

PAEC Inquiry into the Impact of Victorian Government service delivery of changes to National Partnership Agreements

SECTION A – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE AND OTHER ISSUES ARISING FROM THE TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE DATED 17 NOVEMBER 2015

Question 1: NPA on Smarter Schools National Partnerships (SSNP)

On page 9 of the transcript of evidence, the Committee referred to page 33 of the whole of government response dated 6 November 2015 (the response) which stated:

Overall, the Smarter Schools National Partnerships (SSNP) program was found to have caused a greater improvement in student achievement in secondary schools than students at the primary school level, who improved to a lesser degree. The program appears to have been successful in raising student achievement beyond typical growth between year levels in NAPLAN tests. The results also indicated a significant impact of the SSNP program on teaching and learning.

On page 10 of the transcript of evidence, the Chair asked the Department to provide *any other information just in terms of a per capita cost or in terms of the (SSNP) program and quantifying some of those gains.*

The Chair would like to further understand by drilling down to *very tight specifics as to what was the per capita cost for these schools and what were the gains, as a way of trying to flesh out and demonstrate the efficiency of the NP (National Partnerships).*

The Department stated that it would take the question on notice.

For each SSNP program on (i) Improving Teacher Quality (ITQNP), (ii) Literacy and Numeracy (LNNP) and (iii) Low Socio-Economic Status School Communities (Low SES NP):

a) Could the Department please provide the Committee with more details like statistical figures such as per capita costs and other relevant efficiency gains on the nature of these student achievements in both primary and secondary schools?

b) What was the sample size (or how many schools were involved) in the evaluation of student achievements in the SSNP programs?

c) What were the base targets when evaluating the student achievements in the SSNP programs?

a)

A total of **520** schools participated in the Low SES NP and the LNNP, involving **173,588** students:

- **327** schools were selected to participate in the Low SES NP, based on the level of educational disadvantage amongst students.
- The LNNP involved **210** schools, and participation was determined by the number of students performing at or below the National Minimum Standard (NMS) in literacy or numeracy in NAPLAN results.
- **17** schools participated in both NPs.

The ITQNP did not identify individual participating schools as it targeted all Victorian teachers.

As outlined in the Whole of Government response and discussed during DET’s attendance at the PAEC hearing on 17 November 2015, overall the SSNP program was found to have caused a greater improvement in student achievement in secondary schools, while at the primary school level students improved to a lesser degree. This is because there was more room for gain in secondary schools, that is, primary schools are starting from a higher base (more students are already meeting the standard) so every percentage point improvement is harder to achieve.

A national SSNPs evaluation commissioned by the Commonwealth examined the implementation of the LNNP and Low SES NPs in each state and territory. Some extracts from the Victorian chapter of the report are provided below at points i and ii.

For the full text of the evaluation, see: *The National Evaluation for the Low SES National Partnership and the Literacy and Numeracy Partnership - Impact Stage* (<https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/national-evaluation-low-ses-national-partnership-and-literacy-and-numeracy-partnership>)

i. Summary of Victorian evaluation findings

The evaluation found that, in Victoria, participation in these NPs was associated with:

- significant improvement in student achievement in primary school level Numeracy and in secondary level Reading and Numeracy
- growth in achievement among the most disadvantaged Indigenous students, particularly at the primary school level
- higher student perception of their learning environment and their perception of engagement with the teaching practices they experience
- an increase in leadership and teaching capacities
- improved attendance rates of Indigenous students at the secondary school level
- improved Year 7-10 apparent retention rates among all students and Indigenous students
- strengthened engagement of families and the community in student learning.

ii. Specific findings from the evaluation regarding implementation in Victoria

Low SES NP

- For the 2009-2011 student cohort, the results show a statistically significant association between the Low SES NP and growth in student achievement in Years 3-5 Numeracy, with an additional growth of 8.3 points (in mean NAPLAN scores) associated with participating in the Low SES NP, holding all else equal. Significant additional growth in student achievement at the secondary school level was also found for the 2010-2012 student cohort at Low SES NP schools. This corresponded to an estimated impact of 19.2 points in Reading and 13.1 points in Numeracy.
- In the 2009-2011 student cohort, the results show that Indigenous students in Low SES NP primary schools were more likely to exhibit above average growth compared to their Indigenous peers in non-NP schools with a similar socioeconomic profile. This was most apparent in Reading, where over 64% of Indigenous students at Low SES NP schools achieved above average growth compared to 50% of Indigenous students at non-NP schools with a similar socioeconomic profile. In the 2010-2012 student cohort, a higher proportion of Indigenous at students Low SES NP schools generally achieved above average growth compared to their peers in non-NP schools. This was true for all grades and domains with the exception of Years 7-9 Numeracy at schools with similar socioeconomic profile.

