



AEU – ACT BRANCH

SCHOOLS FUNDING REVIEW SUBMISSION

March 2011

The Australian Education Union – ACT Branch welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission to the Schools Funding Review. This submission should be read in conjunction with the AEU Federal submission, and submissions made by AEU-ACT Sub-Branches, ACT public schools and their communities. The AEU is the peak professional and industrial organisation which represents more than 3,100 members in ACT public schools and the Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT). This membership represents the vast majority of principals and teachers and an increasing membership base of Learning Support Assistants, Indigenous Education Officers, Youth Workers and other education workers who directly support students in public schools.

The AEU - ACT Branch supports the goals of the Schools Funding Review as stated by the Commonwealth Government to come up with a new model of school funding informed by the principles of fairness, equity, excellence for all, simplicity, flexibility, stability, value for money, transparency, best practice, evidence, financial sustainability and efficiency in the expenditure of public money. We contend that the current arrangements fail to meet a number of these criteria, and evidence for this will be presented throughout the submission.

The AEU - ACT Branch submission will address these principles as they are picked up in key themes of the December 2010 Emerging Issues Paper.

Key Theme - Equity of Educational Outcomes

One of the themes reflected in the first Term of Reference is equity of educational outcomes:

1: The role of funding arrangements in supporting improved educational outcomes, including:

a) links between school resourcing and educational outcomes;

- b) *funding allocation mechanisms that address current barriers to educational achievement such as English language proficiency, indigeneity, location, disability and special needs, and other disadvantaged groups such as low socio-economic areas and other concentrations of disadvantage.*

The AEU-ACT Branch agrees that “barriers” such as those mentioned in Term of Reference 1 are likely to have an impact on the educational needs and outcomes of students, and thus of schools and sectors.

The Melbourne Declaration on the Educational Goals for Young Australians set two fundamental educational goals:

1. The promotion of **equity** and excellence in education.
2. That **all young Australians** become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens.

The purpose of any new funding system must be the attainment of these goals.

The ACT’s public schools educate the vast majority of students with additional educational needs. This “heavy lifting” needs to be acknowledged in any new funding system. In the majority of cases, it is public schools which are making adjustments to programs, providing additional support services, resources and technologies in order to meet additional needs. A key tenet of any new system for school funding must be the targeting of support for the additional educational needs of various groups of students, as there are large gaps in outcomes between many students in these groups.

ACT public schools educate the majority of students from low Socio-Economic Status (SES) backgrounds.

Independent researcher Barbara Preston’s extensive analysis of the 2006 Census data (B. Preston, *“The social make-up of schools: Family income, religion, Indigenous status, and family type in government, Catholic and other non-government schools”*, October 2007) shows that while the public sector’s share of enrolments has declined, there has been an increasing concentration of students from low-SES backgrounds in public schools and an increasing concentration of students from high-SES backgrounds in the Catholic and Independent sectors.

Australia-wide, from 1991 to 2006, the proportion of low-SES students in public schools has increased significantly, while it has decreased in the private sector. In 2006, public schools enrolled 66% of all students. Within this, public schools educated:

- 78% of students from **very low income** families (less than \$650 of family income per week)
- 77% of students from **low income** families (less than \$1000 per week)

- 68% of students from **medium income** families (\$1000-\$1699 per week)
- 53% of students from **high income** families (more than \$1700 per week)

When it comes to educating students from lower income families, public schools are clearly and increasingly “punching above their weight” by educating an increasing number of students with additional educational needs using limited or reduced resources.

In 2006, across all ACT school sectors (public, Catholic and Independent), 19% of students were from **low income** families. ACT public schools were educating 24% of students from low income families, whereas 13% were being educated in Catholic schools and 10% in Independent schools.

In the same year, across all ACT school sectors, 25% of students were from **medium income** families. ACT public schools were educating 27% of students from medium income families, compared with 23% in Catholic schools and 16% in Independent schools.

And, across all ACT school sectors, 56% of students were from **high income** families. ACT public schools were educating only 49% of students from high income families, compared with 64% in Catholic schools and 74% in Independent schools.

