



QUEENSLAND
TEACHERS' UNION
OF EMPLOYEES

Joint Submission of the Queensland Teachers' Union of Employees and Independent Education Union of Australia – Queensland & Northern Territory Branch to the Queensland Department of Education's focused review of the *Education (General Provisions) Act 2006*

29 April 2022

TERRY BURKE
BRANCH SECRETARY
IEU-QNT

KATE RUTTIMAN
GENERAL SECRETARY
QTU

Table of Contents

About the QTU	4
About IEUA-QNT	5
Organisation of the submission to the review of the EGPA	5
School disciplinary absence and enrolment decisions.....	6
Amendments to s329; s53; s159.....	7
Amendments to s156(2); s158(2); s159(1)	8
Amendments to s283(3); s285; s286(1)-(3); s288(1)-(3); s289(3)-(4).....	10
Amendments to s293(2)-(3); s295(2); s295(2)(b)	12
Amendments to s318; s319(2) or (3); s320	13
Delegations of authority	14
Appeal rights for short suspensions.....	16
Proposed amendments to Chapter 8 of the EGPA	17
Home education.....	18
Meaning of ‘a high-quality education’ in the context of home education	19
Protecting school communities from online abuse	20
The scale of the challenge of online abuse.....	21
Can you identify any issues with the proposed course of action?	23
Is there any other type of online, electronic or phone conduct that could be problematic to school staff and not fall within the proposed definition?.....	23
Should legislative provisions be confined to school staff?	23
If you support the use of penalty units, what level of penalty would you see as appropriate?	23
Are the proposed remedial actions appropriate, and/or are there other remedial actions that could be used to address the issue?	23
Should timeframes for remedial action be specified in the directions e.g. attempts must made to remove a post within 24, 48 or 72 hours?.....	24
Are there any examples of cyber abuse that might warrant the person from also being prohibited from entering a school premises?	24
Hostile behaviour on State school premises.....	24
Opportunities for legislative amendment.....	25
Nomenclature and technical amendments	26
Gendered language.....	26
Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	26
Recognising that wellbeing is a foundation for learning	27
Acknowledging diversity and inclusive education	27
Technical and minor drafting matters	28
Protection from liability for non-state school principals.....	28

Sharing of child safety information.....	29
Transfer notes.....	29
Mandatory reporting obligations.....	31
Enrolment management plans	32
Parents and Citizens Associations.....	33
State special school and special education.....	33
Streamlining enrolment requirements for transfer of students between Queensland state special schools	33
Providing for chief executive to determine whether prospective student is a person with a disability	34
Defining “Instruction” , “Administration” and “Facilities”	34
Additional matters	35
Search powers.....	36
Appeal CEO decision to overturn a decision to refuse enrolment	36
Appendix A: Summary of QTU & IEUA-QNT response to specific proposals to amend the EGPA.	38

About the QTU

1. Established in 1889, the Queensland Teachers' Union (QTU) has chalked up 130 years of achievement as the professional, industrial, and legal voice of Queensland's public education and training sectors throughout regional, remote, and metropolitan Queensland. In 2022, the QTU represents more than 48,000 members of the teaching profession who are employed in special schools, primary schools, secondary schools, other specialist school settings, and TAFE.
2. The QTU's advocacy represents the collective voice of Queensland's state school teachers and TAFE educators and it is heard through our democratic structures. The supreme decision-making body of the QTU is our State Council which is comprised of over 120 democratically elected representatives from every branch throughout the state. Policy positions that have been adopted by QTU State Council underpin this submission.
3. The QTU has a proud history of advocating for policies that improve Queensland education and state schooling. This submission draws on QTU positions including, but not limited to: reducing workload of teachers and school leaders; school codes of conduct and student behaviour; child safety and school communities' right to safety; the right of every young Queenslanders to be able to access excellence in education; and the role of governments to allocate resources so that schools can deliver excellence and equity.
4. This QTU submission to the review of the *Education (General Provisions) Act 2006*, (EGPA), is made in the interests of our members as well as the hundreds of thousands of students whom our members teach every year. This submission builds on the QTU's comprehensive understanding of twenty-first century risks to the safety and wellbeing of students, teachers, and school leaders. While the QTU commends the Department of Education for its comprehensive engagement with stakeholders throughout the review of the EGPA, the QTU does not accept that the collective safety and wellbeing of school communities should be placed at risk to accommodate the concerns raised by parties who have limited experiential knowledge and understanding about the daily operations of Queensland state schools.
5. The QTU is affiliated with the Independent Education Union Australia (Queensland/Northern Territory) (IEUA-QNT) through our membership of the Queensland Council of Unions, the peak body for Queensland's trade unions.
6. The QTU stands in solidarity with the IEUA-QNT and its representations to the review of the EGPA, and that are made in the interests of teachers, school leaders, and education assistants who are employed in Catholic and Independent school sectors.

About IEUA-QNT

7. IEUA-QNT represents ~16,000 teachers, support staff and ancillary staff in non-government education institutions in Queensland and the Northern Territory and consistently engages in debate concerning industrial and social issues through its Industrial and Equity Committees and through its national counterpart, the Independent Education Union of Australia, which receives input from teachers in all States and Territories.
8. As a union of education professionals in the non-government sector, IEUA-QNT's interest in the application of the *Education (General Provisions) Act 2006* (the EGPA) primarily concerns those sections with direct application in non-government schools, and areas where application in government schools sets precedents that might be extended to non-government schools, non-government school students and non-government school communities.
9. IEUA-QNT is affiliated with the Queensland Teachers' Union through our membership of the Queensland Council of Unions, which is the peak body for Queensland's trade unions.
10. The IEUA-QNT stands in solidarity with the QTU and its representations to the review of the EGPA that are made in the interests of teachers and school leaders who are employed in government schools. The IEUA-QNT supports the submissions of the QTU on the provisions of the EGPA which relate to State education.

Organisation of the submission to the review of the EGPA

11. This submission acknowledges the three themes of the focused review of the EGPA which include:
 - i. Protecting students;
 - ii. Providing for the good working order and management of schools; and
 - iii. Modernising and improving the provision of education services.
12. The QTU & IEUA-QNT believe that the review of the EGPA is also an opportunity to:
 - i. Recognise the significant and unique role of Queensland's teaching profession;
 - ii. Place downward pressure on workload experienced by Queensland's teaching profession, and
 - iii. Prepare for change, technology and future work in Queensland schools.
13. This submission responds to the provocations contained in the Department of Education's (DoE) ten consultation papers. The responses draw on our policy

positions and are framed by both the DoE themes of the review as well as the missed opportunities. A summary of responses to specific proposals to amend the EGPA is included as Appendix A to this submission.

14. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise that legislative reform cannot be viewed without consideration of how the proposed reforms will impact resourcing of schools and workload of teacher and principals. The QTU & IEUA-QNT express disappointment that the consultation papers have not been more transparent in explaining the impacts of proposals on resourcing and workload. The QTU and & IEUA-QNT call on the DoE to ensure a specific budget impact statement and a separate workload impact statement are provided in any future proposals arising from the review process, and that both statements are available to stakeholders.

School disciplinary absence and enrolment decisions

15. The DoE's *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* deals with EGPA provisions regarding suspension, exclusion, cancellation of enrolment, and refusal to enrol in a state school. The QTU and IEUA-QNT acknowledge some of the data snapshots that are published in the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment*, namely Table 1 on page 5 and the summary in attachment 2. The Unions note that the DoE do not report on data collected through local implementation of programs based on school-wide positive behaviour learning.
16. All stakeholders expressing an interest in state schooling and the review of the EGPA need to recognise that teachers and school leaders undertake challenging work in complex environments, they do so with professionalism and with the interests of all students in their care.
17. The QTU recognises the suite of behaviour management options that are enacted in every minute of every class, and throughout every Queensland state school, in accordance with the professional judgements of Queensland's teachers and school leaders. One representative case from the state's 1258 schools, comes from Palm-Beach Currumbin SHS, in South East Region. At PBC, teachers and school leaders make professional judgements which are framed by the Essential Skills for Classroom Management and positive reinforcement of the school's Optima Code that is *Be safe, Be responsible, Be a learner*. The school recognises positive behaviour choices with Optima Assemblies. PBC also uses restorative practices.
18. The QTU believes public schooling should provide a quality education in a safe, caring, and supportive environment. A supportive environment requires mutual respect for the welfare, rights and dignity of students, teachers and other school staff and parents/carers, in an environment that is based on equitable opportunities for all. Behaviour which disrupts this environment

should be viewed with concern by the community if it interferes with the rights of students to take full benefit from their years of schooling. No student should be denied the opportunity to learn and socially develop because of disruptive behaviour.

The QTU has long held the view that, in addition to the positive behaviour programs that operate in Queensland state schools, principals shall have the power to suspend students for a specified period, without the need for prior departmental approval, and in circumstance of the student demonstrating repeated or serious breaches of the school's code of conduct. The QTU position is that a student who has been suspended shall have no automatic right of further education at a state school while on suspension and should not be permitted to enter the school grounds or have contact with school personnel for the duration of the suspension. The QTU supports the view that students on suspension are under the complete care of their parents or carers away from the school site. The school has no duty of care during the period of suspension, other than to supply a brief work-program for students suspended for 11 - 20 days only.

