Welcome, everybody. Firstly, I'd like to start by acknowledging that I'm on Aboriginal land and acknowledge, with deep respect, the traditional custodians of the land and pay my respects to Elders, past, present and emerging. I'd also like to acknowledge the Tasmanian Aboriginal community who continue to maintain their identity, culture and Aboriginal rights. So, thanks for joining us today. I'm Darlene McLennan and I'm the manager of ADCET. Today's topic is disability, higher education and e-learning - moving beyond accessible web design. Our presenters are Tim Pitman and Mike Kent from Curtin University. I'm sorry to say one of our other presenters, Katie, is unwell today. Before we begin the presentation, I want to provide a few housekeeping items. This webinar, for those who haven’t joined us before, is captioned by Bradley Reporting and will be recorded. The recording will be available on ADCET in the coming days. To activate your closed caption, click on the CC button in the tool bar located on the top or the bottom of your screen. To increase the number of lines appearing in the caption box, click the small arrow on the top righthand side. If you have any difficulties with your technology throughout the webinar, email us at admin@ADCET.edu.au. Our presentations often run for around 50 minutes. Tim and Mike are saying, as Katie is not here, it may not go as long. You might get an early minute today. We also allow questions after the presentation and normally, that's done through me as we can't often guarantee if people have microphones working. Throughout the presentation, please feel free to write your questions in the chat pod and then I will ask them at the end. If you actually click the option to share with all panellists and attendees, others can actually see your questions and even some people answer it or share other resources, so it's a great way to have another level of engagement in the webinar.   I think that's all. So, now we're going to hand over to Tim and Mike. So thanks, guys.

- Can you hear me OK?

- Yes, we can.

