

# WHAT MUST BE DONE TO ACHIEVE A GOLDEN STATE IN SCHOOL EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA?

Brian J. Caldwell and Tanya Vaughan<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

In May 2011 *The Economist* published an article on the future of Australia under the heading 'The next Golden State', with the sub-title 'With a bit of self-belief, Australia could become a model nation' (*The Economist* 2011: 13-14). Much of the article contrasted the social and economic potential of the nation with the narrowly-focused inward-looking discourse that it alleges is characteristic of politics in Australia. It looked at the characteristics of open, dynamic and creative societies as these have been developed over the years in other nations and offered the following in respect to Australia:

Such societies, the ones in which young and enterprising people want to live, cannot be conjured up overnight by a single agent, least of all by government. They are created by the alchemy of artists, entrepreneurs, philanthropists, civic institutions and governments coming together in the right combination at the right moment. And for Australia, economically strong as never before, this is surely such a moment. (*The Economist* 2011: 13).

In this paper we support the proposition of *The Economist* as it concerns developments in school education. Progress is being made in creating the alchemy but much remains to be done. As far as the question posed in the topic for the symposium is concerned, the evidence supports an affirmative response to the question, namely, privatising policies can indeed support massification and in doing so, they are serving to reduce rather than increase inequality.

We take a broad view of privatisation. A narrow view limits the concept to the ownership and operation of schools and limits the discourse to matters related to public and private schools. In this paper, privatisation includes philanthropic, not-for-profit and corporate contributions to public education. As we shall demonstrate, these contributions are far more substantial than are generally recognised by the public and the profession and, moreover, they are targeted at closing the gap between the achievements of low and high performing students and are thus contributing positively to reducing inequality.

## Governance of school education in Australia

Australia was established as a federation of six states in 1901. There is a federal government, often referred to as the commonwealth government. Two territories have similar powers to the states. Constitutional powers in respect to education lie

---

<sup>1</sup> Brian J. Caldwell is Managing Director and Principal Consultant at Educational Transformations and Professorial Fellow at the University of Melbourne where he served as Dean of Education from 1998 to 2004. Dr Tanya Vaughan is Senior Consulting Researcher and Director of Impact Studies at Educational Transformations and Honorary Research Fellow in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Melbourne. This paper was presented in a symposium on the theme 'Can Privatisation Support Massification without Fostering Inequality? Reconciling Privatisation Policies and Inequity in Education Services and Outcomes', at a conference of the World Educational Research Association (WERA), Sydney, December, 2012.

with the states and territories but the federal government has a powerful influence because it can distribute grants from general revenue and is the only level of government that has the power to levy an income tax.

The federal government can set conditions on how grants to the states can be used and, in recent years, these conditions have been set out in a series of 'national partnership agreements' that reflected the desire in 2007 for 'cooperative federalism' when all governments were of the same persuasion (Labor). States are dependent on the federal government for a large portion of their total revenue, especially smaller states without a strong revenue base. There are signs that consensus among the states is breaking down as governments of different persuasion are elected, for example, the three most populous states of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria as well as Western Australia and the Northern Territory are now non-Labor.

### *Public and private schools*

About 35 percent of students attend private schools in Australia, with this number rising to more than 50 percent at the senior secondary level in the largest cities. In the Australian Capital Territory about 50 percent of all students at all levels are in private schools.

Private schools are normally classified as either Catholic or independent and, together, they are usually referred to as non-government schools (public schools are usually described as government schools). State and federal grants are distributed to authorities representing the interests of these schools. There are Catholic education commissions in each state and territory which distribute the money to schools in their jurisdiction. Grants are distributed directly to independent schools although an association representing the interests of such schools may be involved in certain instances; for example, funds to support building projects or professional development. These funding mechanisms are always the subject of debate, with federal funding re-negotiated every four years.

### *Curriculum*

The federal government established the Australian Curriculum, Reporting and Assessment Authority (ACARA) in 2009 to design and implement the nation's first national curriculum known as the Australian Curriculum. Each state has had its own curriculum but all ministers have agreed to implement the Australian Curriculum which, in most instances will be an adaptation which aligns the state curriculum with the Australian Curriculum. Catholic and independent schools are expected to make similar adaptations.

ACARA also administers the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) for students in Grades 3, 5, 7 and 9, with school performance published on the My School website. Comparisons with like schools are made possible using the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA). Sources of income and fields of expenditure are reported on My School for every public and private school in the country. There are national partnership agreements that commit states to participation in NAPLAN and My School.

