

**SUBMISSION TO THE NEW SOUTH WALES PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION:-
"AN INNOVATIVE AGENDA FOR DEVELOPING BEST PRACTICE MONITORING, EVALUATION AND
EFFICIENCY FRAMEWORKS IN AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL SCHOOL AND HEALTH GRANT GOVERNANCE"**

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY METRICS AUSTRALASIA, SEMETRICA HUB

Introduction

A critical Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) Performance Audit Report of 6 December 2017 **"Monitoring the Impact of Australian Government School Funding"**, focused on the deficient role of the Commonwealth Department of Education (CDET), since 2013 in monitoring Federal School funding to Non - Government schools **(1)**. The **Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit Report, (JCPAA)** in February 2019 reinforced these criticisms of CDET **(2)**. In responding to the absence of any NSW Treasury Program Grant Impact modelling, **SEMETRICA** supports an extension of the **NSW 'Productivity Commissioner's** role to evaluate all Federal grant impacts on NSW Budgets. Adoption of a **GRANT EFFICIENCY REPORTING MODEL** could use **SEMETRICA'S** proven Network Data Envelopment Analysis, DEA methodology to evaluate all grant impacts. **SEMETRICA'S** Grant Evaluation Programs would measure the **Efficiency, Effectiveness, Economy and Equity (4E)**, Good Governance policy dimensions as outlined in recent publications **(3), (4), (5),(6)**.

A recent Evaluation Book by **SEMETRICA** focused on measuring School Technical and Allocative Efficiency as well as Malmquist Productivity metrics for all Government schools in New South Wales. For example such detailed DEA modelling analytics including all SAS Machine Codes are contained in the book **"Nonparametric Estimation of Educational Production and Costs using DEA"**, **Springer, Operations Research and Management Sciences Series, 2014, (4)**. A more recent collaborative school efficiency modelling approach is contained in the comprehensive **"A Two Stage Cost and Learning Efficiency Driver Network DEA Model of Australian Schools"**, **Applied Economics, 2016, (5)**. This was the first such study to use the innovative **Network DEA Efficiency Analytics** method in the International School Finance Efficiency, Productivity Monitoring and Evaluation literatures.

An expanded Grant Monitoring Unit in the NSW PC could undertake yearly Program Finance Policy Monitoring and Evaluation investigations to inform robust future NSW Parliamentary Committee program grant policy debates. It could also encourage a continuous evaluation cycle to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of existing or newly legislated Government Program Funding. The usefulness of these detailed evaluation analytics could also foster needed changes in NSW Grant Guidelines thereby upgrading the Annual Treasury Program Evaluation cycle by using fit for purpose Efficiency Metrics Applications. Such robust and persuasive 4E internationally recognised research methods could underpin substantial Public Sector finance and governance reforms across NSW.

This focus could also be broadened to include needed reporting upgrades in recipient NSW State and Local Government grant impact evaluation activities, across NSW State Government Policy and Program Units. Such renewed grant oversight activity would complement similar upgrades contemplated Federally by the ANAO and JCPAA's recent critical focus on the lack of Health Grant evaluations, as well as the Non-Government School Sector Monitoring activities by CDET. Much Improved Evaluation Impact studies could utilise and expand the methodologies contained in **(4-6)**.

ANAO criticisms of Commonwealth Education Department School Grant Monitoring activities

In 2014/15, 72 per cent (\$38.1 billion) of total recurrent public funding for schools (\$53 billion) was provided by State and Territory Governments. The Australian Government provided \$14.9 billion over the same period. The majority of State and Territory Government funding (91 percent) was provided to government schools. Conversely, the majority of Australian Government funding (64 percent) was provided to non-government schools, ANAO Report, **(1)**, p7. NSW Audit needs to react.

The main ANAO conclusions

This recent ANAO Report provides a timely 'stocktaking' review of the existing approach by the Commonwealth Department of Education and Training to monitoring the impact of Australian Government School funding arrangements, in accordance with the **Australian Education Act 2013**. The full ANAO Report is in reference **(1)**. A summary of the main ANAO conclusions are below.