For extreme offences or repeated breaches of a school's code of conduct, students may be excluded. The student may have re-entry to a state school by negotiation with another school and with behaviour improvement conditions attached. The QTU believes that a student that has been excluded from a state school must actively participate in mandatory counselling before re-enrolment.

19. Before advancing the proposals to amend the EGPA as outlined in the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment*, the QTU urges the DoE to commit to consultation with the QTU to develop clear guidelines which outline expectations for schools in regard to 11 - 20 day suspensions and recommendations to exclude, as well as guidelines for decisions about refusal to enrol. These guidelines should not be onerous or add to the work of principals or their delegates.

[Amendments to s329; s53; s159.](#)

20. The QTU acknowledges text on page 2 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* that proposes an amendment to s329 of the EGPA "to clarify that when a student and parent/s is notified that a school disciplinary absence is being considered, no changes to enrolment may occur until the matter is finalised or the chief executive approves the student's enrolment at another state school."

The QTU supports in-principle the proposed amendment that would prevent a student from enrolling in a new state school to avoid a school disciplinary absence. The QTU's in-principle support is subject to the DoE providing

further detail on which sections of Chapters 8 and 12 will be amended, and the precise wording of an amendment. The QTU will not support an amendment that increases workload on a state school principal (or delegate).

21. The QTU further acknowledges text on pages 9-10 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* that proposes an amendment to s53 and s159 of EGPA. The proposal would ensure continuity of learning for students for whom an application to refuse enrolment has been referred to the chief executive. The QTU supports the rights of all young Queenslanders to education, and the Union acknowledges the position that is put in the consultation paper to the extent that the DoE has an obligation to comply with the *Human Rights Act (Qld)*. However, QTU in-principle support for the proposal is subject to further details. The QTU contends that the status quo is that a student is not enrolled in a state school if a principal has refused enrolment. In the time that it takes the chief executive to make a decision about the student's enrolment, there should be no requirement for teachers or other employees of the DoE at the state school for which the enrolment application has been refused, to provide continuity of learning for the student. The principal refused enrolment, ergo the school has no responsibility to provide services to the student.

[Amendments to s156\(2\); s158\(2\); s159\(1\)](#)

22. The QTU acknowledges the proposals to amend the EGPA that are contained on page 12 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* and include:

- Amend section 156(2) to specify notice must be given to a prospective student and chief executive of a proposal by the principal to refuse enrolment within five school days of receiving enrolment application;
- Amend section 158(2) to specify a decision must be made by the chief executive within 20 school days of the proposal to refer application back to principal to be dealt with under section 156;
- Amend section 158(2) to specify notice of the decision must be given to the prospective student within 20 school days of the proposal to refuse enrolment;
- Amend section 159(1) to specify a decision must be made by the chief executive within 20 school days of referral proposing refusal to enrol prospective student; and
- Amend section 159(1) to specify notice of the decision must be made by the chief executive within 20 school days of referral proposing refusal to enrol prospective student;

23. The QTU notes the refusal to enrol data that is reported on page 5 of the *Consultation paper*. The data indicates that the refusal provisions of the EGPA are very rarely enacted. However, the QTU believes the data also

raises questions that need answers before any legislative change to the EGPA is considered. In the years 2015 – 2019, approximately two thirds of the decisions to refuse to enrol were supported by the chief executive, however in the years 2020 and 2021 there is a reversal so that approximately only one third of the decisions were supported. Was this reversal the result of changes in personnel? Was the reversal the result of a change in procedure? Was the reversal COVID related? What other factors have contributed to this reversal?

Turning to the specific proposed amendments that are listed in the *Consultation Paper*, the QTU does not support the proposal to amend s156(2) that includes placing a time limit of within five school days.

The additional time limit unfairly disadvantages principals who may act in good faith to seek access to additional information before making a decision. The additional time limit means that principals' decision-making powers can potentially be undermined by inefficiencies in the DoE, other government agencies, non-government agencies, and/or non-government schools.

24. The QTU notes the discrepancy in timing between the decision making of a principal, often operating in complex and challenging environments, and the chief executive. The proposal to amend s158(2) and s159(1) provides 20 school days for a decision to be made and notice given. Whereas principals, often operating in complex and challenging environments have less than one school week to make difficult decisions, the chief executive has four school weeks. The QTU notes that the proposed amendment appears to be exclusive of school holidays, and that means that in June – July, that includes two weeks of holidays, the chief executive might have up to six weeks to fulfil their legislative responsibilities. Should a decision be required in the Christmas – New Year period, the chief executive could have as many as ten weeks to fulfil their responsibilities.

The *Consultation paper* makes the case that the proposed amendments deal with students' access to education. On that basis, the QTU recommends the chief executive should make a decision and notify of that decision within 21 days. The QTU contends that the chief executive will make a decision based on the advice of officers of the DoE. The QTU recognises that the process of decision making will include the chief executive receiving an application, delegating the investigation to an officer of the DoE, that officer undertaking an investigation that considers case specific information and taking further advice pertaining to legislative, regulatory, and procedural obligations, the officer synthesising the relevant material and arriving at a recommendation, then reporting their findings and recommendation back to the chief executive for a final decision to be made. To support the chief executive and officers of the DoE decision making, in a 21 day or 20 school day timeline, clear

guidelines need to be established through a consultative process that includes the QTU.

[Amendments to s283\(3\); s285; s286\(1\)-\(3\); s288\(1\)-\(3\); s289\(3\)-\(4\)](#)

25. The QTU acknowledges the proposals to amend the EGPA that are contained on pages 13-14 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* and include:

- Amend section 283(3) to clarify that notice in the approved form must be issued within one school day of the student being told of their suspension (1-10, 11-20 and charge-related suspensions);
- Amend section 285 to specify a maximum time period by which an appeal must be lodged for eligible suspensions is 20 school days after student is issued notice of their suspension (11- 20 school days) and charge-related suspensions;
- Amend section 286(1)-(3) to specify what is meant by ‘as soon as practicable’ in relation to chief executive (or delegate) dealing with a submission against suspension (e.g. 40 school days);
- Amend section 288(1)-(3) and section 289(3)-(4) to prescribe maximum school days in which decision must be made after principal is aware charges have been dealt with (e.g. five school days); and
- Amend section 288(1)-(3) and section 289(3)-(4) to prescribe maximum school days in which decision on ending charge-related suspension must be communicated to student and parent (e.g. five school days).

26. The QTU notes the jurisdictional comparison that is outlined on page 7 of the *Consultation paper*, and specifically the statement,

Legislation in other states and territories is not as detailed with regard to separating the functions of telling and notifying students, and this is similarly reflected in the way their procedures and policies are codified

(Department of Education, 2022, p. 7)

Further, the QTU notes the *Consultation paper* shows that, in Victoria, a student being expelled and their parent/caregiver must be notified within two business days. In NSW, parents of a student being suspended must be notified within 24 hours.

The QTU also notes that s283(2), 289(3), and 295(2) of the current EGPA use variations of the phrase that the school disciplinary absence begins, “... when the principal tells the student...”

On this basis, the QTU does not support the proposed amendments to s283(3) with regards to the commencement of the school disciplinary absence. The QTU contends that the suspension, charge-related suspension,

or exclusion should continue to begin when the school leader tells the student about the decision.

Further, the QTU does support amending the EGPA to change the words from, “as soon as practicable after telling the student,” to a one school day time limit. The QTU recommends the DoE consider a procedural change in which notification of the school disciplinary absence is provided verbally to a student and parent/caregiver, and that OneSchool then automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email. The DoE have the IT capability to determine if an email have been received and opened. In the event that a notification of a decision to suspend is not received or it is not opened within 24 hours, an automated notification should be sent to the Regional Director, and a regional officer should contact the student and parent/caregiver.

27. Amendments to s285 are the next proposal listed in the table on page 13. This proposal deals with a maximum time period by which an appeal must be lodged for eligible suspensions. As a principle of natural justice, the QTU supports the right to appeal, however the QTU does not support the proposal for appeal to be within 20 school days. Excluding public holidays, the proposed time period amounts to four school weeks which could extend across two school years. The QTU recommends that an appeal against an 11-20 school day or charge-related suspension should be made within 21 days.
28. Similarly, the proposal to amend s286 and change from “As soon as practicable after making the decision...” to 40 school days is not supported by the QTU. Excluding public holidays, 40 school days is eight school weeks, that could extend across two school years. The QTU does not oppose the right to appeal, as a principle of natural justice, however the eight school weeks is an unreasonable delay to the student, parents/caregivers, and the school community. If the DoE is committed to replacing the words “as soon as practicable”, the QTU contends that the chief executive should make a decision within 21 days or receipt of the application.

The QTU contends that the chief executive will make a decision based on the advice of officers of the DoE. The QTU recognises that the process of decision making will include the chief executive receiving an application, delegating the investigation to an officer of the DoE, that officer undertaking an investigation that considers case specific information and taking further advice pertaining to legislative, regulatory, and procedural obligations, the officer synthesising the relevant material and arriving at a recommendation, then reporting their findings and recommendation back to the chief executive for a final decision to be made. To support the chief executive and officers of the DoE decision making, in a 21 day or 20 school day timeline, clear

guidelines need to be established through a consultative process that includes the QTU.

29. The proposed amendments to s288(1)-(3) and s289(3)-(4) deal with charge-related suspension, and specifically the timing of processes to both share information with principals, principal decision-making, and for principals to communicate with students and parents/carers. The QTU believes that the DoE must develop procedures for regional offices to follow and that will ensure principals and their school community can support students returning from suspension of charge-related suspension.