LNNP

- In LNNP schools, Victoria was found to have met or exceeded ten targets set to acquire reward LNNP funding, made progress towards seven targets, and did not meet one target. While Victoria fell behind the 2008 baseline in three Year 3 Numeracy measures, the majority of results improved from 2009 to 2011. From 2008 to 2011, the proportion of Year 3 and Year 5 students at or above the NMS for Reading

	<p>and Numeracy improved by between 0.4 and 2.1 percentage points. In addition, the proportion of Year 5 Indigenous students at or above NMS for Reading and Numeracy improved by 3.8 and 6.9 percentage points respectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amongst Indigenous students at LNNP schools, above-average growth was also more likely to be observed compared to Indigenous students at non-NP schools with students from a similar socioeconomic background. In the 2009-2011 student cohort, the results show that, with the exception of Years 7-9 Numeracy, above average growth among Indigenous students in LNNP schools was achieved in greater proportions than in non-NP schools when controlling for socioeconomic status. This was most notable in Years 3-5 Reading where there was a difference of 8%. However, these results were not found when controlling for schools' starting scores. • In the 2010-2012 student cohort on the other hand, a higher proportion of Indigenous students at LNNP schools achieved above average growth compared to their peers in similar non-NP schools. This was found to be true in all grades and domains. The differences were most apparent in Years 3-5 Numeracy (10%) and Years 7-9 Reading (14%) among Indigenous students at schools with similar starting scores. <p>b) The SSNPs national evaluation examined the Low SES NP and LNNP only. All Victorian schools participated in the evaluation, that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 327 schools in the Low SES NP evaluation • 210 schools in the LNNP evaluation. <p>c)</p> <p>i. <i>Literacy and Numeracy NP</i> The baseline targets for rewards funding under this NP are outlined in the table at Attachment 1.</p> <p>ii. <i>Low SES NP</i> The Low SES NP did not have baseline targets for rewards funding. Section 29 a. of the Low SES NP notes that: Reward payments will be based on improvements in performance across participating (low SES) schools against agreed indicators set out in the Literacy and Numeracy NP. The COAG Reform Council will assess whether pre-determined milestones and performance benchmarks have been achieved before a reward payment is made.</p> <p>iii. <i>Improving Teacher Quality NP</i> The Improving Teacher Quality NP did not have baseline reward targets, rather, achievement was assessed against milestones as outlined in the NP variation and in the reward milestones summaries, which are all available on the FFR website (www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au).</p>
--	--

Question 2: NPA on Indigenous Early Childhood Development

<p>On page 14 of the transcript of evidence, the Committee noted from page 30 of the whole of government response to the questionnaire that there was a fairly positive uptake in the participation rate amongst Indigenous four-year-old children in kindergarten programs from 59 per cent in 2007 up to 79.6 per cent in 2014.</p> <p>On page 15 of the transcript of evidence, the Chair asked whether <i>the department have any sense that this led to not only an increase in the level of the participation rote but an increase in the attendance rate as well</i>. The Department has indicated to take the question on notice.</p> <p>Noting the difference between participation rate and attendance rate, could the Department provide the Committee any details on whether the NPA has any effect on the attendance rates?</p>	<p>Data on attendance is collected during the August system-wide kindergarten census, which records attendance during a single hour on a single day. As such, it is not fully representative of actual attendance and cannot be used to draw conclusions about the impact of NP funding on these two centres. No other record keeping of kindergarten attendance is maintained.</p>
---	---

Question 3: DET PowerPoint summary table

<p>At the public hearing, DET provided a "PowerPoint" presentation as part of its opening statement. Slide number 3 showed a table listing all education and training NPAs that were either current, lapsed or terminated. However, the table did not clearly differentiate the NPAs' funding level committed to Victoria and the actual NPA payments received to date from the Commonwealth Government.</p> <p>Building from Slide number 3, could the Department please populate the table <u>below</u> to update the Committee with more specific information on all NPAs in the education and training portfolio entered into since 2008:</p>

