



Refugee
Education
Australia

English language tests for university admissions in the context of displaced students

Test selection guide

Dr Sally Baker (Refugee Education Australia)

Dr Agnes Bodis (Macquarie University)

Professor Ute Knoch (University of Melbourne)

Michelle Manks (Refugee Education Pathways Consultant)

Associate Professor Susy Macqueen (ANU)



Refugee
Education
Australia



Australian
National
University



MACQUARIE
University
SYDNEY-AUSTRALIA

Commissioned by Skill Path Australia



Contents

Contents	2
About this guide	5
Why evaluate language tests?	6
Why do we need to consider displacement contexts?	7
Access to further study for refugees.....	7
Educational Complementary Pathways (CPs) for refugees.....	7
The Refugee Student Settlement Pathway (RSSP) to Australia	8
Language proficiency requirements in the RSSP	8
Why are these guidelines on language test flexibility for displacement contexts required?	8
Structure of this guide	10
How to use this tool	10
Principles for English Language Test acceptance	12
<i>Principle 1:</i> The test is fit for purpose and provides sufficient information for admissions decisions (P1)	12
<i>Principle 2:</i> The test provides consistent and fair measurement (P2)	12
<i>Principle 3:</i> The test’s score equivalence with other tests is robust (P3).....	12
<i>Principle 4:</i> Communication and reporting are clear, accessible, and timely (P4)	12
<i>Additional Principle 5:</i> The test is accessible for a range of test takers in displacement contexts (P5)	13
Test evaluation tool	14
Principle 1: The test is fit for purpose and provides sufficient information for admissions decisions.....	14
P1.1 Explanation	14
P1.1 Information & evidence to gather	14
P1.1 Evaluation	15
P1.2 Explanation	16
P1.2 Information & evidence to gather	16
P1.2 Evaluation	16
P1.3 Explanation	18



P1.3 Information & evidence to gather	18
P1.3 Evaluation	18
Principle 2: The test provides consistent and fair measurement.	19
P2.1 Explanation	19
P2.1 Information & evidence to gather	19
P2.1 Evaluation	19
P2.2 Explanation	20
P2.2 Information & evidence to gather	20
P2.2 Evaluation	20
P2.3 Explanation	21
P2.3 Information & evidence to gather	21
P2.3 Evaluation	21
Principle 3: The test’s score equivalence with other tests is robust.....	22
P3 Explanation	22
P3 Information & evidence to gather	22
P3 Evaluation	22
Principle 4: Communication and reporting are clear, accessible, and timely.....	23
P4 Explanation	23
P4 Information & evidence to gather	23
P4 Evaluation	24
Principle 5: The test is accessible for a range of test takers in displacement contexts (P5).....	25
P5.1 Explanation	25
P5.1 Information & evidence to gather	25
P5.1 Evaluation	25
P5.2 Explanation	27
P5.2 Information & evidence to gather	27
P5.2 Evaluation	27
P5.3 Explanation	28
P5.3 Information & evidence to gather	28
P5.3 Evaluation	28
P5.4 Explanation	29



P5.4 Information & evidence to gather	29
P5.4 Evaluation	29
P5.5 Explanation	30
P5.5 Information & evidence to gather	30
P5.5 Evaluation	30
P5.6 Explanation	31
P5.6 Information & evidence to gather	31
P5.6 Evaluation	31
Overall evaluations	32



About this guide

This test selection guide is an elaboration of the original *English language tests for university admissions: Test selection guide* (Macqueen & Knoch, 2025)¹ designed to help university administrators evaluate and select English language tests and scores for use in admission decisions. The original guide uses principles for test selection developed for the university sector and is based on the International Language Testing Association Guidelines for Practice.²

This guide provides an elaboration of these principles for the context of language assessment for admissions purposes for displaced students. The current document includes the following sections from the original guide:

- Why evaluate language tests?
- Structure of this guide
- How to use this tool
- Principles for English language test acceptance
 - Principles 1–4
- Test evaluation tool for Principles 1–4

Newly added sections for the context of displaced students are the following:

- Why do we need to consider displacement contexts?
- Access to further study for refugees
- Educational complimentary pathways for refugees
- The Refugee Student Settlement Pathway to Australia
- Why are these guidelines on language test flexibility for displacement contexts required?
- Principle 5 for English language test acceptance (*The test is accessible for a range of test takers in displacement contexts*)
- Test evaluation tool for Principle 5

¹ <https://arts.unimelb.edu.au/language-testing-research-centre/resources/guides>

² <https://www.iltaonline.com/page/ILTAGuidelinesforPractice2024>



Why evaluate language tests?

Although many tests claim to assess Academic English for university study, test methods vary considerably. Some tests may emphasise word-level tasks such as gap-fill exercises, while others might give more score weight to whether test takers understand complex arguments in longer texts. It is important to choose tests that model academic language as closely as possible and that are trustworthy measures for making decisions about university admissions so that applicants are treated fairly and admissions decisions are based on robust evidence. Ultimately, using more trustworthy test scores for admission decisions gives institutions a level of confidence that commencing students have a level of English that enables them to participate meaningfully in their studies.

Independent evaluation of tests by institutions is necessary so that tests are selected judiciously for typical intake cohorts and particular institutional contexts. The basis for selection should be **detailed information about the test, test sample materials** (i.e., what exactly does the test entail), **research evidence** about the test validity and **technical reporting**. Examining the test itself, rather than relying on the decisions of other institutions or company marketing, is important. Although tests might be accredited by an accrediting agency, these agencies do not typically accredit tests for particular uses in particular institutional contexts.

Most tests used for admissions decisions are commercial products. By nature, all products are subject to sales pressures. While market competition can be healthy, cost-cutting in testing can mean reductions in factors such as human involvement and test length. Unlike other kinds of products which might have obvious faults that lead to product recalls, safety alerts or reputational damage, language tests that do not work well generally have hidden effects. False positive scores have the potential to admit students who do not have the English skills to cope with English-mediated disciplinary study. False negative scores are unfair to applicants who should have been admitted. For tests that do not simulate the important aspects of the academic domain, applicants may spend years doing “test-wise” preparation activities that are unlike the kinds of language-mediated activities they will need to do at university. This is a waste of time, and frequently of money too.

