

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

**REVIEW OF THE FUNCTIONS EXERCISED BY THE
COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**



**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 2018**

SESSION TWO

Members

**Hon Dr Sally Talbot, MLC (Chair)
Mr K.M. O'Donnell, MLA (Deputy Chair)
Hon Donna Faragher, MLC
Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski, MLA**

Hearing commenced at 10.11 am**Mr RONALD DAVID GORMAN****Deputy Director, Association of Independent Schools of Western Australia, examined:**

The CHAIR: On behalf of the committee I would like to thank you for agreeing to appear today to assist the committee in its review of the exercise of the functions of the Commissioner for Children and Young People. The purpose of today's hearing is to discuss the "School and Learning Consultation—Technical Report", produced by the Commissioner for Children and Young People in January this year. It is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of this committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. Your evidence is protected by parliamentary privilege. However, this privilege does not apply to anything you might say outside of today's proceedings. Today is a public hearing. Hansard will be making a transcript which, in due course, will be published on the committee's webpage. If during the hearing you feel that evidence you are about to give should be given confidentially, please let us know so we can respond appropriately.

Do you have any questions about your attendance here today?

Mr GORMAN: No. I think I am very happy to leap in and have a conversation.

The CHAIR: And you have met Michael Burton, our advisory officer, who is flitting around there?

Mr GORMAN: Yes. I do not see this as a conflict of interest, but I do want to mention that I was on the reference group, which was the work around developing the tool.

The CHAIR: That is very interesting, and not a conflict of interest at all. In fact, you might be able to provide us with some additional insights because of that role. You obviously understand the process very well. Did you want to start with any sort of opening statement or shall we go straight into our questions?

Mr GORMAN: I thought it might be useful just to mention the make-up of our constituency in education.

The CHAIR: Please do.

Mr GORMAN: I think that is quite important. The Association of Independent Schools acts as a membership organisation and sees itself as a sector, not a system. We have no direct jurisdiction over what schools do. Independent schools are governed by a governing body of each school. They have a relationship with state and federal government on that one-to-one basis. Obviously, each school is registered by the Department of Education. They go through a cycle of re-registration against the standards, so that it is clear about the health and wellbeing of young people and the effective governance of schools. That is an important process for us.

We have 158 member schools. We represent what I will call the long-established schools. We have quite a few large, low-fee schools in the metropolitan area. Obviously, a lot of our schools have a religious background—Christian schools, Islamic schools, we have one Jewish school. We also represent what we call the philosophically-based schools, which are the Montessori schools and the Steiner schools. We have a number of community schools within our organisation. We have 13 Aboriginal schools, which are in the Kimberley, the Pilbara and the goldfields. I think at last count we have 11 care schools, which are curriculum and re-engagement schools. Those schools are ones that take on the enrolments of young people who have had quite bad experiences of schooling in general or whose lives are very, very complicated and need a modified curriculum and more

intensive support in their engagement in schooling. That segues very nicely into the work that the Commissioner for Children and Young People has done in terms of student voice.

I am happy to talk a little bit more about our work if you would like. Whilst we do not have direct jurisdiction over schools, we provide a lot of support for schools and school leadership, teachers and students. We primarily are charged to support the governance of each of our member schools. We also then have a number of departments that look after various elements of schooling that schools require of us. We have a psychology service, which is very important to all of our schools. We have an inclusive education team that supports students with disabilities, supports students in the gifted and talented area and works in differentiating curriculum for individual student needs. We have a range of curriculum consultants who work extensively with schools in terms of the implementation of the Western Australian curriculum. We also have a very focused early childhood team that looks at that pre-kindy to year 2 space and supports schools in ensuring that young people are engaged in their learning at school. As I have said, we have schools that are in the metropolitan area, in regional areas and in some of the most remote locations in the state. I am happy to take any questions on the background and function of our organisation.

The CHAIR: Thank you. As you say, you were involved in the preliminary establishment work that went into this report.

Mr GORMAN: Yes, I was. It was actually quite a pleasure to work in this space, because we certainly were keen to give support to anything that gives young people a sense of voice and agency.

The CHAIR: Had you had much engagement with the commissioner and his office before that?