Name of NPA	NP type/purpose	NP Agreement period	NP funding committed to Victoria 2008-09 to 2015-16* †	NP funding received by Victoria 2008-09 to 2015-16	NP Current Status	Further Remarks/ Comments
Universal Access to Early Childhood Education (Several NPs on kindergarten funding)	Service Delivery	January 2009 - December 2017	\$670.3 million expected in total	\$446.5.0 million to date	Current	In 2014 the Commonwealth assessed Victoria as not meeting performance indicators in 2013 and withheld a payment of \$19.6 million.
Indigenous Early Childhood Development	Capital works/Infrastructure*	July 2008 - June 2014	\$16.65 million	\$15.66 million	Lapsed	*Funding was also provided by the Commonwealth and Victoria for ongoing operational costs. See Victorian Implementation Plan at Attachment 2 .
National Quality Agenda	Service Delivery	Ongoing	\$18.89 million to date	\$18.89 million to date	NP under re-negotiation	Future funding TBC
Digital Education Revolution	Service Delivery	Jan 2010 – June 2013	\$131.65 million	\$134.67 million	Lapsed	For government schools only
Empowering Local Schools	Service Delivery	March 2012 – June 2014	\$9.35 million	\$9.35 million	Rolled into schools SPP	For government schools only
Helping our Kids Understand Finances	Service Delivery	July 2011 - June 2013	\$0.40 million	\$0.40 million	Lapsed	
Improving Literacy and Numeracy	Facilitating Reforms	February 2013 – June 2014	\$41.10 million	\$41.10 million	Lapsed	\$29.40 million for government schools
Investing in Focus Schools	Service Delivery	May 2012 – June 2014	\$2.40 million	\$2.40 million	Lapsed	\$2.20 million for government schools
MoneySmart Teaching (Project Agreement)	Service Delivery	July 2013 – May 2017	\$0.70 million expected in total	\$0.48 million to date	Current	
More Support for Students with Disabilities and MSSD Variation	Service Delivery	May 2012 – December 2014	\$55.70 million	\$72.14 million	Lapsed	\$55.70 million for government schools
National School Chaplaincy Programme	Service Delivery	April 2014 - June 2019	Up to \$50.47 million expected in total	\$25.20 million to date	Current	For 2014-15 and 2015-16
National Solar in Schools Program	Capital works/Infrastructure	November 2011 – December 2013	\$11.20 million	\$11.85 million	Lapsed	For government schools only
Rewards for Great Teachers	Service Delivery	June 2012 – December 2013	\$0.0 million	\$0.0 million	Rolled into schools SPP	Victorian government schools did not participate. Non-government schools received approximately \$2.5 million.
SSNP: Improving Teacher Quality	Facilitating Reforms	January 2009 – December 2013	\$122.40 million	\$118.35 million	Lapsed	Victoria did not receive full reward funding in 2011-12 and 2012-13.
SSNP: Literacy and Numeracy	Facilitating Reforms	January 2009 – December 2012	\$89.43 million	\$86.04 million	Lapsed	Victoria did not receive full reward funding in 2010-11 and 2011-12. Note: Victoria set a high number of ambitious standards and targets under the NP compared to other jurisdictions, which affected its achievement of rewards funding (e.g. in 2010, Victoria had 32 targets and NSW had 4, and at the time these were agreed, the Cth was the only party aware of both sets of targets). Refer to COAG Reform Council <i>National Partnership Agreement on Literacy and Numeracy: Performance report 2010</i> (dated 25 Mar 2011).
SSNP: Low Socio-Economic Status School Communities	Facilitating Reforms	January 2009 – December 2013	\$239.16 million	\$221.52 million	Rolled into schools SPP	
Project Agreements for the Commonwealth/State and Territory Joint Group Training Program	Service Delivery	July 2011 – June 2015	\$11.80 million	\$11.92 million	Lapsed	
Pre-Apprenticeship Training	Service Delivery	April 2010 – June 2011	\$0.90 million	\$0.90 million	Lapsed	
Productivity Places Program	Service Delivery	January 2009 – June 2012	Provided as a grant to support Victorian Training Guarantee (VTG)	Provided as a grant to support the VTG	Lapsed	
Skills Reform	Service Delivery	July 2012 – June 2017	\$434.80 million expected in total	\$212.50 million to date	Current	
TAFE Fee Waivers for Child Care Qualifications	Service Delivery	January 2010 – December 2014	Funded for revenue foregone	\$33.55 million	Lapsed	
Training Places for Single and Teenage Parents	Service Delivery	July 2011 – July 2015	\$23.70 million	\$17.41 million	Terminated	Terminated in July 2014. The \$23.7 million includes an additional payment of \$4.7 million agreed through an exchange of letters.
Youth Attainment and Transitions	Facilitating Reforms	July 2009 – December 2013	\$135.40 million	\$71.16 million	Lapsed	Total funding committed to Victoria excludes the State's contribution to LLENs of approximately \$29.2m. Also note that approximately \$67.2 million was provided directly to Youth Connections.