This guide is a tool to help institutional administrators decide which tests to use for their specific contexts when considering the eligibility and admissibility of students who have been displaced and/or who are living in displacement contexts. All major tests claim to be “trusted”, but score users (e.g., an institution that uses a particular score threshold for admissions) have a responsibility to determine if a test is “trustworthy” for their institutional contexts.

Why do we need to consider displacement contexts?

This guide has been written at a time of unprecedented forced migration. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that nearly 125 million people are now forcibly displaced due to war, persecution or, increasingly, climate-created unsafety. Within this cohort, around 45 million people have been classified as refugees.

Forced migration and displacement create significant issues for educational and language development. Forced migration means that refugees³ are often unable to provide evidence of prior learning or qualifications; unplanned displacement often leads to minimal educational access or provision. In countries that are not signatories to the Refugee Convention, access to education is often illegal, particularly to higher levels of study, meaning that refugees have to face further risk of persecution to be able to access learning. These conditions create significant educational disadvantage, including (but not restricted to):

- Long periods of time without access to education
- Fragmented educational trajectories and missing assumed knowledge
- Limited or no access to expert teachers, resources, or national curricula
- Ad-hoc access to informal learning opportunities
- Limited or no access to national education systems (and the qualification systems that verify educational engagement at particular levels).

Moreover, many refugees live in noisy and cramped living and study conditions, which make careful study and preparation for learning or test-taking extremely difficult.

Access to further study for refugees

The UNHCR⁴ estimates that around a quarter of the world's refugees have access to secondary education, and only 9% have access to further education. These figures highlight the massive gap in educational demand and supply. The UNHCR's 15by30 campaign⁵ has set an ambitious mandate to get 15% of the world's refugees into higher education by 2030. To achieve this, issues of access, eligibility, and admissions flexibility need to be considered.

Educational Complementary Pathways (CPs) for refugees

As a result of increasing conflict and climate challenges in recent years, the situation for people living in displacement seeking a durable solution has radically changed. The massive increase in numbers of people living in displacement, coupled with a shifting geopolitical order and removal of aid programs, means that resettlement to a third country is an increasingly rare opportunity. As a result of the challenge, governments and organisations around the world have committed to finding

³ We used the term 'refugees' for brevity but recognise that refugees are not a homogeneous cohort and that this label reduces the nuanced, personal, and context-specific circumstances of individuals, families, and communities.

⁴ <https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-education-report-2025>

⁵ <https://www.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/2023-12/15by30-roadmap.pdf>

so-called ‘Complementary Pathways’ (CPs) to resettlement, often utilising community sponsorship models to help move more people without significantly increasing the cost to governments.

Educational pathways provide a mechanism for both educational advancement, which could lead to skilled labour mobility pathways, and in some cases they create alternative resettlement pathways outside of government programs. Such pathways leverage partnerships with educational institutions, such as universities, to provide (sometimes concessional) access to programs of study.

The Refugee Student Settlement Pathway (RSSP) to Australia

The Refugee Student Settlement Pathway (RSSP) is Australia’s first complementary pathway that leverages the community wealth and material support of tertiary education institutions to provide a new way for displaced young people (aged 18–30) to access resettlement to a third country. The RSSP is operated by not-for-profit organisation [Skill Path Australia](#).

The RSSP currently operates recruitment and selection from three countries in the Asia-Pacific: India, Malaysia, and Thailand. As none of these countries are signatories to the United Nations Refugee Convention, access to their national systems of education is extremely difficult (Thailand), if not outright illegal (Malaysia); consequently, refugees have to find alternative forms of education. Moreover, there is significant variability in the types, quality, and level of education and certification available to refugees and displaced peoples. We have provided country profiles of the education available to refugees in Appendix A.

Language proficiency requirements in the RSSP

Based on the World University Service Canada’s (WUSC) Student Refugee Program, the RSSP uses a humanitarian visa to bring academically able students to Australia with permanent protection, which means that RSSP students are not legally mandated to provide evidence of their language proficiency as part of their visa. However, RSSP students are required to meet the eligibility criteria imposed by individual universities. For students electing to study in accredited programs, such as Nursing, there are externally-mandated language proficiency requirements, which are higher than equivalent qualification-level programs. Even though Nursing is a priority field of study, applying these external requirements for end-of-course professional registration to the application process, serves as a further barrier to inclusion for those whose educational journeys have already been marred by exclusion.

Why are these guidelines on language test flexibility for displacement contexts required?

This guide is designed to help universities consider the circumstances that refugee students are applying from, and the types of constraints that they have faced before applying for a program of study in other countries. This guide includes a new principle (Principle 5), which specifically

considers the needs of displaced test-takers, including issues relating to access to test preparation materials, space, technical access, cultural dress, and irregular forms of identification.

This specific consideration of displacement in guidance on selecting appropriate language tests for university admission is both important and innovative, embedding accessibility for refugee test takers within English language test evaluations. This ensures that universities uphold Australian quality standards, deliver on institutional inclusion commitments, and align with global best practice—while making admissions processes genuinely fair and future-focused.

Structure of this guide

- The **How to use this tool** section outlines an evaluation procedure for selecting English language tests for admissions decisions.
- The **Principles for English Language Test Acceptance** articulate necessary qualities for the valid use of language test scores in university admissions decisions. These can be used as criteria in the test evaluation process.
- The **Test Evaluation Tool** provides explanations and questions based on the principles. The tool lists the information and evidence to gather or request from the **test provider** (i.e., the company or agency that produces the test).

How to use this tool

Evaluating tests requires close engagement with information about the test/s. It is ideally carried out by a committee who are informed about the English language demands of your institutional context. The steps below are suggested as a procedure for determining which tests best match the needs of students with English as an Additional Language (EAL) who are commencing tertiary study in an English-medium context.

