

Home School Liaison Program evaluation: Technical appendices

Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation

March 2026

Contents

Appendices.....	3
Appendix A HSLO statement of duties	3
Appendix B AAO role description.....	4
Primary purpose of the role.....	4
Key accountabilities.....	4
Key challenges.....	4
Appendix C Recommendation elements and rationale	5
Appendix D HSLO survey	23
Survey items.....	23
Appendix E AAO survey.....	26
Survey items.....	26
Appendix F Outcomes evaluation data analysis.....	29
Overview and model description	29
Model results	30
Exploring the propensity score matching approach	31
Appendix G Qualitative data collection.....	33
Home School Liaison Officers (HSLOs).....	34
Aboriginal Attendance Officers (AAOs).....	34
School leadership.....	34
Directors, Educational Leadership (DELs)	35
Program managers (LWO/LWAs)	35
Learning Wellbeing Coordinators (LWCs)	36
Attendance Policy staff.....	37
Delivery Support staff	37
Appendix H Interview and focus group guides	38
HSLO interview and AAO focus group guide.....	38
HSLO focus group guide.....	40
AAO workshop overview.....	40
School leader interview and DEL focus group guide.....	41
PM, LWA, LWC focus group guide	42
Appendix I LWO statement of duties.....	45
Appendix J HSLO and AAO duties to support school practices that promote regular attendance.....	46
Appendix K Professional learning modules.....	47
Attendance specific modules	47
Other online modules.....	48

Appendices

Appendix A HSLO statement of duties

The following list of duties are specified in the HSLO statement of duties (2023).

Home School Liaison Officers:

- monitor student attendance by conducting regular roll checks, identifying areas for development and emerging issues
- collaborate with schools in the review, development and implementation of strategies to improve and promote attendance as an alternative to the Home School Liaison Program
- collaborate with relevant parties in the development of student attendance improvement plans consistent with timeframes for non-attendance and ensure processes and timelines are met in relation to non-enrolment and EDU matters
- document Home School Liaison Program casework and actions for accurate record keeping and analysis using the HSLP Attendance Reporting Tool (HART) system
- organise attendance meetings and conferences with parents, students and school staff and/or compile supporting documentation to ensure correct procedures are followed, if legal resolution is required
- liaise with government and non-government agencies and participate in operations to improve attendance

Appendix B AAO role description

The following excerpts regarding the Aboriginal Attendance Officer (AAO) role duties are taken from the role-specific sections of the AAO role description (2020).

Primary purpose of the role

The Aboriginal Attendance Support Officer role is to create the connection between Aboriginal students, parents, schools and agencies so the student has the best possible chance of re-engaging in their education with the promise of a better future. Aboriginal Attendance Support Officers work strategically to assist schools with meeting agreed attendance targets, and operate as part of the state-wide attendance program to achieve organisational objectives and align with government priorities.

Key accountabilities

- Supporting the implementation of the Aboriginal Education Policy.
- Build and maintain professional relationships and provide strategic and operational advice on attendance matters.
- Provide high level information to colleagues, internal and external stakeholders and external agencies, facilitate regular stakeholder meetings, participate in working parties and other discussions to support regular school attendance.
- Utilise advanced information technologies to prepare high level documents, including court briefings and maintain up-to-date case management records.
- Coordinating pro-attendance strategies for re-engagement.

Key challenges

- Managing a case load of up to 15 Aboriginal students with concerning patterns of attendance and supporting vulnerable families within the Aboriginal community.
- Maintaining a high level of understanding of departmental services, legislation, regulatory requirements and policies to ensuring a safe working and learning environment in a consistent manner across the state.
- Maintaining the quality and accuracy of sensitive information within departmental systems.
- Managing a workload with competing commitments. Priorities may require negotiating and reprioritising work to meet tight deadlines.

Appendix C Recommendation elements and rationale

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
Program purpose, delivery and uptake			
4.8.1	Clarify the HSLP purpose and target population	<p>All stakeholder groups identified a core focus of the program as improving attendance. However, we observed some variation in stakeholder understanding of the purpose of the program. Some stakeholders emphasised the child protection role of the program, while others emphasised the importance of building home-school connections, supporting schools and families with attendance, wellbeing, or student engagement.</p> <p>There is also a lack of clear definition of the target student group. This creates challenges for schools in knowing which students to refer, and for HSLOs, AAOs and PMs in making decisions about accepting students onto the program.</p> <p>There also seems to be a tension between prioritising early intervention and being the last line of support for students.</p>	1 10
4.8.1.1	Increase support for older students	<p>Data indicates that the HSLP intervention numbers reduce as students turn 14, which aligns with the moratorium on legal action for children older than 14 years. The Standard Operating Guidelines (SOG) (p. 28) state that after a 4-week intervention with students over 14 years, a school monitoring process should be implemented because a referral to the Children’s Court is not an option. However, in practice, few students over 14 are accepted into the program. The lack of support for older students was raised across all stakeholder groups as an issue to be addressed.</p> <p>The tendency to decline students over 14 years is also driven by the perception that it is more difficult to make an impact and improve attendance with older students due to broader disengagement issues. Allowing selection decisions to be influenced by the moratorium assumes that legal action will be necessary and means that students who may have been responsive to intervention without legal action are denied the opportunity to receive support.</p>	1

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
4.8.1.2	Implement a more robust focus on early intervention	Some HSLOs, AAOs and schools believe that assistance is sought too late for students to receive the most effective support, largely because schools are required to implement a range of strategies before applying, and cases with extremely low attendance rates are prioritised due to limited HSLP staff capacity. Several HSLOs and AAOs considered it critical to engage in more early, proactive intervention, both focusing on primary school students and cases of emerging absenteeism, to enable more effective support before patterns of absenteeism become entrenched and successful intervention is less likely.	1
4.8.2	Extend and strengthen the HSLO and AAO workforce	<p>Various stakeholders commented that the program was currently under-resourced to meet the demands. On average only 12% of students with less than 50% attendance were supported on caseload in 2023. The number of AAOs is also small in relation to the needs: 39% of students referred to the HSLP in 2023 were Aboriginal, yet only 20% of the HSLP frontline workforce comprises identified roles.</p> <p>Additionally, while acceptance rates for referred students are relatively high, we heard that referrals may not always be submitted for students who warrant support due to concerns of rejection; demand for assistance may therefore not be accurately reflected in application data. The workforce could be extended by creating attendance associate (AA) and senior attendance associate (SAA) GSE roles and employing incumbents from allied health and other relevant backgrounds to avoid draining the already depleted teaching workforce and create a multi-disciplinary HSLP workforce.</p>	3
4.8.3	Revise the current tiered support framework for attendance	<p>The HSLP lacks a well-articulated intervention framework. We recommend revising and expanding the current tiered support framework for attendance with reference to the Kearney and Graczyk (2013) 3-tiered response to intervention model to include more detailed descriptions of intervention tiers, and the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders. The key features of the model for supporting optimal program delivery are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a focus on early intervention and prevention to limit the development of chronic absenteeism and over time reduce the number of students requiring targeted and individual intervention 	2

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear acceptance criteria, and careful screening of applications to ensure that students are allocated to the correct level of intervention required and to staff with appropriate skills. • careful monitoring of students to ensure that assistance can be provided prior to the development of chronic issues • specified processes to enable timely escalation to the next tier if required • clearly defined responsibilities of all stakeholders at each tier to ensure consistent expectations regarding who takes responsibility for students with chronic low attendance. • schools ultimately assuming responsibility for student attendance, regardless of the intervention tier and attempting to create or maintain strong relationships with students and families, to promote continued school engagement once program assistance concludes • strong collaboration between schools and HSLP staff, and, when necessary, collaboration with other relevant members of the Team Around a School (TAaS) to monitor and support student attendance effectively. 	
4.8.4	Convene more effective recruitment panels with deep understanding of the roles to select the best candidates	Currently HSLO recruitment is done by principals of the schools to which the positions are attached. Since principals have limited involvement in day-to day running of the program, HSLP staff may be better placed to make effective recruitment decisions. Including HSLP staff in recruitment may assist in maintaining program quality, consistency and focus.	3

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
4.8.5	Re-assess the attendance support needs of principal networks at least every 3 years to ensure that HSLP staff are deployed where most needed	Analysis shows a moderate alignment between the number of referrals per network and the number of students in that network with an attendance rate of less than 50% (r=0.68). Interpretation of these results should also consider that the number of referrals does not necessarily capture the complexity of cases and that schools may not submit applications for all relevant students, which would impact the correlation. Because attendance patterns are likely to change over time, attendance support needs should be monitored to ensure that HSLP staff are deployed where they are needed most.	4
4.8.6	Revise the SOG and provide clear, explicit and consistent communication of policies and procedures	The current SOG contains gaps, inconsistencies and areas lacking in detail. It should therefore be revised to clarify the program purpose and target group for intervention and present a more specific and detailed intervention framework. Program policies and procedures should be revised and standardised, with clear delineation of roles, responsibilities, procedures and timeframes; these should then be communicated clearly, explicitly and consistently across all platforms to all stakeholder groups. A revised SOG should contribute greatly towards reducing the variability in service delivery and uptake that currently exists across networks. We recognise that some variability should exist due to contextual needs and influences, but there are many aspects of service delivery that should be uniform. At school and network level, standardised policies and procedures would also make it easier for schools to work with the HSLP and will assist in managing the expectations of school staff and DELs and increasing adherence to correct procedures.	10
Program structure and reporting			
5.6.1	Establish a formal HSLP governance structure	The HSLP has no formal governance structure: no leadership team that oversees the operation and takes overall responsibility for the HSLP, including finance, risk assessment, monitoring, and reporting. Although there is a SOG which identifies roles and responsibilities, there is no oversight one step removed from daily program operations to ensure effective and efficient functioning.	5

