



AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL OF TESOL ASSOCIATIONS (ACTA)

**NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR
LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

NOVEMBER 2018

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Preface | 3 |
| The National Settlement Framework | 4 |
| Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) | 5 |
| English as an Additional Language or Dialect Education (schools)..... | 6 |
| English and Indigenous Languages in the Education of Indigenous Students | 11 |
| Languages education (schools & pre-schools) | 12 |
| Young People at Risk | 13 |
| Adult English Language and Literacy Programs | 14 |
| Teacher Education, Training and Development | 16 |
| National Collaborative Research Strategy..... | 17 |
| Strategy Management, Coordination, Monitoring and Reporting | 18 |

Preface

Language is a fundamental resource for all learning and a means by which Australia can achieve outcomes in educational excellence, equity, Indigenous reconciliation and social cohesion.

In an English-medium education and training system, English language skills underpin literacy and numeracy learning and support educational achievement and excellence. Indigenous and migrant students learning English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) need to develop social and academic English to participate and succeed in Australian schools, access further education and training, gain employment, and enjoy community and civic participation.

Research and practice have long established that the best foundation for children who start school speaking a language other than English is to develop literacy skills and academic language ability in that language. Building on the languages that Indigenous and migrant children bring to school promotes the pride, confidence, wellbeing and cultural connectedness that foster educational engagement, resilience and success. Gaining oral and written communication skills in one's mother tongue and other languages supports academic literacy and promotes cross-cultural understanding. Australian society as a whole benefits culturally and economically when young people can maintain, extend and use their precious cultural and linguistic resources in the wider world. The languages of Australia's diverse communities are a resource for and gift to the nation that we cannot afford to ignore.

The cultural and linguistic demands of Australia's regional and international role, our economic and cultural ties, the special place of our Indigenous peoples, our ongoing immigration program and our international refugee obligations should all shape our education and training systems. How we address these cultural and linguistic demands determines whether we reach our full potential, build national prosperity and take our place in the wider world.

These challenges require a coherent and comprehensive national approach to language in education and training. Since the 1970s, Australia has, at various times, achieved world leadership in language in education, notably, the Hawke Government's 1987 National Policy on Languages. At other times, Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments have retreated from or reversed these policies and undermined these achievements. Over the last decades, Australian Governments have too often ignored the crucial role language plays in learning, devolving all responsibility for this area to States and Territories and fostering national policy complacency, neglect and failure.

Government leadership and commitment is needed to restore Australia's leading role in language and literacy education and training, and build on past and present best practice and expertise, regardless of jurisdiction or party politics. The overall goal of this national strategy for language in education and training is to foster the national capacity and responsiveness of Australia's education and training institutions to our multilingual, multicultural society and international community by:

- reinvigorating English language and literacy education for school and adult learners;
- strengthening targeted provision of English language teaching and support to the full range of English as an additional language/dialect learners in all sectors of education;
- leveraging the potential of two-way language learning for Indigenous students through Indigenous languages, EAL/D and bilingual programs;
- implementing a targeted national education and training strategy for young people at risk;
- implementing a coherent, comprehensive, national approach to learning languages of Australian communities across primary, secondary and tertiary education;
- instituting national training and collaborative research strategies to support effective teaching of English language and literacy and languages education in school, VET and higher education sectors
- strengthening whole-of-government reporting, review and policy decision making processes to ensure national language in education issues are adequately considered.

As part of this commitment, implementation of language in education and training policies and programs will be:

- language-based and needs-driven
- informed by research evidence, professional expertise and best practice
- responsive and flexible to local communities and contexts
- genuinely transparent and accountable.

The National Settlement Framework

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>1. Strengthen the coordination, planning and reporting functions of the National Settlement Framework with particular reference to effective delivery of English language services</p> | <p>1. Review the scope, transparency, accountability, effectiveness and data and reporting capabilities capability of the <i>National Settlement Framework</i> (NSF) in relation to the <i>National Outcomes Standards</i>;</p> <p>2. Identify ways to improve the effectiveness, transparency and accountability of national coordination, planning and reporting of settlement services, including pre-school, school and post-school English language services and services for refugee and asylum seekers;</p> <p>3. extend the NSF to include Early Childhood Education and Care and youth transition support services;</p> <p>4. Ensure effective NSF planning and coordination of English language service provision in response to changing immigration and settlement location data;</p> <p>5. Establish annual reporting of achievements against stated NSF education and training objectives, outcomes and priority areas.</p> | <p>The <i>National Settlement Framework</i> (NSF) is the national blueprint for collaboration and planning across the three tiers of government for settlement services for migrants and new arrivals in their first 5 years in Australia. It includes nine priority service areas assisting settlement. Developed in consultation with all State and Territory Governments, the <i>National Outcomes Standards</i> specify systemic outcomes and indicators for the NSF priority areas. Parties to the framework are committed to three focus activities of planning, delivery and evaluation/ review of settlement services.¹</p> <p>Although school English as an Additional Language (EAL) and adult language and literacy programs are identified as priority areas in the framework, authorities responsible for these English support services are not represented on the group overseeing NSF implementation.²</p> <p>The NSF has no visible public profile or discernible impact on English language provision in schools, the AMEP and SEE Programs, VET and HE. The NSF does not involve any reporting requirements to COAG.³</p> <p>The 2017 Parliamentary Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes recommended that “the Senior Officials Settlement Outcome Group produce an annual report on outcomes of the National Settlement Framework for consideration by the Council of Australian Governments”, The Government rejected this recommendation.⁴</p> <p>Under current arrangements, the NSF is a weak, non-transparent service co-ordination framework unable to meet Australia’s settlement service planning and accountability reporting needs arising from its immigration program.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a cross-Ministerial steering group (Education and Training, Immigration and Multiculturalism and Citizenship) to drive the project.</p> <p>Establish a COAG review team to determine:</p> <p>1. the NSF review terms of reference.</p> <p>2. ways to strengthen NSF transparency and accountability reporting for settlement services, including English language provision.</p> <p>3. a mechanism for public reporting on progress against the <i>National Outcomes Standards</i> across the three tiers of government.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>By late 2019, implement recs of the review team.</p> <p>By mid-2020, mechanism for public reporting on progress against the <i>National Outcomes Standards</i> across the 3 tiers of government in place.</p> <p>2020 Annual report of achievements against stated NSF education and training objectives, outcomes and priority areas.</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>2021 Annual report of achievements against stated NSF education and training objectives, outcomes and priority areas.</p> | <p>Within existing resources.</p> |

¹ https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/11_2016/the_national_settlement_framework.pdf

² The Senior Officials Settlement Outcomes Group (SOSOG)

³ The answer to 2018 Senate Estimate Questions on Notice on this issue (SQ18-471) stated, ‘no reports relating to English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) services and outcomes have been produced for the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) through the National Settlement Framework (NSF).

⁴ https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/06_2018/ag-response-joint-standing-committee-on-migration-inquiry-into-settlement-outcomes-report.pdf (recs. 6 & 7).

Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC)

