



The Creche and Kindergarten
Association Limited
ABN 59 150 737 849

257 Gympie Road,
Kedron Qld 4031
T: [07] 3552 5300
E: info@candk.asn.au

www.candk.asn.au

16 May 2016

Deborah Jeffrey
Research Director
Health, Communities, Disability and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE Qld 4000

Question on Notice – Child Protection (Mandatory Reporting – Mason’s Law) Amendment Bill 2016

Thank you for your follow up email citing the Member for Greenslopes’s Question on Notice:

Member for Greenslopes asked witnesses to provide comment on the suggestion of attaching responsibility for mandatory reporting to the position rather than to the qualification as proposed by the Bill.

C&K response

As per our submission, C&K suggests Mandatory Reporting be attributed to *contact roles*, with the language generic enough to endure changes in qualification requirements and role descriptions: “...C&K recommends the requirement be linked to “**educators and/or those undertaking day-to-day work with children**”.

The Draft Bill cites Cert III in Education and Care qual or higher.
The majority of other respondents have said “Approved Provider”.

Certificate III – we see two drawbacks of stating a qualification (eg. Cert III)

1. Many people in direct contact with children in ECEC are *not yet qualified* (ie. they are studying). It would be problematic if these people did not undertake their Mandatory Reporting duty because they felt they did not yet meet the qualification threshold.
2. Conversely some staff on ECEC sites *may* have this qualification yet *may not* have any contact with children (eg. Chef, or Administrator). While nothing prohibits any person anywhere from reporting; it may be problematic if these ‘non-contact’ workers were later found to have neglected a duty that they were not in a position, nor employed, to carry out (ie. closely supervise and care for individual children).


“Approved Provider” — while supportive of this proposal over the draft Bill’s use of qualifications, the drawback is the ‘distance’ this creates between the educator and the “Approved Provider” who may be the CEO of an organisation. C&K is very supportive of the benefits of a ‘collegiate conversation’ between the educator and their supervisor, and/or another person with more experience in the area. However “Approved Provider” may create too many layers.

The best recommendation may be found through discussions with relevant persons regarding the implementation of the teacher mandatory reporting. It is understood that while the ‘teacher’ role is legislated, in practice it is the Principal who makes the notification after a collegiate conversation with the teacher, and after consideration of any additional information that the Principal is privy to.

C&K remains very interested in this policy development and, as the largest provider in Queensland, we are keen to participate in developments at the earliest possible stage.

Again, if you have any questions or wish to discuss this submission further, please feel free to call me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Tizard', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Tizard
Chief Executive Officer