



Democratizing Students' Representative Councils:

A Primary School Pilot

Professor Rosalind Dixon & Rose Vassel



Introduction

Australian democracy is strong but requires safeguarding. Democracy is in retreat in many constitutional systems worldwide, and there are also clear areas of vulnerability for democracy within Australia. This requires an urgent response.

One part of this response involves law and policy. Another involves investing in citizens' understanding of and attachment to democratic ideals. This is a life-long process, but also one that must begin with young people – in primary and high school.

Civics and citizenship education must be a core part of the curriculum of every state and territory in Australia, including NSW – and reforms to achieve this are to be welcomed. But there is also a need to encourage and motivate students to engage with this material, by linking notions of democracy and citizenship to the idea of individual and collective student voice.

One way to do this is by linking existing models of student representative government more explicitly to democratic ideas and processes: this has the advantage of building on existing practices and structures and reducing the timetabling pressures on schools. It also connects ideas of democracy and self-government at a foundational level, in ways that have enduring benefits for young citizens' awareness of what democracy entails, and why it matters.

This report evaluates a small pilot program in NSW primary schools conducted in 2024 ('the Pilot') that aimed to do just this – ie, to embed democratic ideals and educational content within an existing Students' Representative Council ('SRC') model and evaluate its impact on students' knowledge of basic democratic ideas.

The results of the Pilot were encouraging, pointing towards a greater knowledge of basic democratic principles amongst students in both year groups, and an increased ability of older students to understand their own experience (of the SRC) through the lens of democratic structures.



Why more Civics: In and Beyond the Curriculum

Democracy cannot survive and thrive without citizens understanding and supporting its operation. There is also varying support for democracy in Australia, and a decline in the understanding of its operation among primary and high school students.

Support for democracy in Australia has oscillated in recent years, from 65% to 75% support, with as many as 18% of Australians in 2023 saying that “In some circumstances, a non-democratic government¹ can be preferable” to a democratic form of government. Linked to that, satisfaction with democracy has also ranged from 86% to a mere 56%, with 30% reporting they were not satisfied with democracy in 2022².

Knowledge of the workings of our democratic system among school students is concerningly low. In 2024, the National Assessment Program – Civics and Citizenship (‘NAP-CC’) report reported that just 43% of Year 6 students achieved at or above the standard of proficient knowledge of Australian democracy, with only 28% of Year 10 students attaining this level³. (This compared to 53% and 38% respectively in 2019)⁴. Moreover, the attainment of the proficient standard is not evenly distributed across demographic lines – female students, non-Indigenous students and students at metropolitan schools outperform male, Indigenous and rural/regional students respectively. Parental occupation and education were also shown to have a significant impact on outcomes⁵.

One key response to this is an expanded emphasis on civics and citizenship in various state and territory curriculums. School-based civics education is extremely important to reaching a large number and cross-section of citizens: a survey conducted by the Trust and Transparency Unit of the Australian Public Service Commission (‘2023 Trust Survey’), for example, showed that only 25% of Australians have engaged in civics learning beyond their primary and secondary education⁶.

Curriculum-based civics education has also been shown to work: results from the 2023 Trust Survey showed that more than half of the people who received civics education at school felt that they understood democracy “very well” or “completely” (compared to 34% of those with no such education)⁷.

Recent changes in this area are thus to be welcomed. NSW is a good example, having recently reformed its Kindergarten to Year 12 curriculum (effective from 2027). Prior to this reform, there was no mandatory or explicit civics and citizenship education included in the NSW Curriculum (as opposed to the Australian Curriculum), and what was included was dispersed across different subjects⁸. The new History curriculum for Years 7 – 10 has compulsory civics and citizenship content, including on the Australian Constitution, federalism and the separation of powers⁹.

But there is also a need to explain to students the connection between democratic processes and the potential for improvements in their own lives, and that of their families and communities. New civics initiatives should also seek to do this – by connecting civics knowledge with possibilities for positive social change.

