

Chapter 7:

The Factors that Influenced a Policy's Birth, Life and Death

The purpose of this study, "The Birth Life and Death of an Educational Funding Policy", was to illuminate the forces that affect Commonwealth policies which determine the funding of educational institutions in Australia. To achieve this, a case study of the recently abolished New Schools Policy was made which showed how political activities and societal behaviour are inter-related and affect the nature and process of policy making.

The main question that the inquiry set out to address was:

What factors contributed to the formulation, review, implementation and termination of the 1986-1996 Commonwealth New Schools Policy?

To explore the policy process and address the research question chapter 2 developed a theoretical framework based on two models of policy analysis, Harman's adaptation of the Process Model and Easton's Political Systems Theory. A combination of the two models formed a conceptual framework which gave a broader understanding of a multi-dimensional policy process. Harman's process model formed the foundation of the analytical framework, within which to recount the story of the New Schools Policy. It did this by identifying the successive stages of issue emergence, formulation and authorisation, evaluation, redirection and termination of the policy. However, at the heart of this story was a conflict situation. Harman's model revealed aspects of the conflict but Easton's Political Systems Theory probed deeper, providing a clearer understanding of the forces behind the evolution of the policy. It achieved this because as a model it provided a framework for showing how interest groups, official structures and policy actors (Harman, 1980, p64) were able to

influence policy development at various stages. Central to the conflict were the proponents of two different systems of education, government and non-government. These proponents included Government officials, official organisations, educational stakeholders and interest groups. Each group was wishing to protect the interests of its preferred educational system or institution. The interest being protected in this case study was the access to, and level of, Commonwealth financial support.

A complex struggle between the existence and Commonwealth funding of two educational systems, public and private. The forces included:-

- a) political ideologies and party value preferences including equity, choice and competition;
- b) the Governmental party in control and the effects of changes in government;
- c) Commonwealth budgetary constraints, and;
- d) the standing and political weight of pressure groups from both sectors of education, public and private.

Once the conceptual framework had separated the policy into successive and manageable stages the following sub-questions were investigated:

1. Issue Emergence: What political and historical factors contributed to the emergence of the New Schools Policy?
2. Formulation & Authorisation: Who were the main policy organisations and what were the objectives that influenced the formulation of the policy?
What were the explicit and implicit intentions of the policy makers when formulating and authorising the New Schools Policy?

3. Implementation: To what extent were the explicit and implicit intentions of the policy achieved during implementation?
4. Review & Modification: What factors contributed to the initiation of the policy's two modifications?
Which new demands and factors contributed to the Labor government's evaluation of the policy in 1995?
5. Evaluation & Termination: What environmental factors contributed to the abolition of the New Schools Policy?
6. Conclusion: What inferences can be drawn about other Commonwealth non-government funding policies and the nature of future funding policies based on the findings of the study?

Issue Emergence

A sensitive issue surrounding the establishment and funding of new non-government schools arose from the time the Commonwealth authorised its first grants to States for non-government schools in the 60's, through to the Karmel Report in 1973 and until the election of the Hawke Labor party in 1983. At the heart of the issue was Labor's perception that the value of equality of opportunity had been seriously threatened by the Fraser government (Hayden, 1982, p1). The issue was concerned with the appropriateness of a growing non-government sector, its effect on the government sector, and, its subsequent draining of Commonwealth financial resources.

The Karmel Report (1973) had established new funding arrangements for all Australian schools that allocated financial resources on the basis of need. The intention of the report was to raise the resource standards of all Australian schools to

a national level by 1979 (Williams, 1984, p320). Equality of opportunity, along with diversity, was the principal value from which the committee derived its recommendations. Equality of opportunity was interpreted as equal access to schools of roughly equal standards, that is, schools with equal staffing levels, resources and facilities which was at the time equated with the national target for 1979. All students from all walks of life, the report stated, should have an equal opportunity for success (Karmel, 1973, p16).

Prior to the election of the Whitlam government, several key Labor officials had questioned the right of non-government schools to receive any public financial assistance, a minority went as far as to express the view that all education should be politically controlled under the banner of government schools. Whitlam however, made a pre-election promise in 1972 that non-government schools would continue to receive financial benefits (Karmel, 1973, p41). The Karmel committee however, drew attention to the considerable degree of inequality amongst non-government schools and sought to bring about more equal standards in the sector.

In its search for a more equitable allocation of resources the committee assumed that the non-government sector would maintain their share of total school enrolments or, ideally, students would be absorbed by government schools. The possibility of an expanding non-government sector and the impact it would have on the government sector was only briefly considered (Karmel, 1973, p12). The issue of new non-government schools and the system's possible expansion was not addressed. Trends at the time that revealed that the size private sector was showing a decline.

When Whitlam lost the 1975 election to the Fraser government, the new Liberal government continued with the funding arrangements established by Karmel. As a consequence of those funding arrangements along with an absence of guidelines for new non-government schools the non-government sector experienced healthy and rapid growth both in school numbers and total Australian school enrolment share. In

1976 the non-government sector held 21.1% of all Australian school enrolments in 2138 schools while in 1983 that figure had risen to 24.4% in 2362 schools. Subsequently the non-government sector absorbed an increasing proportion of the Commonwealth recurrent education budget (see figure 3.6 on page 54). In 1981 (figures for 1983 were not available) the non-government sector had received an increase of \$256m in Commonwealth recurrent funding since 1976 bringing the budget to a total of \$439m for that year. On the other hand, the government sector had received an increase of only \$129.2m over the same period bringing their total recurrent funding for that year to \$355m (Australian Bureau of Statistics: Year Book Australia, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, & 1984). By the end of the Fraser era the 24% of students in private schools were receiving 56% of the Commonwealth's recurrent budget (Smart, 1987, p144). Labor proponents saw this as undermining the public system of schools and a direct threat to the equality of opportunity to Commonwealth financial resources for all Australian students.

These historical factors surrounding the growth of non-government schools and draining Commonwealth funds to the sector, brought the issue to the political floor. Labor officials in their pre-election promises, stated that they would tackle the imbalance of funding between state and private schools and reassure those who saw the maintenance of public schools as the primary obligation of any government (Bennett, 1982, p176).

Further demands for the initiation of a policy change came after the Labor party had been re-elected in 1983. Senator Susan Ryan, the government's Minister for Education, was under considerable pressure from the Cabinet's Expenditure Review Committee (ERC) to find cuts to the education budget. Ryan found the cuts by progressively reducing the Commonwealth grants to the 'top' private schools by 25% (Australian Treasury, 1983, p88). The cuts were directed at the non-government sector because of the Party's view on public and private education and their emphasis on equality of opportunity. They were also made because of political pressure from

socialist educational proponents such as the Australian Teachers Federation, who wished to see the interests of the public sector protected. With the announcement of the cuts Ryan stated that the Commonwealth wished to review all general recurrent funding policies. These two moves caused a political uproar amongst the non-government sector which feared that the divisive State aid debate had arisen again and that further cuts would be made to other non-government schools. The pressure from the stakeholders, particularly Catholic authorities, threatened to upset the balance of power the Labor government held. As a result, the promise of an eight year funding plan was given to the private sector which offered stability in funding arrangements for existing non-government schools.

To induce further savings to the educational budget, Ryan turned her attention to the growing number of smaller, new non-systemic private schools. This issue was mainly based on the Commonwealth's concern that on numerous occasions, smaller schools had lacked prior planning and had to be economically sustained by the government. This led to several bitter disputes between interest groups on the grounds of equity. On several occasions government schools had to close because they were no longer economically viable, but were later to be reopened as private schools which were in receipt of Commonwealth funds. Ryan looked to this area as it was politically safer. A focus on new, smaller non-government schools would not threaten the balance of power.

The issue of the establishment and funding of new non-government schools had arisen as a result of:-

- a) historical factors surrounding the private sector; its growth and subsequent drain on Commonwealth finances;
- b) the Labor Party's standing on public schooling and their preference for the value of equality of opportunity;
- c) political pressure from several key groups including the Australian Teachers Federation; and

d) pressure from the ERC to find cuts to the education budget.

In 1984 the Labor government took steps to address the issue by formulating a new policy.

Formulation

When formulating the New Schools Policy the Labor government members were explicitly concerned with the fair and equitable allocation of funds to all Australian students while implicitly they wished to dampen the growth of the non-government sector. Underlying their desire to formulate the policy was the need to find cuts to the educational budget and, because of the history of the growth of the non-government sector, the perceived threat to government schooling and the pressure from various stakeholders, cuts were directed at new non-government schools. (see chapters 3 and 4)

These intentions however, may not have necessarily been the original intentions that the policy makers, the Labor Government, set out to achieve. The directions of any given policy would, in most cases, digress from the full intentions of the policy makers' minds because of the influence of pressure groups. This is particularly true in this case where Ryan's first actions caused strong reaction from the Catholic sector. It may well have been the ideal intention of the policy makers to remove funding to the non-government sector as many Labor proponents wished to see prior to the election of Whitlam. However, in the instance of policy making in the political arena, the policy makers are pre-occupied with remaining in power by keeping their supporters on side while attempting to achieve their intentions. This would lead policy makers to move away from the ideal situation to a modified set of objectives.