"(1) The arrangements do not provide a sufficient level of assurance that funding has been used in accordance with the legislative framework, in particular the requirement for funding to be distributed on the basis of need.

(2) Further the department has not used available data to effectively monitor the impact of school funding and to provide greater transparency and accountability.

(3) As such the department is not well placed to determine whether the current policy settings are effective in supporting the achievement of educational outcomes.

(4) The department is yet to establish sufficiently robust arrangements to ensure system authorities have in place, and make publicly available, compliant needs based funding arrangements.

(5) There are also weaknesses in the arrangements established by the department to collect and validate the information provided by approved authorities to account for funding.

(6) These weaknesses have reduced the level of assurance the department has that funding is allocated in accordance with the needs-based principles established under the legislative framework.

(7) The Department has not effectively monitored the requirement for system authorities to have in place needs-based funding arrangements and, therefore, is not well positioned to determine whether the basis on which authorities are distributing Australian Government funding is in accordance with legislative requirements.

(8) Further, in the interest of reducing the regulatory burden on the sector, the department has not monitored whether approved system authorities' funding models are publicly available and fully transparent as required.

(9) Such weaknesses in the current monitoring arrangements have undermined the department's ability to appropriately verify reported schools' data in order to assess progress against established policy objectives and to support accountability, transparency and analysis. This adversely impacts the level of assurance that the department has in relation to the use of Australian Government funding to progress agreed education policy objectives.

(10) Overall the arrangements established by the department have not delivered the level of transparency and accountability envisaged under the Act and the department has not fully utilised available data to inform the development of current and future education policy".

The ANAO focuses more critically on the insufficiency of, (11), "Monitoring the implementation of and progress against policy objectives". In this context "The department has not established robust arrangements

to monitor the implementation plans that are required to be developed, published and maintained by authorities participating in the National Education Reform Agreement (NERA), or used the plans to measure progress against reform directions”.

Further, the department, (12), *“Has not conducted bilateral discussions, prepared annual progress reports or conducted a comprehensive review, as required under relevant bilateral agreements. As a consequence, the department is not well placed to determine the extent to which reform directions established under the NERA have been progressed by authorities. The department has made limited use of the available data to build its understanding of the impact of funding on school educational outcomes.”* SEMETRICA’s bold and practical evaluation upgrade proposals for School and Health Grants are outlined below.

In an apparently belated sign of forced renewal the ANAO acknowledged that, (13), *“The department is, however, working to build its data and evidence capability, including through the establishment of a branch tasked with helping the department to better manage its data assets”.*

The Context for future Reform in Evaluating Commonwealth Grants to State / Local Governments

Future reform of current Australian Government Grant accountability methods should also focus on a more robust evaluation of the efficacy of Commonwealth funding levels using clearly defined Efficiency, Effectiveness, Economy and Equity protocols. Such 4E determinants of Good Funding Governance will promote effective Monitoring and Evaluation outcomes. The approaches used by SEMETRICA in (4-6), indicate the steps needed in this urgent Policy renewal task. The “Gonski 2.0” Report and recently enacted school grant increases by the Commonwealth for both Government and Non-Government sector schools from 2019-2026, also requires improved Evaluation capabilities.

No comprehensive and rigorous CDET evaluation reports exist of the 4E “impact” of past school funding by both Commonwealth and State Governments from 2011-2019. This inadequate situation has been clearly identified in both the ANAO and JCPAA reports. School Funding Metrics should incorporate Evaluation studies which focus on determining the impact of existing and future Grant Funding levels. Such robust 4E Efficiency, Effectiveness, Economy and Equity Logic Model Frameworks, would enhance Federal-State School Grant Governance and Performance outcomes.

