture, recurring deals and decisions which did not attach sufficient regulations to funding. There was no debate about regulation and trade-offs: the battles over state aid instead have resembled protracted trench warfare without too many people lifting their heads to work on other solutions. Private school advocates might argue that the amount of funding falls short of the level at which substantial controls may be warranted. Yet the little regulation of private schools that we do have is not conditional on full funding: it does not even attempt to control those practices which most damage public schools, social capital and in some cases even community harmony.

The purpose of regulation and funding must be linked to community obligations. Despite a few decades of assaults on public infrastructure and services it remains an important role of government to create and maintain the commons or common wealth of a community. The use of public funds must not accentuate social and community division and must not restrict relative opportunities for large numbers of students. It is reasonable to argue that any government funding of private schools should be accompanied by a proportionate measure of public control over the manner in which they operate.

This especially includes practices surrounding the enrolment and 'dis-enrolment' of students. Could and should grants be indexed, not only to existing school resources but also to the enrolment profile of a school? A school's enrolment profile, more than anything else, can readily reveal the extent to which the school serves the whole population or selected portions. Is it possible to base grants around an enrolment index which might include such variables as the income level of the families, student ability levels and any diagnosed disabilities, the recency of newly arrived students from overseas? If not, what other measure might accurately reflect the extent to which a school is serving its whole community?

If it was feasible to measure a school's enrolment profile then government funding could be adjusted according to the extent to which each school enrolled a representative profile of students, compared with the profile of the school's drawing area and the statewide population. A school with an average enrolment profile would receive a certain amount of funding. Those with a profile skewed towards lower income families, less able or disabled students would receive more. Conversely, those schools which had a disproportionately high percentage of advantaged students (on various measures) in their enrolment would receive less.

Precedents for such conditional funding are already well established. Leaving aside the special deals, Commonwealth funding is now linked to socio-economic status (SES) even if it is the average SES of each students' postcode rather than more specific information about the wealth of the student's own family. NSW allocates disadvantaged funding according to a substantial family survey in which parents have to declare their employment and income. All schools in New Zealand are given a SES decile band on which funding is largely based. Even

the idea of ensuring a representative student intake is not new: some urban schools in England use academic banding to ensure and demonstrate that they take the full range of students in their area.

School funding which is linked to such variables as the income level of the families, student ability levels and disabilities would partly overcome the regressive impact of school fees on schooling in Australia. It would also alter other practices which currently enable a school to engineer its student and school achievement profile by using other discriminators: the inclusion of student ability levels in any enrolment profile would discourage schools from using scholarships to attract the most able among low income families, a practice which currently continues to disadvantage low-fee and public schools.

In short, linking funding to the profile of enrolments would establish the principle that organisations using public funding must:

- serve the whole community and not those parts of the public preferred by various providers
- be required to operate in ways which do not undermine the relative opportunities for students in public schools.

For some schools such restrictions might be too much and they would grudgingly forego their government funding in exchange for increased and genuine independence. Some might welcome the challenge to live up to their stated mission and egalitarian principles. The schools which attempt to prove their need by regularly wheeling out their “battlers” in front of the media at every election would have their *total* enrolment profile open to scrutiny.

How schools might create a more balanced enrolment profile is certainly a challenge. It might involve interviews with parents, working closely with principals of public schools or in some circumstances might include entry by ballot. This is used for out-of-zone enrolments in New Zealand public schools.

In addition, a number of vacancies could be reserved for special placement by local education authorities in consultation with the school governing body. While it might be anathema to some people, there is no reason, in this context, why targeted funding shouldn't accompany some of these placements. The reality is that Australia already has a de-facto voucher system with funding following enrolments. We shouldn't reject the principle of targeted funding just because it is currently used in regressive ways.

What also needs to be established is the mechanism through which government support is provided to the schools. The best solution might be to use the provision of staffing to schools as a mechanism, something suggested in a number of forums by Dr Lyndsay Connors²². Dr Connors has calculated that, if you aggregate all sources of funding, an effective 95% of all school students are actually taught by teachers funded from the public purse. It is appropriate to link this public provision of the most important resource to a school's willingness to cater for the whole community.