As former Productivity Commission economist Trevor Cobbold of advocacy group *Save Our Schools* has consistently demonstrated, there are significant differences in education outcomes between high-SES and low-SES students. In his Education Policy Brief of 1 March 2011, Cobbold writes:

The 2009 PISA [Programme for International Student Assessment] results [for Australia] show that, on average, low-SES 15 year-old students are two to three years behind high-SES students in reading, mathematics and science. Results from PISA 2003 and 2006 show that low-SES students enrolled in schools with a high proportion of students from low-SES families are nearly four years behind students from high income families in high-SES schools...

The proportion of high-SES students achieving the highest proficiency levels is about 5 times that of low-SES students. In 2009, only 5% of low-SES students achieved the highest reading proficiency standard compared with 24% of high-SES students. In mathematics, the respective proportions were 6% and 30% and in science it was 6% compared to 28%...

There are also large differences in school completion rates for students from different social groups. The proportion of low-SES students who fail to complete Year 12 is nearly double that of high-SES students. In 2008, 42% of

low-SES students ... failed to complete Year 12 compared to 23% of students from high-SES families.

Equity of educational outcomes for all students must be the aim of a new funding system. Therefore, schools that educate the majority of students from low-SES backgrounds must receive additional funding to help close the educational achievement gap.

ACT Public Schools educate the majority of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

ABS data from 2009 shows that 85.7% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students attended government schools. In the ACT, this figure is 80.1%.

Enrolment Numbers *ABS Schools Australia 2009* Released March 2010: Indigenous Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students - by States and Territories and School Affiliation; All FTE Students.

Barbara Preston's analysis of the income background of Indigenous students shows that public schools educate 90% of low income Indigenous secondary students compared to 70% of high income Indigenous secondary students. Catholic schools educate just 10% of all Indigenous secondary students, but 20% of high income Indigenous secondary students attend Catholic schools. Only 6% of all Indigenous secondary students attend other private schools, although they enrol 10% of high income Indigenous secondary students. (The pattern is similar at the primary level.) (B. Preston, "The social make-up of schools", October 2007)

Trevor Cobbold has shown that there are significant differences in education outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. In his Education Policy Brief of 1 March 2011, Cobbold again refers to the 2009 PISA data:

Fifteen year-old Indigenous students are 2-2½ years behind non-Indigenous students and are three to four years behind high-SES students...

About 55% of Indigenous students enrolled in Years 7/8 fail to progress through to Year 12.

A new funding system must genuinely attempt to close the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students.

ACT Public Schools educate the majority of students with special needs and disabilities.

Productivity Commission data from 2009 shows that 79.1% of students with disabilities and special needs attended government schools. In the ACT this figure is 80.3%.

Productivity Commission *Report on Government Services 2011* [ABS 2010, Schools Australia 2008, Cat. no. 4221.0; DEEWR (unpublished)]

Anecdotal evidence suggests that defence families choose to relocate to the ACT to take advantage of the special education provision that ACT public schools provide.

Public Schools educate the vast majority of students in the ESL New Arrivals Program.

National 2002-06 enrolment data for the English as a Second Language (ESL) New Arrivals Program provided by DEST in 2007 shows that 91.1% of these students are enrolled in government schools. In the ACT this figure is 100%, as all ESL new arrival students enrol in the public system's primary and secondary Introductory English Centres (IECs).

It should be noted that the disadvantage experienced by refugee students is often compounded by a number of factors. It is often the case that ESL students from refugee backgrounds are also from a low-SES background. Refugee students come to Australia with a significant range of experiences, possibly including trauma, and sometimes have little or no formal education.

In the ACT, ESL programs in public schools have undergone significant cuts since the year 2000 despite the fact that the number of ESL students has increased by 35% between 2000 and 2009. This has resulted in a reduced pool of funds being distributed to ESL programs to support a growing number of ESL students. In 2010, only 48% of ESL students identified as requiring additional support were able to receive targeted support from an ESL teacher.

In 2009, the Commonwealth Government changed funding arrangements for the ESL New Arrivals Program and ESL General Support Funding Grants which went towards supporting programs in the ACT's Introductory English Centres. The funds were rolled into a "Specific Purpose" base, and the ACT Department of Education and Training now decides how these funds will be directed. This is done by providing funds for targeted ESL support only for students with English proficiency of 'well below average English speaking competence' or below. In 2010, this resulted in 52% of all ESL students missing out on targeted support. ESL programs in all public schools need to be assured of adequate funding and staffing levels and the ongoing future of the programs.