1. **Form an evaluation committee.** Various perspectives can be useful, including from people who are (1) knowledgeable about the **demands of academic study via EAL** in your institution, (2) familiar with the institution's **admissions procedures**, (3) familiar with **research and best practice in language testing**, and (4) **are experienced in doing the test/s and studying at the institution**. The evaluation committee should not include representatives from test companies.
2. **Gather information and evidence.** Compile relevant information about test/s being considered for the evaluation committee. If information isn't available about an aspect of the test that is of interest to the institution, it is reasonable to request it from the testing company so that the evaluation committee is well informed. "Information and evidence to gather" is listed for each principle in the **Test Evaluation Tool**. Red flags (■) are possible reasons for exclusion based on unavailability of information. There are four main sources, listed below.
 - i. **Descriptive information** about the test content from test provider (i.e., testing company) websites, including information about how the test is scored.
 - ii. **Sample test materials** are an essential source of information about the actual test content and the experience of doing it. Only official test materials should be consulted. A test provider that does not publish full sample materials for all test sections should not be considered. It should not be necessary to pay or even sign up to a company's database to access official sample materials.
 - iii. **Research about each test** should be freely available on the test provider's website. Some of this research should be independent, i.e., carried out by researchers outside the testing company.



- iv. **Quality assurance procedures and technical reports** should be available in the form of descriptions about regular procedures (e.g., rater training methods, test monitoring methods) and routine reports of test performance in administrations which include measures such as reliability statistics and test taker population investigations.
3. **Evaluate test/s independently.** Using the collected information, committee members independently evaluate each test against the questions in Test Evaluation Tool, and make an overall assessment for each section.
4. **Compile committee evaluations.** Compile the *overall evaluations* from each committee member in an overall evaluations table.
5. **Discuss and select test/s.** Committee members discuss their individual evaluations and seek consensus on the suitability of each test.
 - Principle 1 – *The test is fit for purpose and provides sufficient information for admissions decisions* – is a hurdle principle. If it is not met, the test can be excluded.
 - If there are clear gaps in information available about a test, the committee may decide to request further information or exclude the test. For test content and sample materials, always use official information from test providers.
 - Some aspects of tests and test research are difficult for non-specialists to evaluate. However, the committee can check that the listed components and procedures are publicly available, and in some cases, that transparent procedures are communicated. Committee members may choose not to evaluate parts they feel unable to.
 - Ultimately the decision to accept a test for admissions purposes is based on all principles, on balance.



Principles for English Language Test acceptance

English Language Tests must meet the following criteria before they can be considered for inclusion in an admissions policy.

Principle 1: The test is fit for purpose and provides sufficient information for admissions decisions (P1)

- The test measures academic English language proficiency: tasks and scoring methods represent similar tasks, skills and values to those of the academic domain.
- The test gathers sufficient evidence about all four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking.
- Humans are meaningfully involved in evaluating each test taker's use of language.
- The test provider has a validation research agenda which examines the accuracy and appropriateness of scoring, the test's fit-for-purpose for the academic domain, and the impact of the test. The validation research is available.
- The test generates preparation activities that develop academic English.
- The test levels are representative of the range of English language proficiencies relevant to Australian higher education admission.

Principle 2: The test provides consistent and fair measurement (P2)

- The test is reliable and publishes information about its internal properties.
- The Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) is acceptable at score decision points, i.e., the score/s required to enter programs in the institution.
- Scoring practices are unbiased and fair.
- Appropriate accommodations for test takers with diverse needs and circumstances are provided.
- The test is secure.
- Test administration procedures are standardised.

Principle 3: The test's score equivalence with other tests is robust (P3)

- There is a sound empirical basis for the score equivalences claimed.

Principle 4: Communication and reporting are clear, accessible, and timely (P4)

- Information about the test content and test-taking procedures is publicly available and accessible.

- Sample test materials are freely available and easily accessible.
- Test results are communicated clearly and in a timely manner.
- Appeal processes are clearly described in information for test takers.

Additional Principle 5: The test is accessible for a range of test takers in displacement contexts (P5)

- Test preparation materials are freely available and easily accessible
 - Are materials freely available without registration?
 - Are materials freely available with registration (extent of personal info to be shared)?
 - Can materials be downloaded for offline use?
 - Are the materials accessible on mobile, tablet and desktop?
 - Is the platform easy to navigate?
 - Are the instructions available in other languages?
 - Does the practice material cover all parts of the test (full length)?
 - Does the practice material reflect the structure of the test?
 - Does the practice material include question types that reflect the test?
 - Are correct answers or samples provided with explanations?
 - Is individualised or guided feedback provided?
 - Are study guides provided?
- Are the minimum IT and bandwidth requirements likely to be manageable by someone in refugee contexts (noting these might vary widely)?
- Does the test accept irregular IDs?
- Can test takers wear a head covering?
- Is the test taker required to use multiple devices during the test?
- Do the room requirements accommodate the circumstances of test-takers in displacement contexts?



Test evaluation tool

Principle 1: The test is fit for purpose and provides sufficient information for admissions decisions

<p>P1.1</p> <p>Fit for purpose</p>	<p>The test measures academic English language proficiency: tasks and scoring methods represent similar tasks, skills and values to those of the academic domain.</p> <p>The test gathers sufficient evidence about all four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking.</p> <p>Humans are meaningfully involved in evaluating each test taker's use of language.</p>
---	---

P1.1 Explanation

Academic English tests should comprise tasks that require test takers to **engage with and produce language in academic genres on pseudo-academic topics**. ■ A test that does not measure academic English proficiency using substantial, relevant test tasks should not be considered. By nature, tests are time constrained, but academic study requires students to engage with and produce long and complex texts on disciplinary topics. A trustworthy test balances task variety with text and response length. It allows enough time to collect reasonable evidence of a test taker's ability, and that evidence includes a variety of opportunities to demonstrate academic language ability across different types of tasks. A trustworthy test does not waste precious test time with irrelevant tasks/items that might be efficient to score but demonstrate only a narrow aspect of academic language. It is also necessary to look closely at **scoring methods** to check that response complexity is assessed, and not just, for example, number of words or relevance of vocabulary. As with any high-stakes decision-making about people's life opportunities, human judgement should be meaningfully included in the scoring of individual performances, especially for more complex tasks such as academic summaries or arguments.