It is useful to consider how the linking of funding to a school's enrolment profile might impact on schools of various types:

High-fee independent schools: Most of these currently cater for a higher SES population. They would face the choice of having to decline government funding or accept entry of a wide enough range of students to ensure some funding. This might be attractive to those schools which already accept, and even subsidise, the enrolment of disabled or low income students, in part to implement the school's religious charter.

²² Including to the NSWSPC Sustaining Quality Schools conference in Canberra in October 2005.

Moderate fee Anglican or Christian community schools: While the existing enrolment profile is not known it is almost certain that these schools would also need to spread the range of their enrolments. Again this would also reflect and help implement the stated spiritual values of the schools.

Low fee Catholic schools: Based on information known about these schools it is likely that the enrolment profile might closely resemble that of the population local to the school. Enrolment profile linked funding might make little difference and in some cases might even benefit the school.

This proposal is based on a public purpose for public funding. Private schools must be able to demonstrate a level of community and public commitment which matches the extent of their public funding, or see their funding reduced. It is fair to say that a significant number of the staff and parents of private schools are uneasy at the impact of current enrolment practices on government schools. They would far prefer to be a party to better and fairer frameworks. Under these arrangements they would have the chance to make a genuine contribution to, rather than undermine, the common good.

Compliance with legislation and regulations

This is another area where regulation should not be conditional on schools being substantially funded or integrated. The relatively level playing field (by Australian standards) enjoyed by schools in integrated systems can be significantly established in Australia, as a condition of any public funding. Again in the words of the NSWSPC public charter draft principles:

Where tax revenue is applied to schools outside of the public system, it is given on the understanding that in its use of that funding, the school will act in the first instance as an agent for the government in discharging its public education obligations. Specifically, in accepting public money, the school will undertake all of the obligations and implement all of the policies, regulated procedures and accountabilities applying from time to time to comparable public schools, including but not restricted to:

- Enrolment policies and practices
- Annual reporting and financial statements
- Voluntary contributions
- Employment practices
- Child protection
- School uniforms
- Discipline codes and procedures, including suspension & expulsion
- Complaints procedures
- Canteens

This is not an unreasonable ask and it builds on common compliance in areas such as curriculum and (increasingly) teacher standards. Even the federal government is learning to insist on common standards in some areas such as school accountability and reporting. Some of the areas cited above might seem trivial but they are symbolic of the uneven ways in which public and private schools are permitted to operate. Some, including discipline codes and school uniform, are cited frequently by parents who change their child's school.

Special character of faith schools

The integration of private schools into public systems overseas has been accompanied by considerable concessions to the special faith character of the school. This includes allowing the school to discriminate in enrolment of some students and also in the employment of staff to favour those committed to the faith. Most commonly, a proportion of staff positions are tagged to be filled in this way, but selective employment of religious staff is frequently accompanied by other forms of discrimination aimed at securing staff who might be suited to the ethos of the school. It would certainly be the case that, even if private schools were

integrated, they would still insist on the right to use faith and lifestyle criteria in the employment of all their staff.

It is not unreasonable to insist that the type of staff employed and the processes used in government-funded private schools should reflect the extent of their public funding. This would be easy to achieve: the proportion of teachers employed using the criteria of commitment to the faith should reflect the private proportion of the school's income. The remaining staff should be employed using the same criteria as in public schools, something which will be made easier following the establishment of the Institute of Teachers. It is also reasonable to suggest that teachers and other staff employed using public funds should work under the same salary and conditions as teachers in public schools. This would act as a de facto salary cap, a suitable brake on differential salary levels which are increasingly dividing along public/private lines. This doesn't prevent any school from rewarding good teachers through promotion and associated salary increases.

The enrolment of students poses an interesting challenge, with often contradictory implications. Some countries such as New Zealand and much of Canada restrict the enrolment of faith students to those committed to the specific faith. This may have the effect of more accurately implementing the faith charter of the school. The extent to which a school's faith creates a socio-economic mix of enrolments also varies: Catholic schools in England, for example are more likely to be more ethnically and socially diverse than Church of England schools. New admissions legislation has prodded both churches to open their schools to other faiths. In effect, the schools could become more diverse and generic religious schools, although the extent to which they maintain the faith - any faith - is even now debatable.

