

## ***State of Affairs - Gonski 2.0 Review: What the Commonwealth should do (and not do) to drive improvement in school education - Brisbane***

**Brisbane 2 May 2018**

The Commonwealth's Review to Achieve Educational Excellence in Australian Schools (known as the 'Gonski 2.0 Review') is a serious opportunity for a new nation-wide conversation on school education.

The outcomes of the Review will influence the Commonwealth's next steps in national schools policy. A key step will be the negotiations with the states later this year, as the Commonwealth strives to ensure that its contributions to school funding are spent wisely.

The review comes at a critical time. Australia's educational performance is declining internationally, we face new challenges in preparing students for their future lives and jobs, and equity gaps are too wide. But this does not mean that the Commonwealth should have a much bigger role in schooling than it does today.

In this *State of Affairs* event, Julie Sonnemann, Grattan Institute School Education Fellow, along with a panel of leading policy thinkers, explored:

- What is needed to lift educational outcomes at scale?
- What are the benefits, challenges and risks of Commonwealth interventions?
- Where should the Commonwealth focus its efforts, and why?

**Moderator:** Megan French, Grattan Institute

**Speakers:** Leanne Nixon, Assistant Director-General, State Schools Performance, Queensland Department of Education  
David de Carvalho, CEO, NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA)  
Matthew Deeble, Director of Evidence for Learning  
Julie Sonnemann, School Education Fellow, Grattan Institute

MEGAN FRENCH: Welcome everyone to this evening's event in balmy Brisbane. Well, balmy for those of us who are from Melbourne! Thanks to the State Library of Queensland for hosting us this evening. We greatly value our partnership with the State Library and the opportunity it provides us to bring events like this to you all. I'm the Marketing Manager at the Grattan Institute. Just a bit of my background, I host a weekly podcast episode for Grattan and, in fact, used to work for the Department of Education here in Queensland for five years, so I feel like I've come full circle tonight, it's lovely. I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet tonight and pay my respects to their elders past and present. I'll just give you a quick rundown on how tonight's going to go. Following my introduction of the panel, we're going to discuss what the Commonwealth should or should not do to drive improvement in school education for around 40 minutes and then we'll open up to the floor for about half an hour for you, the audience, to ask the panel any questions you may have, before we finish up at around 7.15pm. Obviously the big news this week is that the Gonski recommendations were released on Monday. If you want a quick snapshot of the key themes of our report, head to our Twitter

page - we've just tweeted out a quick summary from the report that you can have a look through before we get going tonight.

Joining me on stage tonight is my colleague, Grattan's School Education Fellow, Julie Sonnemann. Julie has significant experience in education policy and system design and has co-authored several high profile reports on effective teaching, professional learning, equity, and funding, including Grattan's recent report and the one we'll be discussing tonight, the Commonwealth's role to improve schools. Next is Assistant Director-General, State Schools Performance for the Queensland Department of Education, Leanne Nixon. Leanne has been in her current role since 2014 where her priority has been to develop innovative strategies to improve student outcomes and she's recognised for her educational leadership across the teaching profession and professional contributions to advancing learning for students, colleagues and the system. We're also joined tonight by Matthew Deeble, who is the Director of Evidence for Learning, a new Australian non-profit organisation that's forged a ground-breaking role in spreading evidence-based practice across the education sector, allowing great practice to become common practice. Matthew has more than 20 years' experience in building and running enterprises in education, environment and health. Our final panellist this evening is David de Carvalho, the Chief Executive Officer of the New South Wales Education Standards Authority (NESA), an important body in New South Wales for aiming to keep standards in school and teacher registrations high. David has seen both sides of this debate and is perhaps uniquely qualified to discuss tonight's topic, having led the reform of the Federation whitepaper taskforce from January 2014 to June 2015, which he's kindly provided some background reading on for you all tonight.

With introductions out of the way, let's get down to business. The Commonwealth's review to achieve educational excellence in Australian schools - or Gonski 2.0 as it's come to be coined - has been much talked about this year and, by a stroke of pure luck or maybe genius on our part, we've managed to host this event days after the release of the recommendations from this review and just before the Education Council meets on Friday. Couldn't have timed it better if we'd planned it! 2018 is proving a pivotal year for school education with the recommendations just released and new funding agreements between the Commonwealth and each state to be negotiated before the end of the year. Unsurprisingly, the Commonwealth is keen to see more bang for the extra bucks they're investing in school education, but states and territories are keen to retain control of their own educational strategies. Along with Grattan, many education commentators have cautioned about the risk of too much Commonwealth intervention, especially over-regulation of how states and territories are spending their money. So just how involved should the Commonwealth be in improving education outcomes? Before we talk through the recommendations from the report released on Monday I'm first going to ask Julie to fill us in with a little background information to inform our discussion tonight. Julie, can you tell us briefly why Grattan Institute wrote the report on the Commonwealth's role to improve schools?

**JULIE SONNEMANN:** We wrote the report mainly because we felt the political context was right. Because we're in a funding negotiations year, if the Commonwealth is going to expand its reach now is the time when it will do so and that's the main mechanism by which the Commonwealth wants to exert greater control. It normally does it through tying conditions on school funding when given to the states. We thought it was important there was a balanced and independent voice on this topic, given Commonwealth/state relations can be a little bit divided and one-sided at times and really, to pick up on some of the key learnings from the Federation whitepaper process, which David led, and some of the learnings coming out of that, that being that there can be a really constructive role for the Commonwealth in education. So far they have done some very good things in laying the foundations,

but overreach can cause problems in terms of duplication and red tape. So the main message of our report was that the Commonwealth, if it really wants to improve education, should look to its own existing responsibilities first, given it already has quite a lot of responsibility in training teachers, the curriculum and whatnot. If it is determined to act, then it should really prioritise and only do a couple of things where there are clear benefits of scale, efficiencies and co-ordination doing at a national level. While the Gonski report is a lot broader, it does seem in part to follow some of those ideas because it has only put forward a couple of specific things that the Commonwealth will do itself.

MEGAN FRENCH: So obviously the report has identified many big reforms to drive improvement in schools, some of which we will go through tonight, but putting the Gonski report aside for the moment, what are your reviews on what the big reforms should be?