- I'd like to join Darlene in acknowledgment. Mike and I are coming to you from Curtin University in Perth and we also acknowledge the traditional owners and pay our respects. Today, Mike and I will be speaking. I will begin the conversation and move into the research and Mike will take on and talk about the findings more fully. Our topic is about disability, higher education and e-learning. Before we start, I do want to make an acknowledgment that throughout this conversation and our presentation, we will be talking about categories. Obviously, identifying as disability is a categorisation and the higher education sector, the way data is collected creates certain subcategories within that. We acknowledge this is part of the process of identification and we acknowledge categorisation sometimes is done by the person who is being categorised, but other times is done by them and sometimes without their consent or without their support. Therefore, categories can help. They can hinder, but it's impossible for us to present this data today in a way that the sector collects it without creating and talking about these categories. I don't seek to problematise that or discuss it or be for or against it, merely to acknowledge. One thing I would say, and this is why categories are created in higher education disability reporting, is it makes the issue visible and active. The bottom line institutions, and democratic institutions and public policy, this is only when you report something counts and acknowledge that it starts to matter and that can have some very strong inputs, obviously in the disability support and disability research. By way of example, I just wanted to give you two examples of counting categories. These are the categories that the Government has used in the last 25 years to report and count people with disability in higher education. They're about to change, but for the purpose of this presentation, we’re using the ones used for the last quarter of a century. This is the count of 1992 and this is compared to the count in 2017. So, it's just a proportional count, it's not raw numbers and just putting those two columns against it, tells us a lot about categorisations and how it changes over time, in particular, how people defined as having disabilities associated with medical issues have exponentially grown and the other category, the miscellaneous category has grown more, and the other point I would make is in 1992, these categories were being filled in by disability support officers, in other words, they were people defining the students with disability, whereas in 2017, and today, it's the students themselves that are categorising. Adds that layer of complexity, but when you're looking at the issues that we're exploring, talking about disability and technology or disability in e-learning, we are acutely aware as researchers that we are homogenising a very diverse group. First, the good news, and we can see in this chart that we have seen a really significant increase in participation by people with disability. The chart just tracks the last ten years and as it shows, we're seeing the numbers more than double in this period. In 2009, 30,000 students identified as having a disability, and at the most recent count, that was over 70,000. What is not clear is the extent at which this growth is a factor of actual growth, more students in the system, better reporting by universities, in other words students that were always there, but perhaps weren't being recorded as such, or a greater willingness or understanding to self-categorise and self-identify by the students themselves. That said, what we're still seeing is flatlining, change in the subsequent measures of success. So, when we look at things such as, in this case, this graph tells us in their first year the retention of students, the critical first year, survival of the first year of study and we see in the same period, even though the number of students with disability has really increased, they're still remaining stubbornly 3 to 4 percentage points behind the main cohort in terms of their retention. So, it's one thing to get students in, it's another thing to ensure that they actually get successful outcomes that other students do. Another final thing to show how these categories really need to be looked at very closely, this looks at a cohort of students, the way Government tries to identify completion, success, or in other words, do students get through - they take a cohort of students and track them, in this case, for up to nine years, to really take into account people with part-time enrolments or enrolments that have been affected. So, plenty of time, sufficient time to complete. What we find is that 2005 Bachelor cohort after nine years, the average completion rate is around 72%, so almost three quarters of the students would have completed their course after nine years. But, the various categories of disability, again these are self-identified, we see that the completion rates are significantly lower. Except when we get to the visual category, which has the same, in fact, fractionally above. So, we must be very careful not to homogenise these groups when talking about them. Now, to the research project. This was a small project, just one university, we wanted to focus on how students with disability engage with and use technology to support their studies. We had three major parts, one was the environmental background contextual review, one was a very particular performance review of the case study institution, looking at KPIs, measures, milestones and publicly available data, but we just wanted to draw out a couple of slides, not the entire project, but we wanted to focus on what the online survey of students with disability told us, because this is the student voice, these are the people, these are the students themselves telling us of their experiences, telling us of their likes and dislikes and this is the one we particularly wanted to focus on this morning. A little bit on survey respondents. We're talking about a cohort of 229, which for an institution project was a good response, but obviously, caution