

## **Aims, Values and the Curriculum: Report on the meeting held at the House of Commons on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2024**



Brian Hudson, Valerie Bossman-Quarshie, Tony Breslin, Peter Lacey, Brian Matthews, Mick Waters and Sarah Younie

### **Abstract**

*This is the full report on the meeting held at the House of Commons to discuss the aims and values that should underpin a revised curriculum for young people in England. It includes a summary of the inputs of the panel members together with the outcomes of the discussion and debate on the evening of the event. It builds on the initial report of the discussion and debate on the evening that was published in the FEPA Review Volume 1, Issue 1.*

### **Introduction**

The meeting was hosted by Catherine Atkinson MP and organised by the Fabian Education Policy Group. Catherine opened the meeting by welcoming all the participants and panel members. In her introductory remarks she expressed her appreciation of the work of the Fabian Society. In opening the discussion as chair of the meeting, Brian Hudson thanked Catherine and her team for hosting the event and for her support in organising it. He also thanked panel members for agreeing to contribute to the event and to all those attending. He noted that the date for this event was fixed well in advance of the General Election and before the decision to undertake a [Curriculum and Assessment Review](#) was announced by the Secretary of State for Education on 18 July 2024. Therefore, it was seen as particularly timely to consider the aims and values of a revised curriculum for young people in England at that point in time. The Review was welcomed as was the decision that all state schools, including academies, will be required to teach the national curriculum. It was noted that this development was flagged up in the Labour Party manifesto with reference to reforms that “will build on the hard work of teachers who have brought their subjects alive with knowledge-rich syllabuses, to deliver a curriculum which is rich and broad, inclusive, and innovative”. Furthermore, it was pointed out that this statement is reflected in the Aims, Terms of Reference and Working Principles of the Review (p1). However, in turn it was observed that this raises several questions, including what is the meaning of “knowledge-rich” and what is the difference between a syllabus and a curriculum?

In considering the meaning of curriculum, the term is defined in the Call for Evidence as concerning “all of the content (both knowledge and skills) that pupils study during key stage 1, key stage 2, key stage 3, key stage 4 and 16-19 education”. (p13). However, it was stated that this is a very restricted view of the intended curriculum and given its focus on a mere list of content to be covered that it would be more accurate to define it as a national syllabus. Brian explained that, because of the emphasis on factual knowledge that there is an over-emphasis on memorisation in the enacted curriculum by teachers and that experienced by students in school. Regarding the term “knowledge-rich”, it was also noted that this is a widely used term but that it is ill-defined and does not appear in the National Curriculum documentation. Rather it was seen to reflect the preoccupation of the former Schools Minister with the cultural literacy approach of E. D. Hirsch that emphasises factual knowledge and a narrow basic core curriculum. In conclusion the hope was expressed that the Review will recognise a more extended view of the curriculum as an ongoing dynamic living process and result in plans for the development of a broad, balanced and inclusive aims-based and values-based curriculum framework.

The panel was made up of the following speakers: Mick Waters, Professor of Education at the University of Wolverhampton and former Director of Curriculum at the [Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency \(QCDA\)](#); Valerie Bossman-Quarshie, Vice-chair of Islington’s Children’s Scrutiny Committee and teacher; Dr. Tony Breslin, Director of Breslin Public Policy; Brian Matthews, teacher and lecturer at Goldsmiths and Kings College and Professor Sarah Younie, Chair of the International Council for the Education of Teachers (ICET) and MESHGuides representative on the UNESCO International Teacher Task Force panel. In addition, Peter Lacey made an extended contribution from the floor of the meeting. Peter is former lead professional officer at the National Curriculum Council and was a member of the team at the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, which had responsibility for revising the National Curriculum. Each panel member spoke for five minutes followed by 15 minutes discussion time in small groups of participants with time to record comments, feedback and recommendations for the final report. This was then followed by questions and contributions from participants and responses by the panel. Over 150 participants applied to join the meeting which resulted in the meeting being held in a larger Committee Room than originally planned.