| OBJECTIVE /ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>2. Strategy to strengthen participation of migrant and refugee families in Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) services</p> | <p>The Strategy will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. extend the NSF to include ECEC; 2. implement Rec 1 on Community Hubs in the 2017 <i>Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes</i>; 3. ensure provision of information and advice to new migrants on ECEC through: pre-embarkation briefings; Humanitarian Settlement Service; community-based advisors, and Migrant Resource Centres; 4. review access and equity of existing ECEC provision for migrant and refugee families, with particular reference to language barriers, bilingual provision and inclusion; 5. review ECEC training programs and require reporting on inclusion of culture and language competencies; 6. require focus, collaboration and standardised data collection on migrant and refugee families across all relevant agencies; 7. require annual public reporting from the ECEC National Quality Framework (NQF) Inclusion; Agencies on access by migrant and refugee families 8. extend Early Learning Languages Australia to include languages of disadvantaged communities; 9. conduct a large-scale pilot of the Home Interaction Program for Parents and Youngsters; (HIPPY) program, similar to the Indigenous pilot; targeting disadvantaged communities with language backgrounds other than English, with particular focus on the role and expertise of bilingual home tutors and language- and culture-appropriate resources, including available ELLA apps. | <p>Investment in ECEC has bipartisan support because its life-long benefits are well-established and highly cost effective.⁵ As a result of Australia's increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse population, young children from language backgrounds other than English make up a significant proportion of the early childhood cohort. Migrant and refugee infants are under-represented in ECEC provision⁶. Barriers are cultural, linguistic, lack of information, insufficiently welcoming venues and staff who lack required knowledge and competencies.</p> <p>The NQF mandates that ECEC services be accessible for culturally and linguistically diverse communities. The <i>Early Years Learning Framework</i> recognises the importance of home language and culture to children's early learning.⁷</p> <p>To assist ECEC services to include children with additional needs, the Government introduced in 2016 the Inclusion Support Programme which includes temporary employment of bicultural support staff.⁸ In 2017, the Government also introduced the Early Learning Languages Australia (ELLA) program, a series of digital, play-based language learning interactive applications for preschoolers in major languages, with plans for expansion to years F-2.⁹</p> <p>Recent research has highlighted the crucial importance of language-rich, carer-child interaction for children's successful early learning and school transition.¹⁰</p> <p>The HIPPY program has established its value as a combined home and centre-based early childhood enrichment program that supports parents in their role as their child's first teacher in the year before and after school enrolment.¹¹</p> <p>Despite national roll-out to 100 communities, there has been no focused evaluation of the program's effectiveness for CALD families. Evaluation of the Indigenous communities' pilot highlights the need to adapt delivery and materials to meet the language and cultural needs of CALD families.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a joint Ministerial/ Australian Children's Education and Care Authority ECEC steering group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish consultative processes with key stakeholders • conduct reviews 4, 5 • implement initiatives 1,2,3,6,7,8,9 • identify new languages for extending ELLA program • design HIPPY pilot targeting CALD communities. | <p>SOON</p> <p>By end 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Govt considers and implements review recs and future policy directions • extend ELLA program to new languages • implement HIPPY pilot in 10 CALD community groups targeting 1000 children. | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extend ELLA program to new languages • continue to implement HIPPY pilot in 10 CALD communities targeting 1000 children • Findings of HIPPY pilot, report recs • 2020-2021 annual national Inclusion Agency compilation reports on improved migrant and refugee families access to ECEC. | <p>Review: \$200,000</p> <p>Extension of ELLA program to new languages: 10 languages @ \$120,000 = \$1.2m</p> <p>HIPPY pilot: \$8.6m (1,000 children @ \$4,304 per child per annum x 2 years)</p> <p>Total estimated costs \$10m</p> |

⁵ 2014 Productivity Commission on *Childcare and Early Childhood Learning* <http://www.pcgov.au/inquiries/completed/childcare/report/childcare-overviewpdf>

⁶ 2013 Institute of Family Studies reports; ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room>

⁷ <https://www.acecqa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2018-02/belonging-being-and-becoming-the-early-years-learning-framework-for-australia.pdf>

⁸ <https://www.education.gov.au/inclusion-support-programme-isp>

⁹ <https://www.education.gov.au/early-learning-languages-australia>

¹⁰ <https://www.smh.com.au/education/lack-of-childcare-chatter-risks-kids-language-development-20180727-p4zu0f.html>

¹¹ *Investing in our Future: An evaluation of the national rollout of the HIPPY program* (2012) at: https://www.mychild.gov.au/sites/mychild/files/documents/04-2015/hippy_evaluation.pdf

English as an Additional Language or Dialect Education (schools)

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>3. Completion and endorsement of the National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency as nationally agreed measure for collection and reporting of data on English language needs and outcomes</p> | <p>Completion of the project involves:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a survey of jurisdictions' current use/application of and responses to the National Framework; 2. further development of the National Framework in consultation with State/Territory education authorities; 3. national trial and validation of the National Framework; 4. revision and refinement of National Framework 5. endorsement of the National Framework by COAG Education Council. | <p>Australia has no nationally agreed and consistent mechanism for identifying, assessing or reporting on English language learners' English proficiency needs, achievements or progress.</p> <p>Without this, NAPLAN and other national data cannot be disaggregated for reporting on EAL/D students or for Commonwealth needs-based funding allocations to schools. As a result, little is known about the literacy performance of the EAL/D student cohort nationally, while the target group has effectively disappeared from national policy discourse, planning and provision.</p> <p>Australia's continued inability to identify the EAL/D student target group in terms of their English language proficiency constitutes a major, systemic gap in the nation's education evidence base.¹²</p> <p>Commonwealth DET officials have confirmed that lack of progress in the further development of the <i>National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency</i> after December 2015 Education Council meeting was due to displacement by other national priorities.</p> <p>The National Framework is referenced to the <i>English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) Learning Progression</i> developed by ACARA in 2012 following widespread national consultation.</p> <p>NSW has trialled the <i>EAL/D Learning Progression</i> for its validity and reliability in identifying EAL/D students' language proficiency needs.¹³ This process provides a model for a national trial and validation of the instrument.</p> <p>ACT and NSW have adopted the <i>EAL/D Learning Progression</i> to inform low English proficiency needs-based allocations but there is no reporting mechanism. Teachers in other jurisdictions are currently using the <i>Progression</i> on an informal basis.</p> <p>On Friday 22 June, the Education Council endorsed ACARA's 2018-19 work plan. As part of this, ACARA will coordinate feedback from senior jurisdictional data officials on the use and application of the National Framework as part of Education Council processes.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish COAG/DET/ACARA working group to oversee and drive the project.</p> <p>Establish an expert team to implement the project in consultation with ACARA and ACTA.</p> <p>Establish process for periodic consultation with education systems, key stakeholders and experts.</p> <p>Confirm in-principle endorsement of the project by states/territories.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>Further development of the framework in consultation with state/territory education systems.</p> <p>National validation and trial of the framework (by end 2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Revision & refinement of Framework (end 2019).</p> <p>Education Council endorsement of Framework.</p> <p>Framework commissioned for use (end 2020).</p> | <p>Project team (over 3 years) = \$600,000</p> <p>National trial and validation - representative sample of 500 primary and secondary schools, 1000 teachers = \$1m</p> <p>Total estimated costs \$1.6m</p> |

¹² ACTA submission to Productivity Commission at: https://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/208903/subdr120-education-evidence.pdf; ACTA submission to Gonski Review at: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/580_ACTA_full_submission_to_Gonski_Review.pdf

¹³ 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> The trial found that the instrument enabled teachers to make consistent judgements of English language proficiency across all four modes, provided a balanced and accurate reflection of student language development, and can be the basis for development of a single measure of English language proficiency for resource allocation purposes.

English as an Additional Language or Dialect Education (schools) cont.

| OBJECTIVE /ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>4. ANAO review of allocation, targeting and use of low English language proficiency loading funding in systems and schools</p> | <p>Review of the impact of Gonski funding reforms on the delivery and effectiveness of EAL/D programs in schools with particular reference to school autonomy, school based decision-making and other policy priorities. The Review to examine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State/ Territory/Catholic/ Independent school system allocative mechanisms relating to low English language proficiency loading funding to schools and requirements for schools to report back on use of allocations; 2. systems and schools’ targeting and use of these funds to benefit the target group; 3. provision and delivery of EAL/D teaching support through (i) intensive English language programs to new arrivals, and (ii) targeted support to students requiring further assistance in the mainstream; 4. transparency and accountability of schools’ and systems’ reporting to funding authorities, parents and school communities and the public on how; funding is allocated and spent, and outcomes; 5. organisational and staffing arrangements to support EAL/D learners (including teacher qualifications; teaching roles; ratio of EAL/D teachers to EAL/D students; employment status) 6. nature and provision of system support for teachers/schools in catering for EAL/D learners (e.g. Commonwealth/State system planning, policy guidelines, specialist consultancy support, professional development). | <p>Under the Gonski funding reforms, schools and systems are <i>not required</i> to spend low English proficiency funding to support English language learning of EAL/D students¹⁴. School autonomy and flexible funding policies actively encourage diversion of funding away from the EAL/D student target group and are resulting in the erosion of specialist EAL/D programs in schools and the loss of funding, leadership, staffing and expertise in Intensive English centres. In line with this policy approach, State/Territory education system restructures are downsizing or abolishing administrative units and personnel directly responsible for supporting and monitoring EAL/D students’ English learning.¹⁵</p> <p>Successive studies have confirmed the nature and resilience of the languages barriers experienced by EAL/D learners at school. While achieving basic fluency in spoken English typically takes about two years, developing the English language and literacy needed to close the gap in academic performance with their English speaking peers usually takes a minimum of five to seven years.¹⁶</p> <p>There is no transparency in how low English proficiency funding allocations are used by schools and States/Territory systems. Government has confirmed that there is no specific accountability requirement for use of these funds.¹⁷</p> <p>On-going professional learning in this area is no longer offered by systems or is inconsistent, sporadic and dependent on local ACTA affiliates run by volunteers and occasionally other institutions. At the same time, teacher education programs that include units on EAL/D needs for all teachers and specialist EAL/D qualifications are disappearing.</p> <p>Answers to 2018 Senate Estimate questions on Notice SQ 18 - 654, 655, 658, 664, 665, 669 confirm that there has been no ANAO or any other review, audit, or analysis conducted with a specific focus on English as an additional language programs over the last two decades.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>ANAO include audit in their 2019 work plan (published July).</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>ANAO findings and recs (end-2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Government considers ANAO findings and implements recs (mid-2020).</p> | <p>Within existing resources</p> <p>Additional resources to implement audit recommendations to be identified.</p> |