P1.1 Information & evidence to gather

Test providers usually publish descriptive information and official sample (practice) materials on their websites. This information varies in terms of its quality and detail. If information is not available, it is reasonable to request it, but at a minimum, the following information should be publicly available and gathered for the evaluation.

- Descriptive information about the test content (texts, items, tasks, etc.)
- Full official sample materials for the whole test
- The time allowed for the whole test and sub-tests
- The scoring criteria and how these are operationalised by either human or automated methods
- The types of English represented in the test (e.g., accents)



- Mode/s of delivery (e.g., online, paper, typed, handwritten)

P1.1 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
GENERAL: To what extent do test takers have to understand and produce academic English in reading, writing, listening and speaking tasks?	
GENRES & REGISTERS: Is there a variety of academic genres and texts (e.g., essay, summary, article, abstract, lecture, presentation, description)? Is there an authentic range of accents ?	
TOPICS: Is there a range of academic topics across disciplines ?	
ITEMS: Is there a variety of item types (e.g., multiple choice, short/long answer, matching, cloze).	
TEXT LENGTH: How substantial (i.e., how long and complex) are the written or spoken texts that test takers have to understand and produce?	
ACADEMIC LANGUAGE ABILITY: Do the tasks require test takers to: understand and use academic vocabulary ? understand written and spoken academic argumentation and discussion ? produce sustained, meaningful speech connecting their own or others' ideas? produce written texts which require academic skills such as argumentation, use of evidence, summarising or describing?	
SCORING: Do the scoring methods value academic language use, for example the coherence of an argument or the range of academic vocabulary used? Is human judgement used meaningfully in the scoring process for each test taker, especially regarding complex language use such as academic argumentation and extended discussion?	
P1.1 Overall evaluation: Test content is substantially representative of the academic domain. Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P1.2

Fit for purpose

The test provider has a validation agenda which examines the accuracy and appropriateness of scoring, the test's fit-for-purpose for the academic domain, and the impact of the test. The validation research is available.

The test generates preparation activities that develop academic English.

P1.2 Explanation

It is important that research is conducted to show the extent to which a test is an appropriate basis for decisions about entry into the academic domain. If a test is revised, research should be conducted to show that the test remains relevant.

P1.2 Information & evidence to gather

Research should be available on the test provider's website. ■ A test that does not have relevant, publicly available validation research should not be considered. ■ A test that only has company-produced research available should not be considered. Research that relates to superseded forms of the test may not be relevant (e.g., if a test has moved to automated scoring or changed task design since the publication). Research about test validity based on superseded test score mechanisms or task designs should not be included in the evaluation.

Research on the following is useful:

- Test tasks and the skills, knowledge and processes elicited by the test tasks
- Scoring methods, automated/human ratings
- Test preparation activities (called "washback")

P1.2 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Does research demonstrate that the current test tasks and topics capture academic language ability? For example, are there studies linking the test tasks to real life academic tasks?	
Is there any research investigating whether the skills, knowledge and processes elicited by the test tasks are similar to skills, knowledge and processes of the academic domain (i.e., what the test-takers are thinking and doing while engaging with the test tasks)?	
Does research demonstrate that the scoring places value on academic English ability? For example, is there evidence justifying the scoring criteria used for writing/speaking?	



Does research show that any automated methods used in the test scoring methods are well aligned with human judgements?	
If automated scoring methods are used, is there evidence that the automated methods are strongly representative of the criteria?	
Does research demonstrate that people preparing for the test do activities that are similar to academic tasks? ■ Is there evidence that the test methods cause people preparing for the test to focus on superficial techniques such as speaking loudly, speaking without pausing, or using as many multisyllabic words as possible?	
<p>P1.2 Overall evaluation: Research evidence indicates that the test is representative of the academic domain.</p> <p>Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree</p>	



P1.3

Fit for purpose

The test levels are representative of the range of English language proficiencies relevant to the applicant pool.

P1.3 Explanation

The test should be well suited to the English language proficiency level of a typical commencing cohort of students who will be studying through English as an additional language. The score/s used for admission decisions should not be at extreme ends of a test's scoring scale.

P1.3 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider's information about the scores, including:

- The scoring scale used
- Descriptive information about the language proficiency levels in relation to scores on the scale
- Sample performances at different levels, e.g., a writing sample that is typical of a test taker at different score levels

P1.3 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Does the test score range cover the score levels required for admission? ■ If the score/s used for admissions decisions are at the end of the scoring scale, the test should not be used.	
Do the description and sample performance align with institutional expectations of the proficiency level of commencing students?	
P1.3 Overall evaluation: Test score range and samples are well suited to expected proficiency range of commencing students.	
Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



Principle 2: The test provides consistent and fair measurement.

<p>P2.1</p> <p>Consistency & fairness</p>	<p>The test is reliable and publishes information about its internal properties.</p> <p>The Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) is acceptable at score decision points, i.e., the minimum required score for entry to a program.</p>
--	--

P2.1 Explanation

Consider the overall test reliability and sub-test reliability (e.g., reliability of the speaking, listening, reading and writing sub-tests). For high-stakes decisions, such as university entry, reliability values of 0.8 or higher are considered best practice.

Scores around decision-making points for admission should be statistically accurate. The standard error of measurement (SEM) can be used to establish this accuracy. A smaller SEM indicates a higher degree of accuracy.

P2.1 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider produces regular reports on the performance of different versions and administrations. ■ A test that does not make reliability statistics for each sub-test and for the overall test score available, should not be considered. For evaluation of Principle 2, seek routine reporting of the following aspects:

- Reliability statistics and internal psychometric properties of test versions.
- Average standard error of measurement (SEM) values at all score levels.
- Monitoring procedures for human and automated rating/scoring methods.

P2.1 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Is reliability routinely reported for test versions?	
Are reported reliabilities for the overall test and sub-tests at 0.8 or above?	
Is the standard error of measurement (SEM) relatively small around scores used for admission decisions?	
<p>P2.1 Overall evaluation: Reliability and error measurements are reported and acceptable.</p> <p>Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree</p>	



P2.2

Consistency & fairness

Scoring practices are unbiased and fair.

Appropriate accommodations for test takers with diverse needs and circumstances are provided.