* Consistent with table provided at PAEC Hearing, except for Universal Access to Early Childhood Education, Digital Education Revolution, National Solar in Schools Program, Rewards for Great Teachers, SSNP: Literacy and Numeracy, TAFE Fee Waivers for Child Care Qualifications and Youth Attainment and Transitions.

† These figures reflect the agreement signed with the State Government, which is available on the Federal Financial Relations website: www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au.

<p>Question 4: DET PowerPoint summary table (continued)</p> <p>Also building from Slide number 3, could the Department please populate the following table below to provide the Committee a further breakdown of how much of the NPA payments received were utilised for capital works/ infrastructure projects, ongoing service delivery, or facilitating reforms in the education and training portfolio.</p>	
<p>Funding for DET NPs is typically utilised for a single purpose, that is, capital works/infrastructure, facilitating reforms <u>or</u> service delivery. One exception is the Indigenous Early Childhood (IECD) NP, which provided capital funding for the establishment of the centres as well as funding for ongoing operational costs. The funding purpose for each NP has therefore been included in the table above (Question 3).</p>	
<p>SECTION B – QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THE WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSE (DATED 6 NOVEMBER 2015) TO THE COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE (DATED 14 OCTOBER 2015)</p>	
<p>Question 1: NPA negotiations</p>	
<p>Page 5 of the response stated that:</p> <p>Where NPA objectives are developed without adequate consultation with states, or in-depth understanding of existing frameworks and service systems, they risk simply duplicating those policies and services.</p> <p>Page 5 of the Federal Finances Circular No. 2015/03 titled <i>Processes For Drafting, Negotiating, Finalising And Varying Agreements Under The Federal Financial Relations Framework, And Related Estimates And Payments Processes stated that:</i></p> <p>Commonwealth portfolio agencies are responsible for the drafting and negotiation of National Partnerships, in consultation with central agencies. Consultation on policy and programme design issues should occur between Commonwealth and State portfolio agencies following policy and Budget approval. However draft National Partnerships cannot be provided to the States at any stage until a draft has been agreed between Commonwealth central and portfolio agencies for circulation to the States.</p> <p>As the service delivery practitioner that executes and implements the NPAs, does the Department engage/consult formally or informally with the respective Commonwealth portfolio counterparts to contribute the practitioner knowledge and experience on policy and programme design issues during the NPA drafting stage?</p>	<p>Victorian central agencies (the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Treasury and Finance) are ultimately responsible for the negotiation and final agreement to new or revised national partnerships.</p> <p>Ahead of the formal negotiation process, DET discusses the individual agreements with its Commonwealth counterparts. This reflects its practitioner knowledge, policy expertise and responsibility for implementing agreements, delivering against all requirements in those agreements and managing associated risks. Prior to the negotiation of new or revised intergovernmental agreements, the relevant Minister is responsible for bringing a submission to Cabinet to outline a proposed negotiating strategy.</p> <p>For example, DET contributed both formally and informally to the drafting stage of the two year extension to the NP UAECE for 2016 and 2017. DET undertook internal work looking at the risks for Victoria and potential improvements, and met with education officials from the Commonwealth and other states and territories to discuss potential changes to the NP UAECE. The Commonwealth then provided a draft NP for comment through first ministers departments. DET provided formal feedback on the draft to central agencies, and also participated in without prejudice discussions with Commonwealth education officials to discuss the feedback. DET was similarly involved in commenting on a second draft of the NP before the Prime Minister sent a formal NP offer to the Premier.</p>
<p>Question 2: NPA on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education</p>	
<p>Page 30 of the response provided kindergarten participation rates from 2009 to 2014 under the NPA on Universal Access to Early Childhood Education. Could the Department please provide details on kindergarten attendance rates from 2009 to 2014?</p>	<p>Under the NP, attendance is measured as the proportion of children enrolled that attend for at least one hour in the reference week. Attendance data has been collected since 2011 and rates are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 – 95.2% • 2012 – 95.5% • 2013 – 95.8% • 2014 – 95.0%
<p>Question 3: NPAs in which Victoria did not participate</p>	
<p>Page 41 of the response stated that Victoria did not participate in the following NPAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPA on Rewards for Great Teachers - Victorian Government schools did not participate, however, the Victorian non-government school sectors did - Catholic sector signed on for 2 years and the independent sector signed on for the duration of the NP. • NPA on Productivity Places Program - Commonwealth funding was provided as a grant to support Victorian Training Guarantee. <p>Could the Department please provide any explanations why Victoria did not participate in the above NPAs?</p>	<p>NPA on Rewards for Great Teachers</p> <p>The Rewards for Great Teachers NP did not align with Victoria’s approach to rewarding teachers. Victoria also did not accept that the Commonwealth should determine the method by which the rewards were delivered; given the States are the major employers of teachers.</p> <p>NPA on Productivity Places Program</p> <p>The Productivity Places Program (PPP) NP sought to introduce an entitlement-based student demand driven system for training places. As Victoria was already introducing its own demand driven model through the Victorian Training Guarantee, Victoria signed a separate bilateral agreement with the Commonwealth. It was agreed that Victoria would deliver 138,000 productivity places over four years.</p>

