



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

2008–2009–2010

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

No. 64

WEDNESDAY, 23 JUNE 2010

- 1** The Assembly met at 10 a.m., pursuant to adjournment. A quorum of Members not being present, the Speaker (Mr Rattenbury) ordered the bells to be rung. A quorum having been formed, the Speaker took the Chair and asked Members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

**2 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (NOTIFICATIONS AND REVIEW)
AMENDMENT BILL 2009**

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the question—That this Bill be agreed to in principle—

Debate resumed.

Paper: Ms Hunter, by leave, presented the following paper:

Acts that include schedules of reviewable decisions—List.

Debate continued.

Question—That this Bill be agreed to in principle—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 4

Ms Bresnan
Ms Hunter
Ms Le Couteur
Mr Rattenbury

NOES, 13

Mr Barr	Mr Hanson
Ms Burch	Mr Hargreaves
Mr Coe	Ms Porter
Mr Corbell	Mr Seselja
Mr Doszpot	Mr Smyth
Mrs Dunne	Mr Stanhope
Ms Gallagher	

And so it was negated.

3 SHEPHERD CENTRE AND NOAH'S ARK—FUNDING

Mr Doszpot, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) the discontinuation of the Commonwealth Government's Non-Government Centres Support element under the Literacy, Numeracy and Special Learning Needs Program (LNSLN) which will slash funding to the Shepherd Centre and Noah's Ark;
 - (b) the loss of certainty of funding for the Shepherd Centre and Noah's Ark as a result of the reallocation of funding by the Stanhope Government;
 - (c) the lack of staff within the Department of Education and Training (DET) who are specialised, trained and certified in developing the spoken language skills of deaf or hearing impaired children between 0-5 years old;
 - (d) that the Shepherd Centre provides training to DET staff and is a vital organisation skilling parents in helping their children with hearing disabilities develop;
 - (e) the substantial contributions made by the Shepherd Centre and Noah's Ark to the ACT; and
 - (f) that ACT communities require the vital and differentiated services provided by both organisations; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
 - (a) explain why the Minister repeatedly refused to meet with both organisations;
 - (b) meet with the Shepherd Centre and Noah's Ark to ascertain the viability of service continuation and alternatives, and report back to the Assembly by the last sitting day in June 2010;
 - (c) consult with parents of children affected by the discontinuation of LNSLN funding to look at viable alternative models to continue provision of these services, and deliver a comprehensive report to the Assembly; and
 - (d) detail what the Stanhope Government has done to ask the Commonwealth Government to review their decision to discontinue funding.

Debate ensued.

Question—put and passed.

4 EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL 2008

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the question—That this Bill be agreed to in principle—

Mr Barr (Minister for Education and Training), who had already spoken, by leave, again addressed the Assembly.

Debate continued.

Debate interrupted in accordance with standing order 74 and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for a later hour this day.

5 QUESTIONS

Questions without notice were asked.

6 EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL 2008

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the question—That this Bill be agreed to in principle—

Debate resumed.

Question—That this Bill be agreed to in principle—put and passed.

Detail Stage

Clauses 1 to 3, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Clause 4—

On the motion of Ms Hunter, her amendment No. 1 (*see* [Schedule 1](#)) was made, after debate.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Clause 7—

On the motion of Ms Hunter, her amendment No. 2 (*see* [Schedule 1](#)) was made, after debate.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

New clause—

Ms Hunter moved her amendment No. 3 (*see* [Schedule 1](#)), which would insert a new clause 8 in the Bill.

Debate continued.

On the motion of Mr Barr (Minister for Education and Training), his amendment No. 1 (*see* [Schedule 2](#)) to Ms Hunter's proposed amendment was made, after debate.

Mr Barr moved his amendment No. 2 (*see* [Schedule 2](#)) to Ms Hunter's proposed amendment.

Debate continued.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That new clause 8, as amended, be inserted in the Bill—put and passed.

Title agreed to.

Question—That this Bill, as amended, be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 11

Mr Barr
 Ms Bresnan
 Ms Burch
 Mr Corbell
 Ms Gallagher
 Mr Hargreaves

Ms Hunter
 Ms Le Couteur
 Ms Porter
 Mr Rattenbury
 Mr Stanhope

NOES, 6

Mr Coe
 Mr Dospot
 Mrs Dunne
 Mr Hanson
 Mr Seselja
 Mr Smyth

And so it was resolved in the affirmative—Bill, as amended, agreed to.