needs to be taken if you're extrapolating this to a wider understanding or wider findings across the sector. And again, we see the disparateness of the people in the category — in the cohort group and where they come from. One of the key questions we asked them, we said, what technology have you used? And we also wanted to see what the difference was if there was any difference in technologies that the students use on campus and technologies used at home. Now, what we found was the e-books and smart phone apps at university were the most commonly used technological devices. We then compared that to what they said and reported as using at home. Now, we didn't necessarily expect to see a difference there. We didn't expect to see a difference in devices, if you will - at the university, they use some kinds of devices and at home they would use others and indeed, the survey brought that out. They're just as likely to use the same devices at home as they are at university. But even though it's a kind of straightforward comment to make, I think it's an important comment to make and that is when you look at the raw counts, students are using devices more at home and this is really important when we think about inclusive design. It's a small thing, but it can be so easily overlooked at the institutional area. Because, when institutions talk about inclusive design, the instinct is to think about your institution and think how can we make our institution more inclusive. Accessible in universal design, etc, and of course, that needs to be done and that's great. But then, you also have to consider students that aren't on campus and spending significant periods of time not on campus. Our university, our institutions have to extend into there to also ensure the way that the things that we're doing in the university can also be delivered into the students' homes. And again, most institutions are aware of this and they are making attempts to do this, but I would argue that it needs to also go to a third level and that is for us to remember that students, and in this case, students with disability, are designing their own solutions, working out how best to support their own studies. Sometimes, in collaboration with university, but also off their own bat because they have a lifetime of experience and knowledge and they know what works best for them. So, we need to think about inclusive design also being about not projecting institution out to the student, but to actually look at what the people are doing in their homes and saying, to what extent can we redesign our universities to match or be compatible very much with what students were doing for 10, 12, 15 years before they even stepped foot or enrolled in our University.   The next question is a little bit subjective and it's asking students to think about what their preferences are when they're talking about using technology specifically designed for people with disability, or mainstream technology. Now, the reason for asking this question, the impetus is from a policy point of view. The conversations we're having about supporting students with disability in universities go back a quarter of a century. When you look at the early discussion papers around this, I’m thinking about a fair chance for all discussion paper in 1992, it's pre-Internet and they're imagining a world, not imagining, policymakers are living in a world where it's very modernistic and the institutions are imagined as a place where a student with a disability who has insufficiencies in something goes to get the expertise, whether it's people who sign or creation of braille texts or large-scale copying of hard copies into more compatible or easy-to-read fonts or colours or creating audiotapes. The thought is that without the institution's financial, physical and expertise support, the student will not be able to access education. But now, of course, fast-forward 25 years and we're living in a world where all this technological , sorry — many of these technological solutions are existing outside the university. And what we find is whilst the students are saying to us, of course, it depends on the issue, it depends on my particular needs and what kind of software or hardware I need, generally, there's a much stronger tendency for them to say mainstream technology is better than technology specifically designed for people with disability. Again, it's a heads up to the institution that it's not just the institution to think of themselves as experts in this area, but to understand what's happening in the wider environment and shape their institutions accordingly. So, the overall findings of the study, this is the point at which I will pass on to Mike shortly, is that it's great to see that we're seeing a significant improvement of participation of people with disability, but that's only one measure of success. Widening access to participation is just the first step, a very important first step, obviously, but we need to talk more about retaining the students and getting the students through to completion — a positive completion and then, also, for what happens to them after university. We find students with medically related conditions are significantly overrepresented in these studies. These students have a particular pressing need for technological support. We know that the most commonly assisted technologies are e-books and smart phones and we do believe that assistive technologies are increasingly mainstreamed and notwithstanding the need for specific technologies, students are saying the mainstream technology is what they tend to engage with most of the time and use most of the time. Universities still have a large role to play. Just because the students have these technologies at home and become proficient without university help doesn't mean universities don't have an important part to play, such as creating the places in which these students can use these technological resources. And also, socially including these students, particularly if they study online.At this point, I will pass over to my colleague, Mike, and he will take up from where I left off.