Resourcing issues for new arrivals programs are well illustrated by this excerpt from the submission to the review by Dickson College, an inner-north secondary college:

The Dickson College Refugee Bridging Program is essential but it entails additional costs. It should attract additional funding.

The school perceived a need to provide a bridging program to enable students with a refugee experience to succeed in Years 11 and 12. There are currently 18 students enrolled in the program, 30 students have been enrolled since 2009; it is the only program of this nature in the ACT. This program makes a significant demand on

resources as students need intense literacy and numeracy support, which in turn requires small classes of approximately 10. The school funds excursions and camps because we believe that these are valuable educational opportunities which students themselves are unable to fund.

Refugee students attract the extra funding associated with ESL students generally but this is insufficient to resource the specialised support the Refugee Bridging Program provides. Initially, 'new arrival' funding was to be used but this funding has ceased. Lack of funding means texts books and teaching and learning resources are borrowed from other faculties. Lack of funding limits the curriculum; the primary focus is future pathways but there is no funding available to support excursions and the development of ongoing links to other educational options.

Dickson College is proud of the Refugee Bridging Program and the specialised support it provides. Unfortunately, no additional funding is provided to support the Program and, therefore, Dickson College is forced to sacrifice other commitments to support this vital program for college-aged refugee students.

A new funding system must give priority and certainty to the funding of the overwhelming proportion of refugee students who are educated in public schools.

ACT Public Schools educate the majority of students who are 'at risk' of missing out on education.

Whilst specific figures for the ACT are not readily available, education economist and policy analyst Adam Rorris' analysis of 'students at risk' data from 2006 showed that 78% of students defined as being 'at risk' by the MCEETYA Schools Resourcing Taskforce are enrolled in public schools. The skewed nature of educational disadvantage correlates with the higher proportion of students from low-SES backgrounds in public schools. The fact that nearly 80% of the students 'at risk' can be found in public schools provides a clear signal to governments as to where the funding needs can be found.

Equity of Educational Outcomes - Conclusion

In any new funding system, there must be recognition of the additional costs involved in educating children from a diverse range of backgrounds and circumstances. The AEU - ACT Branch fully supports the AEU Federal Conference 2011 decisions:

*14.1.7. The primary purpose of Commonwealth/State government funding is to resource all public schools to a standard which guarantees a world-class education for all children in their local community. This requires a baseline funding guarantee, with **weightings to address disadvantage** including intersecting and compounding disadvantage – low-SES, Indigeneity, geographic location, English language needs, and special needs/disabilities.*

14.1.8. This is the basic principle of an education guarantee in a modern democracy; a national compact to provide all parents and students irrespective of background, income or location with a fully funded, secular, world-class education in their local community.

14.2.5 Private schools whose enrolment includes students with identified special needs/disabilities, students from low-SES families, and Indigenous students would be able to access a pool of money to enable them to meet the learning needs of these students. Schools would be accountable for ensuring the funds are used for that purpose.

The AEU - ACT Branch congratulates the review panel for committing to the OECD's definition of equity in education, namely that "a commitment to equity means that differences in educational outcomes should not be the result of differences in wealth, income, power or possessions." A new funding system that is true to this definition will be critical in achieving the Prime Minister's aim that demography not be destiny.

Key Theme - Government funding

The current government funding arrangements for schools inadequately supports students with the greatest need.

In 2007-8, total expenditure per student (from all sources of income, public and private) in Australia's public schools was \$10,723. In Catholic schools it was \$10,399 and in Independent schools it was \$15,147.

In the ACT in 2010, some elite private schools had a per student income of around \$18,000. Some elite private schools outside of the ACT have a per student income of between \$25,000 and \$35,000.

In summary, across the country, public schools have similar total resources to Catholic schools, 70% of the resources of independent schools and in some cases less than half of the resources available to the most elite schools. This is despite the fact that, as has been demonstrated above, public schools continue to educate more than 80% of students who experience disadvantage, or who have additional educational needs.

In the ACT in 2010, Canberra Grammar School had a per student income (from all sources of funding) of \$18,874, Canberra Girls' Grammar School \$17,841 and Radford College \$15,142. Yet these schools continue to receive \$2000-\$4000 per student annually from government funding, despite having almost double the resources of public schools and negligible levels of education disadvantage.