Page 13 of the *Consultation Paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* observes, "Some students may remain on charge-related suspensions for months or years due to court delays." On that basis and given the high turnover of school leaders through relocations and acting in higher duties, the QTU contends regional offices must ensure they maintain accurate and regularly updated records of students who are suspended on charge-related matters. The QTU also calls on the DoE to ensure that additional resources are available to be deployed to schools to support a student returning from charge-related school disciplinary absence.

[Amendments to s293\(2\)-\(3\); s295\(2\); s295\(2\)\(b\)](#)

30. The QTU acknowledges the proposals to amend the EGPA that are contained on pages 14-15 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* and include:

- Amend s293(2)-(3) to specify that a notice must be issued within one school day of the student and parent being told of the proposal to exclude;
- Amend s295(2) to specify maximum timeframe of 20 days for principal to tell a student of their decision not to exclude;
- Amend s295(2)(b) to specify maximum timeframe of 20 days for principal to send a notice in the approved form of their decision not to exclude a student;
- Amend s295(5) to include requirement for principals to tell the student and parent of the decision to exclude within 20 school days of giving the student a notice under s293(2);
- Amend s295(5) to specify notice in approved form of principal decision to exclude must be given within 20 school days of giving the student a notice under s293(2) of proposal to exclude.

31. The QTU position on the proposal to amend s293(2)-(3) is the same as the position set out in response to the proposal to amend s283(3). The QTU contends that the suspension, pending exclusion, commences when the principal (or their delegate) tells the student about it. The QTU also

recommends the DoE consider a procedural change in which notification of the school disciplinary absence is provided verbally to a student and parent/caregiver, and that OneSchool then automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email. The DoE have the IT capability to determine if an email have been received and opened. In the event that a notification of a decision to suspend is not received or it is not opened within 24 hours, an automated notification should be sent to the Regional Director, and a regional officer should contact the student and parent/caregiver.

32. The QTU supports the proposal to amend s295(2) of the EGPA that would delete the words “tell the student as soon as practicable - ” and insert the words, “tell the student within 20 days - ”
33. However, the QTU does not support the proposal to amend s295(2)(b), as described in the *Consultation paper*. The QTU reaffirms the position that the telling of the school disciplinary absence decision should occur as described in sections 12 and 17 of this submission, and that OneSchool should automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email. The DoE have the IT capability to determine if an email have been received and opened. In the event that a notification of a decision to suspend is not received or it is not opened within 24 hours, an automated notification should be sent to the Regional Director, and a regional officer should contact the student and parent/caregiver.
34. For the reason already described in this submission, the QTU does not support the proposal to amend s295(5) in the manner that is outlined in the *Consultation paper*. The QTU maintains that the notification can be sent from OneSchool and that of regional offices have the appropriate authority to follow up with further notifications in the event that student and parent emails are not opened.

[Amendments to s318; s319\(2\) or \(3\); s320](#)

35. The QTU acknowledges the proposals to amend the EGPA that are contained on pages 15-16 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* and include:
 - Amend section 318 to require show cause process to be used at least 30 school days prior to any final decision about cancellation of enrolment;
 - Amend section 319(2) or (3) to include maximum timeframe of 30 school days for appeal submission following notice of decision to cancel enrolment;
 - Amend section 320 to include maximum timeframe of 20 school days for reviewing, deciding and advising student of outcome of submission.

36. The QTU rejects the proposal to amend s318 which would require at least 30 school days prior to a final decision to cancel enrolment. The relevant sections of the EGPA do not currently place a time limit on the provision to cancel enrolment. The QTU notes that “at least 30 school days” amounts to six weeks of school time, and that this could be extended to eight weeks where the show cause process includes mid-year school holidays and other public holidays. The QTU contends that the words at least 21 days is an appropriate length of time, and that would enable a student to address issues that have led to the show cause process.
37. Similarly, the QTU does not support the proposal to amend s319(2) or (3) and include 30 school days for a student and their parent/caregiver to appeal a decision to cancel enrolment. Earlier in this submission, the QTU reaffirmed the position that, in accordance with principles of natural justice, students and their parents/caregivers should be able to appeal decisions. However, for the reasons noted in the previous paragraph, and as this submission noted in sections 13 and 14, the QTU contends that an appropriate length of time for an appeal is 21 days.
38. Again, the QTU does not support amending s320 to include a maximum timeframe of 20 school days for the chief executive to review, make a decision, and advising a student of outcome of the submission against cancellation of enrolment. The proposal replaces the words “as soon as practicable” with a finite time of 20 school days. The QTU observes that a 20 school day period is at least four weeks, and could be longer in cases when it extends across school holidays. The QTU contends that the status quo applies throughout the period of taken by the chief executive to make a decision, that means that the cancellation of enrolment is effective and there is no responsibility for the principal and school community to provided education services. On that basis, 21 days is a more appropriate length of time for the chief executive to make a decision and notify the principal and student of the decision.

Delegations of authority

39. At pages 16-17, the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* posits three options that deal with the delegation of authority to notify a school disciplinary absence. The QTU supports option 1 in the consultation paper, which is an amendment to the EGPA to allow principals to delegate their authority to both make decisions and to notify students about the decision suspend, propose exclusion, or cancel enrolment to Deputy Principals, Heads of School, or Heads of Campus.
40. The QTU recommends that the DoE consider the following amendments:

- Amend s281 to include provision in (4) to enable delegation of powers to specific positions (e.g. deputy principal or equivalent);
- Amend s291 to include provision in (4) to enable delegation of powers to specific positions (e.g. deputy principal or equivalent); and
- Amend s 316 to include provision in (3) to enable delegation of powers to specific positions (e.g. deputy principal or equivalent).

41. The QTU believes that the current provisions of the EGPA unfairly burden state school principals, and that this is exacerbated in schools with large FTE student enrolment. This QTU submission does not provide school disciplinary absence data for any one school, but the QTU does note the continued growth of some schools. For example, in 2021:

- Gladstone SHS' (Central Qld) FTE student enrolment was 1519;
- Harristown SHS' (Darling Downs Southwest) FTE student enrolment was 1821;
- Trinity Bay SHS' (Far North Queensland) FTE student enrolment was 1813;
- Brisbane School of Distance Education's (Metropolitan) FTE student enrolment was 3892;
- Meridan SC's (North Coast) FTE student enrolment was 2532;
- Pimlico SHS' (North Queensland) FTE student enrolment was 1613; and
- Marsden SHS' (South East) FTE student enrolment was 3118.

Table 1, below, is based on [School disciplinary absences](#) (SDA) data reported by the DoE. The QTU notes two important pieces of contextual information. First, the DoE's [State school students counts](#) reports that enrolments grew by 5.9% in the years 2017-2021. Second, the DoE's SDA data shows a trend of fewer suspensions during 2020-2021, and a reasonable assumption is that this is COVID related. That is why the percentage increase that are report in the table is for the period 2016-2019.

Table 1. *Percentage increase in school disciplinary absence (2016-2019)*

	Central Queensland	Darling Downs South West	Far North Queensland	Metropolitan	North Coast	North Queensland	South East	Total
2021 no. of schools								
	190	207	97	256	225	109	170	1254
percentage increase in the years 2016–2019								
Suspension	22	17.5	13	23	8.5	7.5	9	13.5
- short	23	17	11.5	23	8	7	9	13.5
- long	15	30	46	25	14.5	18	12.5	17

42. With regards to amending s281, the QTU position is that principal workload is adversely impacted by the rapid rate of growth in FTE student enrolments, and the resulting increases in rate of suspensions. At the local levels, schools can access flexible staffing provisions and reallocate resources to support school leaders. However, amendments to the EGPA are required to optimise the effectiveness of the local level decision making. On that basis, the QTU supports option 1 to enable the delegation of the power to Deputy Principal, Head of School or Head of Campus.

43. For clarity, the QTU does not support delegations of authority to positions that are not Deputy Principals, Heads of School, or Heads of Campus. In providing support for option 1 of the consultation paper, the QTU urges the DoE's employee relations team and the regional human resource business partners to ensure that the positions of Deputy Principal, Head of School and Head of Campus are not the subject of workplace reforms and creation of new positions that are known locally with terms like Associate Principal or Dean. Moreover, applications for workplace reform that convert unused FTE to school leader positions should not use any term aside from Deputy Principal, Head of School and Head of Campus.

[Appeal rights for short suspensions](#)

44. The QTU notes the proposal, on pages 17-18 of the *Consultation paper: School disciplinary absence and enrolment* for the introduction of an appeal process for short suspensions, where the total for the school year exceeds 20 school days. The QTU notes correspondence received from Hon Grace Grace, M.P. Minister for Education, dated 29 March 2022, in which the Minister states, "Reform proposals to be pursued through the EGPA review

must be supported by strong rationale and evidence...” The QTU finds no data or hard evidence to support the proposal. Rather, the QTU is appalled at the rationale for the proposal that would serve “as a trigger for a review of support for a student who is continuing to demonstrate serious problem.”