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
5.6.2	Create a chief education officer (CEO) role responsible for overseeing the HSLP delivery	There is no central line management of HSLOs and AAOs. A CEO role responsible for operationalising program delivery of the HSLP, would contribute to improving consistency and quality of program delivery and align the HSLP structure with other programs in the Student Wellbeing Support directorate.	6
5.6.3	Delegate completion and approval of HSLO PDPs to LWOs	HSLOs report to a program manager (PM) for supervision of their day-to-day attendance work, but report to the base school principal for functional matters such as performance management, travel and leave. Although few HSLOs mentioned significant issues with the reporting lines on a day-to-day basis, they noted many principals would not fully understand their role. Several LWOs and some DELS also indicated that this is especially problematic in cases of HSLO underperformance as the principal does not have in depth knowledge of the daily HSLO duties despite being responsible for performance management.	7
5.6.4	Revise LWO role descriptions to ensure alignment with the work undertaken	The HSLP is not the primary function of the LWO role, and the role descriptions do not capture the full extent of the work they do. The LWO role description briefly mentions attendance but does not capture the supervision of HSLOs and AAOs. HSLO and AAO supervision requires considerable investment of time and effort from LWOs which does not seem to be accounted for in either the role conceptualisation or workload.	7
5.6.5	Reduce duplicate HSLO and AAO reporting lines to multiple PMs	Some HSLOs report to multiple PMs across networks and the allocation of schools for HSLOs and their respective PMs may not align. This can contribute to inconsistency within the program as PMs often operate differently and have different expectations of HSLOs/AAOs. It also creates an additional administrative burden as HSLOs and AAOs have meetings with each PM they work with.	7

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
5.6.6	Increase attendance expertise of program managers to improve the quality of HSLO supervision	Only a portion of the LWO/LWA role is dedicated to the HSLP, which limits the time PMs can dedicate to the HSLP component of their role and impacts their ability to focus in depth on the program and supervision of HSLOs/AAOs. Consequently HSLOs/AAOs may have a deeper understanding of the HSLP than their supervisor. This is challenging both for the LWOs, who feel the burden of not being able to supervise their staff effectively and for the HSLOs and AAOs, who feel like they need to train their supervisors instead of being able to rely on them for support.	7
5.6.7	Provide a career pathway in the HSLP for AAOs	While the HSLOs may be eligible to apply for LWO roles and could potentially progress to LWC roles, AAOs, as GSE staff, do not have that option because they generally do not have the required teaching qualifications or school-based teaching experience. Currently their only option for advancement in the department is to apply for roles outside the HSLP. Failing to provide a suitable career pathway for AAOs could result in a loss of expertise from the program.	3
5.6.8	Revise the HSLP reporting structure	<p>As detailed above, there are several features of the current reporting structure that are not conducive to optimal program delivery. We therefore propose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a chief education officer (CEO) role responsible for overseeing the HSLP delivery. • Creating attendance associate (AA) and senior attendance associate (SAA) roles to expand the HSLP workforce (refer to chapter 4) • Creating a dedicated HSLP administrative team to reduce the administrative burden on HSLOs, AAOs, SAAs and AAs (refer to chapter 6) • HSLOs at the equivalent of clerk level 9/10 and SAAs report to an LWA • HSLOs at the equivalent of a clerk level 7/8 and AAs report to an LWO • AAOs and identified AAs report to an LWO • Streamlining the reporting lines, by dividing HSLOs and AAOs into pods of approximately 4 HSLOs/AAOs from neighbouring principal networks, with each pod managed by a single program manager whose sole focus is on attendance matters 	6

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
HSLO and AAO roles			
6.1.1.1	As per section 4.8.6, revise the SOG and provide clear, explicit and consistent communication of policies and procedures to address the problem of variable service quality and consistency across networks	The HSLO and AAO roles have an extensive scope that is not adequately captured in the SOG. HSLOs and AAOs engage in various activities including casework, proactive contact with families, delivering professional learning (PL) for school staff, and presenting at transition or Parents and Citizens (P&C) meetings. These activities are not well documented in their role descriptions, statement of duties or SOG, which means the full extent of their work is not captured in either the role documentation or HART. Revising the SOG and clearly detailing the roles and responsibilities of HSLP staff should also allow greater role clarity and a more comprehensive account of the HSLO and AAO roles.	10
6.1.2.1	As per section 4.8.2., extending the HSLP workforce will provide additional caseload capacity in the program	Caseload numbers often exceed the recommended limit. In a survey, more than a quarter of the HSLOs indicated a caseload exceeding the stipulated maximum of 30 cases and almost two-thirds (63%) indicated caseloads of more than 25 students. This has implications for HSLO workload, their capacity to support all students in need, and their wellbeing. Employing additional HSLOs, AAOs as well as the proposed AAs and SAAs would increase the caseload capacity in the system.	3
6.1.3.1	Create dedicated HSLP administrative support roles to reduce the administrative burden	HSLOs and AAOs reported having a huge administrative burden. For example, they are expected to record casework details and all their attendance-related activities into HART. However, this is time-consuming and exacerbated by the fact that HART is not a user-friendly system. In addition, following up students registered with NESAs for home schooling, and tracing non-enrolled and EDU students consumes a substantial amount of time but these are largely administrative tasks that do not require attendance expertise and could be delegated. The broad scope of the HSLO and AAO roles means that they do not have sufficient time to do enough proactive work and early intervention with schools and families to prevent chronic absenteeism. Reducing their administrative burden would enable them to focus more on casework and proactive intervention.	6

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
6.2.1	Clarify the purpose and scope of the AAO role	<p>There is a lack of common understanding of the purpose, scope and operation of the AAO role.</p> <p>Currently, AAOs support students assigned to their caseload and engage in non-casework activities. They also support and advise HSLOs working with Aboriginal students. Some AAOs reported having around 200 schools in the assigned 'patch' they cover and felt it was their role to provide support to all those schools. This presents a challenge for AAOs, who acknowledge there are schools in their areas they have never visited due to lack of time. However, an executive explained that the perception of having to service 200 schools was erroneous and that the AAO role was meant to have a more strategic focus on short-term assignments in schools. Some school leaders also expressed a need for greater clarity about the AAO role.</p>	2 8
6.3.1	Provide additional support for HSLO and AAO wellbeing to prevent burnout and maintain their efficacy	<p>HSLOs and AAOs found their roles to be emotionally and mentally draining due to high workloads, working with complex families with challenging circumstances, and frequent exposure to trauma. They indicated that their work impacted significantly on their wellbeing, and this was compounded when they worked in isolation. Some HSLOs commented that the available support, including the 3 free employee assistance program (EAP) counselling sessions available per consecutive two-year calendar period, are not sufficient to assist them in addressing the challenges to their wellbeing. Additionally, AAOs felt that their transition to GSE staff had negative implications for their wellbeing. While AAOs were dissatisfied with multiple aspects of the transition, one major negative consequence was no longer being entitled to the school holidays. Although they do have some additional leave entitlement over and above the standard 4 weeks' annual leave, they feel that their previous leave entitlements were essential for supporting their wellbeing.</p>	16

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
6.4.1	Support HSLO and AAO wellbeing via a structured peer mentoring and support program	The HSLO and AAO role is seen to be quite isolating, especially for those working in regional areas or offices without other HSLP staff. The opportunity to debrief and network with colleagues is seen as imperative for maintaining HSLO and AAO wellbeing and learning from colleagues' shared understanding of the challenges associated with their roles. Currently peer mentoring opportunities are inconsistent across networks and dependent on individual teams to arrange. A structured program may include a buddy system for new HSLOs, and small group debrief and collaboration sessions to ensure that HSLOs and AAOs have better access to practical support.	16
6.5.1	Consider how feedback from HSLOs and AAOs could be more effectively managed and addressed	<p>HSLOs and AAOs felt that they had no voice regarding the program delivery in general. In addition, AAOs also felt either silenced or unheard in relation to cultural safety matters. They advocated strongly for a forum to address cultural sensitivity issues and insisted that it should not merely play an advisory role, but rather a structure with the power to make changes.</p> <p>A formal process should be created that allows HSLOs and AAOs to table any issues of concern relating to the HSLP. This process should be communicated clearly to staff at all levels: HSLOs and AAOs should be aware of the opportunity for making their voice heard and staff higher up in the hierarchy should be aware of their role in responding to feedback.</p>	9
6.6.1	As per section 4.8.6, revise the SOG and provide clear, explicit and consistent communication of policies and procedures	<p>HSLOs, AAOs and some LWOs find that communication about program policies and procedures is ineffective and there is a great deal of inconsistency in the messaging they receive from different sources. HSLOs and AAOs noted inconsistencies in the SOG compared to other sources of information and commented that the SOG does not always provide sufficient guidance on program processes.</p> <p>Additionally, HSLOs and AAOs reported that most schools need a better understanding of the processes for program application and support. This challenge is further impacted by staff turnover in schools, as HSLOs/AAOs have to spend time building the capacity and HSLP knowledge of new staff. Having clearer and more detailed guidelines could minimise the problem of HSLOs and AAOs having to train new staff because there is adequate documentation available. An additional benefit would be less reliance on word-of-mouth transfer of information to new staff, which also leaves less room for confusion and inconsistency.</p>	10