### *Professional standards*

The federal government also established the Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) that has established National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST) and a National Professional Standard for Principals (NPSP) each

of which applies to personnel in public and private schools. States continue to have their own standards in one form or another but all ministers for education at both levels of government signed off on these standards and the way they will shape policy and practice. There is a national accreditation scheme for programs in initial teacher education offered by universities that is based on NPST.

While several of these initiatives are overdue, such as a national curriculum and national professional standards, most of the national partnership agreements, like their predecessors, have been embraced by the states because they need the funds. However, the federal government neither owns nor operates a single school.

### **Funding arrangements for public and private schools**

Public schools are owned and operated by the states and territories and receive most of their funds from government, with the smaller proportion of public funding coming from the federal government. Portion of their public funding is determined on a needs basis. They may not charge fees to cover the costs of core learning and teaching. Private schools receive funds from state and federal governments, with most of their public funds coming from the latter. They may charge fees. Public funds for private schools are determined according to a formula based on capacity to secure support from their communities. The formula for federal support of public and private schools is revised every four years with the next revision to take effect from 2014.

#### *The Gonski Report*

The federal government commissioned a far-reaching review of funding for public and private schools to help shape the next revision. The report (Australian Government 2011) is generally known by the name of the chair of the review committee (David Gonski) (The Gonski Report). Implementation depends on agreements being struck with state and territory governments as well as with authorities and organisations representing Catholic and independent schools. How the federal government intends to proceed will be announced shortly before the symposium.

Gonski recommended a dramatic increase in funding for all schools (about \$6.5 billion per year), with the total of funds to be allocated on a needs basis to public and private schools in a way that no school will lose funds.

#### *An exemplar of needs-based funding (Victoria)*

Victoria is of particular interest because its public schools have had more than two decades of experience with a high level of autonomy to the extent that more than 90 percent of recurrent (non-capital) funding is allocated directly to schools, a much higher level than in other states (there is a similar initiative in some schools in Western Australia that are known as independent public schools).

The approach for schools administered by the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria (CECV) through its four diocesan offices is of particular interest because of the relatively high level of autonomy of schools in the system and because the needs-based formula for allocating funds to schools pre-dated the approach in government schools. Significantly, it has a capacity-based approach to determining expectations for particular schools to set the level of parent contributions.

### Capacity to pay

The Public Policy Institute at the Australian Catholic University drew on census data to show family income levels for students attending government, Catholic and independent schools as summarised in Table 1 (for 2006). For example, 18.2 percent students in government schools come from families where income exceeds \$104,000, compared to 31.1 percent for Catholic schools and 43.4 percent for independent schools.

Table 1: Family income for students attending government, Catholic and independent schools for 2006 (%) (Source ABS Census of Population and Housing 2006 as reported in Public Policy Institute 2011: 16 [adapted])

Family income	Government (%)	Catholic (%)	Independent (%)	All sectors (%)
<\$25,999	11.2	6.1	6.1	9.4
\$26,000-\$33,799	12.2	6.8	5.9	10.3
\$33,800-\$62,399	30.0	23.4	19.1	27.2
\$62,400-\$88,399	19.8	21.1	16.1	19.6
\$88,400-\$103,999	8.6	11.5	9.4	9.3
>\$104,000	18.2	31.1	43.4	24.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) developed by the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) is another measure of educational need based on a range of indicators. Interestingly, the profile of ICSEA scores for government and Catholic schools are very similar (as reported by Public Policy Institute 2011: 16-17).

### Outcomes

OECD provides a helpful framework for analysing the performance of nations in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). The three countries with the highest scores for both quality and equity (high quality-high equity) were Canada, Finland and South Korea. Australia is also high quality-high equity but is close to the OECD mean on equity. New Zealand and the United States are both high quality-low equity, with the latter much closer to the OECD mean than the former in respect to quality. The United Kingdom is marginally below the OECD mean for quality and marginally above for equity. The trends among these nations are especially noteworthy. In PISA results for 15-year-olds in mathematics from 2000 to 2006, scores steadily declined in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom and the United States but steadily increased for Finland, although there has been a decline for Finland in more recent tests (these comparisons drawn from Sahlberg 2011).

However, while Australia may be high quality-high equity, there has been no overall improvement in outcomes for students after four decades of relentless change and after a nearly 300 percent increase in funding (as reported in Barber and Mourshed 2007). Australia's performance in PISA has declined relative to other countries and outcomes in NAPLAN have generally flat-lined since the tests were introduced in the

mid 2000s. The impact of philanthropic, not-for-profit and corporate contributions is therefore of interest if they have the potential to improve outcomes.