JULIE SONNEMANN: Most of the big reforms are in the hands of the states and territories, first up, and if you're talking about driving reform at scale then obviously good system design and structures are critical. This is the fundamental job of the state departments and state departments do a lot of work in this space to try and get teaching practice in schools to continuously improve. I think a lot more could be done still on that front, particularly around pedagogy assessment and curriculum support for teachers.

I think if teachers are going to use evidence in their daily work then they need organisational structures that support that. While there are many reforms there to talk to, I think if I was to pick one or two it would be changing the daily work of teachers so that there's a lot more time and expertise to share professional learning so that the professional learning happens during the daily work of teachers, it's not an add-on and it's not something that's done outside the school, it's done very close to practice. I think as part of that, the second part of reform is actually having the best teachers role model that practice. When you look at high-performing systems, they have a clear system for professional learning where expert and master teachers, it's their day job to actually develop others and to have responsibility for a specific subject across schools to look at how, for example, the teaching of maths is going or the teaching of science is going, researching that and looking at the disconnect between practice and research, then feeding that information back through to schools. So I think there are some career structure changes that really need to happen too.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thanks Julie. While we're on reforms, Leanne, I'd like to get your opinion on this. Regardless of whether they're Commonwealth or state-led, what are your views on the big reforms that are needed to lift education outcomes not just in one classroom or one school, but at scale?

LEANNE NIXON: I'd like to reframe that question to begin with because I think the word "reform" causes a problem. I think it's a deficit view of education and often the public narrative that goes on around education, particularly at a national level, is that there is a deficit. If we could reframe these conversations in terms of a strength-based model where we looked at what states are doing successfully and we could build on that, I think that would be a great step forward to us. So I think that's part of it. For us in Queensland, the story of improvement in education is not just a good story; it's actually a great story. In the national conversation and in the discourse that goes on in the media constantly in this space you wouldn't even know that, you don't hear that. My father said to me, "You tell me you're doing good things in education, but I never hear that" and I said, "You can't cut through that". So I think recognition of where the strengths are would be a wonderful start. In Queensland, in terms of our Year 12 certification, 98.1% of all our students get Year 12 certification and 97.2% of our

Indigenous students get Year 12 certification. That's a 5% increase since 2003 and, in fact, the Indigenous result is up. It was at 40% in 2008 and we've closed that gap to within 1%. You don't hear that in the discourse. So I think there is a place for a nuanced conversation about where is the reform happening? Commonwealth intervention or support should be about scaling up the pieces that are working and recognising that there are jurisdictional pieces that are important, are working, and that should be shared.

So for us, Grattan talks about an adaptive education system, one where the system is learning from itself and it's about every principal understanding better how to make better decisions. That's the type of work that system should be investing in and that's the sort of system and the type of work that federal government should be incentivising through their work. The second one, for me, would be about holding the course and don't turn the teaching space. For teachers it's about that constant sense of we're going to reform this or reform that and there's a tiredness around that. The work that the Australian government has done in terms of the Australian curriculum I think is great, but don't change directions around that. Yes, it can be nuanced and yes, there can be refinement of that, but there's an importance in terms of holding the course around that work. The energy that goes into the white anting of our curriculum and the discourse around what's not right with it instead of the strengths of it I think is destructive and I think that if we're going to actually look at how we scale improvement up across Australia then it needs to be about looking at the strengths in our system, looking at the strengths of the work we do, recognising those and building on them.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thanks Leanne. Matt, what does the evidence suggest is needed?

MATTHEW DEEBLE: I think the place to start is the concept of scale. It's really easy for everybody to start thinking about what does this look like at scale in large ways, but the reality - and the evidence supports this - is, to adopt the Bill Clinton frame about "the economy, stupid", it's the learning, stupid, and that actually happens in the most small, incremental ways, every learner in every classroom every day improving. So any question of scale actually has to start by asking are you helping in those everyday decisions that professional teachers, school leaders, paraprofessionals are making to help improve the learning and development for the young people in their care. It's really important to start at that place because you then ask what are the things that are needed to help that continuous improvement occur, working on the strengths that exist inside the profession themselves or the school and the community that it works in. Also, schools are not homogenous. They are social institutions that are of their context, so scale isn't, "It worked let's do it everywhere". It has to be more nuanced than that, but if you begin with the question about helping the learner to improve then you can make some really good progress.

So what does that mean if you're going to help each teacher make a difference for each kid? That, firstly, is about starting with the strengths of the profession and enabling, supporting and strengthening the profession. So the discussion about improving the attraction and the reputation for the profession and society's view of the importance of teaching is really important. The high professional standards to be created through initial teacher education and then the ongoing support through professional learning are all really important. Critically, as we start to think about we know the importance of teaching as a profession, one of the hallmarks of professions that do continuously improve is a deep engagement with data and evidence. So they see it as part of their professional role and responsibility to understand their own data and then to engage with wider data and evidence systems that can help them get better to meet the needs of the learners in front of them. One way of thinking about that is we talk about a phrase of faithful adoption of programs that have been shown to be promising in other places, but

intelligent adaption for local context and need. The other thing that needs to happen for scale for that profession to continue to evolve and make a great difference for their learners is there needs to be a better system that sits around moving the knowledge that does exist more effectively and in more relevant ways closer to the profession so that it can be used easily. That's responsibility of researchers and groups like us that are trying to translate or mobilise the knowledge that does exist and put high quality rigour around that but make it usable, so that busy educators aren't forced and left to do the hard work of asking what on earth does that mean for what I should be doing in my maths class on a Wednesday morning? There's a lot of obligation on the rest of us, including the Commonwealth and systems, to try and make that better.

The final point that I think is really important that'll come to the Commonwealth/state relations is we're very keen that we think about this not as a hierarchy from schools to systems, federal and state, but to think about it as an ecology and an ecosystem, because schools operate in environments in their community. The relationships between the federal tier and the state and territory tier, we don't see it as a hierarchy but rather large players in the ecosystem with varying degrees of influence and strengths that also allows the wider ecosystem of players who are intimately interested in better educational outcomes and themselves have strengths and assets to bring, but are often locked out when it becomes just a conversation about the relationship and the hierarchy. We need that exposure and cross-fertilisation of other industries, the corporate sector, employers, the non-profits, the families and community groups to be a deep part of that conversation and to be recognised in the ecosystem. If we have that model then we can start talking about what are the rights and responsibilities of all of the participants in the system and we think that's a very important way of looking at this as well

MEGAN FRENCH: Interesting. What about you David? Prior to Monday's release, what would you have said was needed in schools?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I'm going to sound like I'm just repeating key messages, but it's the same message.