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
6.7.1	Revise HSLO and AAO conditions of access to departmental vehicles	HSLOs/AAOs feel that availability issues and regulations around use of vehicles make it harder for them to access the vehicles and do their jobs efficiently. For example, they used to be allowed to keep vehicles at home overnight, but now they need to collect them each day, which takes additional time. Lack of easy access to vehicles or wasting time on collecting vehicles has negative implications for school coverage and compounds the existing workload burden.	9
6.8.1	Develop a consistent policy and process for contract renewal	A few HSLOs appear to be in permanent roles, while most are on 3-year contracts. We also spoke to some HSLOs who are on 1-year contracts. This arrangement is very uncertain and adds to the stress they experience in their roles. There also appears to be inconsistency in the renewal of contracts: in some instances, this is a formality, while in others, staff have to reapply for their positions.	3
Cultural safety			
7.5.1	Conduct a cultural safety review of policies and procedures	<p>AAOs felt that the program is culturally unsafe, both for them and for the families they work with because schools did not take prompt action in cases of low Aboriginal student attendance, program timelines are not conducive to cultural safety, navigating the legal processes can be challenging for already vulnerable families, and extensive workloads limit AAOs' ability to work with families in culturally safe ways.</p> <p>We recommend a review of program policies and procedures in consultation with all stakeholder groups and the Aboriginal Education and Communities (AEC) Directorate (or another appropriate body) to improve the cultural safety of the program. The review should also include a review of the AAO role and its associated responsibilities, a career pathway for AAOs, and address the AAOs' request for a forum to address cultural sensitivity issues.</p>	8
7.5.2	Provide cultural supervision by a wellbeing practitioner	AAOs expressed frustration at being supervised by non-Aboriginal program managers, because their proposals for working with Aboriginal students and families in culturally safe ways are often misunderstood, not supported and sometimes overruled. They were also concerned about the lack of insight of non-Indigenous managers into the challenges facing Aboriginal communities and the impact of historical events on their current lives.	7

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
		<p>AAOs also experienced challenges, especially lateral violence, when working off-country. It is often difficult to establish credibility and work effectively with families because they can be regarded as outsiders. We propose that in addition to general PM supervision around HSLP processes and policies, AAOs also access cultural supervision by a specialised Aboriginal wellbeing practitioner to support them in enhancing their overall wellbeing and also with specific strategies for addressing workplace challenges such as lateral violence.</p>	
7.5.3	Provide intensive cultural safety training to all HSLP staff	<p>As noted above, AAOs expressed concern about the lack of cultural safety inherent in the program's ways of operating. Providing intensive cultural safety training for all HSLP staff would better enable them to understand the issues impacting on Aboriginal students and families and ensure they are equipped to manage their interactions in culturally safe ways. This should also reduce some of the cultural load on AAOs to build the capability of other staff and enhance PMs' understanding of the reasoning behind the culturally safe strategies proposed by AAOs. Note: the recently developed Everyone's Business eLearning modules will be important for HSLP stakeholders other than program staff, but some additional specific content may need to be developed to supplement it.</p>	8
7.5.4	Consider compensation options for AAOs' cultural load	<p>Cultural load is recognised as the additional and often invisible responsibilities Aboriginal people have in the workplace for educating their colleagues on cultural matters and racism and representing their cultural group (Australian Public Service Commission, 2023). AAOs report often being called upon to provide advice or assistance with matters pertaining to Aboriginal culture which are not necessarily related to attendance, as well as to build the cultural competence of HSLOs and other colleagues. The AAOs find carrying this cultural load to be a mental and emotional strain.</p> <p>Notably, AAOs have the responsibility for advising and supporting HSLOs with case management of Aboriginal students and families, yet the AAO roles are graded and therefore remunerated lower than some HSLOs, who receive standards-based remuneration under the Teachers in Schools and Related Employees Award (2022). Therefore, it is important to examine the depth and breadth of the AAO role based on the cultural load and complexity involved in their work. This should occur through consideration of a whole-of-government policy around cultural load compensation.</p>	8

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
7.5.5	Engage Elders and community leaders to support Aboriginal families	<p>AAOs identified that navigating the Secretary’s conferences, which are precursors to the legal process, and the legal process associated with low attendance and can be challenging for Aboriginal families. Several HSLOs and AAOs raised concerns about their involvement in the legal process and how it could alienate them from families they work so hard to establish relationships with, because these families view their role as changing from a supportive to a punitive one.</p> <p>A recommendation from AAOs was to identify a pool of Elders and community leaders (ECLs) in each Aboriginal community who could support Aboriginal families at attendance improvement plan (AIP) meetings, Secretary’s conferences and court-ordered conferences, and advocate for culturally appropriate outcomes. Students and/or families could choose their ECL representative, which would give them a sense of empowerment.</p>	8
Program processes			
8.1.5.1	Implement a centralised, online application within the HSLP CRM system	<p>The application process and scope of program support is not universally well understood by schools and other stakeholders, hence HSLOs and AAOs expressed a desire for greater understanding in schools of the program application and support processes. Ultimately, the lack of a clear target group, selection criteria, and well-defined roles and responsibilities creates challenges both for the schools seeking the services and the HSLOs and AAOs delivering them.</p> <p>Additionally, the application process is onerous and inefficient for both HSLOs and schools. The current application form does not require schools to provide sufficient details about the interventions they have implemented. It simply includes a checklist and minimal space for further notes. Additional information about attendance improvement measures implemented by schools would be helpful to HSLOs in their assessment of cases and planning of intervention. Additionally, because data systems are not integrated, program staff are required to search for case history information across platforms, which adds to their administrative burden.</p> <p>A centralised online application would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> allow tracking of student application history across time and locations (for example, if a student moves schools or regions) 	11

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a clearer, single process for schools to follow • allow greater oversight into the number of applications submitted and the related acceptance decisions • provide insights into program demand, patterns, and needs across the various education offices and networks. 	
8.1.5.2	Develop a standardised application review and case allocation process with clear criteria	<p>There are currently several issues with the application review and case allocation processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there is a list of criteria to be considered for case acceptance, they are general guidelines rather than stipulations and they are not applied consistently across networks. • Due to the influence of contextual factors, there is no threshold attendance rate identified for acceptance into the HSLP. • Program acceptance is strongly influenced by HSLO capacity, demand for services and different perceptions about what constitutes an attendance rate that requires intervention; student needs do not always take priority. • Processes for application review and case allocation vary across networks, often without input from HSLOs and AAOs. <p>Although it is not feasible to adopt a uniform approach in all instances, there is room for greater standardisation of criteria and processes to reduce variability. Acceptance decisions should be based on student needs independently of program capacity, which should only be considered once student eligibility for the program has been determined and the case has been triaged. If there is no capacity at the time of application, students should be placed on a waiting list.</p>	11

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
8.1.5.3	Use technology (such as artificial intelligence) to streamline and standardise application processes, with final verification by LWOs in consultation with HSLOs and AAOs	<p>There is variability in processes for accepting and assigning students to caseload across principal networks and decisions are linked to case capacity constraints. To improve consistency in case acceptance decisions, we suggest leveraging technology such as artificial intelligence or machine learning technology. Applications could initially be centrally assessed by a machine learning algorithm based on clearly specified acceptance criteria and weighting for factors such as child protection risks and enabling factors for achieving an improvement in attendance or school engagement. The results of AI screening should be verified by program managers in collaboration with HSLOs/AAOs with reference to their contextual knowledge and experience. Consulting HSLOs and AAOs regarding selection and allocation decisions is important because they have valuable insights that can inform effective decision-making and prevent inefficiencies.</p>	11
8.2.1.1	Review current timeframes based on program data to establish timeframes that allow for case complexities and external factors impacting attendance support	<p>The case management timeframes specified in the SOG are not always responsive to student needs and contextual challenges and do not reflect what occurs in practice. Based on the SOG, improved attendance is expected within the 4-week Attendance Improvement Plan (AIP) period, after which the case is either closed or referred for further action. Despite the specified timeframes, the majority of cases in 2021 took over 4 weeks to close and 24% of accepted non-attendance cases took over a year to complete.</p> <p>Some HSLOs noted that the prescribed timeframes for case management provide a useful benchmark for communicating to families when changes in attendance rates need to occur. However, HSLOs, AAOs, and schools commented that these timeframes can be insufficient for establishing contact with families and developing the relationships necessary to facilitate change, especially in Aboriginal communities. The timeframes also do not account for complex student needs and wait times to access any required external support services.</p>	8 9

