

# The 2012 Federal Budget: implications for public schools

---

**Dr Jim McMorrow**

The Rudd and Gillard Labor governments have been responsible for a number of significant reforms over a range of important policy areas, including: financial and fiscal crisis management; national health funding; parental leave; disability insurance; and aged care.

In relation to schooling, reform has so far been confined to a number of areas, some of which remain contested, including: school reporting through MySchool; tentative steps towards a national curriculum; development of national teaching standards and related rewards for outstanding teachers; school buildings; laptops for senior students; trade training centres in secondary schools; and promotion of devolution of greater responsibility for school management to school leaders.

But reform of the underlying Commonwealth funding arrangements for government and non-government schools remains an intractable, and divisive, policy issue. In 2010, the Government initiated a review chaired by David Gonski to develop transparent, fair and financially sustainable funding arrangements for schools to promote excellent educational outcomes for all Australian students. The report was given to the Government in December 2011 and released publicly in February 2012.

There is no clue within the 2012 Budget allocations, however, of the Government's commitment to implementing the Gonski review or the remedies it recommends.

This uncertainty about future funding policy is evident from the financial decisions and projections outlined in the 2012 Commonwealth Budget for schools.

Table 1 below outlines the Budget's outlays, estimates and projections over the Budget period, from the reporting of actual spending on schools for the financial year 2011-12 through to projected expenditure in 2015-16.

Table 1

**Commonwealth Budget for Schools  
2012**

|                           | Actual          | Estimates       |                 | Projections     |                 | <i>Total 2012-13 to<br/>2015-16</i> | <i>Change 2011-12 to<br/>2015-16</i> |            |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
|                           | 2011-12         | 2012-13         | 2013-14         | 2014-15         | 2015-16         |                                     | \$m                                  | %          |
|                           | \$m             | \$m             | \$m             | \$m             | \$m             |                                     | \$m                                  | %          |
| government schools        | \$4,574         | \$4,561         | \$4,510         | \$4,777         | \$4,939         | \$18,787                            | \$365                                | 8%         |
| non-government schools    | \$7,734         | \$8,311         | \$8,977         | \$9,691         | \$10,457        | \$37,436                            | \$2,723                              | 35%        |
| schools: specific funding | \$1,940         | \$1,522         | \$738           | \$713           | \$1,396         | \$4,369                             | -\$544                               | -28%       |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>\$14,248</b> | <b>\$14,394</b> | <b>\$14,225</b> | <b>\$15,181</b> | <b>\$16,792</b> | <b>\$60,592</b>                     | <b>\$2,544</b>                       | <b>18%</b> |

Source: Budget Paper No. 1 2012, Statement 6, Table 7

Note that the figures in Table 1 include a 'specific funding' line that incorporates Commonwealth commitments for National Partnership programs and - programs administered directly by the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR).

A more complete account of the ongoing impact of Commonwealth funding trends over the budget period is provided in Table 2, which distributes the specific funding line in Table 1 across the sectors<sup>1</sup>.

Table 2 also excludes the final year allocation of \$406 million of the Building the Education Revolution (BER) program in 2011-12, so as to avoid any distortion in comparisons over the Budget years. The BER funding was introduced as a one-off injection of moneys to ameliorate the economic effects of the Global Financial Crisis.

These adjustments provide a clearer picture of the Budget's funding policy priorities and commitments across the government and non-government sectors.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Budget Paper No. 1, Statement 6, Table 7 and the supplementary tables in the appendix to this paper.

Table 2

**Commonwealth Budget for Schools 2011**

|                        | Actual        | Estimates     |               | Projections   |               | Change 2011-12 to 2015-16 |     |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----|
|                        | 2011-12       | 2012-13       | 2013-14       | 2014-15       | 2015-16       | 2011-12 to 2015-16        |     |
|                        | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m                       | %   |
| government schools     | 5,690         | 5,574         | 4,986         | 5,243         | 5,841         | 151                       | 3%  |
| non-government schools | 8,153         | 8,820         | 9,239         | 9,938         | 10,951        | 2,798                     | 34% |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>13,842</b> | <b>14,394</b> | <b>14,225</b> | <b>15,181</b> | <b>16,792</b> | 2,950                     | 21% |
| % government schools   | 41%           | 39%           | 35%           | 35%           | 35%           |                           |     |

Source: Budget Papers No. 1 Table 7 and No.3 Table 2.5; DEEWR Budget Statement Table 2.2.3

Note: differences due to rounding

The amounts in Table 2 are expressed in money terms, with estimated and projected increases resulting from continued growth in enrolments in both sectors, but with an assumed higher rate of enrolment growth in non-government schools, and from annual indexation based on average government school recurrent costs (AGSRC). As the Budget papers note, this yields a rate of indexation well above trends in the Consumer Price Index<sup>2</sup>.