In the Australian context some might argue for faith-specific enrolment restrictions on private schools, thus reducing their disproportionate 'middle class' enrolment profile. On the other hand, public education advocates argue, with some justification, that the narrowing of the enrolment base of schools to specific religions (and even to cultural groups) reduces the contribution that schools can make to social bridging. A possible solution lies in the New Zealand model in which there is a ceiling on the proportion of the enrolment which is non-faith specific.

Accountability: a need to shift the focus

Much of the effort to regulate private schools in Australia has focused on accountability regimes. Some states such as NSW have moved some way to tightening up accountability requirements and in one sense private schools are very accountable. However, the movement to increase accountability has partly missed the point: accountability is built around an explanation of what schools do, rather than specifying what they should do. Current accountability measures by themselves do not sufficiently target the public obligations which should accompany funding.

There is actually an argument for reducing much of the accountability regime on schools which opt to receive minimal or no public funding. The norm in overseas countries is to reduce such accountabilities to cover compliance with generic legislation such as basic health and safety, child protection and similar requirements. The principle of *caveat emptor* (let the buyer beware) should apply to the families who enrol in these schools. The value of this approach is that it provides a further incentive for some schools to opt out of public funding altogether.

The exception might be in those legislation and requirements which currently create an advantage for government-funded private schools at the expense of the public sector. Legislation on such matters as freedom of information, the charities status of private schools,

the audit obligations of government schools combine to unnecessarily expose one sector while protecting the other, despite that sector's level of public funding.

New schools policy

Policies to regulate the establishment of new schools are quite strictly enforced in integrated systems, for example New Zealand and the Netherlands. New schools must demonstrate that they are viable and that existing schools don't meet the demand. Yet a country doesn't have to integrate schools to monitor and govern the establishment of new public and private schools: Australia had a new schools policy until it was abandoned by the Howard government, in the process creating a serial waste of public funds through duplication of facilities. More than one community has witnessed the scenario of Catholic school encroaching on government school enrolments, in turn to lose students to community Christian schools and these in turn to be under siege from Anglican schools. The ecumenical movement is surely blessed by the capacity of some families to move seamlessly from one faith to another.

There is no realistic ceiling on the allocation of public funds for new schools. How much public funding is wasted by the ideological need to duplicate what passes as choice? Do we need a new Christian or Islamic school in every adjoining group of suburbs? Is it an obligation of government to finance these schools?

The lack of a new schools policy in Australia is symbolic of the duplication of state-commonwealth policies, with the states having to maintain a universal and inclusive public system while the Commonwealth disperses new schools without regard for efficiency and need. There are a number of solutions. In the words of the NSWSPC public charter draft principles:

“Where unused capacity exists in the public schools within a community, funding to any non-government schools serving the same community will be progressively reduced, withdrawn or re-allocated among the schools in the community”.

Closing schools

The flip side of new schools is the vexed issue of closure. With the exception of procedures developed by systemic schools there is no policy or criteria for the closure of private schools. This is despite the fact that many have small and fragile enrolments. While it isn't easy to do, the Ministry of Education in New Zealand, the LEAs in England and Wales and the school boards in Ontario have the power to close schools. Not only can such schools be closed in the Netherlands but different religious schools can be merged.

In Australia only government schools can be merged or closed by state governments. The Commonwealth doesn't assume any obligation to close the schools it funds, even if they remain too small to be otherwise viable or cost-efficient. The states have an obligation to provide the first school in any new community and to be the last out when the population declines. Clearly, policy needs to be developed to rationalise provision of private schools where this need exists. It is unacceptable to close a government school in a community and to bus the remaining students to a more distant school while the local faith school remains untouched.

Changes to public education

The lasting lesson arising out of the past few decades is that public education policy cannot be made in a vacuum. Public and private schools don't exist in parallel universes: what goes on in one sector impacts on other schools. The establishment of multi-campus colleges often attracts enrolments from private schools. Increasing resourcing in private schools has an

impact on the public sector which struggles to remain competitive. Improvements in social capital through education will have little chance of being realised while ever these piecemeal changes ignore the total landscape of schools.

The policy changes suggested in this review are designed to prevent government funding from being used to create or exacerbate the growing equity divide and to further reduce opportunities for students. There are many changes occurring in public education which will help those schools become more competitive with private providers. These include sensible devolution of decision making capacity. They may also include increasing specialisation of public schools, something which is possible as long as safeguards are in place to protect access and enrolments. Sensible specialisation need not be accompanied by rampant devolution.²³

There is also the need to include significant increases in investment in public education, most recently identified as being in the order of thirteen per cent²⁴. Despite some mistakes in other policy areas, places such as England, Wales and Ontario have made a substantial new investment in public education over the last half decade.

