Special needs and risk adjustment: inclusivity versus accountability

Cain Polidano, John Haisken-DeNew & Chris Ryan

Tuesday, 21 August 2018
Introduction

- Despite national and international obligations, there is evidence that children with disability experience discriminatory ‘gatekeeping’ behaviour from mainstream schools:
  - 2016 Commonwealth Senate Inquiry into inclusive education
  - 520 out of 745 (70%) Australian families with children with disability reported gatekeeping behaviour (Poed, Cologon and Jackson 2017)
  - 15% of parents of children with disability report difficulties enrolling their child in mainstream schools in Victoria (Jenkin, Spivakovsky, Joseph and Smith 2018)
- Regulation is ineffective in dealing with gatekeeping because it is very difficult to police and prosecute, more effective to address the underlying incentive problem of adverse selection
  - Schools discourage enrolments with a ‘high-cost’ signal to ensure adequate resources to maximise their education outcomes (also called ‘cream skimming’ or ‘dumping’)
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Introduction

- To promote inclusivity, governments make ‘risk-adjusted’ payments, or individually-targeted subsidies to cover the extra cost of special needs, based on individual assessment

- How to hold schools accountable for the funding?
  - In the United States and United Kingdom, under *No Child Left Behind* and *Every Child Matters*, students with disability are required to be involved in mainstream national testing
  - May impose an ‘accountability cost’ on school-average test scores, which can have unintended consequence for inclusion
  - Australian model: give principals discretion to exempt students from national testing on the basis of having a ‘significant’ disability, with parental consent

- No evidence to date on how principals use such discretionary powers
  - Concern is that it may be used to systematically exempt students who are funded, regardless of their ability to sit standardised tests, which may have consequences for accountability
Introduction

- We shed light on this by examining the extent to which principals ‘exempt on the funding flag’, irrespective of observed student capabilities.
- We also estimate the impact that exempting students has on school accountability measures, school-average test scores and school rank.
- Estimate models of initial (year 3) NAPLAN participation in Victoria and NAPLAN achievement on population of students with teacher-identified disability in prep (AEDC), with rhs variables:
  - Receipt of individually-targeted disability funding under the Program for Students with Disability (PSD)
  - Controls for teacher-assessed student capabilities (AEDC), school-level factors (NAPLAN) and student socio-economic variables (NAPLAN)
    - Common support is possible because not all eligible students are funded.
Program for Students with Disability (PSD)

- In Victoria, individually targeted payments are available to meet the extra cost of providing for individual special needs, known as the Program of Support for Disability (PSD)
  - Seven categories: ADHD, hearing, vision, intellectual, physical, severe behavioural, severe language
  - Medium-high student needs based on a medical assessment of diagnostic criteria, rather than need, undertaking prior to school commencement
    - E.g. a criterion for funding under intellectual disability is an IQ of 70 or below
  - 6 levels of funding, based on assessed need: $6095 p.a. (level 1) - $46,519 p.a. (level 6)
  - Safe to say, not everyone who could meet the criteria is funded
    - Based on agreement between principal and parents
    - Costly process
Data

