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PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thanks, Ms Bennett.
MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioner. Before I commence, I understood that the President was going to remind those listening. Please, Commissioner.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yesterday the Commission made a restricted publication order in relation to the evidence of the next witness. I remind everyone that that order still applies to the evidence they give today.

The order requires that anyone who watches or reads the evidence given by the next witness to the Commission must not share any information which may identify the people who will be referred to as "Brad, Jeremy, John, Justin, Mark and Wayne".

In addition, the order also requires that anyone who watches or reads the information must not share any information which may identify any school which may be referred to during the evidence unless the Commission advises otherwise. A copy of the order is outside the hearing room and is available to anyone who needs a copy.

MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioner.
<TIMOTHY JOHN BULLARD, recalled:
[10.05am]

## <EXAMINATION BY MS BENNETT:

MS BENNETT: Q. Mr Bullard, you were sworn yesterday and you understand you are under that same obligation, don't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You've made seven statements - sorry, six statements can I just make sure that $I$ have them all. I'm going to use some pseudonyms, do you have a list of pseudonyms in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. By reference to that list, have you made a statement in relation to someone we will refer to as "Mark"?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Subject to one correction, a typographical correction in that statement which I will draw the Commissioners'
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attention to when we come to that statement, is that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you. In relation to the person with the pseudonym "Brad", have you made a statement connected with the person known as Brad?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And, have you reviewed that statement recently?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. You made a statement in relation to a person we are referring to as "Jeremy"?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And, have you read that statement recently?
A. I have, yes.
Q. Is that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Have you made a statement in relation to somebody we have been referring to as "Wayne"?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Have you read that statement recently?
A. I have, yes.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. You've made another statement which I will refer to as a general statement; do you know the statement I'm referring to?
A. I do, yes.
Q. That's been provided in two different tranches but I'm going to refer to the one you've provided earlier this week as your fifth statement and I'll refer to that as "a general statement". Are you aware of the statement I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
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Q. Speaking of that statement compendiously have you read it recently?
A. I have, yes.
Q. Are the contents of it true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
A. The contents are true and correct except I think yesterday under examination we did refer to paragraph 308 under Question 41, and at that point in time I indicated under examination that I believed that that paragraph was correct. I have since been informed overnight that in fact in relation to paragraph (b), termination of employment as a result of an ED5, there has been one termination, so that would then make four suspensions.
Q. And is that termination in respect of any of the people whose pseudonyms I've mentioned this morning?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Is that the person named "Jeremy"?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you. So, I count five statements, Commissioners, and I'm going to start, Mr Bullard, by asking you about the fourth of those statements concerning Wayne. You heard a report of the evidence of Rachel yesterday?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And she spoke about her experiences following the conduct of Wayne ?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the Commissioners will recall both of those are pseudonyms. It's fair to say Rachel was a student within the Department of Education in 2005, and that she made some allegations, her mother made some allegations in 2005 and she made some allegations in 2007, and those allegations together concerned the conduct of a person referred to as Wayne; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Just to be clear I'd like to understand; we've been talking a lot about the state Code of Conduct.
A. Yes.
Q. In 2005 was the state Code of Conduct different in any
material way to the Code presently in place?
A. No, it was not, however, I do note that in 2005 that Employment Direction No. 5 was in fact known as Commissioner's Direction No. 5 and was different in some respects.
Q. So we see in some of the documents a reference to CD5 and ED5?
A. That's right.
Q. And the material parts of the direction remain the same across the time periods?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. And the Code of Conduct, the state Code of Conduct which you refer to in about paragraph 47 of your Wayne statement is materially the same across the period 2005, 2007 to the present; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. So, I'd just like to understand before we get into the detail of that case study about how that Code of Conduct that you've referred to in your statement is to be understood by the Commissioners and how its relationship to what I'11 talk about as ED5, we understand that to mean CD5 or ED5 depending on the time period. Is that clear? A. Yes.
Q. So when somebody comes to - or in 2005 comes to the Department of Education and says, I have a concern that there has been inappropriate conduct by a teacher towards a student, that could trigger an ED5 to determine if the teacher has breached the Code of Conduct; is that right? A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And the Code of Conduct as you identify it, relevantly at paragraph 47, includes a couple of matters I'd like to understand. First, there's sub-paragraph (4):

An employee when acting in the course of State Service employment must comply with all applicable Australian law.

And you follow there and extract a definition of "Australian law"?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Now, do I understand your evidence to be - let me pause there. That includes any Act of the state or Commonwealth; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So it need not be a criminal law?
A. No.
Q. So it would encompass, for example, laws against sexual harassment, discrimination?
A. Yes.
Q. And at the stage at which the ED5 process is commenced the question is, will an investigation under that direction show on the balance of probabilities that there has been a breach of that code; is that a fair summary?
A. Yes. To commence an ED5 investigation I have to form a reasonable belief that there may have been a breach of that code.
Q. And it need not be - at the stage that you're forming that belief it might be there are facts that you don't know yet?
A. That's correct.
Q. And indeed, it will usually be the case, won't it, that there will be facts that you don't know yet?
A. Yes, it will.
Q. And so, an ED5 is a process that is initiated to determine if there has been a Code of Conduct breach; it would be the tail wagging the dog, wouldn't it, to ask if there is a Code of Conduct breach disclosed in the complaint governing whether or not to carry out the investigation. Is that how you understand it?
A. It's slightly more nuanced than that.
Q. Okay.
A. Because I have to form a reasonable belief that there may have been a breach. So, I can't say I have facts before me and I'm concerned about those facts, and so, if I could give an example that's absent of child sexual abuse? Say that you've consumed too much alcohol at a sporting club on the weekend; nothing to do with employment but someone's come and said, "Gosh, they were a bit under the weather". There I would have to say, given the facts that you were in a private capacity at a private club, not as a
state servant, can I form a reasonable belief that there may have been a breach? And in that case I may well form the view that I cannot. So, the --
Q. Without any further investigation? Because let's take your example because I take it by the fact that you're raising that example I take you to suggest that you see that as a clear-cut example; is that fair?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. What if you get told Mr Smith was drunk at the sports club on the weekend?
A. Yes.
Q. And someone's made that complaint to you. Would you make any further enquiry about the conduct of that person that triggered the complaint?
A. Certainly, absolutely in terms of gathering some more information: our workplace area would, no doubt, try to understand the basis of that complaint. Is it that you are concerned because you know them as your teacher, are you concerned because you have a relationship with that person in some other capacity that you see linked to employment?
Q. He exposed himself on the table while he was drunk, comes out after some investigation; could that trigger an ED5?
A. So, in that case we would need to be looking, I believe, at (14) - so, section 9(14), and we would need to start to think about whether we thought that that adversely affected the integrity and good reputation of the State Service, or we would need to form a view under subsection (4) that in some way he had failed to comply with the law.
Q. And on the example I've given you he's failed to comply with the law, hasn't he? He's exposed himself in a public place. That started to you as a complaint that he was drunk. Upon further enquiry it became something that could trigger (4)?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And you've identified (14), we'11 come back to that because I'd like to add to the hypothetical. Let's say upon further enquiry it turns out there are some kids there who go to school with that person; is that now under (4)? A. Under?
Q. Under (4)?
A. Under subsection (4).
Q. Yes?
A. Once we have children who are students, children and young people who are students, certainly (4) would stand, but we would also go to acting with care and diligence in the course of State Service employment.
Q. Absolutely and I'll come back to that, I'm just focusing for a moment - because at the moment the complaint has come in as one of public drunkenness and that's - your example is a clear-cut complaint outside the scope. With two further questions we've come within the scope of two categories of the Code of Conduct. So, you would agree with me, Mr Bullard, that it's not always straightforward to identify at the point of complaint whether you're properly in ED5 or not?
A. Absolutely, and --
Q. It often requires further investigation, doesn't it?
A. It absolutely does.
Q. Let's turn to number (14) because that's another issue. I think we've established that (4) can respond to a broad range of matters and that those often require further investigation: (14) is even broader, isn't it, than (4)? A. Yes.
Q. So, everything that, if a State Service employee acts inconsistently with Australian law, it will automatically be a (14) as well, is that fair, generally speaking?
A. There still has to be a nexus with employment, is my understanding. So, I'm only hesitating because we're getting into some areas that are legally nuanced about what bringing the integrity and good reputation of the State Service into disrepute may be.
Q. I understand, I am interested though in your opinion as the head of your department which oversees this particular process for Department of Education staff, so I'd like to explore your views, and I accept that you're not acting as a lawyer, as a Secretary, but $I$ just want to understand, wouldn't an employee generally bring the State Service into disrepute by breaching Australian law?
A. You would need to look at the facts of that because
under (14) there does still have to be some - my understanding and advice is - some nexus with your role in the State Service. Now, in terms of how do I treat that, as I've previously said I have to form a reasonable belief there may have been a breach. I don't act in a legal capacity in coming to that and, in fact, in the course of reaching a determination I would think, as one of the things that I'm going to do in the investigation, is to fully understand the facts and then seek legal advice about whether, on the facts that I've been presented with, it is the view of the Solicitor-General that there is that necessary nexus to bring into action clause (14).
Q. Following an investigation, being the key proposition?
A. That's right.
Q. You can't really do that until you've got all the facts before you?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can I just explore with you about that, because I think you said earlier you need to be satisfied, you're the decision-maker, you're what we lawyers would call an administrative decision-maker; do you know what I mean by that?
A. I do.
Q. It's quite different to a judicial decision-maker, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. So when we go back to (4) for a moment, acting in the course of state service employment, the employee must comply with all applicable Australian law, isn't it your role to determine, on the balance of probabilities, if Mr Smith exposed himself at the party, and then you say, if I'm satisfied of that fact on the balance of possibilities does that breach an Australian law?
A. I would need to make an assessment about whether there had - that person had complied or not with Australian law, yes.
Q. But it's your determination, isn't it?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Can we unpack why, in paragraph 48, you say:

Whilst an act of child abuse by an employee, if proven in a court of law would constitute a breach of the code by virtue of subsection (4), there are many instances where a prosecution does not proceed or is unsuccessful.

So, just to pause there: you don't need a breach of law to be proven in a court for subsection (4) to apply, do you?
A. Well, I'm only - I'm only turning my mind to this now because custom and practice has been that you would need to, if you like, have this process operating in reverse; that there had been a breach; for example, a court had made a finding that you'd breached an Australian law and therefore we would activate 9(4) of the Code of Conduct.

So, yes, I accept the matters that you've set out and I accept the process; in terms of our custom and practice, that has not been the way that we have worked within the Code of Conduct.
Q. Has the custom and practice been wrong? In your view as you sit here now before the Commissioners, has it been wrong?
A. I am not going to make a determination as to whether it has or not because I would want to seek some more legal advice about whether what's been expressed here today does in fact provide me with the scope that you've outlined.
Q. Is it your evidence that this hasn't come up for you before?
A. The matter in $9(4)$ is not one that we use as a matter of practice in terms of Code of Conduct.
Q. Is it generally looked at as being applicable only to criminal law?
A. It's looked at as being applicable where there has been a law of the Commonwealth, state or territory that has actually been breached.
Q. And as far as you can tell the Commissioners sitting here - you've been the Secretary since 2017 in an acting capacity?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And then 2018 in a full-time capacity?
A. Yep.
Q. That's five years you've headed the department and I'm just trying to understand, in all that time have you ever had to make a decision about sub-paragraph (4)?
A. So, in terms of what normally happens with sub-paragraph (4), and I wouldn't want to say that I've never made a decision, we've certainly commenced or sought to commence a Code of Conduct, but once we reach a point where someone is even charged with a breach of criminal law or is found guilty, then they will normally resign from their employment.
Q. Well, we have instances in the case studies we're going to look at today where that hasn't happened. So, does the department have in place policies and procedures to actually respond to that situation?
A. Where someone removes them - where someone is charged or?
Q. Where someone might have - where a child alleges they've committed a crime, where a child alleges they've sexually harassed them, where a child alleges they discriminated against them; I'm just trying to understand if that has been viewed as something that triggers a breach of sub-paragraph (4) or if that is viewed as something that is entirely contingent upon legal processes?
A. So, in terms of each of those matters, and just to be very clear on how we step this through, where there is any allegation of child sexual abuse or potential child sexual abuse that is made by a child or young person in our system they're immediately stood down from duty and we quickly gather some initial evidence or facts and we move straight into suspending them under ED4 and commencing Code of Conduct proceedings.

You're asking me which of those apply in different respects or have applied, and my response to that is that clause (2), clause (3), sometimes clause (14) and occasionally clause (4) are the clauses that are used to put those alleged breaches to the employees.
Q. What I'm really testing with you is your positive evidence in paragraph 48 which refers to the need or it adverts to the court of law as being relevant to this process.
A. That's right.
Q. And I'd like to suggest to you that your evidence today suggests it is unclear as to whether or not that's actually the case or not; is that fair?
A. So, the evidence that I'm now giving to you is --
Q. Yes, give it to me now.
A. -- on the matters that you've raised today is that clause (4) certainly requires more advice and consideration as to its applicability.
Q. Isn't it something you should be across, Mr Bullard?
A. When I am entering these allegation - when I'm faced with allegations of child sexual abuse my priority is to ensure that the child who's made the allegations is safe and that we have a way of further investigating the matters that have been alleged, and the way in which we do that and the clauses that we use in section 9 in some respects are immaterial; we need to make a decision about which of those clauses it is most appropriate to investigate the matters under, and we also need to make a determination about which of those clauses we believe have the highest opportunity for success.