The QTU contends that legislative change should not be required for regions to perform their role in supporting schools, students, and their families. Regions should already be able to track the progress of who accumulate multiple short suspensions. Clearly the consequences are not changing behaviours and regions need to assist the school with measures like:

- allocating additional FTE teacher to reduce class sizes,
- allocate additional teacher-aide time,
- ensure access to advisory visiting teachers with speciality in behaviour support or other expertise,
- ensure access to a guidance officer with an increased allocation to the school as needed,
- ensure access to appropriately qualified personnel and undertake a functional behaviour assessment,
- support the student, their family, and the school community to implement a behaviour improvement condition,
- facilitate student programs that are school-based or regional and that target specific behaviours,
- establish and /or enrol the student/s in regional positive learning centres.

45. The QTU believes that if a student is accumulating multiple short suspensions, but regional office is not supporting the school, the student, or the parent/caregivers, an appeal is not warranted. Rather a complaint should be made about the DoE’s regional and/or central failings to allocate appropriate resources to meet the needs of a young person, and this does not require an amendment to the EGPA.

Proposed amendments to Chapter 8 of the EGPA

46. The Consultation Paper proposes to amend Chapter 8 of the EGPA to remove requirements for the chief executive to automatically:

- refuse the enrolment of a prospective student if there is no response to a show cause notice; and
- exclude a prospective student from certain or all state schools if there is no response to a show cause notice.

47. The QTU does not support the proposal to amend chapter 8 of the EGPA to remove requirements to refuse enrolment or exclude a prospective student who does not respond to a show cause process. A show cause process is initiated because a school leaders or officer of the DoE have identified a

matter that potentially sits outside of acceptable operational parameters, and that could include safety of the school community. The QTU reaffirms our position that safety of students, teachers, school leaders, and other members of a school community should not be placed at-risk by an application for enrolment by an individual prospective student. Moreover, safety should not be placed at-risk because a prospective student has not provided information that would demonstrate how they do not pose a risk or that they can engage in education in a manner that does not jeopardise the good working order of a school.

The QTU recognises that a prospective student and their family might not have the capacity to understand or participate in the show cause process. In such circumstances, DoE officers from a regional office should be appointed as a liaison officer to support the prospective student and their family. This might require procedural amendments but does not require a legislative amendment.

Home education

48. The DoE's *Consultation paper: Home education* deals with EGPA provisions contained in chapter 9, including eligibility and registration, and reporting processes. Page 1 of the *Consultation paper* includes a table that shows the number of provisional registrations for home education issued in the years 2008 to 2021, and that specifically shows the growth in provisional registrations for home education.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the *Consultation paper* does not seek to explain causes for the growth in provisional registrations, and yet the growth appears to be the primary reason for the DoE's proposed amendments to the EGPA. The QTU & IEUA-QNT accept prima facie statements provided in the bullet points on page 3 of the *Consultation paper* and that attributes some of the growth in provisional registrations to duplicate or triplicate applications.

The *Consultation paper* focuses on inefficiencies and complexities in the application process but the QTU & IEUA-QNT note the omission of the voice of students who are registered for home education and their parents, describing their experiences, and making the case for inefficiencies and complexities. Moreover, the QTU expresses frustration that the DoE have failed to take action to address inefficiencies and complexities in the work of teachers and school leaders, despite clear descriptions of experience that have been provided through the Promotional Positions Classification Review (PPCR), Workload Advisory Council, and other mechanisms that have sought to remedy the issue of inefficiencies in state schooling.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.

Meaning of ‘a high-quality education’ in the context of home education

49. The QTU & IEUA-QNT contend that home education programs must align with the *Mparntwe Education Declaration* and the education goals for all young Australians. Further, the declaration’s use of the word “all” should apply to young Australians whether they are enrolled in a school or registered for home education.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT believe that the DoE is responsible for ensuring that all young Queenslanders are able to access schooling in accordance with the *Mparntwe Education Declaration*. To that end, the DoE must be an active regulator in making decisions about registration for home education and ensuring legislative, regulatory and other conditions of registration are met.

50. The QTU & IEUA-QNT express alarm at the statement that appears on page 8 of the *Consultation paper: Home education*, and that appears to privilege choice over high-quality teaching and learning that is based on science and rigorous production of knowledge. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledge that later, the *Consultation paper* acknowledges the Australian Curriculum, however the text in the first paragraph in this section relates to pedagogy, not curriculum.

51. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note that the field of educational research has not settled on a definition of high-quality education. The QTU & IEUA-QNT further note that the *Consultation paper* does not attempt to cite any peer-reviewed published research that would support the DoE’s attempt to list some of the factors that underpin high-quality education, and that are published on the bottom of page 8 of the *Consultation paper*.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT do not support the proposal to include a definition of high-quality education in the EGPA. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise s5(1)(a)(i)-(ii) of the EGPA which already establish the objectives of The Act include:

- (i) *help maximise his or her educational potential; and*
- (ii) *enable him or her to become an effective and informed member of the community.*

The QTU & IEUA-QNT strongly assert that any introduction of a legislated definition of high-quality education should only be considered for inserting into the EGPA are extensive consultation with education stakeholders including employers, the Queensland College of Teachers, the Queensland Curriculum Assessment Authority, Parents and Citizens Queensland, and the QTU and

IEU as representatives of the voice of the teaching profession in the government and non-government school sector.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise the text on page 8 of the *Consultation paper* that affirms the DoE appear to support the notion that a program of home education must ensure, “the child will maximise their potential and enable them to become an effective and informed member of the community.”

Protecting school communities from online abuse

52. The QTU & IEUA-QNT welcome the DoE’s *Consultation paper: Protecting school communities from online abuse* because it provokes necessary and urgent dialogue about matters of safety that have been a priority for the QTU & IEUA-QNT. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note page 2 of the *Consultation paper* references the *Occupational Violence and Aggression Prevention Strategy 2021-2023*, which was a welcomed opportunity for collaboration by the QTU with the DoE.

53. This joint QTU & IEUA-QNT submission will address matters related to hostile behaviour on state school premises and opportunities for legislative amendment. The QTU supports further dialogue with IEUA-QNT regarding hostile behaviour on non-state school premises.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise the literature review, and empirical and anecdotal stories contained in pages 1-2 of the *Consultation paper: Protecting school communities from online abuse*. Union members, employed as teachers, school leaders, and education assistants are the faces of such research. We know that responses to online abuse, like classroom management, can range from ignoring the behaviour through to the behaviour having a significant impact on our members: emotionally and physically, professionally, and with their ability to access the cyber world as private citizens.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT share the view that technology opens school communities to opportunities that are exciting as well as those that frighten. The QTU has previously called for the DoE to consult with the QTU and to develop a joint statement on technology, change and future work. A joint statement would include consideration of safety measures.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise exciting opportunities for innovative pedagogies, and we recognise the students in today’s Queensland classrooms will be tomorrow’s global citizens. Classrooms must enable learners to connect with one another in ways that celebrate active citizenry and intercultural understanding. Technology can be used to enable local and global connections, intra and interpersonal understanding, and connections with experiences from other times and places.

However, the QTU & IEUA-QNT express concern over the implications of ICT in schools, that has led to increases in teacher's hours of work and complexity of their work. The proliferation of ICT devices and downloadable apps have resulted in significant disruption to work-life balance. Many teachers report having to set up and administer social media pages for their class or download apps (e.g. class dojo) and respond to notifications in non-rostered duty time. Teacher report using personal devices to administer social media and apps. This not only disrupts work-life balance, but places personal and cyber safety at risk, and places other data on their personal device at risk.

The proliferation of BYOx programs places students at risk. Schools have limited capacity to monitor the peer-to-peer sharing of materials that seek to groom or radicalise youth, disseminate adult material such as pornography, or provide avenues for bullying. Further, schools will have limited capacity to protect students from viruses and cyber-attacks. The QTU & IEUA-QNT also express concern over the proliferation of devices in classrooms that could be used to photograph or record students and/or teachers without appropriate consent.

54. For the reasons outlined above, the QTU & IEUA-QNT welcomes the DoE's consultation and the proposed amendments, and the dual purpose of:
- protecting and valuing the health and wellbeing of school staff; protecting the professional reputation of school staff; and
 - sending a clear message to the community that the department and the school does not tolerate improper online behaviour or bullying of any kind towards its staff.
55. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the DoE's review of approaches in other jurisdictions. The QTU & IEUA-QNT contends that the Queensland Government should set a bar for other jurisdictions to aspire to, rather than adopt a low bar like the seemingly toothless NSW School Community Charter.

[The scale of the challenge of online abuse](#)

56. QTU & IEUA-QNT members, from all sectors across Queensland and the Northern Territory frequently report episodes of online trolling and abuse, including false claims of abuse and inflammatory comments. The psychological impact on online abuse is well documented. In the professional context, the potential for online abuse to impact a person's career bring additional anguish for school staff.
57. Amendments to protect school communities from online abuse are essential.
58. For any legislative change to be effective however, implementation must be led by the employer. In the state schooling that means the chief executive. In the non-state sectors that means school principal.

59. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the intention to permit administrators to issue directions to cease but would we assert that there is an opportunity to adopt a stronger stance.
60. The QTU & IEUA-QNT position is that there is a clear need for accredited and accepted Community Codes of Conduct that must be strictly adhered to by students, parents and other community members.
61. Any such Code must outline that making inappropriate/unfounded/unlawful comments online will not be tolerated and there must be serious and effective consequences for failing to comply.
62. The Code would provide an opportunity for a very clear path outlined that would allow community members to have concerns resolved in a fair and respectful way.
63. Employers must be required to rigidly moderate all sites including school-based sites. All commentary should be moderated and not posted online unless and until approved. This will require an allocation of additional resources.
64. If the moderation process identifies concerns, the school must have clear capacity to steer those complaints down a clear path and reinforce behavioural requirements.
65. Inappropriate posts that are discovered online must be removed immediately. We see no advantage in allowing comments to remain online for 24, 48 or 72 hours, as suggested.
66. There should also be clear parameters about how community members communicate with staff. This includes ensuring it is clear that staff will only respond to communication within reasonable hours (e.g. 8am to 4pm), so that staff are not expected to be checking for messages and emails outside of normal work hours.
67. Employers and schools should not support text messaging as a means of communication with teachers. Sending private text messages to staff, especially on their own private mobiles should be prohibited.
68. The QTU and IEUA-QNT recognise risk to the education workforce when personal devices, like a private mobile phone, are used to fulfil professional responsibilities. Schools could consider making use of a messaging service run by the school through an application. This would also prevent issues emerging when teachers are placed in situations that force them to use their private phones to deal with students.

69. The IEUA-QNT observe that non-government school sector leaders have enormous power, but time and time again, directing parents and students to do the right thing simply is not normal practice.
70. Any legislative change should aim to allow principals to be objective in their approach to maintaining a sense of discipline and integrity in the behaviour within their schools. Many complaints from parents and students are taken at their word with little or no requirement to evidence what is said.
71. While the focus of the proposed amendment is to resolve inappropriate online communication, it is important to recognise that the problem is a result of behavioural/attitudinal positions within the school community.
72. It is particularly important to note that there is no readily accessible legal recourse for school staff who are subject to online or in person abuse: Defamation is a highly expensive civil action that is not an option for many individuals, who should be able to rely on stronger, more enforceable legislative provisions to protect them at work.

Can you identify any issues with the proposed course of action?

73. The terminology deployed in the Act needs to be strong and clear (e.g. not “expectations” but “requirements”).

Is there any other type of online, electronic or phone conduct that could be problematic to school staff and not fall within the proposed definition?

74. The legislation should aim to set a standard of zero tolerance in relation to anything published or stated that is inappropriate.

Should legislative provisions be confined to school staff?

75. Limiting legislative provisions to staff is appropriate for what is, effectively, a health and safety issue, recognising that institutions have a duty of care to staff and protect them from psychosocial hazards.

If you support the use of penalty units, what level of penalty would you see as appropriate?

76. Setting penalties for online abuse is challenging, but the health and safety risks to staff as a result of deliberate or foolish action by parents or students must be taken seriously.
77. The fact that online abuse cost this member their livelihood would suggest that penalties should be substantial.

Are the proposed remedial actions appropriate, and/or are there other remedial actions that could be used to address the issue?

78. Remedial action is useful, but there must be an effective consequence for failure to comply with a school code of conduct in the first instance. Given that school staff would (and do) lose their jobs if they engage in disrespectful

behaviours, action against other members of the school community also needs to be direct and effective.

Should timeframes for remedial action be specified in the directions e.g. attempts must be made to remove a post within 24, 48 or 72 hours?

79. As noted above removal of offending posts must be immediate. Apologies for inappropriate emails or texts sent must be immediate. If there is no compliance within 12 hours of the school being satisfied that the person is aware of the direction, there should be an opportunity to take much stronger action.

Are there any examples of cyber abuse that might warrant the person from also being prohibited from entering a school premises?

80. Any behaviour that undermines the safety of the workplace (violent threats, sexual assault/harassment, threats, abusive language, disturbing imagery etc) should be grounds for prohibition.

81. Any behaviour that undermines the professional standing of a teacher should be prohibited.

82. There is, however, also a need for resources to support employers, particularly with “anonymous” complaints.

83. Investment in data forensics would enable schools to trace the path of an issue.

84. Employers must be encouraged, and enabled, to accept their responsibility in getting to the bottom of these issues. It is not a staff problem – it is a school and community problem.

Hostile behaviour on State school premises

85. The IEUA-QNT supports the submissions of the QTU on the provisions of the EGPA which relate to hostile behaviour on State school premises.

86. The QTU recognises the *Consultation paper* outlines the authority for principals and the chief executive (or delegate) that are contained in Chapter 12 of the EGPA, namely s337, s339, s340, s340(A), s341, s352 and s353. The QTU notes the Department of Education’s statement that, with some caveats, “These provisions do not regulate electronic or online behaviours.”

87. The QTU strongly supports an amendment that would add regulating electronic or online behaviours.

88. The QTU notes that s337(4), s340(5) states a, “direction has no effect until the principal gives it to the prohibited person,” and s341(5) states, “The direction has no effect until the chief executive gives it to the prohibited person.” The QTU recommends that amendments also include removing this

provision, because a principal or chief executive might not be able to provide such a direction in an online context.

Opportunities for legislative amendment

89. The QTU recognises the DoE's outline of opportunities for legislative amendment and broadly supports the intent. The QTU does not support measures that would complicate the work of a principal or their delegate. School leaders, supported by regional office, should be supported by the EGPA and DoE procedure to take immediate action in response to cyber abuse and/or menace, harassment, offensive, inappropriate, or defamatory public comment.
90. The QTU believes that principals or their delegate, and the chief executive or delegate, should be able to issue directions outlined in the consultation paper to any person. This should include, and not be limited to:
- school staff
 - students (prospective, current, and/or past, and/or students from a different school)
 - parents (of prospective, current, and/or past students, and/or from a different school)
 - community members.
91. The QTU believes that failure to follow a direction related to online abuse should result in penalty points. The QTU supports the penalty units listed on page 4 and that can be issued when a person fails to comply with a direction related to conduct, movement or attendance at a state school's premises.
92. The QTU believes that the EGPA should not limit a principal or delegate, or the chief executive or delegate, ability to issue a direction related to online abuse. A principal or the chief executive should have the ability to issue a direction as soon as they become aware of online abuse. The QTU recognises that other remedial actions could be taken at the discretion of the principal or chief executive.
93. The QTU believes that it is reasonable for a principal or chief executive to expect that online content which is the subject of a direction should be removed with immediately.
94. The QTU believes that principals or their delegate can exercise their discretion in making decisions about whether a person who is issued a direction for online abuse can also be prohibited from entering a school premises. A principal or their delegate will make their decision based on the level of risk to the member of the school community who is the target of the online abuse. A person who posts to social media a threatens to harm a member of the school community, should be directed to remove the post and

not enter the school premises. Further, a teacher whose professional practice is the subject of defamatory statements in a group chat, and which causes distress to the teacher, should expect that the statements are deleted and that they will not come to further psychological harm by the presence in the workplace of the person who posted the statements. Such an action would demonstrate the DoE's commitment to the dual purpose of:

- protecting and valuing the health and wellbeing of school staff; protecting the professional reputation of school staff; and
- sending a clear message to the community that the department and the school does not tolerate improper online behaviour or bullying of any kind towards its staff.

Nomenclature and technical amendments

95. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledges the DoE's *Consultation paper: Nomenclature and technical amendments* reports on proposed amendments to support contemporary policy enactments in Queensland schools as well as technical or minor redrafting.

Gendered language

96. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledges the *Consultation paper* has identified sections of the EGPA in which gendered language is used, namely the use of pronouns she or he, and hers or his s5(1)(a)(i)-(ii), s5(2)(d), s7(b)(iii), s75(3), s124(1)(b), s168(4), s182(5), s330(3), s386(3), s387(6), s387(9), s421(1), s424(2) and s425(2).

97. The QTU & IEUA-QNT support the use of gender-neutral language and replacing gendered nouns with gender neutral nouns. For example, s5(1)(a)(i) could replace the gendered pronouns "his or her" with the words "child or young person."

Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

98. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise the *Mparntwe Education Declaration* contains three paragraphs on supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander learners to reach their potential. Amendments to the EGPA that recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples could be guided by the matters including, but not limited to:

- Promotion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership, knowledge and learnings
- Targeted effort and investment to foster access, engagement, progress, and achievement for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students' educational performance
- Establish culturally safe learning environments

- Adopt measures to increase Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' meaningful participation in the education workforce
- Ensure engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is based on the principles of shared decision-making, place-based responses and regional decision-making, evidence, evaluation and accountability, targeted investment, and integrated systems.

99. The QTU's Gandu Jarjum committee, comprised of teachers and school leaders who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is able to provide unique First Peoples perspectives on the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teachers, school leaders, student, and communities, and can assist the DoE develop a proposal for formal recognition in the EGPA.

Recognising that wellbeing is a foundation for learning

100. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise the importance of wellbeing in schools, for students their teachers, and school leaders. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note that there is no proposed EGPA amendment that would seek to define wellbeing, and on that basis, the QTU & IEUA-QNT do not support the inclusion of wellbeing in the EGPA. The QTU & IEUA-QNT further note the rise of wellbeing programs in contemporary schools, that are research-informed and often tailored to suit the needs of school communities. Such programs are often delivered by teachers, school leaders, and school communities often without additional resources from the DoE. The QTU & IEUA-QNT will not support amendments to the EGPA that recognise wellbeing as a foundation for learning, unless the amendments clearly define the role of the Minister and chief executive, as opposed to teachers and school leaders.