Question 4: Regulation of early childhood education and care services under the NQF

Page 42 of the response stated:

The following shows Commonwealth funding from 2010 to 2014 to Victoria to support regulation of early childhood education and care services under the NQF:

- 2010/2011 - \$1.34 million
- 2011/2012 - \$3.15 million
- 2012/2013 - \$5.14 million
- 2013/2014 - \$4.63 million
- 2014/2015 - \$4.63 million

This funding contributes roughly a third to the annual budget for Victoria's regulatory authority.

In addition, under the NPA, Victoria shares the cost of supporting the Australian Child and Education Care Quality Authority (ACECQA) with the Commonwealth Government and other States and Territories. This cost has varied over the period but was \$1.5 million in 2014/2015.

- a. Does the Commonwealth funding from 2010 to 2014 represent budget figures or actual payments received?
- b. Was the cost of \$1.5 million in 2014-2015 for supporting the Australian Child and Education Care Quality Authority (ACECQA) a budget figure or actual cost figures?

a. Budget figures. Actual payments received were as follows:

- 2010/2011 - \$1.34 million
- 2011/2012 - \$3.15 million
- 2012/2013 - \$5.14 million
- 2013/2014 - \$2.32 million*
- 2014/2015 - \$6.95 million*

* The second 6-monthly payment for 2013/2014 was delayed and paid the following financial year.

b. Actual cost figures (less GST).

c. Could the Department please populate the table below to provide the Committee with details on Victoria's share of actual cost figures for supporting the Australian Child and Education Care Quality Authority (ACECQA) for each annual financial year period of the NPA?

c.

Financial Year Period (FY)	NPA on National Quality Agenda - Victoria's share of supporting the Australian Child and Education Care Quality Authority (ACECQA)^	
	Budget (\$m)	Actual (\$m)
2010-11	Nil*	Nil*
2011-12	0.64**	0.64**
2012-13	1.55	1.55
2013-14	1.70	1.70
2014-15	1.65	1.65

^ Note that amounts listed in the table include GST

* ACECQA was established on 1 January 2012. Jurisdictions were not required to provide funding to ACECQA prior to this date (Schedule D, Clause 3 of the NP NQA).

** figure for 1 January-30 June 2012.

Mandated NAPLAN Measures	Target Group	2008 NAPLAN Result (baseline)	2009 NAPLAN Result	2010 NAPLAN Result	2011 NAPLAN Target	Weighting
Students at or above national minimum standard ⁽¹⁾ (ALL) (Reading and Numeracy)	Year 3 Reading	94.4%	96.6%	95.8%	95.8%	5.0%
	Year 5 Reading	89.9%	92.9%	92.0%	92.0%	5.0%
	Year 3 Numeracy	96.7%	94.5%	96.6%	96.6%	5.0%
	Year 5 Numeracy	93.3%	96.7%	96.1%	96.1%	5.0%
Students above national minimum standard ⁽¹⁾ (ALL) (Reading and Numeracy)	Year 3 Reading	79.3%	85.1%	84.4%	84.9%	5.0%
	Year 5 Reading	73.9%	76.7%	75.4%	75.9%	5.0%
	Year 3 Numeracy	87.9%	80.2%	82.0%	82.5%	5.0%
	Year 5 Numeracy	73.0%	76.7%	81.0%	81.5%	5.0%
Mean Scale Score (ALL) (Reading and Numeracy)	Year 3 Reading	393.1	404.9	406.0	406.5	5.0%
	Year 5 Reading	472.4	482.7	479.5	480.0	5.0%
	Year 3 Numeracy	395.9	389.7	390.7	391.7	5.0%
	Year 5 Numeracy	467.7	477.1	484.0	484.5	5.0%
Students at or above national minimum standard ⁽¹⁾ (INDIGENOUS) (Reading and Numeracy)	Year 3 Reading	87.3%	91.1%	88.6%	90.0%	2.5%
	Year 5 Reading	75.7%	85.1%	79.4%	81.0%	2.5%
	Year 3 Numeracy	91.6%	88.8%	89.4%	90.9%	2.5%
	Year 5 Numeracy	80.3%	92.7%	90.4%	88.8%	2.5%
					Sub Total NAPLAN Measures Weighting	70.0%