Mr GORMAN: Some—not a lot. We have worked closely with the commissioner over a period of time, but this was my first engagement in terms of a reference group appearance.

The CHAIR: This is a very big body of work—it is the biggest that the commissioner and his office have ever undertaken. Do you have any general comments to make about the review? Is it useful?

Mr GORMAN: It is useful. We have already started making use of the commissioner's work with our member schools.

The CHAIR: Excellent! Would you like to talk us through that just in a general sense? If you want to drill down to specific issues, that is fine, too.

Mr GORMAN: Certainly. Knowing that this work was being done by the commission, we asked the commissioner to address our Briefing the Board conference, which is our peak conference for governing body members, principals and school leaders. We did that prior to the release. Obviously, he could not talk about what was coming, but we wanted schools to be aware that this work was being undertaken. Certainly at that point we had a very well-attended session, and people were quite engaged with the commissioner in terms of looking forward to what this may say to the education sector. Subsequently, we asked the commissioner to address our association's annual general meeting, which was very successful. It was certainly appreciated by the many principals who attended that. More recently, we asked the commissioner to address our key curriculum gathering just several weeks ago. That was very successful. We have also made sure that links to all of the work that comes out of the commission is part of our communications with schools. We are very, very interested in supporting the work, because we certainly think it is worthy. It is something that I know schools are very thankful for—particularly this report.

The CHAIR: Do you have a view about the opt-out provisions associated with the collection of this data?

Mr GORMAN: Golly.

The CHAIR: The education department has taught us that it is called passive consent, so I am now going to use the term “passive consent”. The committee is quite keen, and we are advocating pretty actively, for the system to move to passive consent so that a larger cohort of students can be captured by the data.

[10.20 am]

Mr GORMAN: My view is that this is probably the beginning of something which should be extended and built upon, so certainly in my role as reference group member, we were cognisant that the type of engagement meant we were going to get some and not all. The obvious is, “Wouldn’t it be good to expand that and have all?” I think that is work for the future. This is certainly something that allows us to, in fact, say that.

The CHAIR: Yes and AISWA would be supportive of that measure?

Mr GORMAN: We would be supportive of that.

The CHAIR: With all the usual riders associated with that about protecting students.

Mr GORMAN: Of course, yes.

The CHAIR: Just to drill down into some of the recommendations, I am happy to give you the floor if you want to just talk us through AISWA’s response to some of the recommendations, if there are particular ones that you would like to draw attention to?

Mr GORMAN: I might do that.

The CHAIR: Yes, sure.

Mr GORMAN: As an association, we engage with schools, as I have mentioned, particularly in the area of school leadership and professional learning. One of our flagship programs called Amplify: Designing Bright Futures was based on the higher level of engagement in schooling. This was basically predicated on, and I will just read the research words: students who believe they have a voice in decision-making are seven times more likely to be academically motivated than those who do not. I have some reference points there, which I can send you. That was part of our case for change in that project.

The CHAIR: Is that quote drawn from some other research?

Mr GORMAN: That is Willms, Milton and Friesen, 2009.

The CHAIR: I will get Michael to follow that up with you to provide the reference for the committee.

Mr GORMAN: I will send those.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr GORMAN: There was quite a lot that we used as a proposition for a case for change. We also drew on work that was done by the New Media Consortium, which is an international consortium. The two key findings that have been recurring in that K–12 space have been a shift to deeper learning for students and a recommendation that there be a redesign of the business model of schooling itself. I am also mindful, as background to response to the recommendation, that AITSL, which is the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, in 2014 did publish that 38 per cent of students are bored at school and 22 per cent cannot remember what they have learnt that day. That is alarming. Certainly, as an educator, that is alarming. The Grattan Institute last year also came out with a report on student engagement and rated that 40 per cent of students were disengaged at school. Those students are not necessarily obvious. They are at school, they are doing well, but the engagement in the learning and their responses were really quite interesting and should be of concern for all of us in terms of how we see schooling, pedagogy and school leadership.

The CHAIR: It is a fascinating reorientation of that understanding of engagement, isn't it?

Mr GORMAN: Yes, it is.

The CHAIR: It is something that the TKI has taken up. Telethon Kids Institute researchers have pointed out that you cannot measure engagement necessarily by attendance.

