

I have two concerns that appear to come within your Scope. In 2010 PHIDU published an atlas covering aspects of education in South Australia (Understanding educational opportunities and outcomes: A South Australian Atlas).\

It provided a range of data at a small geographical area level, to highlight regional variations in educational participation and outcomes. A dataset that we could only use in part was NAPLAN , which we could get by home address of student for Government schools only.

These data were important to have by home address, as many students attending government schools do not attend local schools, even at primary level. This is, of course a bigger issue for non-government schools. While schools are an important focus in addressing inequalities, the area-based data we publish are also important in understanding regional differences in outcomes across the life course.

Even though the SA education dept. marked the NAPLAN papers for all schools/ sectors, the non-government systems were provided their results to distribute, so there was no information held centrally by student location. This could be overcome, as all sectors are funded by Government and it could be a requirement

Once all data are amalgamated, data for students or sectors are not identifiable, although one sector could compare its results with the total (all sectors), or with the other sectors (total minus their sector) “ and that could hardly be seen as a privacy concern.

Being a national collection, AEDC data are available by address of the child and are widely used, including by community groups to develop programs for ECD.

Data with full coverage of all students across Australia are also not available for pre-school, primary or secondary students at a sub-state level, other than at the (currently) 5-yearly Census. Similarly, the Census provides the only data as to Aboriginal children in pre-school, primary school etc. by community.

John Glover