## **Philanthropic, not-for-profit and corporate engagement in public education**

### *Corporate contributions*

The Australian Government, through its Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR), commissioned a report on connections between business and schools. A Business-Schools Connection Roundtable was established with leaders from the business sector. There were extensive consultations throughout the country and surveys were conducted to determine the extent of current and past associations. It was clear that partnerships were more numerous than generally understood. Recommendations for strengthening and extending engagement were made. The report (Business-Schools Connections Roundtable 2011) described such engagement in terms of transformation and the support of the wider community.

Our education system has embarked on a bold transformation to ensure that all our young people have access to a high quality 21st century education, regardless of where they live, their gender, cultural background or socio-economic status. In combination with the development of a national curriculum, physical infrastructure, new technology and other reforms, school-based partnerships—with business and the wider community—promise to deliver effective outcomes for our young people. Such partnerships have flourished over the past two decades. In many cases, business involvement in education has seen marked increases in the quality and extent of engagement of students, parents and whole communities in their schools. Nevertheless, there is much to be done to ensure that all schools can benefit from business connections.

As the world has become more complex, so have the community's expectations of schooling. Contributing to this is a growing recognition that educating our young people is the responsibility of the entire community, not just schools. This has led to an increasing focus on schools developing partnerships with the broader community—including parents, community organisations, businesses, and other education institutions.

(Business-Schools Connections Roundtable 2011: 1)

### *An exemplar in corporate contributions (Schools First)*

An important initiative in Australia is the *Schools First* project of the National Australia Bank (NAB), Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) and the Foundation for Young Australians (FYA) for which NAB allocated \$15 million over three years (2009-2011) to recognise and reward outstanding school-community partnerships (the program continued in 2012). In the first two years of the program 195 awards were made from 2,432 applications with funding totalling \$10.15 million (NAB 2011: 4). *Schools First* offers an online Partnership Matching Service that 'helps schools, businesses and community organisations find a partner' (*Schools First* 2012). Public and private schools are eligible to apply for these awards.

### *Mapping philanthropic and not-for-profit contributions*

Tender Bridge is a national subscription-based research and development service of the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) that is available for schools and not-for-profit entities in education. The organisational subscription is currently \$200 per year. It maintains a data base of more than 1,000 funding sources that can support schools directly or in partnership with an eligible organisation. Details of education-related grants, scholarships and sponsorships from business, philanthropy, government (all levels) and universities are updated weekly and made available to subscribers.

More generally, Tender Bridge offers four services: (1) accessing funds (as described above), (2) professional learning to assist subscribers and non-subscribers, (3) personalised guidance and project idea clarification and (4) an editing service to assist subscribers prepare applications for support. Cases of subscriber success are shared every few months through the publication *Tender Bridge Quarterly*. These services are provided to public and private schools.

Leading Education through Education and Philanthropy (LLEAP) is a three-year project partnership of the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) through its Tender Bridge project, The Ian Potter Foundation and the Origin Foundation. The project was described by Michelle Anderson, Project Director, Tender Bridge, in the following terms:

As a new research project, Leading Learning in Education and Philanthropy (LLEAP) aims to address these issues by exploring whether the full potential of funding and partnerships available to Australian schools is being achieved. The project aims to find ways to improve the quality of grant seeking and grant making in Australia, with a focus on identifying better ways for the philanthropy and education sectors to connect and collaborate. (Anderson 2011: 56)

A survey of a representative sample of schools, not-for-profits and philanthropies was conducted in 2011. There were 302 responses from every state and territory: 138 schools, 84 philanthropies and 80 not-for-profits. Case studies were conducted. Hands on Learning (HOL) for example, was initiated in 1999 at Frankston High School in Melbourne but in 2012, 13 years later, it extends to 18 schools across Victoria and Queensland. Notable are the number of supporting partnerships which included the Education Foundation, Myer Foundation and Sidney Myer Fund, AMP Youth Boost Fund and Social Ventures Australia (SVA) (see below for more details about SVA). The SVA role was described in these terms:

In 2005, SVA invested \$40,000. They saw that the program was a way to deal with the huge issue of student disengagement. But they did not provide the funds. That's not their remit. Instead, SVA removed the burden from Russell [Kerr] (the founder of HOL) alone to seek supporters. SVA sought support on the school's behalf. That was a crucial value-add in terms of time, knowledge and networks. (Anderson and Curtin 2012: 5)

SVA increased its support to \$300,000 from 2005 to 2008 and sourced \$1 million for the program. As far as impact is concerned, across the HOL network there has been a 54 percent reduction in the number of absences, 83 percent drop in detentions and

92 percent of students have taken up apprenticeships or further study (Anderson and Curtin 2012: 7).