Mr GORMAN: No. You need to go to—I call them the experts—the students themselves and have that conversation and, of course, you need the right questions to ask and the right environment in which to ask them. We were very interested in that sort of background in terms of agency and student voice. In fact, part of our submission to the Gonski 2.0 review highlighted a need for greater student voice and agency in learning. If I may, can we perhaps just run through the recommendations?

The CHAIR: Please do, yes. That would be very useful for us.

Mr GORMAN: Recommendation 1: we are very pleased with the work and we are very pleased with the recommendation. It does give schools something to think about and I would hope gives something for schools to act upon. In terms of recommendation 1, I think it would be useful, and I like the sense of having effectiveness of policy and practice at a school level across WA. That makes really good sense, even though we appear to be three separate organisations, and we are, we are constantly—certainly in Western Australia—talking to our colleagues in the various system sectors and making sure that, actually, our business is all of young people's business in the state. Certainly, I would be very, very happy to offer recommendation 1 with support. I am interested in schools demonstrating, via their annual reports, the actions that they have taken in terms of student survey responses. In the independent sector, schools do conduct surveys. It is their business, not ours. If there were to be a shift towards a policy position on that, I would just like to be on record as saying that the burden of compliance is an issue. How do principals add that to their work in terms of leadership? That is not to not support it, but it is just to say that we would need to be cognisant of the extra responsibilities we may be passing to schools.

The CHAIR: It goes to the heart of what we mentioned just now about how you measure engagement. If you are doing it by attendance, it is quite easy.

Mr GORMAN: Attendance is easy, yes.

The CHAIR: But if you are looking for some other measure, it is more labour intensive to collect the data.

Mr GORMAN: Yes. The obvious one is the attendance issue and it is of concern, but the lack of being at school is a smaller percentage of a bigger issue and that is why some more focused work in terms of surveys probably should be done.

Finding 2 is of interest to our association and our constituency in terms of Aboriginal students. We are very, very active in supporting the governing bodies and principals in our remote and rural Aboriginal schools. We have worked with the Department of Education's cultural competency framework with our schools, which I think goes towards that. We have also provided further training in terms of cultural competency, which is a self-reflective process for teachers to measure their effectiveness and the effectiveness of the whole school. In terms of supporting Aboriginal students, from the findings, I think that is essential for all of us. I am very happy with that.

Certainly finding 3, that has a strong link between engagement and relationships—I am particularly interested in that. The recommendations are all fine. The one that was of interest to me was the teacher training recommendation. That is certainly not within our scope, but I think that is worthy of consideration and pursuing. There is one particular piece of work that looks at personal

characteristics for students, and I think it is probably worthwhile looking at some of those personal characteristics for teachers as well, which comes out of the Center for Curriculum Redesign. It is an international think tank about engagement and young people's learning. They draw attention to the knowledge, skills and character sets that would set people up to be successful in their time at school and in their future. Again, I can get a reference to you.

The CHAIR: That might be useful, yes.

[10.30 am]

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: With the teaching of the teachers, we have heard some suggesting in previous hearings that we need to do some more work around building their capabilities in a broader social sense, but also managing those personal relationships because, obviously, they impact on the student and how the student learns. Do you have any opinions or comments on that?

Mr GORMAN: Yes, I am happy to make some comments. My understanding of teacher training, certainly in Western Australia, is that we are in pretty safe hands. So our universities are doing a grand job; I would like that on record. It may very well be an issue of funding. I think the more effort or capacity for universities to offer an insight into young people's learning, brain development and character development and how they can best engage with young people and support their learning would be worthy, but I can see budgetary implications in that, which is probably something that is a little bit awkward for WA at the moment so I will not pursue that. But certainly at a university level, I do not know if we would be able to contribute, but we are very, very keen in working in partnership with universities. We will often work with universities and research projects, which we hope feeds back in to the teacher training cycle. That would be notionally any future contribution that we would make in that area.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: Slightly off topic: within your constituency of independent schools, you do have some schools that teach different types of pedagogy. In terms of engaging with students, which is mainly what this report is about, have you found that these schools identify more or less with the recommendations and findings about engagement?