MEGAN FRENCH: That's okay, it's good to repeat key messages, reinforce them.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: If you ask parents what makes a difference for your kid's learning they'll say the teacher. We all know that. We all know that the people in front of their kids, the ones that do the teaching, engage the kids in the learning, are the most important part of the system, if you like. So going to Matt's point about if you want to make change at scale, it's like the Australian super ad or the Paul Kelly song: from little things big things grow. It's support for the profession. I'd like to acknowledge the presence tonight of John Ryan and I'm sure he's got colleagues here from the Queensland College of Teachers in the room. Queensland is blessed in having such a fine agency to promote and support the profession because that is crucial to generating change at scale. John and I were both present at a conference in Wellington recently, the International Federation of Teacher Regulatory & Registration Authorities, and a key message there was around exactly how do we better support teachers to use the data effectively and I'm sure we'll come to this when we come to discuss the Gonski recommendations. It's all very well to say we need to develop this online assessment tool, but you just can't build it and they will come; you need to have a system that supports teachers to be able to use such a tool effectively.

The other thing that we've got in Australia which I think we really need to capitalise on more is the national certification of highly accomplished and lead teachers, that whole organisational infrastructure to reward good teachers, but not just teachers who are good at being in front of kids; highly accomplished and lead teachers are teachers who are recognised for having a multiplier effect across their school and across their system. So, again, it's from little things, big things grow. You have a good teacher in the classroom and then you empower them to influence their colleagues and not just in their own school, but more broadly. So system leaders can make a big difference here by supporting principals to build into their school improvement plans how do I get more highly accomplished lead teachers? We've got to focus on what good practice is already happening, not making teachers feel that the big burden is getting their portfolio together to prove that they're doing something. They're already doing it. It's a case of recording it, rewarding it, acknowledging it and spreading it. That's my take.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thank you. I definitely feel like I've got a real theme of acknowledging what's already working from everybody tonight. Moving on, I'd like to spend a little time now considering what the benefits, challenges and risks of Commonwealth intervention might be. David, I'll throw to you again here. Thinking back to the federation whitepaper process, what did you learn about the benefits, challenges and risks of intervention and what might work best to mitigate the risks?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I'm going to acknowledge someone else in the audience tonight and that's Julian Jefferis. Julian was one of my colleagues in the reform of the federation whitepaper taskforce in the Commonwealth, in the Prime Minister's Department. The room that we worked in was known as "the emporium". I don't know if anyone would guess why we called ourselves the emporium, but Henry Parks was a failed small businessman several times over and his last and least successful venture was a thing called The Emporium. It's somewhat fateful that we called ourselves the emporium because, as you know, unfortunately the reformed federation whitepaper ran aground. I say it was shortly after I left, but there are other reasons for that! That was a real opportunity that was missed, I think, for various reasons.

It's very rare that you would get, for example, a Prime Minister and then two highly regarded state Premiers, one on either side of the political divide in New South Wales and South Australia. Those guys were really working hard to make things happen. One of the things that had bedevilled efforts to reform the federation in the past was whenever proposals were put forward states, in particular, would go, "But who's paying for it?" You immediately went to the money question. One of the successes we've had in the process, and it was due to, I think, good political leaders at the state level but also good senior leaders at the bureaucratic level, was there was an agreement to put aside the money question for the time being and focus on the merits of the policy cases that we were looking at. The big policy cases, we call them the big rocks, were health, education and housing. These were the big Commonwealth/state funding agreements that everybody agreed needed to be reworked and we did work hard and put out six discussion papers with every word agreed by every jurisdiction, which is remarkable. So we had this really strong sense of goodwill but then, unfortunately, the draft green paper was leaked - I have my suspicions, it's not north of the border, anyway, from New South Wales - and that undid a lot of the goodwill.

The key risks around federation reform, around education reform and any of these big Commonwealth/state relations issues has to do with exactly the problem that's been pointed out by Julie, that the historical setup of the tax system where the vast bulk of tax revenue in the country as a

result of changes that were made during the Second World War, where income tax was transferred to the Commonwealth, means that you've got the Commonwealth holding most of the money and an enormous part of state governments are now dependent on Commonwealth grants. This was recognised in the reform of the federation process, in fact it was recognising even earlier than that, in 2007, when the Labor Government recognised it and tried to do something about it by instituting a new intergovernmental agreement on federal financial relations, which was supposed to reduce the number of agreements that the Commonwealth used to coax, bribe, force and bend the states to their will. As a result, you culled a large number of these intergovernmental agreements but they just grew again. There is a sort of pathological unwillingness at the Commonwealth level to let the states get on with it. This is the second time I've presented on this panel. The first time was in Canberra and I felt I was on fairly safe ground by accusing them of all being nationalist centralists. When I told my colleagues that I had this job running the federation reform whitepaper taskforce a lot of them just said, "Well that's easy to fix, just get rid of the states". They said it half-jokingly, but it was and probably is still a widespread cultural bias in the Commonwealth public service that we have to make the states do what we want them to do with our money. That's the kind of language that was used.

So I think the key challenge for the Commonwealth and the states going forward into the next bilateral agreement phase, the negotiation phase around reforms to education, will be how the Commonwealth exercises its fiscal capacity in ways that are benign and positive and that support the states and don't try to corral them into a straitjacket of one-size-fits-all across the country. That's the big risk. I haven't seen anything to date that would give me too much concern that they're going to do that but, as I say, there is an underlying cultural prejudice and when you have Prime Ministers and Commonwealth Ministers who feel the need to get out and claim the space, it's understandable that that temptation is there. I hate to say it's a bigger picture. Education is important, but the success of federal forms of government across the world is really important and precious. We need to protect and maintain a federalist culture, and the principle of subsidiarity, which is one of the principles you'll see in the handout that I've given you, is crucial to that. I hope that the Commonwealth has that front of mind when it starts sitting down to discuss it with the states.

MEGAN FRENCH: Leanne, I'll turn to you. Given your experience at a state government level and in schools, what are your thoughts on this?