7 KANGAROO CULL

Mrs Dunne, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes the:
 - (a) Government's decision to conduct a kangaroo cull in ACT reserves;
 - (b) cull is being informed by the Kangaroo Management Plan and the animal welfare code of practice for kangaroo control;
 - (c) support for the kangaroo cull from the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment and the RSPCA;
 - (d) disinformation campaign conducted by some groups about the need for, and methods used, in the cull; and
 - (e) decision by the Government to bury the kangaroo carcasses rather than offer them for sale;
- (2) supports the Government's decision to conduct this kangaroo cull; and
- (3) calls on the Government to ensure:
 - (a) accurate information about the conduct of the cull is made available to the community; and
 - (b) that carcasses are disposed of commercially rather than buried.

Mr Stanhope (Minister for Territory and Municipal Services) moved the following amendment: Omit paragraphs (2) and (3), substitute:

- “(2) supports the Government's decision to responsibly manage kangaroo numbers in the ACT's nature reserves; and
- (3) calls on the Government to:
 - (a) ensure accurate information about the conduct of the cull is made available to the community;
 - (b) ensure that the feasibility of the commercial disposal of carcasses is fully examined in advance of future culling activity, taking full account of legislative, regulatory, social, environmental and market issues; and
 - (c) by the last sitting day in 2010, report to the Assembly on the progress of this work and arrangements for the disposal of carcasses in future kangaroo culling operations.”.

Mr Rattenbury moved the following amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment: Omit paragraphs (3)(a) to (3)(c), substitute:

- “(3) (a) ensure accurate information about the rationale and conduct of all culls is made available to the community prior to the annual commencement of culling;
- (b) ensure that the ACT does not develop a commercial kangaroo meat industry;
- (c) ensure that, in the context of culls being undertaken for biodiversity purposes, the feasibility of utilising kangaroo carcasses for consumption is fully examined in advance of future culling activity, taking full account of legislative, regulatory, social, environmental and market issues; and
- (d) by the last sitting day in 2010, report to the Assembly on the progress of this work and arrangements for the utilisation of carcasses in future kangaroo culling operations.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That Mr Rattenbury's amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 4

Ms Bresnan
Ms Hunter
Ms Le Couteur
Mr Rattenbury

NOES, 11

Mr Barr
Ms Burch
Mr Coe
Mr Doszpot
Mrs Dunne
Ms Gallagher
Mr Hanson
Mr Hargreaves
Ms Porter
Mr Smyth
Mr Stanhope

And so it was negatived.

Mr Rattenbury, by leave, moved the following amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment: Omit paragraphs (3)(a) to (3)(c), substitute:

- “(3) (a) ensure accurate information about the rationale and conduct of all culls is made available to the community prior to the annual commencement of culling;
- (b) ensure that, in the context of culls being undertaken for biodiversity purposes, the feasibility of utilising kangaroo carcasses for consumption is fully examined in advance of future culling activity, taking full account of legislative, regulatory, social, environmental and market issues; and
- (c) by the last sitting day in 2010, report to the Assembly on the progress of this work and arrangements for the utilisation of carcasses in future kangaroo culling operations.”.

Question—That Mr Rattenbury's amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 4

Ms Bresnan
 Ms Hunter
 Ms Le Couteur
 Mr Rattenbury

NOES, 11

Mr Barr
 Ms Burch
 Mr Coe
 Mr Doszpot
 Mrs Dunne
 Ms Gallagher
 Mr Hanson
 Mr Hargreaves
 Ms Porter
 Mr Smyth
 Mr Stanhope

And so it was negatived.

Adjournment negatived: It being 6 p.m.—The question was proposed—That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Question—put and negatived.

Mr Rattenbury, by leave, moved the following amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment: Omit paragraph (3)(a), substitute:

- “(a) ensure accurate information about the rationale and conduct of all culls is made available to the community prior to the annual commencement of culling;

Debate continued.

Question—That Mr Rattenbury's amendment to Mr Stanhope's proposed amendment be agreed to—put and passed.