Linking Civics to Student Voice

There is a strong commitment at every level of government in Australia to promoting student “voice”. This is reflected in longstanding government policy, including a nation-wide commitment to enabling young Australians to become “active and informed” citizens (since the Hobart Declaration on Schooling (1989))¹⁰ or “active and informed members of the community” (Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration (2019)).¹¹ It is also reflected in the Student Wellbeing Framework, which includes “provid[ing] opportunities for authentic student decision-making over matters that affect them” as an effective practice for student voice,¹² and the priority that is given to amplifying student voice in the education policies of many of the States and Territories.¹³

A strong student voice helps make schools and universities better at responding to the learning and social and emotional needs of young and adult learners. It also encourages a sense of agency and self-efficacy among students: this can itself improve social and emotional well-being, as well as increase motivation and engagement in the learning process.

The notion of voice also has a deeper democratic underpinning: it is linked to the democratic idea that citizens should be individually and collectively self-governing. Helping students understand this, from an early stage, can also help increase their attachment to democratic ideals.

In addition, there are practical advantages to linking the idea of student voice to civics and citizenship education. Civics and citizenship education features in the curriculum for primary school students, however it is not offered as a subject and is instead incorporated into the HSIE learning area. The crowded nature of the curriculum, and lower priority given to civics and citizenship education,¹⁴ makes adding new areas of study difficult. However, structures for promoting student voice – such as the existing Students' Representative Council (‘SRC’) system adopted in most Australian schools – offers a natural opportunity to engage students in civics without imposing additional substantial time or resource constraints.

¹ ‘Lowy Institute Poll 2023’, Lowy Institute (Web Page) <<https://poll.lowyinstitute.org/charts/attitudes-to-democracy/>>.

² Sarah Cameron and Ian McAllister, Trends in Australian Political Opinion: Results from the Australian Election Study 1988-2022 (Report, December 2022) 100 <<https://australianelectionstudy.org/wp-content/uploads/Trends-in-Australian-Political-Opinion-Results-from-the-Australian-Election-Study-1987-2022.pdf>>.

³ Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, ‘National Assessment Program: Civics and Citizenship 2024: Report’ (Report, 2025) 18-19 <<https://nap.edu.au/docs/default-source/nap-sample/nap-cc-2024-public-report.pdf>> (‘2024 Report’).

⁴ Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, ‘NAP Civics and Citizenship 2019: National Report’ (Report, 2020), pp 22-25 <<https://www.nap.edu.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/20210121-nap-cc-2019-public-report.pdf>>.

⁵ ACARA, 2024 Report (n 3) 20.

⁶ Australian Public Service Commission, ‘Trust and Satisfaction in Australian Democracy: 2023 National Survey’ (Report, February 2024) p 25 <https://www.apsreform.gov.au/sites/default/files/resource/download/Feb%202024%20-%20Democracy%20Report%20-%20with%20Alt%20text_0.pdf>.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ ‘The State of Civics and Citizenship Education in NSW: Comparison between the NSW and Australian Curriculum’, Rule of Law Education Centre (Web Page) <<https://www.ruleoflaw.org.au/civics-and-citizenship-education-in-nsw/>>.

⁹ ‘7 – 10: History 7-10 Syllabus’, NSW Curriculum (Web Page, 2024) <<https://curriculum.nsw.edu.au/learning-areas/hsie/history-7-10-2024/content/stage-5/fa417f1d53>>.

¹⁰ The Hobart Declaration on Schooling (1989) <https://www.apf.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Environment_and_Communications/Completed_inquiries/pre1996/arts/report/e04.pdf>.

¹¹ Education Council, ‘Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration’ (2019) p 6 <<https://www.education.gov.au/alice-springs-mparntwe-education-declaration/resources/alice-springs-mparntwe-education-declaration>>.

¹² Student Wellbeing Hub, ‘Australian Student Wellbeing Framework’ (Webpage) <<https://studentwellbeinghub.edu.au/educators/framework/>>.