I need to point out that it doesn't matter which of those clauses that I choose to investigate in terms of the sanction that I can impose. So, people might assume, if I went to (4), law is going to bring a higher sanction. People might assume that, but I am not fettered in any way when I get to the end of making a determination about a breach as to which of the sanctions as laid out I can use.
Q. I understand that. Why don't we try and illuminate this by reference to one of the case studies and by reference to the case study explored yesterday with Rachel concerning Wayne. Could the operator bring up TPOL.0002.0004.0061-0008, at page 8. Mr Bullard, this will be a summary of the initial complaint, part of the initial complaints. Do you broadly remember what the initial complaints were?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. So, we've got the tucking into bed on at least two occasions, Wayne tucked in Rachel, the "nice arse" comment, the drawing of a penis with a biro, physical contact by piggybacking, touching and bruising on the leg, rubbing shoulders, provision of alcohol. They're roughly the
allegations as they were initially.
There was then subsequently, and I'11 just pause there. Do you need any further detail around those? Do you broadly know the ones I'm talking about? A. Yes, I do.
Q. I'11 ask the operator to bring that down. There was around the same time a bit later in 2005, added to that complaint was the "MILF in training" t-shirt, do you remember that?
A. I do.
Q. And, "MILF", you understand means, "Mother I'd like to fuck"?
A. I do now, yes.
Q. There was also some complaints around that time about contact in breach of a direction that Wayne not contact Rachel?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was also a complaint concerning some correspondence; do you remember that? Perhaps I'll come back to that one because I think it arises at - let's just stick with these ones for now. Those are what I'm going to talk about as the 2005 allegations. Is that clear? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, those allegations basically arose in the course of 2005; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And you've had a report of Rachel's evidence that there was more but she felt constrained about revealing more and that she was confused by the process and affected by her age. You've had a report of that evidence?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. You're aware that the investigation took two years?
A. Yes.
Q. And, I think I understand your evidence that that time period was too long?
A. It was a very long time period, yes.
Q. And, was it too long?
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A. Yes, it was in my opinion too long.
Q. And at the time did the department, to the best of your knowledge, have any ability to require that the investigators justified the time they were taking?
A. I can't speak to that, I don't know what the approach was in 2005.
Q. Does it today have the power to cause the investigators to justify the time they're taking?
A. Certainly, and in terms of the evidence that I provided to Ms Norton yesterday, we do check in on where different investigations are at and have, if you like, report backs or status reports on those.
Q. And, can you enquire as to the gender composition and training of the investigators?
A. Yes, we could.
Q. And, have you ever done that?
A. Not to the best of my knowledge, and the point --
Q. Is there any process for you to do that, is there any protocol?
A. No, there is not, and the points that were made in the Commission yesterday around that, which were very good points, have been discussed last night, about what we can be doing to ensure that there is gender composition and appropriate balance in the investigators that are provided.

I saw a summary of Rachel's evidence yesterday, as I've said, and I've also gone back and reviewed the matter and I absolutely accept that part of the impact that this matter had on Rachel was compounded by the way in which the matter was investigated and the approach that those investigators took, and I do not accept that we could say that that was in any way acceptable.
Q. And my question is, are there any systems today that are different to the systems in place then?
A. So, the change would be - and I think I talked about this yesterday - that at the time that this was undertaken there would have been a mosaic of different approaches as to whether we had internal people looking at it, whether there was an external investigator, whether there was a mix; and today we use independent investigators to go and look at matters such as this, so that would be the change.
Q. So, there's no protocol or system presently in place to make sure that there is a proper approach to gender or having a trauma-informed approach. Do you, for example, have a tender process for your investigators where you say, "Demonstrate that you have these capacities"?
A. So, that's been discussed across government and it's work that we have undertaken to lead. Certainly in terms of, if you like, trying to put together a panel of people who have appropriate qualifications, gender mix, balance, trauma-informed approach; that work is underway, but I absolutely accept at the moment every agency is going off and commissioning. And I think, as I said yesterday, in a small pool, in a small pool in Tasmania of people that can undertake these investigations to the standard that is required and expected.
Q. So, the answer to my question is, there's no difference in terms of current systems and processes between 2005 and the present day, in that respect?
A. My response is that the professionalism of the investigators and the fact that they're independent is a change in the process from 2005.
Q. But there is nothing new in place to take steps to ensure gender, trauma-informed or qualification status? A. No, not at this point and, as I said, it is a matter that was under active discussion.
Q. I understand. Could I ask the operator show us TPOL.0002.0004.0061-0011, at page 11, this is from the investigator's report. We might, if the operator will forgive me - I'm sorry, that's the wrong reference - if the operator will forgive me, we might go to page 1 of that document first, just to show what it is.

That's the report that was done by the investigators; is that right?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Have you read it?
A. I have read it.
Q. Could I ask the operator to go to what is marked as page 11? I just want to draw your attention to a comment that the investigator makes having investigated the 2005 comments. The investigator says:
... it is apparent on the evidence obtained ...

Perhaps we could, at the first line 8.6:
... it is apparent on the evidence obtained during the course of this investigation that the respondent continues to assert what might be arguably categorised as an artificial delineation as to his contact with Rachel when in school, and when not in school.

Although the respondent as a
[REDACTED]-year-old male may find it easy to make this distinction, a somewhat naive [REDACTED]-year-old school girl may not be armed with such a level of understanding.

Now, that's what the investigator put to the department in 2005. You've read that before?
A. Yes, have I.
Q. And you'd agree with that analysis?
A. The analysis as --
Q. That one should perhaps not be so quick to draw artificial delineations between the contact of an older male teacher and a younger school girl?
A. Absolutely. Yes.
Q. Yes, could I ask the operator to bring that down?

Going through each of the allegations in 2005, I can take you to this as required, I'11 bring that up briefly as a matter of fairness to you. Could I ask the operator to show TPOL.0002.0004.0179-0002, page 2. These are the 2006 findings in respect of the 2005 allegations. Have you familiarised yourself with those?
A. Am I able to see the document?
Q. Yes.
A. Is that the letter from the then Secretary to Wayne?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
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Q. Let's leave it there because I'm not sure about the redactions. I'11 come back to the addressee. You will see there the finding of the department is that the tucking into bed on at least two occasions was upheld?
A. Yes.
Q. The "nice arse" comment was upheld. The drawing of the penis with a biro was upheld. The physical contact by piggybacking was upheld. The touching, the bruising on the leg was upheld. The rubbing shoulders was dismissed. The provision of alcohol was upheld. And the contacting while under a direction not to contact was upheld. That's your understanding of the outcome of that investigation?
A. At that point in time.
Q. At that point, yes. And there were additional matters concerning the MILF $t$-shirt?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was upheld?
A. Ah --
Q. Well, let me put that another way: it was accepted that the t-shirt was provided?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was found ultimately that it wasn't worn and so wouldn't bring the state into disrepute?
A. That is correct.
Q. And I think you say in your evidence that that distinction was not relevant, the fact that the t-shirt wasn't worn was not relevant, ought not have been relevant to the analysis?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Could I ask the operator to bring that down? And, as I understand it, the conclusion of the department then in relation to the 2005 allegations was that they either were not sufficient to bring the State Service into disrepute or they were outside the course of employment; is that a fair summary?
A. Eventually.
Q. Well, do you mean by that, that that's the landing point in 2007 at the time that the matter was closed?
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A. That's correct, yes.
Q. So, there was some more correspondence and then ultimately it was concluded that either it was not sufficient to bring the state into disrepute, and that's the MILF t -shirt?
A. Yes.
Q. And the others were not in the course of employment and therefore not relevant?
A. With the final determination, yes.
Q. They were upheld in the sense that they happened, save for the rubbing of shoulders?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. But they were held to be not in the course of employment?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Let's just explore about how that lands with you today, and as a matter of fairness to you I understand that you would not make that decision today; is that right? A. Absolutely.
Q. You would see the conduct of Wayne as being in the course of employment?
A. I would, yes.
Q. And that's because the student-teacher relationship was formed while Rachel was a student at the school?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that relationship was relevant to his dealings with her at all times?
A. Yes, that's correct, and I think it's important also to point out that there's a change in the policy environment between when this occurred and today which we use to deal with matters such as this. So, at the time that this occurred, whilst there were some policies around, if you want, fraternisation with students or friendships with students outside, they were not framed - they were framed more as advisory than mandatory.

We now have the Conduct and Behaviour Standards which make it very clear that conduct such as that displayed by Wayne is not acceptable, and so, that's what we use to
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bring the Code of Conduct in.
Q. So, which category of Code of Conduct are you using to bring that into? Is that bringing into disrepute under (14) --
A. No.
Q. Is it treating people with respect without harassment, victimisation or discrimination?
A. We normally look at (2), care and diligence because we're saying that care and diligence involves, or must involve, acting within the policies and procedures as set out by the department, but we also use respect and harassment.
Q. Just to interrupt: it was the course of State Service employment that was the barrier to the findings, wasn't it, in the 2005 complaints?
A. The nexus with employment. The argument that was put up as I understand it in 2005, and you have articulated it well, is that Wayne had a view, and it was a view that was, I understand, litigated with some veracity, that the matters --
Q. Ferocity?
A. Ferocity, the matters that were under investigation he'd undertaken in his private life and in a private capacity. The Conduct and Behaviour Standard as framed does not allow that to occur, so we would say you had breached a policy or procedure of the department and therefore it is in the course of your employment and therefore you're in breach.
Q. I'm not sure I quite understand the distinction, because the change is now that a policy operates upon a teacher more broadly, so your policy expectation, so to the extent that you direct your employees to comply with policies, you give them a lawful direction.
A. No, I don't give them a lawful direction. Under their employment arrangements they have to comply with the policies and procedures of the State Service and we have developed policies and procedures around conduct and behaviour that's expected of individuals and they must comply with those, and the policies are now drafted to say "must", not "you might want to consider".
Q. So, is it your evidence that the change in policy has
led to a change in the department's understanding of when someone acts in the course of their employment?
A. The policy has expanded what "in the course of employment" means.
Q. And so your position is that, in the absence of those policies, the position would be unchanged from 2005 ? A. I would be concerned that in the absence of those policies the position would be unchanged.
Q. I'11 come back and explore with you what your evidence is about what caused the change and the impact of legal advice upon that change. I had understood that there was some relevant legal advice that caused a shift in your understanding of when someone acts in the course of their employment; is that not the case?
A. In terms of Wayne or in terms of other matters?
Q. Generally speaking, that you had some advice that changed your view about when someone acts in the course of their employment?
A. Generally?
Q. Generally?
A. I have received advice pertaining to particular matters that I've had under consideration; I don't know if there is a particular piece of advice, but you might wish to point me toward part of my statement so that I can refresh my memory on that.
Q. Okay, as I understand your evidence what we would look to now to see this done differently is, there is a policy which changes the way that you see "in the course of employment"?
A. That's right.
Q. And, can you tell us the name of that policy?
A. It's the Conduct and Behaviour Standards.
Q. So, let's return now to 2007 and the matter is concluding as far as the investigators are concerned, and you refer in your statement at paragraph 92 to a close-out meeting which Rachel gave evidence about yesterday. Do you know the meeting I'm talking about, it was in early $\square$ of 2007?
A. So, it - are you referring to the paragraph that says:

Following conclusion of the investigation Rachel and Anne were advised of the outcome.
Q. Thank you, you did use the pseudonyms. Yes, that's right. You're aware that was early 2007?
A. Yes, to the best of my knowledge, yes. I don't know that I have the time of that meeting at the top of my time.
Q. And you're aware that at that meeting, and I think you refer to this at paragraph 112 of your statement, there were further disclosures made?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Now, those disclosures were - and you say that she became visibly upset and informed the investigators her original complaint had been incomplete. Rachel then provided a lengthy and detailed set of new allegations? A. Yes, she did.
Q. And those allegations included kissing, including after she said "no", that Wayne rubbed his hand up and down her leg, touched her crotch area over her clothing, put his finger in her mouth and asked her to do the same, talked to her about her private life, gave her alcohol, told her they could date after she turned 18 , said "I love you", sent letters saying "I love you". That's a reasonable summary of the complaints she later made?
A. Yes, it is, yes.
Q. And you have a report of the evidence that she gave to that effect yesterday?
A. Yes .
Q. I think there are also some allegations about some dirty jokes or videos that may have been shown on school computers?
A. Yes.
Q. At the point of that disclosure, is it fair to say that those allegations should have been investigated by the department?
A. Yes.
Q. And, is it fair to say they were not investigated by the department?
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A. You've referred to a number of investigations, and my understanding is that the dirty jokes or videos from the computer in his office was the subject of further investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. My understanding is that the other allegations as put by Rachel were not investigated.
Q. Yes, and they needed to be investigated, didn't they?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And they should have been investigated?
A. Absolutely should have been.
Q. And, just to pause there: yesterday when Rachel gave evidence, in your report of her evidence did you hear her say that Wayne had in fact kissed her in the office at school?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. So far as your review of the matter suggests, did anyone tell her that it might be relevant to the actions of the department that some of this abuse happened on school property?
A. That's not information that I have around what was discussed or not discussed with Rachel at that meeting.
Q. Indeed, there's no suggestion that that was ever put to her in any of the documents that you have?
A. I have no evidence that that was put to her.
Q. And her evidence yesterday doesn't suggest that it was put to her?
A. That's right.
Q. And in fact that, after she made those disclosures, after she made that quite traumatic disclosure, there wasn't any follow-up about those allegations, was there, from your department?
A. My understanding is that, apart from the dirty jokes or videos, no.
Q. And it's fair, isn't it, that, had somebody investigated, the full scope of even beyond the disclosures she had made in that meeting might have become apparent?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was important that they become apparent because, had those matters been substantiated, Wayne ought not be anywhere near children; is that fair?
A. Absolutely.
Q. I want to just understand as wel1, just to pause again: at that stage, as you understand it sitting here today, those allegations could constitute a breach of either (14) or (4), couldn't they?
A. Yes.
Q. And they need to be investigated before you can form a view about them?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the department's - and to be fair to you, Mr Bullard, this is something that you frankly, I believe, concede in your statement - that the department's response to this was woefully inadequate; is that fair?
A. The department's response to this was woefully inadequate, and I - as I said yesterday - apologise to Rachel for the manner in which it was handled. I came to this matter as one of the reviews of historic matters and, quite frankly, I was distressed reading the file and the way in which the allegations had been undertaken.