Question—That Mr Stanhope's amendment, as amended, be agreed to—put and passed.

Mr Rattenbury, by leave, moved the following amendments together:

- (1) Omit paragraph (1)(a), substitute:

- “(a) Government's decisions to conduct a kangaroo cull in ACT reserves for biodiversity management reasons;”.

- (2) Omit paragraph (1) (d).

Debate continued.

Ordered—That the question be divided.

Amendment (1) agreed to.

Amendment (2) agreed to.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes the:
- (a) Government's decisions to conduct a kangaroo cull in ACT reserves for biodiversity management reasons;
 - (b) cull is being informed by the Kangaroo Management Plan and the animal welfare code of practice for kangaroo control;

- (c) support for the kangaroo cull from the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment and the RSPCA; and
 - (d) decision by the Government to bury the kangaroo carcasses rather than offer them for sale;
- (2) supports the Government's decision to responsibly manage kangaroo numbers in the ACT's nature reserves; and
- (3) calls on the Government to:
- (a) ensure accurate information about the rationale and conduct of all culls is made available to the community prior to the annual commencement of culling;
 - (b) ensure that the feasibility of the commercial disposal of carcasses is fully examined in advance of future culling activity, taking full account of legislative, regulatory, social, environmental and market issues; and
 - (c) by the last sitting day in 2010, report to the Assembly on the progress of this work and arrangements for the disposal of carcasses in future kangaroo culling operations."—

be agreed to—put and passed.

8 COMPANION ANIMALS

Ms Porter, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) recognises the need for guidelines for the breeding and selling of companion animals in the ACT; and
- (2) welcomes the ACT Government's steps to develop a mandatory code for the breeding and selling of animals in the ACT.

Debate adjourned (Mr Hargreaves) and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.

9 ELECTIVE SURGERY WAITING TIMES

Mr Hanson, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes that:
 - (a) the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare *Australian Hospital Statistics 2008-09* report released on 17 June 2010 shows that elective surgery waiting times in the ACT are the longest in Australia;
 - (b) the report shows that since the previous report was released in 2009:
 - (i) the median waiting time for elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 50th percentile) has worsened from 72 to 75 days, which is 31 days longer than the national average of 34 days;
 - (ii) the length of time that the majority of people have been waiting for their elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 90th percentile) has worsened from 372 to 378 days, which is 158 days longer than the national average of 220 days; and
 - (iii) the percentage of people who have waited more than a year for elective surgery in the ACT has worsened from 10.3% to 10.6% which is more than three times the national average of 2.9%;

- (c) patients waiting for surgery that should be completed within 60 days (Category 2A) are included in the numbers of people who have been waiting for over a year;
 - (d) allegations have been made that serious mistakes were made and lists were being deliberately manipulated after an elective surgery patient was downgraded from Urgent Category 1, requiring surgery within 30 days, to Semi-Urgent Category 2A, requiring surgery within 60 days;
 - (e) an elective surgery patient has alleged that he was informed by ACT Health staff that in the case of elective surgery patients requiring urgent elective surgery, that “anyone who isn’t operated on in the 30 days, the hospital downgrades”;
 - (f) the ACT President of the Visiting Medical Officers Association has alleged that the practice of downgrading urgent elective surgery patients who cannot be seen on time is “an illegal stunt that’s done by the administration to try and make their figures look better”; and
 - (g) the community has lost confidence in the Minister’s ability to effectively manage elective surgery in the ACT and believes that the Government is not doing enough to reduce waiting times for elective surgery;
- (2) calls on the Minister to provide to the Assembly by close of business on 24 June 2010:
- (a) the number of elective surgery patients in the ACT who in the last 24 months have been downgraded from Urgent Category 1 to a lower category;
 - (b) for each case where a patient was downgraded:
 - (i) the details of how long the patient had been on the waiting list as an Urgent Category 1 patient on the day that they were downgraded;
 - (ii) an explanation of why each patient was downgraded from Urgent Category 1; and
 - (iii) an explanation of who initiated the decision or the request to downgrade the patient, that being either the patient’s doctor or an ACT Health official; and
- (3) calls on the Minister to immediately explain to the Assembly why the ACT has the longest waiting times for elective surgery in the nation and why the waiting times have deteriorated under her administration.