¹³ See Victoria Department of Education, ‘Student Voice’ (Webpage, 26 May 2021) <<https://www.education.vic.gov.au/school/teachers/teachingresources/discipline/humanities/civics/Pages/studentvoice.aspx>>; NSW Government – Education, ‘Student voice, participation and leadership’ (Webpage, 6 December 2023) <<https://education.nsw.gov.au/schooling/students/student-voices/student-voice-and-leadership>>; ACT Government – Education, ‘Student voice’ (Webpage) <<https://www.education.act.gov.au/public-school-life/student-voice>>; Tasmanian Government – Department for Education, Children and Young People, ‘Our Approach to Child and Student Wellbeing’ (Webpage, 29 September 2023) available at <https://www.decyp.tas.gov.au/about-us/strategies-and-frameworks/our-approach-to-wellbeing/>.

¹⁴ ‘Learning across the curriculum’, NSW Department of Education (Web Page) <<https://educationstandards.nsw.edu.au/wps/portal/nesa/k-10/learning-areas/hsie/history-k-10/learning-across-the-curriculum>>.

The Pilot

a) Scope and Design of the Pilot

The Pilot involved students in Years 2 to 5 from four primary schools located near UNSW Sydney: Bellevue Hill Public School ('BHPS'), Double Bay Public School ('DBPS'), Randwick Public School ('RPS') and Woollahra Public School ('WPS'). These schools were recruited based on their existing connections to the UNSW research community, and proximity to UNSW for research and workshop purposes.

Each school in the Pilot was asked to make several modifications to their SRC process, in line with democratic principles, including notably: (i) encouraging students to run in teams; (ii) to give speeches or campaign on certain pre-defined themes; and (iii) requiring all students elected to the SRC in Term 1 to seek re-election in Term 3, rather than serve for a full year and never face re-election or any form of electoral accountability. In addition, participating schools were asked to show a short video on democracy to students in Terms 1 and 3, prior to or as part of the election process, explaining how democratic ideals were embodied within the SRC process (the video can be viewed [here](#)).

Image 1 to the right sets out the steps involved in the SRC Pilot, including the elements of the new model that schools were encouraged to integrate into their existing SRC structure:

SRC Pilot

Student Education

Students informed of new SRC election format and three themes to guide debates: wellbeing (teacher and student), charity and the environment

Start of year survey

Start

Students in Year 2 - Year 5 complete short survey (in quiz form) during class time to test baseline knowledge of basic principles of democracy.

Student education + introduction of themes

Students run in teams of two

Teams give speeches focusing on 1-2 themes + reasons why they should be elected

SRC Elections

New model of SRC elections focusing on meaningful debate and informed choice.

SRC Formations

New SRC formed and members instructed on principles and expectations of SRC members. Members form theme-based streams or committees

Formation of SC and "committees"

→ Wellbeing
→ Charity
→ Environment

Term 1 / 3
"Planning"

Term 2/4
"Implementation"

Activities including:
• Online cross-school meet-up for streams
• Mid-term online training session on driving change

SRC Operations

New model of SRC operations focused on "planning" and "implementation" within three theme-based streams.

Mid-Year Elections

To encourage accountability, fresh elections for the SRC are held mid-year. SRC members can re-run, and students can run for election for the first time.

SRC Election, SRC Formation and SRC Operation phases repeat in Terms 3 - 4

End of year Survey

Finish

Students in Year 2 - Year 5 complete short survey (in quiz form) to identify whether their knowledge of basic democratic principles has improved.



b) Implementation of the Pilot

Teachers at each of the participating schools were invited to a training webinar at the start of the 2024 school term, in which they learned about the Pilot and changes to the SRC structure and were given the opportunity to ask questions. They were also provided with materials, including Image 1 above and a short video, with the latter shown to students before the Term 1 and Term 3 elections to help students understand the changes to their SRC and how they related to basic principles of democracy.