¹⁴ Answer to Question on Notice SQ18- 000651, ‘While Government funding is calculated with reference to students enrolled at a school. Schools and school systems are not required to spend specific amounts of funding on individual students. This includes funding provided under each of the loadings for disadvantage’

¹⁵ ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room>, p. 57-73

¹⁶ Collier, V. (1989). How Long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language, *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(3), 509-531; Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first and second language proficiency in bilingual children, in E. Bialystok, *Language processing in bilingual children*, Cambridge: CUP; Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students’ long-term academic achievement; Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 487-499). Springer US; Hakuta, K. (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? *University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute*; 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.

¹⁷ Answer to 2018 Senate Estimate question on Notice SQ 18-650.

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>5. Development of national school EAL/D capability frameworks to support continuous improvement of EAL/D programs through whole-school planning, implementation and evaluation in the following delivery settings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - urban schools; - Intensive English centres; - regional /remote schools with significant indigenous student enrolments. <p>2. The frameworks to identify levels of implementation across key areas of school operations that address the nature, size and diversity of the EAL/D student target group (Indigenous, new arrivals, refugee, migrant students).</p> | <p>1. Design, development, trialling and evaluation of national school EAL/D capability frameworks to support continuous improvement of EAL/D programs through whole-school planning, implementation and evaluation in the following delivery settings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - urban schools; - Intensive English centres; - regional /remote schools with significant indigenous student enrolments. <p>2. The frameworks to identify levels of implementation across key areas of school operations that address the nature, size and diversity of the EAL/D student target group (Indigenous, new arrivals, refugee, migrant students).</p> | <p>The nature and distribution of EAL/D students across the years of schooling requires both targeted and whole school approaches to organising EALD teaching support within a school. A whole-school approach to EAL/D provision is essential, especially in many schools in Australian state capital cities where EAL/D learners comprise the <i>majority</i> of the enrolments.</p> <p>Under school-based, flexible resource management policies, school principals and executive have greatly increased discretion over the use of resources allocated to their school. The scope of executive decision-making encompasses use of previously dedicated EAL/D funding for other purposes and now includes: flexible funding and staffing of EAL/D within school budgets; employing casual teachers without EAL/D qualifications; making EAL/D teaching support a ‘priority’ one year, but not the next; or discontinuing the school’s EAL/D teacher positions and programs altogether.¹⁸</p> <p>In schools, EAL/D learners access specialist instruction through different modes of program delivery organised by EAL/D teachers in collaboration with executive staff. With increased emphasis on school-based management and decision making, there is a pressing need for school-based planning and evaluation tools to assist EAL/D teachers and executive staff in continuous improvement and development of effective whole school EAL/D programs reflecting best practice standards.¹⁹</p> <p>Research has highlighted the key role played by school leadership in building inclusive whole school systems of support that meet the language learning needs of EAL/D students.²⁰ Such leadership is distributed across the school and distinguished by an informed instructional focus that involves: promoting effective, differentiated pedagogy and collective staff responsibility for progress towards shared goals, ongoing collection and formative use of data to monitor student engagement and achievement for instructional improvement and whole school planning, developing strong professional development support programs for all staff, including administrators, with opportunities for peer and expert coaching, and collegial sharing, assisting parent and family participation, building school-community relationships.²¹</p> <p>ACER has developed a national school improvement tool.²² However, being a generic tool, it does not address the specific English learning needs of students and program operational issues that determine effective EAL/D provision. ACTA has developed a prototype tool to address this need.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a COAG/ Education Council steering group to drive the project.</p> <p>Establishment of an expert working group including state/territory managers and professional stakeholders.</p> <p>Project design briefs.</p> <p>Establishment of a project team.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>Review of relevant tools, research and framework design (mid-2019).</p> <p>Development of frameworks for urban, rural/regional school and IEC settings (2019).</p> <p>Initial pilot in key sites and stakeholder consultation. (2020).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Large scale, two-year trial of revised framework (2020-21).</p> <p>External evaluation of the use and effects of the tool during the trial (end 2021).</p> | <p>Project team: \$150,000</p> <p>Pilot and trial (support for 500 teachers): \$500,000</p> <p>External evaluation: \$150,000</p> <p>Total estimated costs: \$800,000</p> |

¹⁸ These impacts of school-based decision making are elaborated in ACTA’s submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room> p.57-73

¹⁹ ACTA has identified best practice standards for effective English language provision in schools. See ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room> p.109-124

²⁰ *Successful Language Learners (SLL)* project in DEC NSW (2011). *Literacy and Numeracy Pilots: Final Report*. DEEWR: Canberra. Accessed at: https://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/images/stories/PDF/Eval_Rep/Schools/Teach_Learn_Share_22_Successful_Language_Learners.pdf; Calderón, M., R. Slavin, & M. Sánchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *The Future of Children*, 21, 1, pp. 103-127; Scanlan, M., & López, F. (2012). ¡ Vamos! How school leaders promote equity and excellence for bilingual students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48, 4, pp. 583-625; Stufft, D. L., & Brogadir, R. (2011). Urban principals’ facilitation of English language learning in public schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 43, 5 pp. 560-575;

²¹ Elfers, A, & Stritikus, T. (2013). How school and district leaders support classroom teachers’ work with English language learners, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 10, pp. 1-40.

²² <https://www.acer.org/school-improvement/improvement-tools/national-school-improvement-tool/>; and https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=tll_misc

English as an Additional Language or Dialect Education (schools) cont.

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>6. National School Resourcing Board review of the low English language proficiency funding loading</p> | <p>Review to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the accuracy and appropriateness of the current ‘disadvantaged LBOTE’ measure underpinning the Low English language proficiency loading 2. the adequacy of funding allocations for schools, with particular regard to the English language learning needs of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • newly arrived students, • children entering school from non-English speaking homes, • children in the ‘developing phase’ of English language learning, and • students from refugee backgrounds, including those with disrupted schooling 3. optimum needs-based weightings and cut-off points for low proficiency funding entitlements based on modelled data generated from use of the <i>National Framework for Assessing English Language Proficiency</i>. 4. adequacy of Commonwealth Government resource planning processes and use of immigration data to meet the English language learning needs of EAL/D learners in schools. | <p>Current use of the ‘disadvantaged LBOTE’ measure does not reflect the English language proficiency needs of the target group and does not ensure effective targeting of resources. Analysis has shown that application of this inaccurate measure effects gross misalignments between students captured by this measure and students with actual English language proficiency needs.²³</p> <p>Current low English language proficiency loading amounts bear no relation to former English as a Second Language New Arrivals per capita funding (\$5,039 in 2005)²⁴ or modelling. The current annual funding amount covers a mere two or three days of intensive English teaching at current teacher salary rates.</p> <p>Teachers report that where needs-based funding is in place, cut-off points are set too low resulting in grossly insufficient funding to support immediate post beginners of English, i.e. those learners in the ‘developing phase’ of the <i>ACARA EAL/D Learning Progression</i>, who are most likely the highest need group.²⁵</p> <p>Answer to 2018 Senate Estimate Questions on Notice SQ 18-666 revealed that the Australian Government made no provision in the four-year finding period for the additional English language learning needs of school aged children of the special 12,000 Syrian and Iraqi refugee intake announced in 2015.</p> <p>Answers to 2018 Senate Estimate Questions on Notice SQ 18-640, 641, 668 also indicate that the Government has done no modelling or validation of the English language proficiency funding loading.</p> <p>Answer to 2018 Senate Estimate Question on Notice SQ 18-644 also indicates that the Government currently has no plans to review the low English language proficiency funding loading.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Board includes audit in their 2019 work plan (published July).</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>Board findings and recs (end-2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Government considers findings and implement recs (mid-2020), including need for increased funding.</p> | <p>Review: within existing resources</p> <p>Additional resources to implement review recommendations to be identified.</p> |