The intentions of the new policy were alluded to by:-

a) key officials in the Labor party;

- b) statements made in Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) documents; (pp69-70 in the thesis)
- c) the terms of reference given to the panel of Commissioners assigned with the task of formulating the policy (pp71-72 in the thesis); and
- d) the recommendations of the panel in their report Planning and Funding Policies for New Non-Government Schools (pp75-76 in the thesis).

Statements made by key Labor officials leading up to, and just after, the 1983 Federal election made it clear that as a party Labor believed that the value of equality of opportunity had been assaulted by the previous Liberal government. Statements made by Bill Hayden (1982), John Dawkins (1982) and Susan Ryan (1983) pointed this out along with the ethical dilemma the party were in when broaching the subject of funding parental choice of non-government schools with taxpayers' money. All three made it clear that the Labor government would ensure that taxpayers' money would be used appropriately and that government schooling would be maintained at all costs. These statements made it clear that they wished to ensure that Commonwealth funds were fairly and equitably allocated to all Australian students rather than allowing them to be used to support a superior level in resources found in some non-government schools. These schools were seen to have abused 'needs' programs by finding loopholes in the previous policies and were able to provide a higher level of resources at the taxpayers' expense.

The issues began to be addressed in July 1983 when the Commonwealth Schools Commission released interim funding guidelines for non-government schools in its Participation and Equity - Funding Guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commissioners for 1984. The report stated the Labor government's and the CSC's objectives to "improve public confidence in government schools in Australia", "restore stability and predicability in funding arrangements for government and non-government schools" and "provide better planning and improved co-ordination in

relation to the development of new non-government schools” (Department of Education and Youth Affairs, 1984, p1-2)

The report affirmed the government's financial support for new non-government schools but implemented several revisions to the policies which had applied in the past. The guidelines, amongst other recommendations, stated that proposed new schools should not ‘impact’ existing government and non-government schools by duplicating resources that already adequately existed in the area.

In 1984 the CSC released a discussion paper Funding Policies for Australian Schools. The paper reiterated the complex and sensitive issues surrounding non-government schools and the impact that they were having on government schools. The document went on to suggest that a working party be commissioned to review the issues with view to designing a new policy.

Both documents made it clear that the CSC and the Labor government were concerned with the impact that new non-government schools were having on the government sector. The documents implied that the aim was to steady the flow of students from the government to the non-government sector. The objectives outlined in the two documents recommended that the government should “improve the public confidence in government schools in Australia” and “restore stability and predicability in funding arrangements for government and non-government schools” (Department of Education and Youth Affairs, 1984, p1-2) These two objectives would be achieved by dampening the non-government sectors growth.

In taking more formal action in response to the issues, the Hon. Susan Ryan commissioned a panel of Commonwealth Schools Commissioners to formulate a new policy. This panel chaired by Ms Lyndsay Connors, in March 1985 released their report Planning and Funding Policies for New Non-Government Schools.

The terms of reference of the Connors Panel alluded to the intention to address the issue of the steady movement of students from the government sector to the non-government sector. This was implied by the obvious fact that the panel should address issues pertaining to new *non-government* schools and not new *government* schools. This was recognised and criticised by the Australian Parents Council in their review of the Connors Report in May 1985.

The final recommendations of the panel of Commonwealth Schools Commissioners handed to the Minister for Education, the Hon. Susan Ryan, set criteria for the securing of Commonwealth recurrent funding for new non-government schools. Explicitly the recommendations aimed to ensure that certain physical and educational standards were met in all schools, both those already in existence and those proposed, as well as protecting students rights to an equitable education. The report used the notion of 'impact' as a basis of their argument, raising the possible negative impacts that new schools could have on existing schools. Implicitly the recommendations were designed to protect existing educational structures by restraining the growth of new schools and new places.

Authorisation

On March 21 1985, Senator Grimes speaking on behalf of the Minister for Education, said that: "The Government has accepted all of the recommendations of the (Connors) panel and is confident that the implementation of these recommendations will lead to a more equitable and efficient approach to the planning and establishment of new non-government schools, to the benefit of all Australian children in government and non-government schools." (Grimes, 21 March 1985, p531)

The opposition reacted strongly. It saw the recommendations as an attack on the non-government sector in order to protect a the perceived 'weakening' government

system. They rejected the government's intention to restrict the growth of the non-government sector and their obvious intention to give less support to the value of parental choice.

Other authorities and organisations saw the future of new non-government schools being restricted on the basis of budgetary constraints. Catholic education authorities and the Australian Parents Council saw the recommendations as a 'strait jacket' for the non-government sector restricting growth by limitations on the budget. They too, were concerned that little effort had been taken to consider the rights of parents to the choice of educational institution for their children.

The government defended the policy by stating that it was the intention of the government to ensure that Commonwealth funds were distributed equitably between the government and non-government sectors (Ryan, 21 March, 1985) and not to neglect the right of choice.

On the other hand support for the Connors recommendations was found not only in the government sector and with its proponents but also in established parts of the non-government sector. In its negotiations with school authorities, Connors had found that, particularly in Victoria, there was great concern about competition within the independent sector undermining the capacity of existing established schools' ability to maintain their viability (Connors, 1996 pers. comm. 1st Oct). Many established non-government schools had welcomed the policy because it promised to protect their existing institutions and enrolments by restricting the establishment of new schools.

Despite the considerable opposition to the recommendations of the Connors Report, the Labor Party held the balance of power, and on 21 March 1985 legislation was passed. The recommendations of the Connors Panel became known as the 'New

Schools Policy'. The new arrangements contained in the policy came into effect and applied to new non-government schools that were to be established from 1986.

Implementation

From the time that the New Schools Policy was implemented there was a suppression in the growth of non-government school enrolments and the number of new non-government schools. With this came a reduction of Commonwealth recurrent funding recurred by the sector. This indicated an achievement of the policy makers intentions. (see above pages 84-91 in chapter 5)

Prior to the policy's implementation the growth in the enrolment share to the non-government sector had been quite marked. Each year there was an increase until 1982 when the non-government sector held 23.8% of total Australian school enrolments. That year had seen an increase of 3.5% in real growth of enrolment shift over the previous year's percentage share. From 1982 until 1986 the growth in the shift stabilised to around 2.5% real growth per year. 1986 saw a turning point. From that year the trend slowed until 1991 when there was a 0% growth. At that time the non-government sector held 27.9% of enrolments. While the non-government sector was still increasing its enrolment share, the rate of the shift was slowing. (see pp84-86)

The same phenomenon was seen in the growth of new non-government schools. Until 1985 both the government and non-government sector had experienced a dramatic growth in the number of schools. That year, 1985, saw a peak in the number of non-government schools in Australia at 2502 schools compared with 2157 schools in 1974. 1986 again saw a turning point. From that year onwards, the growth in the number of non-government schools steadied until in 1994 the sector had only added 18 additional schools to their number making a total of 2520 schools receiving

Commonwealth recurrent funding. This did not mean that new non-government schools were not gaining approval and commencing operation. On the contrary, an average of 36 new schools were gaining provisional approval each year from 1986 to 1996. According to the McKinnon Review, until 1995 a total of 251 non-government schools had commenced operation since the institution of the New Schools Policy. The steadied figure in the number of schools was due to closures and amalgamations of existing schools. (see p86-88)

Data pertaining to Commonwealth financial outlays presented a similar picture. By comparing the ratio of government to annual non-government general recurrent funding per year a picture of a more equitable allocation of funds was seen. Until 1986 the non-government sector had been gradually receiving a greater share of the Commonwealth recurrent budget. In 1986 the non-government sector was receiving 1.97 times more than the Commonwealth government sector. This ratio began to fall until in 1993 when the non-government sector was receiving 1.67 times the amount. These figures also indicated that the Commonwealth government was making considerable savings in the general recurrent budget each year. Ryan had achieved the cuts she was under pressure to find. (see above pp89-91)

While the figures do not conclusively point to the New Schools Policy as being the factor that retarded the growth of the non-government sector, comments from members of the Coalition interviewed by the writer as well as the Labor government indicated that indeed it was due to the policy. During the policy's implementation several key Liberal officials attacked the Labor party stating that the restrictions contained in the New Schools Policy had successfully retarded the growth of the non-government sector and blighted the right of parents to educational choice. At the same time key Labor officials including Senator Collins and Senator Dawkins stated that the policy had brought new stability in funding arrangements. It was being enjoyed by both the government and non-government sectors and the allocation of finances was fairer and more equitable. (above pp93-94)

The explicit and implicit aims of the policy had been achieved with some degree of success. Commonwealth recurrent funds were being more fairly distributed amongst the students of Australia while the growth of the non-government sector showed signs of slowing. Along with the achievement of the policy makers' intentions came savings to the general recurrent budget which had been the underlying force which drove the formulation of the policy in 1985.