Mr GORMAN: Yes, there are a range of pedagogical practices, which is fine.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: I have one in my electorate, so I am aware.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: Can I ask a question about pedagogy?

Mr GORMAN: It is ways of teaching. You could say direct instruction by being at the front of the classroom and taking students through a set series of sequences with direct interaction between the teacher and student would be a pedagogy. Another one might be inquiry learning, for example, where young people are encouraged to co-construct the curriculum around the questions that they may want to pursue and how that plays out in terms of the curriculum delivery. I think it is worthwhile saying that whilst there is a range of philosophical and pedagogical practices, every independent school in Western Australia must demonstrate the implementation of the Western Australian curriculum. That is a given and part of the re-registration process sees that through. A number of schools do apply for curriculum recognition. They are mainly the Steiner schools, the Montessori schools and the schools that are offering the baccalaureate program. What we are working with or what we would like to do with schools is pose those questions of: "How do we maximise young people's success at school and for their future?" which has shades of the Melbourne declaration, of course; and, "How do we best do that?" We are very, very keen to do that work ourselves, obviously, but this work with the commission has actually been very, very helpful in terms of agency and student voice. This is probably more an opinion piece than anything that I would be able to prove with hard numbers, but with the implementation of the Early Years

Learning Framework, there is very clear articulation around student agency. I think that is very worthy and a fine document. I would be suggesting that that sense of agency, with the capacity for young people to be involved in a co-constructed curriculum, which links to deep learning and greater engagement, will be supported by the commissioner's work. So it is not just an early childhood issue. It is actually a matter of learning because we have young people in our schools for 14—some 15—years, which is a very handsome slice of a period of life. That should, of course, be of concern and interest to all of us. That sense of school improvement, with a focus on learning and the conversations we have with school leavers as well are really important to us.

The CHAIR: That is very useful. You have got to, I think, that group of recommendations under finding 3, which takes us to recommendation 7.

Mr GORMAN: Yes. I am happy with 7—really, happy with all of them, but I have nothing particular to say about finding 4. If I can move over to finding 5, this relates to quite a bit of what I have had to say to date. Coming back to your question, Jessica—the issue of stimulating in a positive learning environment—is featured in finding 5. I am interested in the relevance of the curriculum to children. The feedback that we do get when we talk around curriculum is that it is crowded and there is a sense that perhaps some form of review may be worthwhile in terms of—what is useful for young people's progress through school? In terms of recommendation 9, is a big call. I am happy that there would be a review of the *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. It is an opportunity to, I think, reframe the business model of schooling, if you like. Of course, the wording is actually very specific: “the relevance of the curriculum and other aspects of education to meet the contemporary needs of students.” For me, I think that is the key recommendation that really needs to be thought about and considered at a state level and a national level. We are quite mindful that some of the international research that we do look at and share with schools talks about the issues of deep learning, co-constructed curriculum and the often-used phrase, “twenty-first century skills and thinking.” We are 18 years in and I think we are still trying to have a hard think about how that acts out for schools. I think recommendation 9 is timely for consideration, if I can leave that with you.

The CHAIR: Yes. There is some interesting tension in there. The department was just addressing this issue and talking about the fact that you try to write these kinds of documents, like the Melbourne declaration, and try and write them in very broad language so that they do not change too quickly, so you can make adjustments to the delivery of services underneath the umbrella of the declaration without having to constantly go back and tweak it. But, at the same time, once it moves past a certain point, it becomes very hard to make those changes at the grassroots level.

[10.40 am]

Mr GORMAN: I agree. Certainly the general capabilities are fine. I think we know an awful lot more to refine how we articulate what I would call the dispositions that learners need to be successful at school. Certainly the dispositions or character traits that young people need as they enter either training or further education, or particularly the workforce, is of great interest to us, and we do quite a bit of work around that space. As the Melbourne declaration stands, certainly it is a very global proposition and one that is very comfortable, but I think sitting under that, within the curriculum space, a review of the capabilities would also be quite helpful. I am not sure if this is appropriate, but I think it is timely that there be a review of NAPLAN. I would be keen to talk more about that if there is appetite here. One of the research projects that we embarked on in the NAPLAN space, and we partnered with Edith Cowan University on this, is that we asked some simple questions: are the kids okay in terms of the experience of NAPLAN? This is our fourth year of research into that space. We were finding that if there was less stress or focus around the event of

NAPLAN, then young people were actually far more comfortable with the NAPLAN experience, but as the focus grew, the stress grew, and that became problematic. One of the findings that I was a little bit concerned about was that quite a number of year 3 students regarded the experience of NAPLAN as something that affected their future jobs.