A more accurate picture of the impact of Commonwealth budget decisions is provided by a presentation of those decisions in real terms, that is by adjusting the budget amounts for estimated increases in the price of schooling. Table 3 below presents an estimate of the changes in Commonwealth funding for government and non-government schools in real terms, based on trends in the wages and salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff, and in the cost of teaching materials and other non-salary resources for schools.

**Table 3 indicates that Commonwealth funding for government schools is projected to *decrease* in real terms for each of the financial years from 2011-12 to 2014-15. Commonwealth funding then increases in 2015-16 due to the re-introduction of some National Partnership programs. The overall effect is that government schools would receive \$673 million less in real terms in 2015-16 than they received in 2011-12, a cut of 12 per cent.**

This reduction in Commonwealth funding for government schools is due mainly to the winding-down or cancellation of national partnership programs and a number of DEEWR - administered programs<sup>3</sup>. Government schools have received more than their enrolment share of funding these programs, especially those targeting schools and students with higher concentrations of socio-economic disadvantaged backgrounds and need for more intensive literacy and numeracy support. These are the schools and students that are therefore harder hit by the Budget's changes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Budget Paper no. 1, pages 6-18 and 6-19; see also the report on the current National Education Agreement in the DEEWR Budget Statement, page 57.

<sup>3</sup> See supplementary tables S2 and S3 in the appendix to this paper for an outline of the range of national partnership and administered programs affected by the 2012 Budget.

Table 3

## Commonwealth Budget for Schools 2012

### All Commonwealth funding for schools - estimated constant 2012-13 prices

|                               | Actual        | Estimates     |               | Projections   |               | Change             |      |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|------|
|                               | 2011-12       | 2012-13       | 2013-14       | 2014-15       | 2015-16       | 2011-12 to 2015-16 |      |
|                               | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m                | %    |
| government schools            | 5,903         | 5,574         | 4,805         | 4,871         | 5,230         | -673               | -12% |
| non-government schools        | 8,458         | 8,820         | 8,905         | 9,233         | 9,806         | 1,348              | 15%  |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>14,361</b> | <b>14,394</b> | <b>13,711</b> | <b>14,103</b> | <b>15,036</b> | 642                | 4%   |
| % government schools          | 41%           | 39%           | 35%           | 35%           | 35%           |                    |      |
| Estimated Schools Price Index | 96.39         | 100.00        | 103.75        | 107.64        | 111.68        |                    |      |

Excludes BER funding and allocates specific funding payments across sectors:  
see Table 1

Sources for estimated Schools Price Index:

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Wage Price Index, Cat no 6345.0 December 2011;

Consumer Price Index, Cat no 6401.1, March 2012.

**By contrast, the figures in Table 3 reveal that Commonwealth funding for non-government schools is projected to *increase* in real terms by more than \$1.3 billion. This is a real increase of 15 per cent by 2015-16 for non-government schools over the 2011-12 level.**

These increases for non-government schools arise mainly from the assumptions built into the Budget estimates and projections that preserve and protect the Commonwealth's current funding scheme for non-government schools. In particular, the ongoing indexation of general recurrent grants by annual movements in average government schools recurrent costs (AGSRC) at a level that exceeds increases in the real costs of schooling overcompensates for the non-government sector's share of the budgeted reductions in National Partnership and DEEWR-administered programs.

The projected funding increases for non-government schools would be the equivalent of providing an additional 12,000 publicly-funded teachers for that sector. Non-government schools would also be better placed to use the real increases in Commonwealth funding to offer higher salaries or professional rewards or conditions for the employment and retention of highly-skilled teachers in an increasingly competitive employment market for teachers.