Modifications

During the course of the life of any given policy, information will be returned to the policy makers regarding the attainment of the policy's original objectives. This information Easton terms 'feedback' and the channel that it flows through, the 'feedback loop'. Feedback enables policy makers to make necessary modifications to a policy to bring it closer to achieving its intentions. Along with feedback, new demands may arise from the environment that require a modification of a given policy. The New Schools Policy underwent two modifications, once in 1988 and once in 1991. (see chapter 5 pp96-104)

The 1988 modification to the New Schools Policy was made to further retard the growth of the non-government sector by stopping the biggest expansion in the sector, that of small non-systemic schools. It may have been that the policy makers' wish to reinforce the original intentions of the policy namely; to ensure an equitable allocation of financial resources by preventing the growth of the non-government sector. The evidence for this argument was not great however. There was greater evidence for the driving force behind the 1988 modification.

Dawkins was under pressure from the Expenditure Review Committee to find further reductions in the education budget because of increased pressures for economic restraints (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1987, p6). Because of the

government's standing on private education and support of the public sector they again looked at non-government schools to find the savings. One way to restrain the growth in schools expenditure and create savings, was to limit the expansion of new non-government schools and the level of assistance allocated to them.

A focus was again made on small non-systemic schools as their financial viability had been threatened by poor planning and heavy reliance on Commonwealth funding. Interestingly however, the non-governments greatest expansion was not in the area of small schools but rather in the categories 301 - 400 and 401 - 600 enrolments (McKinnon and Walker, 1995, p23). It would appear that the modifications were aimed at the small schools not because they were relying heavily on Commonwealth financial support but because they would not have had the political weight to affect the balance of power held by the government. This claim is substantiated by the fact that in making decisions about the modifications the relative power of several stakeholders was taken into account including the National Catholic Commission, the National Council of Independent Schools' Associations, the Australian Parents' Council and the Australian Council of State Schools' Organisations. The modifications made did not adversely affect those stakeholders' operation and existing structures including their ability to expand. The government were protecting not only the interests of the major stakeholders, but also their own.

In 1991 Dawkins announced further changes to the New Schools Policy. The changes were seen as a relaxing of the then present restrictions. Explicitly they were intended to provide greater flexibility and reduce Commonwealth regulations for non-government schools. However, while appearing to relax restrictions they merely served to streamline the administrative procedures. Several major stakeholders from the non-government sector had expressed their concerns about aspects of the guidelines that were cumbersome or that placed undue restriction on the operation of existing non-government schools. As a result of the voicing of their concerns to the Minister, Dawkins streamlined the policy. Interestingly however, the changes, or

'relaxing of restrictions', did not adversely threaten to increase the level of funding to the non-government sector. The government were still able to control the growth of the non-government sector and the amount of funding being allocated to it by the policy.

Both modifications of the policy had been made in response to feedback pertaining to the relative success of the policy gauged against its original intentions as well as new demands arising from the environment in which it operated. The 1988 modification was made to further reduce the growth of the non-government sector in order to provide further savings in the educational budget. The 1988 modifications were made carefully to avoid affecting the position and operation of the major stakeholders in the private sector. Smaller schools were targeted by the modifications because they were less able to exert political pressure and alter the course of government and governmental decisions. The 1991 modifications were made in response to new demands arising after authorities had time to operate under the guidelines. The modification in 1991, seen as a relaxing of the then current restrictions, did not adversely threaten to damage the policy makers' original intentions.

Evaluation

After 10 years of operation the Labor government received considerable feedback about the policy and the environment in which it acted. Easton's feedback of information promotes authorities to take any necessary adjustments to a policy according to new demands arising from the environment in which the policy acts (Easton, 1965, p367). After 10 years, feedback prompted the authorities, namely the Labor Government, to evaluate the New Schools Policy. Evaluation of a policy, according to Harman, leads to two possibilities, redirection or termination. (chapter 6)

After Dawkins announced the 1988 changes to the New Schools Policy demands to have the policy altered arose and were directed at the government and the opposition. Two stakeholders, the Christian Community Schools and the Parent Controlled Christian Schools began lobbying to have the policy altered or abolished. To apply greater pressure to the government they joined forces and formed the Australian Association of Christian Schools (AACS). The main task of the AACS was to apply enough pressure on the government to have the policy abolished or to at least have the category 6 funding restriction removed, in order to allow them to establish low fee non-government schools. The Seventh Day Adventist Schools and sections of the Anglican Church supported the actions of the AACS. While neither organisation joined the AACS they individually applied their own pressure.

There was considerable covert and overt pressure against the views of the AACS. Several sections of the non-government sector including the Uniting Church, parts of the Anglican Church and the Lutheran Schools were keen for the policy to remain. In their view a relaxing of restrictions would have a negative effect on established schools by providing cheaper private alternatives.

The AACS directed their pressure at the then Minister for Education, the Hon. Ross Free. According to the AACS, Free was sympathetic to their views and as a result instigated a comprehensive evaluation of the policy. However this claim is not substantiated. Free in an interview with the researcher revealed that the initiation for the review had come from the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) and was prompted by the fact that the policy had been in operation for 10 years and the environment in which it operated had substantially changed.

Whether the review was instigated as a result of pressure exerted by the AACS, Seventh Day Adventist Schools and parts of the Anglican Church or by DEET is not known. The fact is that there was pressure on the government to have the policy

altered. Not surprisingly however the terms of reference given to the committee took account of the concerns that the pressure groups had raised. These terms included:

* the appropriateness and effectiveness of measures to encourage educational and financial responsibility on the part of new schools, including the restriction of new, non-systemic schools to categories 1 to 6, minimum enrolment requirements and the requirements for forming a schools system.

*....

The review will involve seeking written submissions and conducting Australia wide discussions and consultations with State and Territory governments, non-government education authorities and the education community. A discussion paper will be produced to further the consultation process in mid 1995 (Free, 1995, p1).

In this light the claims of the pressure groups had been heard and action was going to be taken.

On March 1 1995 a press release stated that the New Schools Policy was to be extensively reviewed by Professor Ken McKinnon, recent retired Vice Chancellor of the University of Wollongong and Foundation Chair of the Commonwealth Schools Commission. The methodology of the review specified that all stakeholders were to be consulted and be given opportunity to have an input, a facet that had been neglected and subsequently criticised in the 1988 and 1991 modifications. The consultation process involved the release of three progressive documents, a discussion paper, an interim report, and a final report.

The review faced a barrage of views and pressure from both ends of the private and public education spectrum. On one end the non-government stakeholders welcomed the review and their opportunity to play a valuable part. Most of the non-government stakeholders wished to see the restrictions that had been inhibiting the growth of the private sector removed, these included the category 6 funding cap and enrolment minima and maxima, both of which had been introduced in the 1988 modifications. On the other hand proponents of the government sector were expressing open opposition to the funding of non-government schools. The NSW Teachers Federation summed up many of the views with the statement: "Any proposals which deliver

more money to private schools and which make it easier to open new schools, are opposed by the Federation" (NSWTF, 1995, p1). The Australian Education Union believed that there was a need for greater control in the opening of new non-government schools.

After canvassing all the views, the final report was released in April 1996. The report recognised the plural values - efficiency, choice, excellence and competition, as well as equality, equity, access and exclusiveness that modern Australia had embraced. With these in mind it sought to draw the opposing ends of the values scale closer together, provide workable rules and achieve a sense of fairness among all parties. The recommendations contained in the report suggested the removal of the restrictions implemented in the 1988 modification, which the AACS had been primarily lobbying against. However Planned Educational Provision remained the corner stone for consideration of applications for eligibility for funding which ensured that existing schools and structures would have been protected.

Termination

Any policy developed by one party in government is likely to be under threat once their opposition party wins government, the New Schools policy was no exception. In March 1996, one month before the report of the McKinnon Review was released, the Labor government lost the Federal election to the Liberal Coalition. The Liberal party had always voiced their opposition to what its members labelled as the notorious and infamous New Schools Policy. They had argued that it should be completely abandoned on the grounds of parental choice. The Coalition in opposition had voiced this view ever since the policy's implementation in 1985. Indeed it had been an election promise that if the Liberal party regained power they would abolish the policy altogether. The perceived message they saw the Labor party giving to the people as a result of the policy was "that unless people are well off, they will not have educational choice or, at least, their choice will be severely limited.

They will be compelled to take what they can get at the local school" (Andrews, 1993, p2270).