 - Thanks very much, Tim. I'm going to talk about some of the rationale for our study. I'll put my glasses on. When I look out at you at the screen, I can't see you, but I can see my notes. So, a little bit behind the justification for this study and, I suppose, the moral and legal requirements for making education accessible to people with disability. So, we'll do a chronological look at the access to education, Disability Discrimination Act from 1992 where it talks about how it's unlawful for an education place to discriminate against a student on the grounds of disability, deny access to a student or limit their access. It’s unlawful for an education provider to discriminate against a person on the grounds of the person’s disability or by developing curricula or training courses having content that will either exclude the person from participation or subject the person to any other detriment.   For some of you in the industry, you may be following debates around setting up the start of a course. These are the inherent requirements — the inherent requirements around a course. And some of these start to sail very close to the line about which side of this particular legal act we are on. So, the universities are often trying to make the distinction between saying, well, it's OK, we can train you to be… a nurse is a classical example of it, but in order to be able to be registered as a nurse, you need to meet these inherent requirements which counter what the act is saying here. So, that's a bit of an aside, but some of these things that actually go back quite a long way have sort of been wound back at the moment, which is a cause of concern. We go forward to 2005, Disability Standards for Education set out some standards. So, to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination against persons on the ground of disability in the area of education and training, to ensure as far as practicable, persons with disabilities have the same rights to equity before the law in the area of education. We get, rather than it is illegal to do this, it's something that is, as far as practicable. So, we sort of see that wind back happening in 2005, to promote recognition and acceptance within the community - the principle that persons with disabilities have the same fundamental rights as the rest of the community. Next year, in 2006, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disability, again highlighted the importance of the physical, social, economic, cultural environment to health and education, information and communication for students with disability to ensure people with disabilities are independently and access on an equal basis with others of the physical environment to transportation and communications and to ensure persons with a disability are able to access general tertiary education, vocational training, adult education, lifelong learning without discrimination and on an equal basis with others. Like article 24, it's ambiguous what they're saying and Australia is obviously a signatory to this convention. So, with that as the legal background, sorry, I'm making hand gestures off the screen… This, I suppose, highlights where we're coming from. At what point are we dealing with equality and equity, and how does that apply to people with disability, particularly accessing higher education? Now, part of our motivation for this study came from some prior work and ongoing work that we've been doing, looking at the use of captions for recorded lectures, particularly in an online context, also for students on campus who might benefit from that technology and prior to that, we looked at sort of broader questions around access and use of technology. Some of my research looking at … specifically at this university of Curtin University. The thing we extended with this study was looking, really, at some of the outcomes and also, getting a better appreciation for the student voice in terms of the online survey. So, just concluding some of the recommendations that we came up with. Some of these obviously, as Tim was saying, this was very much a study that was aimed specifically at this one institution and some of these recommendations then speak directly to the University. So, the first is as soon as practical, the University should adopt an efficient automated captioning system for all recorded lectures to say provide a timely captioning service to all students. In our survey, a number of students commented that they found that the provision of captions was very important. They also found that the way we do captioning at the moment, which is a manual, external captioning service often takes more than a week to turnaround and students were saying that by then, the actual learning and teaching has moved on, so they're only getting access to the lecture once everyone else has stopped discussing that particular course material. This is a potential work around. Obviously, there's issues around, I suppose, the effectiveness of automated captioning systems of how well it works, particularly in different topics. I know that a recent study they did at University of Western Australia found that different subject areas work less well and better with automated captions, so that's something to consider in future. So, the second recommendation was consideration needs to be given to an inclusive digital strategy that embraces students with complex medical disabilities, as well as those in other categories. I know I've spoken here at ADCET previously about the other categories, students with disabilities, which is sort of a way where we bundled up students with acquired brain injury, intellectual disabilities and mental illness. The way that breaks down is it's very dominated by students with mental illness, but the stigma associated with that particular type of impairment means that we can't even use its name, but it also means we're not very good at accommodating for those students. Similarly, complex medical disabilities provide challenges where you have students that might have fluctuating levels of impairment, how do we — and we tend to have a very regimented, you know, our semesters are going to be 13 weeks long, you need to finish within a certain period of time. How does that accommodate people who are very capable of doing these studies at bursts of four weeks at a time and then need gaps, how do we accommodate that?   As I was just reading this, it's interesting that, you know, the other students that had poor outcomes, as we saw on the early slides, those with mobility disabilities, and in this recommendation, I didn't include those students, probably because they tend to be much more obvious on campus, but nonetheless, the fact that they're getting really poor outcomes also raises a whole lot of important questions. And then, you know, when I'm writing my notes for this talk I'm like, how do we make higher education accessible for students with vision impairment, blindness? So, there's obviously — we're doing better with different types of impairments, but none of them are doing as well as students who don't have disability. In our survey, 33% of respondents said that the digital technologies that have been provided to them by the university were inadequate. That's a pretty — given the universities invest in these technologies to make the study more accessible for students, that's a low hit rate. That's something where more research is needed to see what students are using, and as Tim was saying before, the use of more mainstream accessibility technology has changed a lot over the last 25 years. How do we better incorporate that and target it to try to improve some of these outcomes? I suppose, related to that is technical support, particularly for students who are external to campus where we had a very low rate of… it was acknowledged that they weren't getting the tech support they needed in many cases. And finally, one of the other comments that came up, and I'm not sure this is necessarily specific for students with disabilities although, obviously, it’s students with disabilities we're getting this commentary from around the provision of social and emotional support. Students highlighted the fact that when you study externally, it's very isolating. So, how can we get that other element, which is still using technology, but not providing technology as such, but using technology to provide social and emotional support. I'd like to acknowledge, we both would like to acknowledge, that this research was funded through Curtin Teaching Innovation Grants Scheme grant from 2018 and we are very grateful for that and I think, now, we would like to take questions.