The projected real funding reductions in Commonwealth funding for government schools, on the other hand, amount to the funding equivalent of a loss of almost 7,000 teachers in those schools at a time of projected ongoing growth of enrolments in government schools in the years ahead.

The Budget papers attempt to justify the reductions in National Partnership and other specific funding programs as being expenses that '...by their nature are time limited'<sup>4</sup>. The papers go on to refer to other increases as if the National Partnership moneys are not meant to be counted. But it is the case that the funding provided by these programs have assisted schools, especially those with concentrations of students with special needs, to provide additional staff and school programs for the benefit of their students and communities. Formal evaluation of programs is in progress, with a view to advising governments on their sustainability and possible extension. From the point of view of schools and their teachers and students, the 'withdrawal' and 'winding down' of these programs are real and certainly more than accounting adjustments.

---

<sup>4</sup> Budget Paper No. 1 2012, page 6-18.



Some of the increase in Commonwealth funding for non-government schools arises from the estimated higher rate of enrolment growth in that sector. But, as can be seen from Table 4 below, even when funding is expressed in per student terms the differential effects of Commonwealth budget decisions on government and non-government schools remain.

**By 2015-16, as the figures in Table 4 reveal, Commonwealth funding for each student in a government school is projected to *decline* in real terms by \$385, or 16 per cent, against the amount received in 2011-12; while funding for each student in a non-government school is projected to *increase* by \$495, or 7 per cent, over the same period.**

Table 4

## Commonwealth Budget for Schools 2012

### All Commonwealth per student funding for schools -estimated constant 2011-12 prices

|                             | Actual           | Estimates        |                  | Projections      |                  | Change             |      |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------|
|                             | 2011-12          | 2012-13          | 2013-14          | 2014-15          | 2015-16          | 2011-12 to 2015-16 |      |
|                             | \$               | \$               | \$               | \$               | \$               | \$                 | %    |
| government schools          | 2,578            | 2,420            | 2,067            | 2,067            | 2,193            | -385               | -16% |
| non-government schools      | 6,967            | 7,148            | 7,079            | 7,185            | 7,463            | 495                | 7%   |
| <b>Projected enrolments</b> |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                    |      |
| government schools          | 2,289,759        | 2,303,000        | 2,325,000        | 2,356,000        | 2,385,000        |                    |      |
| non-government schools      | 1,214,000        | 1,234,000        | 1,258,000        | 1,285,000        | 1,314,000        |                    |      |
| <b>all students</b>         | <b>3,503,759</b> | <b>3,537,000</b> | <b>3,583,000</b> | <b>3,641,000</b> | <b>3,699,000</b> |                    |      |
| % government schools        | 65%              | 65%              | 65%              | 65%              | 64%              |                    |      |

# Implications

---

## *Gonski*

The Commonwealth has produced a budget that encapsulates the very problems identified by the Gonski review; and that demonstrates the urgent need for the reforms proposed by that review.

As noted in the above text and tables, the key drivers of the trends in Commonwealth spending on schools revealed in the 2012 Budget are:

- Real increases in both total and per student funding arising from the annual indexation of recurrent grants through the application of the AGSRC measure.
- Changes in Commonwealth funding for National Partnership and other DEEWR-administered programs<sup>5</sup>:
- Estimated increases in student enrolments, but with a higher rate of growth in non-government schools, resulting in average annual increases over the Budget period.

The increases arising from AGSRC indexation and the changes in National Partnership and administered programs are at odds with the recommendations of the Gonski review panel.

*AGSRC:* The 2012 Budget's ongoing assumptions around AGSRC indexation would, if Gonski continued to be ignored, extend the inequity of applying such increases to all schools regardless of relative need. A better approach, as recommended by Gonski, would be to protect the value of the Commonwealth's investment in schooling through an inflation measure more directly relevant to schools' cost patterns; and to target real increases through differential loadings for schools with different patterns of student and school characteristics, such as school size and location, socio-economic status, limited English language proficiency, indigenous backgrounds and student disability.

*Categorical programs:* The Budget's decisions on National Partnership and DEEWR-administered programs illustrate the disruptions to schools and the administrative

---

<sup>5</sup> See Tables S2 and S3 in the appendix

workload created by unstable, clip-on programs. These decisions also send a confusing message to schools about the Commonwealth's priorities.