The Liberal party remained true to that promise and in their first budget released in August 1996 they announced the intention to abolish the New Schools Policy. Explicitly the Liberal government abolished the policy to provide greater educational choice and a more competitive market for the parents of Australia, values that the party places more emphasis upon than equity. However it would appear that the Liberal government are using the value of individual freedom and choice as a tool for applying competitive pressures to promote efficiency. Dr David Kemp, Federal Minister for schools, acknowledges that government policies are intending to shape the enrolment balance so that the states 'cost-shift' students from government to private schooling. (Marginson, 1997, p7) By deliberately increasing the public's use of private schooling the Commonwealth government are hoping to share the cost savings of the States in not educating children in government schools to help it offset additional grant outlays to non-government schools. This is hoped to achieve considerable savings to the Commonwealth budget, an estimated \$120m over the next three years (Raethel, 1996), an extremely appealing facet to a government that inherited a considerable National debt. It is claimed that with every new private school student \$1 700 will be removed from the education budget of the States as parents will be paying a greater proportion of the cost. This is a contentious claim however, and will be tested in time. Many proponents of government schools argue that small number of students moving to the non-government sector will not result in an immediate cutting of educational resources in the public schools. The savings will therefore not be immediate. The interesting point is however, that both governments were looking to find savings to the education budget and because of their support for opposing educational systems, made policy decisions to find those savings from the sector they favoured least. Labor, espousing in the public sector and equity, gained savings from the private sector, while Liberal, because of their belief in choice and competition, are hoping to gain savings from the government sector.

Future Directions

Reaction to the abolition of the New Schools Policy was obviously mixed. Reactions ranged from extreme concern for the welfare and future of the government system, to a welcoming of the possibilities it brought for the growth of the non-government sector. Interestingly the issues raised in response to the abolition of the policy were not new, they were all raised prior to and during the implementation of the policy. The non-government sector is again showing signs of strong growth, the threat on equity has been voiced, the impact of duplicated resources, the creaming off of students, the economic viability of small non-government schools and strong pressure from stakeholders who strongly support a free education system, have all again been brought to the attention of the authorities. This leads us to speculate about the future direction of Commonwealth funding policies for non-government schools.

Already many State governments are taking action in response to the issues again raised. New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia have exerted their constitutional rights by commencing to examine the registration of new non-government schools in their jurisdictions (Educare News, 1997, p3). These State governments are opposing a completely free market for the establishment of new non-government schools and are taking steps to control the growth of the private sector within their jurisdictions. It is possible then, that in the future, the Commonwealth will allow State governments to take greater control of the funding and establishment of non-government schools and remove themselves from the contentious issues that surround the debate. On the other hand the Commonwealth may remain in control and if a government which is sympathetic to public education returns to power it is very likely that a new policy aimed at stabilising the two systems, is again formulated. It is unlikely however, due to the pressure that exists, that it will be as restrictive as the previous New Schools Policy. If the Liberal

government remains in power for another term there may be a greater move towards student-centred funding rather than the funding of systems and institutions. This move will however be met with strong opposition and it would be unwise for any government who wishes to remain in power.

Concluding Comments

This research paper has sought to contribute to the understanding of policy making by illuminating the forces that affected each stage in the process of Commonwealth educational policy making. The forces it has revealed in the case study of the New Schools Policy involved a complex struggle between the existence and Commonwealth funding of two educational systems, public and private. These forces included: political ideologies and party value preferences including equity, choice and competition, the political party in control and the effects of changes in government, Commonwealth budgetary constraints, and the political weight of pressure groups.

The conceptual framework developed from two models of policy analysis, Harman's Process Model and Easton's Political Systems Theory, provided an excellent base in which to explore these forces. It enabled a complex policy to be broken down into smaller successive stages which could individually be examined, revealing the intricacies that affected the policy's life. It provided an excellent structure allowing the actions of interest and pressure groups to fit easily, a facet that had considerable bearing on the policy's direction. The structure was however, somewhat limited in its ability to permit an exploration of those actions. Adding another dimension to the model, for instance, some political theory on pluralism, would have perhaps permitted the search for a greater understanding of the role of stakeholders in the policy process. While this may have been helpful, the complexity of the model may have become unmanageable.

Whilst the researcher has made a concerted effort to ensure the validity and adequacy of the findings by consulting with colleagues, participants and documentation, the defensibility of the findings may not be fully convincing to the reader. Several factors may have had a bearing on the findings, some of which were out of the control of the researcher, while others may lead to further research to provide more satisfactory answers.

The position and standing of the researcher had considerable bearing upon many of the findings. Availability of sources was limited because of a lack of political connections. Politicians, because of their heavy work load or because it was not politically expedient, were less inclined to reveal aspects of information that would have had a bearing on the policy decisions because of the status of the researcher. Added to this was the reluctance of parliamentary libraries to release information because of library policy concerning outside borrowers. A researcher with a more respected background would have more than likely been able to gain additional, and more accurate, information.

Time played a considerable part on the research for two reasons. Firstly, time constraints and the appropriateness of time allocation for a project of this size and nature have limited the depth of aspects of the investigation. For instance more time would have enabled a more detailed investigation of the major stakeholders, particularly those who were making demands for policy change. This may have revealed a greater understanding of their motives and methods of applying pressure on authorities along with the effects that the pressure had. Secondly, the passage of time had a considerable effect upon the findings. The passing of time clouded the memories of several of the key players, particularly politicians who dealt with numerous other policy decisions and issues during their term in office. Specific instances and intentions behind individual decisions were often hard to recall and inferences had to be made.

Several of the findings were based upon inferences made by the researcher. While an attempt was made to verify the inferences by cross checking with other sources, they are none the less inferences. Had more time been available and the researcher had a more respected position, then the inferences, particular with respect to the intentions of the main policy makers, may have led to more rigorously defended answers.

The financial and non-financial data pertaining to consequences of the New Schools Policy were not conclusive. The trends displayed after 1986 when the policy was implemented may have been affected by other factors such as demographic shift. While the important factor that had a bearing on the policy decisions was the 'perception' of the consequences by those operating under the policy decisions, it would never the less have been interesting to explore the actual effects of the policy by examining other aspects that may have affected the trends. Again time was the limiting factor.

Whilst the above factors may have a bearing on the defensibility of the findings in the readers eyes, they were none the less mostly out of the control of the researcher. The research has adequately revealed the factors that affected the policy process of a Commonwealth educational funding policy and has sought to contribute to the understanding of the policy process. Further research would be helpful in providing a more indepth look at: the stakeholders and the pressure they applied; the intentions of the political parties and the policy makers and the actual effects of the policy decisions. This research would ideally be completed by a researcher with a higher political and public profile. It would however merely serve to increase the validity of the findings, along with giving a new dimension to the understanding that stakeholders play in the process of policy making. It is therefore hoped that the contribution this research has made will be very valuable to those interested in the factors that influence educational policy processes.

REFERENCES:

- Ashdown, C. 1997, 'Private School Approvals Soar', *Education Review*, vol. 1, no. 5, p. 1.
- Andrews, K.J. 1993, Historic House Hansard Parliamentary Database, October 20, p. 2270.
- Association of Independent Schools of Victoria 1995, Initial submission to the review of the Commonwealths New Schools Policy, May.
- Australian Association of Christian Schools 1995, Review of the New Schools Policy - submission from the Australian Association of Christian Schools, 12 May.
- Australian Education Union 1995, Submission to the review of New Schools Policy, May.
- Australian Parents Council 1985, *A.P.C. Response to the Commors Report*, A.P.C. Review, vol. 3, pp. 10-13.
- Australian Treasury 1983/4, *Budget Paper - Australia*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Allison, G.T. 1971, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Little Brown, Boston.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, 1978-79, 1979-80, 1981-82, 1982-83. *Year Book Australia*, 'Expenditure on Education'.
- Barnes, A. 1972, The Age, 21 & 22 September in Mortensen, K.G. 1985, *Politics and Sociology of Funding Australian Schools: 1962-84*, vol. 1 of Series: Schooling in Australia, Gerald Griffin Press. Melbourne.
- Baume, P. 1985, CPD, Senate, 21 March in Mortensen, K.G. 1987. *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*. vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Baume, P. 1985, CPD, Senate, 27 March, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*. vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Bennett, D. 1982, 'Education: Back to the Drawing Board' , in *Labor Essays, 1982. Socialist Principles and Parliamentary Government*, eds. Evans, G. & Reeves, R. Drummond, Melbourne.
- Boyd, W.L. 1987, 'Balancing Public and Private Schools: The Australian Experience and American Implications' , in: *Educational Policy in Australia and America, Comparative Perspectives*. eds. Boyd, W.L. & Smart, D. New York.
- Brough, J. 1997, 'Labor's Radical Reform Option for Higher Education: Smart Cards to Buy University Places', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 April, p. 9.
- Brough, J. 1997, 'Funding Shift to Private Education to be Fought', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 November .
- 'Budget Responses at a Glance', *Educare News*, issue 69, September 1996, p. 5.