## Summary of presentations

*A focus on curriculum development essentials, Mick Waters*

The first speaker was Mick Waters who argued that a good place to start would be with a clear statement about what the experience of childhood and youth should be in our nation. Within that statement, there would be clarity about the role of the school. He noted that this generation of children will have more opportunities than ever and at the same time face challenges that will need to be addressed in the way we support them through their growing years. None are immune from the risks posed by smoking, drugs, alcohol, poor diet, lack of exercise, weaponry, gangs and the internet. Added to that a growing proportion is at risk from poverty, poor living conditions and hunger. Yet almost all are loved though access to rich experiences varies enormously. From a statement of commitment to children and young people should come a consideration of what role schools can play through the curriculum offered. We must move away from the curriculum being seen solely as the timetabled lessons or the route to national exams. The curriculum should state what we want children to learn while at school: in lessons, of course, and in the routines of school life along with events such as visits, performances, work experience and charitable involvement. The concept of ‘extra curricula’ needs to end and instead we should envisage the entirety of the learning offer for all children.

To determine our aims for the curriculum, we should turn to a civic conversation, involving those working in education of course, but also consulting with the public, including employers, parents and pupils. The consensus would be stronger than many imagine, and the debate might help to rid ourselves of a tendency to lurch to polarities when we discuss children’s learning. It is possible to have academic as well as vocational excellence. Imagination and creativity can exist alongside scholarly pursuits. Specialism in subject disciplines can harmonise with integrated learning opportunities. Our aims will point us towards children becoming competent and confident people, able to think for themselves and act for others. They would understand how to look after their own bodies, contribute positively to their community and protect their planet. They would learn to work in teams, at times as a leader and at others as follower. They would learn to appreciate the sensitivities, orientations and differences in others and value culture and identity. They would be fascinated by the natural world and intrigued by humankind’s efforts to expand and improve, while at the same time making mistakes and creating unintended consequences, taking them into the realms of science, geography and history. They would learn the basics, poetry, dance, art, music, drama, cooking, gardening and fitness.

Learning how to read, write and manage mathematics would serve that learning well while opening doors to the vast world of high-quality literature and the intrigue of mathematics at a level many adults would find beyond them.

Tests and exams would be available, used to inspire children to extend themselves. The metronomic anchor of norm-referenced exams that see a quarter of our children destined to failure could be replaced by criteria-based assessments. These could be available on a ‘when ready’ basis, using micro credentials in the way that business does nowadays, valuing what people can do, rather than pitching one person against the next in a bizarre competition. Artificial Intelligence and nanotechnology are already changing the potential for how we offer opportunities for learning. We should make them work for us rather than try to suck them into the old story of schooling. In concluding he asked that surely, we would want our children to experience a curriculum that will help them to embrace the opportunities and address the challenges of the world they will inherit and influence? He finished by arguing that we can achieve this through consensus with the recognition that learning needs to balance purpose and rigour with intrigue and joy.

*Local Authority values and relationships with schools, Valerie Bossman-Quarshie*

The second speaker was Valerie Bossman-Quarshie who began by outlining Islington Council’s Education plan “Putting Children First” which sets out missions, goals and priorities for Islington’s children and young people. The education plan is based on a vision whereby every child and young person in Islington must feel safe and thrive, leading to a fulfilling life. Education is seen as key to achieving this vision and transforming outcomes for children and young people. The plan recognises that education empowers successful and confident school leavers to shape both their individual and their communities’ prosperous futures. The mission is to ensure that by 2030 every child, whatever their background, has the same opportunity and ambition to reach their educational potential in a good Islington school. She argued that the plan aims to equip and empower every child and young person with the learning and skills for life and the future world of work. The plan sets out an ambition to reimagine education and consider what might be possible for future generations. She stressed that this cannot be achieved by schools or the council in isolation and that putting children first is everyone’s business, which includes all regardless of background.

She continued by outlining the more specific aims of the plan which aim to ensure that by 2030 exam results for all pupils are in the top 25% within London; to create a sense of belonging so that every

pupil wants to attend school and does so; to guarantee there are good local school places for all children; to work in partnership with schools and settings to make the best use of and share good practice; to use data to target support to children and young people who are not doing as well as they should; to make sure no child feels discriminated against in any school or setting; to increase the number of two-year olds in free early education; to reduce the number of suspensions and permanent exclusions from school; to ensure every young person has the option of going on to further education, an apprenticeship, or work when they leave school; to make sure that full advantage is taken of Islington's unique access to digital, cultural and music organisations and to ensure that every child quickly gets any necessary additional support from whichever agency. In conclusion Valerie outlined the six immediate priorities for Islington's young people in its education plan. These are to reduce the number of Fixed Term Exclusions (FTEs), levels of Persistent Absence (PA) from school and levels of young people aged 16-19 not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). Further they are to improve outcomes for vulnerable groups, increase take-up of Islington's Free Early Education Entitlement (FEEE) for two, three and four-year-olds and to improve attainment at KS4. The link to Islington's Education Plan 2023-2030 can be found [here](#).