²³ Statistics Unit, Centre for Educational Statistics and Evaluation, NSW DEC (2013) Improvements and Alternatives to the Disadvantaged LBOTE Measure Report at: http://www.cesensw.gov.au/images/stories/PDF/Improvements_and_alternatives_to_the_Disadvantaged_LBOTE_measure.pdf

The analysis concluded that the “disadvantaged LBOTE” measure not only significantly *underestimates* the size of the cohort needing EAL/D support but it also *does not capture the right students*, and therefore should not be used to identify the ELP loading for EAL/D students. It estimated that using “disadvantaged LBOTE” as a proxy for English language proficiency suggests that 74.7 per cent of the \$100 million earmarked by Gonski-funding for limited English language proficiency would be misdirected to students who do *not* require EAL/D support.

²⁴ MCEETYA Schools Resourcing Taskforce Discussion Paper: Funding for English as a Second Language New Arrivals Students at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED534658.pdf> The report used 2005 financial data to model the additional per student costs to systems of providing intensive English instruction to newly arrived ESL students. It identified *Estimated Current Additional Costs* to be \$6,160 (for non refugee students) and \$10,349 (for refugee and humanitarian students) and *Estimated Required Service Provision* costs to be \$7,745 (non-refugee students) and \$18,730 (refugee and humanitarian students).

²⁵ http://docs.acara.edu.au/resources/EAL_D_Learning_Progression_Foundation_to_Year_10_09052014_file_2.pdf

English as an Additional Language or Dialect Education (schools) cont.

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>7. ANAO review of international student programs in Australian schools</p> | <p>The review to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State and Territory systems' compliance with the requirements for overseas students in the <i>2013 Australian Education Act</i> and the <i>Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS) Act</i> 2. uses of revenue raised from international student fees to provide quality services to international students, their parents and the school community 3. the English language learning needs of international students and adequacy of English language assessment, funding and provision to meet these needs. 4. adequacy of transparency and accountability of national reporting on international student programs 5. access and equity impacts of international student programs on provision of English as an additional language support services to Australian citizens and permanent residents with English language proficiency needs. | <p>Programs for international fee-paying students have grown over the last three decades and provide significant and increasing revenue streams for State and Territory Governments. Annual per student fees currently range between \$11,000 and \$17,000.</p> <p>To protect and enhance Australia's reputation for quality education Australia provides rigorous protection, including tuition protection, for international students under the 2000 ESOS Act and related legislation. No such service guarantees are available to domestic students requiring English language support services.</p> <p>Currently, there is little or no transparency in how international students' fees are used at system or school level, how much revenue generated by international students goes to schools and assists the students themselves. At the same time, there are anecdotal reports of these students suffering stress and inability to cope with the demands of the senior curriculum.</p> <p>Many students are found on enrolment to have insufficient English language proficiency for learning in the Australian curriculum and require English as an Additional or Dialect (EAL/D) support. EAL/D programs are usually marketed by education systems as part of the school services available to overseas students.</p> <p>The <i>National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students</i> commenced implementation in 2018. Standard 6 of the code (Student Support Services) requires schools to provide, at no additional cost, English and academic support services to overseas students as needed to enable them to achieve expected learning outcomes.²⁶</p> <p>International students do not attract the Commonwealth low English proficiency loading.²⁷ Many State and Territory education systems allow international students to access existing EAL/D services but do not pass on the revenue raised through international student fees to cover the full costs of English language provision in schools to meet the additional demand. In the context of fixed provision 'within an existing resources' environment, this policy approach comes at the expense of domestic students with English language proficiency needs.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Request ANAO to include audit in their 2019 work plan (published July).</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>ANAO findings and recs (end-2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Government considers ANAO findings and implements recs (mid-2020).</p> | <p>Audit: Within existing resources Additional resources to implement audit recommendations to be identified.</p> |

²⁶ <https://internationaleducation.gov.au/Regulatory-Information/Documents/National%20Code%202018%20Factsheets/Standard%206.pdf>

²⁷ Answer to 2018 Senate Estimate Questions on Notice on this issue (SQ18-647)

English and Indigenous Languages in the Education of Indigenous Students

| OBJECTIVE /ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATION |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>8. Language in education policy and plan for Indigenous students in regional and remote schools</p> | <p>Development and implementation of a national policy and plan informed by a national audit addressing key language in educational issues below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the social, cultural and linguistic contexts in which Indigenous students access schooling in rural/remote areas the everyday cultural and linguistic capital which Indigenous children bring to school and should inform curriculum students' engagement and participation in school their EAL/D learning needs identified in NAPLAN and other learning data sets adequacy of available assessment tools to measure students' English learning needs and growth effective language pedagogy for Indigenous students' learning across the curriculum; targeting of resources to meet Indigenous children's English language proficiency needs two-way science programs that combine Indigenous and western knowledge to achieve environment, education employment and reconciliation outcomes. exemplary Indigenous language/bilingual programs that promote effective two-way language learning system staffing strategies to ensure and promote quality program implementation and continuity in rural and remote schools the nature and development of leadership expertise needed for effective whole school language inclusion teacher preparation and training for teaching Indigenous students (including Indigenous Assistant Teachers) in regional and remote schools, including access to TESOL training. <p>The policy plan will pilot and up-scale best practice, along with standards/principles for inclusive policy review, program design and delivery.</p> | <p>Lack of focus and effort on addressing language the foundational ability for all learning has contributed to education policy failure for Indigenous students and the Closing the Gap Strategy. The diversity and range of language(s) knowledge that Indigenous children bring to school and that supports their life out-of-school is largely ignored in current approaches to the education of Indigenous children, which are narrowly focussed on literacy in English and ignore or denigrate existing language competencies.²⁸</p> <p>Research evidence is clear that building on and developing the language(s), knowledge and skills that children bring to school promotes their sense of self-worth, wellbeing, confidence and cultural connectedness and that a strength-based approach best fosters academic attendance engagement, participation and achievement in school, as well as future employment.²⁹</p> <p>NAPLAN testing does not provide an accurate or productive basis for assessing most Indigenous students' achievement and needs, especially as the tests assume an urban, English-speaking life-world and background.</p> <p>Findings and recommendations of the 2012 House of Representatives inquiry³⁰ into English and Indigenous language learning in Indigenous communities has routinely been ignored in all Indigenous plans, strategies and reviews.³¹ Language learning issues of Indigenous students were also ignored in the recent <i>Independent Review into Regional, Rural and Remote Education</i>.³²</p> <p>The characteristics of effective remote schools that achieve good outcomes for Indigenous students have been well documented but not systematically applied.³³</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a steering group in OP&C to oversee and drive the project.</p> <p>Establish a COAG working group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop terms of reference for the national audit commission the audit team ensure ongoing consultation with system authorities, communities, stakeholders and experts Audit to commence mid-2019, completed by end-2019. | <p>SOON</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actioning audit recs for national policy and inform Closing the Gap Refresh (2020). Policy and plan developed Teachers and tertiary providers access TESOL training strategy. School grants to pilot, secure and up-scale best practice - 50 schools (2020). Monitoring and reporting on progress (2020). | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers and tertiary providers access TESOL training strategy. School grants to pilot and up-scale best practice- 50 schools (2021). Monitoring and reporting on progress (mid 2021). External evaluation of the project (end 2021). | <p>Audit: \$200,000</p> <p>Additional resources required to support the recs relating to the strategy and the Closing the Gap Refresh.</p> <p>School grants to pilot, secure and up-scale best practice - 100 hundred schools: \$4m</p> <p>Evaluation: \$200,000</p> <p>Total estimated costs: \$4.4m</p> |

