

**SUBMISSION TO PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION SEPTEMBER DRAFT REPORT  
NATIONAL EDUCATION EVIDENCE BASE**

**Introduction**

The Australian Council of TESOL Associations (ACTA) is the peak professional body for TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) educators in adult and school settings. It comprises representatives from state and territory TESOL associations, whose members include teachers, researchers, consultants and curriculum developers.

As a body that advocates for the interests of students who are learning English as their second or additional language, we welcome the opportunity to provide advice on the Productivity Commission's September draft report on the National Education Evidence Base.

Our submission focuses on the long-standing issue of the serious gap in national data collection and reporting in relation to the English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) student target group. As a subgroup of the larger population of students from language Backgrounds other than English (LBOTE), students for whom acquisition of English is essential for participation and achievement in the Australian Curriculum can only be identified on the basis of their levels of English Language Proficiency.

The current lack of a nationally consistent measure of English Language Proficiency perpetuates the 'invisibility' of the EAL/D learners and prevents effective national policy planning, provision, monitoring, evaluation and research necessary to support this group's successful participation in Australian education and training and contribution to our multicultural society.

At a time when schools are becoming increasingly linguistically diverse as a result of Australia's indigenous population and its continuing migration and humanitarian programs, now more than ever, development and implementation of a nationally consistent measure of English Language Proficiency as part of the national education evidence base is a priority for Australia.

**The EAL/D student target group**

EAL/D learners are school aged students who have language backgrounds other than English *and* who are learning English as their second or additional language at school. The EAL/D target group encompasses newly arrived and ongoing Australian born students; refugees and international students functioning at all levels of English language proficiency with the following profiles:

- students beginning school with minimal or no exposure to English, whether born overseas or in Australia to parents with language backgrounds other than English
- students with no previous formal schooling in any country beginning school

- students with disrupted educational backgrounds beginning school
- students starting school in Australia with schooling equivalent to that of their Australian-born chronological peers
- students with disrupted education in one or more countries returning to Australia.

The EAL/D target group also includes Indigenous students who have little or no exposure to Standard Australian English and are learning Standard Australian English as their second or additional language or dialect at school.

The EAL/D target group therefore may enter Australian schooling as new arrivals at any year from Kindergarten to Year 12, and be distributed across all years of schooling with varying levels of English language proficiency.

EAL/D learners are in the process of becoming bilingual or multilingual users of English. They enter the school system with language skills and cultural and cognitive abilities, bringing to the task of learning a range of linguistic and cultural resources that contribute to their English language and curriculum learning.

Successive studies have confirmed that for EAL/D students at school, learning English typically takes about two years to achieve basic fluency in spoken English, and a minimum of five to seven years to develop the English language and literacy needed to close the gap in academic performance with their English speaking peers<sup>1 2</sup>. These two types of proficiencies have been called Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), and academic English, or Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)<sup>3</sup>. The key factor determining the time taken is the level of literacy which students have developed in their home language. Refugee and other students with disrupted education and little or no literacy in their first language can take between seven to twelve years to develop the level of English needed to achieve academic parity with their English speaking peers.<sup>4 5 6</sup>

The educational disadvantage experienced by the EAL/D target group arises from insufficient levels of English language proficiency needed to access, participate and succeed in the English-medium school curriculum. While EAL/D learners come from different socioeconomic backgrounds, English language proficiency is the prime disadvantage factor determining the learning needs and potential educational disadvantage of this group. The relative educational

---

<sup>1</sup> Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first and second language proficiency in bilingual children, in E. Bialystok, *Language processing in bilingual children*, Cambridge: CUP.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.

<sup>3</sup> Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 487-499). Springer US.

<sup>4</sup> Collier, V. (1989). How Long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language, *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(3), 509-531.

<sup>5</sup> Hakuta, K. (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency. *University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute*.

<sup>6</sup> Demie, F. (2013). English as an additional language pupils: how long does it take to acquire English fluency?. *Language and Education*, 27(1), 59-69.

disadvantage for refugee students has been estimated as having a negative impact on performance of -0.463 (or 3 quarters of a performance band on NAPLAN), comparable with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, and -1.807 (or 3 performance bands on NAPLAN) for a newly arrived refugee student<sup>7 8</sup>.