P2.2 Explanation

Tests should carry out routine investigations into whether the test is biased towards any particular group. Another safeguard against bias is meaningful human engagement in task development processes, including human review for bias and content that is harmful, discriminatory or derogatory. Tests should have a transparent score appeal procedure which involves a genuine second assessment (e.g., human review of automated scoring, a different human rater for human scoring). Test accommodations should be available so that all test takers can participate equitably and to the best of their ability.

P2.2 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider produces regular summaries of test bias investigations on current versions of the test, e.g., country of origin, gender.

Test provider specifies the accommodations available for test takers and communicate these clearly on their test website.

Test provider has transparent procedures for:

- Score resolution processes (in the event of discrepancies between raters or rating mechanisms)
- Appeals processes, including human scrutiny for automatic scoring.

P2.2 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Is test bias routinely investigated and reported on by the test provider?	
Are test accommodations available?	
Do score appeals processes involve a genuine second assessment?	
P2.2 Overall evaluation: Procedures for bias detection, test accommodations and score appeals have transparency and integrity. Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P2.3

Consistency &
fairness

The test is secure.

Test administration procedures are standardised.

P2.3 Explanation

Scores on a test that is compromised by cheating or lack of security cannot be trusted so it is important that tests have comprehensive security measures. Cheating is possible in all forms of test delivery, but test centre delivery significantly reduces the range of possible methods of test compromise that exist in uncontrolled environments.

Large scale tests cannot produce consistent scores if they are administered inconsistently in test centres across the world.

P2.3 Information & evidence to gather

Test providers publish information about security and integrity procedures, such as:

- Identity checking and test invigilation methods
- Storage of test materials
- Test taker information
- Test data
- Test administration security
- Test administration staff recruitment
- Score report verification processes

Test providers describe how standardised procedures are maintained across test centres.

P2.3 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Are there comprehensive test security and integrity procedures in place for test taker identification, test materials, test data, test taker information, test administration procedures and staff recruitment?	
Are standardised procedures of test administration maintained across test centres?	
Are score report verification procedures available?	
P2.3 Overall evaluation: The test is secure and has standardised administration procedures. Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



Principle 3: The test’s score equivalence with other tests is robust.

P3 Equivalence	There is a sound empirical basis for the score equivalences claimed.
-------------------------------------	---

P3 Explanation

Different tests use different methods of eliciting English language ability from test takers. They have different scoring methods, score ranges and score scales. Therefore, scores on tests cannot be compared directly. To determine whether a score on a different test is equivalent, test providers must have empirical evidence from a “concordance study” using a robust methodology and a large sample of test takers around the score level/s required for admissions.

P3 Information & evidence to gather

The test provider publishes one or more test score equivalence studies (“concordance studies”) which shows how the test was equated with other test/s, the equivalent scores and any limitations (e.g., small sample size at certain score levels). ■ A test that does not have a publicly available concordance study available should not be considered.

P3 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Does the test have a strong evidence base for its score equivalence to other test/s accepted for admission?	
P3 Overall evaluation: Score equivalences have a sound evidence base. Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



Principle 4: Communication and reporting are clear, accessible, and timely.

P4 Communication	Information about the test content and test-taking procedures is publicly available and accessible. Sample test materials are freely available and easily accessible. Test results are communicated clearly and in a timely manner Appeal processes are clearly described in information for test takers.
-----------------------------------	--

P4 Explanation

Good communication about the nature of a test and its methods of scoring is important so that test takers know what to expect and can do their best.

Score reports should clearly indicate overall and subtest scores and relevant level descriptions so that the score can be interpreted. The timing of test results depends on how complex the marking/rating process is and the extent to which humans are involved. Test scoring that is fully automated can be reported relatively quickly. Human involvement and checking processes take time. Test scoring (marking/rating/scoring) should have some human involvement, especially for the evaluation of more complex criteria, and there should be checks in the process. Therefore, while immediate scoring is not feasible, results should be returned in a reasonable timeframe (around 4 weeks).

There should be clear information for test takers about what to do if they would like to appeal a score, and the allowed timeframe. The process of review should be transparent.

P4 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website has the following information freely available and accessible:

- Explanation of the intended use/s of the test score
- Descriptions of all test components (sub-tests, tasks, item types, response expectations, timings)
- Clear, accessible, descriptions of scoring methods (e.g., rubrics, relative weightings of tasks/criteria, explanations of automated methods)
- Score scale and meaning of score levels
- Examples of typical performances at different proficiency levels
- What to expect during the test administration (e.g., identity check, security)
- Accommodations available
- Free official sample materials of full test. ■ A test that does not provide free, official sample materials should not be considered.

Test provider website provides a sample score report and an indication of expected timeframe for test results.

Test provider website has the following information:

- Appeal procedure for test takers to follow and timing
- Description of score review procedure
- Timeframe for acknowledgement of complaints
- Timeframe for investigation and action plan to resolve complaints

P4 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Is information available in accessible language about test structure, test components (sub-tests, tasks, response expectations), cost, scoring criteria and methods, test conditions, score interpretation and meaning, and intended uses of scores?	
Are sample materials of the full test freely and publicly available to test takers?	
Do score reports contain clear, interpretable information about overall scores, subtests and score explanation?	
Do score reports contain information about the test administration, e.g., date, test centre?	
Are results available in a timely manner?	
Is there a clear appeal procedure with timeframe available to test takers?	
<p>P4 Overall evaluation: Information about the test content, test-taking procedures and reporting is clear and accessible. Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree</p>	



Principle 5: The test is accessible for a range of test takers in displacement contexts (P5)

<p>P5.1</p> <p>Test prep materials</p>	<p>There is fair consideration given to the preparation needs of people living in displacement contexts</p>
---	--

P5.1 Explanation

Test takers in displacement contexts may encounter difficulties with internet connectivity and accessing devices. For this reason, it is useful to assess whether the test information and practice materials are **accessible**, e.g. available offline, downloadable and printable. Second, as there may be limited opportunities to prepare for tests through commercial test preparation materials, it is also essential to determine to what extent the materials that are available online reflect the real test (**relevance**). Finally, displacement contexts may limit test takers' access to tutors and language specialists, so the **pedagogical value** of the preparation materials should be assessed as well.