²⁸ eg Northern Territory 2014 Wilson review at: https://www.nt.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/229016/A-Share-in-the-Future-The-Review-of-Indigenous-Education-in-the-Northern-Territory.pdf

²⁹ Guenther, J. et al. (2014) *Red Dirt Thinking on Remote Educational Advantage* at: <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=197109386575105;res=IELHSS>; Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (2017) Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty two years of large scale longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*: 37, p. 203-217

³⁰ *Our Land Our Languages* at: [file:///D:/Users/z3281608/Downloads/http_www.aphref.aph.gov.au_house_committee_atsia_languages2_report_full%20report%20\(1\).pdf](file:///D:/Users/z3281608/Downloads/http_www.aphref.aph.gov.au_house_committee_atsia_languages2_report_full%20report%20(1).pdf)

³¹ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010–2014 at: http://scseec.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/ATSI%20documents/ATSIEAP_web_version_final.pdf; National Aboriginal and ACTA/ALAA/ALS joint submission to the consultation on the Plan at: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/141_IEAP_Submission_final.pdf and Torres Strait Islander Education Strategy 2015 at:

http://www.scseec.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/ATSI%20documents/DECD_NATSI_EducationStrategy.pdf; Evaluation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010-2014 Final Evaluation Report at: http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/ATSI%20documents/ATSI%202010-2014%20Final%20Evaluation%20Report/1Final_Evaluation_ATSIEAP_ACILAllenConsulting.pdf

³² https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/01218_independent_review_accessible.pdf

³³ National Curriculum Services (2012) *Success in remote schools* at: http://www.whatworks.edu.au/upload/1341805220784_file_SuccessinRemoteSchools2012.pdf

Languages education (schools & pre-schools)

| OBJECTIVE /ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>9. Develop a national languages education policy and action plan</p> | <p>1. Develop a national languages education policy informed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a national audit of state and territory languages education policies and languages data collection; current research on home language maintenance needs of preschool and school-aged children, and the local community ecologies and pedagogies that sustain language learning. <p>2. Develop a 10-15year national languages education action plan with a strategic focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> promoting awareness of benefits of languages learning with a view to changing attitudes among school leaders, parents and communities; establishing languages within the K-6 core curriculum; promoting continuity of secondary language learning through mandatory language study to Year 10 and incentives (including a review of ATAR) to increase provision/uptake to Year 12; increasing the number of language teacher graduates through teacher education scholarships; expanding language teacher employment through priority placement of language teacher education graduates and pathways for overseas trained teachers to re-enter the profession. <p>3. On-going curriculum development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> developing language progressions to assess students' language competencies and development; fostering innovative, engaging language pedagogies, e.g. rich tasks, CLIL, simulations; piloting effective models of community-connected bilingual/ immersion programs; expanding on-line language education resources (including South East Asian languages). | <p>Australia now rates lowest of all OECD countries in school and HE language learning, with student numbers declining markedly in the last 20 years.³⁴ Key factors are structural and curriculum disincentives to sustained languages learning. Becoming the effective province of elite schooling, languages study has limited access and participation by low SES and rural students.</p> <p>The need to reverse this situation is urgent. Australia currently lacks a national languages policy. Previous efforts to produce national languages education plans have been unsuccessful³⁵ with Governments being unable to sustain the commitment necessary for full implementation. The last comprehensive vision for languages in education was 1987 National Policy on Languages under the Hawke Government. Subsequent narrow, economic-only language policy rationales, which ignore the key role of cultural and identity engagement in motivating learning, have repeatedly been adopted and then abandoned.³⁶</p> <p>Previous language policy and provision has largely overlooked and marginalised the rich language resources of Australia's diaspora communities. These communities speak languages that are potential bases for formal study, provided they are seen to offer rewarding career pathways, for example, in trade and diplomacy. Labor's recent commitment to fund scholarships for native language speakers to teach Asian languages in schools acknowledges the potential to leverage these resources in promoting our engagement with Asia.³⁷</p> <p>Language policy and planning must confront the central problem of aligning learner pathways and school provision with feasible <i>long-term</i> goals that are supported by stable resourcing, teacher training and supply, and underpinned by community demand that builds student and then teacher language skills over time. Victoria's languages education plan offers a potentially robust model of long-term language planning.³⁸ The key ingredients are clear expectations, targets, staged and sustainable strategies, ongoing resourcing, and a commitment to the long-term.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministerial steering group to drive the project a COAG/ Education Council reference group to negotiate state/ territory languages education commitments an expert working group including state/territory managers and professional stakeholders to lead development of the policy and plan. <p>Audit start by mid-2019, completed by end-2019.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>National languages curriculum projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> language pedagogy action research language assessment tools community-connected program pilots online resources. <p>Expert working group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> drafts language policy identifies planning strategies, incentives, timelines & consultation processes. <p>Annual national report on languages provision.</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Continue national language curriculum projects.</p> <p>Expert working group finishes languages policy and plan.</p> <p>COAG Education Council endorses plan.</p> <p>Annual national report on languages provision (mid-2021).</p> <p>External evaluation (end 2021).</p> | <p>National & state/territory languages plan commitments: within existing resources.</p> <p>National audit: \$200,000.</p> <p>National language curriculum projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> language pedagogy action research grants (100 sites): \$3m language assessment tools grants: \$1m Community-connected programs pilots (50 schools @ \$75,000): \$3.75m Early Language Literacy App and Language Learning Space tools (including SE Asian languages): \$850,000 <p>External evaluation: \$200,000</p> <p>Total: \$9m</p> |

³⁴ https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/the_current_state_of_chinese_indonesian_japanese_and_korean_language_education_in_australian_schools.pdf

³⁵ MCEETYA Language Education Working Group in 2005 and the Language Education Working Party in 2012.

³⁶ <https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=aer>

³⁷ http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/2013/docs/australia_in_the_asian_century_white_paper.pdf

³⁸ <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/sites/g/files/net691/f/melc-review-of-languages-education-policies-australia.pdf?v=1531721557>

Young People at Risk

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>10. Development of English focussed education and training pathways for young people at risk</p> | <p>Young people (12-24 years) at risk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous youth - humanitarian entrants - refugee youth with minimal/no previous education - early school leavers - those in contact with the justice system. <p>The initiative will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review the language access, equity and effectiveness and identify systemic gaps/barriers of education and training for at risk young people; • ensure the English language and literacy learning needs of at-risk young people are fully addressed in any inquiries into post-secondary education; • identify, upscale and provide sustainable funding for best practice program models that integrate English language and literacy, numeracy, basic education, IT and other skills (e.g. music, arts, sports, leadership) with work/training; opportunities and life skills and that offer an IEC/ school + SSP+ AMEP + TAFE learning pathway; • develop a coordinated network of flexible, needs-based first and ‘second chance’ education and training across schools, AMEP, ACE and TAFE within the Multicultural Youth Advocacy Network (MYAN) Youth Settlement Framework; • implement an expanded, stage 2 Youth Transition Support pilot, coordinated by MYAN, with a particular focus on partnership delivery of Ucan2 program in IEC/ mainstream school, SSP/AMEP, and TAFE and Jobactive and community settings. | <p>In 2016/17, 5,041 or 89% of all humanitarian youth aged 12-24 years arrived in Australia with ‘nil’ or ‘poor’ English language proficiency.³⁹ In urban centres, school-aged youth may access on arrival secondary Intensive English Centre (IEC) support but remain at high risk of drop-out in the transition to high school.⁴⁰ Older youth may be able to access targeted, needs-based programs delivered by AMEP, adult and community education (ACE) and the community sector.</p> <p>Key features of effective programs for these youth are known but uncommon: English-focussed courses, with wrap around settlement, wellbeing and vocational counselling support, geared towards literacy, numeracy, worked-related and personal development skills providing accredited pathways to employment and/or further education and training.⁴¹ These programs, however, are highly unstable, being part of an insecure training sector totally dependent on short-term contract funding.</p> <p>Hopes for an IEC/school + SSP⁴² + AMEP + TAFE learning pathway for this target group have not been realised due to eligibility restrictions and institutional barriers between schools and AMEP, difficulties establishing viable youth-specific SSP classes, and inadequate English language provision in TAFE.⁴³</p> <p>A promising Youth Transition Support pilot was conducted as a DSS funded delivery network in six sites during 2016/2017.⁴⁴ Coordinated by MYAN, the pilot applied the four pillars framework of: partnership for employment; strong connections with education; increased vocational opportunities; and sports engagement for youth. Within the pilot, Ucan2, a program developed by AMES and Centre for Multicultural Youth to provide an early intervention platform to support young people into education and employment pathways, was trialled in IEC, mainstream school and Jobactive and community settings.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a cross-Ministerial steering group (Youth affairs, Education and Training, Multi-culturalism and Citizenship, Immigration) to drive the project.</p> <p>Establish a COAG schools/ AMEP/ TAFE advisory group.</p> <p>Establish expert working group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - develop review terms of reference; - establish consultative and monitoring processes with key sectors, stakeholders/ experts; - commission review (within 3-6 months). | <p>SOON</p> <p>Design of stage 2 Youth Transition Support pilot, identification of school, AMEP, TAFE and community sites.</p> <p>Review report by mid2019, actioning of review recs.</p> <p>Stage 2 YTS Pilot starts (mid 2019).</p> <p>Report on strategy progress (end 2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Stage 2 YTS Pilot implementation 2020 -2021).</p> <p>Reports on strategy progress (2020, 2021).</p> <p>Evaluation of YTS Pilot (end 2021).</p> <p>Evaluation of the Strategy (end 2021).</p> | <p>Review: \$200,000</p> <p>Stage 2 YTS Pilot: (10 -12 sites) \$30m over two and half years.</p> <p>YTS Pilot Evaluation: \$200,000</p> <p>Total estimated costs: \$30.4m</p> |