- Great, thank you so much for that. That's fantastic. Yes, some interesting data there and information. We've got a couple of questions. So, one of the questions was, they were just wondering whether participants self-reported multiple disabilities, such as hearing and vision impaired students or so forth within the data set you're collecting.

- Yes, there was a high level of reporting of multiple disability types.

- Did the study include expectations of students on what would be provided in terms of technology in comparison with their experience once they commenced their study?

- Sorry, could you repeat that?

- Did the study include expectations of students on what would be provided in terms of technology in comparison with the experience once they commenced their studies? Did students have an expectation coming to university that this would be provided, that would be provided and then actually get there and it's not the case?

- No, we didn't include that question. It would have been a lovely question.

- It would have been, wouldn't it?

- We should take our scoping study to the group.

- Please do. That would be great. And so, there was another one here. I will just change my things here… In regards to the categorisation of disability, do you have any thoughts on the national consistent collection on data of students — of school students with disabilities? I don't know if you've come across that. We did talk about it the other day, Tim. Have you got any thoughts on that at all?

- I find this — this is a very interesting area for me as a person who doesn't identify as having a disability, there is a real sense of I feel awkward and hesitant about this and so, coming into this, if you will, cold, for want of a better word, my departure point is, first, consistency. I'm a sociologist, I collect social data and consistency is paramount, otherwise you can't make meaningful comparisons or reasonable conclusions. But I operate from the premise when we're in the area of disability, asking a student to just identify as having a disability, let alone identifying what type of disability, you have to be able to demonstrably prove that in identifying the student, there is either a direct benefit to the student or an indirect benefit to society. In other words, by identifying, that will allow us, the institution, to help you. Or, it may not allow us to directly help you, but in collecting that data, it can help us become more knowledgeable and understanding of a situation and therefore, we can actually make improvements to the sector as a whole. And that's where I'm really interested. I'm saying, my whole 12 months of this scholarship is work on doing this. I'm really wanting to hear from people with disability about what these categorisations do for them and do to them.I understand, the more I speak to people, the more I understand how this informs self-identification, very important in terms of how they identify themselves, who they communicate with, who they relate to, who they draw support from, etc. What I'm still not sure on is why this data is being collected by a Federal Government agency and, at least to me, it seems to be sitting there and not doing anything. So, that's what I'm concerned about. Why collect data if you don't then act on the data?   I don't know if that answers the question. That's the concern I have.

- And, look, the national consistent collection of data, yeah, it's kind of a big question as well. So, probably didn't answer it, but I think you asked more questions in that, which is great. And I suppose, it's a good time to give a plug for tomorrow's webinar, which will be Tim presenting on the fellowship that he's going to undertake with the National Centre along with David, also doing a fellowship with the National Centre. So, we've got them tomorrow at 1pm Australian Eastern Standard Time, I think we're in at the moment, now. But we'll give it a plug at the end as well. Another question was, can you recommend ways we can reduce the homogeneous... how do you say that... the homogeneous of people with disabilities, as it currently happens?

- That's an interesting question, isn't it? It produces questions around universal design, we want to create a homogeneous everyone. Trying to make everything accessible in multiple ways for different people. I think it's particularly important if we're looking at the other category of disability, trying to, you know… trying to engage with that in a sensible way where we're talking about, you know, even if we look at a smaller category within mental illness and we're dealing with people who may have anxiety, depression, PTSD, they're the three most common, schizophrenia. They are not all mental illness that you make accessible in the same way, everyone has separate needs. I think part of it is people being prepared to talk about it and acknowledge. I suppose, getting back to what you were just saying about there needs to be some payback for us basically breaching people's privacy or asking them to disclose. Similarly, when people are disclosing, you need to have enough granularity to be able to engage in making education more accessible for people, in fact, the world accessible for people.

- To that, I’d add, this is an absolute conflict in disability research. It's called the — some people call it the “recognition redistribution paradox”. You can write PhDs on it, I'm desperately trying to summarise it. As a sociologist, I come from the redistribution end of the scale. In other words, put aside disability for the minute - when you look at something like poverty, you say, poverty is a social and economic barrier. We need to acknowledge poverty and acknowledge the ways in which it works against the person and our end goal is to eliminate policy. The policies of redistribution about keeping those in need, we try to face that distinction. We're trying to say, poverty no longer exists. Being working class is no longer a social or economic stigma. That's the redistribution. From the a cultural perspective, you have the policies or the acts of recognition, which is to say, there is nothing wrong with being disabled, disabled is part of my identity, it makes me who I am and therefore, I don't wish to efface it, I wish to acknowledge and champion and celebrate it and that gives me the community of practice, it gives me people who I relate to and gives me an identity in the same way that people identify with supporting a football team or identify as coming from a part of the world. These two are in conflict.If you go from the '70s, the '80s and early '90s, the government was completely about redistribution. It was all about, disability is a social and economic barrier, we wish to efface that barrier, but now, we're getting into more nuanced discussions where the community is saying to us, that’s great, we don't want barriers, but we don't want you to efface our identity in the process of getting rid of these barriers. And it's an ongoing tension. It’s, how do you remove the barriers without distinction? People are writing PhDs on that, so I can't give a straight answer in this webinar.

- It's brilliant, though. I love the discussion. The next question, I suppose, you know, goes against that in the sense of universal design, and if we're going to look at universal design, we continue to realise that we identify people with disability and so forth. The question was, do you have any thoughts about how universities could best work together to look at universal design and technology together, but just that sense of trying to avoid, you know, the reinvention. We are a large sector, but in some ways, we're also a connected sector. Is there ways that you think we could work collectively together to improve the practice of universal design around technology?