I was also, I have to say - "pleased" is probably too strong a word - that I was able to find additional allegations and they are the ones that are outlined that had not been investigated and therefore an investigation was still open to me, which is what I then commenced to do.
Q. We will come back to that because I want to understand the scope of the investigation you've now commissioned and what limitations there might be around that, but just to pause. If you'll take it from me that Rachel provided written allegations around 2007 following those allegations.

Can I take you now to your statement at paragraph 106(d) where you refer to additional information received by the department via email about nine days later. A. Yes.
Q. That's an email of 2007.
A. Yes.
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Q. Could I ask the operator to bring that up. TDOE.0002.0013.0286-0190. While the operator's bringing that up, Mr Bullard, you don't tell us here what this email was about, but is it fair to say it was relevant to the allegations that had been made?
A. Yes .
Q. So it says, and I'11 read it as much as I can:

Regarding our previous discussion ...
This is from the investigator to an officer of the department:
... I provide details I had gathered in the past as a result of Mr Wayne's behaviour towards his past students.
[X] was a grade [X] student at 2001. She called Wayne a paedophile on the grounds that Wayne had sent sexual messages to her and co-student [Y]. Also, [X] advised that Wayne was living with another friend, [Z], shortly after she finished grade [REDACTED]. She was made to apologise to Wayne for this comment. Wayne apparently called her a slut in front of other students and staff.

Further, it goes on:
John was allegedly living with a student shortly after she finished $\square$ and then got engaged to her.

And I'11 just confirm what's under that redaction. I think that should be "Wayne", it might be an error of our redaction, which I'11 confirm:

There is also another former student of Wayne who has information about being kissed by Wayne when she was his student. The principal has the person's name, but advised that the person is not at this stage [yes, should be "Wayne"] that the person is not at this stage prepared to
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provide a statement.
Now, that email, if I can suggest to you on the base of the documents, went nowhere; is that fair? A. So far as I understand that's fair, yes.
Q. There was no investigation - I'll just ask that document then come down. So, you have Rachel's very serious allegations and nine days later these very serious allegations; is that fair?
A. Yes .
Q. The conduct that's talked about there is entirely consistent with the allegations made by Rachel, isn't it? A. Absolutely.
Q. And, investigating one means investigating all, doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And they all go to whether or not there's been a Code of Conduct breach under (14) and (4) at the very least?
A. Yes, but I would also look to (3).
Q. And (2) ; their range?
A. And try on (2) as well, yeah, absolutely.
Q. Doesn't there need to be, Mr Bullard, a sense of urgency that this kind of matter is pursued with vigour by the Department of Education?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And there was an absence of that vigour at the time, wasn't there?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And we're going to come back to about how that's changed and how that will change, but at this stage that email seems to have gone into a memory hole and not progressed at all; is that a fair summary?
A. That is a fair summary, yes.
Q. All right, I'd like to then see what happens next, because we accept, I think - and do I take it from you that even at the time, even on the narrower policies as they operated in 2007 the information in the 2007 disclosures, coupled with that email, ought to have triggered ED5?
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A. Yes, absolutely. I look at the matters in that email and, as you point out, there are a number of allegations of alleged conduct of Wayne; each on their own would be a trigger following --
Q. Even then though?
A. Even though, they should be, yes, but certain1y today --
Q. Has anyone investigated why it didn't trigger anything then?
A. The file was reviewed by me as part of my review of historic allegations. To the best of my memory there is no indication as to why they weren't proceeded with.
Q. Your review is focused, and appropriately focused may I say, on Wayne and making sure that everything appropriate is done in respect of Wayne; is that a fair summary? A. Yes.
Q. Has there been a separate investigation or consideration of how the systems of the department broke down so fundamentally that this went nowhere?
A. No, not so far --
Q. Well, shouldn't there be?
A. -- not so far as I'm aware. All of the matters, the historic matters that have been reviewed are informing our knowledge of where there have been systemic breakdowns in processes or the application of legislation or policies; they all are. So, as part of the work that we are doing through safeguarding our children and young people, we've got a rich information set, unfortunately, about things that have not gone as we would expect.
Q. What I'm trying to understand though is, is one of those failures a failure of the systems of accountability within the Department of Education? Leave aside Wayne for just a moment: ought there be accountability and oversight into this failure?
A. In terms of, should we now investigate this failure historically?
Q. Yes, as to how did this happen?
A. Yes, we do need to look at how this happened; only by looking at the things that haven't worked are we going to inform ourselves of how to place ourselves to do this
properly in the future, and I suppose to provide some comfort to people who might be thinking what accountability sits now; all such matters as those in that email would now come to me. So, there are many steps in the chain historically about where people could make judgments about whether or not to progress it to the Secretary for consideration, and matters such as that would now naturally come to me for advice about whether to proceed.
Q. And I'm going to need to return with you to talk about how the Commission can see those lines of accountability as opposed to - how we can see those lines of accountability, I want to return to that, but I want to stick with this story for now.

So, as at 2007 you have the Rachel allegations and the email, all of which I think you accept even at the time were significant, ought to have triggered an urgent response and should have been investigated; is that fair? A. Yes.
Q. And they were Code of Conduct matters, even at the time?
A. They may have constituted Code of Conduct matters. So, just to be clear, the allegation in a breach, when you move into the process you're investigating an allegation. So, they're not - they're Code of Conduct matters insofar as they are matters to be investigated, not Code of Conduct matters in terms of there being an automatic breach; I just want to make that distinction.
Q. Yes, of course, absolutely, so in fact they had not yet been investigated, so you could not say one way or the other whether Wayne as at $\square 2007$ had breached the Code of Conduct or not?
A. I think the premise that you're putting to me is that they should have been subject to consideration by the Secretary as to whether there may have been a breach of the Code of Conduct and therefore whether that should have proceeded to investigation.
Q. Yes, and I think we're in heated agreement that they should have gone for an investigation; is that fair? A. They should have been referred to the Secretary to make a determination about whether to proceed to an investigation, yes.
Q. And in the absence of that referral the department as a unit, as an entity, had not yet decided whether Wayne had breached the Code of Conduct at all?
A. On the matters that were in that email? That's correct, yes.
Q. Yes. Or on the matters that Rachel had referred to?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And so there were a number of Code of Conduct issues, even on the understanding then, that the department had not formed a view about whether there had been a breach at that stage?
A. There were a number of matters which had come to light that, for whatever reason, were not put to the Secretary of the day so that he could turn his mind to whether or not there may be a breach of the Code of Conduct which would then follow that an investigation should have occurred, yes.
Q. Well, I don't think there's any daylight between our two propositions.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm saying the department should have done an investigation; you're saying they should have done an investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. They didn't do an investigation?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. There was an outstanding question over whether Wayne had breached the Code of Conduct; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let me just suggest to you that there was a mandatory report to CPARS; that's right?
A. I'11 accept that, I don't have that off the top of my head.
Q. There was no report to the Teachers Registration Board?
A. That's my understanding - well, the Teachers

Registration Board did not exist --
Q. In 2007?
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A. In 2007, yes.
Q. There was no report in 2007?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. I think that's in your statement but I'11 check it.
A. Yes, and I apologise if I'm not being straight on my answers; I'm trying to juggle five scenarios, so if you could point me to parts in my statement that would refresh my memory, that would be good.
Q. Thank you. Can I ask the operator to bring up document TPOL.0002.0004.0077-0002. So we had the disclosure by Rachel on , we had the further email on and this letter to Wayne on . Have you seen that letter? Would the operator just zoom in a little so that Mr Bullard can see the letter?
A. Yes, I believe that's the second - I don't want to call it a second determination, but it's a second conclusion that was reached by the then Secretary, yes.
Q. If the operator could show us the second page, it says, and I'11 quote:
.. all current investigations are now
concluded and I consider these matters to
be at an end.
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. That wasn't right, was it?
A. I was unable to determine on the file as presented to me whether or not at the time that Mr Smyth made that statement he had any advice as to the fresh allegations, no.
Q. Mr Bullard, I'm not asking you what he knew, I'm asking you as a matter of fact as you sit here now, that's not right, is it?
A. As a matter of fact in terms of that, and remembering the dates as I do, no, that statement is not correct.
Q. That's false, isn't it?
A. The statement is incorrect in terms of there are two facts that do not accord with each other. Whether Mr Smyth was making a false statement as to those is not anything I
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can comment on.
Q. I'm not at the moment talking about intentionally misleading anyone. I'm saying as a matter of fact that's a false statement?
A. It's an incorrect statement.
Q. Is there a difference between a false statement and an incorrect statement that I don't understand?
A. Probably the weight in which the word "false" "suggests that there was some wrongdoing on Mr Smyth's behalf, but if you're assuring me that you're --
Q. Without imputing intentionality to Mr Smyth, at this stage that's a false statement, isn't it?
A. That's right.
Q. Thank you. It is a significant failure of the systems and processes of the department that a letter with false information, it could be permitted to be sent?
A. A letter with false information should never be sent, but I will just point out that the - from my recollection the proximity between the new information coming to light and that letter being sent was fairly close in terms of timing.
Q. That might be a reason that the systems failed, but my proposition I'm putting to you, it is a significant failure of the systems and processes of the department that false information was sent under the department's letterhead?
A. May I suggest that, in fact, the wording of that letter is probably one of the failings in this: we should never say that all investigations are finished and off you go, you know, I think that a better draft of that letter would have said, "On the evidence that I currently have before me the investigations are at an end".
Q. So, I'd just like you to focus on my question, which is, it's a significant failure of the policies and procedures of the department that that letter got sent? A. I would argue that it's a failure that the new information that had come to light was not put to Mr Smyth in a manner that was timely and made - allowed him to make a proper determination as to whether the letter that was sent was correct or not.
Q. Again, I'm not sure there's a difference between us,
save that you seem to be at pains to insulate Mr Smyth. I'd like to just put the proposition to you that the systems and processes of the department failed in allowing this letter to be sent. Why is that --
A. I accept that the processes failed; I think the proposition you originally put to me was that there was a significant failure, and I'm saying to you that due to the complexity of the timing of the information coming to light, that we would need to understand more around why that information was not put to Mr Smyth.
Q. There are systems and processes that ought to have made sure that Mr Smyth had that information.
A. I accept that, yes.
Q. It is a significant failing of the systems and processes of the department that it did not get to Mr Smyth?
A. It is a failing of the systems and processes --
Q. You don't think that's significant?
A. If you want me to concede its significance I'm happy to do that because at the end of the day the matters that should have been investigated were not, and if we put the child at the centre, which is what we should be doing, then we should be taking every action that we can to ensure that Secretaries have the information that they need to make proper determinations about the employees who they have in their systems, so you and I agree on that.
Q. Mr Bullard, the Secretary was informed in around June 07, I think on your evidence; I'11 take you to the paragraph. No? Perhaps I'11 come back to that.

Some months later there was an ad that was put in the local paper, and I'11 ask the operator to bring that up, it's TPOL.0002.0004.0071-003:

After an extensive investigation, the
Department of Education has determined that Wayne has not breached the State Service 2000 Act Code of Conduct.

Wayne has been appointed to a Position with the Department in . He took up that position [in 1 .