Local Measures	Target Group	2008 Result	2009 Result (baseline)	2010 Result	2011 Target	Weighting
Teaching and Learning Index Mark II (including Classroom Behaviour and Student Safety) from the Attitudes to School Survey	Primary Years 5 & 6 in Govt and Catholic schools	not applicable	77.2	78.2	78.5	15.0%
Learning Environment factor from Staff Opinion Survey	Primary Years in Govt and Catholic schools	not applicable	78.3	79.8	79.9	15.0%
					Sub Total Local Measures Weighting	30.0%
					Total Weighting	100.0%

Footnotes:

1. Reported historical results and the calculation of 2011 targets for NAPLAN 'national minimum standard' improvement measures do not include exempt students.

Approved Variations:

- Students from 11 Special Schools (and 1 school with a Special Campus) will be excluded when reporting NAPLAN performances results, in addition to exempt students.
- Inclusion of NAPLAN measure 'proportion of students above national minimum standard'.
- Use of 2009 baseline for Victoria's two local measures.

Additional Notes from Victoria:

- Assessed students are those whose results directly contribute to the results reported. For Victoria, this does not include exempt students or students from Victoria's 11 Special Schools and 1 School with a Special Campus. Participants assessed under Victoria's local measures are staff and students from participating schools.
- At or Above the National Minimum Standard – Victoria's targets are based on maintaining the high performance of Victorian students' 2010 results.
- Above National Minimum Standard measure – Victoria's targets are calculated as a 0.5 percentage point improvement of student performance between 2010 and 2011.
- Mean Scale Score measure – Victoria's targets are calculated as a 0.5 score point improvement of student performance between 2010 and 2011 (with the exception of the Year 3 numeracy target which is calculated as a 1 score point improvement of student performance between 2010 and 2011).
- At or Above the National Minimum Standard for Indigenous students – Victoria's 2011 targets are calculated as a 1 percentage point improvement on the average of the last three years of NAPLAN
- The data for Local Measure 1 are sourced from the Attitudes to School (student) Surveys and the data for Local Measure 2 are sourced from the Staff Opinion Surveys. Both Government and Catholic NP schools data are included.
- The answers to the surveys are responses on a scale of one to five, where one is Strongly disagree and five is Strongly agree. The score is then converted to a 100 point scale. The improvement is described as being a change in scale points from 2009, which was the base year.

VICTORIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Element 1: Early Childhood service integration—Children and Family Centres (CFCs)