LEANNE NIXON: As has been said by other members of the panel, what makes the difference for student success and outcomes is what a teacher does daily in a classroom. Of course, the Commonwealth has no line of sight into a classroom, so whatever they do, whatever policy, whatever they put in place, they can't actually see that it's made a difference, so the role of the state in that is absolute vital. Having said that, and this is a contested area and I may get boos from the audience, the place of NAPLAN as a national measure for us to be able to say as a system things are going well or they're not going well or what are the policy levers we need to pull is a great piece of work. Whether you like NAPLAN or not, the concept of it is vital and the piece the Commonwealth has provided. The discourse around it though has been destructive at a local level because what you can't see is the individual student or school stories of improvement in that big data and that's a real issue for us and a real danger. The further we remove the data from the teacher then the less that data impacts on what the teacher does in terms of the teaching/learning process. So I say that the Commonwealth has a role in the big data for systems, but in terms of that line of sight to what it actually does, that's the risk. Where we start using that big data to say teachers need to do this and that doesn't work, so I see that as a real risk.

I'd also comment, David, on what you said. You're absolutely right about that Commonwealth agreement piece. I'm very nervous about prescriptive reforms that don't align with or build on the work that is successful in a jurisdiction that come from the Commonwealth, I suppose, because those reforms or prescriptive reforms are measured by money or time. They're not measured by success of the outcomes. They're measured by this is how long this agreement will go for, four years, and this is the amount of money you will get and when that runs out we're done. It's got nothing to do with measuring what would successful movement in that space look like, what would successful reform look like? That's a basic flaw for that interface between the Commonwealth and the state because it's not actually about the outcomes; it's measured by time or by money.

MEGAN FRENCH: David, is there anything you want to add to that?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: Yes. The other thing that I think will need to be carefully monitored, I guess, in the process is time and money is one thing, but there is also past experience with particularly the health agreements - and Matt, you may be familiar with this from your work - that setting up KPIs where Commonwealth money is at risk if you don't hit them can seem like a good idea at the time.

LEANNE NIXON: Well no, I wasn't asking you for that.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: No, but what I'm saying is it can seem to the Commonwealth like a good idea at the time.

LEANNE NIXON: Yes. I wouldn't describe the outcomes personally.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: There's a great book that was co-authored by John Wanna and Michael Keating around this called *Institutions on the Edge* and they said that the Commonwealth bureaucracy habitually underestimates the capacity of state governments to seem like they're doing what the Commonwealth wants them to do. State governments are very adept at knowing how the data works and presenting the data in certain ways, so I think it's a flawed mentality for the Commonwealth to bring. I hope they don't do it this time. I hope they've learnt the lessons of the past from past agreements where if you say "unless you meet this KPI, X% of your funding is going to be at risk". It's no way to engender a partnership, so we just need to watch that one as well.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thank you. Let's move to current events of the week, Gonski 2.0 report. Julie, before we get into a discussion about the recommendations, could you give us a brief summary of the key themes that came out this week?

JULIE SONNEMANN: The report had 23 recommendations across five key areas and those who've read it will know that it was a very comprehensive 110 pages' worth. The five areas that it covers are early years transitions, so the role of parents and carers in particular for children's learning before school; student growth and more of a focus on general capabilities, such as critical thinking and creativity in the curriculum; the third one is around the teaching profession and improving professional learning and whatnot; the fourth is around school leaders, training, and a review of the AITSL principle standards; and the fifth is around innovation and continuous improvement, and there was a specific recommendation there for a new national research body that would be independent of government, which is also a commitment that the Labor Government has supported so there's bipartisan support for that. So it's very broad, it articulates a lot of reforms that are in the area of the state government and it

articulates a small number of things that the Commonwealth will support and do. It has been criticised by some for being a very high level document and I'd best describe it as a really good vision statement. Personally, I think that it was right that the document didn't get into the "how" of some of these areas because that is actually the state governments' role and I think the more the Commonwealth tries to articulate and get involved in that it's just going down the wrong path. This document just has been written as a statement. I think in terms of how it's used and what happens next in terms of implementation will be decided shortly in the negotiations. There is still a possibility that the federal government could use this document and tie some of the recommendations to state governments, or they might not. So it could go either way.

MEGAN FRENCH: Matt, given your work in advocating for the national research evidence body, what look to be some promising reforms in your opinion? Are there any opportunities that have been missed?

MATTHEW DEEBLE: I think I want to start this discussion perhaps tying into the last one about the role of the Australian Government, but it also applies to any government. Where you've got a desire to see change there are really three levers that you're going to pull on. You've either got funding (how much money am I going to give), you've got accountability (how are you going to show me that you're doing what we need) or you've got capability (how am I going to improve the work of the people making the change). So I think for all of us waiting to see what the report would say, we're still waiting, I guess, to really understand how does the Australian Government perceive the way it's going to work. At least the report now I think leans much more strongly on the idea of developing capability in the sector for the benefit of the agenda and that's to be welcomed. The risk of the accountability lever being pulled so hard that it breaks is some of the discussion that was happening before. If we're in a frame of capability then there are a number of bits of the report that work towards how we're going to create those sorts of improvement.

You're right, our very strong interest has been on the last category that Julie was talking about, being the system of a continuous improvement model and, on the specific recommendation of that, creating an independent evidence institute where we're pleased and we welcome the way in which the report itself has framed that discussion. There's an excellent supplementary paper that the Australian Government have just released as well on the particular topic that the University of Melbourne put together for them and I'd recommend, for people who are geeky enough to really want to get it into it, you go and have a look at it. It does a good job of talking about the features that you would want to have in an evidence body or an institute that doesn't replicate what is already happening either in systems, the non-government as well as in the government systems, or that are happening in research institutes already, or that are happening with the current national bodies with ACARA and AITSL. We're really interested in that part of the role that this independent and independent, not just of government but independent of everybody, can play to act as an honest broker with an eye on that improvement and outcomes agenda and with no fixed position on how to get there, but rather by following the evidence and the learning that occurs throughout the system. So we think the construction of that recommendation looks good. We also think that's one that should be supported from both sides of politics because it allows everybody to reject our past a change of government and to sign up to an ongoing commitment to learning, and if it's constructed right in the discussion that now happens between the states and territories it can mobilise the knowledge of the great work that is occurring and share that to other places.

