

Review of the loading for students with disability 2019–public submission

St John's Regional College, Dandenong

Stakeholder type: Principal

Jurisdiction: Victoria

Summary

Response to Question 1:

- comparison of primary to secondary sector within the top three levels is disadvantageous for the secondary setting.
- confusion over criteria within the definitions of the top three levels.
- uncertainty regarding the funding loadings within the top three levels
- relevance of Extensive category to mainstream educational settings, particularly secondary when alternative pathways are often sought in higher years of schooling
- System encourages adjustments in order to play the “funding game” in order to meet the NCCD 20% of school population suggested.

Submission

Questions

Given NCCD process is in its 5th year, why is it that some government primary schools do not place students on the NCCD data?

- inaccurate or incomplete transition data makes it difficult for the secondary setting when trying to meet the needs of the students i.e. without clear identification of previous adjustments
- time involved in the NCCD process
- does this process need to be undertaken annually given outcomes from assessments e.g. Cognitive /WISC stand for 18 months -2 years?
- continued clarity and examples needed for more accurate identification of students
- assessments are required to move students to a higher level of the NCCD; this is restricted by new demands of LDL to have a USER B code in order to undertake assessments
- outsourcing of assessments is costly and could be covered by NCCD funding
- according to National School Resource Board 2018, loadings for students with a disability as a percentage of the base per student amount is less for Secondary students than Primary in top three areas.
- large number of QDTP students but no financial benefit.
- teachers hesitancy to “Impute” a disability and lack of official diagnosis impacts on schools ability to place students on NCCD