The AEU – ACT Branch contends that responsible public funding arrangements must ensure that priority is given to overcoming disadvantage, particularly in public schools. Australia's most recent PISA results show that our education system is

delivering for the students at the high achievement levels but that it is largely failing the students at the lower achievement levels. Students in public schools in the ACT, like those across the country, would benefit enormously from a recalibration of the arrangements for government funding of schools to address need.

The SES model is inherently and deeply flawed. It entrenches and perpetuates disadvantage.

The SES funding model sees private school funding follow the student, based on an assessment of the socio-economic status of the geographical area in which that student lives. The illogical nature of this mechanism is reflected in the decision by the Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA) to cease using it to calculate a schools' Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) on the *MySchool* website. The new ICSEA on *MySchool 2.0* makes assessments of a school's socio-economic status (and/or level of advantage or disadvantage) based not on census collection data as it had in the especially problematic *MySchool 1.0*, but on the educational qualifications and incomes of parents/guardians. Whilst imperfect, this is a more reliable mechanism for assessing disadvantage and serves to further discredit the flawed SES model which is inherently biased against public schools and in favour of private schools.

Within the ACT, disadvantage is spread both across and within suburbs. Most ACT suburbs contain pockets of disadvantage. One example is the unusually large (by Canberra standards) suburb of Kambah, where the particular circumstances perfectly illustrate the flawed, illogical and biased nature of the SES funding model. Some Kambah residents are professionals earning high salaries and residing in million dollar homes. Other Kambah residents are at or below the poverty line. Currently, private schools receive funding for each Kambah student based on an assessment of the socio-economic profile of that area. That private school benefits from the fact that children from relatively wealthy families happen to come from a suburb where the presence of low income families brings down the socio-economic average. This is a windfall for private schools and it allows them to increase the attraction of their school for higher income families. This has the effect of enticing or 'sucking out' Kambah's higher income families into private schools and 'residualising' local public schools.

The Goals of the Review

As stated at the beginning of this submission, the AEU - ACT Branch supports the goals of the Review to come up with a new model of school funding informed by the principles of fairness, equity, excellence for all, simplicity, flexibility, stability, value for money, transparency, best practice, evidence, financial sustainability and efficiency in the expenditure of public money. In our view, it is long overdue.

Here the AEU – ACT Branch addresses a few of these principles that have not been addressed in detail above (such as fairness, equity and excellence for all).

Value for money

In 2009, Canberra Grammar School made a \$500,000 profit and had net assets worth \$14.8 million.

In the same year, Canberra Girls' Grammar School's profit was not available but its net assets were worth \$67 million.

In 2008, Radford College had a surplus of \$1.7million and had \$26.3 million in net assets. In 2007, its surplus was \$1.6 million.

There is no justification for schools to sit on enormous assets and make large profits when other schools and students have to make do with much less. Areas of need are clear. For example, there is considerable nationally-comparable data available which speaks to the high literacy and numeracy needs of some students in some schools across the country and in the ACT. Reporting of the data is logically accompanied by direct and targeted resourcing of programs to address areas of need. Under the current funding arrangements, unacceptably high levels of government funding goes to some schools that do not demonstrate a need, as evidenced by national and international data.

Transparency

Whilst public school finances are made completely public, the same cannot be said for the finances of many private schools. The AEU - ACT Branch contends that funding to private schools should be determined by rating each private school with reference to enrolment practices, compliance with mandated curriculum, public accountability, fees charged and **the total income, assets and resources at the disposal of that school**. On the acceptance of government funds, private schools must be obliged to provide details of profits, assets and financial reserves such as investments, foundations and trusts. As Julia Gillard argued in her time as Education Minister, it is only by looking at the total resources of schools that we can reach an understanding of the relationship between resourcing and outcomes. We will never truly have transparency until this condition is met.

Financial sustainability and efficiency in the expenditure of public money

The SES model has failed to achieve one of its stated aims of reducing private school fees and increasing accessibility. As former Education Minister David Kemp told Parliament on 29 March 2001, "... schools like Wesley College and numbers of other schools have also indicated that, when they receive the funding entitlement

that they will under this [SES funding] policy, they will be *reducing their fees* and that will be welcomed by many students and many families. *Our policy will continue to put a downward pressure on school fees.*" (Hansard)

Private school fees have increased substantially over the period 2001-2011. (See Appendix A.)