In addition, to support the Pilot and encourage schools' participation, UNSW also ran two in-person leadership workshops for students elected to the SRC in March and August 2024 at Woollahra Public School, aimed at refining students' leadership skills and encouraging information and skill-sharing across year groups and different schools. Each workshop was attended by over 70 students in Years 2 – 5. Member for Wentworth, Allegra Spender MP, spoke to the students at one of the workshops.

“Teaching students about their democracy and empowering their engagement in it is both critical to their engagement in learning, but also is the best way of sustaining an informed and cohesive society. The questions from the kids were thoughtful and probing, and their interest in improving their community was inspiring.”

- Allegra Spender MP, Member for Wentworth, after speaking at one of the SRC workshops.

There was also variation between schools in terms of how they adopted the revised SRC process. We were conscious that each participating school was engaging in the trial with different pre-existing SRC structures in place, and we were prepared to accommodate a degree of variation amongst participating schools in their uptake of the new model. For example, at Double Bay Public School the Term 1-2 SRC representatives remained in their positions and new Term 3-4 representatives joined them to form a larger Student Voice group. We are also aware that one school (RPS) did not show the SRC Pilot video to all students prior to the Term 1 elections. We sought to remedy this by issuing repeat reminders to schools to show the SRC Pilot video to students prior to the Term 3 elections.

c) Pilot Evaluation

Research Design

The SRC Pilot was accompanied by a research study (the ‘Evaluation’) which sought to test the hypotheses that exposing primary school students to democratic processes in the SRC processes in their school would increase their understanding and knowledge of the basic principles of democracy and civic engagement.

The Evaluation was conducted using a Kahoot survey administered to primary school students in Years 2 to 5 in each of the participating primary schools. The survey was administered twice - at the start of the school year in 2024, prior to the commencement of the SRC election process, and again at the conclusion of the school year in 2024 following the conclusion of the SRC election process and most SRC operations for the year.

The four schools participating the SRC Pilot also participated in the Evaluation, along with Beauty Point Public School (‘BPPS’), which was the “control” school to assist the research team to separate the impact of other variables on student knowledge of democratic principles (for instance, the impact of a year of curriculum-based education between the quiz conducted in Term 1 (‘T1’) and the quiz conducted in Term 4 (‘T4’)).

We estimated, using past enrolment figures from each school and average class size, and assuming that only 50% of students in Years 2-5 would participate, that a minimum of 500 students would participate in the surveys, with a total potential pool of 1820 participants.

Students in Year 6 did not participate in the Evaluation, as most primary schools engage Year 6 students in a separate “prefect” process which is distinct from the SRC. Students in Year 1 also did not participate due to the difficulties associated with understanding democratic principles at this level and administering a quiz that will measure this.

Importantly, data was collected anonymously. No identifying data was collected about students (teachers were instructed to use the Kahoot “random nickname generator” to ensure that students would not identify themselves in the quiz), and accordingly individual student performance in each quiz and between the T1 and T4 quizzes was not tracked.

Quiz Questions

The survey questions were designed to focus on principles of democracy and student voice/representation specifically, and to be appropriate for students in Year 2 to Year 5. A quiz consisting of four true/false questions was designed for the Year 2-3 students, while students in Years 4-5 completed the same quiz with an additional three multiple choice questions. Having regard to available time and resources within schools, the quiz was short (6-10 minutes), simple and in a game-ified form to ensure student engagement.

Conducting the Evaluation

Implementation of the Evaluation proceeded smoothly and largely as expected. Schools were generally responsive and enthusiastic in their participation, with all five schools participating in the Evaluation in T1, and the same five schools participating in T4. The short and interactive nature of the quizzes made them easy to roll-out.

Data collection was coordinated and conducted by the participating schools. The research team provided the schools with links to the surveys and instructions to teachers on how to administer the surveys within their classrooms. Data was collected automatically through Kahoot upon completion of each quiz.