- Burke, G. 1983, 'Public Educational Expenditure in the Seventies and Eighties', *Australian Economic Review* 3rd quarter, pp. 34-45.
- Cheetham, J. 1996, 'State Cuts to Pay for Private Sector Increase', *Educare News*, issue 69, September Issue, p. 1.
- Chipman, L. 1990, 'Providing more Scholar per Dollar', *The Weekend Australian*, 10-11 November, p. 24.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. 1989, *Research Methods in Education*, 3rd edn, Croom Helm, London.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. 1972, 'A Garbage Can Model Of Organisational Choice', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1-25.
- Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. 1974, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- Collins, R.L. 1992, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 2 December, p. 4086.
- Commonwealth Schools Commission 1984, *Funding Policies For Australian Schools*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, April.
- Commonwealth Schools Commission 1985. *Quality and Equality: Commonwealth Specific Purpose Programs for Australian Schools*. Canberra. December.
- Commonwealth Schools Commission 1986, *Annual Report for 1985*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, May.
- Commonwealth Schools Commission 1987, *Commonwealth Programs and Policy Development for Schools: 1988*, Canberra Publishing and Printing Co, Canberra.
- Connors, L. 1985, *Planning and Funding Policies for New Non-Government Schools. Report of Panel of Commonwealth Schools Commissioners*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, March 1985.
- Cyert, R.M. & March, J.G. 1963, *A Behavioural Theory of the Firm*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Davidson, K. 1984, 'Hidden Assets of Private Schools', *The Age*, 26 April.
- Dawkins, J. 1989, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 21 December, p. 3386.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training 1996, *Budget 96: Questions About Changes to Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs*. URL - <http://www.gov.au/budget96/>
- Department of Employment, Education and Training 1996, *Commonwealth Programs for Schools, Administrative Guidelines*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Department of Education and Youth Affairs 1984, *Participation and Equity: Funding Guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commissions for 1984*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

- Dror, Y. 1984, 'On Becoming More of a Policy Scientist', *Policy Studies Review*, vol. 4, no. 1, August.
- Dubnick, M.J. & Bardes, B.A. 1983, *Thinking About Public Policy: A Problem Solving Approach*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Dunk, L. 1970, Labor Splits Over Aid to Schools: Campaign Opens in Uproar, *The Age*, 5 May.
- Durston, B. 1987, 'Public and Private Schools - A Commentary', in Boyd, W.L. and Smart, D. *Educational Policy in Australia and America*, The Falmer Press, New York.
- 'The Editorial', *The Australian Financial Review*, 6 July 1984.
- Federation of Parents' and Citizens Associations of New South Wales 1995, Submission to the Department of Employment, Education and Training regarding the review of the New Schools Policy: July Discussion Paper. September.
- Foster, L.E. 1987, *Australian Education: A Sociological Perspective*, 2nd edn, Prentice Hall, Sydney.
- Fray, A. 1995, 'Archbishop Lashes Govt Over Schools', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 October, p7.
- Garcia, L. 1996, 'Private Schools Winners as Funding Rises 5pc', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 August.
- Garms, W.I., Guthrie, J.W., & Pierce, L.C. 1978, *School Finance: The Economics and Politics of Public Education*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Grimes, D. 1985, CPD, Senate 21 March, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*. Vol 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Harman, G. 1973, Pressure groups and educational policy and administration in Australia. Paper read at ANZAAS Conference in Perth, 17 August.
- Harman, G. 1980, 'Policy making and the Policy Process in Education', in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego (eds). *Canada and Comparative Educational Administration*, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Harman, G. 1983, *The White Paper and Planned Change for Education in Victorian Government Schools*. Research working paper no. 83.10, Parkville, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.
- Harman, G. 1985, 'Handling Education Policy at the State Level in Australia and America', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 29, no. 1.
- Harman, G. 1995, *Approaches to the Study of Educational Administration*. Lecture Notes for EdAs 469-14, University of New England.
- Harkin, J. 1997, 'State Schools Fear Two Tiers', *Educare News*, issue 72, February, p. 1.
- Harradine, B. 1985, CPD, Senate, 21 March, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*. Vol 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.

- Harrold, R. 1996, *Finance for Education: Unit Outline, Lectures 1-8*, Ed.A.S. 478, University of New England.
- Hayden, B. 1982, 'The Contemporary Implications of Democratic Socialism', in *Labor Essays, 1982. Socialist Principles and Parliamentary Government*, ed. Evans, G., and Reeves, R. Drummond, Melbourne.
- Hawker, 1989, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 2 November, p. 2313 & 23 November, p. 2768.
- Hogan, M. 1984, *Public vs Private Schools: Funding Directions in Australia*, Penguin Books, Ringwood.
- Hogbin, G. 1987, 'Privatising the Consumption of Education', in *Privatisation: An Australian Perspective*, ed. P. Abelson, Australian Publishing, Sydney.
- Hogwood, B.W. & Gunn, L.A. 1984, *Policy Analysis For the Real World*, Oxford University Press, Great Britain.
- 'Holding Explains State Aid Plan', *The Age*, 19 May 1970.
- Howard, J. 1983, Historic House Hansard Database. 10 November, p. 2595.
- Jenkins, W.I. 1978, *Policy Analysis: A Political and Organisational Perspective*, Martin Robertson, Great Britain.
- Jennings, R.E. 1977, *Education and Politics: Policymaking in Local Education Authorities*, Batsford, London.
- Johnson, S. 1982, 'Need and Greed in the Private School', *The National Times*, 29 Aug- 4 Sept, pp. 8-11.
- Karmel, P. 1973, *Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee for the Commonwealth Schools Commission*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Kemmis, D. 1980, 'The Imagination of the Case and the Invention of Study'. in *Towards a Science of the Singular*, ed. H. Simons, CARE Occasional Publications, University of East Anglia.
- Kemp, D.A. 1990, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 13 November, p. 3932.
- Kemp, D.A. 1991, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 11 November, p. 2804.
- Kemp, D.A. 1992, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 26 May, p. 2792.
- Kitney, G. 1982, 'Dawkins Stakes Future on Rolling Private Schools', *The National Times*, Nov 7-13, pp. 3-4.
- Lambert, J. 1997, 'The Abolition of the New Schools Policy: Implications for the Future'. in *Unicorn: Journal of the Australian College of Education*. vol. 23, no.1. April, pp. 26-31.
- Lambert, J. 1995, Towards a rationale for new, low fee Anglican schools, April.

- LeCompte, M.D. and Goetz, J.P. 1982, 'Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research', *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 52, pp31-60.
- Lindblom, C. E. 1959, 'The Science of Muddling Through', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp79-88.
- Lindblom, C.E. & Braybrooke, 1963, *A Strategy of Decision*, Free Press, New York.
- Lowi, T. 1970, 'Decision Making vs Policy Making: Towards an Antidote for Technocracy', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 30, May/June 30, pp. 314-325.
- MacGibbon, D. 1985, CPD, Senate, 27 March, Mortensen, K.G. 1987. *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*, vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia. Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Macintyre, S. 1985, *Winners and Losers*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Macklin, M. 1985, CPD, Senate, 21 March, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987. *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*, vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Maley, B. 1997, 'Hard Lessons for State Schools', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June, p. 17.
- Marginson, S. 1997, 'Public Verses Private', *Education Review*, March, pp. 7-8.
- Maslen, G. 1983, 'A Tough Time for Senator Ryan', *The Age*, 15 March.
- McIntosh, G. 1996. *States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 1996*, Bills Digest Service, No.42 1996/97, September.
- McKinnon, K & Walker 1995, *Discussion Paper: Review of the New Schools Policy*, Department of Employment, Education and Training, Australian Government Publishing Service, July, Canberra.
- McKinnon, K & Walker 1996, *Final Report: Review of the New Schools Policy*, Department of Employment, Education and Training, Australian Government Publishing Service, April, Canberra.
- Meighan, R. 1981. *A Sociology of Education*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, London.
- Mortensen, K.G. 1985, *Politics and Sociology of Funding Australian Schools:1962-84*, vol. 1 of Series: Schooling in Australia, Gerald Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*, vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia. Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Nagel, S. 1984, *Contemporary Public Policy Analysis*, The University of Alabama Press, USA.
- New South Wales Teachers Federation 1995, Interim report: review of the New Schools Policy. NSW Teachers Federation Response.
- Newell, N.J. 1993, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 20 October, p. 2275.
- Peterson, P.E. 1976. *School Politics Chicago Style*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Preston, B. 1989, *Commonwealth General Recurrent Funding for Schools: The Outcome of the 'Eight Year Plan.'* Australian Teachers Federation Background Notes, no. 70.
- 'Private Schools Winners as Funding Rises 5pc', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 August, 1996, p. 2.
- Prunty, J.J. 1984, *A Critical Reformulation of Educational Policy Analysis: Policy Development and Analysis*, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia.
- Prunty, J.J. 1985, 'Signposts for a Critical Educational Policy Analysis', *Australian Journal of Education*, vol. 29, no.2 pp. 133-40.
- Putt, A.D. & Springer, J.F. 1989, *Policy Research, Concepts, Methods and Applications*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Raethel, S. 1996, 'Move to Privatise Schooling Condemned', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 August.
- Reith, P.K. 1989, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 1 November, p. 2293.
- Roberts, G.K. 1971, *A Dictionary of Political Analysis*. Longman, pp. 152-3.
- Ryan, S. 1985, CPD, Senate, March 27, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*. vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Ryan, S. 1985, Letter to the: *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 June.
- Ryan, S. 1984, *Commonwealth Schools Commission Guidelines 1985-88*, Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Australian Government Publishing Service, 14 August, Canberra.
- Short, 1989, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 22 December, p. 5111.
- Smart, D. 1987, *Education Policy in Australia and America: Comparative Perspectives*, Falmer, New York.
- South Australia Commission for Catholic Schools 1995, SACCS response to the Interim Report of the New Schools Policy, October.
- South Australia Commission for Catholic Schools 1995, Response to the July 1995 Discussion Paper, review of the New Schools Policy.
- States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 1996, Senate, Second Reading Speech.
- Stockley, D. 1983, 'Political Ideologies and Australian Education', in *Sociology in Education*, ed. R. Browne and L. Foster, 3rd edn, Macmillan, South Melbourne, pp. 47-58.
- Teague, B. 1985, CPD, Senate, 21 March, in Mortensen, K.G. 1987, *Issues: Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1973-1986*, vol. 2 of Series: Schooling and Employment in Australia, Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- Teague, B. 1990, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 18 December, p. 5837.