Current Governmental 4E Audit standards for evaluating the spending of all Federal grants by both State and Commonwealth agencies are either unknown or being ignored. ***Such shortcomings could be eliminated by authorising an expanded ANAO EVALUATOR GENERALS OFFICE' to oversight all Commonwealth Funding Programs.*** This move would seek robust Commonwealth/State Agreement to Monitor and Report such an agreed 'Joint Reform Agenda,' as proposed by the Australian Productivity Commission on a biennial basis, to be included in its '5 Yearly Productivity Reviews'.

Detailed potential new directions in Non-Government School Grant Evaluations and Governance

The need exposed by the ANAO for such an Evaluator Generals' Office or an Australian Productivity Commission Grant Governance Unit, would initiate rigorous 4E School and Health Governance Monitoring and Evaluation reporting standards. Such upgrades are clearly needed to improve the current deficient monitoring work undertaken Federally, as documented in the ANAO School and Health Sector Funding Monitoring shortcomings, fully reported on 6 December 2017 and 6 February.

These ANAO reports were buried in the rush to Christmas 2017, but now need to be revisited in assessing any upgrades in Federal School /Health Grant monitoring procedures. Also upgraded School Grant Monitoring and Evaluation reports need to be developed to determine the impact and efficacy of all Commonwealth school grants on States, as well as meeting the future needs for detailed, meaningful Commonwealth legislated monitoring and evaluation Parliamentary reporting .

The response of the Australian Government Education and Training Department to belatedly set up the National School Resourcing Board, (NSRB) in 2017, to provide greater independent research into the determination of Commonwealth recurrent school funding is welcome. Further Network DEA Modelling however is needed to ensure greater compliance with upgraded funding accountability standards for all Australian Government Schools and Hospital systems.

Such requirements were originally intended in the recommendations of the 2011 'Gonski 1' *Review of Funding for Schooling*. Also the report of the "Review to Achieve Educational Excellence in Australian Schools", the "Gonski 2.0 Report," emphasised the need for better evaluations of the distribution of non-government grant funding in parallel with their revised needs-based school funding model. The New Zealand Productivity Commission recently advocated similar studies (8).

Upgrading Commonwealth School and Health Grant Evaluations by State Departments of Education and Health.

Additional upgraded School Grant Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks are also required in assessing the usage and impact of Commonwealth Grants allocated to State and Territory Government Education and Health Departments. Parallel well-specified Government school Network DEA models could also inform future Governance ,Monitoring and Evaluation assessment upgrades in each State and Territory department. Such work could be informed by a recent well-crafted policy relevant contribution to this debate on School Governance by Professor Rodney Maddock, (7).

Professor Maddock's article, "**Why Education Departments should be broken up**", describes their current shambolic decision making environments as "All State Government Education Departments across Australia make policy, allocate funds, build schools, operate the largest players in the field, (public schools), and act as regulators as well". "This bundle involves multiple conflicts of interest because the Departments operate the Public Education system but also regulate the Public, the Catholic and the Independent School systems,"(page 2 of (7)

However clear directions for change in all State government school agencies are contained in the recent Productivity Commission, (PC) "Competition Policy Review" headed by Professor Ian Harper which indicated that "Governments should retain a stewardship function separating the interests of policy (including funding), regulation and service delivery," (page 2 of (7).

Professor Maddock also draws the following conclusions from this Productivity Commission Review as "the implication is that State and Territory Education Departments need to be **BROKEN UP**. Responsibility for the operation of public schools needs to be separated from the policy making and regulatory functions and put into a separate authority".

"Having a single entity responsible for the delivery of public school education would also open up the way for other avenues of review, with the Auditor Generals (both Commonwealth and all State and Territory Audit Offices), being able to assess the value being delivered by benchmarking each State system against the others and also the non-government school systems, using PC-ROGS Data".