If you want me to concede a significant failing, the placing of that ad is a significant failing.
Q. Well, I will ask you to make that concession, but before we get there, that is a false statement too, isn't it? Well, let's break it down, was there an extensive investigation?
A. No, I don't consider and, for the reasons that we've already discussed, there was an extensive - or there was an investigation of a number of matters, but not all matters, and I don't accept that that was a statement that was true.
Q. As a person reading that public notice, that public notice communicates, doesn't it, that the department has no further concerns with any allegations against Wayne; do you accept that?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that was false, wasn't it?
A. It was, yes.
Q. It hadn't been extensively investigated and this notice operates to clear him, doesn't it?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And it does so publicly, and it provides the department's support of him by identifying that they have given him a position?
A. Absolutely.
Q. It expresses confidence in Wayne?
A. It does.
Q. It does so after, months after - this is 2007 - 2007, the department is expressing public confidence in Wayne; that is a significant failing, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. It is false, isn't it?
A. Yes, as stated it --
Q. And it misled the public or had the capacity to mislead the public?
A. It is misleading, yes.
Q. And it was directed to the public?
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A. Yes, it was.
Q. It had the capacity to harm Rachel who had to live in that small community?
A. Horrifying.
Q. It was a significant failure by the department, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. I'11 ask the operator to bring that down. That was authorised by the department, wasn't it?
A. I understand, yes.
Q. Do you know who authorised it?
A. No, I do not have that information.
Q. At the time that statement was put and published, was the Secretary aware of the further allegations?
A. Yes, on the timeline that you've set out, yes.
Q. And so, how is it that the systems and processes of the department permitted that statement to be published?
A. I do not know.
Q. Has anyone ever looked into that?
A. Not so far as I'm aware, no.
Q. Does that not suggest a substantial lack of accountability within the department when something like that can go unanswered?
A. Now?
Q. Yes?
A. Well, these are matters that have only recently been referred and come back to my attention, these are matters of the past; I'm not saying that as an excuse, but in terms of things that happened and the reason that they happened, of course that concerned me, absolutely concerned me, and that is why, when I re-examined the historical allegations regarding Wayne, I've already said that that caused me both personal and professional distress and all of that information needs to inform the work going forward to ensure that those things don't happen again.
Q. Mr Bullard, what I'm really trying to understand is, does this indicate - does the failure to investigate how
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the public could be misled in this way suggest, should the Commissioners take it to be, that there are no systems or processes of accountability in the department to pick up things like this?
A. Well, there are systems and processes of accountability. I think that the fact that we had information that may have pertained to matters of concern regarding current employees, and we undertook under our own volition a process by which each of those was in turn investigated, shows that we are willing to go back and look at the management actions of previous people.
Q. Just to pause. You're not investigating this, you're not investigating how this came to be published, are you? A. We are using the information that we have to hand to inform how we improve in the future. I can assure the Commission that we would never be publishing.
Q. All right. The Department of Education did not proactively report the matters concerning Wayne to the Teachers Registration Board; do you accept that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Wayne reported to the Teachers Registration Board on , and I'11 ask the operator to show us TPOL.0002.0004.0071-0001. Have you seen that document, it's heavily redacted. I'11 ask the operator to - that's from Wayne to the Teachers Registration Board and he summarises the complaints made against him in what $I$ think you'11 agree is not entirely fulsome?
A. Yes.
Q. And so, he notified the Teachers Registration Board; the Teachers Registration Board should have been informed by the Department of Education, shouldn't it?
A. Yes, it should.
Q. Of both the 2005 and the later allegations?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd accept it's a failing that that didn't happen?
A. Yes.
Q. I ask the operator to bring that document down. Teachers Registration Board then asked you, and I'11 ask the operator to show us, TPOL.0002.0004.0075. This is the
response - sorry, this is the Teachers Registration Board asking you, and I draw your attention to the last paragraph above, "Thank you for your assistance", it says:

Consequently, I am writing to ask the department to provide a report to the Board about the allegations, the investigations undertaken and the subsequent outcomes for this matter.

You see that?
A. Yes I do.
Q. That's a fairly orthodox request from a Regulator, isn't it?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. The following day there was a response, I'll ask the operator to show us TPOL.0002.0004.0075-0002. I just ask that we show the whole letter first. So, this is the following day, $\square$, this letter here:

I refer to your letter of $\square 2007$
requesting the Department to provide
information to the Teachers Registration
Board about departmental investigations into allegations against Wayne.

I advise that investigations into a series of allegations that Wayne had breached the State Service Act 2000 Code of Conduct were recently concluded. The allegations against Wayne, and the outcomes of the investigations, are summarised in the final
letter sent to Wayne on $\square$ 2007. I have attached a copy of this letter for your information.

That's the letter that I think we agreed earlier was misleading, wasn't it, the $\square$ letter? A. Yes.
Q. That's the information that you provided to the Regulator. Can I ask the operator to bring that down. The department misled the Regulator, didn't it?
A. We11, it depends what was in the knowledge of the person that sent that --
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Q. No, I'm not asking again, I'm not asking, Mr Bullard --
A. And --
Q. -- about intentionality, I'm asking about objectively.
A. If you are asking me, was that factually correct given the further allegations --
Q. Yes.
A. -- then so far as it related to allegations pertaining to Wayne: no. As far as it related to the conclusion of matters that have been under investigation for a potential breach of the Code of Conduct: yes.
Q. No, that's not right either. I think that we agreed earlier that the department had before it a range of allegations which should have been investigated as Code of Conduct breaches but were not. And can I ask you, and I'11 ask the operator to bring the letter back up, this letter communicates to the Teachers Registration Board that the Department of Education had considered and concluded all of its investigations into alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct. Isn't that what it communicates?
A. Well, that letter is talking about a series of allegations around a breach of a Code of Conduct.
Q. Yes.
A. And the outcomes of those investigations which had been concluded.
Q. Yes, and so, would a reasonable reader of this understand that it was the position of the department that you had concluded any investigations you might have into whether an employee, acting in the course of State Service, had complied with all applicable Australian laws?
A. Ah --
Q. Nowhere in that letter does it say there are a range of matters of concern which we did not investigate? A. That's right, I --
Q. And so, it gives the impression, does it not, that you had concluded all of the investigations concerning potential Code of Conduct breaches?
A. It gives information that the allegations that had been subject to investigation were concluded. I'm not
arguing with you that there should have been other matters that were investigated, but it does not go to that, and if I can look at --
Q. No, Mr Bullard, I'm going to ask you to focus on this, it's really important.
A. I understand why it's important, but I also think it's important to understand that, if you move this into a contemporary environment the TRB would be advised of all matters of concern that come to me around potential breaches or investigations.

So, I understand where you're going in terms of your questioning, and I absolutely - we are in strong agreement, that for that letter to be comprehensive it would have and should have outlined that there were some other matters of concern which were currently being considered in terms of whether or not to proceed.

The letter as it stands there, I read, as relating to those that had been concluded under the Code of Conduct. So, I'm not arguing with you around other information that that letter should have included, but the statement as it sits there is, as I read it, and you may read it differently, talking about those matters that were under investigation to which the --
Q. Is that a fulsome disclosure of what the department had done?
A. No, it's not a fulsome disclosure of the position of the department in terms of having matters that were under current consideration and had been concluded but other information that should have been considered.
Q. It omitted substantial issues, didn't it?
A. It could have referred to the fact that there were new investigations - well, actually, that there was other information to hand, but of course what we know is, for whatever reason - and we don't accept that there should have been a reason - that a decision somewhere had been made not to proceed with investigating other matters.
Q. The Regulator, it is important that the Regulator has full and frank disclosure from the Department of Education, isn't it?
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. This is not full and frank disclosure, is it?
A. This does not reflect how we would interact with the Teachers Registration Board today.
Q. No, Mr Bullard, I'm not asking you about today; I'm asking you to tell us, tell this Commission on your oath sitting here today, is that letter true? Do you read it now as being a truthful and full statement of the position as you understand it to have been at the time?
A. It is not true by omission.
Q. That's right, it is a false letter?
A. It is not true by omission.
Q. Again, I am not sure what the difference is between a letter that is not true and a letter that is false, but perhaps we need not debate the point now.

I put it to you again, Mr Bullard, that the department, by omission, misled the Regulator: do you accept that?
A. Yes.

MS BENNETT: Commissioners, I'm conscious of the time, and I think we said we'd have a break at about this time and return to Mr Bullard after the break.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Bennett.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Bennett.
MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioners.
Q. Mr Bullard, we've been through some correspondence concerning the communications from the Department of Education around Wayne. There was a further communication, this time from Wayne's lawyers to the department on . This is towards the end of 2007, so as the timeline runs - I'll ask the operator to bring it up, TPOL.0002.0004.0084-0001.

As the timeline runs we have the initial investigation from 2005, concludes in 2007, the further email on 2007, the letter of closure to Wayne on 2007, then the publication in the newspaper on $\square$ 2007, and then
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the communication with the Teachers Registration Board in 2007.

By 2007 Wayne had become aware of Rachel's additional allegations against him that were made in 2007 and his lawyers wrote to the department. Have you seen this letter before, Mr Bullard?
A. It's not familiar to me, but $I$ accept that it may have been an annexure.
Q. If I could ask the operator to go over the page, it effectively asks a series of questions of the department, and it asks the department the questions that are there set out:

Did [the investigators] meet with Rache7
and Anne in 2007?
And those questions follow, I'll give you a moment to read that. I'll draw your attention in particular to Question 4:

Did Rachel make further allegations against
my client at the meeting with [the
investigators]?
If so, what action did [they] or other
Departmental officers take in response?
Would you accept from me, Mr Bullard, that that letter was sent to the Department of Education in the context of an ongoing dispute between Wayne and the Teachers Registration Board about whether he ought to be registered? A. I will accept that from you, I don't have that --
Q. You don't have personal knowledge of that?
A. I don't have that top of mind, no.
Q. If we go back to the first page, I'll just see if that's obvious on the face of the document. You will see there the first:

Wayne has been advised by the Teachers
Registration Board it has received complaints made against Wayne [by two blanked out names]. The board have also advised they received other documents and
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statements.
And then it goes on from there. You would accept that it's reasonably clear from the face of the document that there's a Teachers Registration Board issue going on for Wayne?
A. Yes.
Q. And that Wayne's lawyers are seeking clarification about Rachel's allegations for the purposes of that communication?
A. Yes, I accept that.
Q. I ask the operator to bring that down. The response from the department came on 2007, so a few weeks later, it's at TPOL.0002.0004.0085-0001. This is a response to that letter. You will see that in the first line, it says:

## Thank you for your letter of

Have a read of that document. Have you seen that before?
A. Look, again, I may have but I hope that you'11 accept that the volume of documents that we've provided is --
Q. I accept that entirely.
A. -- is large and, just for the Commissioners, in terms of the file regarding Wayne, which I know that we've provided in full, there was a lot of duplication and it was quite a disorganised file so --
Q. I'm not at all critical, $I$ found it difficult to navigate too, so this document arose --
A. Yep, I can recognise that as a piece of correspondence from the Department of Education, yes.
Q. Yes, so that's a piece of correspondence which communicates to Wayne's lawyers in the context of his ongoing dispute with the Teachers Registration Board that:

I wish to advise that the Department has no outstanding issues with Wayne in relation to the State Service Act Code of Conduct at this time.
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A. That's right, yes.
Q. That's not true, is it?
A. I think you need to read that as a statement of fact.

As I understand the facts as we've discussed, there were no outstanding issues in relation to the State Service Code of Conduct; that's a different premise to whether there should have been, and you and I have agreed that on the facts as presented and the additional evidence that was provided to the department, that there should have been additional Code of Conduct proceedings undertaken.
Q. It says, Mr Bullard, that:
... the department has no outstanding issues in relation to the State Service Code of Conduct ...

To pause there. The reasonable reader of this letter, put yourself in the position of somebody receiving this letter: you would accept from that, wouldn't you, that the department had no concerns that this person had, in the course of acting in the course of State Service, not complied with any applicable Australian law?
A. Coming to that and if I put myself as an objective reader of that, yes, I accept that.
Q. And it would communicate to the objective and reasonable reader that the department had formed the view that Wayne had at all times behaved in a way that did not adversely affect the integrity and good reputation of the State Service?
A. No, I think that you're misinterpreting the - how to apply the balance of probabilities. You're asserting that there is some determination made around suitability there, whereas in fact the onus is on the department to prove that there are elements of behaviour that make - that are in breach.
Q. What I'm suggesting to is that that letter communicates that it had made that determination in Wayne's favour; do you accept that?
A. It makes a statement that there are no outstanding issues with regard to Wayne with regard to a Code of Conduct.
Q. Yes.
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A. I'm just being particular here because some people may interpret that as going to his fitness to teach or of being of good character: that is not what that statement around the Code of Conduct makes, and the Teachers Registration Board would well understand that given the structure of their Act and the matters that they need to turn their minds to, which do include fitness to teach.
Q. May I pause there, I think the President would like to ask you a question.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Q. My question is this: you've said that this relates solely to the investigation that was conducted and completed. If that's so, then people can have no confidence that the Teachers Registration Board or the department are actually concerned about the safety of children, can they? If it's confined in the way that you've suggested, what is the purpose of this process? A. So, thank you for that question; we need to place this in a period of time and probably what is more useful is to say, what is the purpose of the process as it stands today, because absolutely where do you get confidence from the process?

So, looking at where a decision was made as to whether or not there was a potential breach that required investigation is a really important matter here. At the time that we can see on the evidence that's been provided and the questioning that has proceeded today decisions were made at different levels of the organisation; is that a piece of information or data that we need to put to the Secretary or not? That does not happen now. Every allegation that's raised is put through Workplace Relations to me and then every allegation that is raised is put to the Teachers Registration Board as a piece of information to assist their decision-making.

MS BENNETT: Q. How do you know, Mr Bullard?
A. Because that's the process that we have.
Q. Well, with respect, there's been a stunning lack of accountability for these failings; how do you have confidence, how can this Commission have confidence that the systems and processes are now accountable? A. What do you mean by "a stunning lack of accountability"?
Q. Let's go back to this letter for a moment. Do you think that this letter communicated with the candour that the Teachers Registration Board was entitled to expect from the Department of Education?
A. No, it does not.
Q. It lacks the candour that they were entitled to expect?
A. It does.
Q. It had the potential to mislead, didn't it?
A. By omission, yes.
Q. Yes, and in fact it is, I suggest to you, misleading: do you accept that?
A. If read - if read broadly as we have discussed, yes.