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
8.2.2.1	Consider allowing HSLOs to make greater use of home visits and refine risk assessment processes to enable more home visits at the point of need	HSLOs and AAOs view home visits as beneficial for building relationships, making contact when families cannot be reached through other methods like phone or letter, and providing a culturally responsive method of contact for Aboriginal families. Schools also commented on the benefits of having HSLOs perform home visits and acting as a bridge between the home and school when contact could not otherwise be established. The perceived value and effectiveness of the HSLP is viewed by some schools and HSLOs as being diminished by the reduction in timely home visits due to the stringent risk assessment processes. Some HSLOs also expressed frustration with difficulties accessing adequate police support for the specified risk assessment processes. There is a need to balance the safety of HSLOs and AAOs at home visits with the ability to conduct visits in a timely manner to maximise their impact.	9
8.3.1.1	Review the emphasis placed on the legal process as an endpoint of the HSLP	Although the legal process is a useful deterrent for some families, it generally has limited benefits for improving attendance. Many stakeholders consider it ineffective and perceive it as a 'toothless tiger' rather than a deterrent, especially as the consequences of the legal process are often too lenient to lead to behaviour change. The legal process was often seen as contrary to supporting families with addressing the underlying causes of student non-attendance. The moratorium on legal action for students older than 14 also drives program acceptance decisions thereby limiting support to older students. We propose that the legal process should not disproportionately influence the program support offered but should rather exist as a possible escalation point rather than a driver of decision-making.	1
8.3.2.1	Increase the availability of Secretary's Conference conveners by increasing the access to convener training, and consider options for increasing staff in the pool of conveners	At present, many HSLOs and AAOs assist each other by convening Secretary's Conferences for their colleagues. However, HSLOs and program managers noted the challenges with sourcing conveners for their conferences due to the limited availability of trained staff and the voluntary nature of the activity on top of already high workloads. The time commitment for attending and convening conferences is particularly challenging for HSLOs and AAOs in regional areas, given potentially long travel times to conference locations, and the additional difficulties with locating appropriate staff in regional and remote areas.	12

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
		<p>To convene conferences, staff need to have completed relevant training, however, training is not delivered frequently in all areas.</p> <p>To increase the supply of trained conveners we recommend the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making more training available • reallocating the conference convening duties to or sharing the duties with school staff • creating a small number of convener officer roles whose primary duty would be to convene Secretary's and court ordered conferences statewide • outsourcing to externally qualified Family Group Conference Facilitators. 	
Data and systems			
9.1.5.1	Assess the CRM software requirements for HSLP	There was widespread agreement among stakeholders that HART is no longer fit-for-purpose. Reported limitations include slow and time-consuming data entry, and challenges in accurately capturing data. We recommend employing a business analyst with CRM experience to undertake a detailed assessment of stakeholder requirements of a software-based CRM tool for the HSLP and to implement the most fit-for-purpose solution to meet the needs of users.	13
9.1.5.2	Consider how a new or enhanced CRM system for the HSLP can be integrated with other systems used by the department in reporting on aspects of attendance	HART is a standalone tool, not linked to or integrated with other departmental systems dealing with attendance, most notably Scout, CSAW and Sentral. When managing complex cases, staff need access to data beyond what is captured in the HART system to obtain a holistic understanding of students' needs and circumstances that can inform their decisions about intervention. They require comprehensive background data from other platforms, which they are not always able to access. Some staff reported that HART's lack of integration with other systems results in considerable duplication of effort and additional administrative burden. Integration of a new or enhanced CRM system is therefore an important consideration when reviewing the HSLP CRM system.	13

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
9.1.5.3	Create a comprehensive hands-on training program for all staff using the new or improved CRM system, with detailed supporting documentation, and communicate this to all HSLOs and AAOs	We were advised that when HART was initially implemented, a train-the-trainer approach, supported with some documentation, was used to build staff capacity in using the system. However, this change process seems to have been sub-optimal for building sufficient staff capability and current users perceive HART training to be unsatisfactory. We therefore recommend that after enhancing or replacing the current CRM system, comprehensive training be provided, supplemented by detailed supporting documentation.	13
9.2.2.1	Conduct a needs analysis among HSLP staff to determine their data access requirements	Some HSLOs and AAOs reported that they do not always have access to relevant student background data to support effective decision-making regarding selection into the program and case management, especially with complex cases. A needs analysis to determine the data access requirements of HSLP staff is essential to inform decisions about which data systems they need access to.	14
9.2.2.2	Ensure ongoing access for all HSLOs and AAOs to all data necessary for their role, including individual student attendance data from Scout	As noted above, HSLP staff need access to data beyond what is captured in the HART system to obtain a holistic understanding of students' needs and circumstances. HSLOs and AAOs noted they are not always able to access the necessary systems for viewing essential background information on students and families. This adds to the administrative burden and leads to delays as they may need to request access or information from other sources.	14
Professional learning and support			
10.1.1.3	Review and revise the current induction program to provide comprehensive and timely role-specific induction	The current HSLP induction process does not provide sufficient or timely guidance for all levels of HSLP staff. Many HSLOs and AAOs reported that they did not have immediate access to a thorough induction program when they commenced their roles, and essentially either proceeded without much guidance or relied on colleagues for advice. The current induction primarily includes a set of online modules and although staff perceive it as	15

Report section number	Recommendation elements	Rationale	Overarching recommendation
		being useful, it is still not sufficient for their needs. PMs also lack sufficient role-specific induction materials and consequently experienced HSLOs and AAOs often have to assume the responsibility of training incoming PMs.	
10.2.3.1	Deliver ongoing statewide PL with the content and frequency better suited to staff needs	The current ongoing online PL does not meet the needs of HSLOs and AAOs. Most HSLOs and AAOs found the weekly sessions inconveniently timed and the content repetitive, not responsive to their learning needs, and at times provided conflicting information to other sources. They also viewed the PL as not tailored to their levels of experience, and too frequently targeted at new appointees.	15
10.2.3.2	Provide network-based face-to-face PL based on the expressed needs of HSLOs and AAOs	HSLOs and AAOs suggested that rather than frequent statewide PL, they would prefer a greater focus on network-based professional learning that can be better targeted to their needs to reflect the contexts in which they work. There was a general preference for face-to-face PL.	15
10.3.1.1	Facilitate opportunities for HSLOs and AAOs to collaborate with and learn from their colleagues' experience	HSLOs reported that peer mentoring and professional networks are valued forms of support. However, there is a lack of consistent peer mentoring and support opportunities for HSLOs and AAOs. Peer mentoring and networking provides opportunities to collaborate, ask questions, and share knowledge and advice. Some HSLOs regard the advice of colleagues as more beneficial than the current weekly PL sessions as it can incorporate more specific advice related to cases and provides the opportunity to share ideas.	15

Appendix D HSLO survey

A bespoke online survey for HSLOs was developed in Qualtrics, an online survey platform. An invitation email containing an anonymous survey link was administered by departmental email to all HSLOs. As at October 2023 not all HSLO positions were filled: 6 of the 114 positions were vacant, and 3 on offer, meaning that a total of 105 HSLOs received the invitation email.

The survey remained open for 10 days, and a reminder email was sent after 6 days.

A total of 83 complete responses were received when the survey closed, a response rate of 79.1%. Given the survey was distributed via an anonymous link it is not possible to determine which HSLOs responded and specific demographic characteristics other than those asked specifically in the survey. Some non-response may have been due to absence from work (leave, sickness or other causes).

Survey items

The HSLO survey items are displayed in Table i below.

Table i HSLO survey questions

Item	Survey question	Response options
1	Start	
2	How long have you been a HSLO?	Less than 1 year 1 year to less than 2 years 2 years to less than 3 years 3 years or more
3	How many years of teaching experience do you have?	0-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11-20 years 20+ years
4	How many students do you have on your current formal caseload?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 30+
5	The school I am based at is	Metropolitan Regional Remote
6	In the past two weeks, what percentage of your work time was taken up by case management of individual students, as opposed to general duties to support school attendance	Indicate on a slider – 0% to 100%

Item	Survey question	Response options
7	My duties are well balanced between student case management and other activities to support schools	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
8	(Only respondents who answered 'Strongly disagree' or 'Somewhat disagree' to Q7) Would spending more or less time on case management, rather than other required role duties, make you more effective in improving attendance?	More time on case management Less time on case management
9	The mandatory HSLO induction e-learning modules I completed prepared me well for my role	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
10	Overall, I have constructive working relationships with the schools I support	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
10a	(Only respondents who answered 'Strongly disagree' or 'Somewhat disagree' to Q10) What is the main barrier you face in your working relationships with schools?	Communication Staff engagement Time Geographic distance Other (please specify)
11	In my interactions with students or their families I have felt concerned for my health and safety on one or more occasions	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
11a	(Only respondents who answered 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree' to Q11) In my interactions with students or their families, I have felt concerned for my health and safety at:	School visits only Home visits only Both home and school visits
12	Ongoing professional learning provided by the department that is specific to the Home School Liaison Program helps me to be more effective in my role	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
13	The Home School Liaison Program's organisational structure (i.e., the reporting lines, organisation, supervision, distribution of duties and responsibilities) helps me to perform my role effectively	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
14	I believe my work makes a positive difference by helping students improve their attendance	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Item	Survey question	Response options
15	Experience as a teacher is integral to doing the HSLO job effectively	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
16	My duties outside of individual case management (e.g., whole school or network strategic attendance work) make a positive contribution to increasing attendance	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
17	I receive the support I need from the Department to do my job effectively	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
18	Does the Home School Liaison Program address a system need for supporting overall student wellbeing in addition to the program's specific focus on attendance issues?	Yes No
18a	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q18) If 'Yes' to Q18, please specify	Free text

Appendix E AAO survey

A bespoke online survey for AAOs was developed in Qualtrics, an online survey platform. An invitation email containing an anonymous survey link was administered by departmental email to all AAOs. At the time of survey distribution in February 2024, there were 25 AAOs included on the distribution list.