Other positive proposals that Professor Maddock identified were "the creation of an Office of the Education Ombudsman for all school systems, thereby increasing transparency and accountability. Also in their role as stewards, policy makers could be assessed with PISA, NAPLAN and other school level finance and staffing data for the overall performance of the system without distractions from operational considerations". These could also be additional tasks for an upgraded **ANAO "Evaluator General's Office, and/or an expanded network of Australian/State Productivity Commissions"**

Professor Maddock also makes reference to a follow up **Australian Productivity Commission** Review into the “Delivery of Human Services” which focused on education and health functions, strongly reinforcing the messages from the prior Professor Harper **Australian Productivity Commissions'** ‘Competition Policy Review’. “Such deliberations should result in Australia having a sensible Governance model for its School Education system” Professor Maddock concluded.

CONCLUSION

SEMETRICA'S above support for the creation of an **ANAO Evaluator General's Office** or an **Expanded Australian and State Productivity Commission's role** in Federal School and Health Grant Impact Monitoring and Evaluation assessments, indicates that a robust Commonwealth and State Government Performance Measurement, Benchmarking, Evaluation and Governance system is ‘now within our grasp’. These reforms will embed 'Good Public Governance' protocols into Australian Government School and Health Grant Funding Impact Assessments.

The recently re-elected Commonwealth Government now has a clear rationale for developing a once in a generation creation of an **ANAO Evaluator General's Office**, and/or an **extended Australian and State Productivity Commission Oversight role**. Such developments would need to utilise robust Efficiency and Productivity protocols for evaluating the sustainability of the Australia wide School Education and Health Grant Funding systems.

State of the Art Evaluation and Performance reporting analytics would be needed to upgrade the assessment capabilities of staff undertaking these 4E assessments of State Education and Health functional budgets. To accelerate such policy research a new Governance Program of Efficiency Metrics modelling could closely follow the successful Research Agenda pioneered by SEMETRICA in Australia. SEMETRICA's detailed ‘Logic Model’ Framework was first presented to the Australian Productivity Commission's, **PC**, 2016 Inquiry into “The Australian Education Evidence Base”, **(8A)**.

An updated version of such methodologies was also presented to the New Zealand Productivity Commission's 2018 Inquiry into “Measuring and Improving State Sector Productivity” **(8B)**. SEMETRICA has also provided its 5 published School Efficiency Journal Articles and Springer book to the UK Department of Education for their recent upgrade of UK School Finance Efficiency Modelling.



REFERENCES

1. The Auditor General, ANAO Report No. 18 2017-18, “Monitoring The Impact Of Australian Government School Funding,” Department of Education and Training, December 6, 2017, Australian National Audit Office, Canberra.
2. The Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit (JCPAA), Report 476, Findings on National Audit Office Report, ANAO, No.18 2017-1DET, "Monitoring The Impact of Australian Government School Funding," February, 2019, Canberra.
3. V.C. Blackburn, “ An Econometric Analysis of School Finance in Australia with special emphasis on measuring the impact of Commonwealth School Grants on Government School

Budgets in the six Australian States from 1973/74 to 1982/83," The 1983 Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Australian National University, Canberra, November 23-27, 1983.

4. V.C Blackburn, S. Brennan, and J. Ruggiero, "Non-Parametric Estimation of School Education Production and Costs Using Data Envelopment Analysis-DEA", Springer International Series in Operations Research and Management Sciences, New York, 2015.
5. P. Wanke and V.C. Blackburn, "Cost and Learning Efficiency Drivers in Australian Schools: A Two Stage Network DEA Approach," Applied Economics, FEBRUARY, 2016.
6. A. Haug, and V.C. Blackburn, "Government Secondary School Finances in New South Wales Schools: Accounting for Student's Prior Achievements in a Two Stage DEA at the School Level," Journal of Productivity Analysis, APRIL, 2017.
7. R. Maddock and L. Campbell, "Why School Education Departments Should Be Broken Up," The Conversation, 1 JUNE 2016.
8. V C Blackburn, "SEMETRICA's Logic Model of School Performance Measurement" submissions to (A) the Australian Productivity Commission's inquiry into 'The Education Evidence Base' and (B) the New Zealand Productivity Commission Inquiry 'Measuring State Sector Productivity' 2018.