Ms Gallagher (Minister for Health) moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

- “(1) notes that:
- (a) the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare *Australian Hospital Statistics 2008-09* report released on 17 June 2010 shows that elective surgery waiting times in the ACT are the longest in Australia;
 - (b) the report shows that since the previous report was released in 2009:

- (i) the median waiting time for elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 50th percentile) has worsened from 72 to 75 days, which is 31 days longer than the national average of 34 days;
 - (ii) the length of time that the majority of people have been waiting for their elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 90th percentile) has worsened from 372 to 378 days, which is 158 days longer than the national average of 220 days; and
 - (iii) the percentage of people who have waited more than a year for elective surgery in the ACT has worsened from 10.3% to 10.6% which is more than three times the national average of 2.9%;
- (c) patients waiting for surgery that should be completed within 60 days (Category 2A) are included in the numbers of people who have been waiting for over a year;
 - (d) allegations have been made by a patient and by Dr Peter Hughes, President of the VMOA that waiting list data has been manipulated by downgrading the clinical categories of some patients; and
 - (e) these allegations remain unsubstantiated; and
- (2) calls on the Minister to provide to the Assembly by the final sitting day of this calendar year:
- (a) an independent interim review of The Waiting Time and Elective Patient Management Policy that came into effect on 1 January 2008;
 - (b) a report from the Surgical Services Taskforce on the effectiveness of the current policy;
 - (c) as part of those reports examine any evidence of “downgrading” of patients not in line with the current policies in place; and
 - (d) that ACT Health works with the Health Services Commissioner in the development of these reports prior to their tabling in the Assembly.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That Ms Gallagher’s amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 6		NOES, 9	
Mr Barr	Mr Stanhope	Ms Bresnan	Ms Le Couteur
Ms Burch		Mr Doszpot	Mr Rattenbury
Ms Gallagher		Mrs Dunne	Mr Seselja
Mr Hargreaves		Mr Hanson	Mr Smyth
Ms Porter		Ms Hunter	

And so it was negatived.

Ms Bresnan, by leave, moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “17 June 2010 shows that” in paragraph (1)(a), substitute:

“the ACT has the:

- (i) longest median elective surgery waiting times in Australia; and
- (ii) second highest level of admission per 1000 people in the population and the least number of reporting hospitals;

- (b) the report shows that since the previous report was released in 2009:
 - (i) the median waiting time for elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 50th percentile) has worsened from 72 to 75 days, which is 31 days longer than the national average of 34 days;
 - (ii) the length of time that the majority of people have been waiting for their elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 90th percentile) has worsened from 372 to 378 days, which is 158 days longer than the national average of 220 days; and
 - (iii) the percentage of people who have waited more than a year for elective surgery in the ACT has worsened from 10.3% to 10.6% which is more than three times the national average of 2.9%;
 - (c) patients waiting for surgery that should be completed within 60 days (Category 2A) are included in the numbers of people who have been waiting for over a year;
 - (d) allegations have been made about possible manipulation or mismanagement of the elective surgery waiting list and that some patients have been downgraded categories; and
 - (e) the Auditor-General conducted an audit of ‘Waiting Lists for Elective Surgery and Medical Treatment’ in 2004, and is interested in revisiting the subject; and
- (2) requests the Auditor-General to conduct an audit of ‘Waiting Lists for Elective Surgery and Medical Treatment’ and consider as part of that audit concerns raised about the management of the elective surgery waiting list.”.

Debate continued.

Papers: Ms Gallagher presented the following papers:

Elective surgery waiting times—

Copy of Waiting Time and Elective Patient Management Policy.

Copy of form letter from the Manager, Surgical Bookings/Pre-Admission Clinic.

Paper: Mr Hanson, by leave, presented the following paper:

Elective surgery waiting times—Copy of letter from the Manager, Surgical Bookings/Pre-Admission Clinic, dated 13 October 2009.

Paper: Ms Bresnan, by leave, presented the following paper:

Elective surgery waiting times—Bresnan talking points, dated 23 June 2010.