*Beyond Subjects and Grades: Towards a new approach to curriculum and assessment*, Tony Breslin

Tony Breslin was the third speaker who argued that a review that just produces tweaks to what is a conventional traditional subject timetable will not address the challenges facing young people, the education system or wider society at this time. Nor will replacing one set of subjects with another: "more of this and less of that" or "one in, one out", whatever the mix, address the challenge. He continued by arguing that any proposed outcome should be objectives-led and, with reference to the late Richard Pring, posed the question "what do we want the educated child/young person/adult to look like, whatever their presumed or actual ability, at 11, at 19, at 30?" Tony contested that taking an objectives-led approach, one focused on the purpose of schooling - and education more broadly - while giving professionals the agency to innovate and be creative in pursuing these objectives, offered the best way forward. He continued by arguing that while we need to be clear about what we expect from our publicly funded education system, we should resist the temptation to detail exactly how educational institutions and education professionals must achieve this. To borrow a phrase from the (slightly hackneyed) manuals on educational governance, policymakers should focus on the strategic, not the operational.

Against this background Tony offered the following five steps as a starting point. First, trust schools, colleges and the profession and produce a Review that establishes curricular principles and a direction of travel, rather than one that simply sets out a tweaked body of curriculum content to be delivered from a certain date. This would give schools and colleges the obligation to develop (and trust them to create) a broad and balanced curriculum around a much more focused core, one that seeks to develop the enabling competencies of literacy, numeracy and oracy in all learners. Second, signal the intention to end the dominance of GCSE at 16 (and the resultant 'fail and retake' culture) and acknowledge that eight, nine or ten GCSEs does not amount to a curriculum that is either broad or balanced – it merely offers a series of variations on a narrowly academic theme. Third, utilise the potential of online assessment to evolve towards a model of just-in-time examining, with assessment opportunities across the 14-19 continuum, rather than at the current pre-post-16 cliff edge, a shift that would enable and require, over time, a much greater level of collaboration between those in secondary and further education. Fourth, move towards a model that exposes every young person to a suite of academic subjects, a genuine taste of appropriately accredited 'vocational and technical' (or *professional*) learning, and the opportunity to engage in an accredited - and much richer - personal and social development programme, including opportunities for community engagement, volunteering and the development of political literacy – themes that were emphasised in [Bernard Crick's landmark report on Citizenship Education in 1998](#). Fifth, re-establish a QCDA-type agency: these proposals rely on the (re-)establishment and strengthening of a culture of curriculum thinking and development system-wide, with change evident in classrooms by the close of this Parliament, and transformation embedded by the time those currently in Reception reach the middle secondary years. Such an agency is necessary to drive, support, oversee and share the lessons from this transition as we work through it.

Tony concluded by highlighting that behind all of this is a belief that, at any level and in any phase, a curriculum is more than a list of subjects, more than a timetable. It is the complete learned experience of the child or young person in the school or college and, as such, it needs to be underpinned by clear principles about educational purpose and informed by a sense of what we want and need the educated person to look like - an approach that Richard Pring had advocated when launching the [Nuffield Review of 14-19 Education](#) over two decades ago. It was needed then; it is *vital* now.