At Canberra Grammar School, fees for Year 12 have more than doubled over the period, from \$8,500 to \$17,930 per year.

Similarly, Canberra Girls Grammar School fees for Year 12 have increased from \$8,359 to \$17,350 per year.

The pattern is similar across other ACT private schools.

The value for money of the current arrangements is brought into question because increased Commonwealth funds have not been used to meet the stated aim of keeping private school fees down, thereby making private schools more accessible or inclusive. Instead, funds from increased fees have been used to improve facilities for the students who are already enrolled, and to entice those families who may be able to afford the significant fees into their schools and away from under-resourced public schools. The money has been used to improve the "product" and to attract those with the means to pay for it. Funding has also been used to increase assets - to improve sporting facilities and ICT provision. It has been used to increase teacher salaries and thereby make the salaries of public school teachers uncompetitive. It has been squandered away - bolstering surpluses, acquiring real estate and increasing profits.

Over the period 2001-2011, Commonwealth funding to ACT private schools almost doubled in many cases and more than doubled in others. In 2011 alone, Daramalan College, Marist College and St Mary MacKillop College will *each* receive more than \$9.7 million in Commonwealth funding.

It is clear also that Commonwealth funding increases have no connection with student enrolment numbers.

ACT schools that were in an establishment phase in 2001 when the SES model was introduced, such as Radford College, Brindabella Christian College, Emmaus Christian School and Burgmann Anglican School, have seen Commonwealth funding increases of between two and four times any increase in student enrolments over the last decade.

Canberra Grammar School's student numbers increased by 6.2% over the period, yet its Commonwealth funding increased by 98.6%.

Daramalan College saw an increase of 9.9% in student numbers, yet received an 85.1% boost in Commonwealth funding.

The trends are similar for Canberra Girls' Grammar School, Marist College, St Edmund's College, Merici College, St Clare's College, St Francis Xavier College and St Mary MacKillop College.

Furthermore, Commonwealth funding increases clearly have no connection with increases in the operational costs of private schools.

The wage price index published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that private education and training costs increased by 44% between 2001 and 2010. The lowest increase in Commonwealth funding to ACT schools over the period is 63.3% (Merici College). Others are well over 100%.

The basis for increases in Commonwealth funding to private schools is unclear given that it is demonstrably not based upon improving access and parental "choice", student enrolment increases or the operational costs of private education. It is crucial that the Review Panel examines this matter.

The AEU – ACT Branch is deeply concerned that more and more public money is being used to extend privilege and perpetuate social inequity rather than addressing the demonstrable resource needs of our public school students, the funding for which is the primary obligation of governments.

All students deserve a high quality, well-resourced education. There are currently profound unmet needs and unrealised aspirations across the ACT's 84 public schools. As articulated by dozens of these schools in their respective review submissions, there is an urgent need for basic items such as:

- Extra teachers, education support staff and administrative staff
- Suitably trained relief teaching staff to enable teachers to be released to attend professional learning, etc.
- Additional school counsellors - current counsellors (42.5 positions across 84 schools) are stretched to meet the complex needs of students whilst school chaplains are usually unqualified for or incapable of doing counsellor work
- Twenty-first century learning environments
- Up-to-date Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) provision
- Appropriate heating and cooling systems to prevent students and staff from working in extreme temperatures (either high or low)
- Adequate and well-maintained sporting facilities
- Adequate resources to support literacy and numeracy programs

- Teacher-librarian provision and support as a minority of ACT schools have a full-time, qualified teacher-librarian to provide information literacy programs and guidance to students and teachers
- Vocational Education and Training in Schools (VETiS) teacher support in the areas of workload, administration and student assessment
- ESL student support
- Adequate staff and support to meet the needs of Indigenous students
- Extension programs for high-achieving students
- Life skills and social skills programs
- Transition programs for students moving between the various stages of schooling e.g. from primary to high school
- Additional student welfare and counselling support
- Experiential learning programs that enhance student access to the curriculum, such as excursions and outdoor education
- Support for students with disabilities - transport, technological devices, exercise equipment , additional occupational therapists and nursing staff

As previously noted, the imbalance in resource provision that currently exists between public and private schools is reflected in recent results of international sample testing such as that conducted by PISA. The gap between Australia's high achievers and low achievers is increasing, and this discrepancy is greater than the average for developed countries. Australia's education system has been shown to be *high quality, low equity*, which means that our education outcomes are very good overall but that there is a significant educational achievement gap between children from high socio-economic backgrounds and those from low-SES backgrounds. The consequences of a continuation of the current drift of students from high income families into private schools whilst low income families comprise an increasing proportion of public school enrolments is potentially disastrous for social cohesion and economic prosperity.