It is estimated that there are currently over 300,000 students identified as EAL/D learners needing English language support in schools throughout Australia.

Australia's cultural and linguistic diversity means that EAL/D learners will continue to be a significant component of the student population in the early years of schooling. In the coming decade, immigration will be an increasing proportion of Australia's population growth<sup>9</sup> while international crises will continue to put pressure on Australia's refugee and humanitarian intakes<sup>10</sup>. To meet this demographic and educational challenge, developing a responsive national education evidence base capable of identifying and monitoring the English language proficiency development of Australia's school EAL/D student population is essential.

### **The current national education evidence base for EAL/D**

The data collection and reporting systems that comprise Australia's national education evidence base do not capture the key linguistic risk factor that creates education disadvantage for the target group resulting from Australia's migration policies and linguistic diversity - English language proficiency.

Despite public acknowledgement of Australia as a successful 'immigration nation' and multicultural society, over the last two decades, the nation has actually lost its capacity to identify and report on a key group that determines its success as a multicultural society - students with English language proficiency needs.

Since its establishment by the Commonwealth Government in the early 1970s, the English as a Second Language (ESL) Program (now English as an Additional Language or Dialect - EAL/D) has provided the policy basis for national reporting of newly arrived and ongoing English language learners in government and non-government primary and secondary schools across Australia. ESL learners were identified by education authorities on the basis of need for ESL support as determined by their participation in the school's ESL program.

Public reporting of students participating in the ESL General Support program ceased after the Commonwealth Government subsumed the program as part of a broadband literacy program

---

7 Nous Group (2011) *Schooling Challenges and Opportunities: A Report for the Review of Funding for Schooling Panel*. p. 73. at: [file:///C:/Users/TOSHIBA/Downloads/Nous%20-%20Schooling%20Challenges%20and%20Opportunities%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/TOSHIBA/Downloads/Nous%20-%20Schooling%20Challenges%20and%20Opportunities%20(1).pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Gonski Report, (2011) p.119 at: <https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/review-of-funding-for-schooling-final-report-dec-2011.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Cully, M. & Pejoski, L. (2012) Australia unbound? Migration, openness and population futures. In; *A Greater Australia: Population, policies and governance* Committee for Economic Development. p.70.

<sup>10</sup> For example, Commonwealth Government's recent decision to accept an additional intake of Syrian refugee families and to increase the number of humanitarian places from 13,500 to 20,000.

in 1997. Although the ESL New Arrivals Program continued until 2008, there has been no public reporting of ESL New Arrivals students by the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) since its establishment in 2000.

As a result, the EAL/D student target group has effectively disappeared from national policy discourse and planning. As they have become invisible within education policy, EAL/D students are no longer a priority for English language teaching support. This erosion has been reflected in Commonwealth policy and programs. National Partnership programs, for example, made little or no reference to EAL/D learners as an educational priority. Increasingly, EAL/D learners are subsumed within a low SES or underperforming literacy student group in National Education Agreements (NEA) and detailed bilateral agreements and plans.

During this period, the nationally consistent definition 'Language background other than English' (LBOTE) developed in 1997, has become a defacto and inaccurate substitute for the EAL/D student target group. As outlined below, this student category hides more than it reveals.

As shown in **Appendices A and B**, most existing national data collections and reporting processes rely on LBOTE or equivalent category as a broad language/cultural diversity measure of the school population. This situation conceals crucial information about LBOTE students' levels of English language proficiency and constitutes a serious, systemic gap in national data evidence base.<sup>11</sup>

### **The need for a national English language proficiency measure**

The identity and 'visibility' of the EAL/D target group is fundamental to the targeted provision and development of effective teaching support programs. At the national level, the absence of a nationally consistent approach to identifying the target group in terms of levels of English language proficiency has resulted in national policy stagnation and neglect in the area of EAL/D education as evidenced by:

- perpetuation of an inaccurate disadvantaged Language Background other than English (LBOTE) measure of English learning need of the EAL/D student target group on which Australian Government needs-based schools funding for students with limited English language proficiency is allocated to states and territories
- continued inability to report on the literacy and numeracy outcomes of the EAL/D student target group under Australia's NAPLAN program
- the lack of systematic, accountable, public reporting of EAL/D student funding, provision and outcomes at national, state and school levels.