*The relationship between education and democracy: the need to avoid promoting right wing values,*

Brian Matthews

The fourth speaker was Brian Matthews who started by drawing attention to the way in which we are seeing a rise in far-right governments across the globe, such as Giorgia Meloni in Italy and Donald Trump in the USA. This shift is often accompanied by narratives focused on traditional gender roles and nationalism, frequently based on distortion and misinformation. He argued that education plays a significant role in supporting democracy, but that our current educational system reinforces right wing values. To support democracy in schools, students need to develop essential skills such as self-reflection, respect for others' viewpoints, critical thinking, compassion, and a passion for learning. Education should promote diversity, challenge sexism and racism, and encourage active citizenship. Students must also be equipped to analyse information for bias and falsehoods, honing their ability to detect misinformation. The English National Curriculum, however, is focused on a narrow range of subjects, with little emphasis on creative thinking or personal development. It prioritizes content knowledge and exams over process and skills. This exam-driven focus can lead to stress, anxiety, and feelings of failure among students, particularly when the curriculum is rigid and leaves little room for exploration beyond academic subjects. Schools are ranked through league tables and Ofsted, further intensifying this pressure. This approach undermines the development of democratic capabilities such as cooperation and collaboration, reinforcing a culture of individualism and competitiveness in education.

He continued by arguing that the National Curriculum does not foster the skills necessary for active, engaged citizenship. Historically, the curriculum has excluded key subjects such as Media Studies, critical thinking, and social studies, all of which are crucial for understanding democracy. For example, when the National Curriculum was introduced in 1988, it removed these subjects and focused more on traditional, conservative values. Additionally, the reduction of university input into teacher training further diminished the emphasis on critical thinking and reflective practice in education. The increasing marketization and central control of education is seen to have contributed to a fractured school system, alongside an over emphasis on memorisation rather than the development of critical thinking skills. As a result, students are not encouraged to think critically or engage deeply with ideas and understanding, which is vital for fostering a democratic society. For schools to better serve the democratic process, he argued that we need a curriculum that is explicit in

its purpose and aims. The focus should be on helping students think critically, develop subject knowledge across diverse fields, and cultivate social and creative skills. This approach would not only benefit students academically but also encourage them to become active, thoughtful participants in society. In turn, it would help reduce feelings of alienation and encourage lifelong learning and democratic engagement.

*The need to create a holistic, compassionate, and inclusive educational experience for young people in England*, Sarah Younie

Sarah Younie was the fifth speaker who argued that the principles reflected in the title of her talk emphasize the need to address both cognitive and emotional growth in students, with a focus on their well-being, identity, and overall sense of achievement. One of the central concerns with the current curriculum is its emphasis on subject content, and with respect to values, the focus is on British values. The existing model tends to reduce students to target grades, overlooking their individuality and unique potential. To address this, the curriculum must shift toward a more holistic approach, valuing each student as a human being beyond their academic output. Teaching should not only engage the mind (the cognitive aspect) but also nurture the heart, helping students develop emotional intelligence and a sense of belonging in society. This broader, more inclusive vision of education challenges the reductionist view that only certain academic skills and knowledge are valuable. So, a critical aim must be to move beyond an overly academic focus. The current system measures success through academic exams, which can diminish the life chances of students who do not fit into this narrow framework. This is especially concerning when we consider that a significant proportion of students—around 40%—are disengaged with the traditional educational model. The recent rise in the number of children considered ‘missing’ from school after the COVID-19 pandemic, especially those labelled as NEETs (Not in Education, Employment, or Training), illustrates the consequences of this limitation. Expanding assessment methods to recognize a wider range of competencies and aptitudes can help to ensure that all students experience a sense of success in school, not just those who excel in traditional academic subjects. Such an approach would empower students with a stronger sense of self-worth, self-identity and understanding of a broader range of what achievement can mean, preparing them for life beyond school.

A compassionate curriculum also demands an emphasis on arts and creativity. Sir Ken Robinson famously argued that education should not reduce students to mere "memory banks." Instead, it



should engage students' senses and emotions, providing them with aesthetic experiences that foster creativity, self-expression, and personal growth. The arts—whether through music, drawing, acting, cooking, or gardening—offer students an opportunity to experience the world more fully, with all their senses engaged. These experiences should not be relegated to optional subjects but should be valued as essential components of a well-rounded education. Creativity is not just about producing art but about developing the capacity to engage with the world in a meaningful, authentic way. Furthermore, to truly support students' well-being and identity development, the curriculum must incorporate socio-emotional learning. These skills—such as emotional regulation, conflict resolution, bullying prevention, and cooperation—are essential for students to navigate the complexities of modern life and society. The challenge is that soft skills, though recognized by organizations like PISA, are often difficult to measure and assess. However, this should not be a reason to neglect their importance. Teaching these skills can be just as vital as academic knowledge because they contribute significantly to students' overall ability to conduct themselves in their life beyond school, navigating the challenges of increasingly complex living in contemporary advanced capitalism and a volatile world.