- Teague, B. 1991, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 14 November, p. 3256.
- Teague, B. 1992, Historic House Hansard, Parliamentary Database, 2 December, p. 4015.
- Tierney, J. (Chair) 1995, *Report of the Inquiry into Accountability in Commonwealth-State Funding Arrangements in Education - Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee*, Senate Printing Unit, Canberra.
- Truman, D.B. 1951, *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*, Knopf, New York.
- Watson, L. 1996, The Federal budget and schools: paper presented to a public policy seminar at the Australian National University Canberra, October 8.
- West, P. 1983, 'Australia and United States: Some Differences', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 27, no.3, October, pp. 414-416.
- Whitlam, G. 1973, Hansard, CPD, 27 November, pp. 3932, in Mortensen, K G. 1985, *Politics and Sociology of Funding Australian Schools:1962-84*. vol. 1 of Series: Schooling in Australia, Gerald Griffin Press, Melbourne.
- 'Wider Choice in Schooling', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 May, 1996, p. 10.
- Williams, G. 1997, 'Low-Fee High Value Trend' , *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 February, p. 18.
- Williams, R. 1984, 'Interactions Between Government and Private Outlays: Education in Australia, 1949-50 to 1981-82' , in *Economic Record*. vol. 60, no. 171, December, pp. 317-325.
- Williams, R. 1985, 'The Economic Determinants of Private Schooling in Australia' , in *Economic Record*, vol. 61, no. 174. September, pp. 622-628.
- Wirt, F & Douglas, E. 1982, 'Social Science and Educational Reform: The Political Uses of Social Research', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 4, Fall, pp. 1-16.
- Yin, R.K. 1984, *Case Study Research Design and Methods*, Saga Publications, Beverly Hills.

Appendix A:

Models of Policy Analysis

Rational or Classical Model

This model is based on the idea that policy is related to a sequence of related and rational steps. The steps may include a) recognition of the existence of a problem, b) preliminary appraisal or inquiry into the problem, c) identification of goals and objectives d) collection of possible solutions to the problem, evaluation of the costs, benefits and consequences of each, and e) choice of action.

Its approach is useful as it provides a guide for policy development, and a basis for evaluating policy in various contexts. It is particularly useful when it relates to a situation where a decision is to be made by a single person, or group of people.

Its weaknesses however arise when it is applied to the majority of policy situations. The reality is that policy is not the product of a single mind, or insular group of people, which the rational model assumes. It also fails to come to terms with the distinctively political aspects of policy making, its disorder and the consequently strikingly different ways that policy emerges. Further more, it assumes that policy makers have the time to seek all possible solutions, and economically appraise each before a decision is made, which is more often than not, not the case. The constraints of time and finance often limit policy makers to the exploration of few alternatives, and their possible consequences. (Harman, G. 1985)

Incrementalism

The theory of incrementalism was put forward by Charles Lindblom. He viewed policy as a fragmented activity, rather than logical. Essentially policy is shaped by a sense of political feasibility. (Harman, G, 1985) "It is decision making through small or incremental moves on particular problems rather than through a comprehensive reform program. It is also endless; it takes the form of an indefinite sequence of policy moves. Moreover, it is exploratory in that goals of policy making continue to change as new experience with policy throws new light on what is possible or desirable." (Lindblom, C. 1963)

Policy makers devise solutions that are acceptable to a variety of interests. This could be viewed as a possible weakness, as policy makers only consider alternatives which differ marginally from existing policies, as he believes that any greater change would run the risk of being unaccepted. (Harman, G. 1985) He seldom expects however, that a policy will provide the final resolution to the problem, policy, Lindblom explains is an endless process, it is a process of successive changes seeking to fulfil a set of desired goals. (Lindblom, C. 1959) To an extent, the work of Easton, (Political Systems Model, 1965) agrees with this model.

The main weakness of this model Harman notes, is its inability to account for fundamental changes in policy, and for the fact that sometimes policy makers behave in a non-incremental manner.

Political Interest Group Theories

One of the major theorists behind the Political Interest Group Theory, is David B. Truman. (1951) As a theory it stresses the importance of pressure and interest groups. Truman suggested that society is made up of competing interest groups, all pushing for a particular set of outcomes. The theory, in its extreme form, see policy making purely as a product of group conflict and compromise. Policy makers are simply the adjudicators in the process. Groups lay claim to their demands based on three variables: the internal characteristics of the group; their relative position in society; and the characteristics of government and governing procedures. (Harman, G. 1985) It is particularly useful when explain educational policy making, as many decisions made pertaining to education are in answer to conflicts, and interests from the society in which the system serves.

Bargaining Theories

Bargaining theories are similar to the Political Interest Group Theory. They see policy as the output of bargaining games. They attempt to explain decisions made by looking at the groups or individuals placing pressure on the system, their motivations, and the compromises that were made. It sees policy as the result of conflict and compromise rather than as a solution to a problem. (Harman, G. 1985) Peterson, (1976) applied this theory in a study of city education and policy making.

The main weakness of this model, is that it only attempts to explain a particular kind of policy making, policy that is associated with conflict. Not all policy making situations involve conflict, often policy is the culmination of a joint or group effort, or the result of an individual.

Lowi's Policy Typology

Lowi's Policy Typology is one of the more complex models, put forward by Theodore Lowi (1970) He assumes that policy determines politics, rather than policy being the product of political activity. Lowi views policy as "deliberate coercion - statements attempting to set for the purpose, the means and the subjects of coercion." (Lowi, T. 1970) His examination of policy begins with an analysis of the different outputs of government policy, and then attempts to establish systematic relationships between those outputs and the differences in the processes from which they evolved. (Harman, G. 1985)

Political Systems Model

The Political Systems Model was pioneered in political science by David Easton. "The approach stresses the value of viewing policy-making as an interactive process, through which *inputs*, including demands and support for policy change or initiation of new policies, are converted into *outputs* or policy decisions. Outputs, in turn, affect various components and by means of "feedback" mechanisms lead to new demands. As a model it is based on the assumption that political activities and behaviour in a society, or part of it, are inter-related, and that disturbances in one part inevitably affect others." (Harman, 1980) This particular model is useful because it provides a framework that allows interest groups, official structures, and policy actors to fit easily. (Harman, 1980) More importantly, it allows a way of conceptualising the whole policy process, how it relates to the environment, and how various aspects of the environment, such as political action, changes in government, changing societal demands, and changing priorities, are linked to the policy process.

Organisational Models

These theories of policy see policy as the product of the functioning of large organisations according to patterns of behaviour. To a great extent, policy is the product of rules and regulations. (Harman, G. 1985)

One of the earliest works using this model was done by Cyert and March. (1963) In that work they attempted to explain the organisational structure of firms. Decisions, they claimed, were then based on the goals and objectives of the organisation. Their analysis was concerned with three variables; organisational goals, organisational expectations, and organisational choice. At the heart of their theory there are four concepts which relate to each of these, goals, expectations, and choices. These are: *quasi resolution of conflict*, at the heart of firms there is often conflict over goals and direction which is often resolved by sequential attention to goals; *uncertainty avoidance*, the attention to short term problems, rather than long term strategies; *problematic search*, simple rules that lead the search to the problem, then to possible solutions; and, *organisational learning*, over time organisations learn from experience, and hence change their goals and direction. (Harman, G. 1985)

This model has been applied to educational policy making and has been useful in explaining policy outcomes.

Garbage Can Model

The name, while conjuring up images of a mishmash of ideas, thrown together and the resulting policy tipped out, is quite misleading. It is a theory developed by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) for the study of policy in universities. It could more appropriately named organisational choice in organised anarchies (Harman, G. 1985) as it is based on the premise that some organisations can be described as having inconsistent and unclear goals, unclear ideas and rules, and by fluid participants who vary in the amount of time they devote to the organisation, and are "organised anarchies."

In the rational model, choice of policy leads to the following of a series of sequential steps, but with the garbage can model, choice varies over time as the problems, solutions and decision makers associated with the choice come and go. (Harman, G. 1985) Decisions emerge from a complicated interplay between problems, the personnel associated with the problem and its solution, the production of solutions, and the nature of the alternatives for that choice.