- I think we can acknowledge that some institutions are doing it much better than others and trying to learn from what could be, you know, what might be best practice. So, here in Western Australia, by example, the Murdoch University does very well with recruitment of students with disabilities compared to the sector at large. So, looking at what they're doing. I mean, again, that's only, you know, access at completion, but clearly, if you look at the stats, something different is happening there, what is that? So, I think we sort of, in a way, we're sort of enforcing an approach where most universities are following their own policy. So, I think the very first step in that process would be to look at what's working in what areas and how to distribute — where appropriate, how to distribute that across the sector, because there seems to be large variations in what outcomes are for different institutions in different categories, retention or completion or success. So, I think that would be a good first step. I think having something like the National Centre of Student Equity in Higher Education is another good thing we've got working for us.

- I was going to go to a pragmatic level - follow the money. And one way to do it would be to say, the more money that goes to ADCET, the National Centre, they're saying if you want to do action, we want to do research, whether it's scholarship or research, if we have coordinated national organisations in control of that research and action, they will obviously say, everything you do then goes to the whole sector. I'd follow the money and start giving the money, not to universities directly, but to the organisations that the community — the disability community says, these are the people who speak on my behalf.

- It's interesting. So, that kind of leads to a bigger question is that, you know, disability is probably one of the — people with disability are getting to be the fastest growing equity group and we're not seeing that prioritisation around the financial, you know, the money that kind of then follows that increase in that equity group. Is there anything that you think could be done to kind of improve that, to work towards a better financial…

- Some of this study hints at the potential for mainstream accessible technology. So, stuff that's coming out of the box, like, you know, iPhone or an Android phone with its suite of accessibility functions. The automated captioning services that are just coming as a standard free app and that sort of thing. I think there's a lot of resources that we're perhaps not deploying effectively or talking to our students about deploying effectively. And I think that that's sort of extremely low-hanging fruit that we could really work with and it's a bit unfortunate in this study, similar to the question about how we didn't ask people what their expectations were. You know, we weren't able to then burrow down into expert users going, OK, you've used this technology at home effectively, what do you do and how can we use you as an exemplar for students who might be in the same position?

- I think a lot of universities are doing that around getting collective students, you know, working together, sharing. I know a couple of universities have read and write, for example, user groups. So, you're sharing that practice with each other, which is a fantastic outcome. The AustEd list, for those who aren’t aware, there's a list for disability practitioners and academics that share good practice and put out questions for each other and so that's, you know, if you are trialling new technologies or looking at technologies that may support a student with particular needs or so forth, that group actually works really well to help provide information. I don't think I've ever come across a sector which shares so freely, which is just a delight. Now, we've got some time for some more questions, if anybody wants another question. We have got one more, but just to give a quick plug while people are thinking about questions, Jane's put into the chat panel the next webinar we're doing tomorrow. But also, we have a range of information around inclusive technology on the website, ADCET, including the free apps from Apple, etc. So, there's a whole heap of information for people wanting more information around that.

Another question that we've got, Tim and Mike, in terms of a more effective provision of technology adjustments and students playing a more active role designing their own solutions, do universities utilise assessment processes that focus on functional need, rather than disability labels? I suppose, that question would be to Curtin. Do you know if they do that?

- My understanding is that definitely moved to functionality. In other words, the focus, and again, this is why I find it's interesting for categories, they collect focus on the disability. But when you speak to disability support officers, certainly the ones I've spoken to, it's all around functions. Functional needs, you know, what can we need to ensure the education can be delivered. I think the people that are dealing directly with students are acutely aware of this and absolutely driven by the functional approach. It's the extent to which that then flows through the actual institution itself. I think we've still got problems.

- No other questions have come through. Is there any final remarks from either of you guys?

- Not from me. Just thank you very much for the opportunity to talk about this.

- Yeah, thanks very much and thanks for your questions as well. It's always good to sort of get some, I suppose, feedback and interest in what's happening. I look forward to your webinar tomorrow.

- Yeah, it's a fantastic research project and I think there's potential for further research in this area and also, even to expand beyond Curtin and find out more across the country.

So, as we said, the webinar has been recorded and it will be on ADCET in a couple of days. We might even get an article written about the research, because I think it is some — there's some questions in that that we need to keep asking ourselves as a sector. So, well done to you both and to Katie and thank you for giving your time to us.

- Thanks very much.

- Thank you, everybody, for joining us and thank you to the captioner today.