Mr Seselja (Leader of the Opposition) moved the following amendment to Ms Bresnan’s proposed amendment: Add:

- “(3) calls on the Minister for Health to table any and all documents relating to the brief the Minister for Health referred to by the Minister for Health in question time on 22 June 2010 in response to Mr Hanson’s question relating to hospital waiting times by the close of business of Tuesday, 29 June 2010, including, but not limited to, briefing papers, meeting notes, emails, correspondence from your Department.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That Mr Seselja’s amendment to Ms Bresnan’s proposed amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 5	NOES, 10
Mr Doszpot	Mr Barr Ms Hunter
Mrs Dunne	Ms Bresnan Ms Le Couteur
Mr Hanson	Ms Burch Ms Porter
Mr Seselja	Ms Gallagher Mr Rattenbury
Mr Smyth	Mr Hargreaves Mr Stanhope

And so it was negatived.

Debate continued.

Question—That Ms Bresnan’s amendment be agreed to—put and passed.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes that:
 - (a) the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare *Australian Hospital Statistics 2008-09* report released on 17 June 2010 shows that the ACT has the:
 - (i) longest median elective surgery waiting times in Australia; and
 - (ii) second highest level of admission per 1000 people in the population and the least number of reporting hospitals;
 - (b) the report shows that since the previous report was released in 2009:
 - (i) the median waiting time for elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 50th percentile) has worsened from 72 to 75 days, which is 31 days longer than the national average of 34 days;
 - (ii) the length of time that the majority of people have been waiting for their elective surgery in the ACT (days waited at the 90th percentile) has worsened from 372 to 378 days, which is 158 days longer than the national average of 220 days; and
 - (iii) the percentage of people who have waited more than a year for elective surgery in the ACT has worsened from 10.3% to 10.6% which is more than three times the national average of 2.9%;
 - (c) patients waiting for surgery that should be completed within 60 days (Category 2A) are included in the numbers of people who have been waiting for over a year;
 - (d) allegations have been made about possible manipulation or mismanagement of the elective surgery waiting list and that some patients have been downgraded categories; and
 - (e) the Auditor-General conducted an audit of ‘Waiting Lists for Elective Surgery and Medical Treatment’ in 2004, and is interested in revisiting the subject; and

- (2) requests the Auditor-General to conduct an audit of ‘Waiting Lists for Elective Surgery and Medical Treatment’ and consider as part of that audit concerns raised about the management of the elective surgery waiting list.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

10 ADJOURNMENT

Mr Stanhope (Chief Minister) moved—That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Question—put and passed.

And then the Assembly, at 9.43 p.m., adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

MEMBERS’ ATTENDANCE: All Members were present at some time during the sitting.

M M KIERMAIER
Acting Clerk of the Legislative Assembly

SCHEDULES OF AMENDMENTS

Schedule 1

EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL 2008

Amendments circulated by Ms Hunter

1

Clause 4

Page 2, line 9—

omit clause 4, substitute

4 Establishing government schools etc Section 20 (5) and (6)

substitute

- (5) Before making a decision to close or amalgamate a government school, the Minister must take the following steps:
- (a) tell the school community that the Minister is considering closing or amalgamating the school and the reasons why;
 - (b) obtain a report from the committee established under section 20A to use in consultation with the school community under paragraph (c) that—
 - (i) comprehensively assesses the impacts of closing or amalgamating the school on the school community; and

Note For what impacts must be assessed, see s 20B.
 - (ii) identifies alternatives to closing or amalgamating the school;
 - (c) consult with the school community for at least 6 months on the educational, economic, environmental and social impacts of, and identifying alternatives to, closing or amalgamating the school;

Note For how the Minister must undertake consultation, see s 20A.
 - (d) publish in a daily newspaper—
 - (i) notice of a proposal to close or amalgamate the school; and
 - (ii) details of where a copy of the report mentioned in paragraph (b) can be obtained;

Example

a website operated by the administrative unit responsible for this Act

Note An example is part of the Act, is not exhaustive and may extend, but does not limit, the meaning of the provision in which it appears (see Legislation Act, s 126 and s 132).