Acknowledging diversity and inclusive education

101. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise the importance of diversity and inclusive education. That is why the QTU has been campaigning on the matter of school funding for more than a decade. The QTU remains appalled that the National School Reform Agreement (NSRA) was signed by the federal government and the Queensland government, and that no Queensland state school receives 100% of the Schooling Resource Standard, and that in 2022, Queensland states school are underfunded by 11.1%.

102. Amending the EGPA will not correct the systemic funding inequity that the Queensland government committed to when it signed the NSRA. The QTU will not support amendments to the EGPA that acknowledge diversity and inclusive education, unless the amendments clearly define the role of the Minister and chief executive, as opposed to teachers and school leaders.

Technical and minor drafting matters

103. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledge page 5 of the *Consultation paper* discusses attendance for compulsory schooling and participation obligations.

104. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise s177 and s234 of the EGPA refer to physical attendance. The QTU & IEUA-QNT also recognise the DoE's discussion pertaining to limits that might be applied to students engaging in hybrid/flexible models of education such as remote learning. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note concern that expanding provisions to include online spaces might have unforeseen consequences. Specifically with regards to a duty of care.

A teacher exercises a duty of care for a student who physically attends a classroom and the teacher and student are co-located in the same physical space. Any amendment to the EGPA that expands the recognition of online spaces in which the teacher and student are not co-located in the same physical space must ensure that the teacher does not have the same duty of care. For example, in the event of a fire in a classroom, a teacher exercises duty of care by working with students to follow well-rehearsed fire drill evacuations. If a fire were to occur during online delivery of a lesson, a teacher should not have the same duty of care. In another example, a teacher has a duty of care to a student, when they are co-located in the same physical space to provide a safe learning environment and check on student wellbeing if the student presents as distressed. A teacher should not have the same duty of care to a student who might be distressed but does not have their camera or microphone turned on for an online lesson.

105. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the description of what counts as attendance when a child is enrolled in a program of distance education on page 5 of the *Consultation paper*. QTU members report some variation in how this is applied across schools. The QTU understands that some schools of distance education record attendance when a student completes and returns the assigned work. Other schools of distance education record attendance by student participation in online streaming of lessons. The QTU believes that further consultation with stakeholders should determine a clearer definition of attendance for students enrolled in schools of distance education, and that a revised definition should inform proposed amendments to the EGPA.

Protection from liability for non-state school principals

106. The IEUA-QNT supports the clarification of protection from liability for non-State school principals.

107. The IEUA-QNT takes the view that the current s180 "Notice to principal of non-State school" which grants power to the chief executive to "ask" for information amounts to a direction to principals to provide that information.

108. Provision of information is “required or authorised” in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.
109. The IEUA-QNT proposes the amendment of s180 to provide for the chief executive to provide the Notice to the governing board of the school, rather than personally to the school’s principal.
110. The DoE’s paper considers the Commonwealth *Privacy Act*. It does not consider the way in which a principal may be placed in a position of conflict if directed by the chief executive to release student material, but directed by their employer not to release that information. While it is arguable the principal must prioritise the statutory compulsion over the direction of their employer, this conflict can be avoided if the legislation contemplates the chief executive addressing the Notice to the entity who has the capacity to authorise release of information.

Sharing of child safety information

111. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledge the DoE’s *Consultation paper: Sharing of child safety information* which aims to that support the sharing of student information between schools. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognises the contribution of the *Final Report of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse* is shaping this consultation paper.
112. Students presenting in class without the school and teachers having access to full and accurate background information about the student presents risks to the student as well as significant risks to school staff. It is well settled law that school employers have a duty of care to inform staff of any information relevant to the conduct and capacity of a student, prior to allowing the student to present in class.
113. The QTU & IEUA-QNT support changes to legislation which make access to full and accurate student information, including interstate information, more efficient.

Transfer notes

114. The QTU & IEUA-QNT believe s280E of the EGPA should be amended to enable information about student charge or conviction to be shared with principal of new school prior to enrolment and for the purposes of refusing enrolment of a prospective student.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT believe that sharing information in this manner is supported by the DoE’s identified three themes for the EGPA review, namely:

- Protecting students;
- Providing for the good working order and management of schools; and
- Modernising and improving the provision of education services.

Further, page 6 of the *Consultation paper: Sharing of child safety information* refers to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse which supports the need for sharing of information proposed by the QTU & IEUA-QNT. The Unions concur with the Royal Commission's acknowledgement of the need to ensure appropriate safeguards are in place for transfer of sensitive information.

115. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledge the prescribed list contained in s25 of the *Education (General Provisions) Regulations* includes:
- (a) student-identifying information;
 - (b) medical details;
 - (c) school details;
 - (d) level of schooling;
 - (e) allocation of State education;
 - (f) school attendance;
 - (g) educational performance;
 - (h) educational support;
 - (i) behavioural issues;
 - (j) any of the following made under a law of a State, the Commonwealth or a place outside Australia—
 - (i) an order about the person with whom the student is to live, including, for example, a custody order or residence order;
 - (ii) a guardianship order, including, for example, an order appointing a guardian for the student or an order appointing a guardian for a matter for the student.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT suggest that an amendment to this provision would include specific guidance as to what is needed by a new school to address student's safety and wellbeing needs.

116. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recommend that additional consultation should be undertaken with representatives of state schooling, Catholic Education, and Independent Schools Queensland and stakeholders including the QTU and IEUA-QNT to determine a consistent approach to transfer notes and that accords with the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The management of the administrative process of transfer notes should be determined by representatives from the three school sectors. The QTU & IEUA-QNT believe that the principal of a prospective students should request the enrolment history of the student, and then request transfer notes from past schools. A principal's access to transfer notes should not be limited to the immediate past school at which a prospective student was enrolled.

117. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recognise that further work might be undertaken at a national level, which supports interstate transfers of students.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT are broadly supportive of such a process but supports Queensland legislative change without waiting for the conclusion of any national body of work.

Mandatory reporting obligations

118. The QTU & IEUA-QNT acknowledge the DoE's *Consultation paper: Mandatory reporting obligations* which explores opportunities to create better alignment between the mandatory reporting obligations and requirements across the EGPA, *Child Protection Act 1999* and *Criminal Code Act 1899*. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the DoE's analysis of mandatory reporting obligations across the three Acts suggests differences in:

As mandatory reporting obligations and offences have evolved over time for staff in education settings, differences have emerged. Across the three Acts, differences are evident in:

- the types of abuse to be reported;
- triggers for mandatory reporting;
- when a person must report (i.e. the timing);
- to whom the report must be made;
- the penalties that can apply when reporting obligations are not met;
- the type and age of a child about whom the mandatory obligation relates to (e.g. a child versus a student, a child under 16 years or under 18 years).

119. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the consultation paper is underpinned by two fundamental positions that are identified on page 2, and include:

- (i) Current level of protections for child and student safety must be maintained, including who is required to report.
- (ii) Each Act serves a different purpose and any options explored will not interfere with the purposes of each Act.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT insist that a third fundamental position be included for any amendments to the EGPA that arise from this consultation paper, which is that any additional requirements for teachers and principals will be resourced by the DoE and fully funded by Treasury.

120. Various reporting requirements with varying thresholds in time, in type and in burden has proven challenging for schools and early childhood education.

121. There are regular occurrences where school staff comply with one reporting regime, believing one report will cover the full range of their obligations.

122. The question of synthesising three overlapping obligations, which sometimes require duplication of a report, must be faced, given the

prevalence of students making disclosures to school staff in circumstances where the student would not make that disclosure to any other adult.

123. The QTU & IEUA-QNT support alignment of terminology around timeframes to assist in clarifying obligations without impacting on the nature of the report or why it is needed. It is possible to develop terminology that increases consistency without reducing the power of the provisions.
124. The QTU & IEUA-QNT have noted the potential for duplicate reports to be necessary under all three Acts. The QTU & IEUA-QNT recommend Government consider resourcing and enacting a “one-stop” online reporting process. Under such a scheme, those reporting could opt to identify the area of law they believe is obligating them (it could be one or all three) and a formal report form appropriate to the relevant Act/s in question could then be completed and referred to the appropriate person.
125. This would also allow the DoE to capture the full picture of reporting in all schools and centres, instead of just what is available from State Schools.
126. The scheme could be maintained by the Department of Justice and Attorney General or the Queensland Police Service.
127. The QTU & IEUA-QNT do not support aligning penalties. The various penalties (from no penalty to serious criminal penalty) are created for very different reasons.
128. We also note that there are also reporting requirements under the *Youth Justice Act* for children in detention centres, which are not considered in the *Consultation Paper*. While there may not be crossover with educational settings in general, there are likely to be educators working in detention centres and clarification on their reporting obligations as part of this process may be necessary.
129. For the purposes of considering other options, we would draw attention to the current Northern Territory model, which imposes a single obligation on all adults over 18, and greatly simplifies reporting requirements, but obviously requires stringent enforcement to be effective.
130. Similarly, as suggested, if the current Acts remain the same, reporting could be done through a well-resourced reporting portal that delineates the obligations between the Acts and ensures direct and immediate referral to the appropriate agency.

Enrolment management plans

131. The QTU and IEUA-QNT acknowledge the DoE's *Consultation paper: Enrolment management plans* (EMP), and application of EMPS as a strategy

manage school utilisation and enrolments in schools as the near their maximum enrolment capacity.