In conclusion, Sarah argued that a revised curriculum must prioritize both cognitive and emotional growth, create a broader definition of success, and foster compassion and creativity. This shift in focus will enable students to develop a strong sense of self-worth, a deeper understanding of the world around them, and the skills necessary to thrive in society. It is time to wake students up to their full potential—intellectually, emotionally, and creatively—rather than anesthetising them with a narrow, overly academic curriculum.

*The language and purpose associated with the curriculum, Peter Lacey*

In his contribution from the floor of the meeting, Peter Lacey began by holding up two visual aids in the form of sculpted heads. The one on the left is carved and the other is moulded.



He continued by informing the meeting that the woodcarver had told him that the carved head had always been inside the wooden branch from which he carved it. What he had done was to reveal it. There were other heads, similarly carved, on the pavement. Each was different. On the other hand, there are thousands of these moulded heads. All identical because they were cast in the same mould. This is a metaphor here for a purpose of education.

He emphasised his belief that a purpose of education, as it applies to the individual, is to reveal, realise, sustain, and develop possibility. By this is meant to realise the poet, the historian, the scientist, the engineer, the artist, the mathematician, the musician ... or whatever latent talent might exist. And this applies to each and every learner. This lends itself to a culture of curiosity and learner agency. He also emphasised his belief that it is **not** a purpose of education to cast the individual in a predetermined mould. By this is meant the teacher being the deliverer of knowledge, in sequence, from a curriculum warehouse to form the learner's mind. This lends itself to a culture of teacher control and conformity, with the possibility that some learners' minds will not fit the mould.

He asked, "does all this matter when designing a curriculum?" His answer was yes, because a curriculum should be designed **and** expressed in a way that reflects **educational** purpose. The point he was making is about **how** the curriculum is written. Given the woodcarver's explanation, could a national curriculum be expressed in terms of "journeys of becoming" rather than "content to be transmitted"? So, for example: a curriculum for mathematics is rewritten as a curriculum for becoming mathematicians: a history curriculum is rewritten as a curriculum for becoming historians, and so on. And, whilst we are looking at language, can we repurpose assessment to ascertain **not** how

learners perform, but what they achieve? In these ways 'delivery' and 'performance' can be purged from the education lexicon, and replaced with 'teaching', 'learning', 'becoming' and 'achievement'.

**Key points from participants:**

This opportunity for small group discussion was very well received and there was a buzz in the room when it was evident participants were engaged in and thinking about the issues. The speakers and contributions from the floor addressed the issues from a wide variety of perspectives and written comments were received from around eighty participants. There was considerable agreement about the key issues although the terminology varied as listed below.

- The present National Curriculum of England is content led with an emphasis on discrete subjects and norm-based assessment. It is leading to a significant proportion of pupils feeling an increased level of anxiety and fear of failure.
- It is important that the National Curriculum has a clear set of aims. Ultimately, we need a curriculum that engenders and develops democracy and compassion. It should recognise all aptitudes and abilities. Assessment should be in line with the aims and involve more criteria referenced approaches.
- Pupils should have a richer personal and social development programme including the development of the skills of collaboration, communication, critical thinking and creativity (the 4Cs). Also, ITE is hamstrung by Ofsted and can do little to address such learning. Pupil voice is important and should be valued more.
- There should be a breadth of learning that values the arts and vocational learning with appropriate value placed on cognition and understanding rather than on just learning 'about'.
- There is a lack of women's representation in elements of the current National Curriculum.
- All pupils should engage with aspects of vocational, technical and professional learning.

- The role of Local Education Authorities (LEAs) is important, but they are finding it difficult to help schools because of funding and the structure of education provision, especially for SEND. The involvement of LEAs is imperative in creating a cohesive and locally responsive education system with a curriculum that also reflects local concerns and needs.
- There is a need to focus on the needs of Afro-Caribbean and White working-class boys with a curriculum that is relevant for them. The workforce needs to reflect the diverse nature of UK society with greater inclusion of black and ethnic minorities and genders.
- Education is political because the National Curriculum does not support pupils in developing the social skills necessary for a democracy.
- Parents' partnerships are needed with school connectedness and a sense of belonging.