P5.1 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website has the following information freely available and accessible:

- Test preparation materials that can be used offline or downloaded.
- Test preparation materials that can be accessed from various devices (mobile, tablet).
- Platform that is easy to navigate.
- Information and instructions available in multiple languages.
- Preparation materials that cover all parts of the test and preferably provide a full length test. These materials should have a similar structure to the test and use question types that appear in the test.
- Correct answers or work samples are provided with explanations. Individualised or guided feedback is provided.
- Study guide is provided.

P5.1 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Are materials freely available with registration (extent of personal info to be shared)?	
Can materials be downloaded for offline use?	

Are the materials accessible on mobile, tablet and desktop?	
Is the platform easy to navigate?	
Are the instructions available in other languages?	
Does the practice material cover all parts of the test and is it full length?	
Does the practice material reflect the structure of the test?	
Does the practice material include question types that reflect the question types of the test?	
Are correct answers or samples provided? Are explanations provided?	
Is individualised or guided feedback provided?	
Are study guides provided?	
P5.1 Overall evaluation: Test preparation materials	
Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P5.2

Minimum IT requirements

There is fair consideration given to the IT and bandwidth challenges that people living in displacement contexts face

P5.2 Explanation

People living in displacement contexts may have unstable access to wifi and may experience outages in bandwidth. If bandwidth drops out due to weather, crowding, or other conditions related to living in displacement contexts, the test progress can be impacted.

P5.2 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website provides information in plain language about what bandwidth is required to take the test, as well as information about what happens in the case of bandwidth dropping, so that displaced test-takers can make informed decisions and plan for the best place to take the test.

P5.2 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
<i>Are the minimum IT and bandwidth requirements likely to be manageable by someone in refugee contexts (noting these might vary widely)?</i>	
<i>Are the provisions for bandwidth dropping or other technical issues sufficient for someone in a refugee context?</i>	
P5.2 Overall evaluation: Minimum IT requirements Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P5.3

Irregular forms of ID

There are provisions included that account for refugees using irregular forms of ID for registration and authentication purposes

P5.3 Explanation

Because of the nature of forced migration, many refugees do not have access to current forms of official documentation, such as passports, driving licences, or birth certificates. Refugees may have other forms of identification, such as a UNHCR registration card or other forms of documentation that classify the holder as a refugee/ displaced person.

P5.3 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website clearly outlines what forms of identification are permissible for accessing their test, and these go beyond official or regular ID.

P5.3 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Does the test accept irregular IDs?	
P5.3 Overall evaluation: Irregular forms of ID Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P5.4

Head coverings

There are provisions included that account for the cultural practice of head covering

P5.4 Explanation

Many forced migrants that have escaped conflict or unsafe conditions are adherents of faiths that require their heads to be covered.

P5.4 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website clearly outlines what head coverings are permissible (and provide an explanation for why any forms of dress are not acceptable).

P5.4 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Can test takers wear a head covering?	
P5.4 Overall evaluation: Head coverings Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P5.5

Multiple devices needed

There are provisions included that account for the challenges displaced students might have with using more than one device for test-taking

P5.5 Explanation

Many refugees live in poverty or poverty-like conditions, meaning that access to multiple devices on which to take a test may be difficult to obtain without planning.

P5.5 Information & evidence to gather

Test provider website clearly outlines alternatives to having multiple devices; if no alternatives exist, the test provider website clearly states that multiple devices are necessary so displaced test-takers can make provisions to access another device in advance of their test date.

P5.5 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Is the test taker required to use multiple devices during the test?	
P5.5 Overall evaluation: Multiple devices Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



P5.6

Room requirements

The room requirements are not disadvantageous to people living in displacement contexts

P5.6 Explanation

Refugees often live in areas that can be characterised as noisy and cramped. This can make room requirements, such as having a closed door, difficult to achieve without planning.

P5.6 Information & evidence to gather

The test provider website clearly outlines the room requirements so that displaced test-takers can find alternative accommodation if they are not able to meet them. The test provider ideally does not enforce a closed door policy where it is unavoidable.

P5.6 Evaluation

Questions	Evaluation of [test name]
Do the room requirements accommodate the circumstances of test-takers in displacement contexts?	
P5.6 Overall evaluation: Room requirements Delete as applicable: Agree – Partially agree – Disagree	



Overall evaluations

Compile evaluations (*Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree*) from all committee members as a basis for discussion and consensus.

Overall evaluation	Committee Member 1	Committee Member 2	Committee Member 3	Committee Member 4
P1.1 Overall evaluation: Test content is substantially representative of the academic domain.				
P1.2 Overall evaluation: Research evidence indicates that the test is representative of the academic domain.				
P1.3 Overall evaluation: Test score range and samples are well suited to expected proficiency range of commencing students.				
P2.1 Overall evaluation: Reliability and error measurements are reported and acceptable.				
P2.2 Overall evaluation: Procedures for bias detection, test accommodations and score appeals have transparency and integrity.				
P2.3 Overall evaluation: The test is secure and has standardised administration procedures.				
P3 Overall evaluation: Score equivalences have a sound evidence base.				
P4 Overall evaluation: Information about the test content, test-taking procedures and reporting is clear and accessible.				
P5.1 Overall evaluation: Test preparation materials are freely available and easily accessible				
P5.2 Overall evaluation: The minimum IT and bandwidth requirements are manageable for displacement contexts				
P5.3 Overall evaluation: The test accepts irregular forms of ID				
P5.4 Overall evaluation: The test does not discriminate against people with head coverings				
P5.5 Overall evaluation: The test does not disadvantage test-takers who cannot access more than one device to take the test				
P5.6 Overall evaluation: The room requirements do not create disadvantage to people living in displacement contexts				
Tentative consensus (for discussion)				



Appendix A: Displacement and educational access in India, Malaysia and Thailand

India

Overview of the refugee context in India

For decades, India has hosted diverse refugee groups and has found durable solutions for many forcibly displaced people. As of early 2025, there are approximately 273,400 refugees and persons in refugee-like situations in the country. Key populations include Afghans (11,680), Chinese nationals (73,400, including Tibetans), persons from Myanmar (99,880), Sri Lankans (83,300, largely Tamil refugees in Tamil Nadu), and others from countries such as Somalia, Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (5,140).