132. The QTU notes the consultation plan refers to the Queensland Ombudsman's 2019 investigation in which the ombudsman is reported to have found current practice does not comply with s169 of the EGPA, "because (EMPs) did not state the specific number of places available for out-of-catchment prospective students" (p. 2). The QTU also notes that DoE's discussion on complexities that would arise with specifying a school's enrolment capacity for persons who reside the catchment area in an EMP.
133. The QTU supports the proposal to delete s169(b) and s171(d).

Parents and Citizens Associations

134. The QTU is proud of our shared history with P&Cs Queensland, our mutual commitment to public education in every school throughout Queensland, and our common interest in advancing state schools.

The QTU understands that P&Cs Queensland will be providing a response to the proposals contained in the *Consultation paper: Parents and Citizens Associations*.

135. The QTU maintains the position that any amendments to the EGPA should not adversely impact on the workload of Queensland's state school teaching workforce. In the case of amendments arising from the *Consultation paper: Parents and Citizens Associations*, the QTU will not support amendments that add to the workload of principals (or their delegate), nor amendments that add to the responsibilities of a principal.

State special school and special education

136. The IEUA-QNT supports the submissions of the QTU on the provisions of the EGPA which relate to state special school and special education.
137. The QTU acknowledges the DoE's *Consultation paper: State special school and special education* and its two proposals to (i) streamline enrolment requirements for transfer of students between Queensland state special schools, and (ii) provide for the chief executive to determine whether prospective student is a person with a disability.

Streamlining enrolment requirements for transfer of students between Queensland state special schools

138. The QTU notes the references to the EGPA in the consultation paper under the heading "Defining the issue". The QTU notes that there is no specific proposed amendment under the heading "Opportunities for legislative amendment" on page 3 of the consultation paper. On that basis, the QTU offers in-principle support for the proposal that will enabling special school

principals to directly enrol a student transferring from another Queensland state special school without the need to refer the enrolment application to the chief executive or their delegate. The QTU believes that Transfer notes should be provided to the new principal and that the Transfer notes might require details over and above that which is detailed in Chapter 14 of the EGPA. The QTU and other stakeholders should be consulted in the development of any additional requirements.

Providing for chief executive to determine whether prospective student is a person with a disability

139. The QTU does not support the proposal to amend the EGPA to provide for the chief executive, rather than the Minister, to approve the policy setting out the criteria to be considered in deciding whether a person is a person with a disability for the purpose of non-state school students and children below compulsory school age accessing special education.

140. The QTU notes correspondence received from Hon Grace Grace, M.P. Minister for Education, dated 29 March 2022, in which the Minister states, “Reform proposals to be pursued through the EGPA review must be supported by strong rationale and evidence...” The QTU finds no data or hard evidence to support the proposal.

Defining “Instruction”, “Administration” and “Facilities”

141. The QTU acknowledges the DoE’s *Consultation paper: Defining “Instruction”, “Administration” and “Facilities”* and the DoE’s intention to provide clarity to school communities, including principals (or their delegates) and parents.

142. The QTU notes that analysis of approaches in other jurisdictions that is provided in the consultation paper, specifically reference to NSW and Victoria where they “define the components of their educational program which are non-chargeable in their legislation” (p. 2), and that these non-chargeables components, “relate to the eight learning areas of the Australian Curriculum.” The QTU contends that this text would not resolve the challenge presented by charges associated with participation in vocational education and training and school-based apprenticeships; consumables used in industrial design and technology and home economics; school-based programs of excellence in academics, the arts and sports; curriculum requirements to undertake field trips or off-site learning; and delivery of the Queensland Instrumental Music Curriculum. This list is not exhaustive.

143. The QTU has consistently raised the matter of inconsistent charging of fees. The QTU delegates elected to the Instrumental Music Reference Committee have sought to list this as an agenda item on multiple occasions. To the DoE representatives on the IMRC have refused to answer or been

unable to answer reasonable questions that the QTU delegates have tabled. QTU delegates are rightfully concerned that, while inconsistencies remain, they are open to complaints and possible disciplinary action. The QTU delegates have expressed concern about the lack of transparency and accountability at a regional level, regarding the use of regional instrumental music levies that are collected.

144. The QTU notes the proposed definition “Instruction - includes staffing resources to teach the curriculum, such as but not limited to teacher salaries and teacher aide services, and the resources used to assess students against the curriculum, such as but not limited to printing examination papers” (p. 3). The QTU seeks clarification on the degree to which this definition considers consumables (e.g. timber in an ITD class) as included in the resources used to assess students. In an ITD class, a student will be need timber as a resource to be assessed on their skills such as wood turning and joinery. Unlike an exam paper, where a student can strike out or erase an error and rewrite their response, in ITD, students might require two or three pieces of timber to demonstrate mastery of a skill.
145. The QTU notes the proposed definition “Administration – includes the provision of staffing and resources to administer the operations of the school, such as but not limited to administrative and other staff salaries, school newsletters, first aid services and first aid materials” (p. 3). The QTU seeks clarification on the degree to which levies can be collected to supplement administration staff wages, for example to support the administration of a school-based program of excellence or a regional instrumental music program.
146. The QTU notes the proposed definition “Facilities – includes the provision of infrastructure to support a student’s learning and ensure a healthy and safe environment, such as but not limited to buildings, amenities, gyms, libraries, furniture and utilities” (p. 3). The QTU seeks clarification on a school or region’s capacity to charge students for access to additional facilities that are external to the school, for example a swimming pool in the delivery of the Australian Curriculum in Health and physical education, or a restaurant as a course of study in Hospitality.
147. The QTU notes the consultation paper posits an either-or binary option, to amend the EGPA or provide more detailed definitions in departmental policies and procedures. The QTU recommends both.

Additional matters

148. The QTU & IEUA-QNT appreciate the opportunity to engage in this consultative process with the DoE and other stakeholders. In addition to matters raised in the ten consultation papers that have been distributed by the

DoE, the QTU & IEUA-QNT recommends consideration of the matters listed below. For clarity, the QTU & IEUA-QNT support the right of every Queensland child to access high-quality education. However, the QTU & IEUA-QNT also believes that every child has a right to be safe, and that the Union's proposed amendments aim to protect students and provide for the good order and management of schools. The QTU & IEUA-QNT contend that the Union's proposals bear specific relevance to the themes of protecting students and providing for the good order and management of schools. The QTU & IEUA-QNT proposals deal with the health, safety and wellbeing of teachers and school leaders as well as students and the wider school community, and the QTU & IEUA-QNT note that the Unions have consistently maintained the view that the review process is an opportunity for the Queensland Government and DoE to continue to place downward pressure on the workload of teachers and school leaders.

Search powers

149. There is no authority for school staff to search student property without the consent of the student. That means that a principal or teacher who forms a reasonable suspicion that a student is in possession of a weapon and the intent to do harm to self or others, has no authority to search student bags, lockers, or items of clothing. Moreover, a principal or teacher who forms a reasonable suspicion that a student is in possession of illicit drugs with the intent to consume or exchange with other parties, has no authority to search.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT propose an amendment to the *Education (General Provisions) Regulations 2017* that would enable the searching of student's property in both state and non-state schools, including lockers, bags, mobile devices and clothing, without the student's consent.

The QTU & IEUA-QNT understands other stakeholders in the review of the EGPA believe that the examples raised in support of this QTU & IEUA-QNT proposal can be dealt with using hostile persons provisions and contacting the Queensland Police Service. The QTU & IEUA-QNT note the mandatory reporting data for 2021 that is published in the Department of Education's *Consultation paper: Mandatory reporting obligations* and, while that is a separate issue, is an indication of the additional workload that the QPS might experience if the matter of search powers is not resolved in the current review process.

Appeal CEO decision to overturn a decision to refuse enrolment

150. The QTU has advocated for an avenue for principals to appeal any decisions by chief executive that direct the principal to enrol a prospective student who presents a risk to the safety and good order of a school. If the chief executive decides not to refuse enrolment of the prospective student at the school under the provision contained in s158 and s161 of the EGPA, the

decision is binding on the principal. The QTU proposes that s158 and s161 of the EGPA should be amended to enable the principal to make representations to the Minister, in a further submission, for review by the Minister, in cases in which the principal considers enrolment of the prospective students is a risk to safety or wellbeing of members in school community.

Appendix A: Summary of QTU & IEUA-QNT response to specific proposals to amend the EGPA.