For example, the Budget papers announce the wind-down over the Budget period of funding for the Digital Education Revolution and the *smarter schools* element of the National Partnerships, including funding for *improving teacher quality, literacy and numeracy* and *low socio-economic status* school communities. Some of these programs may be discussed with the States when the current National Education Agreement concludes, but the Commonwealth's thinking about their future is not revealed in the Budget papers.

Programs directly administered by DEEWR to be reduced or discontinued over the Budget period include: *national Asian languages in schools; school chaplaincy; local schools working together; quality outcomes; online diagnostic tools; Indigenous education; and Teach Next* (the program designed to place 'career-change' professionals into teaching in areas of shortage).

At the same time, a number of National Partnership and DEEWR - administered programs are budgeted to be introduced, extended, or deferred to a later year, including: *empowering local schools; rewards for great teachers; reward for school improvement; maths and science participation; and a national trade cadetship.*

The Gonski report promises a more coordinated, transparent and coherent approach to schools funding, based on a national schools resource standard that would replace the range of specific programs provided by all governments. This kind of approach would end the confusing trends evident in the current Commonwealth Budget and provide more coherence and certainty for schools and systems, particularly in the government sector.

*School funding reform:* The Commonwealth Minister has indicated that his Government is aiming to introduce legislation on schools funding later in 2012<sup>6</sup>. The only Budget item relevant to this commitment is the provision of \$5.8 million over the next two years for further work on validating and refining elements of the Review's recommendations, and to support stakeholder consultations<sup>7</sup>.

The Minister's statement and the Budget allocation for ongoing work provide some hope that the Government will meet the high level of expectations in the education

---

<sup>6</sup> Peter Garrett, Media release and transcript, 5 April 2012.

<sup>7</sup> Budget Papers No. 1, page 6-20 and No. 2, page 119.

community that the Gonski recommendations will be met before the end of the current funding period in 2013. Legislation would need to be in place by late 2012 to give schools and systems time to adjust to any changes in funding conditions.

Central to the Gonski panel's proposed funding framework is the construction of a national approach to providing the resources schools need against an agreed resources standard. This would require State governments to complement the Commonwealth's funding contribution with additional funding from State sources.

This is one of the most significant but difficult issues entailed in the implementation of the Gonski recommendations, which will require sensitive and sustained negotiations with the States. But this should not preclude the Commonwealth from taking action to demonstrate its own commitment to real reform.

### *Budget contradictions*

The 2012 Budget also presents a number of policy contradictions.

Three examples:

- Over \$400 million has been projected for phase two of the National Partnership on *empowering local schools* program in 2015-16. This program '...aims to empower participating schools to make decisions at a local level.'<sup>8</sup>
  - This funding is available to government, Catholic and independent schools, raising the obvious question of why non-government schools that are already 'empowered' to make decisions at a school level would require public resources for this purpose.
  - The papers also note that funding for this program in 2011-12 was provided for non-government schools only in Western Australia. This reflects the refusal of the WA Government to accept the \$5 million originally offered on the grounds that the State was already operating 'independent public schools'<sup>9</sup>. Catholic and independent school authorities, however, have accepted the money, which appear to be supporting such costs as '*travelling to conferences*', '*improving access to data*' and '*reviewing governance, infrastructure planning and community engagement*'<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Budget Paper No. 3 2012, page 60.

<sup>9</sup> 'Schools miss out on funding', *The West Australian*, 23 April 2012.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

- While Government funding is provided to universities to support students from disadvantaged backgrounds to participate successfully in higher education, programs designed to support such students to succeed in schooling are being withdrawn.
- The Government has made a clear commitment to the non-government sector that no school will 'lose a dollar' in the context of the Gonski review of schools funding. The current Budget allocations reflect this assurance. But it is clear from the above tables drawn from the Budget that there is no comparable commitment for government schools.
  - It appears from the 2012 Budget allocations that it is only students in government schools who are being asked to 'make a contribution' to the Budget surplus, while at the same time non-government schools are being protected against making a similar offering.

These examples are more than mere foibles. They present a confusing 'narrative' about the design of government policy priorities and contribute to a continuing loss of confidence in the strength of the Government's commitment to public education.