*An exemplar in philanthropic support (Ian Potter Foundation)*

The Ian Potter Foundation is one of the largest philanthropies in Australia. It is a partner in LLEAP. Among grants allocated at a single meeting in August 2012 are the following related to schools:

- Foundation for Young Australians (FYA): \$50,000 for its Young People without Borders project to design and build an innovative and interactive digital platform that will connect young volunteers with each other, host organisations and corporate supporters.
- Ardoch Youth Foundation: \$50,000 to support disadvantaged communities in Melbourne by extending the reach of oral language development support in Ardoch's partner schools and early childhood centres through a specialist speech pathology and volunteer support program.
- Foundations for Rural and Regional Renewal (FRRR): \$600,000 over three years to help ensure that schools, pre-schools and community organisations supporting children and young people in rural and regional communities have access to small amounts of funds to support their communities. FRRR was established in 2000 and in its first 10 years distributed over \$25 million to help build capacity in community organisations in rural and regional settings. Its mission is 'to champion the economic and social strength of Australia's regional, rural and remote communities through partnerships with the private sectors, philanthropy and governments'.
- Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER): \$150,000 over two years for its Dare to be Different documentary project for a dissemination strategy for a published case study about a fully-serviced special school: Port Phillip Specialist School (PPSS) which was the subject of *An Extraordinary School: Re-modelling Special Education* (James 2012). PPSS raised several million dollars from private sources over more than a decade to assist the re-development of its site and build an outstanding Performing Arts Centre, reflecting the priority the school gives to arts education.

*An exemplar in not-for-profit support (The Song Room)*

The Song Room (TSR) is a Melbourne-based not-for-profit that offers free music and arts-based programs for children in disadvantaged and other high-need settings. Approximately 20,000 students participate in its programs each week. According to TSR, 700,000 students in government primary schools in Australia have no opportunity to participate in programs in the arts. TSR is supported by grants from federal and state governments with substantial support from foundations, not-for-profits and the corporate sectors.

The impact of the program was confirmed in research in 2010 by Educational Transformations commissioned by TSR and funded by the Macquarie Group Foundation. The findings were published in *Bridging the Gap in School Achievement through the Arts* (Vaughan, Harris and Caldwell 2011), launched by Hon Peter Garrett, Australia's Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth. A detailed account is contained in *Transforming Education through the Arts* (Caldwell and Vaughan 2012).

The research was conducted against a background of international research in both primary and secondary schools in all sectors. The research team examined the performance of students in 10 schools in highly disadvantaged settings in Western Sydney. Three schools offered a longer-term program over 12 to 18 months, and three schools offered an initial short-term program of 6 months. In each instance the program was conducted for Grade 5 and 6 students for one hour on a single day once per week. A control group of four schools did not offer The Song Room program. The three groups of schools were a matched set. At the time of the study they scored roughly the same on the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA), as calculated in 2009. An even closer match was evident when 2010 ICSEA scores were used. The study is a rare example of quasi-experimental design in educational research.

Important differences were found in favour of students that undertook the TSR program. The findings have national and international significance. First, related research in other countries is confirmed. Second, there appears to be a direct association between the arts and outcomes in other areas. Third, the wisdom of including the arts in the Australian Curriculum is confirmed. The key findings were as follows:

1. Participation in TSR is associated with a gain of approximately one year in Year 5 NAPLAN scores in reading and approximately half a year in science and technology when compared to outcomes for students in matching schools.
2. Participation in TSR is associated with higher levels of social and emotional well-being (SEWB) on every dimension of the ACER SEWB scale compared to measures for students in matching schools.
3. While there was no implication that students in TSR in participating schools had a propensity to engage in juvenile crime, the findings are consistent with world-wide research on factors that mitigate such engagement.

While caution must always be exercised in drawing cause-and-effect relationships, these differences in comparisons in matched sets of schools were statistically significant. Moreover, the longer the students were in TSR programs the greater the differences.