Challenges

There were some early reports of issues with conducting the Kahoot quiz, which arose from the volume of new devices accessing the platform, but which were subsequently managed by the research team. We were also informed that data collection was incomplete in one school due to security requirements on student devices (ie, some younger students were unable to log-on to participate in the quiz), and there were insufficient devices in some classrooms among students.

The research team also received an enquiry from a parent concerned about whether their young student would be able to read the questions, which was addressed by explaining that teachers could read the questions to students where necessary. Otherwise, no complaints or issues were raised by teachers or parents.

Finally, the most significant challenge arose from issues with data collection in T1. Due to delays in approval processes, we were not able to monitor the data on Kahoot as it was collected from schools and did not collect precise information that would allow us to tie a particular quiz to a particular school. This was remedied in T4, with unique quiz links issued to each school that allowed us to precisely differentiate quizzes based on which school completed them.

Consequently, to differentiate the T1 data we have relied on retrospective information from each school about when they completed the T1 quizzes. As some schools completed their quizzes in the same period, we have not been able to completely delineate the quiz results as between the control school (BPPS) and the intervention schools. Instead, we have grouped them as follows based on approximate timing information (“WPS/BPPS”, “DBPS” and “RPS/BHPS”). This method allows us to conclude, albeit roughly, whether one intervention school (WPS) performed better than the control school (BPPS), and then whether the three intervention schools (DBPS, RPS and BHPS) also performed better between T1 and T4.

#	Question	Years	Answer
1	True or False: “Australia is a Democracy”	All	True
2	True or False: “If the government of Australia does not keep its promises, there is nothing that the people can do about it”	All	False
3	True or False: “Political parties in Australia are like political teams”	All	True
4	True or False: “The SRC is a form of democracy in my school”	All	True
5	Democracy means that the government: (a) Is elected by the people; (b) Listens to the people; (c) Has to tell the people about what it has done; (d) All of the above.	4-5 only	(d)
6	My school has an SRC so that: (a) The school can save money by getting students to fix things; (b) Students who are bored will have something to do; (c) Students can join in making decisions about our school; (d) The SRC can tell the principal about students who do bad things.	4-5 only	(c)
7	Which of the following ways of choosing the SRC is democratic? (a) Teachers put names in a hat and draw out the students to be on the SRC; (b) The students all vote in an election for who should be on the SRC; (c) A writing competition where the best student essays win a spot on the SRC; (d) The teacher chooses students to be on the SRC.	4-5 only	(b)

d) Results of the Pilot Evaluation

Number of Students

288 students participated in the T1 quiz and 434 in the T4 quiz (see Figure 2 in the Appendix). This was across 15 total quizzes conducted in T1, and 25 total quizzes in T4. The difference between T1 and T4 participation results from a significant increase in the number of quizzes conducted amongst Year 2-3 students in T4: 101 students in Years 2-3 participated in six quizzes in T1, while 242 students in Years 2-3 participated in 15 quizzes in T4. The numbers amongst Year 4-5 students are, however, roughly comparable.

We attribute this increase to our ability to (remotely) monitor the data collection process through Kahoot in T4. In T1, for approval reasons we were unable to use Kahoot to track the number of quizzes completed, and consequently relied on school reporting on when data collection was complete. In T4, we could monitor which schools had completed quizzes and issue timely follow-ups and reminders to schools where appropriate. This resulted in significantly greater participation overall. However, we do not have an explanation for why this increase was principally among Years 2 and 3.

Conclusions from the Evaluation

While the grouping of schools based on the T1 data is imperfect, it does permit us to reach some tentative conclusions about the effect of the SRC Pilot on student knowledge of democratic concepts and their ability to relate their knowledge to their in-school experience.