If read to the letter of what is set out it is correct, but as I have said, by its omission of other matters of concern, it may be read as saying that that person has no matters of concern that are known to the department.
Q. And what accountability mechanisms are there for the department to satisfy itself that its processes are better now than they were then?
A. So, the process as it was set out then, as I've said, was a mosaic of approaches. The processes as it's set out now is, every allegation that is raised must be referred to Workplace Relations and Workplace Relations must refer it to me. Every allegation that is raised must be referred to the Teachers Registration Board, the Working with Vulnerable People Check and the Integrity Commission, and Teachers Registration Board where it relates to a teacher, and that is the process that sits in place now.
Q. Can I suggest to you, Mr Bullard, that if I had have asked your predecessor on $\square$ 2007, "Are you required to be frank and open with the Teachers Registration Board?", he would have said to me, "Absolutely that is required"?
A. Yes.
Q. And you sit here today saying to the Commission, "It is required that I receive all complaints". How do we know that you're getting them all, is my question?
A. Because that is what the requirement and the processes are in the department. Now, I think we've spoken before around the importance of culture and policies and
procedures here, and we've spoken about the need for multiple checks and balances. You obviously will want to be asking me, are 100 per cent of allegations referred to you?" I cannot say that they are, but what I can say to you is, principals, school leaders, business unit managers, are very clear about what is required of them now.
Q. Can you say it's 50 per cent? Do you know if it's 75 per cent?
A. Well, I think if you look at the number of allegations that have been referred over years, you will see they have increased - they have increased, absolutely increased. I'm sorry, I don't have the figures with me but we could provide that information.

From memory when I became Secretary, I think it was around two matters that have been referred to me that --

## PRESIDENT NEAVE: Q. Two per year, sorry?

A. Yeah, and I think I would ask for some leniency here in terms of what I'm communicating.
Q. Yes, I understand.
A. 2018 I became Secretary, two matters put to me that involved child sexual abuse. Now, that's gone up - and I don't want to quote a number, but it's gone, it's 10s, you know, it's 30, 40, 50, in terms of then the next years combined together. What that suggests to me is that people have got the memo: if you have a matter of concern regarding the potential abuse of children, then don't deal with it at a local level, don't put it into Learning Services, you know, to see how you should deal with it, come through to Workplace Relations and activate a process.

Can I just make a reflection on that though? I was very cognisant, and it made me reflect, of the evidence given by the professors, Professors McCormack and Smallbone, that you can risk sending a negative signal by having such a strict requirement in place. And I think that there was some discussion around, how could people log matters of concern that didn't lead to a full-blown investigation, because in a school setting you might feel very uncomfortable knowing that, if I go and ring Workplace Relations about Mike, Mike disappears tomorrow, when Mike is under investigation.

Now, my view would be, we need to know about those
concerning instances and have a process by which we can be dealing with those, but at the moment we don't have that, and so, we have gone to the pointy end of the process.
Q. Can I understand it this way: what's changed between 2007 and today is, you've got policies which expand the course of conduct proposition, so more things now trip up the ED5 process; is that fair?
A. Trigger?
Q. Trigger, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. There is now a general direction in place that everything that concerns child sexual abuse comes to you? A. Yes.
Q. Does that incorporate grooming and precursor conduct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would it encompass all of the matters that are the subject of case studies?
A. Where they were recognised as such. So, the other thing that we have absolutely recognised in the evidence that we've provided to date to the Commission is that a number of these issues are very nuanced in what behaviours you will see and that we need to absolutely invest in training our workforce to understand something that may or may not constitute a matter of concern.
Q. What are the oversight mechanisms for you to be comfortable that the changes you need to see are happening so that it all comes to you?
A. So --
Q. Oversight mechanisms.
A. So, a clear expectation at all levels of the organisation about what occurs; reviews of where that hasn't occurred. So, I'm very concerned, and in an organisation as large as ours there are instances where something comes to light that's been recorded and dealt with at a school level and not reported, so we need to go and understand why that has or hasn't occurred. We've already recognised that we need to invest in the training that's available for people.

And the other thing is too, quite frankly, ensuring
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that we're engaging with people on the ground, which I pride myself on doing, to listen to what their experience is of how this is - or not operating and the reasons as to why that can be.
Q. So, let me see if I've understood: we've got the mechanisms presently in place upon which the Commission should rely to be satisfied that this sort of process that we've talked about can't happen again, is your clear expectation communicated to staff, that they should communicate all matters of any concern level to Workplace Relations to be escalated to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Reviews of where that hasn't happened?
A. Yes.
Q. Training and your personal engagement?
A. Yep.
Q. It seems to me that those safeguards are reasonably dependent upon you personally; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a systems problem from your perspective?
A. Yes.
Q. So, how are we going to fix that?
A. So, absolutely in terms of the work that the safeguarding - Office of Safeguarding is doing; it is around ensuring that those things are recorded and proceduralised, but if necessary legislated to ensure that they occur.

I have come to this role and believe have made significant improvements. I'm not saying that by any account it's perfect, but $I$ also accept that a number of those improvements as they stand rely on my personal way of operating and the expectations that I set and the disposition that I come to these matters with, so I accept that.

And I also accept that for an institution that has perpetual succession and will have a range of Secretaries over the next 150 years of its existence, that is not --
Q. Safe.
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A. -- safe.
Q. Before I leave the case study of Wayne, I want to understand a couple of final matters. I think we've established on my count there are three communications which were not frank and contained omissions that came from the Department of Education, and you have given your very strong views that that was never deliberate.

What I'd like to understand, Mr Bullard --
A. Well, I haven't - I would just correct you there. I am - and maybe this is a matter of being pedantic: you have put to me that those statements are false; I am interpreting that as that there was an intention to mislead, that the information that existed that was not communicated was known. So, whilst I concede that, when read, they may be misleading, I can't concede that they are false statements because I do not and cannot know what was in the mind of the people that drafted those letters at the time. So, I'm not --
Q. The question I'd like to ask: I accept that you don't know if anyone intentionally misled a Regulator, and you don't know if anyone intentionally misled the public, and you don't know if there are any other --
A. That's right.
Q. -- intention to mislead. Would you agree with me that it would be incredibly significant if there were an intention to mislead in these circumstances?
A. Absolutely, I would.
Q. Has anyone ever checked if it was intentional or if it was inadvertent?
A. No, they have not because --
Q. Should someone have checked, Mr Bullard?
A. Because these matters have only recently been re-investigated. So, we need to be cognisant of the fact that, over the 150 years of public education, there are millions of pages of records that record the actions of people within the agency.

The matters that you have pointed out today are of concern, and I've conceded they're of concern, and so far as I was able to act upon them to ensure that Wayne did not continue to pose a risk to children and young people in the

Department of Education, I have done that.
To be forward-looking, we will use the information that we see in those matters to inform us about what went wrong and how we can improve, but placed where we are in a point in time, with the period of time that we've had to consider those matters, they have not been re-investigated in terms of the individuals who may have been involved in them, if we could ascertain who they are.

> I'd also point out --
Q. Is it --
A. Could I also just point out one other thing? So, even if you were to ask me, "Shouldn't those people be subject to a Code of Conduct for not acting with care and diligence?", a number of those people are no longer employed within the department and therefore do not fall under the State Service Code of Conduct.
Q. You don't carry out investigations after people have resigned under ED5?
A. So, can I just be very clear on that? Where people have resigned and are no longer employees, I don't have the jurisdiction to carry out an investigation. However, where that person is employed and I commence an ED5 investigation, and they choose then to resign, I continue with that investigation, I bring it to a conclusion, I make a determination that I would have made had they still been employed and I communicate that to the employee. That is actually not something that is set out within the employment direction or the State Service Code of Conduct, but it is something that $I$ consider is best practice.
Q. I just want to understand, Mr Bullard: is this viewed, are these failings viewed as matters that put children at risk? Is that how they're seen by you today as you look back, that these are matters that put children at risk? A. Put children at risk at the time or are matters that still put children at risk?
Q. By misleading the Regulator, did that have the potential to put children at risk?
A. I'm happy to concede a step further; I'm happy to concede that, by not investigating the other matters that were raised by Rache1, that were raised in the email that you have put to the Commission today, it did put children
at risk because it did not allow full investigation of all matters known to the department.
Q. And can I suggest to you that the failures that we've catalogued in relation to this matter today have not been responded to with a sense of urgency as it relates to how the public and the Regulator were misled about Wayne? There's been no sense of urgency to find out how that happened, has there?
A. It has not been in terms of the work that we've been undertaking, the focus; because in terms of the energy and effort that I've put into the matter in relation to Wayne, it is to investigate Wayne and his behaviours that were not investigated; it is to suspend Wayne immediately from duty so that he was no longer in a school; it is to report the matter to Tasmania Police and the Teachers Registration Board and Working with Vulnerable People. So, in terms of the resources and energy of the agency to date in relation to the matter of Wayne, that has been put into ensuring that he poses no further risk to children and young people in our schools.
Q. And not into identifying those who may have been involved in those pieces of misleading correspondence? A. You have asked --
Q. Is that fair?
A. You have asked a question as to where the energy and effort of the agency has been put to date, and I have made it clear that we have put that energy and effort into ensuring that children and young people are not at risk from Wayne. I'm not saying that moving forward we won't go off and do some other work in relation to this matter, but our priority must always be the safety of children and young people; the child and the young person needs to be at the centre of the work that we do, and whilst there may be matters that need to be investigated further in terms of the employees' actions, they are matters that we will deal with as secondary matters.
Q. And do you see them as unconnected to the safety of children? Investigating how a regulator was misled, you see that as unconnected to the safety of children?
A. I see that as a low risk to children and young people today given the processes that I have explained to you that we now have in place, which is that, when we are aware of allegations of child sex abuse we provide a letter, the
initial letter, regarding a potential breach to the Teachers Registration Board. We make it clear to people who are providing evidence that that information too shall be provided to the Teachers Registration Board. We provide the full investigation report and my determination to the Teachers Registration Board.

So, do I see a failing in 2007 to report as a major risk to children and young people today given the processes, procedures and information-sharing that we have in place? I don't.
Q. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. Mr Bullard, what year did Wayne cease teaching?
A. Wayne ceased teaching - I would need to check the date, Commissioner, but it was only once I re - oh, I informed him of the fresh allegations against him and of my determination to undertake a Code of Conduct investigation.

MS BENNETT: I think, Commissioner, the evidence will show that was 2018 when the matter was reported to the - but I'11 ask my learned instructor to confirm. The matter was reported to the Working with Vulnerable People register in of 2018 and I believe it was that process that triggered a shift in Wayne's status, but I'11 --

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Did you say 2018, Ms Bennett?
MS BENNETT: I'11 just check because I don't want to mislead the Commission. My notes say that's when - there also might be a distinction between working for the department and working as a teacher.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And I believe that Wayne went on to work for the department for some time but potentially not in a teaching role the entire period.

Perhaps I'11 ask my instructor to confirm that and we'11 return to it, yes.
Q. But it's not so historical when viewed in that way, is it, Mr Bullard?
A. Sorry, what was?
Q. It's not so historical when viewed in that sense, is it, that the matter lay where it was - no, I withdraw that, we'11 move on to the next case study?

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Before we do.
Q. Mr Bullard, we heard from Rachel yesterday. I just wanted to give you an opportunity now, though, to make any observations you choose to in relation to the unnamed children who were referred to in the email, including the child who made disclosures about Wayne and allegations of sexual misconduct who was forced to apologise to Wayne? A. Appalling. Absolutely appalling. It's very important that we create an environment where children and young people have agency and feel heard, and that's an absolute underpinning of our organisation now.

And what I believe is that any indication of an allegation that isn't believed sends a signal to all those other children and young people who may have issues of concern that it's not worth raising, but I also think it's very adult-centric to have required that child to apologise, because Wayne may have felt that his professional standing was in some way harmed by that allegation. So, it does disturb me that the outcome of raising an issue, whether it be, you know, through a formal channel or through a comment that's made, is that you have to apologise is of great concern.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thanks, Mr Bullard.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: I have one further question.
Q. I think you have indicated that you need to have systems that are not dependent on the personality of the Secretary?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that you have played - you have been very involved in ensuring child safety issues are taken seriously. I wondered if you wanted to make any comment on what will happen when the department expands in size and the challenges that that might present; you changed the culture in the context of education, you and your successors will have additional responsibilities. What are the sorts of systems you will need to ensure that those matters are
dealt with in the way that you're foreshadowing?
A. So, I will start with something that you've acknowledged has changed, or I hope it was an acknowledgment around the culture; that's where we absolutely need to start as we move into being the new agency of Education, Children and Young People, and that's the beginning focus of the work as we bring those two agencies together: who are we, what do we stand for, what are our expectations, what are the values that guide our decisions and behaviours? So that is the first layer which - that work is already underway.

To the fore of that, we need to bring those elements that sit within our culture, and I acknowledge that have only been amplified since 2021 in our new strategic plan which is ensuring that children are safe and heard, and ensuring that as a priority the safety and wellbeing of children sits front and centre.

The second element which is going to be really important because as we move into a new organisation there are potentially going to be competing policies, procedures and approaches, is that we quickly settle, where it relates to safeguarding children and young people, on our approach; by "our approach" I mean the approach of the new agency, and that we move very quickly to communicate that and set out our expectations in terms of the way that that is deployed, if you like, through the workforce.