The survey remained open for 1 week, and a reminder email was sent after 4 days.

A total of 16 complete responses were received when the survey closed, a response rate of 64%. Given the survey was distributed via an anonymous link it is not possible to determine which AAOs responded and specific demographic characteristics other than those specifically asked in the survey. Some non-response may have been due to absence from work (leave, sickness or other causes).

Survey items

The AAO survey items are displayed in Table ii below.

Table ii AAO survey questions

Item	Survey question	Response options
1	How long have you been an AAO?	Free text entry of number of years in role
2	The network/s I cover are:	Metropolitan Regional Remote
3	In a typical week, what percentage of your work time was taken up by case management of individual students, as opposed to general duties to support school attendance?	Indicate on a slider – 0% to 100%
4	My duties are well balanced between student case management and other activities to support schools	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
5	(Only respondents who answered 'Strongly disagree' or 'Somewhat disagree' to Q4) Would spending more or less time on case management, rather than other required role duties, make you more effective in improving attendance?	More time on case management Less time on case management
6	What do you see as the current purpose / focus of the AAO role?	Free text entry
7	Would you change the purpose / focus of the AAO role?	Yes No
8	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q7) What do you think the updated purpose / focus of the AAO role should be?	Free text entry

Item	Survey question	Response options
9	Please indicate which of the following non-casework activities you engage in as part of your role (select all that apply):	Proactive contact with families prior to being on caseload School-based AIPs with families Convening Secretary's conferences Activities associated with legal action Community and cultural engagement activities including inter-agency meetings, AECG meetings, school holiday programs, cultural events, etc. Meetings with attendance teams, LWOs, etc. Meetings with other agencies Running PL sessions for staff Attending PL Following up EDU students Checking NESAs databases for students whose home schooling has expired Roll checking Providing data to LWO and LWA for meetings with youth and mental health, school administrative managers, network specialist facilitators, etc. NIPs interviews JATS and Street Sweeps Advising school staff about correct attendance procedures Supporting parents with enrolment processes Speaking at transition meetings with parents (preschool to kindergarten; year 6 to year 7) Talking about attendance at P&C meetings Providing items on attendance for newsletters/websites/Facebook, etc. Other cultural activities (please specify) Other (please specify)
10	Which 3 to 5 non-casework activities do you typically spend most time working on:	Same response options as Q9
11	Which of the following non-casework role activities do you think are the top 3 most beneficial for improving student attendance?	Same response options as Q9
12	Could any of your current role activities be reassigned to other personnel?	Yes No
13	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q12) Select those role activities that could be reassigned to other personnel:	Same response options as Q9
14	Which of the following types of intervention do you think has the largest impact?	Early intervention Supporting emerging attendance concerns Supporting chronic attendance concerns Last resort support Other (please specify)
15	Were you working as an AAO prior to the transition of the role from being school-based to education support staff members?	Yes No

Item	Survey question	Response options
16	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q15) Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: I was satisfied with the transition process of the AAO role from being school-based to education support staff	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
17	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q15) Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: I am satisfied with the end outcome of the AAO role becoming part of the education support staff workforce	Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
18	(Only respondents who answered 'Strongly disagree' or 'Somewhat disagree' to Q16 or Q17) Please indicate the areas of the transition process and/or outcome you are dissatisfied with:	Level of information provided regarding the transition process Level of information provided regarding the implications of the transition Consultation on transition process Changes to working time and leave (e.g. school holidays) Other (please specify)
19	(Only respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q15) Please provide any additional comments you have regarding the transition of the AAO role from being school-based to education support staff	Free text entry
20	Which aspects of the HSLP work well?	Free text entry
21	In addition to the cultural components of your work, are there any other key differences in the work you do as an AAO compared to the HSLOs?	Yes (please provide details) No
22	Is there any distinction in the students you work with on caseload compared to the Aboriginal students that HSLO's work with on their caseloads (e.g. needs, characteristics, etc)?	Yes (please provide details) No
23	Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide for consideration as part of the evaluation of the HSLP?	Free text entry

Appendix F Outcomes evaluation data analysis

Overview and model description

Quantitative analysis for the outcome evaluation of the Home School Liaison Program used a difference-in-differences (DID) approach.

DID is a quasi-experimental design that uses longitudinal data from intervention and control groups. This creates an appropriate counterfactual to estimate a causal effect of a specific intervention by comparing the changes in outcomes over time between the intervention group and a control group.

In this outcome evaluation, the intervention and control groups are, respectively, the cohorts of students accepted into the HSLP and students with similar attendance rates and characteristics but declined entry into the program. The intervention is the HSLP, and the outcomes of interest are pre- and post-HSLP intervention attendance rates.

The assumption in DID estimation is that in the absence of intervention, the unobserved differences between intervention (HSLP) and control (no HSLP) groups will be the same over time. The DID approach removes biases that could be the result of underlying differences between those groups, as well as biases from comparisons over time in the HSLP group that could be the result of trends due to other causes of the outcome.

The attendance rate of student j in period t is defined as:

$$\text{Attendance rate}_{jt} = 1 - \text{Absence rate}_{jt} = 1 - \frac{\text{Number of days absent}_{jt}}{\text{Number of days enrolled}_{jt}}$$

The model fitted was a negative binomial generalised linear model with a log-link, fitted using generalised estimating equations. The negative binomial approach was the most appropriate distribution for absences, which are count data that cannot go below 0. The generalised estimating equations approach gives population-averaged estimates of the program's effect.

This resulted in the following model equation:

$$\hat{Y}_{jt} = \exp\{\beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{GROUP}_{jt} + \beta_2 \times \text{TIME}_{jt} + \beta_3 \times (\text{TIME}_{jt} \times \text{GROUP}_{jt}) + \gamma X_j + \epsilon_{jt}\}$$

where

- \hat{Y}_{jt} is the absence rate of the student j in period t
- GROUP_{jt} is an indicator variable with the value of 1 if the student was accepted onto the HSLP and 0 if the student was excluded
- TIME_{jt} is an indicator variable for the time point, which equals 0 for observations before the start of the HSLP intervention and 1 for observations after the completion of the program
- X_j is a vector of control variable (listed in section 2.4 of the main report)
- ϵ_{jt} is the error term.

The estimate of interest (the impact of the HSLP) is coefficient β_3 .

Given that each student has two observations, one before the HSLP intervention and one after the completion, the appropriate correlation structure is a 2×2 matrix:

$$\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where ρ is the correlation parameter between the two observations from the same student. The same \hat{W} matrix is used to estimate the associated robust standard errors.

Model results

The results of the estimated model are presented in Table iii - Modelled absence rates and attendance rates for accepted students and declined students, where declined students had their attendance examined at the same time point as the accepted student most similar to them. We conducted hypothesis testing on coefficient β_3 that determines if the growth in absence rate for the students accepted into the program was significantly different to the growth for those students who were declined entry to the program.

The β_3 coefficient can be interpreted as the multiplicative difference in the growth of absence rate for accepted students compared to excluded students. For the data in our model, $\beta_3 = -0.096$, so being accepted onto the program leads to an expected growth in absence rate of $\exp(-0.096 \times 1) = 0.908$, whereas being excluded from the program leads to expected growth in absence rate of $\exp(-0.096 \times 0) = 1$. The difference is $0.908 - 1 = -0.092$, which is the reported effect size.

We transformed the results into attendance rates. The multiplicative structure of the attendance rate scale breaks down, but this does not affect the hypothesis testing of the β coefficients. The principle of equivariance ensures that the transform of the maximum likelihood estimator of the parameter is equivalent to the maximum likelihood estimator of the transformed parameter. The delta method can be employed to transform the standard errors while ensuring that they are asymptotically equivalent. For convenience, both original and transformed estimates and standard errors are reported.

Table iii - Modelled absence rates and attendance rates for accepted students and declined students, where declined students had their attendance examined at the same time point as the accepted student most similar to them

Variable	Estimate of absence rate	Robust SE	p-value	Attendance rate (transform)	SE (transform)	[95% confidence interval]	
(Intercept)	0.151	0.186	0.416	-0.163	0.216	0.26	-0.587
Student properties							
Year level	0.029	0.005	0	-0.03	0.005	-0.02	-0.039
Gender (M)	0.004	0.014	0.806	-0.004	0.015	0.025	-0.032
Aboriginality (Y)	0.051	0.016	0.002	-0.052	0.017	-0.018	-0.086
LBOTE (Y)	-0.066	0.026	0.01	0.064	0.024	0.111	0.017
SEA Value	-0.007	0.004	0.059	0.007	0.004	0.014	0
NCCD Adjustment level	0.003	0.006	0.579	-0.003	0.006	0.008	-0.014
School properties							
Level of schooling - Infants	-0.138	0.24	0.566	0.129	0.209	0.539	-0.281
Level of schooling - Primary	-0.086	0.042	0.039	0.082	0.038	0.157	0.007
Level of schooling - SSP	0.038	0.076	0.621	-0.038	0.079	0.116	-0.193

Variable	Estimate of absence rate	Robust SE	p-value	Attendance rate (transform)	SE (transform)	[95% confidence interval]	
Level of schooling - Secondary	0.115	0.041	0.005	-0.122	0.046	-0.031	-0.212
ICSEA	-0.001	0	0	0.001	0	0.001	0.001
School size - student FTE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent LBOTE	-0.001	0	0.093	0.001	0	0.001	0
Percent Aboriginal	-0.003	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.005	0.001
SA1 Remoteness (ARIA++)	0.01	0.006	0.123	-0.01	0.006	0.003	-0.022
Crime rate	0.383	0.156	0.014	-0.467	0.23	-0.017	-0.917
Group	0.073	0.018	0	-0.076	0.02	-0.037	-0.114
Time	-0.1	0.025	0	0.095	0.023	0.139	0.051
Time x Group	-0.096	0.028	0.001	0.092	0.025	0.142	0.042

Exploring the propensity score matching approach

Propensity score matching was explored twice in the process of the outcome evaluation. Firstly, to find similar students to top up the sample of students denied entry to the program to ensure a larger comparison group. When that failed, an attempt at matching was then used as a further method of controlling for minor differences between the two groups.