It can also support hubs of innovation that happen in schools that even state systems miss because they themselves are looking in a certain way, and it can let it move horizontally as well as vertically through the system. So there are some really important design features to help it do that and not have it become another piece of bureaucracy against which people either game or avoid, the key principles around independence, transparency and an agenda that lets it look at innovation, as well as bringing the knowledge that exists from high quality trials or from evidence and learning from overseas, but then made locally relevant. This speaks back to the federalist point: you need to be strong in understanding our federation and there are reasons that there are differences at a state and territory level that absolutely have to be kind of baked into the work. So we think that's really good. I think in terms of the question of missed opportunity, what it hasn't done, some of the criticism is going to the heart of the terms of reference about how should this occur to see the change that we're looking for? Julie, I take your point that maybe it was good that it didn't do that, but there's obviously been a decision not to do it. So what it doesn't describe well is how does the age old relationship and conversation between the different sectors, the state and the Commonwealth, work their way through to give effect to these principles so that really is now put into the hands, I guess, of the Ministers of Education Council and the Secretaries from around the country. It might have been helpful to give a little bit more guidance as to the roles and responsibilities against these domains; I think it could've been more helpful.

I guess the last bit in that work is, given that it's now going to sit in that model for them, this becomes a question of it'll be viewed through the lens of the funding agreement and I think you've got the challenges and opportunities that were described earlier. We're very keen to make sure that, where possible, in this next stage of the process all the participants can find parts of common cause and agreement that do make sense to operate nationally and get moving on it, rather than have it all looked at through the prism of the trading game that will occur through the funding conversation.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thanks Matt. David, before we open to audience questions I'd like to ask you to finish off this part of our evening with your thoughts on the recommendations. Anything contentious that's worthy of note? Julie mentioned the high level nature and Matt's mentioned the lack of the "how". Do they go into enough detail, in your opinion?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I've got a foot in both camps. I think I'm generally supportive of Julie's view that there is an advantage to the lack of specificity on one hand because you can now talk about this document as this is something that the Commonwealth should be doing, leading a national conversation and setting high level aspirational directions, but not being too specific about how it's operationalised. So that's putting a positive spin on the lack of specificity, but I can also see why so many commentators have been disappointed with it, particularly those who look to the Commonwealth to exercise their fiscal leverage to make things happen, they wanted more specificity about the things that they really like. There's been criticism, and I think it's not misplaced but I'm not too concerned about it, around notions of very vaguely worded recommendations. If I can give one example, say, motherhood, nobody could possibly object, but you then ask what does that mean in practice? For example, ensure all students have the opportunity within schools to be partners in their own learning. Who could possibly object? Well, people have objected because the lack of specificity about what that means in practice means that there is wide scope for people to interpret that in ways that they say the Commonwealth are pushing this line or that line when, in fact, the Commonwealth may not be doing that at all. So that's one example.

The other is around the push for what is referred to as general capabilities and the list normally starts with the four Cs - critical thinking, creativity, collaboration and communication - but unless it's actually

spelt out by what that means in a disciplinary sense it becomes very hard. What exactly do you mean by critical thinking in history, what do you mean by critical thinking in history, and how do you measure them? All those questions are left unanswered which allows room for the critics, if you like, to put the worst possible interpretation on the document. That's the failing, I guess, or the downside of a lack of specificity, but I'm prepared to live with it because I think it does leave room for jurisdictions and they're the ones now that have to do the hard yards to put the flesh on the bone, so to speak.

MEGAN FRENCH: Thank you everyone for that detailed analysis. I've seen from the registration list that we have quite a few people here tonight with a vested interest in education and schooling, which is great. I'm sure you've all got thoughts and questions for our panel. I will ask that when you're framing your questions tonight please do keep it short so we have a chance to hear from as many people as possible. Forewarning: I will be brutal and I will tell you to wrap it up if I need to. While you're gathering your thoughts on what questions you'd like to ask I'll start us off with a question that was submitted prior to tonight. The question for the panel is should schools dump the practice of so-called ability streaming? David, do you have thoughts on that? You seem to.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I think, on balance, yes. What we should be encouraging and skilling teachers up to do are skills in differentiated teaching to mixed ability classes. Again, this is an area where the lack of specificity in the report has attracted worst case scenario interpretations that individualised learning means each teacher has to prepare 30 individual lesson plans for each of their students. It doesn't actually say that, but because it's not spelt out that it's not saying that it allows people to go there. Technology is perhaps going to open up new levels and possibilities for greater fine grain assessment of students' capabilities which, again, using big data and learning analytics may be able to help teachers develop more fine grained approaches. But in general the capability that we should be supporting teachers to develop is that ability to exercise and practise differentiated teaching. I think there's enough evidence around the pros and the cons of streaming by academic ability to suggest that there are better ways of going about it.

MEGAN FRENCH: Matt?

MATTHEW DEEBLE: This is a shameless plug for Evidence for Learning's free website, but we have a toolkit where you can look at the summary of the research on that very topic, so go to [evidenceforlearning.org.au](http://evidenceforlearning.org.au) and have a look. You really do have to start with what do we know so far on that topic in general from the studies that have occurred and there is a good body of evidence that does talk about the risks that occur with streaming having a positive impact on higher achieving students, but a strongly negative impact on those that are poor achieving. It also skews even worse for people from low socioeconomic backgrounds. So there's an equity question about how does that model impact on certain learners and so I think you start in that place that says if there are some real downsides from the model, can you address those downsides in your local implementation of that? Again, I come back to it doesn't mean that if the evidence says that then no-one should do it anywhere but that you proceed with caution or, if you're not going to do that, how are you in another way in a classroom of mixed ability going to address the know quite substantial range of abilities, some say five, some say seven years in middle schooling. So they're not simple answers, but if you begin with what do we know so far with a nuanced approach and how confident can we be in it, then you can make more thoughtful responses to the question.

MEGAN FRENCH: Leanne, did you have anything you'd add?

LEANNE NIXON: Yes. I think it's a problematic piece. I think starting with the capability to differentiate is absolutely vital because I don't know how you cut any group or ability stream, any group that doesn't have a range of capabilities. Teachers still need to be able to do that. I think there are place-based solutions for a range of reasons, what type of ability are we actually talking about, and I think principals are great at making local decisions with their parent communities about the best way to structure their schools and I would be supportive of that.

MEGAN FRENCH: Great. We might open it up now to the floor.

AUDIENCE: To follow-up on that first question, don't selective schools - which fortunately Queensland's state system doesn't have very many of yet but, as I understand it, New South Wales does - constitute ability streaming at an institutional level?