Refugees and asylum seekers primarily live in urban settings alongside host communities, but are spread across at least 11 states. Tamil Nadu, Delhi, Jammu and Kashmir, and northeastern states such as Mizoram and Manipur host significant refugee populations. Approximately 46% of refugees are women and girls, and 36% are children under 18.

Legal Status, Protection, and Mobility

India is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention or its 1967 Protocol and does not have a national legal framework for refugee protection. However, it has a mixed approach: some refugee groups, such as Tibetans and Sri Lankan Tamils, receive direct government support and documentation, while others, such as Afghans, Rohingya, and refugees from Africa, are protected under UNHCR's mandate.

Registered refugees holding documentation from UNHCR (or, for certain groups, from Indian authorities) can access basic services, though protection remains fragile and discretionary. Urban mobility is generally unrestricted, but lack of formal legal status exposes many refugees to risks such as police harassment, arbitrary detention, and barriers to accessing public services. Employment opportunities are limited to informal sectors, with no legal right to formal work.

Access to Education

India's Right to Education Act (RTE) guarantees free and compulsory education for all children aged 6 to 14 years, including refugee and asylum-seeking children in principle. Refugee children can access government primary schools, although enrollment often depends on local administrative practices and may require advocacy from NGOs or UNHCR. In government schools, instruction is typically delivered in the regional language of the state, such as Hindi, Tamil, or Bengali, with English taught as a second language. Refugee children frequently face challenges adapting to unfamiliar languages and curricula.

Access becomes more difficult at the secondary and higher secondary levels, where admission procedures may require formal identity documents or academic certificates that many refugee youth do not possess. Financial barriers and continued language difficulties further restrict participation.

Non-formal education pathways, including the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS), offer an alternative for displaced youth unable to attend mainstream schools. NIOS provides flexible study options and nationally recognised certification, with courses and examinations available in English, Hindi, and Urdu.

Recognition of Secondary Completion

Students who complete their secondary studies through NIOS or formal Indian schools receive recognised certification. However, many refugee youth experience interrupted schooling, gaps in documentation, or limitations in accessing standardised examinations. NGOs often support youth in preparing for NIOS exams or other equivalency assessments.

Pathways to Higher Education

Refugee youth in India face significant barriers to tertiary education, particularly related to financial constraints, lack of recognised legal status, and limited access to scholarships.

The DAFI (Albert Einstein German Academic Refugee Initiative) scholarship program, administered by UNHCR and partners, provides opportunities for qualified refugee students to pursue undergraduate degrees in India. Some private universities and colleges, particularly in Delhi and southern India, may admit refugee students on a case-by-case basis, sometimes offering fee reductions or financial support.

However, without formal refugee recognition by the government or legal status that allows employment after graduation, even those who complete degrees face limited prospects. Durable solutions—including third-country education pathways, resettlement opportunities, and complementary labor migration schemes—are essential to ensure that their education leads to meaningful futures.

Key Considerations for Australian Institutions

Refugee students from India may have incomplete academic records, disrupted education histories, or gaps in formal certification. English proficiency levels vary depending on the refugee community's background. Afghan and Tibetan refugees may have had greater exposure to English-medium education compared to others, while many Myanmar and African refugees may require additional language support.

Malaysia

Overview of the refugee context in Malaysia

As of March 2025, approximately 192,800 refugees and asylum-seekers are registered with UNHCR in Malaysia, including about 24,000 of school-going age. The majority—around 174,410 individuals—are from Myanmar, with Rohingya (114,190), Chin (28,850), and other ethnic minorities (31,370) fleeing conflict and persecution. The remaining population includes refugees and asylum-seekers from more than 50 other countries, notably Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Afghanistan, Syria, Sri Lanka, Palestine, and Iraq. Approximately 64% of the refugee population are men and boys, and 36% are women and girls. Children under the age of 18 represent nearly 56,520 individuals. Malaysia does not have traditional refugee camps. Instead, refugees in Malaysia primarily reside in urban areas, often in low-cost housing, with the largest populations living in Kuala Lumpur and the surrounding Klang Valley. Other notable concentrations of refugees are found in Johor and Penang.

Legal Status, Protection, and Mobility

Malaysia is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention and does not recognise refugees in national law. Refugees and asylum-seekers are treated as irregular migrants, lacking legal status, the right to work, or access to public services. Despite these challenges, Malaysia has historically tolerated the presence of refugees and allowed UNHCR to register individuals, provide services such as health care and education, and advocate on their behalf. Mobility within Malaysia is physically possible but risky; refugees are vulnerable to immigration raids, extortion, and abuse, particularly in urban areas.

Access to Education

Refugee children do not have access to formal education in Malaysia’s public education system. Instead, they rely on informal, community-run learning centres, often supported by NGOs, religious groups, and refugee communities. As of 2025, approximately 128 community-based learning centres operate across the country, offering basic education focused on literacy, numeracy, and life skills. However, access remains extremely limited: Only 30% of the 24,000 displaced youth of school going ages are enrolled in community learning centers.

14% (1,234) Refugee children aged 3-5 years enrolled in pre-school education	44% (5,046) Refugee children aged 6-13 years enrolled in primary education	16% (874) Refugee children aged 14-17 enrolled in secondary education
--	---	---

Barriers to education include the inability to afford fees even at community centres, security and safety risks while travelling to or attending school, lack of standardised curricula, lack of

accreditation or recognised certification, high turnover of teachers (many of whom are volunteers with limited training), and widespread underfunding.

Recognition of Secondary Completion

Because community-based learning centres are informal, they cannot confer recognised Malaysian academic certification or access to national public examinations. Some students pursue alternative qualifications, such as the IGCSE where available through partner NGOs or private arrangements, or the GED diplomas via online or international programs. However, these options are limited by cost, availability of qualified teachers, and access to testing facilities.