Plan period: 2009-2014

Implementation Plan Revised: May 2011

Commonwealth Investment: \$ 16.65m over 6 years

Milestone (Essential elements)	What are we trying to do? (Aim)	Who will do it? (Roles and responsibilities)	How are we going to do it? (Strategies)	How will we know how we are going? (Measures)	How long will it take? (Timeframe)
Management – Site locations.	Identify the most appropriate locations for Aboriginal Children and Family Centres.	State Government in partnership with key community stakeholders including the Victorian Advisory Council on Koori Health (VACKH), NP IECD Advisory Group and local Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations (ACCOs).	Site selection criteria for 2 Aboriginal Children and Family Centres (one urban/ one rural) will include: demographics, anticipated population growth, community need, existing level of service provision; identified service delivery gaps; opportunities for joint investment (including into existing services); capacity of service provider	Location of centres identified Site of centres identified	Locations identified by July 2009 Sites identified by October 2009
Management – Building/refurbishment	Establish two Aboriginal Children and Family Centres (one rural/ one urban).	State Government in consultation with the local ACCOs and local government	Undertake consultation with local community and local government to develop service model and design.	Centres operational within timelines and budget	Commence construction of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> first Centre in the second quarter of 2009 – 10 the second centre in the third quarter 2009 – 10
Service Delivery – types and/or models	Ensure a range of universal services including Maternal and Child Health, early learning and care and secondary services, including family and parenting support are accessible for Aboriginal children and their families in an integrated setting.	An appropriate governance structure will be established for each centre prior to the centre being built that supports strong community connection and representation from relevant service organisations.	Through consultation with local community and local government, establish integrated early learning and care within each centre as well as a combination of outreach services to meet identified service gaps including Koori Maternity Services, Maternal and Child Health, playgroups, occasional care, parent groups and other services as appropriate.	Increased proportion of Indigenous children attending the Children and Family Centres who have had all age-appropriate health checks and vaccinations Increased proportion of Indigenous three and four year olds participating in quality early childhood education and development and child care services Increased proportion of Indigenous children attending the Children and Family Centres who go on to attend school regularly Increased proportion of Indigenous children and families accessing a range of services offered at or through Children and Family centres, but not limited to childcare, early learning, child and maternal health, parent and family support services	For the duration of the Agreement (following agreement on baseline data)

Milestone (Essential elements)	What are we trying to do? (Aim)	Who will do it? (Roles and responsibilities)	How are we going to do it? (Strategies)	How will we know how we are going? (Measures)	How long will it take? (Timeframe)
Service Delivery – Staffing and Workforce Development	Ensure appropriately qualified and culturally competent staffing mix (including Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal staff) and joint professional development.	State Government in consultation with the community and local government	Develop an Aboriginal recruitment and training strategy in partnership with the Victorian Advisory Council on Koori Health and the NP IECD Advisory Group, Recruit and train necessary staff in preparation for the establishment of the centres.	Staff recruited Training needs addressed Staff feedback	Necessary staff recruited prior to the opening of the centres Training needs identified and incorporated into professional development plan on an annual basis
Linkages and co-ordination	Establish a single governance structure to manage the centre. Support strong Aboriginal community involvement in the governance structure	State Government in consultation with the community and local government	Develop a single governance structure to manage the centre that enables establishment of an integrated service. Work with local Aboriginal communities to assist their participation in the governance arrangements Establish partnerships with agencies that propose to deliver a service from the centres.	Governance structures and processes established	2009/10 for each centre
Community Involvement	Strong community support for the centre from project proposal through to service operation including location, service model, building design, governance arrangements, monitoring.	State Government in consultation with the community and local government	Strong community support of the centre will be developed through consultation with the Victorian Advisory Council on Koori Health and the NP IECD Advisory Group, the local community and Local Government.	Utilisation of the centre Community feedback Establish concurrent evaluation	Over the duration of the Agreement
Data and Reporting	Monitor the effective operations of the centre Monitor the outcomes for the centre users at an individual and population level.	State Government in consultation with the community and local government will monitor the effective operations of the centre NP IECD Advisory Group will monitor outcomes of the centres	Utilise existing sources of data, including the Victorian Child and Adolescent Monitoring System and the Aboriginal Child Health and Wellbeing Survey. Other sources of data and evaluation mechanisms will be developed and considered through the NP IECD Advisory Group.	As outlined in NP IECD following agreement by Commonwealth, States and Territories on baseline data	Reporting from August 2010

Milestone (Essential elements)	What are we trying to do? (Aim)	Who will do it? (Roles and responsibilities)	How are we going to do it? (Strategies)	How will we know how we are going? (Measures)	How long will it take? (Timeframe)
Risk Management	<p>Ensure the viability of the centre</p> <p>Ensure strong community support of the centre</p>	<p>State Government in consultation with the ACCO and Local Government</p>	<p>Support the lead agency to implement a sustainable business model, appropriate financial management capabilities and appropriate governance arrangements.</p> <p>Actively engage the local community in the development of centres from project proposal through to service operation including location, service model, building design, governance arrangements, monitoring.</p>	<p>Centres operate within budget</p> <p>High utilisation rates</p> <p>Active participation of parents and community members in the centre</p>	<p>Risk management strategies will be reviewed and monitored over the duration of the Agreement</p>