³⁹ [http://www.myan.org.au/file/file/MYAN%20Youth%20Settlement%20Trends_2016-2017%20Final\(2\).pdf](http://www.myan.org.au/file/file/MYAN%20Youth%20Settlement%20Trends_2016-2017%20Final(2).pdf)

⁴⁰ High schools are typically ill-equipped to cater for the high support needs of this group. This situation exacerbated by deteriorating IEC and school EAL programs Cf. ACTA submission into Migrant Settlement Outcomes. p.97, 57-73.

⁴¹ ACTA identified best practice standards for effective English language provision for refugee youth. See ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room> p. 135-146. See also MYAN National Youth Settlement Framework at: [http://www.myan.org.au/file/file/Youth%20Settlement%20Framework%2031%20March%202016\(1\).pdf](http://www.myan.org.au/file/file/Youth%20Settlement%20Framework%2031%20March%202016(1).pdf) Examples of best practice are the St Joseph’s Maree Program at: <https://www.sjflcmaree.com/>, the Melbourne-based AMES refugee youth program, Bright Futures (defunded in 2017), and the TAFE Young Adult Migrant English course (YAMEC).

⁴² The Settlement Services Programme (SSP) provides core settlement support for humanitarian entrants and other eligible migrants in their first five years of life in Australia.

⁴³ ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room> p.94-105.

⁴⁴ <https://drive.google.com/file/d/116WX2-gxBR7uszZkDF9KfFbYJupRLS07/view>

Adult English Language and Literacy Programs

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>11. Commonwealth quality, targeted provision for English language and literacy programs in the post school sector oriented to effective further learning pathways accommodating diverse learner goals and circumstances</p> | <p>1. Competitive contracting to be replaced by long-term contracting to not-for-profit agencies decided according to quality and “fit for purpose” criteria.</p> <p>2. Review to be conducted on the mission and role of AMEP and SEE programs in the VET sector to define and articulate provision in terms of clients’ starting points, needs and goals, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The AMEP: for migrant learners of English aged 16 and older. Eligibility defined in terms of arrival date and a needs-based formula, central to which is proficiency in English and previous education level (goal: successful settlement). ii. The SEE Program: for whose schooling has been mostly/all in Australia (i.e. who are effectively native English speakers) but <i>who lack basic literacy skills</i> (goal: access to training and employment). iii. Indigenous adults who lack basic literacy and numeracy. Need to determine whether a distinct program is required (goal: access to training and employment). iv. English and related skills/pre-entry programs/on-going support in TAFE & HE for those above AMEP eligibility levels (goal: success in training and education pathways). v. Community programs to serve special needs at local levels, e.g. mothers with young children; those not seeking to enter the workforce; the elderly (goal: long-term social cohesion). <p>3. Adequate awards and conditions to be specified in new contracts.</p> | <p>Providing English for new arrivals is part of the Commonwealth’s responsibility for immigration. Since the beginning of the post-War migration program, the Commonwealth has had direct responsibility for the landmark, previously world class Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP). The AMEP was securely funded until the mid-1990s and managed by the Immigration Dept. until 2017.</p> <p>The Commonwealth has also provided short-term literacy and numeracy/basic skills tuition under various guises within Dept. of Education & Training (DET) labour market programs. The latest iteration is the Skills for Education and Employment (SEE) Program, which, in reality, caters mainly for those on certain visa categories who exit the AMEP and are assessed by Centrelink as “job seekers”.</p> <p>With the shift of the AMEP into DET, the goals of the AMEP have been blurred with those of the SEE Program. Its settlement role has been downgraded into “Social English” for non-job seekers. At the same time, the SEE Program fails to address the needs of non-migrants.</p> <p>Both programs are badly served by short-term competitive contracting, which prevents long-term planning and pathway development, drives down workforce skills, erodes quality provision, creates massive hidden waste and disruption, and has induced ever-narrowing anti-educational compliance requirements.</p> <p>TAFE competition with private providers who advertise but do not provide quality support has led to cost-cutting that has eroded Foundation Skills pre-entry and/or concurrent English support.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>1. Establish a Ministerial task force within DET to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • undertake genuine consultation with stakeholders (existing providers incl. teachers, current clients, ethnic associations, professional groups, unions, etc.) regarding future goals and mission of the AMEP and SEE Program (to be completed within 3 months). • commission a comprehensive public review of English language and literacy programs in the post-school sector; terms of reference to follow from the above consultation process and to include review of KPIs (to be completed within six months). • propose administrative and management arrangements within DET to ensure staff expertise and commitment necessary to fulfil program responsibilities for i-v opposite (this will require a major shift in DET culture away from its narrow labour market focus and adherence to short-term competitive contracting). <p>2. Extend the Settlement Services Advisory Council to include (a) representation from ACTA, providers and practising teachers, (b) a sub-committee directed to languages policy and provision, including for English, and (c) strengthened capacity to advise DET on programs i-v opposite.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>Following the public review, and based on its findings, distribute draft Requests for Tender for programs for i-v opposite. Allow 6 weeks for comments from <i>all</i> stakeholders (see opposite column).</p> <p>Final call for tenders 1 month later; allow 3 months for tenders to be submitted.</p> | <p>LONGER TERM</p> <p>New contracts to commence no later than January 2021.</p> | <p>Within budget.</p> <p>Termination of short-term competitive contracting will result in cost savings. Though difficult to quantify due to hidden waste in the current system, a forensic audit could uncover some of these costs.</p> <p>Salary costs will rise but will be offset by the above cost savings and greater efficiencies.</p> <p>More open-ended eligibility requirements will not result in excessive demand if appropriate criteria for support payments are put in place.</p> |

Adult English Language and Literacy Programs (cont.)