Pathways to Higher Education

Public universities in Malaysia are not open to refugees. A small number of private universities and colleges have developed partnerships or scholarship programs to offer access to refugee students, although barriers remain high due to cost, documentation requirements, and the need for a study visa.

Key partnerships include Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) between UNHCR and several institutions such as the University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus, International University of Malaya-Wales (IUMW), Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Brickfields Asia College, International Innovative College, and HELP University. Some of these institutions offer scholarships or reduced fees to refugee and asylum-seeking youth.

Additionally, organisations like Fugee⁶ offer higher education scholarships for refugees seeking to study for a bachelor's degree, diploma, or foundation course. Online and distance education options also provide critical access points for those unable to attend in-person programs. However, without legal rights to work in Malaysia after graduation, refugee youth face limited prospects for using their qualifications, making access to durable solutions—including resettlement, scholarships abroad, or third-country pathways—essential to ensure their education is not wasted.

Key Considerations for Australian Institutions

Refugee students from Malaysia may lack formal academic certification or government-issued identification. English proficiency varies: many learning centres use English or bilingual instruction (English and Burmese or Rohingya), but standards differ widely. Students often demonstrate strong motivation and aptitude but may have experienced interrupted or informal schooling. Flexible admissions processes, academic bridging programs, recognition of alternative qualifications are essential to improving equitable access to admissions for these students.

⁶ <https://www.fugee.org>

Thailand

Overview of the refugee context

People uprooted from Myanmar, also known as Burma, began crossing into Thailand in 1984 to escape armed conflict and military repression. Today, approximately 90,000 refugees—mostly ethnic Karen and Karenni—live in nine camps along the Thai-Myanmar border, many of whom have lived in protracted displacement for over 30 years. Refugee youth born in camps have never had any formal identification—neither from Myanmar nor Thailand—making proof of identity and education records difficult to obtain.

In addition to the camp population, an estimated 5,000 to 8,000 asylum seekers and refugees from more than 50 countries—including Pakistan, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Somalia—live in urban areas such as Bangkok and Chiang Mai. These individuals remain undocumented and face frequent risk of arrest and deportation.

Legal Status, Protection, and Mobility

Thailand is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention and has no legal framework for recognising or protecting refugees. While camp-based refugees are registered through a joint process by UNHCR and the Thai government, this status does not grant legal residency or the right to work. Urban refugees are treated as irregular migrants and face frequent risk of detention.

In 2022, Thailand launched a National Screening Mechanism (NSM) intended to assess protection needs, but implementation remains limited. Camp residents live under strict movement restrictions and cannot leave without a permit—rarely granted and inconsistently applied. Urban refugees have greater mobility but live under constant threat of immigration enforcement. There are no formal pathways to naturalisation or long-term integration, leaving most refugees in limbo and dependent on humanitarian assistance.

Access to Education

In the refugee camps, most children and youth attend community-run schools and learning centres, often supported by NGOs. These schools follow the Karen State Education Department or Myanmar government curriculum and are not accredited by Thai authorities. Languages of instruction include Karen, Burmese, and English, depending on the subject and grade level. Thai is not widely taught, and camp-based youth rarely speak it fluently due to their isolation from host communities. English proficiency varies but is often developed through school-based instruction, supplementary classes, or NGO-led preparation for exams such as TOEFL and GED. Refugees outside the camps theoretically have access to Thai public schools under a 2005 Cabinet Resolution that guarantees education for all children, regardless of legal status. In practice, however, they face significant barriers: lack of identity documents, Thai language requirements, discriminatory attitudes, and limited awareness among school staff. A small number of displaced youth manage to enroll in Thai primary schools, but few reach secondary or tertiary levels.



Some young people access education outside both the Thai public system and the camp-based schools. This includes community-based learning centres in urban areas (which are often informal and limited in capacity), distance education programs like the GED (General Educational Development) diploma, or the IGCSE. A small number attend Thai non-formal education centres, though these typically require Thai literacy and local approval.

Recognition of Secondary Completion

Since camp-based and non-formal systems are not accredited by Thai authorities, many refugee students lack officially recognised diplomas. Some obtain internationally recognised qualifications such as the GED or IGCSE, while others rely on placement exams, portfolio assessments, or academic references to access postsecondary opportunities abroad.

Thai universities remain largely inaccessible to refugees due to their undocumented status, lack of formal credentials, language barriers, and financial constraints. As a result, overseas scholarships are often the only viable pathway to higher education. NGOs and community organisations play a key role in preparing students for these opportunities, including support with documentation, test preparation, and application processes.

Pathways to Higher Education

Thai universities are not accessible to most refugees due to their lack of legal status, missing or unrecognised documentation and qualifications, financial barriers and language requirements (Thai or English, depending on the institution).

NGOs and community groups work to prepare refugee youth for overseas scholarships, which are seen as critical alternatives for students unable to access national systems. Students often present non-formal transcripts, GED results, or strong academic references in lieu of formal certification.

Key Considerations for Australian Institutions

Refugee students from Thailand may not have official transcripts or national identification. While English proficiency varies, it is often stronger than Thai language skills—particularly for camp-based learners. Many students have strong academic motivation but face interrupted schooling and limited access to digital tools or academic advising. Institutions considering refugee applicants from Thailand are encouraged to offer flexible admissions, tailored academic bridging, and psychosocial support to ensure successful transition and retention.





Refugee
Education
Australia

www.refugee-education.org.au

To discuss further, contact:
contactus@refugee-education.org.au



For questions or further information about the refugee education, please contact:

Sally Baker, CEO, Refugee Education Australia

sally@refugee-education.org.au

For information about the Refugee Student Settlement Pathway, please check here: <https://www.skillpath.org.au/students> or contact:

Steph Cousins, CEO, Skill Path Australia

steph@skillpath.org.au

For further information about the original Test Selection Guide, please contact:

Ute Knoch, Language Testing Research Centre, University of Melbourne

uknoch@unimelb.edu.au

Susy Macqueen, Australian National University

susy.macqueen@anu.edu.au



Refugee
Education
Australia

69 Coorumbung Road,
Broadmeadow, NSW 2292

0497 084947

ABN 99 681 498 662



contactus@refugee-education.org.au



www.refugee-education.org.au