There is no reason to shield public schools from some of the policy options mentioned above. Any policy to reduce the socio-economic sifting created by school fees also needs to consider other forms of selection which may impact on opportunities for students in other schools. Whether public educators like it or not, it opens up the debate on the place and future of selective schools in both public and private school settings.

Selective schools are excellent schools, in some cases helping talented students achieve results above levels they may achieve in other school settings. However we cannot escape the high probability that selective schools diminish the quality of the education commons which is available to all students. Public educators need to look very carefully at what PISA is revealing about the inverse relationship between selectivity and equity:

In Hungary, Belgium and Germany, for example, students are sorted into schools of different types according to their school performance as early as age 12. The intention is to group similar students within schools differentiated by the extent of academic or vocational emphasis in their curriculum. This is intended to minimise variation within schools in order then to provide the curricula considered most appropriate for the differentiated student groups. It has the consequence of maximising the variation between schools²⁵

In Poland the early streaming of students into schools of different types was abandoned in favour of substantially comprehensive schooling. Not only was the between-school variation reduced but Poland was the only country to improve its average performance significantly on all PISA measures. It did so largely by raising the achievement levels of its poorer performing students. As McGaw says:

...there is a benefit for advantaged students in keeping company with similarly advantaged students but a compounded disadvantage for disadvantaged students keeping company with others like themselves.

The long term benefits for the whole community of teaching gifted and talented students in separate schools is simply not proven and is almost certainly contributing to the equity divide.

²³ There is a host of related issues of the nature of comprehensive and specialist schooling, the issues of school zoning and enrolment policies which needs to be the subject of a separate review

²⁴ "Government schools 'underfunded by 13%'" *The Age*, September 4, 2006. The MCEETYA Schools Resourcing Taskforce findings show the public school system needs an extra \$2.4 billion a year to meet goals education ministers set in 1999.

²⁵ Barry McGaw, *Achieving Quality and Equity Education* VASSP Annual Leadership Conference, Melbourne, September 2006

At the same time, earlier suggestions to reduce the number of selective schools in NSW²⁶ were made in the absence of any linked proposals to change private schools and would have certainly shifted the enrolments of gifted and talented students into private education.

²⁶ *Inquiry into the Provision of Public Education in NSW, Report of the 'Vinson Inquiry'*, Pluto Press, 2002.

Conclusion

There are clearly significant forces for division and inequity in schooling in Australia. What is demonstrably different about Australia is the extent to which public policy on the establishment and funding of schools is part of the problem rather than part of the solution. With all its faults, at least the idea behind integrated schooling acknowledges that schools should not diminish the common good. The question has always been whether integrated schooling should be an option for Australia.

This review seeks to make a contribution in the way that it:

- reaches a firm conclusion about the relevance of integrated schooling models to Australia. This may help to eliminate what is amounting to a distraction in the form of the ongoing debate about public and private schooling
- firmly links, as an alternative, public support and funding of private schools to a carefully defined set of obligations, especially the obligation on a funded school to serve all of the public.

Clearly solutions for Australia can be found in considerably increased regulation without creating an integrated system. This requires an increased public awareness of the issues and corresponding pressure on governments to act. A source of pressure might be created by the closure of more public schools (partly due to demographic change) and the loss of a quality local free education for families. Until governments start to feel this pressure they are going to be most unwilling to wind back the operational advantages and flexibility they have given to private schools.

The other need is for genuine commonwealth-state agreement on a raft of schooling and funding issues. The report of the MCEETYA task force on resourcing of schools shows promise, but the track record of the MCEETYA, going back to the Adelaide Declaration, shows that the federal government pays little more than lip service to such agreements.

For public educators there is certainly pressure to provide, within an equitable framework, a greater element of choice for parents and to address sincerely felt parental concerns and anxieties. After all, if MY child is special (and they all are) can I really be sure that the local comprehensive school is good enough? Part of the answer may lie in specialisation, as long as it is not accompanied by discrimination in enrolments, especially encouraged by local control over student admissions.