That's a big task, I accept, but it is one that we recognise and it is one that we have resourced internally to ensure that we're doing that as expediently as possible

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Do you expect, with that quite enormous task from what you've described there, that you will be able to continue to lead in the way that you've described here, where you are able to go out to schools and talk about safeguarding in ways that embed, I guess, some of those principles that you want schools to run with? A. So, when you come to large tasks in large organisations you need to be deliberate about where you spend your time. And, I know from the work of the department that I could spend every day on the urgent and important, but I actually need to move into those areas that are strategic and provide leadership.

I'm very taken by the Child Safe Principles that have
leadership as number one because that is absolutely where you're going to set that tone and culture.

One of the things that as an executive we are actively considering is, how do we organise ourselves in taking on this new organisation to ensure that we provide that space and time. It's even more important to be out on the ground and providing the leadership, person-to-person, leader-to-leader that needs to occur. So, do I think that that's going to be easy? No. But am I committed to providing space for me to do that? Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you. Ms Bennett.
MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioners.
Q. I'm going to move to, the person you refer to as John, if you'd like to have a look at your pseudonym list.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is not a person about whom you were asked to prepare a statement and I'd like to put - as a matter about which I will have some discussions with the Teachers Registration Board this afternoon. I'd like to put a document to you that concerns John, in part, to assist Ms Kerri Collins who gave her evidence on Monday -A. Yes.
Q. -- to understand the sequence of events.
A. Yes.
Q. So, I understand this is not a period over which you have any involvement in the department, but I think it's important that we join these dots together. Could I show you a document of $\square$ 2004, it's TTRB.0004.0073.0624-0012, at pages 12 and 13.

Just to remind you, I'm sure I don't need to remind you, Ms Collins' evidence was that she suffered abuse at the hands of John when she was about 7 years old, disclosed at the age of about 11. Police decided not to take further steps then. The matter was then the subject of a trial in around 2001 or 2002; the trial never proceeded. John was committed for trial but the trial was discontinued at the request of the DPP.

So, shortly after the trial was discontinued this
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letter was written, five months after the trial was discontinued, this letter was written to the Teachers Registration Board by the Department of Education and I'm going to read it out for those who can't see it on the screen:

```
... [John] has endured the frustration of a
prolonged period of the matter being before
the courts, adjourned and ultimately
discharged in of this year. The
allegations were not sufficient to proceed
with any prosecution. In fact the
Department of Public Prosecutions did not
allow the charges laid by the Police to
proceed to trial.
To expedite John's return to teaching in
2005 he was advised by me in }2004\mathrm{ to
seek registration as a teacher. Some
five months later this is still to be
decided by the Board.
The delay, on top of the previous two years
of waiting, has had a dramatic impact on
his emotional health. He has been
supported in preparing for a return to the
classroom in 2005 and he has spoken
positively of the prospect.
If I ask the operator to go down, I'11 skip some
``` paragraphs:

The Department of Education has previously decided not to proceed with any internal investigation when John was advised to seek registration. Approve his registration or seek an investigation of the claims that have already been judged twice as insufficient against the standard of reasonable doubt.

It is not for me to tell you how to undertake your work, and I choose to do so only on this occasion because of the major negative impact the ongoing delay is having on one of our valued employees.

Now, can I pause there, and as I said I bring this up because I believe it to be critical to the piece of the puzzle for Ms Collins. Can I ask for your reflections on the appropriateness or otherwise or how you feel when you read that letter in light of Ms Collins' evidence to this Commission on Monday?
A. I think that letter is confronting, to be honest. So, is it appropriate to write and say, look, what are you doing with someone's registration? I would argue, yes, and there may be occasions when you just want to understand, are they going to be registered or not? I'd be interested to know how that came about because I note that the period of time, as I understand it and as you've said I have not made a statement on this, that there was some backwards and forwarding for a number of years before we got to this point, and I'm wondering if this is the first time that he's had to seek registration under the Act which came in in 2000.

There's absolute overreach there in providing your personal opinion about the fitness to teach or not. They almost acknowledge, whoever the author is, acknowledges that, "Oh, I shouldn't really be telling you how to do your job but, you know, we believe that this person's fit to teach."

I want to make an observation, and again, it is a change in practice: there seemed to be a view in the past that somehow you would look to external bodies as to whether or not someone was fit. So, oh, you've got your teachers registration, you've got your RWVP, the police have told us that they're not going to proceed, and therefore that's fine. I take no signal from any other decision-making body as to whether or not it's appropriate for me to proceed to investigate: that's a decision, I believe, I have to make myself.
Q. I understand that, and I just want to return to this letter for just one moment, I won't ask for it to be returned to the screen, but I'm just conscious of Ms Collins and her potentially watching this or reading the transcript, and I just want to give you a final opportunity to reflect. Can I suggest to you, it is an entirely inappropriate letter?
A. Yes, I agree.
Q. And it's not child-centric, it's not focused on
protecting children?
A. I agree.
Q. And Ms Collins would be entitled to feel entirely betrayed by that letter?
A. Absolutely, she would feel entirely betrayed.
Q. She should feel that?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. Are there any other reflections you'd like to offer on that letter conscious that Ms Collins may be watching?
A. So again, on behalf of the department I apologise that that letter was sent, and my overwhelming reflection on that letter, absent of the detail of it is, why was an adult put at the centre of the decision-making?

Again, I think coming back to your question, Commissioner, around the apology: why were we more concerned around an adult feeling uncomfortable or disgruntled or disenfranchised than we were around the child or young person who was involved? And that is a very, very clear example of the crux of the cultural change that we need to embed in every aspect of our organisation, and that is, that children have a right to feel safe and be heard.

And, whilst we have obligations to employees and we need to ensure that we're discharging those - I don't absent myself from workplace health and safety obligations and ensuring that people feel supported - but whilst those two are not mutually exclusively and we need to ensure that, wherever they come into conflict with one another, as they do from time to time, that we put the child first.
Q. As I said, we'11 be speaking with the Teachers Registration Board this afternoon, I suspect that their evidence will be that that letter was influential in John becoming registered and remaining registered for some time, and I take it that contributes to your sense of sadness and disappointment that that letter got sent?
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. Now, I'm conscious of the time and I'd just like to indicate how I propose to proceed. Tomorrow we will hear from Mr Leishman in the morning, so 1 will not now go to
that; that is a matter about which you have been asked to give a statement, and so, I will wait until after Mr Leishman has spoken at this Commission and I will ask you to give some reflections after that time and I won't do so now.

There are a couple of other case studies and I'd like to briefly go through them now and I won't take, you'll be relieved to hear, the kind of depth and time that I have taken on the earlier ones but I'd like to highlight some of the issues.

Can I ask you to refresh your memory about Jeremy, and perhaps you will accept from me or tell me if this is a fair summary, that the uncontroversial facts are that in about 2012 there were some reports of conduct by a teacher in relation to students which demonstrated what could be called poor boundaries and was otherwise inappropriate. Is that a fair high level summary about --
A. Yes.
Q. And I think there's been some evidence this week that you might have seen that gives us an insight into the importance of precursor behaviour, and I wonder, Mr Bullard, if you can reflect on that 2012 behaviour in light of that evidence?
A. Yes, I think it's a good example of the need to ensure that that evidence is somehow recorded, so a number of instances of behaviour that, whilst individually may be considered at sort of lower level touching, inappropriate comments, et cetera, only when combined show that there's a potential pattern of behaviour that may be of concern. So, looking back through the file, and obviously, and I imagine you will be getting to the more serious matter --
Q. Yes.
A. -- but looking back through the file you could see in retrospect, oh, there were some early indicators there that maybe we needed to have a watching brief on this person.
Q. And I think it's uncontroversial and you accept at about 132 of your statement concerning Jeremy that the allegations should have been referred to the Teachers Registration Board but were not?
A. That's correct. I'm just checking.
Q. That happened because the correct department, I think
at paragraph 133, you explained why that didn't happen.
And I think your explanation suggests that that was because - and I'11 just make sure I have it in a manner that's fair to you - that it should have gone to a different part of the department. How do you understand it, about why that didn't go to --
A. Are you referring me to 133 ?
Q. Yes?
A. Well, we didn't have, as I understand it, at that time a process whereby those matters needed to go to Workplace Relations, so again, we're back in the mosaic age of, let's make some decisions around how we might deal with this, is a conversation from a principal or a senior leader enough, do we need to go to Learning Services, Human Resources, or do I need to escalate it? So the issue that I've got there is, there's a judgment made on the ground about the seriousness or otherwise, and as you quite rightly pointed out, until such matters are investigated, how are you going to know?
Q. And so, at that stage there was no system that required the notification to proceed to Workplace Relations, and it was only Workplace Relations that knew to escalate it to the Teachers Registration Board?
A. Well, that's a sweeping statement and I think we were fortunate, and I know the Commission was fortunate enough to hear from Ms Carter. So, someone like Ms Carter in a school would be dealing with that and knowing Teachers Registration Board has to know. We can't replicate Ms Carter across - unfortunately - across the whole organisation, so that's why again I've said we've centralised a lot of these things so that we can tick off, if you like, the range of reports that we need to make.
Q. You're still dependent on the ground level, it coming up through the principal, the principal then referring; that's a common pathway, isn't it?
A. Coming up through the principal, and the principal then referring, but there is also an opportunity because we need to accept that some people might not feel comfortable with that, and I'm not saying that principals would necessarily be involved; there is the ability for any member of staff to ring Workplace Relations or Legal Services and to report that in.
Q. So then, as you correctly identified, that precursor
conduct was - never went anywhere, then in about 2015 there was an allegation that the same person had been seen putting his hand on a student's thigh and there are no records of that incident that you have been able to locate. Is that fair?
A. My understanding, and you will correct me if I'm wrong, is that that was a matter that came to light during a Supreme Court trial in relation to other matters which we will discuss.
Q. Yes.
A. So, my understanding is, and you're nodding so I'm taking that it's correct, that during the course of the trial there was some evidence led from other people in the school who made that disclosure but there is no record of that.
Q. That's right, so there were other people at the school who didn't make the disclosure at the time they observed at 2015?
A. And provided evidence at the trial, yes, that's correct.
Q. I guess that's the proposition I'm trying to tease out, is that, receiving the information from the people who observe it at the time can be down to luck sometimes? A. Well, it's down to training, isn't it?
Q. Yes.
A. So, acknowledged skills and capabilities in this area are front and centre. There are a number of aspects of that which I think we need to - I say "we" collectively here - turn our minds to, there is action and what I observe and whether I should be concerned about that or not, and we know that when we get into the areas of grooming that becomes highly complex, and then there's the weight that we should give to intent.

I believe that sometimes the intent aspect is given too much weight. "I see you do that, but I believe that you would have done that because you care, or that you were trying to help", and so, the training needs to provide really clear focus on both the types of actions or activities that are of concern, and also what weight do you give or impute around the intent that may or may not attach to those.
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Q. Going then to 2016, another student alleged that Jeremy took the student into a small storeroom, kissed her on the mouth, put his hand under her sweater inside her bra, touching her breast, grabbed her hand, put it on his penis, told her she must not tell anyone or he would go to gaol and have to kill himself, and after she left the he asked if she enjoyed the lesson. That report was made shortly after the occurrence and the teacher was sent home. The Teachers Registration Board was notified in three days and he was suspended as a teacher. Is that a fair summary of what happened there?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Do you accept there was an oversight by the department in failing to notifying the Integrity Commission, I think you say that at paragraph 207 of your statement?
A. In terms of how we would now proceed I think that that was an oversight, yes.
Q. He was charged in 2016, found not guilty in 2019 and from 2019 there was no barrier from that time to carrying out an investigation, was there? A. No, there was not.
Q. It took a little while to do that; what was the cause of the delay, Mr Bullard?
A. I sought advice on that because it was a matter of concern to me that really only came to light when I was preparing this statement. I am told that there was some interaction with the Solicitor-General around legalities; I don't have the information as to those legalities, but I absolutely concede that the time was not acceptable from the Supreme Court trial concluding and me actually starting an investigation, because I think that's an important thing to note. Whilst I had stood him down, I couldn't investigate whilst the police investigation and trial was underway. So, it was only once it had concluded that I was able then to proceed with an ED5 investigation. But I can't shed any more light, I'm sorry, about why - exactly what happened in that time except to concede that it was too long.
Q. Thank you. I think you say in your statement at about 208 that if information about the outcome of ED5 investigations is personal information, and that therefore you can't tell the complainant, the child about the outcome of that investigation --
A. That's correct.
Q. Do I understand that correctly?
A. That's correct.
Q. You'd accept that that's a pretty significant flaw in the system?
A. It is, and I think I may have said this in my evidence yesterday, of significant concern to me.
Q. Yes.
A. And I might reflect that that concern's only been compounded as we have gone through the review of matters, because as part of that we have gone to Tasmania Police and, where appropriate, ask that they contact adult complainant - people who are now adults, to see whether there's any further evidence that they wish to provide to us that may assist in our consideration of the matter. And in at least one of those that come to mind the impact of believing that the matter was never investigated or dealt with has only compounded the hurt and suffering of the initial complainant.