Propensity score matching to identify similar non-referred students

With only 453 students declined entry to the program in the sample, there was a desire to increase the group's sample size by including similar students who were not referred to the program but had similar low attendance and other relevant characteristics (listed in section 2.4 of the main report), to those that were referred. These students could be deemed to be a plausible comparison group for observations against those accepted into the program. This would improve the precision of the estimates.

A logistic regression was used to model the log odds of being accepted into the program. The log odds produced by this model were used to pair excluded students with accepted students. The same logistic regression was run on the leftover accepted students who had no match and students in the general population. The leftover accepted students were paired with general population students who had the most similar log-likelihood.

While the students were well matched on attendance at the commencement of the HSLP intervention, examining the two groups' attendance trajectories revealed that the non-referred students who were matched were not similar to their accepted peers. We suspect that the volatility of termly attendance could account for this effect. A student might have a decrease in attendance for one term and, on that basis, appear similar to a student referred to the program. However, in a later term, their attendance moves to its natural mean which differs from the attendance of accepted students. This also explains why on an aggregate level the groups are so different to each other. The underlying propensity is not similar to the students in the program.

Any inference about the program using this sample of non-referred students would be biased because their natural move to the mean would be misinterpreted as evidence against the program.

Full propensity score matching for weighting

Given our inability to top up the sample, the only comparison would be between students referred to the program but excluded entry and those referred to the program and accepted. There are far fewer excluded students than accepted students, and we do not wish to drop any accepted students because the effect of the program will hinge upon their attendance. As such, full matching which drops no participants but instead re-weights them is the preferred option.

A logistic regression was run to determine the student's underlying propensity to be accepted to the program. Students in the two groups were weighted based on their estimated log-likelihood.

We used standardised mean differences to examine the balance of the covariate distribution between weighted groups. This statistic showed that weighted groups were not sufficiently balanced. Given that we could already control for confounding variables using regression-based techniques, we considered incorporating weights unnecessary.

Appendix G Qualitative data collection

The qualitative data collection was conducted between November 2023 and February 2024.

Interviews and focus groups were conducted with home school liaison officers (HSLOs), Aboriginal attendance officers (AAOs), learning and wellbeing officers (LWOs), learning and wellbeing advisors (LWAs), learning and wellbeing co-ordinators (LWCs), principals/deputy principals/head teachers (attendance), directors educational leadership (DELs), and members of the policy and delivery teams. Table iv provides an overview of participants and data collection methods and Table v displays participant distribution by SPD, where relevant.

To determine the sample size in each stakeholder group (HSLO, AAOs, LWOs/LWAs, LWCs) a rough guide of 10% was utilised. For all focus groups, participants were assigned to focus group time slots based on availability and group size.

Table iv Overview of the data sources

Data source	Methods	Number
HSLOs	Interviews, focus groups, written submission	12
AAOs	Focus group, interview ¹ , workshop	22
LWOs/LWAs	Focus groups, interview ¹	7
LWCs	Focus group	5
DELs	Focus groups, interview ¹	8
School leadership	Interviews	9
Attendance Policy team	Interviews	3
Delivery Support team	Interviews	5
Other	Interviews	2
Total		73

¹ Interviews were only conducted for indicated stakeholder groups only where participants were unavailable for the scheduled focus group time slots

Home School Liaison Officers (HSLOs)

Interviews

A total of 11 HSLOs participated in individual one-hour interviews conducted via Microsoft Teams. The sample of HSLOs was determined using the base school of the HSLO, noting HSLOs work across numerous schools. Sampling involved grouping HSLOs by school types, School Performance Directorates (SPDs), and ASGS remoteness. Within each group, HSLOs were randomly selected and sent an email inviting them to participate in an interview. The SPD distribution of HSLOs who participated in qualitative data collection is displayed in Table v.

Focus groups

Two focus groups of 5 participants each were conducted to obtain clarity or further detail on key issues raised during the interviews. All HSLOs who participated in the interviews were invited to participate. Prior to the focus groups the evaluation team documented preliminary impressions and findings from the interviews and circulated these to the participants. Focus groups provided the opportunity for HSLOs to comment and/or elaborate on the initial findings.

Aboriginal Attendance Officers (AAOs)

Focus groups and interviews

A sample of AAOs were recruited with the assistance of the Delivery Support Coordinator, Student Wellbeing Support and an AAO regarded as a leader by other AAOs. The Delivery Support Coordinator received advice from the AAO leader regarding a sample of 9 AAOs who may be helpful informants for the evaluation. The evaluation team invited these 9 AAOs to participate. A total of 5 AAOs participated: 4 in a focus group and 1 in an individual interview.

Interview questions investigated the scope of the AAO role, collaboration with other program staff, cultural and community work involved with the role, perceptions of structures and reporting processes, views on casework intervention and overall perceptions of HSLP effectiveness. Refer to Appendix H for further details.

Workshop

All AAOs in the HSLP were invited to participate in a face-to-face professional learning day in February 2024 facilitated by the Student Wellbeing Support Directorate. As part of the program, one 90-minute session was conducted by CESE evaluators. This session was attended by 22 AAOs. The session explored challenges experienced by AAOs and some possible solutions utilising whole group discussion and small group activities. Appendix H contains further information.

School leadership

In November 2023, the evaluation team interviewed a total of 9 principals and school leaders. Most interviews were conducted individually, except for two joint interviews, where two staff members were interviewed together. Most interviews were conducted with principals, though some principals delegated the interview to a member of staff deemed better placed to comment on the HSLP. Participants included 5 principals, 2 deputy principals, 1 head teacher, attendance and 1 teacher responsible for student attendance.

A purposive sample of schools was selected to maximise coverage across SPDs and school types, with consideration given to a school's involvement with the HSLP based on HART case numbers and case type (non-attendance, non-enrolment, etc.). The sample was selected to increase the likelihood that schools would have sufficient knowledge and experience with the HSLP to provide detailed comments and feedback. The distribution of principals and school leaders who participated in qualitative data collection by SPD is displayed in Table v.

Interview questions investigated how the school works with HSLOs and other program staff, perceptions of structures and reporting processes, views on casework intervention, overall perceptions of HSLP effectiveness and suggestions for program improvement. Refer to Appendix H for further details.

Directors, Educational Leadership (DELS)

The evaluation team conducted two focus groups with a total of 7 DELS. Additionally, 1 DEL was interviewed individually due to scheduling difficulties.

DELS from selected principal networks were invited to participate in the focus groups. Principal networks were purposively selected to maximise spread across SPDs. Principal networks were ranked according to number of HSLP cases based on HART data. Within each SPD, a principal network with a high number of HSLP cases was selected, as well as a principal network from a metro, rural, and remote SPD with a low to mid number of cases. The sample was selected to increase the likelihood that DELS would have sufficient knowledge and experience with the HSLP, while trying to encompass any additional variability in program experiences. The distribution of DELS included in qualitative data collection by SPD is displayed in Table v.

Focus group questions investigated how the HSLP operates within principal networks, degree of collaboration with HSLP staff, perceptions of structures and reporting processes, views on casework intervention, and overall perceptions of HSLP effectiveness. Refer to Appendix H for further details.

Program managers (LWO/LWAs)

A total of 7 program managers participated in the evaluation. 5 LWOs and 1 LWA participated in one of two focus groups, and an individual interview was held with 1 LWA.

The sample of program managers was selected at a school level. That is, a sample of schools was selected, and the relevant program manager assigned to each school was invited to participate, noting that program managers work across multiple schools. School selection followed a similar approach to that outlined above to sample DELS. Schools were categorised based on SPD and ranked according to HSLP case numbers. The sample was constructed to include schools with a spread of case numbers within each SPD, specifically including schools with high case numbers within each SPD as well as schools from metro, rural, and remote SPDs with low to mid numbers of cases.

Given low response numbers to the first round of invitations, a second round of sampling was conducted. The second round involved attempting to select a school in a similar geographical region and with similar case numbers to that selected in round 1, for areas where no response had been received. In some instances, a school with similar case numbers in a different geographical region but the same SPD was selected given program managers work across multiple schools (that is despite selecting a different school, the program manager was the same individual, so an alternate selection was required).

Interview and focus group questions for LWOs/LWAs and LWCs investigated how the HSLP operates within principal networks, the degree of collaboration with other HSLP staff, perceptions of structures and reporting processes, views on casework intervention, and overall perceptions of HSLP effectiveness. Refer to Appendix H for further details.

Learning Wellbeing Coordinators (LWCs)

A total of 5 LWCs participated in a focus group. Selection of LWCs was made at a principal network level. That is, a sample of principal networks were selected and the relevant LWC assigned to each principal network was invited to participate. Principal networks were sampled to invite representatives from each SPD, with consideration to also include principal networks with a mix of both high and low HSLP case numbers, and prioritising networks that had not been sampled in previous waves of data collection.