| OBJECTIVE /ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | IMMEDIATE | SOON | LONGER TERM | |
| <p>12. Institute emergency measures to halt on-going damage to the AMEP</p> | <p>1. Suspend use of the Australian Core Skills Framework (ACSF) in the AMEP to determine client eligibility and progress, pending the above review, which includes consideration of its suitability for use with learners of English as a second/additional language.</p> <p>2. Terminate the Pre-employment and Social English streams.</p> <p>3. Reinstate the International Second Language Proficiency Rating Scale (ISLPR) to determine eligibility for the AMEP.</p> <p>4. Base assessments of continuing AMEP tuition entitlements on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISLPR assessments of clients with less than ‘functional English’ • provider reports of regular attendance in class. <p>5. Permit clients up to 10 days non-attendance at class without penalty or adverse reports on progress.</p> <p>6. Mandate that AMEP curriculum and tuition be directed to comprehensive settlement goals.</p> <p>7. Review commercial arrangements relating to curriculum licences and restrictions on open access.</p> <p>8. Notify all stakeholders of the Government’s intention to review the mission and role of the AMEP & SEE Program and to re-define these with reference to learner needs as per i-v in Action 11 above.</p> <p>9. Direct Centrelink to ensure that interviews with those enrolled in the AMEP and SEE Program are conducted at out-of-class times.</p> | <p>The Government’s introduction of its ‘business model’ in 2017 has had disastrous impacts on the AMEP and SEE Program and deflected the AMEP from its core mission in providing English tuition to promote migrant settlement.⁴⁵</p> <p>The current AMEP contracts (for 2017-2020) mandate that the ACSF replace (a) the ISLPR in determining AMEP entitlements, and (b) the Certificates in Spoken & Written English (CSWE) in reporting learner outcomes and assessing on-going entitlements. The stated rationale – to align the AMEP with the wider VET system – confuses the crucial difference between <i>aligning</i> and <i>changing</i> assessment systems. The ACSF is not fit for purpose as it is directed to teaching basic literacy to native English speakers. Its use has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disrupted and diverted the AMEP from its settlement and teaching mission • destroyed the previous nationally consistent, relatively reliable and established system for (a) ensuring migrants’ equitable access to tuition entitlements, (b) reporting on learning outcomes, and (c) assessing provider performance in relation to learning outcomes.⁴⁶ • undermined teacher morale by requiring them to use the ACSF, which they regard as inappropriate and excessive, to comply with audit and KPI criteria. <p>The current contracts also require clients be allocated to either a <i>Pre-Employment</i> or <i>Social English</i> stream. The latter permits larger classes, lower teacher qualifications and less assessment. The former has entirely dispensed with settlement topics that are not employment-oriented (e.g. shopping, health care, local neighbourhood). This stream is indistinguishable from the SEE Program, except that it is open to wider range of clients.</p> <p>Negative flow-on effects on English and literacy courses seeking re-accreditation are now evident. Streaming has reduced AMEP provider flexibility in creating needs-oriented classes. Classes now combine learners at levels from absolute beginner to advanced.</p> <p>Current attendance requirements do not take account of clients’ responsibilities and needs in coping with family illness, effects of trauma, etc. Centrelink routinely requires interviews during class times.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Notify AMEP providers, the Quality Assurance provider and those working on accredited curricula for the AMEP of 1 – 8 opposite and that, in the light of 7, current AMEP and SEE contracts will be extended by 12 months.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>See Action 11 above.</p> | <p>LONGER TERM</p> <p>See Action 11 above.</p> | <p>See Action 11 above.</p> <p>Reversing contractual requirements re the ACSF may be disruptive and highlight resources wasted in attempting to implement it. Some costs may accrue in relation to reversing the direction which course accreditation is now taking.</p> <p>However, returning to use of the ISLPR and removing learner progress KPIs should be cost neutral and may entail savings. It will certainly increase efficiencies in assessing eligibility, teaching, formation of classes and reporting.</p> |

⁴⁵ ACTA Background Paper: Problems in the AMEP and SEE Program at: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/591_Problems_in_the_AMEP_SEE_Program_25_May_2018_-_an_ACTA_Background_Paper.pdf

⁴⁶ See Senate Committee: answer to Education and Employment Department of Education & Training Question SQ16-000938: “The Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) service providers will be bound by outcome-focused Key Performance Indicators in relation to improved English language proficiency of clients.”

Teacher Education, Training and Development

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIME FRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>13. Development of a national TESOL training strategy for English language and literacy teaching to migrant and Indigenous English language learners in the pre-school, school, VET and Higher Education sectors</p> | <p>Review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> national and state specialist professional standards, accreditation, entry-level training, TAFE and university providers; system workforce planning, teacher supply and career pathways for specialist English teachers in schools, adult migrant and Indigenous education settings; need for accredited TESOL⁴⁷ retraining for specialist and class teachers, school leaders, principals and TAFE managers. <p>Informed by the above, the national TESOL training strategy will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> develop professional standards for specialist TESOL teaching at different career stages as a national priority area; require all pre-service teachers to undertake mandatory TESOL studies that address the language learning needs of diverse learners; strengthen State/Territory standards, qualifications and accreditation requirements for EAL/D as a teaching specialisation and recognition of school-based EAL/D professional learning programs as pathways to full specialist EAL/D accreditation; strengthen national provision of TESOL training courses for school, TAFE and HE teachers at different career stages; provide targeted research funding to build TESOL expertise and practice of non-specialist teacher educators. | <p>Effective teaching of English language learners in schools, VET and HE sectors relies on the employment of teachers with specialist entry-level TESOL training and qualifications. Specialist training for schools involves 100 hours of Graduate Certificate TESOL study in English language, second language acquisition and development; TESOL method and curriculum and sociocultural contexts. For TAFE, this involves a Masters' degree of 1 EFT year of TESOL studies. TESOL training also provides an essential skill base for effective literacy teaching.</p> <p>Recognition of TESOL qualifications and standards by state/territory teacher accreditation bodies is variable, lacking or unclear. Except for NSW, states do not recognise EAL as a specialist teaching area. The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership's <i>Australian Professional Standards for Teachers</i> do not identify the specific knowledge and skills required for specialist EAL/D teaching⁴⁸.</p> <p>This uncertainty affects recognition and accreditation of TESOL as a teaching specialisation. Currently, tertiary institutions have reduced or discontinued specialist programs because education authorities no longer recognise or require such qualifications. Most specialist courses are now oriented towards international fee-paying overseas teachers. There is inconsistency in addressing the needs of EAL/D students in initial teacher education across the country, with NSW the only state adopting EAL as a national priority area.⁴⁹</p> <p>In this context, new graduates are ill-prepared to teach English language learners. Meanwhile, the existing pool of specialist TESOL expertise in school and VET sectors is shrinking. There is a growing gap between the increasing language learning needs of refugee migrant students in schools and the lack of specialist in-service training or professional development opportunities for teachers, leaders and principals.⁵⁰</p> <p>Effective implementation of the national training strategy can be achieved through national regulations on TESOL teacher standards and English proficiency prerequisites, TESOL accreditation and teaching studies in initial teacher education and cumulative professional development; a grants program to support tertiary TESOL course development and non-specialist teacher educators' TESOL expertise; and a teacher scholarship program to incentivise demand.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE</p> <p>Establish a Ministerial/DET expert working group to develop review terms of reference and coordinate the strategy, consultation processes with key stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultation with HE through the Australian Council of Deans of Education and system authorities through COAG.</p> <p>Review of state/territory TESOL standards, workforce planning, training pathways and provision.</p> <p>AITSL to include development of EAL/D standards in 2019 workplan.</p> <p>Guidelines for TESOL courses and teacher educator TESOL research grants.</p> | <p>SOON</p> <p>AITSL EAL/D standards developed (end 2019).</p> <p>Grants to training institutions to develop robust models of different forms of TESOL studies.</p> <p>Research grants to teacher educators to develop TESOL expertise.</p> <p>TESOL study modules developed, TESOL research conducted (end 2019).</p> <p>Monitoring and reporting on progress (end 2019).</p> | <p>LONG-TERM</p> <p>Scholarships for teachers to cover TESOL course fees.</p> <p>Monitoring and reporting on progress (2020).</p> <p>Evaluation of the Strategy (end 2021).</p> | <p>Review: \$150,000</p> <p>TESOL course development grants: (40 tertiary providers in 2019) \$600,000</p> <p>Teacher educator TESOL research grants (40 teacher educators in 2019) \$600,000</p> <p>TESOL course scholarships: (1000 teachers over two years) \$2m.</p> <p>Evaluation: \$150,000</p> <p>Total estimated costs: \$3.5m</p> |

⁴⁷ Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) is the umbrella term that refers to English as an additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) (formerly English as a Second Language -ESL) teaching in schools and English language teaching to adult migrants.