So, I accept that that is the statutory regime that Parliament has set. I have sought advice around a number of ways that we might be able to deal with that, wanting to provide at least some level of information, and I've been advised that I can't do that.
Q. And I think you refer, in 209 of your statement, to Solicitor-General advice, and you've set out there that the advice that you've received is that it would breach the Personal Information Privacy Act if any detail of the ED5 was revealed to the complainant. That's your understanding?
A. That's the advice that I have received, yes.
Q. We'11 return to this tomorrow, but you're obviously bound to accept Solicitor-General advice?
A. I am, yes.
Q. Can you seek a second opinion to put to the Solicitor-Genera1?
A. I cannot.
Q. So, even if you wanted to spend your own funds to engage a private member of counsel or firm to provide an
alternative view for the consideration of the Solicitor-General in performing that really important function, you are unable to do it?
A. I am unable to do it, and - look, maybe we can discuss this more.
Q. We will, we'll come back to the role of the Solicitor-General.
A. But it certainly needs to be framed in a Westminster system where the Attorney-General is the first law officer of the Crown and the Solicitor-General is the second law officer of the Crown, so it's under that auspice and framework that we come to a position where we are bound to accept that advice. For people in corporations or private business they might think that's odd, and certainly if you're in private business you might want to shop around for advice that suits, but we do not have that opportunity and it's a moot point as to whether that should be available.
Q. Would you like it to be available? Would you like to be able to get other advice?
A. You're asking someone who worked in the Office of the Solicitor-General for five years.
Q. Yes.
A. Certainly, with that - no, I wouldn't, and there's a reason for that, and that is that government has to have a clear position on matters of law until such time as a court overturns that. And so, what it does provide us with is guaranteed certainty to proceed on a path to frame our decisions in, and know with confidence that, until a court of law has overturned that position, that's what stands. And for the good operation of government, that certainty needs to stand: we can't have duelling pieces of advice. The administration of agencies regarding legal matters would grind to a halt.
Q. We'11 return to that tomorrow, if we may. Let's turn to the matter of Mark, if you have a look at you're pseudonym list. Do you know who I am referring to when I talk about Mark?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You've made a statement in relation to Mark, and at its core this is a matter that concerns potentially inappropriate correspondence on social media?
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A. Yes, it does.
Q. Your view, as I understand your statement is, the matter may not have been investigated appropriately at the time; is that a fair summary?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because key parts of the allegations could have been tested but were not?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And this was - there was no report of this investigation to Workplace Relations, so this is another example - I think 59(d) of your statement - another example here where there was no central record, no searchable record, for this to go to Workplace Relations?
A. No, that is correct. Just on the matter, and not, I suppose for full disclosure, I think there's a question on this one around whether it does constitute child sexual abuse.
Q. Yes.
A. Or simply a breach of a social media policy.
Q. Yes, and it's something that ought to have prompted a perhaps more fulsome investigation than happened; I think that's fair, isn't it?
A. Well, as you have set out, you end up with a piece of data which, if you then move into an investigation, might reveal other pieces of data. So, on its face one-off interaction with a student on social media --
Q. I think you'11 find it's more than one-off, but I accept that. It was not child sexual abuse on its face, I accept that and I think we can take that as part of this case study.
A. Yes.
Q. What I'd like to understand perhaps is that, it was because the Learning Services, the report made it to Learning Services and it was never reported back to Workplace Relations?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do I understand that that's part of the silo that you've been talking about?
A. It's not so much a silo; there are - so, for full - to
provide full information, there is a central HR that undertakes the payroll, recruitment and retaining staff, and there is a regional HR. So, local offices that have HR people in them that assist with day-to-day matters; if you can imagine the volume of transactions related to schools in terms of people coming on, going off, et cetera, they are great and someone needs to be at the frontiine to assist schools to do that.

In the past there have been determinations made around the seriousness of matters, and certainly in terms of regional HR, it may not be unusual for schools to go and seek advice about how to deal with a matter.
Q. And that's something I'd like to just explore briefly with you through the lens of . If you have a look at your pseudonym list you can see who I'm referring to when I refer to
A. No, I don't have anyone down there called
Q. I may have an old list, we did change the names at the last minute. I'm sorry, it's Brad.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, thank you. Now, there are allegations - I'11 be clear about these parts, this is not information that comes from Tasmania. There were allegations of sexual misconduct made against Brad in 2003 in New South Wales, interstate, that resulted in no disciplinary action. There was an investigation in 2006 that concerned Brad, again interstate, and there was a finding that he be subject to disciplinary action on the basis that he engaged in Reportable Conduct as understood in that scheme, and he was formally monitored for a period of six terms. Is that all reasonably fair?
A. That, again, my understanding of what happened in another jurisdiction is not great, but that - I accept your assertion as to those facts, yes.
Q. No, that's right. He came to Tasmania as a relief teacher and was engaged in 2012; is that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. None of that - now, this is not a defect I lay at the feet of the department, but none of that information followed him?
A. No.
Q. So, is it part of your practice now to ask recruits if they have previous investigations or findings?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it in 2012, do you know?
A. I don't believe - wel1, no, because that's something that we've introduced since I've been Secretary.
Q. Thank you. And you'd agree that coordinated information sharing between jurisdictions is a priority for this kind of work?
A. Yes, it is, and certainly in terms of the
communication of this type of information, between one TRB
or registration authority and another, it's very, very pertinent and important. And I note and I think I may have made a statement to the fact that there is some work underway to sharpen up that data sharing.

But I'd also like to bring to the Commission's attention the mutual recognition agreements that have been entered into nationally of which we have very significant concerns, because they will basically allow members who are registered in other jurisdictions to come and work here almost in a Free Trade sense that you can just move between states and registration here is worth registration there.
Q. And you lose the oversight in that system, don't you?
A. Well, the TRB loses the oversight. There is a high level of - it is very, very useful to have a local registrating body that teachers still have to go to once they arrive to say, "Here I am, and are you okay with me moving to this jurisdiction and teaching?"
Q. I'm going to summarise quite briefly the sequence of events that followed Brad from about 2018, and I won't be fulsome but I'11 try to be fair.
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me if \(I\) miss anything that you think is important. So, I'11 refer to these as school 1. Brad was reported to have displayed some inappropriate conduct by being too close to other staff, calling an autistic child "stupid", calling Aboriginal people "savages", and passing naked dolls around the classroom. Is that a fair summary? A. Yes.
Q. In school 2 in 2009 Brad was - so this is a different school, he's a relief teacher at all of these schools?

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Sorry which date, I thought you initially said 2018.

MS BENNETT: Yes, 2018 was school 1. Then, he's a relief teacher at school 2 in 2019, where he was alleged to have stared at female students for long periods of time, be in their personal space, put his hands on their shoulders while explaining work, and he was told by the principal to be careful with his actions around children. Is that fair? A. Yes.
Q. I think we know that around that time the principal was sufficiently concerned about Brad that she contacted a previous teacher, and that is reminiscent of Ms Carter's evidence about her practice to check in.
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd accept that's a reasonably ad hoc approach?
A. Very.
Q. And it needs to be systematised?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Brad then moved on to school 3, and again, I think it's common between us that none of these complaints followed Brad; is that fair?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And that at school 3 in \(\quad 2020\) Brad went on an orienteering trip with his students and was reported to have been overly familiar with some of the female students and called a Grade \(\square\) student "beautiful" and that again was reported to school 3 but it made nowhere towards any sort of a record capable of identifying a pattern; is that fair?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. That system just didn't exist as at February 2020.
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. School 4, again another school, later in 2020 the teacher's assistant at that school raised concerns about Brad's compliments to students and physical touching of students. A Grade \(\square\) student talked about how he had hit or
tapped her on the backside and placed his arms on her and told her she was beautiful. You will find this in new statement at about 131. That's 2020. Is that a fair summary of school 4 ?
A. M'hmm, yes.
Q. We can see there a reasonable example of the accumulation of conduct over the time, can't we?
A. Very concerning, yes.
Q. The sort of thing that a systemic approach would capture and allow to be reviewed and allowed to be red flagged?
A. Yes.
Q. And it wasn't in this system because no such system exists?
A. That's right.
Q. And even on the SSS system that does exist, that tracks only the students, not the teachers?
A. Yes, that's right, and one of the things through the case management platform that we want to develop is how these matters are recorded and escalated with the system dictating the way that they are then put up and dealt with.

So, absolutely accept here that the fact that you have a person working in multiple schools displaying behaviour which I would argue on some of that behaviour should have been escalated, but on other behaviour you'd think, well, that's a one-off and a bit odd but, you know, not going to report; it's only when you see that accumulated as a set of evidence that you are alerted, very alerted, to the fact that there is an issue that needs to be dealt with.
Q. As I've gone through it, you can see the trend escalating, can't you, from 2018 to 2020, it's gone from -A. Yes, the behaviour becomes, if you like, more overt.
Q. Yes. And the aim of the system that has children at its centre will be to prevent it becoming more overt and prevent it becoming more harmful?
A. Yes, and we need to be really careful that a child-centric system doesn't only acknowledge the behaviour toward a child; you could see that there might be a behaviour, not rely on the child, that it also needs to be able to flag, oh, there's five children with one employee
as much as it does to flag, there's one child who's subject to an employee; so there's a real opportunity there, I think, to be able to draw evidence together.

I think, can I just - to describe the complexity of what we're dealing with, it is again that fairness to an employee that they're not getting, you know, flags against them - which, to be honest, I think is secondary - with the confidence and ability to be storing, if you like, what might appear on the face to be minor matters of concern to allow a system and someone reviewing that to make judgments that there's an issue.
Q. And you heard about the evidence from South Australia that they've struck that balance very much in favour of the identification of trends and allowing that information to be identified and stored; did you hear that evidence? A. I didn't hear the evidence of South Australia, but on the basis of that evidence we agreed that we will be following up with South Australia to better understand how they do that because it's of great interest to us.
Q. Is there any barrier to the sharing of information of this kind between schools in the department?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And so, schools are free to say, "Brad was here and I've got a bad feeling about him"; there's no Privacy Act concerns about that?
A. No, not between schools at all. What I do think though is important, and again I'm talking a lot about reporting it in, is that it comes in at the time in the absence of the system being live, is that it's reported in centrally. I understand from the evidence that I've provided and putting that together, there was a misunderstanding about actions that we could take with relief teachers, which is removing them from the register or in fact flagging them on the register as having concerns. So, certainly on the basis of what happened here, we've made sure that people out in our Learning Services and schools understand that we can do that, and we've asked that they do come in and tell us so we can make a determination as to putting a flag against a person.
Q. So, as I understand it, concerns were raised along the way and, as you explain in paragraph 61(e) of your statement, that those concerns were raised with Learning

Services?
A. Yes.
Q. And Learning Services, you tell us was unaware at the time that there was an ability to remove an employee from the register?
A. Yes .
Q. And so, just to make clear what that means is, a relief teacher can be employed by any school provided they're on this register; is that right?
A. That's correct, so --
Q. And relief - I'm sorry.
A. I was just going to expand on that. So, in terms of, if you want to visualise it as a casual pool of employees, we can't just have people randomly going off and employing whoever they want because there are some preconditions to employment around, do you have your RWVP, are you a registered teacher, that need to be acquitted, as well as teachers wanting to record information about, I only work Wednesdays and Thursdays and I'd prefer to teach in science. So, the register is a compilation of all casual employee teachers and schools can only employ teachers who are on that register.
Q. So, while Brad remained on the register, he could be employed?
A. That's right.
Q. And Learning Services didn't know that they could take him off?
A. Yep.
Q. And so, they left him on?
A. Yes.
Q. And they would have taken him off had they realised?
A. Yes, they - well, they should have taken him off.
Q. They should have taken him off but they didn't know that they could?
A. That's right.
Q. And that's in 2020?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. How is it possible, Mr Bullard, that in 2020 such a fundamental aspect of Child Protection was not known by those in Learning Services?
A. I can't explain that, but it is of concern to me.
Q. It is a systemic failing, is it not?
A. In terms of people not knowing our controls that we needed to have around relief, yes.
Q. And, it is a systemic failing that has the potential to place children at risk?
A. Yes, absolutely, and again, coming back to the case management platform, in terms of the way that we've structured the information management systems across the department, our view was that they are not going to fix this; that just school A putting something in a file that other schools can see is not going to fix it. The case management platform, on the other hand, will provide a very easy way that schools can enter information of concern and that that will then go through a chain of decision making without schools having to take further action. So, in terms of what we see with Brad it is of considerable concern to me.
Q. Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Just in relation to the case management platform, can I just check - I'm always keenly interested in implementation. If I am a school social worker and I have observed behaviour that perhaps involved five different students, would I need to go to each student's individual record on the SSO to record the incident and record the incident on the new data platform? A. The new data platform will replace the SSS system as well.
Q. And, does that include the technical fixes around being able to, I guess, tag something in multiple files? A. Yes, absolutely. So, the case management platform actually started as a child-centric platform to replace the SSS system, which I think you've heard from our very experienced staff provides a number of barriers to being able to flag activity of concern, but running alongside that there's another component which will deal with this, if you like, Reportable Conduct and how it's escalated.