### *Responsibility for reform*

From the standpoint of public education, the 2012 Budget perpetuates a funding pattern based on the policy directions of the former Howard Government. Its key drivers are those established by the elements of the Howard Government's funding scheme for non-government schools; a scheme that has been widely criticised, including by the Minister, as being inequitable and dysfunctional<sup>1112</sup>.

The Howard Government's funding scheme has been in place since 2001. Its extension to 2013 – and at least to 2016 if the current Budget allocations were to be realised – means that a whole generation of students has experienced the inequities of that scheme.

In a sense, the delay in providing a government response to the Gonski recommendations is unsurprising. Schools funding arrangements are extraordinarily difficult to change, either where the funding structures are fundamentally sound and widely supported or where, as in this case, they are so flawed that it is difficult to know where to begin any reforms.

---

<sup>11</sup> Justine Ferrari interview with Peter Garrett, 'Axe to fall on school funds deal', *The Australian*, 27 April 2011.

<sup>12</sup> See also the criticisms in the Gonski report, *Review of Funding for Schooling*, pp 53, 70, and 85.

It is also the case that it is notoriously difficult to construct funding policy formulae for the complex array of independent schools with their widely different educational, financial and community characteristics. As was the case in previous attempts at funding reform, complaints and concerns from the independent sector about the complexity of financial modelling for their schools threaten the course of relevant legislation, guidelines and administrative arrangements<sup>13</sup>.

Such complexities do not apply to the same extent in relation to systemic schools, despite the difficulties in current negotiations between the Commonwealth and the States over funding responsibilities. It would be perfectly appropriate for the Commonwealth to commit its funding for government schools and, as is the case with the current round of National Agreements, to require the States to meet agreed accountability outcomes as a condition for that funding.

An optimist's view of the 2012 Budget would be that the Government is continuing its modelling and consultations, that legislation has been promised for later this year, and that the winding-down of categorical programs might be a 'clearing of the decks' prior to the introduction of the kind of cohesive, transparent and coordinated schools funding arrangements recommended by the Gonski panel.

In Australia's federal system, the responsibility for schooling remains with the States and Territories. The ways in which the Commonwealth has exercised its option to become a funding partner in schools, government and non-government, have led to most of the problems and inequities identified by the Government itself and confirmed by the evidence and argument presented by the Gonski report.

The primary obligation for the reforms needed in the interests of quality and equity in schools funding lies with the Commonwealth. The current Labor Government has recognised this through its decision to set up the Gonski review.

The 2012 Commonwealth Budget would therefore have to be the last time that schools funding estimates and projections continue to place government schools in a lesser, and precarious, financial position.

The benefit of the doubt about the Government's intentions for these schools cannot be extended beyond the next Budget. That next Budget will need to provide the funding authorised by new legislation for the funding of all schools that rectifies the current flaws and that positions the Commonwealth as a mature and responsible partner in financing public schooling of the highest quality.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ruth Callaghan, 'Gonski momentum slows', *Education Review*, May 2012, page 12.

# Supplementary Tables

---



Table S1

**Budget 2012: National Specific Purpose Payments**

|                        | 2011-12       | 2012-13       | 2013-14       | 2014-15       | 2015-16       | Increase<br>2011-12 to 2015-<br>16 |     |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----|
|                        | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m           | \$m                                | %   |
| government schools     | 3,756         | 4,005         | 4,284         | 4,603         | 4,939         | 1,183                              | 32% |
| non-government schools | 7,588         | 8,183         | 8,841         | 9,558         | 10,330        | 2,743                              | 36% |
| <b>all schools</b>     | <b>11,344</b> | <b>12,188</b> | <b>13,125</b> | <b>14,161</b> | <b>15,269</b> | 3,926                              | 35% |
| % govt schools         | 33%           | 33%           | 33%           | 33%           | 32%           |                                    |     |

Sources:

Budget Paper No. 3 2012, Table 2.5

Department of the Treasury Budget Statements 2012, Table 2.7

Table S2

### Commonwealth Budget for schools 2012: National Partnership Payments

| Programs   | 2011-12        | 2012-13        | 2013-14      | 2014-15      | 2015-16        | Change        |
|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
|  | \$m            | \$m            | \$m          | \$m          | \$m            | \$m           |
| Closing the gap in the NT                                | 45.3           | 0.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -45.3         |
| Digital Education Revolution                             | 200.0          | 200.0          | nfp          | nfp          | nfp            | -200.0        |
| East Kimberley Development                               | 16.8           | 4.2            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -16.8         |
| Empowering local schools                                 | 57.2           | 0.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 403.4          | 346.2         |
| Fort Street noise insulation                             | 7.5            | 0.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -7.5          |
| Helping our kids understand finance/ money smart schools | 1.0            | 1.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -1.0          |
| NT schools   | 45.3           | 0.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -45.3         |
| Solar schools  | 41.0           | 45.7           | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -41.0         |
| Rewards for great teachers                               | 50.0           | 10.0           | 40.0         | 125.0        | 250.0          | 200.0         |
| Reward for school improvement                            | 10.0           | 10.0           | 9.0          | 30.6         | 61.3           | 51.3          |
| School pathways  | 1.9            | 1.7            | 1.3          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -1.9          |
| Secure schools   | 5.7            | 5.0            | 5.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -5.7          |
| Smarter schools  |                |                |              |              |                |               |
| teacher quality  | 235.6          | 193.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -235.6        |
| literacy/numeracy  | 211.5          | 0.0            | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0            | -211.5        |
| low SES school communities                               | 371.0          | 362.9          | 225.8        | 174.0        | 0.0            | -371.0        |
| students with disabilities                               | 78.7           | 78.7           | 39.2         | 0.0          | 0.0            | -78.7         |
| Trade Training Centres in Schools                        | 270.4          | 181.9          | 126.1        | 253.9        | 375.7          | 105.3         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>1,648.9</b> | <b>1,138.8</b> | <b>446.4</b> | <b>583.5</b> | <b>1,090.4</b> | <b>-558.5</b> |

Source: Budget Paper No. 3

Table 2.5

Excludes early childhood education funding and the Building the Education Revolution program

Table S3

## Commonwealth Budget for schools 2012: Administered programs

| Programs                         | 2011-12      | 2012-13      | 2013-14      | 2014-15      | 2015-16      | Change                    |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
|                                  | \$m          | \$m          | \$m          | \$m          | \$m          | 2011-12 to 2015-16<br>\$m |
| Teach Next                       | 4.3          | 5.2          | 4.4          | 2.0          | 0.0          | -4.3                      |
| National Trade Cadetship         | 0.0          | 3.1          | 12.5         | 12.5         | 12.5         | 12.5                      |
| Online Diagnostic Tools          | 14.9         | 10.0         | 9.7          | 9.7          | 9.7          | -5.2                      |
| Australian Baccalaureate         | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 2.7          | 2.7                       |
| Indigenous Ranger Cadetships     | 0.9          | 1.3          | 0.8          | 0.0          | 0.0          | -0.9                      |
| Asian languages in schools       | 4.6          | 0.5          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | -4.6                      |
| Grants and Awards                | 4.1          | 4.1          | 4.1          | 4.2          | 4.3          | 0.1                       |
| School Chaplaincy program        | 74.0         | 74.0         | 74.0         | 0.0          | 0.0          | -74.0                     |
| Children with Autism             | 5.4          | 5.4          | 5.5          | 5.6          | 5.8          | 0.4                       |
| Quality Outcomes                 | 50.5         | 58.5         | 48.0         | 40.1         | 37.0         | -13.5                     |
| Open Learning                    | 8.9          | 3.0          | 3.6          | 3.7          | 3.8          | -5.1                      |
| Local schools working together   | 10.0         | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | -10.0                     |
| Student resilience and wellbeing | 1.9          | 1.2          | 1.1          | 1.7          | 6.2          | 4.3                       |
| <i>Review of School Funding</i>  | <i>0.0</i>   | <i>4.8</i>   | <i>0.6</i>   | <i>0.0</i>   | <i>0.0</i>   | <i>0.0</i>                |
| One laptop per child             | 11.7         | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | 0.0          | -11.7                     |
| Maths and science participation  | 0.0          | 3.1          | 4.7          | 4.7          | 4.5          | 4.5                       |
| Indigenous education             | 48.8         | 30.8         | 30.9         | 31.0         | 31.0         | -17.7                     |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>240.0</b> | <b>205.1</b> | <b>200.0</b> | <b>115.3</b> | <b>117.5</b> | <b>-122.5</b>             |

Source: DEEWR Budget Statement, Tables 2.2.3 and 2.2.6