Cohen and March claim that it was an appropriate model for their study of policy at a University as "Although a university operates within the metaphor of a political system or a hierarchical bureaucracy, the actual operation is considerably attenuated by the ambiguity of goals, by the lack of clarity in educational technology, and by the transient character of many participants." (Cohen & March, 1974)

It would be a useful model for applying to policy making in organisational structures such as a school board, or council, where members have other employment, and the giving of their time to the organisation is gauged by their availability and other commitments.

Process Model

This model provides a useful frame work with which to explain the policy process. "It sees the policy process as a series of steps or stages in which different kinds of decisions have to be made." (Harman, 1980) This particular model is very similar to the rational model, however the rational model "assumes that policy is the product of one mind, which often is not the case," (Harman, 1980) while the process model allows for a team approach to policy making where alternatives are discussed and debated. Six stages or steps were identified by Jennings in his study on policy making in English schools: *initiation* when there is a recognition of a problem; *reformation of opinion* when opinions are gathered about the problem; *emergence of alternatives* when various alternatives are explored; *discussion and debate* when alternatives are shaped into policy proposals; *legitimisation* when a choice is made; and *implementation* when the policy is put into effect. (Harman, 1980)

Appendix B:

Attachment B

GUIDELINES FOR GENERAL RECURRENT AND CAPITAL GRANTS FOR NEW NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS Contained in: PARTICIPATION AND EQUITY - FUNDING GUIDELINES TO THE COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION COMMISSIONS FOR 1984

1. Under present policies, all non-government schools have been given an automatic entitlement to Commonwealth per capita grants, subject to those schools receiving registration or other approval from the appropriate State authorities, and establishing their non-profit making status. This entitlement has hitherto applied regardless of the financial viability of some new non-government schools or their possible impact on existing schools.

2. In order to promote the economic use of resources and the balanced development of schools, the Government has adopted new criteria for Commonwealth general recurrent and capital grants to ensure that new non-government schools seeking Commonwealth financial assistance have demonstrated reasonable prospects for viability and will not have a significant negative impact on existing government and non-government schools. The new criteria will be applied only to new non-government schools registered since the government took office on March 5 1983; schools which received registration since then will be funded for the remainder of 1983 at the current rate and will be advised that funding thereafter is subject to their satisfying the new criteria. In interpreting the new criteria in relation to proposed new Aboriginal schools, the Commission will take into account the special circumstances of Aboriginal communities.

3. General Recurrent Grants

3.1 NOTIFICATION

As an aid to forward planning, the Government will require schools authorities seeking general recurrent assistance for new non-government schools to notify the Schools Commission formally of their intention to commence by 1 July of the preceding year (for 1984 only the operative date will be 1 September 1983). Schools are encouraged to notify the Commission earlier to assist with the processing of applications and the forwarding of advice to schools. It is intended that proposed new schools will be notified by 30 September, at the latest, of the preceding year of the Minister's decision on their application for funding.

3.2 FINANCIAL VIABILITY

3.2.1 Prior to recommending that new non-government schools receive Commonwealth general recurrent assistance, the Commission, through its State Planning and Finance Committees, should be satisfied that evidence had been provided to indicate reasonable prospects for viability over the next five years. In reviewing a school's viability, account should be taken of the capacity of the school's community, in conjunction with State and Commonwealth grants, to provide an adequate level of resources over the five years. Enrolment projections for that period will need to be supported by documented evidence. Appropriate demographic and financial data should be provided by applicant schools and reviewed by the Commission. Proposed new schools which have not been initially supported with Commonwealth capital grants should demonstrate that their long-term viability is not necessarily contingent upon the expectations of future Commonwealth capital assistance.

3.2.2 The assessment of a proposed school's standards, including its curriculum, staff qualifications and experience and facilities, continues to be the responsibility of State registration authorities. State registration will continue to be a condition of Commonwealth support.

3.2.3 The intention of these measures is to provide an assurance that proposed new schools seeking Commonwealth recurrent grants will have the financial capacity to provide educational services of an adequate standard over a reasonable period.

3.3 IMPACT ON EXISTING SCHOOLS

3.3.1 The government wishes to avoid a situation whereby a new non-government school seriously threatens the financial and educational viability of existing government or non-government schools. The Commission, through its State Planning Committees and with the assistance of expert consultative advice, should consider applications for Commonwealth general recurrent grants from new non-government schools having regard to the following:

- * The need for consultation and, where possible, coordinated planning in developing areas. Where a proposed new school is located in a developing area, those sponsoring such schools are required to show that there has been prior consultation and, where possible, joint planning with State education authorities. Such planning should have regard to the traditional pattern of school enrolments in government and non-government schools in this or comparable areas.
- * The impact on existing schools in established areas. An analysis of demographic and enrolment trends should be undertaken with a view to determining the effect of a proposed new school on existing schools in terms of enrolments, curriculum offerings, organisational and staffing structure, financial and other resources, and utilisation of facilities.

3.3.2 Where there are indications that inadequate consultations have ensued, or that a proposed new school in an established area would seriously impair the financing or operations of existing schools, a recommendation may be made to withhold Commonwealth recurrent grants. Final decisions will rest with the Commonwealth Minister.

4. Other Commonwealth Recurrent Grants

New non-government schools which have been able to satisfy the above criteria for general recurrent grants, generally would not be eligible for other forms of Commonwealth recurrent assistance for schools.

5. Capital Grants

The above guidelines should also be applied in determining eligibility for Commonwealth capital funds, loan guarantees or leasing grants. Should a proposed new non-government school seek and be promised Commonwealth capital assistance some years before opening, the guidelines should be followed at that time.

(Department of Education and Youth Affairs, 1984, p16-17)

Appendix C:

COMMONWEALTH SCHOOLS COMMISSION'S Proposed Changes to Attachment B contained in the Funding Guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commissions for 1984.

Commonwealth policies for funding new non-government schools should be subject to the adjustments below. State and non-government authorities would be consulted before implementing these changes.

- i) new schools, as a condition for Commonwealth recurrent funding, should meet enrolment guidelines such as those set out in the report of the Australian Education Council on the Registration of Non-government Schools;
- ii) investigations into the impact of new non-government schools on existing government and non-government schools should include opportunities for members of the public to make submissions and to appear, in order to ensure that all views may be heard.
- iii) Commonwealth establishment grants to new non-government schools should only be made available to new schools, systemic and non-systemic, serving developing areas.

(Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1984, p73)

Appendix D:

Letter to Dr Tannock, Chairman of CSC 1984

Dear Dr Tannock,

In its Guidelines to the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the Government announced the steps it was taking to improve the capacity of the Commonwealth, State and non-government authorities to develop a more equitable and efficient approach to the planning and establishment of new non-government schools.

The Government has asked the Commission to appoint a Panel of Commissioners to draw up proposals for co-operative arrangements at the State and Territory level, involving State and non-government school authorities, for the notification and assessment applications according to a negotiated set of priorities so as to enable the Commonwealth to budget for general recurrent funding of new non-government schools from 1986. The Panel was asked to consult closely with States and non-government school authorities on the draft proposals.

The Panel should consult on the following possible range of priority areas for the purpose of assessing applications for Commonwealth assistance:

- (i) new schools (including extensions and relocations) in areas of population and enrolment growth;
- (ii) extensions (defined in existing guidelines as extension from primary to secondary or junior to senior secondary) and relocations relating to the expansion of upper secondary participation;
- (iii) extensions and relocations which reflect various stages of planned progression;
- (iv) extensions and relocations reflecting various stages of unplanned progression;
- (v) new schools (including extensions and relocations) located in stable areas catering for special educational needs relating to various forms of educational disadvantage;
- (vi) relocations and extensions in stable areas;
- (vii) new schools (including extensions and relocations) located in declining areas catering for special educational needs;
- (viii) new schools (including extensions and relocations) in areas of population and enrolment decline.

The Panel should also take account of situations where the nature of an established area is undergoing substantial change, for example, as a result of migration.

In considering possible machinery at the State level for the implementation of the new arrangements, the Panel should take into account the current role of State Planning and Finance Committees and consider ways in which machinery for assessment of new non-government schools can be integrated with the responsibilities and operation of Planning and Financing Committees.

The Government does not consider it appropriate for the Commonwealth to be solely responsible for this function and looks to the Panel to develop ways in which this could become a joint undertaking with both State and non-government authorities. The Panels proposals should be based on the need to minimise the administrative burden on Commonwealth, State and non-government authorities, while at the same time ensuring that the rights of proponents of new schools to a fair and equitable hearing are protected and that appropriate monitoring procedures are developed.

Although not central to its consideration, the Panel should also comment on possible future directions for a more coordinated approach to the registration of non-government schools consistent with the AEC Report of November on this matter.

The Panel is asked to submit its Report by November 1984.