Proposal	QTU position	Comment
<i>Review process</i>		
Budget impact statement	Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT call on the Department of Education to ensure a specific budget impact statement and a separate workload impact statement are provided in any future proposals arising from the review process, and that both statements are available to stakeholders.
Workload impact statement	Recommended	
<i>School disciplinary absence and enrolment decisions</i>		
<i>Amend s329</i>	In-principle support	The QTU's and IEUA-QNT's in-principle support is subject to the Department of Education providing further detail on which sections of Chapters 8 and 12 will be amended, and the precise wording or an amendment. The Unions will not support an amendment that increases workload on a state school principal (or delegate).
<i>Amend s53</i>	In-principle support	The QTU's and IEUA-QNT's in-principle support is limited to the rights of young Queenslanders to education. The Unions do not support any requirement for a school community to provide education service to a student for whom a principal has refused enrolment.
<i>Amend s159</i>	In-principle support	The QTU's and IEUA-QNT's in-principle support is limited to the rights of young Queenslanders to education. The Unions do not support any requirement for a school community to provide education service to a student for whom a principal has refused enrolment.
Amend s156(2)	Not supported	The proposed phrase "within five school days" unfairly disadvantages principals whose decision making may be delayed by inefficiencies in government and non-government agencies.
Amend s158(2)	Not supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend the chief executive should make a decision and notify of that decision within 21 days and that clear guidelines for chief

Amend s159(1)	Not supported	<p>executive decision making need to be established through consultation with the QTU.</p> <p>The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend the chief executive should make a decision and notify of that decision within 21 days and that clear guidelines for chief executive decision making need to be established through consultation with the QTU.</p>
Amend s283(3) “notice in the approved form”	Not supported	The school disciplinary absence should commence when the student is told about the decision. The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend the Department of Education consider a procedural change in which notification of the school disciplinary absence is provided verbally to a student and parent/caregiver, and that OneSchool then automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email.
Amend s285	Not supported in current form	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend that an appeal against an 11-20 school day or charge-related suspension should be made within 21 days and that clear guidelines for chief executive decision making need to be established through consultation with the QTU.
Amend s286(1)-(3)	Not supported in current form	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend that the chief executive should deal with a submission against suspension within 21 days of receipt of the application and that clear guidelines for chief executive decision making need to be established through consultation with the QTU.
Amend s288(1)-(3) & Amend s289(3)-(4)	In-principle support	The QTU’s and IEUA-QNT’s in-principle is on the basis that the Department of Education develop procedure which ensures regional offices have responsibility to ensure principals and school communities are supported.
Amend s293(2)-(3)	Not supported	The school disciplinary absence should commence when the student is told about the decision. The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend the Department of Education consider a procedural change in which notification of the school disciplinary absence is provided verbally to a student and parent/caregiver, and that OneSchool then automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email.

Amend s295(2)	Supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT support the proposal to amend s295(2) of the EGPA that would delete the words “tell the student as soon as practicable – ” and insert the words, “tell the student within 20 days –”
Amend s295(2)(b)	Not supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend the Department of Education consider a procedural change in which notification of the school disciplinary absence is provided verbally to a student and parent/caregiver, but that OneSchool then automatically generates a notification to the student email and parent/caregiver email.
Amend s318	Not supported in current form	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend that the words “at least 21 days” is an appropriate length of time, and that would enable a student to address issues that have led to the show cause process.
Amend s319(2) / (3)	Not supported in current form	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend that an appeal against a decision to cancel enrolment should be made within 21 days.
Amend s320	Not supported in current form	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend that the chief executive should deal with a submission against a decision to cancel enrolment within 21 days of receipt of the application.
“ability to delegate authority”	Option 1 supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT support amending the EGPA to provide state school principal with the ability to delegate authority to Deputy Principal, Head of School, and Head of Campus.
“appeal rights for short suspensions”	Rejected	The QTU and IEUA-QNT believe that if a student is accumulating multiple short suspensions, but region is not supporting the school, the student, or the parent/caregivers, then an appeal is not warranted. Rather a complaint should be made, and this does not require an amendment to the EGPA.
Amendments to Chapter 8 of the EGPA re “show cause”	Not supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT believe that procedural amendment including a new role for regions will sufficiently address the matter and that there is no requirement for a legislative amendment.
<i>Home education</i>		

Application process	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.
Changing calculation of time periods for internal review decisions	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.
Expanding grounds for cancellation of registration	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.
Streamlining review of written reports	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.
Removing requirements to issue Certificate of Registration	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.
Meaning of 'a high-quality education' in the context of home education	Rejected	The QTU and IEUA-QNT strongly assert that any introduction of a legislated definition of high-quality education should only be considered for inserting into the EGPA after extensive consultation with education stakeholders including employers, the Queensland College of Teachers, the Queensland Curriculum Assessment Authority, Parents and Citizens Queensland, and the QTU and IEU as representatives of the voice of the teaching profession in the government and non-government school sector.
Reporting on educational progress	Not supported at this time	The QTU and IEUA-QNT express concern that, without understanding the causes of growth in provisional registrations for home education, the Department of Education's proposed amendments are pre-emptive and cannot be supported at this time.

<i>Protecting school communities from online abuse</i>		
Hostile behaviour on state school premises Chapter 12 of the EGPA, (incl. s337, s339, s340, s340(A), s341, s352 and s353)	Strong support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT strongly support an amendment that would add regulating electronic or online behaviours. In the online context, the QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend deleting the words “direction has no effect until the principal (chief executive) gives it to the prohibited person.”
Opportunities for legislative amendment	In-principle support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For any legislative change to be effective however, implementation must be led by the employer. • There is a clear need for accredited and accepted Community Codes of Conduct that must be strictly adhered to by students, parents and other community members. • Directions should be able to be issued to any person. • Failure to follow a direction related to online abuse should result in penalty points. • A principal or the chief executive should have the ability to issue a direction as soon as they become aware of online abuse. • Online content which is the subject of a direction should be removed within 24 hours. • A direction for online abuse should also be able to prohibit a person from entering a school premises.
<i>Nomenclature and technical amendments</i>		
“gendered language”	In-principle support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT support the use of gender-neutral language and replacing gendered nouns with gender neutral nouns.
“recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples”	In-principle support	Gandu Jarjum, the QTU’s committee comprised of teachers and school leaders who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is able to assist the Department of Education develop a proposal for formal recognition in the EGPA.

“recognising that wellbeing is a foundation for learning”	Not supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT will not support amendments to the EGPA that recognise wellbeing as a foundation for learning, unless the amendments clearly define the role of the Minister and chief executive, as opposed to teachers and school leaders.
“acknowledging diversity and inclusive education”	Not supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT will not support amendments to the EGPA that recognise acknowledge diversity and inclusive education, unless the amendments clearly define the role of the Minister and chief executive, as opposed to teachers and school leaders.
s177 & s234	In-principle support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT note concern that expanding provisions to include online spaces might have unforeseen consequences.
<i>Sharing of child safety information</i>		
s280E	Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT call for an amendment to s280E of the EGPA to enable information about student charge or conviction to be shared with principal of new school prior to enrolment and for the purposes of refusing enrolment of prospective student.
s25 EGPR	Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT call for an amendment to s25 of the EGPR to include student’s safety and wellbeing needs.
“transfer notes”	Recommended Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT believe that the principal of a prospective students should request transfer notes from past schools. The QTU and IEUA-QNT do not support delaying Queensland work on transfer notes, pending work at a national level.
<i>Mandatory reporting obligations</i>		
	Recommended	Any additional mandatory reporting obligations for teachers and principals must be resourced by the Department of Education and fully funded by Treasury.
	In-principle support	The QTU & IEUA-QNT support alignment of terminology around timeframes to assist in clarifying obligations without impacting on the nature of the report or why it is needed. It is possible to develop terminology that increases consistency without reducing the power of the provisions.

	Recommended	The QTU & IEUA-QNT recommend Government consider resourcing and enacting a “one-stop” online reporting process. The scheme could be maintained by the Department of Justice and Attorney General or the Queensland Police Service.
	Not supported	The QTU & IEUA-QNT do not support aligning penalties. The various penalties (from no penalty to serious criminal penalty) are created for very different reasons.
	Recommended	For the purposes of considering other options, we would draw attention to the current Northern Territory model, which imposes a single obligation on all adults over 18, and greatly simplifies reporting requirements, but obviously requires stringent enforcement to be effective.
<i>Enrolment management plans</i>		
s169(b) & s171(d)	Supported	The QTU and IEUA-QNT support the proposal to delete the words, “for persons whose principal place of residence is outside the catchment area.”
<i>Parents and citizens associations</i>		
		<p>The QTU recognises P&Cs Queensland are the appropriate stakeholder to respond to the proposals contained in the consultation paper.</p> <p>The QTU and IEUA-QNT will not support amendments that add to the workload of principals (or their delegate), nor amendments that add to the responsibilities of a principal.</p>
<i>State special schools and special education</i>		
“Streamlining enrolment requirements for transfer of students between Queensland state special schools”	In-principle support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT offer in-principle support and believes that Transfer notes should be provided to the new principal and that the Transfer notes might require details over and above that which is detailed in Chapter 14 of the EGPA. The QTU and other stakeholders should be consulted in the development of any additional requirements.

“Providing for chief executive to determine whether prospective student is a person with a disability”	Not supported	On 29 March 2022, Hon Grace Grace, M.P. Minister for Education, wrote to the QTU, stating “Reform proposals to be pursued through the EGPA review must be supported by strong rationale and evidence...” The QTU and IEUA-QNT find no data or hard evidence to support the proposal.
<i>Defining “Instruction”, “Administration” and “Facilities”</i>		
“Including definitions in the EGPA”	In-principle support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT seek further consultation with the Department of Education on defining the terms Instruction, Administration, and Facilities in the EGPA.
“Including definitions in departmental policies and procedures, with more detailed information and examples	In-principle support	The QTU and IEUA-QNT seek further consultation with the Department of Education on the definitions of Instruction, Administration, and Facilities in departmental policies and procedures.
<i>Additional matters</i>		
“search powers”	Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend amending the EGPR 2017 to enable searching of student’s property without their consent.
s158 & s161	Recommended	The QTU and IEUA-QNT recommend amending s158 and s161 of the EGPA to enable a principal to appeal a decision by the chief executive relevant to refusing enrolment of a prospective student.