Summary of Milestones and Commonwealth Payments			
Element 1 – Establishment of 2 Children and Family Centres in Victoria with changes requested by			
Reporting Period	Agreed Milestones for the Period	Basis of Payment	Commonwealth Payment Amount * (\$mil)
Jan –June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance process for NP IECD established Data analysis complete and short list of locations proposed 	Receipt of Annual Report 31 August 2009 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.495m B: \$0.495m DEECD: \$0.030m <hr/> Total \$1.020m
July – Dec 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locations Ministerially agreed and formally announced Local consultative groups established in Whittlesea (W) and Bairnsdale (B) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community consultation and engagement commences in Whittlesea building on work of City of Whittlesea, DPCD and DEECD to establish a Aboriginal Kindergarten in Thomastown Community consultation and engagement commences in Bairnsdale building on work of DEECD and Kilmany Uniting Care to establish an Aboriginal Kindergarten in Bairnsdale Neighbourhood House <p>Location 1 – City of Whittlesea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Officer employed – Commenced working to oversee building design and construction, build capacity of lead agency to drive initiative with local community Community Development Worker employed to link existing services and facilitate community consultations and engagement. <p>Location 2 – Bairnsdale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment planning for Project Officer and position advertised 	Receipt of Progress Report 31 January 2010 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$1.994m B: \$1.826m DEECD: \$0.081m <hr/> Total \$3.900m
Jan –June 2010	<p>Location 1 – City of Whittlesea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site agreed with community Land tenure process completed Consultancy contracted to design CFC building Building design agreed with community <p>Location 2 – Bairnsdale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Officer employed – Commenced working to oversee building design and construction, build capacity of lead agency to drive initiative with local community Community Development Worker employed to link existing services and facilitate community consultations and engagement 	Receipt of Annual Report 31 August 2010 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$1.0792M B: \$0.000m DEECD: \$0.052m <hr/> Total \$1.1312m
July – Dec 2010	<p>Location 1 – Whittlesea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Childhood Coordinator recruited and working full-time to develop policies and procedures and recruit staff for new centre Construction commences November 2010 (2nd quarter 2010 - 11) 	Receipt of Progress Report 31 January 2011 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.2698m B: \$1.26525m

	Location 2 –Bairnsdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site agreed with community • Land tenure process completed • Building design agreed with community • 		DEECD: \$0.043 <hr/> Total \$1.57805m
Jan –June 2011	Location 1 – Whittlesea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing operations of Centre Manager and Early Childhood Coordinator Location 2 –Bairnsdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	Receipt of Annual Report 31 August 2011 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.449667m B: \$0.000m DEECD: \$0.034m <hr/> Total \$0.483667m
July – Dec 2011	Location 1 – Whittlesea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing operations • Building completed by 2nd quarter 2011 – 12 • Centre Operational November 2011 (2nd quarter 2011 – 12) Location 2- Bairnsdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing construction • Ongoing operations with Centre Manager • Early Childhood Coordinator recruited and working full-time to develop policies and procedures and recruit staff for new centre • Construction commences August 2011 (1st quarter 2011-12) 	Receipt of Progress Report 31 January 2012 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$1.490334m B: \$0.42175m DEECD: \$0.019m <hr/> Total \$1.931084m
Jan –June 2012	Location 1 – Whittlesea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing operational costs Location 2- Bairnsdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	Receipt of Annual Report 31 August 2012 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.590m B: \$0.0 DEECD: \$0.0 <hr/> Total \$0.590m
July – Dec 2012	Locations 1 and 2 – Whittlesea and Bairnsdale Ongoing operational costsLocation 2 – Bairnsdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bairnsdale building completed by 1st quarter 2012 – 13 • Centre operational July 2012 	Receipt of Progress Report 31 January 2013 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.526m B: \$2.214m DEECD: \$0.030m <hr/> Total \$2.77m
Jan –June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing operational costs 	Receipt of Annual Report 31 August 2013 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.525m B: \$0.525m DEECD: \$0.032m <hr/> Total \$1.082m

July – Dec 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing operational costs 	Receipt of Progress Report 31 January 2014 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.526m B: \$0.526m DEECD: \$0.030m <hr/> Total \$1.082m
Jan –June 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing operational costs 	Receipt of Progress Report January 2014 describing satisfactory achievement against Milestones	W: \$0.525m B: \$0.525m DEECD: \$0.030m <hr/> Total \$1.082m
Total Australian Government Payment			\$16.65m

*Financial information for Element 1 will be provided upon completion of construction tenders for the Children and Family Centres.

* Payments can be made on a pro-rata basis if milestones for the period are only partially completed. If this occurs, the remaining portion of the payment will be made available immediately following completion of relevant milestone