⁴⁸ To fill this gap, ACTA developed *EAL/D Standards Elaborations* to highlight the requirements of specialist EALD teaching at different teacher career stages and to inform teacher practice, professional learning goals, pre-service teacher courses and in-service professional learning programs. The document can be accessed at: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/531_60238_EALD_elaborations-Full_Version_Complete.pdf

⁴⁹ <http://educationstandards.nsw.edu.au/wps/wcm/connect/670e53ab-aff0-467a-a49d-ae5f17cd36fa/elaborations-in-priority-areas.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=> and <http://educationstandards.nsw.edu.au/wps/wcm/connect/670e53ab-aff0-467a-a49d-ae5f17cd36fa/elaborations-in-priority-areas.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=>

⁵⁰ Watkins, M., Lean, G., Noble, G., & Dunn, K. (2013). *Rethinking Multiculturalism Reassessing Multicultural Education*, UWS and NSW DEC: Sydney.

National collaborative research strategy for language in education and training

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>14. Development of a national collaborative research strategy for language in education and training, encompassing English language and literacy teaching to migrant and Indigenous English language learners in the pre-school, school, VET and Higher Education sectors</p> | <p>Establishment of a focused national research program through an expert advisory council that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. identifies and develop a national research agenda and priorities for language in education and training 2. coordinates short, medium and longer term policy and practice relevant research 3. identifies areas for best evidence syntheses and description research on typical learner groupings, key learner variables and factors 4. promotes national and local research collaboration with industry partners on key priorities 5. investigates and promote national and international best models of EAL/D practice for classrooms, schools and systems 6. disseminates applicable research to drive best practice in English language teaching for Australia’s linguistically diverse schools, VET and HE 7. advises the Australian Research Council of language in education and training research priorities 8. establishes a national network for research planning, collaboration, coordination and dissemination. <p>The Strategy supports language in education and training research through earmarked funding to a) the Australian Research Council to award research grants to HE on a competitive application basis and b) Evidence Institute for Schools.</p> <p>Successful research grant recipients will be required to participate in national research forums and develop and implement a teacher professional development program based on research findings.</p> | <p>Australia currently has no national agenda or coordinating mechanism dedicated to investigating or disseminating national and international research in the fields of language in education and training.⁵¹</p> <p>State and territory education systems have at times partnered with universities to research exemplary, evidence-based practice for schools and classrooms that bridge the research-practice divide. Despite identification of some best practice models, take-up in Australian school system policy or planning remains limited.⁵² Past exemplary research also lies forgotten⁵³</p> <p>Successful research ARC applications in the area of language in education and training are extremely rare due to limited funding and competing research priorities. Currently research into English language learning and teaching and related/complementary fields is almost exclusively concerned with the international student market.</p> <p>University promotion incentives, funding constraints and funding bodies’ research priorities discourage collaborative industry partner research between HE and other educational sectors, including sites where English is taught/learned (pre-schools, schools, the VET sector).</p> <p>While established specialised research institutes add to Australia’s research capacity, they cannot by themselves ensure a national collaborative approach or nation-wide development and up-scaling of innovative practice⁵⁴.</p> <p>To ensure productivity benefits for education and training, development and application of an evidence base for specialised language teaching practice needs systemic support, evaluation, up-scaling, dissemination and embedding in teacher training, professional learning programs, curriculum and policy.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE Establish a national expert Advisory Council to develop and coordinate the strategy.</p> <p>Consultation with HE through the Australian Council of Deans of Education and other key experts/ stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultation with education and training system industry partners through COAG.</p> <p>Conduct research needs analysis with HE and industry partners.</p> <p>Review of language in education and training research.</p> | <p>SOON Develop expression of research interest process and funding guidelines for ARC and Evidence Institute.</p> <p>ARC evaluation and funding of research proposals.</p> | <p>LONG-TERM Implementation and monitoring of funded research.</p> <p>National research forums (2020, 2021).</p> <p>Research-informed professional development programs (2020, 2021).</p> <p>Public reports on research outcomes (end 2020, 2021).</p> <p>Evaluation of the Strategy (end 2021).</p> | <p>Advisory Council secretariat support: \$300,000 over three years (matched HE funding)</p> <p>ARC earmarked funding for language in education research: (up to 40 projects in 2020-21) \$6m</p> <p>Earmarked funding for language in education research by Evidence Institute for Schools: \$6m (from \$280m allocation)</p> <p>Evaluation: \$200,000</p> <p>Total estimated costs: 12.5m</p> |

⁵¹ ACTA(2017) *Submission to the Review to Achieve Educational Excellence in Australian Schools* at: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/580_ACTA_full_submission_to_Gonski_Review_.pdf

⁵² ACTA has identified best practice standards for effective English language provision in schools, for adults and for refugee youth. See ACTA submission to the 2017 Inquiry into Migrant Settlement Outcomes at: <http://www.tesol.org.au/Advocacy/Media-Room> p.109-124, 126-133, 135-146.

⁵³ Notably work done by the former AMEP Research Centre.

⁵⁴ For example, the recently established Sydney Institute of Community Languages Education. The research focus of the proposed ‘Gonski’ Evidence Institute for Schools is the comparative effectiveness of *existing* teaching methods.

Strategy management, coordination, monitoring and reporting

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTION | DESCRIPTION | CURRENT SITUATION | IMPLEMENTATION & TIMEFRAME | | | RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>15. Establish a coordinating unit dedicated to managing, monitoring and reporting actions in the Language in Education and Training Strategy</p> | <p>A dedicated unit within DET, staffed by 4-5 officers and headed by a Branch Manager, tasked to support strategy implementation and establish a whole-of-government approach to language in education and training.</p> <p>The functions of the unit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oversee the design, implementation and resourcing of language in education and training initiatives; coordinate initiatives across government and jurisdictions; ensure alignment/integration between strategy initiatives and other government policies and priorities; monitor and report progress in implementation of initiatives; commission evaluations of initiatives; provide policy analysis and advice to government on language in education and training issues; establish processes that ensure language in education and training issues are considered in relevant Government reviews, initiatives and policy development; rebuild the expertise within government needed to effectively manage and implement initiatives; identification and deployment of relevant expertise within and outside the department; manage and coordinate working groups supporting implementation of initiatives; establish, support and maintain effective advisory mechanisms and key stakeholder consultative processes. | <p>Successful implementation of the 14 actions within the strategy requires ongoing management, coordination, monitoring and reporting by a special unit with expertise in language in education and training issues.</p> <p>Government education and training reviews have routinely ignored the educational needs of English language learners. e.g. Gonski 2.0 review, <i>Independent Review into Regional, Rural and Remote Education</i> teacher standards, the AMEP new business model, reforms to competitive contracting for provision of government services; schools and VET funding.</p> <p>Currently, the Commonwealth public service has no focused expertise in the area of language in education and training. Restructuring, devolution of functions and programs to states and territories has led to a loss of corporate knowledge and impaired Government's capacity to effectively plan and manage programs in this area.</p> <p>Policy reforms and programs have major, long-term implications for provision for English language learners, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reinvigoration of TAFE sector review of casualised employment in various areas e.g. adult education, aged care, Early Childhood review of short-term contracting for government services review of accountability procedures and use of KPIs in the public sector. <p>Policy development in these and other areas needs to take account of and include consideration of their impact on programs for English language learners in relevant sectors (HE, VET, schools, pre-schools).</p> <p>Establishment of a language equity and access "impact test" that explicitly assesses the implications for language in education and training of Commonwealth government policies, programs and initiatives is required.</p> | <p>IMMEDIATE Creation and staffing of the unit within DET.</p> <p>Planning, design and funding of initiatives.</p> <p>Develop action plan and timetable.</p> <p>Develop key performance measures and reporting mechanisms.</p> <p>Develop guidelines for the language equity and access impact test and impact statements.</p> | <p>SOON By end 2019: Actioning, monitoring and reporting of initiatives.</p> | <p>LONGER TERM By 2021: Implementation, monitoring and reporting of initiatives. Evaluation of the overall Strategy.</p> | <p>Establishment and staffing of the unit over three years - \$2.5m</p> <p>Budget allocation covers costs of implementing (and evaluation where appropriate) of each initiative in the Strategy.</p> <p>Total estimated budget under management: \$74.7m</p> |