The CHAIR: It would become like the old 11-plus in the UK.

Mr GORMAN: Yes. That is of interest. That sort of research within our sector has actually been reflected to principals so that they can think about young people's learning rather than worry about the event of NAPLAN. There are ways of meeting national reporting, which probably would be helpful at a national level. I think a broader window of the assessment would be a pretty smart move. It may send psychometricians nuts, but I am happy to put the proposition that if the window were greater, students could engage in the assessment at a period of time when a teacher thought it might be appropriate for them to do that. For national reporting, a sample of student performance can be raised from that. It would not remove whole cohort testing; it would actually use it as a tool, which I think teachers and school leaders would find far more useful.

The CHAIR: It would actually be measuring what it set out to measure, rather than something else.

Mr GORMAN: Yes, and be used for something else. Obviously, with the online space, the quick turnaround is very welcome. But as I have said, if there was a point of readiness and a greater window of six months—let us say two terms—I think that would be welcomed by teachers. I have no doubt it would be welcomed by parents. And the students would have a sense of ownership about their inputs into their own reading assessment or their numeracy assessment or their writing assessment. Given that we are talking about national issues, I thought I would just weigh in with NAPLAN.

The CHAIR: Yes. Thanks for those comments; that is useful. We might come back to that at some stage in the future.

Mr GORMAN: Certainly supporting students who require assistance in schools in recommendation 10 is important. I guess coming back to some of your initial comments about making sure that we ask the right questions, that would be a space certainly for all students, but particularly Indigenous students and students with disabilities or learning difficulties in terms of their interface with schooling and their learning. I think there would be great value in pursuing recommendation 10. Child-safe policies, of course, and the matter of mental health was something that came up, which we would support—probably a proposition that would have a greater focus on making sure that we know how our kids are travelling. I was expecting a briefing from our senior psych this morning, only to be told he is dealing with a regional school that is dealing with a suspected suicide of a year 12 student. That is a tragic event. Mental health is something that I think has come out of this report as something that we do need to consider further. Physical health I think we get, typically because you can see it or diagnose certain things, but mental health, whilst there are a lot of very good programs being used across the system sectors in Western Australia—I do know that—it is an area that I think requires more conversation and more capacity for school leaders, teachers and young people to be involved in conversations in that area.

The CHAIR: That is very interesting. I am happy if you continue to work through the recommendations.

Mr GORMAN: Sure.

The CHAIR: We are nearly there, I think.

Mr GORMAN: The mental health one was in reference to finding 7, so I am happy with recommendations 13 and 14. Really, the recommendations have come out of a methodology that

was used quite well. It gives us something to work on in terms of further research. I would certainly like it on record that we are very thankful for the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the work that was done on that, because its contribution to schooling at this point in time is significant, but its contribution to how we might support young people into the future is, I think, far reaching as well. I think in Western Australia we should be very proud of this; I certainly am, so I think we should be.

The CHAIR: I will just ask my colleagues if they have any questions to follow up with you.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: I was surprised to hear that year 3 students were possibly suffering with stress with NAPLAN. That should never happen for grades 1, 2, 3 and 4. They are talking about their job prospects.

Mr GORMAN: Yes.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: I try to relate. They are little kids. They get asked what they want to be. They say, "I want to be a doctor or a fireman." It does not come in until you are starting to look at high school subjects for years 7 and 6. That is very disappointing. I just thought that your comment about that—I am not being personal —

Mr GORMAN: No. It was a surprise for us as well.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: Is it the federal education side that dictates NAPLAN or is it —

Mr GORMAN: It is a federal initiative. A lot has been said and researched into the NAPLAN space. In fact, our research was based on anecdotal concerns about pushdown curriculum, because the first year of NAPLAN is year 3. We did decide to find out what teachers, parents and young people thought, and we did. The upside was that we were heartened that there was probably less stress than we had perhaps thought, given the anecdotal evidence. Certainly the number of year 3 students who were talking about their job, I mean that is an observation that schools can react to or do something with. There was even one incident of a group—I am not sure which year level—that knew something was important because the new set of pencils came into the classroom, which is amusing on one level but it actually signals —

The CHAIR: Imagine carrying a dread of new pencils through your entire life!