Yours sincerely,
Susan Ryan
14 August 1984

Appendix E:

Background to the Panel of Commissioners Selected to Draw up Proposals for a New Schools Policy

The panel appointed to draw up proposals consisted of five commissioners chaired by Ms Lyndsay Connors. (B.A., Dip.Ed.) At the time Ms Connors was a full time member of the Schools Commission. Before her appointment in 1983 she was a freelance journalist with experience in government schools parent organisation. The remainder of the panel was made up of; Sr Denise Desmarchelier (B.A., Dip.Ed. M.Ed. Admin), Principal of John XXIII College in Claremont, Western Australia; Mr Vin Faulkner, (B.Sc., B.Ed., M.Ed.Admin.) senior officer of the Catholic Education Office in Victoria; Mr Ronald Sackville, (LL.B.(Hons), LL.M.) Co-chairman of the Australian Co-ordinating committee of Jewish Day Schools; and; Mr Doug Swan, (B.A., F.A.C.E.) Director-General of the New South Wales Education Department. (Commonwealth Schools Commission, May 1986, pp5-7)

Appendix F:

Bodies and Organisations who Made Submissions to the Connors Panel, 1984-85

The following bodies and organisations responded to the Connors panel before the final report was submitted; in each state; the Department of Education, the Association of Independent Schools, the Catholic Education Commission/Office, and the Planning and Finance Committee. In the Northern Territory; the Department of Education, and the Planning and Finance Committee Chairman. In the Australian Capital Territory; the ACT Schools Authority, the Catholic Education Office, and the Planning and Finance Committee. And on a National level they consulted; the Australian Teachers Federation, the National Catholic Education Commission, the Australasian Division of Seventh Day Adventist Church, National Union of Associations for Christian Parent-Controlled Schools, Christian Community Schools, Australian Co-ordinating Committee of Jewish Day Schools, the Australian Parents Council, the Independent Teachers Federation, the National Council of Independent Schools, the Board of Lutheran Schools, and the Australian Council of State School Organisations. (Connors, 1985, pp31-32)

Appendix G:

Terms of Reference to the McKinnon Review

The Commonwealth Government will review the operation of the New Schools Policy in 1995.

The New Schools Policy was introduced in 1985 to take effect from 1986 and was the culmination of work undertaken by the Commonwealth Schools Commission which resulted in the report *Planning and Funding Policies for New Non-Government Schools*.

The policy operates within the context of the Government's commitment to the dual system of education and seeks to encourage the orderly development of schools for both educational and financial reasons. Through the application of the Policy financial support is directed to new or extending non-government schools in areas of enrolment growth and restricted in areas of enrolment decline. While the Government supports parenthood choice of school, its responsibility to be prudent with public funds requires it to consider the impact of a new non-government schools or the expansion of an existing school on the viability or curriculum offering of existing schools.

The review will examine the operation of the New Schools Policy in the light of the changed environment since the policy was developed.

The review will take into account:

- * The strong growth in the non-government school sector; in particular the increase in small schools with little prospect of attaining high enrolments and the growth of schools catering for specific ethnic, cultural, religious or philosophical backgrounds.
- * The demand driven nature of the Commonwealth's commitment to the funding of non-government schools and the implications for the Commonwealth Budget of present trends.
- * Developments in the way in which State and Territory Governments provide government school education and provide support for the non-government sector.
- * The relative size of the schooling sectors.

The review is asked to comment specifically on:

- * Desirable future directions for the New Schools Policy.
- * Desirable changes to improve the implementation of the policy.
- * The effectiveness and appropriateness of measures to encourage educational and financial responsibility on the part of new schools, including restriction of new non-

systemic schools to categories 1 to 6, minimum enrolment requirements and the requirements for the formation of school systems.

- * The desirability or otherwise of varying minimum enrolment requirements according to the location of schools.

- * The roles and functioning of New Schools Committees including the most appropriate arrangements for chairing New Schools Committees.

- * State/Territory recognition requirements for non-government schools across Australia and the inter-relationship of these with the New Schools Policy.

- * The influence of advances in information technology on schooling and whether the Commonwealth should provide support for distance education in non-government schools.

Methodology

The review will be undertaken by a prominent educator with a knowledge of the Australian schooling system and a background in Commonwealth funding arrangements for non-government schools. The review will successively produce a discussion paper, progress reports on selected issues and a final report.

Consultation

Submissions to the review will be called for by press advertisement in March 1995 and a comprehensive consultation program will be conducted in all States and Territories during 1995.

The report of the review is to be presented to the Government by February 1996.

(McKinnon, 1996, p118)

Appendix H:

Statistical Information Pertaining to Australian Schools

Table H.1
Number of Government and Non-Government Schools in Australia
1972 - 1995

Year	Government Schools	Non-Government Schools
1972	7362	2190
1973	7310	2176
1974	7295	2157
1975	7266	2140
1976	7306	2138
1977	7325	2125
1978	7364	2145
1979	7392	2200
1980	7444	2235
1981	7531	2261
1982	7556	2312
1983	7546	2362
1984	7544	2481
1985	7561	2502
1986	7589	2496
1987	7575	2504
1988	7535	2519
1989	7513	2523
1990	7490	2517
1991	7470	2510
1992	7400	2508
1993	7366	2499
1994	7159	2520
1995	7366	2499

Source: Australian Education Council : *Statistical Annex - National Report on Schooling in Australia* 1989, p7 & Australian Bureau of Statistics: *Year Book Australia* 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, & 1995.

NB Figures for 1992 unavailable and so estimate made based on trend

Table H.2
 Student Enrolments - Government and Non-Government Schools
 1972-1995
 (Figures rounded to the nearest '000)

Year	Government School Enrolments	Percentage of Total School Enrolment	Non-Government School Enrolments	Percentage of Total School Enrolment
1972	2 224 000	78.4	610 000	21.6
1973	2 235 000	78.5	611 000	21.5
1974	2 254 000	78.6	618 000	21.4
1975	2 290 000	78.7	620 000	21.3
1976	2 323 000	78.8	624 000	21.2
1977	2 349 000	78.8	630 000	21.2
1978	2 354 000	78.6	638 000	21.4
1979	2 336 000	78.2	650 000	21.8
1980	2 318 000	77.7	666 000	22.3
1981	2 299 000	77	688 000	23
1982	2 283 000	76.2	712 000	23.8
1983	2 281 000	75.6	735 000	24.4
1984	2 261 000	74.9	757 000	25.1
1985	2 231 000	74.2	775 000	25.8
1986	2 208 000	73.6	794 000	26.5
1987	2 197 000	73.1	808 000	26.9
1988	2 198 000	72.7	825 000	27.3
1989	2 194 000	72.4	837 000	27.6
1990	2 193 000	72.1	848 000	27.9
1991	2 217 000	72.1	858 000	27.9
1992	2 234 000	72.1	865 000	27.9
1993	2 228 000	71.9	870 000	28.1
1994	2 215 000	71.5	884 000	28.5
1995	2 208 000	71.1	901 000	28.9

Source: Source: Australian Education Council : *Statistical Annex - National Report on Schooling in Australia* 1989, p7 & Australian Bureau of Statistics: *Year Book Australia* 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, & 1995.

Table H.3
Commonwealth Recurrent Expenditure to Education by Sector
1974-1995

Year	Government Schools	Non-Government Schools	Inflation Rate
1974	\$117.9m	\$110.6m	12.9%
1975	\$186.7m	\$133.8m	16.8%
1976	\$225.8m	\$13m	12.9%
1977	\$235.5	\$205.2m	13.9%
1978	\$242.5m	\$237.2m	9.6%
1979	\$266.74m	\$277.9m	8.2%
1980	\$307.4m	\$345m	10.1%
1981	\$355m	\$439m	9.5%
1982			10.4%
1983			11.5%
1984			8.0%
1985	\$555.929m	\$1092.520m	6.0%
1986	\$591.317m	\$1139.754m	8.4%
1987	\$620.075m	\$1191.699m	9.4%
1988	\$666.471m	\$1248.604m	7.3%
1989	\$729.836m	\$1299.319m	7.1%
1990	\$770.780m	\$1338.593m	8.3%
1991	\$802.384m	\$1368.443m	5.3%
1992	\$838.778m	\$1379.233m	1.9%
1993	\$898.145m	\$1500.881m	1.1%
1994		\$1542.004m	1.8%
1995		\$1585.333m	3.2%

Source: 1974-1981 Australian Bureau of Statistics: *Year Book Australia*, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, & 1984

1985-1995 McKinnon, K. 1995 *Discussion Paper: Review of the New Schools Policy*. & McKinnon, K. 1996 *Final Report: Review of the New Schools Policy*. DEET Canberra.

Inflation Rate: AMP Australia, data bank, in financial years.

NB. Missing data unavailable due to change in financial presentation in ABS yearbooks in 1983

Table H.4
 Apparent Retention Rates of Secondary Schools Students to Year 12, Category of
 School, Australia, Selected Years 1967 -1994
 (per cent)

Year	Government Schools	Non-Government Schools
1967	18.4	36.3
1971	25.9	46.1
1976	29.6	54
1977	29.7	54.9
1981	28.5	56.9
1986	42.3	67.4
1987	46.8	70.4
1988	51.3	74.9
1989	54.3	76.3
1991	66.9	81.6
1992	73.8	84.7
1993	73.1	84.2
1994	70.6	83.3

Source: Australian Education Council: *Statistical Annex - National Report on Schooling in Australia*
 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1994