The changing nature of English as additional language learning and development in schools requires application of an appropriate national English language proficiency framework capable of capturing identifiable English language progressions at and across different proficiency levels and all years of schooling. It is only against such an English language proficiency framework that

---

<sup>11</sup> The only exception to this data gap would appear to be the Australian Early Development Index which identifies English as a Second Language as a background factor.

valid performance and value-added data appropriate to these students can be collected and reported.

Without an appropriate English language proficiency measure, the learning needs of this group of ESL students can be easily misidentified. EAL/D students who are developing CALP are readily misdiagnosed as having English literacy or special education needs because they present with native-like conversational fluency but display gaps in academic, written English<sup>12 13</sup>. In this way, a student's language acquisition can be misconstrued as a literacy or a learning problem.

The growth of NAPLAN and literacy testing in the past decade has led to the equation of EAL/D student need as English literacy support. However, English literacy intervention programs designed on the assumption of native speaker oracy development do not specifically address the language educational needs of students who are learning English as their additional language. In reviewing the evidence base of literacy and numeracy programs, the ACER Report for the NSW Ministerial Advisory Group on Literacy and Numeracy found that few literacy interventions had a specific focus on ESL learners or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and that few of these interventions were able to demonstrate efficacy or effectiveness.<sup>14</sup>

Confusion between literacy and English language development is particularly acute in early childhood education. Early learning screening instruments and continua assume monolingual mother tongue development in English and when applied automatically to EAL/D learners result in invalid or inappropriate assessments.

Such assessments fail to discriminate students' skills at the early levels and rely on students' speaking proficiency to identify their comprehension of written texts. For example, Best Start assessment, which is conducted in English, discriminate against Kindergarten students from EAL/D backgrounds. Most EAL/D students automatically receive a 0 in their Best Start assessment. These students' performance is then mapped onto a literacy continuum which does not acknowledge that students may start school with little or no spoken English. This result does not provide the teacher with any information about the literacy and numeracy skills they start school with and consequently does not inform teaching for the large number of EAL/D students starting school in Kindergarten.

In these contexts, there is potential for re-creating educational disadvantage where EAL/D learners enter an education system with reduced capacity for proactive and appropriate support; they then struggle and fail to achieve designated standards until identified as literacy underachievers who may receive 'early', remedial assistance of varying appropriateness and

---

12 Lo Bianco, J. (1998). ESL ... Is it migrant literacy? ... Is it history? *Australian Language Matters*, 6(2), 1 and 6-7.

13 Cummins, J (1984a) Wanted: a theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. C Rivera(ed) *Language proficiency and academic achievement*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

14 Australian Council for Educational Research. (2013). *Literacy and Numeracy Interventions in the Early Years of Schooling: A Literature Review. Report to the Ministerial Advisory Group on Literacy and Numeracy*. NSW DEC: Sydney, at: [https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/media/downloads/about-us/news-at-det/announcements/yr2013/acer\\_report\\_8April2013.pdf](https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/media/downloads/about-us/news-at-det/announcements/yr2013/acer_report_8April2013.pdf)

effectiveness. With the disappearance of the EAL/D target group, subsumed within a low SES or underperforming literacy student group, the very idea of a proactive teaching support based on anticipated educational need or risk, will increasingly be replaced by reactive, post hoc intervention based on identification of past student underperformance.

Since the 1990s, State and Territory education systems have met this diagnostic and curriculum challenge through the implementation of nationally developed assessment frameworks such as ESL Scales, ESL Bandscales and the development of related state-based curriculum frameworks. However, as these frameworks are specific to jurisdictions, they are unable to provide nationally comparable measure of English language proficiency necessary for identification and representation of the EAL/D student target group in data at the national level.

### **Potential of the *EAL/D Learning Progression* as a national English language proficiency measure**

The ACARA EAL/D Learning Progression, developed as part of the national curriculum to describe the language development progression typical of EAL/D students<sup>15</sup> may provide a nationally consistent measure of English Language Proficiency that makes visible the language needs of 'invisible' ESL students. If adopted as a nationally agreed English language proficiency measure, this framework could identify the EAL/D target group as a subgroup of the nationally defined LBOTE group from the 'ground up' based on existing state and territory education systems' EAL/D assessment and data collection.