If there is not a change in funding arrangements, we could end up with "two Australias" – the wealthy in a well-resourced school system, and the poor and needy in a residualised, under-resourced one. As shown, public schools educate the overwhelming majority of students with additional educational needs. Public schools cannot be expected to do more with an increasingly smaller portion of the funding pie. Australian education policy-makers should be interested in closing, not increasing, the gap in educational achievement, which is the key to income creation, national prosperity and social cohesion. Australia's egalitarian tradition and the concept of "the fair go" have been placed in serious jeopardy by the SES funding model.

A 2006 government report found that the SES funding model was inequitable and flawed. However, during the last decade, both the Coalition and Labor governments

have chosen to maintain or guarantee Commonwealth funding to private schools even though, by the model's own formula, almost half of these schools are no longer entitled to the same levels of funding. Despite attacking the model whilst in Opposition, the ALP pledged during the 2010 election campaign to retain the model until the end of 2013.

The AEU – ACT Branch welcomes the independent review in the sense that the panel can be politics-neutral and focus on an objective appraisal of the SES funding model and the numerous idiosyncratic adjustments that have been made to it over time.

The Branch looks forward to a new funding model that considers the individual circumstances and needs of students in public schools and recognises the crucial importance of public education in producing informed and active citizens, broad social cohesion and economic prosperity, thereby securing the future of this nation.

Appendix A

ACT Private Secondary Schools by Enrolment, Commonwealth Government Funding and Fees

(Incomplete)

2001-2011

School	Funding Status	Enrolments 2001	Estimated Enrolments 2011	Enrolments % increase	Comm. Govt. Funding 2001 (ERI)	Estimated Comm. Govt. Funding 2011 (SES)	Comm. Govt. Funding % increase	Fees 2001 (Yr 12)	Fees 2011 (Yr 12)	Fees % increase
CGS	FG 2008	1413	1501	6.2	1668579	3313908	98.6	8500	17930	110.9
CGGS	FG 2008	1350	1421	5.3	1873146	3170059	69.2	8359	17350	107.6
Dara	FM	1395	1533	9.9	5250780	9721756	85.1		6100	
Marist	FM	1570	1654	5.4	5473031	9749420	78.1	3000		
St Ed	FM	1175	1243	5.8	4119241	7384298	79.3			
Trinity	FM	741	1175	58.6	1867156	5235240	180.4			
Brind CC	FM	258	368	42.6	865320	2027930	134.4			
Orana	FM	436	601	37.8	1254048	3139566	150.4			
Emmaus	FM	178	278	56.2	494406	1552802	214.1			
Radford	FM	951	1516	59.4	2411736	5938171	146.2	5135	12300	139.5
Burgm	FM	145	1032	611.7	370475	5604713	1412.8			
Merici	FM	971	975	0.4	3656350	5970038	63.3	1740	6614	280.1
St Clares	FM	1166	1253	7.5	4388824	7673400	74.8		5178	
St Fra X	FM	894	1206	34.9	3365769	7384300	119.4	3500		
St M Mc	FM	1584	1591	0.4	5962176	9744875	63.4	2400		

Notes:

FG means Funding Guaranteed and FM means Funding Maintained. This is the mechanism whereby schools are guaranteed their funding even when they are shown to be overfunded.

The ERI is the Education Resource Index which preceded the Socio-Economic Status (SES) model, introduced in 2001.

Sources:

Enrolment and Commonwealth funding figures are from Senate Estimates 2004-5 and 2010-11.

2001 school fees come from the SMH Good Schools Guide 2000 (for school year 2001) and *The Canberra Times*.

2011 school fees come from individual school websites and *The Canberra Times*.