LEANNE NIXON: I was principal of a selective school, the Queensland Academy for Health Sciences, so I would say that yes, that is institutional to a certain degree, but there is still a range of students with a range of abilities in a range of different areas within that cohort. So yes, to a certain degree you're right. Was the cohort interesting, did they learn lots and was it a great place to be? Yes. Did they have challenges? Did they not succeed at things? Yes. Did they face the same challenges that all teenagers face? Yes. So I hear what you're saying and that's a debate that the evidence points to, but there are reasons why those opportunities exist and parents make those selections for a reason. I mean, if we really wanted to we could point to the non-state sector where if you've got the money you can pay to go to it, is that not a selective piece? So I think it's a debate that's tested and ongoing.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I think the last comment that Leanne made in her previous response is relevant here and that is what does the local school want to do? You'd be aware that in New South Wales there is an ongoing debate around the place about selective schools. Interestingly, not so much about the selective sports and performing arts schools where there is seen to be if you like a Silicon Valley effect of hothousing people with particular skills and the benefits that come from having them study together. So this is why I say you can't be too overly categorical about this, but pointing to the evidence that Matt has suggested and balancing that with, I guess, a degree of local autonomy in the decision making is critical.

AUDIENCE: Moving away from ability streaming, a question around wanting some more elaboration on the understanding of the national research body and your recommendations, particularly David, around that body. I'm obviously very cognisant of the work that SVA has done and also our state body through Leanne. There are a lot of bodies out there at the moment that are currently dabbling in research, there's international, there's the Education Endowment Foundation and also science research in the US. What's your understanding or recommendation going forward for a national research body? Is this something that might sit with the SVA or something that's going to be housed locally within states or federally managed?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: Good question. I think there are a couple of interesting analogies in the health sector. Queensland has a fantastic health and research institute, but there's also a national health and research institute. The key I think is going to be not to duplicate effort and how do you construct an institutional architecture that leverages existing effort? There are a number of bodies in New South Wales within the Department; we have the Centre for Educational Statistics & Evaluation, which produces some great work. At one stage when I originally saw the Labor Party's suggestion a few

months ago I thought what might be better than what they were suggesting and what's come through in the report, but I've since thought about it again, was something akin to the Australian Institute of Health & Welfare (AIHW) where you have the Australian Institute of Education which would not just look at schooling, but would bring together data and research from early childhood education, schooling, vocational education and higher education, and produce, like the AIHW does, biannual research reports and things like that. Theoretically I think that's appealing, but from a point of view of institutional architecture, funding etc. it's probably overkill. I would see a better way of going to be working with the states to come up with a sort of distributed model that uses and leverages existing research capability both in the state sector and in the not-for-profit sector.

MATTHEW DEEBLE: I might just make one comment about our submission to the review. I was talking about some of those principles and about independence and transparency. Two of the others that are relevant for your question are, one, that it shouldn't duplicate what exists already in bodies like CESE, it should be differential so states themselves can ask what are our priorities that could be commonly invested in, and that the money should come as federal funding that can then be co-invested with states where there's a question that's of interest to them or from multiple states where a common question transitioning students or highly mobile communities might be one that affects a number of systems and they might be interested in co-investing in research on that question that could then use themselves.

So one was this idea of don't duplicate and leverage what's already there, but also that this body quite critically should be a commissioner of research and a broker for it but not conduct it itself, so that it should be spending towards those existing institutions that already do that work and increasing the capability in that work. The importance of making sure that it's happening with at least a common national agenda is that you can get consistency of the output and then delivery of the information in forms that are useful for educators. If you have pockets of funding, which is what happens at the moment in education to different institutions for things that they care about, not just they care about but because that's their area of expertise, it becomes very difficult for anyone to synthesise those things together and turn that back into the trade-offs that actually systems and schools have to make, because they're not just introducing something to make a difference. That's helpful to know, but they also want to understand compared to doing what else and how much does it cost to do that? They're the pieces of information that matter to make a decision about what you're going to do in your local budget.

LEANNE NIXON: Just to add that, I think there are complications to doing it nationally. I think one real strength of this is the signal that it sends that school education is typically an area where there hasn't been as much rigour in the research and evidence compared to other sectors, like health and whatnot, and this is actually a bit of a change. There has been a lot of change in the evidence in the last 10/15 years through randomised controlled trials and whatnot, but in terms of raising the bar for the standard and quality of evidence and having that being a nationwide discussion.

AUDIENCE: Necessarily, we've talked a lot about data tonight and things like NAPLAN have been mentioned and data analytics. We could also add PISA to that as well. That kind of data privileges certain kinds of thinking about intelligence and learning and it doesn't privilege other kinds of intelligence of learning, so it seems mathematics and science, for example, are the benchmarks that Australia is seen to be slipping against nationally, yet people like Sir Ken Robinson would argue that we shouldn't be looking just at that kind of data. So my question is what data should we be looking at?

MEGAN FRENCH: Do you want to take that, Leanne?

LEANNE NIXON: I'm happy to answer that. We should be looking at the data around what goes on in a classroom. We should be looking at the learning of a child in a curriculum area, what's happened there? The person that understands that is the teacher, what does the child need to move from here to here in their learning and what's the teaching practice I'm going to put in place to make that happen? So it's that local data that actually makes the difference for students. As I said, the big data gives us the levers in a policy sense, but if we're actually talking about the outcomes for a student then it is about what that child needs to know, what they need to understand, what skill they need to develop to move from one place to the next in their learning. If we're going to talk about 12 months of learning, as Hattie talks about, then we need to be able to use the data that's the local data based on the curriculum that's broad, that values a whole range of things that those narrow pieces, like PISA etc., don't measure. But I'm not critical of them in the sense of what they do for us as a system or as a nation to move those policy levers.

MEGAN FRENCH: Do you want to add anything?