EAL/D Learning Progression was developed by ACARA in 2011, with input from content experts across jurisdictions and academia. Its development was also informed by existing state EAL/D assessment tools (e.g., CURASS ESL Scales and ESL Bandscales). The instrument describes the development of English language typical of students learning English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D). It includes broad descriptions of the characteristics of learner groups at each of four phases of English language learning (Beginning, Emerging, Developing and Consolidating). More detailed descriptors are provided for each of the four modes of language (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and are also differentiated by three stages of schooling (Kindergarten-Year 2, Years 3-6, Years 7-10).

The instrument was developed as part of the Australian Curriculum to support non-specialist teachers to understand the broad phases of English language learning, monitor EAL/D students' linguistic progression, and inform teaching and learning. As such, it has the potential to be implemented nationally as a broad measure of English language proficiency. If implemented as a nationally consistent measure of English language proficiency, it has the potential to be used:

- to identify the EAL/D learner target group
- to identify the relative English language learning support needs of each school, system or jurisdiction,

---

<sup>15</sup> ACARA (2014). *English as an Additional Language or Dialect: Teacher Resource. EAL/D Learning progression*. ACARA: Canberra at: [http://www.acara.edu.au/resources/EALD\\_Learning\\_Progression\\_revised\\_February\\_2014.pdf](http://www.acara.edu.au/resources/EALD_Learning_Progression_revised_February_2014.pdf)

- to analyse and report EAL/D learners' NAPLAN performance at school, system or jurisdiction level,
- as an additional indicator of educational disadvantage in the calculation of ICSEA (replacing the previously used disadvantaged LBOTE measure).

A trial was conducted by the NSW Department of Education on the validity and reliability of the EAL/D Learning Progression instrument for identifying ESL students' language need with a view to resourcing. The trial, found that the instrument enabled teachers to make consistent judgements of English language proficiency across all four modes; that the *Progression* provides a balanced and accurate reflection of student language development and can be the basis for development of a single measure of proficiency – the basis for allocation of ESL funding<sup>16</sup>. The trial recommended the EAL/D Learning Progression was suitable as an ESL resource allocation mechanism but not as an ESL teaching-learning assessment tool.

Currently a number of different tools are used across jurisdictions to assess English language proficiency of EAL/D students. As development of the *EAL/D Learning Progression* was informed by these tools, it was thought that it would be possible to map or empirically align existing tools against the *EAL/D Learning Progression* to both support the assessment process and to derive nationally consistent data on English language proficiency of EAL/D students.

### **LBOTE as a proxy measure for English language proficiency**

The *Final Report for the Review of the Funding for Schooling*<sup>17</sup> identified English language proficiency as a key disadvantage factor and recommended a per student loading for limited English language proficiency as part of a schooling resource standard. It recommended funding for EAL/D students be based on their assessed levels of English language proficiency.

However, a survey conducted in 2011 of all state and territory government school systems showed that no consistent measure was currently available for identifying or reporting English language proficiency of EAL/D students across jurisdictions.<sup>18</sup>

As an interim measure, the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) developed a disadvantaged LBOTE variable to capture EAL/D student need. This measure was incorporated in the calculation of the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) (ACARA 2011). The variable is defined as the percentage of the parents in the school community who are both LBOTE and completed a school education of Year 9 equivalent or below.

<sup>16</sup> Statistics Unit, Centre for Educational Statistics and Evaluation, NSW DEC. (2013). *NSW Trial of the reliability and validity of the EAL/D Learning Progression*, DEC: Sydney. at: <http://www.dec.nsw.gov.au/documents/15060385/15385042/Report26Februaryfinal.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Gonski Report, (2011) at: <https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/review-of-funding-for-schooling-final-report-dec-2011.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> At the request of the Australian Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs Senior Officials Committee (AEEYSOC) and the Ministerial Council for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (MCIMA), the Schools Data Sub Group conducted the survey during July and August 2011 on funding for ESL/EAL/D student support across States and Territories.