We compared the T1 results for the BPPS and WPS group with the separated results for each of these schools in T4. This data shows a greater improvement for the intervention school (WPS) than the control school (BPPS) against the T1 average. This suggests that the SRC Pilot positively contributed to the rate of correct answers, over and above the effect of curriculum-based learning through the year. As shown in Figure 4 (see Appendix):

1. For Years 2-3, the BPPS results in T4 showed a 3.28% improvement in total number of correct answers compared to the T1 average, whereas the WPS results showed an **improvement of 6.94%** (that is, **3.67% better than the control school**);

2. For Years 4-5, BPPS experienced a decline of -3.12% in total number of correct answers, whereas **WPS experienced an improvement of 0.93%** (that is, **4.05% better than the control school**); and
3. The **intervention school (WPS) performed better** than the control school (BPPS) across **three out of four questions in the Year 2-3 quiz**, and in **five out of seven questions for Years 4-5**. The most notable improvement for Years 2-3 was in student ability to relate their understanding of democracy to the structure of the SRC (Q4), and for Years 4-5 in recognising the multiplicity of principles at work in a democratic society (Q5).

The Evaluation data for the other intervention schools (DBPS, BHPS and RPS) also showed an increase in number of questions correctly answered between T1 and T4 (noting, however, that it was not possible to directly compare these results to the control school results). For further details, see Figures 5 – 6 in the Appendix:

1. For **Years 2-3**, there was an **increase of 8.25%** in the number of questions correctly answered between T1 and T4. The biggest improvement for Year 2-3 was in student understanding of government accountability to the people (Q2; 15.12%), followed closely by the notion that political parties operate like teams (Q3; 14.39%);
2. For **Years 4-5**, the effects were less significant. There was an **increase of 0.43%** in the number of questions correctly answered between T1 and T4. When the potentially confounding effect of question 5 is controlled for (removed), this becomes an **increase of 4.19%**, between T1 and T4, in the number of questions correctly answered; and
3. The biggest improvement for Year 4-5 was in understanding that Australia was a democracy (Q1; increasing from 75.9% to 98.5%) and of government accountability to the people (Q2; 11.96%). However, across all four intervention schools (including WPS), there was no improvement in correct answers to Q6 and Q7 (multiple-choice questions targeted at Year 4-5 students). In fact, there was a notable decline in performance. This could also be suggestive of greater time pressure or student difficulty understanding the question structure.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Civics and citizenship education is a crucial area for governments to focus on – as part of an attempt to safeguard democracy. This also requires a formal expansion of the civics and citizenship curriculum, and efforts to connect the knowledge students gain in this process to broader values and ideas of individual and collective self-government and voice.

The Pilot detailed in this report represented one modest attempt to do this – by encouraging NSW primary schools in the Pilot to embed principles and ideas of democracy within the context of student voice initiatives, such as an SRC.

The Pilot was small in scale, and hence offers useful insights as to the potential of a program of this kind, and its practical feasibility. But it does not provide definitive evidence of short- or long-term efficacy of an intervention of this kind. Evidence of this kind would require a much larger pilot, greater resourcing, and a multi-year study of students and their attitudes to democracy.

It was also conducted in a relatively limited geographic area, with higher-than-average levels of family income and education. This also undoubtedly affected the roll-out of the Pilot to some degree. We were able to control for these effects through a before and after Kahoot survey, and by comparison to a control school. But high levels of social capital can affect feasibility as well as direct information attainment, and hence, there would be clear benefit to expanding or replicating the Pilot in a more diverse geographic and economic setting.

Part of the aim of the Pilot and this report, however, is to encourage exactly this – that is, the continued experimentation around models of student voice and SRC delivery, and in particular, the ways in which they can be used to promote knowledge of and commitment to democratic ideals.

The Pilot also aims to provide proof of concept – and a model – that could be used by a wide range of schools in this context. Some schools may already have models that are more developed, and democratically informed than the Pilot. Schools with a full-scale student parliament are one example. But for those that do not, the Pilot model offers an off-the-shelf model that can be adopted and adapted to suit the particular context of a school community – and one that has been pre-tested and designed with democratic principles in mind.