MATTHEW DEEBLE: Yes. It's interesting, PISA in their last round actually included questions around collaboration, so they're trying to get to measures on some of these what we're calling general capabilities in Australia or I believe they talk about them as competencies. The question is really about what can you measure and there's an interesting joke about late night in the car park and you walk along and see a guy standing underneath the street light and a chap comes up to him and says, "What are you doing?" and he replies, "I'm looking for my car keys". He says, "Oh, they're here they?" and he replies, "No, I left them back over near the car". He says, "Well why are you looking here?" and he replies, "Well, the light's better here". We've got a challenge of you can't measure what you can't measure and whilst we can agree a general good, it's a bit to David's point before, if we don't have ways of assessing or describing progressions through these other measures - and let's have a go at it, how do you get progressions in creativity or in empathy - it becomes very difficult. So we can all say that they're important skills, but to actually make them teachable you need to describe them, have progressions for them and have ways of measuring them. I think that's important work to do and some of the work that our partners do internationally is starting to look at those non-cognitive domains and the impact back on learning, again, taking the big knowledge that can then help local decision making. So I think it's a really rich area for research and inquiry, but we have to get more specific and defined about it and then ask what difference does it make? There's a lot of work to be done before it can be useful back in the hands of teachers.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: And just to go back to a point that Leanne made earlier, it's not that you stop looking at the NAPLAN and PISA data. I mean, Pasi Sahlberg, who's now at the Gonski Institute at New South Wales University with our former Minister, acknowledges a lot of the criticisms about PISA but he says, "But it's all we've got in terms of credible international comparisons, which can provide insights". I read an article of his recently where he was making these arguments and I conducted a thought experiment and substituted NAPLAN for PISA and it almost read credibly. All these problems with it, but it's all we've got in terms of national comparisons across systems. Without NAPLAN you don't have a measurable gap to close in terms of Aboriginal education outcomes. So it's not that you stop looking at that, but what else do you look at as well? One of the things that I think we really need to work hard on is measures of schooling quality. One of the problems with NAPLAN is that it has become a proxy for the quality of schooling whereas schooling is much more complex and multifaceted than that, so what else do you look at? I think parents would be particularly interested - I was when I was a parent of school aged kids - in what's a good measure, a credible measure of student wellbeing,

for example? Let's look at bullying rates and things like that, what's actually going in the school environment? So there are other aspects of the school environment that we should be thinking about. How do we collect data on that and measure it?

AUDIENCE: I'm the parent of three primary school teachers. They're experienced teachers and they're in their 40s and 50s. Their main complaint seems to be that they are so time-poor that they don't feel as though they're able to give to their students the amount of time that they would like to. You don't want to lose these experienced teachers, they're hardworking, so do you see a way of bridging this gap so that they don't feel as though they're not being effective by not overloading them with administrative sorts of work?

LEANNE NIXON: I'll make a comment on that. One of my first comments about holding the course is absolutely vital. Changing the curriculum again is not something we want to do. The expectation of communities about what teachers will solve in classrooms beyond just the curriculum is extensive. If you read the papers it's the bullying, it's the swimming; whatever else you want to name becomes the immediate go-to place is the school. Our core business is about learning outcomes. Those pieces need to be aligned to the curriculum so that teachers have some space to say this is my core work, these capabilities live within the curriculum, this is the work we need to do. So that political will of holding the line about that and not changing the course I think is part of the solution to easing that. Having said that, as an ex-teacher and principal, how long is a piece of string? I think we forget the moral imperative of people who go into teaching. They do it because they love it. They are dedicated, they care, and so they always feel that they're never doing enough. That is a challenge for us as individuals in classrooms to manage and I think we don't recognise the dedication that is there. Sometimes it is easing the load, but as well it's easing the load personally on how much you give in that space.

AUDIENCE: You've spoken about the lack of specificity in the report and the need for 12 months of learning for each student. How would you see that being implemented for high ability students?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I think that's work that needs to be done. What does 12 months' learning look like for high ability students/low ability students/students of ability in-between? What does it mean for students with learning difficulties? This is one of the issues. I think the work that needs to be done by state jurisdictions goes exactly to that point. I'm not in a position at this stage to say what the outcome of that further work would be, but it's a task that all state jurisdictions need to undertake to define what this actually looks like and identify, in particular, the pedagogical approaches that might be necessary to deliver on that, and they might be different in different subjects as well. Are we looking at every subject? This is the other problem with the report. They are talking about focusing on literacy and numeracy, but then you can read the report and say it seems to be that they want progressions in every KLA and in every general capability. These are aspects of the report that make it vulnerable to the criticisms that I referred to before. I'm not in a position to answer specifically your question. This is work that has to be done.

LEANNE NIXON: It's a great question and it's actually one we're working on at the moment because it is an absolute challenge. If a student's on an A, on an A, on an A, what does that look like? For a student that's on a D, 12 months on they move to a C and we know they've actually gained more than 12 months of learning, we can measure that. But for those high achieving students, how do you actually measure that? Where people go to is "it's deeper learning". What does that really mean? We are actually running a state-wide inquiry circle, so our adaptive education system at the moment with a range of

schools, I think it's up to 70 schools, where we are exploring and developing an answer to that question, because it is one of the biggest challenges. As I said before, I was principal of a selective entry school and what I didn't say at that point was the greatest thing I learnt at that was my absolute principal guilt about I had had students of that ability and capability that were beyond anything I'd imagined, but those kids had lived in every school I had ever been in and had we asked enough of them? No, we hadn't asked enough. I live with that guilt constantly, so that question about how do we do 12 months' growth for our brightest students is absolutely one that's dear to my heart. I'd love to have a conversation with you about it further afterwards.

MATTHEW DEEBLE: I might just make one wider point about the benefit of evidence and learnings from elsewhere to inform the people that are going to have to make that real. We often talk about the "what works agenda" like we're out there to tell you what works. Well, it's actually not what works, it's what worked, so somewhere else at another time, but if there's lots of it that gives you a sense it might be a good bet. The other bit is it should be what works for whom and under what conditions. So the obligation on the rest of us, the researchers, the people that are trying to marshal this knowledge, ought to be getting much better at saying what sorts of activities make a difference for what kinds of learners and the stages that they're at. If we can say something with greater confidence about people based on family circumstances or experience with trauma or operating at a high academic ability, what could you do to extend, then knowledge can be very helpful for people that are then diving into the deeper question of what are we going to do about it as a system or what are we going to do about it as a school. We're getting better at being able to differentiate in the research too.

LEANNE NIXON: And Matt knows my criticism of the research is that, as a practitioner, I can read all the research in the world, but it doesn't tell me what I'm going to do tomorrow in a classroom with a teacher to develop what piece of capability. What's my local context that I need to read into that? I suppose the piece of work Matt knows about that we've been doing is how do you translate that into the right question to ask as a principal to ensure you understand what's the practical on the ground piece you're going to do that is going to move the capability of staff, to move the outcomes for those students?