As it was the only nationally consistent measure available at the time, the Gonski Report recommended that the loading for limited English Language Proficiency (ELP) be based on the 'Disadvantaged LBOTE (Language Background Other Than English)' measure established by the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA).<sup>19</sup>

### **The inadequacy of the current LBOTE measure**

It was not until 1997 that a nationally consistent definition of Language background other than English (LBOTE), the group from which the EAL/D student target subgroup is identified, was developed. Although the LBOTE definition was a necessary preliminary to an EAL/D one, efforts to develop a nationally agreed definition of EAL/D student target group did not proceed after adoption of the LBOTE definition. The development and adoption of a nationally consistent means of identifying the EAL/D student target subgroup with the LBOTE group therefore remains the 'unfinished business' of the national data improvement agenda.

In the absence of a nationally consistent means of identifying the EAL/D target subgroup with the LBOTE group, LBOTE students have become the de facto and misleading proxy for EAL/D students.

In relation to national assessment and reporting, this has resulted in the performance of EAL/D students remaining hidden within the reported performance of LBOTE students on national literacy and numeracy tests. The range of literacy and numeracy performance of the LBOTE group reflects the diverse socioeconomic characteristics of the group and consequently misrepresents the performance of the EAL/D student subgroup<sup>20 21 22</sup>.

Reporting of high performing LBOTE students (who may not be EAL/D learners) gives false assurance that there is no language problem hindering student achievement, while low performing LBOTE students, seen as an undifferentiated low SES disadvantaged subgroup, mask EAL/D learners' English language proficiency needs.

The Gonski report proposed that funds be allocated according to English language proficiency need<sup>23</sup>. Currently, 'disadvantaged LBOTE' is used as a measure for allocating ESL funding. The current disadvantaged LBOTE measure on which Australian Government needs-based schools funding for students with limited English language proficiency is allocated is a grossly inadequate national measure for determining the English language proficiency need of the EAL/D student target group.

---

<sup>19</sup> However, the report noted that State systems were better able to measure ELP through their own enrolment processes, annual ESL surveys and classroom assessments (p.118). Nevertheless, disadvantaged LBOTE was the measure included in the report and in subsequent modelling because it was the only available nationally consistent measure.

<sup>20</sup> Lingard, B., Creagh, S., & Vass, G. (2012). Education policy as numbers: Data categories and two Australian cases of misrecognition. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(3), 315-333.

<sup>21</sup> Creagh, S. (2014). A critical analysis of problems with the LBOTE category on the NAPLaN test. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 41(1), 1-23.

<sup>22</sup> Creagh, S. (2016). 'Language Background Other Than English': a problem NAPLaN test category for Australian students of refugee background. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(2), 252-273.

<sup>23</sup> Gonski Report, (2011) at: <https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/review-of-funding-for-schooling-final-report-dec-2011.pdf>



The NSW Department of Education and Communities (DEC) conducted an analysis of the 'disadvantaged LBOTE' measure.<sup>24</sup> The report found the 'disadvantaged LBOTE' measure was not a reliable proxy for EAL/D students' English language proficiency (ELP) needs as it was essentially a low SES measure, rather than an indicator of low ELP, and does not correlate with the cohort who actually requires English language support. The analysis concluded that the disadvantaged LBOTE measure not only significantly underestimates the size of the cohort needing support but it also does not capture the right students and should not be used to identify the ELP loading for EAL/D students. These conclusions were reached by comparing disadvantaged LBOTE students to those with low ELP as gauged by the NSW DEC measure of English as a Second Language (ESL).

The report concluded that the significant misalignment between Disadvantaged LBOTE and English language proficiency results in a misdirection of available targeted funding. It estimated that using Disadvantaged LBOTE as a proxy for English language proficiency would mean that 74.7 per cent of the \$100 million earmarked by Gonski for limited English language proficiency would be misdirected to students who do not require EAL/D support.

The LBOTE measure is therefore not fit for the purpose of national identification and reporting on students from language backgrounds other than English who have English language proficiency needs, nor for the purpose of allocating national targeted funding to state and territory education systems based on English language proficiency need.

