

Our concerns are summarised to three main points.

1. Equity. Examples of occasions which did not meet this criterion are:

- Some schools postponed / delayed their test while others did not.
- Curriculum in Queensland does not the national curriculum from which NAPLAN was set.
- Different schools had stricter security around the test (= more stressful for the candidates) than others such as testing in classrooms with posters, rules etc clearly visible compared to testing en-masse in a hall.

2. Narrowing of the curriculum. Examples include:

- Teaching to the test now occurs with many hours of test practice and teaching embedded in schools' calendars and curriculum delivery.
- NAPLAN tests do not tell schools / teachers any information about individuals which have not already been identified by the processes used by the teachers and/or schools. In other words narrowing the curriculum is of no real benefit to schools or teachers other than a general overview of the whole cohort. It is done for the benefit of the test implementers whom should recognize that this is NAPLAN's main purpose.

3. Simplistic (and thus unfair) reporting and comparison of schools.

- NAPLAN results to date have simply been a measure of the skills and ability of the student and not a measure of the quality of teaching.
- Results which show how much a school 'improves' its intake of students is a better measure of school or teacher quality.