Like the program managers, response numbers were low for the first round of participation invitations, so a second round of sampling was conducted. Again, the second round involved attempting to select a principal network in a similar geographical region and with similar case numbers to that selected in round 1, with some variance required due to LWCs working across multiple principal networks.

Table v Distribution by SPD of participating HSLOs, School leaders, DELs and LWOs/LWAs/LWCs

SPD	HSLOs	School leaders	DELs	LWOs, LWAs, LWCs	N
Metro	6	7	4	3	20
Metro South and West	2	5	2	2	11
Metro South	4	1	1		6
Metro North		1	1	1	3
Regional	3		1	5	9
Regional South	1		1	2	4
Regional North and West	1			2	3
Regional North	1			1	2
Rural	1	1	3	4	9
Rural North		1	2	3	6
Rural South and West	1		1	1	3
Connected Communities	2	1			3
Total	12	9	8	12	41

Attendance Policy staff

Interviews were conducted with program staff in the policy team identified by program owners as key informants of the program. Joint interviews were conducted with the student attendance and educational neglect advisor, and the AAO and HSLO advisor given the overlap in their role duties. An individual interview was conducted with the leader, student participation.

Delivery Support staff

In the delivery team, individual interviews were conducted with key informants in the following roles: specialist program coordinator, team lead delivery support, director delivery support, executive director student wellbeing support.

Appendix H Interview and focus group guides

HSLO interview and AAO focus group guide

The questions and related prompts from the HSLO interview guide are listed below. Similar questions were utilised for both the HSLO interviews and AAO focus groups, and adapted to each role accordingly.

1. How long have you been employed as a HSLO?
2. What do you think is the main purpose of the HSL program?
 - Do you think school staff, families and department staff have a shared understanding of the purpose of the HSLP program?
3. What does a typical week in your role as HSLO look like?
 - What do you spend most of your time on?
 - What is the most rewarding aspect of your role?
 - What is the most challenging aspect of your role?
 - Is there anything about the context of your work (i.e. primary vs high school; regional vs metro) that makes your role harder or easier?
 - How do you find working from a base school?
 - How much time do you spend in the school vs other settings?
4. Could you tell me about the casework versus non-casework aspects of your role?
 - How many students do you have on your current caseload?
 - What percentage of time do you devote to casework versus non casework tasks during a typical week?
 - What do you think makes the biggest impact on student attendance: casework or non-casework activities?
 - What challenges do you experience with non-casework tasks?
5. How effective do you think the case management model is for improving student attendance?
 - Which aspects of the casework model work well?
 - Which aspects of the casework model do not work well?
 - What are your thoughts on the acceptance criteria for casework?
 - Based on your experience, what are some key factors that contribute to successful casework intervention?
 - Is the recommended period of 20 school days sufficient time to see improvements?
 - What are the criteria for case closure? Are the criteria appropriate?
 - What happens with students who are not accepted into the HSLP for casework intervention?
 - Can you tell me about what happens if casework intervention has not led to improvements?

6. Can you describe a recent casework experience to give me an understanding of what it involves?

7. Could you tell me about your experience of using the HART data platform?
 - How user-friendly is the platform?
 - What challenges do you experience when using HART?
 - Could you suggest any improvements to HART? I.e. are there any things that HART either cannot do or does not do well?

8. As a HSLO you report directly to a program manager rather than a principal. How do you find this reporting arrangement?
 - Are the tasks and expectations associated with your role clearly communicated? Are there any areas of ambiguity?

9. Do you have a good understanding of the roles and responsibilities of others involved in the program?
 - Do you work closely with AAOs?
 - What are your working relationships like?
 - What are the similarities and differences in your roles?
 - Do you think school staff, families and department staff understand your role and responsibilities in the program?

10. What skills, experience and personal qualities are most important for being successful in your role?
 - If you were responsible for hiring HSLOs what qualifications, skills, experience and personal qualities would you consider important?
 - Have you found your teaching qualifications and experience useful in your current role?

11. What can you tell me about professional learning and development opportunities available to support you in performing your role?
 - What PL has been most useful in improving your skills and knowledge for your role?
 - Are there any areas in which you feel you need additional PL?
 - Are there any aspects of the PL that have not been useful?

12. What is your overall impression of the HSL Program?
 - Do you think that the program is effective in improving student attendance? Why or why not?
 - If students improve their attendance, is the improvement sustained over time?
 - Do you think that the HSL program meets the needs of schools, students and parents?
 - What could the HSL program do differently or do more of to improve student attendance?
 - Can you think of any benefits of the HSL program other than improving student attendance?
 - Can you think of any negative consequences of the program?

13. To what extent have you been involved in legal action processes for student attendance?

- Can you talk me through your involvement with a legal action process?
- How effective do you think legal intervention is in improving student attendance?
- Do you have any other comments on legal action?

HSLO focus group guide

1. Review of findings from interviews

- Key challenges of the HSLO role
 - Review key challenges and add any additional items to the list
 - List the top 3 issues that are a challenge for you personally or in your network
- Non-casework activities
 - Review activities and supplement list with any additional activities
 - Which 3 activities consume the most time in your schedule
 - Are there any activities you wish you could spend more time on?
- Caseload applications
 - What's working well and what needs to be changed
- Balancing casework and non-casework activities
- Any suggested improvements

2. Review of survey findings

3. Additional comments and areas for clarification.

AAO workshop overview

1. Identifying key challenges in the role

- Large group discussion to identify and review key role challenges of the AAO role. Participants then individually identify their top 3 challenges on the list compiled by the group.

2. Small group activities to explore selected challenges

- Participants are assigned a key challenge (based on activity 1) and in small groups discuss the challenge, noting aspects they find difficult and identify changes that could improve the situation.
- After small group discussions, each group presents summary to wider group, followed by whole group discussion.

3. Closure

- Any final comments that anyone would like to make about the HSLP.

School leader interview and DEL focus group guide

The questions and related prompts from the school leader interviews are listed below. Similar questions were asked of school leaders and DELs, and adapted to each role accordingly.

1. What do you think is the main purpose of the Home School Liaison Program?
 - Do you think everyone involved in the program (HSLOs/AAOs, principals, DELs, other program team members, students, families) has a shared understanding of its purpose?

2. Can you tell me how the Home School Liaison Program operates in your school?
 - How do you work with the HSLO and/or the AAO?
 - How do you work with your DEL in managing attendance issues at your school?
 - Do you think your school is able to make optimal use of the services provided by HSLOs and/or AAOs?
 - Have you had experience working with more than one HSLO or AAO?
 - Is there consistency across HSLOs in the way they operate?
 - Is there consistency across AAOs in the way they operate?

3. What are your thoughts on the application process for HSLO/AAO support?
 - On what do you base your decision to apply for HSLO/AAO support?
 - How appropriate are the acceptance criteria for HSLP support?
 - Are there any changes you would like to see in the application process?
 - To what extent are you satisfied with the outcomes of your applications for HSLO/AAO support? Do you feel you can access program support when you need it?
 - What follow up occurs for students whose applications for case management were not successful?

4. How effective do you think the case management model is for improving student attendance?
 - Which aspects of the casework model work well?
 - What are some key factors that contribute to achieving success in casework intervention?
 - Which aspects of the casework model do not work well?
 - Is the recommended period of 20 school days sufficient time to see improvements in attendance?
 - What happens if casework intervention is unsuccessful?
 - What are the criteria for case closure? Are they appropriate?
 - What follow up occurs after the end of casework intervention?

5. Can you tell me more about the non-casework support HSLOs and AAOs provide at your school?
 - Which non-casework activities work well?
 - Which non-casework activities do not work well?
 - What makes the biggest impact at your school: casework or non-casework activities?

6. What are your thoughts about the roles and structures within the HSL program?
 - Do you have working relationships with staff connected to the HSL program other than HSLOs and AAOs?
 - Do you think everyone involved the program (HSLOs/AAOs, principals, DELs, other program team members, students, families) has a shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities in the program?
 - Are the reporting structures generally efficient and appropriate?
 - More specifically, what do you think of the arrangement whereby HSLOs report to program managers rather than principals?
 - Do program staff have the right skills, experience and personal attributes for their roles?

7. What is your overall impression of the HSL Program?
 - Do you think that the HSL program is effective in improving student attendance? Why or why not?
 - If students improve their attendance, is the improvement sustained over time?
 - Do you think that the HSL program meets the needs of schools, students and parents?
 - What could the HSLP program do differently or do more of to improve student attendance?
 - Can you think of any benefits of the HSL program besides improving student attendance?
 - Can you think of any negative consequences of the program?

8. Have you had any experience with the legal action regarding students' attendance? If so, how effective do you think legal action is in improving student attendance?

PM, LWA, LWC focus group guide

The questions and related prompts from the PM focus group guide are listed below. Similar questions were also utilised for the LWA and LWC focus groups, and adapted to each role accordingly.

1. What do you think is the main purpose of the HSL program?
 - Do you think everyone involved the program (HSLOs/AAOs, principals, DELs, other department staff, students, families) has a shared understanding of the purpose of the program?