### **Improving the national education evidence base for EAL/D learners**

Recent developments under the auspices of the Education Council reflect progress towards addressing Australia's English language proficiency in schools data gap.

In 2012, the Australian Government agreed to fund a project endorsed by the Strategic Policy Working Group (SPWG) of the Standing Council for School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC) to investigate any improvements that could be made to the 'disadvantaged LBOTE' measure, with a possible view to informing Australian Government needs-based schools funding for students with limited English language proficiency in the new funding quadrennium.

A collaborative project was proposed involving an empirical mapping between their existing EAL/D assessment tools and the *EAL/D Learning Progression* with a view to demonstrating alignments and equivalences. It was hoped that assessments using existing tools could be 'converted' to an *EAL/D Learning Progression* equivalent and so avoid the need for any additional student assessment or data collection for the purpose of national reporting.

Collaborative work was undertaken throughout 2014 and 2015 involving individual jurisdictions in mapping the *EAL/D Learning Progression* against their existing EAL/D

---

<sup>24</sup>Statistics Unit, Centre for Educational Statistics and Evaluation, NSW DEC. (2013). *Improvements and Alternatives to the Disadvantaged LBOTE Measure Report* at: [http://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/images/stories/PDF/Improvements\\_and\\_alternatives\\_to\\_the\\_Disadvantaged\\_LBOTE\\_measure.pdf](http://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/images/stories/PDF/Improvements_and_alternatives_to_the_Disadvantaged_LBOTE_measure.pdf).)

assessment tools. The outcome of this process was the development of a national framework that relates state and territory jurisdictions' English language proficiency assessment tools to the ACARA English as an additional Language or dialect (EAL/D) Learning Progression.

The Education Council has recently endorsed the *National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency* and is considering options for use and application of the framework and further work to ensure its rigor and accuracy.

## **Recommendations**

As the peak professional body concerned with effective EAL/D instruction for speakers of other languages and dialects, ACTA believes that a nationally consistent approach to identifying students with English language proficiency needs in our multilingual nation is long overdue, and therefore support national efforts to conclude the development and adoption of a *National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency*.

It is therefore recommended that the Productivity Commission support:

1. adoption, when completed, of the *National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency* as Australia's nationally consistent English language proficiency measure as an integral part of its National Education Evidence Base
2. incorporation of the nationally consistent English language proficiency measure into national education data collections and reporting where appropriate and feasible
3. use of the *National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency* for the purposes of national identification and reporting of students with English Language proficiency needs - the EAL/D target group.
4. use of the *National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency* to inform the allocation of available Commonwealth targeted funding for students with English language proficiency needs to state and territory education systems during the 2018-2021 schools funding quadrennium.

Dr Michael Michell  
President, ACTA  
School of Education  
University of New South Wales  
UNSW SYDNEY 2052 AUSTRALIA

October, 2016

## Appendix A

### Inclusion of English language proficiency need in key national education data collections

National education data collection	Language background other than English (LBOTE)	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background)	English as an additional language	English language proficiency
National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN)	Yes	Yes	No	No
National Schools Statistics Collection	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ABS data 'speaks a language other than English at home' + self assessed 'how well speak English'
Nationally Consistent Collection of Data on School Students with Disability	No	No	No	No
National Data Collection	No	No	No	No
Non Government schools collection – School Service Point	No	Yes	No	No
Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC)	Yes Main language spoken at home by child	Yes	No	No
Longitudinal Study of Indigenous Children (LSIC)	Yes Main language spoken at home by child	Yes	No	No
Longitudinal Study of Australian Youth (LSAY)	Yes Main language spoken at home by child	Yes	No	No

## Appendix B

### Inclusion of English language proficiency need in key national education reporting

National education data collection	Language background other than English (LBOTE)	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background)	English as an additional language	English language proficiency
National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLaN)	Yes	Yes	No	No
Australian Early Development Census National Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
National Report on schooling in Australia	Yes	Yes	No	No
ACARA National Assessment Program (NAP) Report	Yes	Yes	No	No
Schools Australia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes Based on ABS data 'speaks a language other than English at home' + self assessed 'how well speak English'
Report on Government Services	No	No	No	No