AUDIENCE: About 15 months ago Ken Boston came up and addressed a group on the issue of Gonski 1 and whether it was a mirage. Do you think there is a likelihood then Gonski 2 might in retrospect be seen to be a mirage which recommends all sorts of good things, but nobody actually gets around to doing anything?

LEANNE NIXON: Well, I won't answer that.

JULIE SONNEMANN: There are some genuinely new things in this piece of work, but a lot of the recommendations are actually things that state governments have been trying to do for many years. So articulating them is not necessarily helpful to move that process along and I didn't think necessarily that was the intention of this document, but I would hope this product is a really good synthesis of the key things that we need to achieve as a system and what policymakers should be focusing their efforts on. I would hope that this may stop focusing on smaller issues or more faddish ideas to really lay it all out in one document what are all the things that we need to do and then let's have a conversation around what bits the state government is doing, what bits the Commonwealth is doing, and we're all on the same page about generally what needs to happen. That's what I see the purpose of this particular review being. Will it solve all problems and will it suddenly make solutions appear at the state level? I

doubt it, but I think it at least puts them on the agenda in a really public way which hopefully will spark a lot of discussion and debate at the state government level as well about the extent to which it's already happening or not happening, and those conversations are very productive I think. I'm not sure if I've entirely answered the question, but it's a difficult one.

MEGAN FRENCH: In terms of it not becoming a mirage, would tying the recommendations to the funding agreements stop that?

JULIE SONNEMANN: It's a very good question. I don't think so.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: The problem is the recommendations are not specific enough. When you say "tying the recommendations to funding agreements" it would be like trying to nail jelly to a wall. I just think the states need to do the work to operationalise this and, to the extent that that's part of the bilateral discussions between the Commonwealth and states, that will be the proof of the pudding.

MEGAN FRENCH: Matt, did you have something you want to add?

MATTHEW DEEBLE: We have been waiting for the report because the Australian Government or current Minister had said, "I wanted to have this report to tell me what Commonwealth should do". So we didn't know what the view of the Commonwealth was. That's now been expressed in the report and has been, by both the Prime Minister and the Minister, saying we accept the recommendations. So to the extent that people were jumping at shadows before about what was the Commonwealth keen on, we now have a statement from them that this is what they're keen on achieving at the level that we now understand it to be. So I think that's positive and if you take the glass half-full view about it, it also leaves the appropriate room for a good discussion with the states and territories and the non-government school sector as well to understand how are we going to do that. I think that now comes to the goodwill and efforts of people to say the ways in which they're going to implement that in their different jurisdictions and in their different contexts. For those of us that don't have a seat at the table, the non-profit sector, social organisations and others, I think we're just hoping to land on some things that we say are right for the Commonwealth to do and we think that's strongly about a national independent body that can bring other perspectives to the question and also strongly support the discussion about enhancing the professional reputation and support around teaching and school leadership. All of us I think can agree how critical that is and then we start asking how do we support and help that as well as we can.

AUDIENCE: Building on a comment you just made, no-one tonight has used the phrase "crisis in education" which is comforting, but it is a phrase that I've heard used in the media all week after Gonski 2.0 was released. There seems to be a continual problem and Leanne referenced tonight the prominent deficit discourse in education and the way we speak about quality teaching or quality teachers. My question is how do we change the reputation of schools, teachers and the profession nationally to engage in a more positive view of education?

MEGAN FRENCH: Anyone want to take that one?

DAVID DE CARVALHO: I think it's a good point. Mr Gonski himself, I think, was trying to correct the record, I guess, because on Monday the headline was "a generation of students failed" using the PISA data as evidence of that. There's been a century of reform efforts in New South Wales and you can

draw a lot of lessons from those. Successful reforms are ones where you don't start by dissing your past. An attempt to create a burning platform where there isn't one is not helpful. So I think the kinds of comments that Leanne opened with today are going to be important. I think the Ministers will make this point on Friday. Again, it's part of the dynamic of Commonwealth/state relations that when the Commonwealth is unhappy with progress by the states on matters that it feels some pressure to demonstrate progress on it will point the finger at the states in this way. I don't think that is conducive to productive and collaborative efforts moving forward. I'll stop there because I'm just talking from the federal/state relations issue, but others might have a comment around the reputational question.

MATTHEW DEEBLE: I think I've got a bit of a contrary view in that the dangerous dialogue is one that talks about you're calling it a crisis, but we should focus on the strengths and build. I don't disagree with the importance of strengths-based activity, but to not acknowledge the public discourse that exists, even if it's not whipped up into a frenzy, in the worries for families and communities about is this the right education for my kids going forward, are we focusing on the right things, are the skills and the knowledge that we're developing going to be right? Perhaps they're eternal concerns of a parent, and I do have school age children so I carry that now. It's important for the sector that not just the teaching and school leadership professions or the system, but everybody has a clear-eyed discussion about the data that we do have that tells us about where we're at in our performance, as much as that could be improved working with what we have at the moment. There are some challenges and I think denying that they exist or accusing others of making that into being hysterical actually creates a greater problem. So I think a clear-eyed discussion of the challenges that do exist and then building from what we can do to improve and engaging in a really meaningful conversation with everybody else that are total stakeholders in this that aren't doing the supremely important work in classrooms is a really important discussion.

DAVID DE CARVALHO: Instead of asking "what's the problem we're trying to solve" you frame it as "what's the opportunity you need to seize". It's just a different way of framing it.

MEGAN FRENCH: Very good. Time has definitely run away from us so, unless anyone else has anything burning to add there, I will draw the event to a close. I'm sure we could keep talking about it all night. I would like to once again thank the State Library for hosting us this evening, thank you Louise. If you aren't already, you might like to consider joining their mailing list to stay informed about the other events and exhibitions they have upcoming. Thanks also to you, the audience, for your attention and thoughts this evening. If you didn't get a chance to ask your question, some of the panel may be around for a few moments following the event if you'd like to come up and have a chat with anybody. Finally, thanks once again to our incredible panel for your insights and analysis tonight. This is a complex but important topic and it's vital that these kinds of conversations are taking place and are hopefully informing our governments to use evidence and expertise in all their policy decisions. I'd invite you all to join me in thanking the panel for their time tonight. Thank you and good evening.

END OF RECORDING