2. The role of an HSL program manager (PM)/learning and wellbeing officer (LW0)
 - What are your main responsibilities in the HSLP?
 - How many HSLOs do you supervise?
 - Do you feel that you are adequately equipped to support HSLOs? What would help you to support them more effectively?
 - Do you work across more than one school network?
 - What are your main duties outside of the HSLP? Approximately what percentage of your time is spent on HSLP?

- What is the most rewarding aspect of your role?
 - What is the most challenging aspect of your role?
3. Lines of reporting
- Who do you report to?
 - Although the HSLOs report to you (i.e. PMs/LWOs), their performance management is done by school principals. What are your thoughts about this dual reporting arrangement?
 - How do you work with the Attendance Operations and Attendance Policy teams?
 - Who do you have contact with? About what?
 - How effective are these interactions?
 - Do you think staff in these teams understand your role and responsibilities in the program? Do you understand theirs?
4. Professional learning and development
- What support was available to you when you commenced this role?
 - What PL has been most useful in improving your skills and knowledge for your role? Are there any aspects of the PL that have not been useful?
 - Are there any areas in which you feel you need additional PL?
 - Do you contribute to professional learning for HSLOs and AAOs?
5. The work of HSLOs and AAOs
- What are the key activities within these roles?
 - What do you think are the most important skills, experience and personal qualities required for HSLOs and AAOs to enable them to be effective in their roles?
 - How beneficial do you think it is for HSLOs to be accredited teachers?
 - Do you have any role in the recruitment of HSLOs? Do you know where the funding for the roles comes from (i.e. is it from schools or corporate)?
6. Schools and the HSLP
- Do you think that schools are making optimal use of the services provided by HSLOs and AAOs?
 - Is the HSL program being implemented consistently across HSLOs and AAOs, schools, and regions? Can you comment on any variations you are aware of?
 - What direct interaction do you have with schools regarding the HSL program? Who? About what?
7. In your opinion, is the HSL program functioning as described in the Standard Operating Guidelines (SOGs)?
8. What is your overall impression of the HSL Program?
- Do you think that the program is effective in improving student attendance? Why or why not?
 - If students improve their attendance, is the improvement sustained over time?

- Do you think that the HSL program meets the needs of schools, students and parents?
 - What could the HSLP program do differently or do more of to improve student attendance?
 - Can you think of any benefits of the HSL program other than improving student attendance?
 - Can you think of any negative consequences of the program?
9. Could you describe how you evaluate applications for HSLP support?
- What are the acceptance criteria for HSLP support?
 - Are there any changes you would like to see in the application process or criteria?
 - To what extent do you think schools are satisfied with the casework referral processes and outcomes?
 - What follow up occurs for students whose applications for case management were not successful?
10. Case management
- Which aspects of the casework model work well?
 - Which aspects of the casework model do not work well?
 - What are some key factors that contribute to successful casework intervention?
 - Is the recommended period of 20 school days sufficient time to see improvements?
 - What are the criteria for case closure? Are the criteria appropriate?
 - What happens if casework intervention is unsuccessful?
11. Non-casework activities of HSLOs and AAOs
- What activities do HSLOs and AAOs engage in outside of their casework?
 - How effective do you think these non-casework activities are?
12. To what extent have you been involved in legal action processes for student attendance?
- What involvement do you as PMs/LWCs have with the legal action process?
 - How effective do you think legal intervention is in improving student attendance?
13. Could you tell me about your experience of using the HART data platform?
- How user-friendly is the platform?
 - What challenges do you experience when using HART?
 - Could you suggest any improvements to HART? I.e. are there any things that HART either cannot do or does not do well?

Appendix I LWO statement of duties

The following items are listed in the statement of duties contained within the LWO position description (2017).

- Assisting in the management of the disability, learning and support service provisions in accordance with state policy and guidelines and making recommendations regarding assets and resource access.
- Assisting, advising and supporting schools and teachers to achieve enhanced learning outcomes for Aboriginal students, students with additional learning or behaviour needs and those at risk of disengaging.
- Coordinating and supporting the disability, learning and support multi-disciplinary team including transition, itinerant and other specialist staff working with schools and students.
- Liaising with Learning and Teaching officers in supporting schools in the development and implementation of educational programs.
- Providing specific advice to schools on personalised learning and support for students with additional learning or behaviour needs, and those at risk of disengaging.
- Providing support to schools for student health and wellbeing, discipline and school attendance and student leadership opportunities and assisting schools following serious incidents.
- Supporting inter-agency initiatives, collaboration and comprehensive service delivery including strengthening links between schools, police and other agencies.
- Supporting the delivery of professional learning relating to Learning and Wellbeing including child protection and wellbeing, disability and engagement.

Appendix J HSLO and AAO duties to support school practices that promote regular attendance

The SOG specify the following support school practices AAOs and HSLOs may undertake as part of their work in the HSLP (p. 25).

Working with the Learning and Wellbeing team, AAOs and HSLOs support school practices that promote regular attendance and may include:

- develop student attendance improvement plans, in consultation with school personnel and parents, to resolve attendance issues
- support school attendance programs (e.g. PIPs and NIPs)
- participate in attendance meetings with parents, students and school staff
- organise attendance meetings and conferences with parents, students and school staff and/or compile supporting documentation to ensure correct procedures are followed, if legal resolution is required
- engage with local communities (including AECG) related to student non-attendance issues
- document HSLP casework and actions for accurate record keeping and analysis in HART
- work with other agencies, e.g. NSW Police Force on joint anti-truancy operations
- liaise with government and non-government agencies and participate in operations to improve attendance
- advise schools on additional strategies as an alternative to HSLP support
- compile support documentation if legal resolution is required.
- monitoring student attendance by conducting regular Roll Checks, identifying areas for development and emerging issues
- collaborating with schools in the review, development and implementation of strategies to improve and promote attendance as an alternative to the HSLP
- collaborating with relevant parties in the development of student attendance improvement plans consistent with timeframes for non-attendance and non-enrolment cases
- AAOs and HSLOs are supervised locally by a Program Manager and are accountable to that officer for the performance of their duties
- the allocation of AAOs and HSLOs is based on data and department priorities as well as audit recommendations
- newly appointed AAOs and HSLOs must complete the mandatory e-learning modules within 10 weeks of their employment in the role
- AAOs and HSLOs are authorised as 'Attendance Officers' under Section 122 of the Education Act 1990
- AAOs and HSLOs should not make home visits before they are authorised as 'Attendance Officers'
- AAOs and HSLOs work with schools to which they are allocated. In some situations, Learning and Wellbeing teams can liaise to have AAOs work across different principal networks
- AAOs are corporate personnel but may also be teachers. HSLOs are school based teaching service personnel.

Appendix K Professional learning modules

Attendance specific modules

Table vi Attendance specific PL modules

Module	Summary / Description of course	Rationale
Module 1 (all DoE staff): Supporting Student Attendance – NR29048	This course is for all NSW DoE staff to access. It is 1hr in length and fee-free. The course focuses on the indicators for attendance issues and school strategies to promote attendance. The course is mandatory for staff working in the Attendance Support Program (Home School Liaison Program).	This training is designed to help the school staff identify the importance of school attendance, indicators for attendance issues and school strategies to promote attendance. It also focuses on the role of schools and authorised Attendance Support Officers in supporting and protecting children and young people.
Module 2: Attendance Support Program – Operation and Context – NR29204	This module will help the personnel within the Attendance Support Program to understand the purpose of training requirements, performance and review process, and importance of record keeping. This module will also provide an understanding of health and safety requirements needed for home visits.	This module is designed to act as part of the authorisation training of Attendance Support Program staff.
Module 3: Attendance Support Program – Program Management – NR29205	This training will discuss the application process for non-enrolment, non-attendance, non-engagement, and enrolment destination not known cases in detail. It will also explain the guidelines for case allocation, case reviews, and record keeping.	This module is designed to act as part of the authorisation training of Attendance Support Program staff.
Module 4: Attendance Support Program – Case Work – NR29206	This training will explain the importance and the process of the Attendance Improvement Plan (AIP), conditions and guidelines for making home visits by the Attendance Support Officers, and importance of record keeping. It will also discuss risk management planning for home visits and managing NESAs databases.	This module is designed to act as part of the authorisation training of Attendance Support Program staff.

Module	Summary / Description of course	Rationale
Module 5: Attendance Support Program – The Legal Process – NR29208	This module is most relevant for persons who are authorised by the New South Wales Department of Education (DoE) to conduct school conferences, as outlined in 22 B-D of the Education Act 1990. It also discusses the guidelines and procedures for Legal proceedings.	This module is designed to act as part of the authorisation training of Attendance Support Program staff.

Other online modules

Table vii Other online PL modules

Module	Summary / Description of course	Rationale
Scout Introduction	<p>This online learning provides an introduction to Scout for Department of Education staff. You must complete this learning to receive access to Scout reports.</p> <p>This learning will provide you with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of Scout. • An outline of the general governance of data within Scout, privacy of information and what this means for you. • A demonstration on how to sign into Scout and how to access Scout reports. • Where to get support for Scout. <p>Upon completion, your Scout access will be automatically provisioned in 2 business days.</p>	<p>This learning has been developed by the Scout Team to support Department of Education staff who are required to use Scout as part of their role.</p> <p>Scout reports allow schools to make evidence-based decisions, conduct planning and undertake research that can better support our students and wider school community.</p> <p>Scout gathers data from multiple sources both from within the Department and externally, translating data into easy-to-use reports for teachers, school leaders and other school staff.</p>