TSR commissioned Educational Transformations to conduct a second study in 2011 on the impact of the arts on community engagement and student outcomes in indigenous communities in Queensland. The Arts Indigenous Parental Engagement (CAIPE) was funded by the Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) as a Parental and Community Engagement (PaCE) project in association with the Department of Education and Training in Queensland. A detailed report of the findings will be released shortly. A pre-publication announcement was made by TSR and reported in *The Australian* on 22 October 2012 (Ferrari 2012). Key findings include improved attendance, academic achievement, and higher parental expectations, with stronger impact in regional compared to urban and remote schools. While it was not possible to assemble a control group, the study involved pre- and post- measures on a range of indicators.

It was noted above that 700,000 students in government primary schools in Australia have no opportunity to participate in programs in the arts. Students in public schools in low socio-economic settings appear to be at a comparative disadvantage to their counterparts in schools in more affluent communities and in private schools. An explanation may be that large numbers of private schools have, at least in the eyes

of parents, a more holistic view of the curriculum and have well-developed programs in the arts that have withstood the narrowing effect of high-stakes testing. There are notable exceptions, of course, especially for public schools of long standing or where the arts are a 'protected' specialisation. An associated reason that takes account of socio-economic status in the public sector as well as in the private sector is that these schools have more financial resources to draw on or have higher levels of social capital from which they can secure support for the arts.

*An exemplar in capacity building (Social Ventures Australia)*

Social Ventures Australia (SVA) is a non-profit organisation established in 2002 by The Benevolent Society, The Smith Family, WorkVentures and the AMP Foundation. As noted in its 2011 Annual Report, revenue in 2011 grew by 18 percent to \$11.17 million. The organisation has raised over \$45 million to fund innovative social ventures and strengthen the non-profit sector more broadly. Its efforts as part of the GoodStart syndicate helped to provide early learning services for 72,000 children in 660 centres. Over the past five years, the consulting team within SVA has worked with over 160 organisations on more than 350 projects.

SVA has demonstrated its commitment to the school sector in many ways, including the organisation of two 'dialogues' of what it calls 'an uncommon alliance'. These were one-day events in Sydney in September 2011 and September 2012 which brought together representatives of major philanthropies, not-for-profits and senior leaders in systems of public education. The focus in 2012 was on the contribution of teachers to schools in securing improved outcomes for students in disadvantaged settings, with the theme being 'Great teaching in tough schools'. The event was supported by AMP, Bryan Foundation and Robertson Family Foundation.

SVA has identified four change levers that have a significant impact on outcomes for students for disadvantaged backgrounds, which they describe as:

- Early learning: Ensuring low socio-economic status children attend a high-quality early education program
- High-performing schools: Developing high-performing schools in low SES neighbourhoods through improving teacher effectiveness and quality leadership
- Engaged parents and communities: Supporting parents, businesses and the wider community to engage with schools and support students
- Effective pathways: Supporting low SES students to access effective pathways from school to further learning or work

SVA directly supports a number of what it calls Bright Spots within its venture portfolio by providing funding, expertise and access to networks. In the education arena, it is currently supporting the Australian Indigenous Mentoring Experience, the Beacon Foundation, Ganbina, Teach for Australia, and The Song Room.

The organisation is now exploring how to showcase Bright Spots that effectively train and prepare teachers for low SES schools or offer induction, mentoring, and professional development to new teachers in low SES schools, working in partnership with governments from all jurisdictions. SVA is also exploring, together with schools and philanthropists, how it can provide flexible financial support and guidance to Bright Spots and disseminate information about associated innovations.

## **Governance**

The least adventurous aspect of the involvement of the private sector in public education is governance. In broad terms Australia still has the same governance arrangements as it has had for more than a century. Public schools are built, owned, funded and operated by governments but with a steadily increasing injection of funds from the philanthropic, non-for-profit and corporate sectors as described in the previous section.

Some states provide schools with more autonomy than they have had in the past, notably Victoria (self-managing schools) and Western Australia (a minority are self-managing independent public schools). Attendance zones have been loosened. The federal government is implementing in association with the states and territories its Empowering Local Schools program over the next eight years but, in most instances, governments as well as Catholic and independent schools are choosing to use the associated funds to build capacity within current levels of autonomy rather than increase the level of autonomy.

Only a few public schools have become specialist schools along the lines developed in England over the last two decades. After a slow start in the Thatcher years, specialist secondary schools grew rapidly during the Blair and Brown years to the point that virtually all secondary schools became specialist secondary schools, offering one or more specialisations for which they received additional public funding that effectively doubled the extra cash or in-kind support they received in partnership with public or private entities. The specialist program was abandoned with a change of government in 2010.