Mr GORMAN: Yes. To colour in those bubbles; that is right. We did find small percentages of students who exhibited stress as a result of NAPLAN. I would put the proposition that if one student is suffering stress, then that probably needs a rethink. Given that we do have a federal initiative that is for national reporting and arguably for feedback into student success at school, if we could actually make NAPLAN itself a smarter tool, then great—teachers would be happy, I am sure parents would be happy and kids would go, "Yes, I can do this."

[10.50 am]

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: I understand what you are saying about having it over the two terms. I have also heard the argument that having it at the time of year that it happens is too early in the year, so the first term is usually spent cramming for NAPLAN and then having it. It builds on the stress. I would like some commentary around that. But, also, is there a differentiation between being nervous about doing NAPLAN and being stressed about it? Nerves are not necessarily a bad thing but stress certainly is.

Mr GORMAN: Nerves are not necessarily a bad thing; stress is a bad thing. Our partnership on this was with the School of Arts and the School of Education, so we pulled psychology into the education space and that was where the tool was built. I am happy to get the technical part of it to you. Cramming—that is really, really interesting, because the research that we have had delivered to date simply suggests that if you worry less about the event of NAPLAN, the less stressful it is and

the students do okay. The report is actually called “NAPLAN? No worries”. This sense of cramming for success may be cramming for the wrong thing. I do not know. The point around when it is taken, in Western Australia historically it was August—the WA measurement was in August. I do know that when that was shifted to earlier in the year, teachers and school leaders were concerned about that. Of course, how do you make young people ready for NAPLAN? You want them to be able to engage in the sort of assessment that it is, but you do not want them to be engaging in those types of reading question responses for a whole term. As a teacher, I would be going, “What have I lost? I have lost a term.” I would not be doing that.

The CHAIR: I just had two areas that I was going to ask you to address very briefly, because we are running out of time. The first one is about engaging parents. We heard some evidence from the P&Cs and P&Fs a couple of weeks ago, which suggested that very, very few teachers are involved in those groups, which are seen as parent groups, but after all they are citizens and friends. Do you think there is an avenue for encouraging teachers to look at the involvement with the P&Cs and P&Fs, or do we need a different kind of engagement?

Mr GORMAN: I certainly cannot speak for the department, but for independent schools, because it is obviously a choice-driven enrolment, parents have a very clear stakeholding in their choice for their child or children. There are not organisations that cover groups of schools as such. It is that engagement. One of the things, however, where I can make the observation is that it is important to have those who may be from less advantaged backgrounds come into schools. I would say that schools attempt and try to do that regardless of background. It is important. I do know there is a particular researcher from New Mexico, George Otero, who talks about the simple act of a parent walking through the school grounds and what that signals to a student can actually turn a student around. The research there says that if a parent values, is seen at and participates with the function of schooling, that has an effect on student attendance and performance. I cannot say too much for ours because of the type of enrolment that we have.

The CHAIR: Yes, there is a substantial difference there. The other area I was going to ask you to briefly touch on is the issue that actually made the headlines in relation to this report, which is children feeling safe. Do you have any comments about that finding?

Mr GORMAN: The headlines sensationalised something that I think the commissioner was putting in terms of schools working very, very hard to ensure that schools are safe. Certainly in our sector, schools have all been trained in mandatory reporting and safe school practices. Some schools have even altered the very physical nature of the field of vision so that people are clear about young people’s safety at school. I would say, yes, of course, that is school business. That attention is drawn to it is a good thing.

The CHAIR: We might wrap it up there. Thank you very much for coming in today. A transcript of this hearing will be forwarded to you for correction of minor errors. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days from the date of the letter attached to the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be added via these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary document for the committee’s consideration when you return your corrected transcript of evidence. Thank you so much, Mr Gorman, for coming in.

Mr GORMAN: Thank you.

Hearing concluded at 10.56 am