- Base sample is mainstream Victorian public school students in the 2012 Australian Early Childhood Development Census (AEDC)
  - Triennial teacher responses to >100 questions on each child’s development in prep (May-July)
  - Answers combined to produce indices in 5 domains: physical, emotional, social, language and cognition and communication and general knowledge
  - Includes teacher assessments of disability, based on an observed condition that limits student’s ability to do school work in a regular classroom
  - Student-level AEDC data is not made available to the school
- Linked to the AEDC 2012 at the individual level is:
  - Year 3 NAPLAN data (from 2015 and 2016), including test scores and participation status
  - PSD receipt, funding type and funding levels for 2012 and 2015 provided by Victorian Department of Education and Training
### Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEDC 2012 disability status</th>
<th>Sample for analysis</th>
<th>Omitted from the sample</th>
<th>Targeted PSD recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AEDC disability, PSD funding prep-year 3</td>
<td>AEDC disability, No funding</td>
<td>Level 5-6 funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>0 0 0 6 165</td>
<td>35,822</td>
<td>35,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>14 111 2 3 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>4 679 0 0 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>13 156 0 0 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>7 2,210 0 4 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/behavioural</td>
<td>40 1,062 0 3 81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning impairment</td>
<td>75 181 0 10 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With learning impairment</td>
<td>383 446 10 34 137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without learning impairment</td>
<td>57 502 0 7 52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593 5,347 12 67 541</td>
<td>35,822</td>
<td>42,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Has a disability, PSD continuous receipt prep-year 3</th>
<th>Has a disability, no PSD receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes in Year 3 NAPLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat year 3 NAPLAN reading test</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attained at least national minimum standards (270)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attain national minimum standards</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal exemption</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn by parent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AEDC Prep student capabilities and impairments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEDC language and cognition national index</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable (0-10th percentile)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At risk (11-25th percentile)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track (26-50th percentile)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track (50-100th percentile)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEDC Prep impairment/condition</th>
<th>Has a disability, PSD continuous receipt prep-year 3</th>
<th>Has a disability, no PSD receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/behavioural</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning impairment</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, with learning impairment</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, without learning impairment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School characteristics</th>
<th>Has a disability, PSD continuous receipt prep-year 3</th>
<th>Has a disability, no PSD receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEDC share of school prep peer cohort with disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEDC share of school prep peer cohort with disability who receive PSD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEDC school cohort size</th>
<th>Has a disability, PSD continuous receipt prep-year 3</th>
<th>Has a disability, no PSD receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 entrants</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60 entrants</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100 entrants</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student socio-economic background</th>
<th>Has a disability, PSD continuous receipt prep-year 3</th>
<th>Has a disability, no PSD receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's highest education qualification (NAPLAN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Year 12</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET qualification</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or higher qualification</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEDC non-English speaking background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEDC Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (ATSI)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEDC female</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEDC indicator for lives in Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Probit marginal effects of NAPLAN participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
<th>Standard errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD receipt prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.280***</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSD funded condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism spectrum disorder</td>
<td>-0.254***</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>-0.093*</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>-0.364***</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>-0.275***</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe behavioural disorder</td>
<td>-0.256***</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe language disorder</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>-0.503**</td>
<td>(0.236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of PSD funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1-2 prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.227***</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3-4 prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.338***</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Probit marginal effects of NAPLAN participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language and cognitive (standard)</th>
<th>Language and cognitive, social &amp; emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSD receipt prep-year 3</strong></td>
<td>-0.280*** (0.029)</td>
<td>-0.274*** (0.029)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language and cognitive skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language and cognitive (standard)</th>
<th>Language and cognitive, social &amp; emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At risk (11-25pc)</strong></td>
<td>0.124*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.109*** (0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (26-50pc)</strong></td>
<td>0.176*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.153*** (0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (51-100pc)</strong></td>
<td>0.234*** (0.017)</td>
<td>0.204*** (0.019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emotional development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language and cognitive (standard)</th>
<th>Language and cognitive, social &amp; emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At risk (11-25pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.028** (0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (26-50pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.035** (0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (51-100pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.042*** (0.018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language and cognitive (standard)</th>
<th>Language and cognitive, social &amp; emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At risk (11-25pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.008 (0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (26-50pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.002 (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On track (51-100pc)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.027 (0.020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predicted & actual year 3 NAPLAN results