There are no counterparts in Australia to charter schools in the United States. There are no proposals in Australia for what are arguably the most significant of initiatives in England, namely, the creation of academies. They were an initiative of the Blair government to replace low performing secondary schools in areas of severe disadvantage in cities around the country. Private sector contributions in cash and membership of governing bodies were required in the early stages.

## **Summary**

Two meanings of privatisation have been adopted in this paper. The first concerns sectors of schooling. A steadily increasing proportion of students are attending private schools in Australia to the extent that a majority at the senior secondary levels in the largest capital cities do so. There is a strong relationship between income levels of parents and the proportion of students attending private schools. In this regard, patterns of participation reflect inequalities in family income. While it is a matter for separate and more detailed analysis, it may be argued that these patterns tend to perpetuate these inequalities.

Proposals for the distribution of a larger pool of funds from federal and state sources, as proposed in the Gonski Report, call for the adoption of a student needs-based mechanism that distributes funds to public, Catholic and independent schools. Some jurisdictions have had student needs-based funding mechanisms for several decades and these allocate a large majority of recurrent funds directly to schools. Especially noteworthy are the approaches for public and Catholic schools in Victoria.

National curriculum and national professional standards have been developed and agreed to by all ministers for education and these apply in the same fashion to public

and private schools. In the medium to long term, these frameworks and the application of new funding mechanisms may serve to reduce inequalities in schools.

There is a strong case to be made that privatisation in the second sense is serving to decrease inequalities in that philanthropic, not-for-profit and corporate contributions are targeted mainly at meeting the needs of students in public schools in highly disadvantaged settings. Evidence presented in the paper suggests that this is a significant factor in bringing about what *The Economist* described as the 'Golden State' for schools in Australia, 'created by the alchemy of artists, entrepreneurs, philanthropists, civic institutions and governments coming together in the right combination at the right moment' (*The Economist* 2011: 13).

## Conclusion

The developments reported in this paper were not evident a decade ago. National frameworks have emerged in the last five years and, while there may be ongoing debate about their structure and scope, there is bi-partisan support for their uniform application across the public and private sectors in school education. Similarly, philanthropic, not-for-profit and corporate contributions to public schools, especially to support efforts to close the gap between low and high performing students, were very much at the periphery until recently. Contrary to an often held view, private effort in support of public education is likely to reduce rather than increase inequality. Other measures may be more important and have greater impact, for example improving the quality of teaching and ensuring that all students no matter what the setting have access to it, but the private sector is making a significant and growing contribution.

## References

- Anderson, M. (2011) Maximising the impact of philanthropy in education, *Teacher*, May, pp. 56-59.
- Anderson, M. and Curtin, E. (2012) *Cases Companion Document*, A Tenderbridge Project in association with the Ian Potter Foundation and the Origin Foundation, Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Australian Government (2011) *Review of Funding for Schooling – Final Report*, Report of the Expert Panel, David Gonski (Chair), Canberra: Australian Government.
- Barber, M. and Mourshed, M. (2007) *How the World's Best-Performing School Systems Come out on Top*, London: McKinsey & Company.
- Business-Schools Connections Roundtable (2011) *Realising Potential: Businesses helping schools to develop Australia's future*, Canberra. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/Documents/RoundtableReport.pdf>> (accessed 23 May 2011)
- Caldwell, B.J. and Vaughan, T. (2012) *Transforming Education through the Arts*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Ferrari, J. (2012) Arts programs close indigenous gap in one year, *The Australian*, 22 October, page 3.
- Public Policy Institute (ACU) (2011) *Issues Paper: Parental Contributions to Education*, Prepared by the Public Policy Institute of the Australian Catholic

University for the Independent Schools Council of Australia. November. Online. Available HTTP:<  
<http://www.isca.edu.au/html/PDF/PPI%20Paper%203%20Parental%20Contributions.pdf>> (accessed 7 February 2012)

James, S. (Ed) (2012) *An Extraordinary School: Re-modelling Special Education*, Melbourne: ACER Press.

Sahlberg, P. (2011) *Finnish Lessons: What Can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland?* New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Schools First (2012). NAB Schools First Newsletter – 31 January 2012. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.schoolsfirst.edu.au> >(accessed 1 February 2012)

*The Economist* (2011) 'The next Golden State', *The Economist*. 28 May, pp. 13-14.

Vaughan, T., Harris, J. and Caldwell, B.J. (2011) *Bridging the Gap in School Achievement through the Arts: Summary Report*, Melbourne: The Song Room.