The enduring oddity in our evolving landscape of schools is that we have never really had a national (and rational) debate about the issues increasingly emerging in the public-private divide. Current frameworks, by default (or as some say) by design, are set up to condemn one sector to struggle and assist the other to succeed. It is certainly well beyond time to have this debate and develop sustainable public policy for our schools. In the process we need to be clear about what are real and what might be diversionary issues. In the words of Tom Bentley:

“The crucial issue is not whether you go to a government or a ‘government-independent’ school, but the extent to which variation between schools reflects socio-economic stratification and social geography, and to which the structure of schooling places students in ‘streams’ which fix their destination as adults from an early age. This is true *within* the public and private sectors, as well as between them.

Even without deliberate policy, the combination of these various factors can produce an overall direction of change in which the competitive use of individual choice, combined with selection and streaming and an increasing concentration of social geography, will stratify the opportunities available to students from different socio-economic backgrounds and undermine the performance of the system as a whole”²⁷.

²⁷ Bentley, Tom *A fair go: public value and diversity in education*, Demos 2004

In one sense the current public-private divide and debates about the ownership of schools are masking the more critical and damaging equity and opportunity gaps created by schools being able to assume, with public funding, quite different sets of obligations. The most damaging schools choice of all is the choice of some schools to decide which parts of the community they wish to serve.

Public education has played a very important role in helping to build the social capital and the social bridging that keeps our societies and communities together. Right from the outset Sir Henry Parkes envisaged public schools as making “no distinction of faith, asking no question about where a child was born, what may be his condition of life or what the position of his parents, but inviting all to sit side by side”.

While the distinctions of faith have persisted in schooling we need to ask ourselves what we can now do to maximise the extent to which our students can really sit side by side.

We need to go back four decades and have the debate and create the frameworks we should have made when funding was first given to private schools. The debate needs to refocus on the part played by the resources contributed by the community towards the education of its children. Do we really want the wealth generated by the whole community to support agencies and services which demonstrably do not serve the whole community ... and in the process might be restricting opportunities for all our young people, threatening our social and community fabric and probably the future wealth of the community?

Chris Bonnor
October 24th, 2006

Background Sources included:

Pauline Nesdale *International perspectives on government funding on non-government schools*, Education Forum, No 7 March 2003.

<http://www.nfer.ac.uk/eurydice/themes-home.cfm>

Chris Ryan and Louise Watson *The Drift to Private Schools in Australia: Understanding its Features* The Australian National University Centre for Economic Policy Research, DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 479 September 2004

Barry McGaw, *Achieving Quality and Equity Education* VASSP Annual Leadership Conference, Melbourne, September 2006. <http://www.aspa.asn.au/>

Kober, Nancy *Lessons from other countries about private school aid* Centre on Education Policy www.ctredpol.org

Jenkins, Stephen P., Micklewright, John and Schnepf, Sylke V. (2006) *Social segregation in secondary schools: how does England compare with other countries?* Southampton, UK, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/19204/>

The Sutton Trust *The Social Composition of Top Comprehensive Schools*, January 2003 www.suttontrust.com/reports.asp

Kober, Nancy *Lessons from other countries about private school aid*, Centre on Education Policy <http://www.cep-dc.org/>

Interviews:

Phil Crompton, Headteacher, Holgate School, Hucknall, Nottingham
Ian Turner, Director of Strategy, Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, London
Alan Flintham, Education Consultant, Derby and formerly Headteacher, Quarrydale Comprehensive School, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Nottinghamshire
David Shannon, Headteacher, The National School, Hucknall, Nottingham

Stephen Marshall, Director, DELLS, Cardiff
Arwell Thomas, Executive Services Officer, DELLS
Ann McGregor, Head of Provision of School Places, DELLS
Sylvia Lindoe, Head of Schools management Division, DELLS
Stephen Hughes, Head of School Statistics, DELLS
Alan Landsdown, Head of Additional Needs and Inclusions, DELLS.

Roger Griffin, Headteacher, Kings Monkton School, Cardiff

Mike Benson, Executive Director, Ontario Principals' Council, Toronto

NZ schools in Auckland and district visited in 2004 in conjunction with the Role of the Principal Project: De La Salle College, Avondale College, Kaipara College.

Additional:

Thanks also to Ross Pearce and Bernie Shepherd for comments on the draft.