APPENDIX – EVALUATION RESULTS

Figure 2: Student Participation

Term	Years	Subset	# Students	# Quizzes	AVG Cohort
1	Years 2-3	All	101	6	16.83
1	Years 4-5	All	187	9	20.78
T1 TOTAL			288	15	18.81
4	Years 2-3	All	242	15	19.27
4	Years 4-5	All	192	10	19.20
T4 TOTAL			434	25	19.23
TOTAL			722	40	19.02

Figure 3: Total results (control and intervention combined)

T	Years	#	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	AVG
1	2-3	101	75.25%	42.57%	66.34%	78.22%	-	-	-	65.59%
4	2-3	242	73.14%	46.69%	73.55%	86.36%	-	-	-	69.94%
% Change			-2.11%	4.12%	7.22%	8.15%	-	-	-	4.34%
1	4-5	187	81.82%	70.59%	86.63%	88.24%	38.50%	81.28%	86.10%	76.17%
4	4-5	192	92.19%	80.73%	85.94%	92.71%	38.02%	70.83%	70.83%	75.89%
% Change			10.37%	10.14%	-0.69%	4.47%	-0.48%	-10.45%	-15.26%	-0.27%

Figure 4: BPPS and WPS results

T	Yr		#	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	AVG
1	2-3	BPPS/ WPS	18	61.11%	50.00%	88.89%	72.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	68.06%
4	2-3	BPPS	75	78.67%	53.33%	69.33%	84.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	71.33%
BPPS Change T1 to T4				17.56%	3.33%	-19.56%	11.78%				3.28%
4	2-3	WPS	19	78.95%	47.37%	73.68%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%
WPS Change T1 to T4				17.84%	-2.63%	-15.20%	27.78%				6.94%
WPS Change cf BPPS				0.28%	-5.96%	4.35%	16.00%				3.67%
1	4-5	BPPS/ WPS	108	86.11%	73.15%	84.26%	85.19%	46.30%	79.63%	85.19%	77.12%
4	4-5	BPPS	50	88.00%	74.00%	74.00%	86.00%	32.00%	84.00%	80.00%	74.00%
BPPS Change T1 to T4				1.89%	0.85%	-10.26%	0.81%	-14.30%	4.37%	-5.19%	-3.12%
4	4-5	WPS	95	91.58%	86.32%	91.58%	94.74%	55.79%	64.21%	62.11%	78.05%
WPS Change T1 to T4				5.47%	13.17%	7.32%	9.55%	9.49%	-15.42%	-23.08%	0.93%
WPS Change cf BPPS				3.58%	12.32%	17.58%	8.74%	23.79%	-19.79%	-17.89%	4.05%

Figure 5: DBPS, BHPS and RPS

T	Years	#	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	AVG
1	2-3	83	77.93%	42.02%	62.38%	79.31%	-	-	-	65.41%
4	2-3	195	74.61%	57.15%	76.78%	86.10%	-	-	-	73.66%
% Change			-3.31%	15.12%	14.39%	6.79%	-	-	-	8.25%
1	4-5	79	75.90%	67.12%	89.81%	92.34%	28.01%	83.49%	87.28%	74.85%
4	4-5	47	98.53%	79.07%	86.43%	97.06%	5.88%	74.66%	85.29%	75.27%
% Change			22.63%	11.96%	-3.38%	4.72%	-22.13%	-8.83%	-1.98%	0.43%

Figure 6: DBPS, RPS and BHPS (Year 4-5) – Question 5 removed

T	Years	#	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q6	Q7	AVG	AVG
1	4-5	79	75.90%	67.12%	89.81%	92.34%	83.49%	87.28%	82.65%	65.41%
4	4-5	47	98.53%	79.07%	86.43%	97.06%	74.66%	85.29%	86.84%	73.66%
% Change			22.63%	11.96%	-3.38%	4.72%	-8.83%	-1.98%	4.19%	8.25%