- (e) give written notice of the matters mentioned in paragraph (d) to—
 - (i) the parents and citizens association; and
 - (ii) the chairperson of the school board; and
 - (iii) the principal of the school.
- (6) Not less than 12 months after telling the school community that the Minister is considering closing or amalgamating the school, the Minister must—
 - (a) publish notice of the final decision in a daily newspaper; and
 - (b) give written notice of the decision to—
 - (i) a parent of each student at the school; and
 - (ii) each member of the school’s parents and citizens association; and
 - (iii) each member of the school board; and
 - (iv) the principal and each teacher at the school; and
 - (c) explain to the school community the reasons for the final decision and how the following have been taken into account in making the final decision:
 - (i) the school community’s views;
 - (ii) the relevant general principles of this Act under section 7;
 - (iii) the principles on which chapter 3 is based under section 18.

2

Clause 7

Proposed new section 20 (9)

Page 3, line 20—

omit proposed new section 20 (9), substitute

- (9) In this section:

school community, in relation to a school that is proposed to be closed or amalgamated, means the members of the community affected by closing or amalgamating the school, including students at the school, students’ families, the school board, the principal and teachers at the school and the local community.

Examples—local community

residents, local businesses

Note An example is part of the Act, is not exhaustive and may extend, but does not limit, the meaning of the provision in which it appears (see Legislation Act, s 126 and s 132).

3**Proposed new clause 8**

Page 3, line 25—

insert

8 New sections 20A and 20B

insert

20A Independent committee

- (1) The Minister must establish an independent committee.
- (2) The functions of the committee are to—
 - (a) prepare the report mentioned in section 20 (5) (b); and
 - (b) undertake the consultation on behalf of the Minister under section 20 (5) (c).
- (3) The committee must consist of 3 people selected after consultation with the appropriate standing committee.
- (4) In this section:

appropriate standing committee means—

- (a) the standing committee of the Legislative Assembly nominated by the Speaker for this section; or
- (b) if no nomination under paragraph (a) is in effect—the standing committee of the Legislative Assembly responsible for the consideration of educational issues.

20B Impacts of closing or amalgamating schools

- (1) An assessment under section 20 (5) (b) must include information about the following educational, economic, environmental and social impacts in relation to closing or amalgamating a school:
 - (a) the following educational impacts:
 - (i) the range, quality and depth of education programs;
 - (ii) the age and condition of school infrastructure, facilities and resources;
 - (iii) teaching resources and workloads;
 - (iv) social and learning environment for children;
 - (v) extracurricular activities;
 - (vi) parent participation in school;

- (vii) out-of-hours school programs;
- (viii) findings of research studies on school size;
- (ix) student outcomes, especially those of parents who have a low income, are Indigenous or from a non-English speaking background or with disabilities;
- (x) access to public education;
- (xi) school enrolments;
- (b) the following economic impacts:
 - (i) recurrent and capital savings and costs, including one-off savings and costs, of closing or amalgamating the school for the Territory, including—
 - (A) staffing and resources; and
 - (B) school bus transport; and
 - (C) traffic and safety arrangements; and
 - (D) building maintenance and security;
 - (ii) financial impact on parents, including transport and travel time;
 - (iii) financial impact on local business including ongoing viability;
 - (iv) a comparison of the cost, per student, to operate the school with the cost, per student, to operate other ACT government schools and average cost across all ACT government schools;
- (c) the following environmental impacts:
 - (i) traffic congestion;
 - (ii) air pollution;
 - (iii) greenhouse gas emissions;
 - (iv) noise levels;
 - (v) open green space adjacent to the school site;
- (d) the following social impacts:
 - (i) demographic projections of parents with school-age children, including taking into account expected land releases;
 - (ii) implications for parents who have a low income, are Indigenous or from a non-English speaking background or of students with disabilities;
 - (iii) safety of children walking or cycling to school;

- (iv) neighbourhood community facilities;
 - (v) access to recreational and leisure facilities;
 - (vi) provision of government services;
 - (vii) community support networks;
 - (viii) local employment;
 - (ix) heritage values of school buildings.
- (2) An assessment may include information about any other impacts in relation to closing or amalgamating the school.
-

Schedule 2**EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL 2008**

Amendment circulated by the Minister for Education and Training

1**Amendment 3****Proposed new section 20B (1) (a)****Proposed new subparagraphs (viiia) and (viiib)***insert*

(viiia) student literacy and numeracy outcomes;

(viiib) other educational outcomes;

2**Amendment 3****Proposed new section 20B (1) (b) (iii)***omit*