**Recommendations from the participants:**

- Move to an aims-based curriculum with pupil-development and democracy at its heart. Look at the Labour NC of 2010 as a model. The curriculum should educate learners to become empathetic citizens.
- Relationship building should be at the centre of the aims for the curriculum and be integral, not bolt-on. Include compassion and acceptance of diversity.
- Learning to be based on social cognitive/constructivist learning theory, incorporating activities such as problem solving and investigations.
- Introduce a curriculum that includes Arts and vocational aspects. Cross-curricular lessons, which would also include some Maths and English.

- Wide range of types of assessment, including criterion referenced, to be used. All abilities and aptitudes need to be recognised.
- Set up a Qualifications and Curriculum Authority type organisation.
- Change ITE to prepare professional teachers, not deliverers, be reflective practitioners, critical reflectors, be evidence-based. Consider making teaching an M level profession as in other countries and in line with Labour values under the previous Labour administration.
- Trust teachers and educators to develop their practice so they are not denied the chance to use their professional judgement, their knowledge of their learners and their context to inspire learners rather than instruct using a prescribed set of lessons.
- Introduce a Sure Start type intervention that works with pupils and parents.
- Redesign accountability models to allow for positive reform and development of Ofsted and the promotion of creativity. Schools need to be bastions of democratic thinking
- Understand all the elements that support ideas to introduce policies, processes, structures and curricula that defend democracy.
- It is vital that there is large-scale change under Labour over a period of time.

### **Recommendations from the Fabian Education Policy Group**

Finally, we conclude this report by focussing on the recommendations of the Fabian Education Policy Group itself which are based on our response to the Call for Evidence from the Curriculum and Assessment Review. The closing date for submissions to the Review on 22<sup>nd</sup> November coincided closely with the House of Commons event. The Fabian Education Policy Group recommends that the principles and purpose of the curriculum can be clearly stated in relation to four areas:

- Firstly, a clear statement of what our country sees as a good childhood and youth is vital. Within this statement we would expect there to be a strong commitment to well-being in the context of secure, free, responsible, happy individuals and communities.
- Secondly, we recommend that the seven principles emphasized by [Education Scotland in 2016](#) should provide an overarching commitment to what the curriculum should be characterized by: i.e., challenge and enjoyment; breadth; progression; depth; personalization and choice; coherence; and, relevance.
- Thirdly, we recommend that there should be an acceptance of the importance of the three main drivers of curriculum (i.e., the development of understanding across areas of knowledge; an objective led approach which allows for matters to do with citizenship, social justice, the economy and other matters to be fulfilled; and a commitment to child development which allows for personal growth).
- Fourthly, we recommend establishing a curriculum that will enhance for all cognitive, affective, creative and practical knowledge, understanding, skills and dispositions. It will be vital to embrace the valuable approaches taken by others including the OECD who have called for an emphasis to be placed on the 4 Cs (i.e., critical thinking; collaboration; creativity and communication).

Finally, we recommend the establishment of a representative and authoritative body to oversee these developments in the future with a stature that is comparable with the former Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency ([QCDA](#)).

## **Authors**

Brian Hudson, Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Sussex and Guest Professor at Karlstad University, Sweden.

Valerie Bossman-Quarshie, Vice-chair of Islington's Children's Scrutiny Committee and teacher

Dr. Tony Breslin, School Improvement and Governance Development Consultant, and Chair at West Herts College Group and Trustee at Agora Learning Partnership

Peter Lacey, former lead professional officer at the National Curriculum Council, and a member of the team at the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, with responsibility for revising the National Curriculum

Brian Matthews, teacher and lecturer at Goldsmiths and Kings College

Mick Waters, Professor of Education at the University of Wolverhampton and former Director of Curriculum at the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA)

Professor Sarah Younie, Professor of Education at De Montfort University and Chair of the International Council for the Education of Teachers (ICET)

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of Chris Harris, Marilyn Leask and Deb Outhwaite for their help in organising the event at the House of Commons and of Ian Davies and Chris Harris for their feedback in finalising this report.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License.