Predictions are ‘out of sample’ fitted values using univariate OLS NAPLAN model results.
## Estimated school impacts of PSD non-participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile rank of school-average year 3 NAPLAN reading participant scores</th>
<th>School NAPLAN reading measure</th>
<th>Marginal effect per PSD exemption</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest quintile (N=335)</td>
<td>Rank within quintile</td>
<td>3.35***</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 423)</td>
<td>0.526***</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quintile (N=193)</td>
<td>Rank within quintile</td>
<td>12.026***</td>
<td>(0.936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 434)</td>
<td>1.165***</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quintile (N=214)</td>
<td>Rank within quintile</td>
<td>11.728***</td>
<td>(1.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 441)</td>
<td>1.252***</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quintile (N=206)</td>
<td>Rank within quintile</td>
<td>14.131***</td>
<td>(1.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 450)</td>
<td>1.438***</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest quintile (N=192)</td>
<td>Rank within quintile</td>
<td>7.665***</td>
<td>(1.232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 459)</td>
<td>1.527***</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=1140)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>8.166***</td>
<td>(0.408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (mean 440)</td>
<td>0.979***</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change in school-level NAPLAN scores from including year 3 NAPLAN predicted values for non-participants with PSD regressed on number of PSD exemptions.*
Conclusions

- Given discretion, principals heavily exclude students with disability from initial testing based on the flag of individually-targeted funding
  - Precautionary approach without information on student disability and capabilities
  - Strategic decision to alleviate impacts of enrolment on measures of school accountability
    - Appears to be greatest incentive for middle-achieving schools
    - On average, those excluded are capable of attaining minimum NAPLAN standards

- Implications for accountability
  - No ‘reference point’ information to hold schools accountable for the effective use of targeted disability funding, which may have implications for quality of special education
  - School-average measures of NAPLAN reported on MySchool can be affected in a non-trivial way
Conclusions

- Possible incremental reform:
  - 1. Remove scores of funded students from the calculation of school-average scores for MySchool
    - Lessens any accountability cost of enrolment
    - Incentivises schools to initiate assessments for funding
  - 2. Review principal response
  - 3. If no response, introduce extra requirement for principal exemption: use of alternative standardised and ‘condition appropriate’ assessment tools
    - Imposes a cost on exemption and incentivises principals to evaluate the appropriateness of NAPLAN versus other accountability measures
### School exemption rates by NAPLAN year 3 rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile rank of school-average year 3 NAPLAN participant scores</th>
<th>Participation rate</th>
<th>Maximum no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest quintile</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quintile</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quintile</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quintile</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest quintile</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=1140)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAPLAN year 3 rank by school-average score
## Alternative treatment of PSD receipt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
<th>Standard errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD receipt prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.280***</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuity of funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous funding rep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.308***</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost status prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.135***</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained status prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.354***</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1-2 prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.227***</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3-4 prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.338***</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excluding withdrawn and absent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD receipt prep-year 3</td>
<td>-0.224***</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Probit model of attaining national min. stds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSD receipt prep-year 3</td>
<td>0.418*</td>
<td>-1.176***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.217)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-out own, school mean disability exemption rate (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.523***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-out own, school mean disability withdrawn rate (2)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.486***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.244***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School mean non-disability withdrawn rate (3)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.174***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.585***</td>
<td>1.178***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rho</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>[0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School choice and accountability in Victoria

- Highly liberalised school education market
  - High degree of school choice, including from Catholic and independent schools
  - Public schools have high levels of fiscal autonomy
- School achievement in NAPLAN is central to school accountability
  - School choice is supported by reporting of school-average NAPLAN scores in MySchool
  - Declining public-school enrolments can lead to school closure or merger
  - School-average NAPLAN scores are part of a suite of indicators used for regulatory oversight
- Everyone is expected to participate in NAPLAN, but:
  - Principals may exempt students with disability & new NE migrants, with consent from parents
  - Parents can withdraw children on philosophical or religious grounds
Introduction

- National and international obligations to provide inclusive and high quality education ‘for all’ in mainstream education
  - UN General Assembly 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
  - UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
  - National anti-discrimination legislation, e.g. *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*

- Mainstream education is also recognised as being best for children with disability
  - For children with disability, this means equal access to quality education in mainstream schools (Cologon 2013; Hehir et al. 2016; Forlin et al. 2013; Mitchell 2014)