What we're trying to do is make it as easy as possible
for people to be doing their job but at the same time putting in flags where they think there are matters that need to be reported elsewhere, so we're trying to drive information sharing in a way that's the least burdensome it can be to people like social workers, psychologists and school leaders.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Q. Can I ask what the timing is for that system to be up and running?
A. So certainly my understanding is that at the moment the component regarding the reporting of conduct of concern that's flagged to employees is under testing, so it's in the test phase. And the SSS replacement is underway, but there is some testing and - that has gone on by people who has to use it on the ground which means there are parts that need to be revisited. One of them is that ability to tick a box to say, I'm concerned that this may relate to grooming or harmful sexual behaviours, et cetera, so that the data extraction out the back end doesn't rely, as it does at the moment, on keyword searching.
Q. I may have misunderstood you; I thought that you were saying that the case management system will ultimately replace the SSS system?
A. Yes, it will.
Q. But for a while they'll be operating side-by-side; is that right?
A. No, sorry, I wasn't clear. There's a number of components to the case management platform. So, one is the SSS. So, if we look at the, if we want to call it, reporting matters of concern component; that's being actively tested now. There's another module around SSS which is under development.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Sorry, I'm still interested in this. Is the intent that, when it's rolled out, it will be the complete system that includes the replacement of SSS. So, from day one it'11 be --
A. There will be - I will need to come back on the timing of that. There is a three-year work program for all different components, so this will be the platform that is going to service a whole lot of aspects of our business and tie the information together. I would need to come back on the timing of the, if you like, the issues of concern or
matters of concern component and the SSS component and when they're rolling out.
Q. I'd be interested to see that, so the multiple parts; I guess I'd like to ultimately know the timing for when an individual within a school could complete one record and it will serve the multiple purposes of being uploaded on a child's file, where it's relevant, and being flagged against a teacher's?
A. We can certainly provide information around the design and implementation of those components and provide a timeframe, yep.
Q. Thank you, that will be helpful, thank you?

MS BENNETT: Q. I wanted to clarify one final thing from your statement as it relates to Brad and that's at paragraph 69. I want to make sure I understand what you understand the limitations of the Personal Information Protection Act to be because you there say that:

It contains a general prohibition on the use or disclosure of personal information
for a purpose other than for the purpose
for which the information was collected.
You say in there "generally". Well, Brad was not an ED5 case?
A. Yes.
Q. But I understand you to be saying there that there are limits, because of that Act, on matters that you can disclose to the regulator and the Department of Justice who are administering the Working with Vulnerable People register. Do I understand your evidence correctly about that?
A. So, those limitations need to be read in terms of the requirements or powers of those bodies as well, and so, it's understanding the interrelationship of all of the legislation. The personal information protection, that should be, Act 2004 has a blanket disclosure, but then under the TRB Act and the RWVP there are requirements to provide some information.

If we move to the TRB Act, for example, we can provide information that pertains to the ED5 in its broader sense but we've been advised, I believe, that we can't provide
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witness statements or a full investigation file. Now, we overcome that by advising people at the opening that their statements may be used for other purposes and asking whether they want to say that they don't want that to happen.

But what I'm showing there is that there is some discomfort - and I'm using "discomfort" in a broadly legal sense - there's some discomfort between the inter-relationship; it's not very, very clear around how they'11 relate. On top of that, and in relation to - you might be coming to this, so I err - but in relation to Brad, there is an element of inter-agency communication that did not occur.
Q. Yes.
A. And again, there's Personal Information Protection Act requirements there as we move agency-to-agency. But also, I understand - and this is not my area of expertise - that the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act has certain requirements in it regarding the sharing of information.
Q. Can you tell the Commissioners, if you're - sorry. Is this something that needs to be stream1ined and simplified for your sake and the sake of other regulators?
A. Yes, please. So, there are a number of bodies that have either regulatory or decision-making functions that are receiving pieces of data, either around children who may be being impacted or actually around individuals who may be causing harm, and I think you can see on this matter that there are - there would have been different opportunities, had information been shared, to ascertain a pattern of behaviour that would have been of concern that would have allowed regulators to act more quickly.
Q. Can I just conclude by suggesting, I want to just identify, based on my review of your various statements, what I understand to be at least some of the deficiencies or areas of improvement that you've identified. And I just want to see if I understand correctly.

Firstly - I won't go through them all, and we take and accept and are grateful for the candour with which you have identified areas for improvement. We acknowledge that that is a comprehensive identification of areas for improvement, and I'd also like to identify that you have made
concessions around those matters or made those identifications without substantial prompting from us, and we see that as an appropriate engagement with the Commission.

You've identified some areas where the department needs to improve as including the ED5 process. There are some shortcomings around that process; is that fair? A. Yes.
Q. It's not best practice, it's not timely and it's fallen short in various respects of community standards and expectations; is that fair?
A. Yes, it is. And can I add that through the course of questioning yesterday there are other things that, through that process, we need to turn our minds to, particularly in relation to the gender balance of investigators and ensuring that the qualifications are correct. So, I'd also like to say that, out of yesterday's examination, that we've become aware of other things that we need to look at, too.
Q. Would you add to that list the coordinated approach to support for children and families who are making the allegations and complaints?
A. Yes, although that's something that I do want to assure the Commission that we've become a lot better at. So, I haven't had an opportunity through today's hearing to say - to assure the Commission that in our contemporary management student support are notified immediately of a child making an allegation of this nature and that social workers and psychologists are made available to support those children and young people, because I think it's really important that we understand that, before the machine ramps up to look at the Code of Conduct, that we're supporting the children and young people who have made disclosures.

And I also want to say that I believe that we can be better at that, and that we are moving now to employ case managers who oversee the coordination of that support to ensure that it occurs immediately but also ongoing into the future.
Q. You've identified a document, "Our Approach to Improvement - A Guide to Student Voice and Agency" as a recent improvement?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a document from this year; is that right?
A. I think it might be the end of last year.
Q. Early - last year?
A. Yes, that's right. Through my professional experience overseas, this is a particular area of interest to me because this is the area I worked in, which was child agency and youth voice, and the voice of children and young people. One observation that I'll make is that going out and saying to young people, "Please make disclosures if you feel uncomfortable," is not going to cut the mustard. You've actually got to empower young people and show that you're serious, and sometimes that might actually start with, "Let's have a discussion about what we're going to serve in the canteen or the configuration of the playground or how the timetable works or what your learning style is, because that builds the confidence and trust in adults in school environments that may well lead to a disclosure.
Q. I think you acknowledge as well that there is some work to do around mandatory report training of staff; is that fair?
A. Yes, that's fair. But in, I suppose, caveating that, recognising that we've got to actually come back to the why and build that culture of understanding.
Q. Yes.
A. We have had for a number of years a requirement, a, "You must undertake yearly with your staff a mandatory reporting training," and I believe in a majority of settings and a majority of years that's delivered. Do people understand why they're doing it? Do people understand all the other aspects of safeguarding children, or do they just think, "Now, I know there's a phone number for me to ring if I'm concerned"?
Q. How do you check if they're doing it?
A. In previous years we have done surveys and we've actually asked, "You're required to do this; have you done it?"
Q. So, do teachers have to certify they've carried out their mandatory reporting training?
A. Principals have to, and for the past couple of years have not been, but at points in times principals are asked
to certify, "I have delivered these things that are requirements of the department." When we move into an on1ine training environment we will be able to see, not just schools, but down to every individual that has or hasn't been through that. And this was a model that we used around COVID. So, COVID did provide some benefits. One was, how do we set up an online training module around COVID-safe behaviours that at the end of you need to answer a series of questions, and then in the back of the database every manager can see who has or who hasn't successfully answered those things?
Q. You heard there was some evidence from Ms Collins, Ms Drake and Ms Carter --
A. Yes.
Q. -- all emphasising the need for greater support from social workers or Allied Health. Can you tell the Commissioners about whether there are any plans towards improvement in that direction?
A. So, the first thing I'll say is there has already been a significant increase in social workers and psychologists into the system, not as an excuse but just as an observation that it's been a commitment since 2014 that we need more of these people, and yes, we're in active discussions around how we may be able to obtain more through the budget process. I think that the necessity for support, not only in child safeguarding but more broadly, the lives of children are more complex than they've ever been and supporting them to ensure that they're in a state where they're happy and well and engaged in learning is requiring significant skill and investment.

The other side though that I will say - and I keep coming back to this - is that certainly at the moment there may be a perception in our system that that's where the accountability and responsibility lies for keeping children safe, and we need to build that universal level of understanding. And not saying that every teacher is a skilled social worker, but every teacher understands the importance of child safeguarding, understands what our expectations are, knows how to deal with a report and where to refer it.

So, we've got 10,500 people in our system. Each and every one of them knowing what part they play and how to respond, I believe will make a difference.

MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioners, those are the questions --

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes, sorry. I have some follow-up questions to that. There were some issues raised in Ms Collins statement, which you will have read, about the structure of social work, the status of social workers, their pay, all of the issues which may arguably stand in the way of recruiting good people to those positions. A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any comments to make on that or is that an area which is going to be the subject of a budget submission?
A. Well, Ms Collins has as one of our senior and most experienced social workers been working with Learning Services around some of those ideas, and not since she revealed that in the Commission. My understanding is, a number of those ideas are around residents, you know, residents for social workers, social workers on the West Coast, how do we support their transport are actively being discussed and I think some have been taken up.

So, we need to make the jobs in Tasmania much more appealing to those people that we wish to recruit, and we need to accept that we're a small state but we're actually very regionally dispersed and quite remote, and so, we've got to be clever in how we do that.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS BENNETT: Commissioners, I had no further questions for Mr Bullard today. The only other matter I was going to identify: My learned instructor noted that our records indicate that Wayne resigned on - well, was teaching until this year.
A. Yes, and --
Q. Last year, sorry.
A. Last year. He has resigned.
Q. Yes.
A. I just want to assure the Commission, we've continued with the investigation of Wayne.

MS BENNETT: Yes, thank you. Commissioners, those were
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the matters, unless there's anything further?
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Bennett. Any questions?
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. I just wanted to check in, and it came up yesterday in your evidence; in relation to ED5, is it your view that there should be a more customised approach rather than a one-size-fits-all for the types of complaints you get?
A. Yes, that is my view. I understand, having gone back and looked at the State Service Act last night, that there may be an opportunity in section 10 to do that. I think that there is a recognition in, might be 4 - 10(4), that in the employer, which is in this case is the Premier, making Employment Directions there can be different treatments of different matters.

My point yesterday was at the moment the ED treats everything at the same level, and my observation was that in previous iterations in CD5, I think the 2002 version, there were a number of pathways that could be taken. I think that would bring about expediency in dealing with some of the matters, yes.
Q. Do you believe that that would - I certainly accept the expediency argument, but do you also believe there would be an opportunity within that to create a more specialised response to those allegations that involve any potential harms to children?
A. Absolutely, and I would be a strong advocate for more centralised management and decision-making around matters of this importance but also where the impact is this great, and I think I reflected that the State Service Commissioner, when that role existed, did have a role; and, refreshing my memory, in matters that could lead to termination, which these invariably are, that it was most appropriate that they were managed centrally by someone who was, if you like, one step removed from the Head of Agency but also had experience and resources to undertake that. And my personal view is I would be very, very supportive of that.
Q. Do I take that to mean that you would be supportive of these matters being dealt with under the responsibility of the Head of State Service? Have I got the structure right? A. As it exists now, that would be the head of the State Service. And what occurred, and I couldn't tell you
the year - it's certainly since I've been back in the service - is that the State Service Act was amended to remove the role of State Service Commissioner and many powers were then handed to the head of the State Service to deal with. I think there's a question about whether it sits there or whether there is a separate role that's established to do it. And that would be a matter, really, for the Commission to consider.
Q. Are you hampered by the fact that these are considered under Employment Directions rather than under a safety investigation?
A. I don't believe we are hampered, but it is not explicit. Does that make sense? So, it doesn't get in the way of people that want to do it in a way that is child-focused and Child Safe, but it doesn't also amplify that as being a - it doesn't provide the guidance around the pathway that should take.
Q. It allows for individual digression as to whether they - you decide to be child-focused in the way you undertake these; is that what you're saying?
A. Yes, it does have a clause in the ED around interviewing children and the way that you come to that, but it doesn't set out a guidance that puts you into a train of process, where it involves a child, that sets out best practice around how each of those elements should be dealt with. So it really is up to the individual decision-maker or Head of Agency about how they equip their responsibilities.
Q. So at present across the State of Tasmania we rely on heads of agencies deciding to be child-focused?
A. Yes, that's absolutely correct. Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: That's al1 I had. Thank you, Mr Bullard.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: No, I have no further questions.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you very much indeed, Mr Bullard. We'll see you again tomorrow.

And can I just remind everybody that there is an order in place which, I reminded people of at the beginning this morning, requires that anyone who watches or reads the evidence given by Mr Bullard not to share any information
which may identify the people who were referred to as "Brad, Jeremy, John, Justin, Mark and Wayne", and that there's also an order in place relating to the sharing of the information which may identify any school, and a copy of that order is outside the hearing room and is available to anyone who needs a copy.

\section*{LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT}

MS BENNETT: Commissioners, the next witness is Ms Ann Deborah Moxham, the registrar of the Teachers Registration Board of Tasmania. If I could ask that she be sworn in, or perhaps before we do that we might --

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes, I've got to make a restricted publication order.

So, the Commission will make a restricted publication order in relation to the evidence of the next witness in order to avoid identifying particular schools and other relevant people. In the context of the scope of this inquiry, the Commission makes this order because it is satisfied that the public interest in the reporting on the identities of certain people who may be discussed during this hearing, as well as the identity of any particular schools, is outweighed by other considerations, namely, the potential impact of the evidence on the wellbeing of the relevant school communities and relevant privacy considerations.

The order requires that anyone who watches or reads the evidence given by the next witness to the Commission must not share any information which may identify the people who will be referred to as "Brad, Jeremy, John, Justin, Mark and Wayne".

In addition, the order also requires that anyone who watches or reads the information must not share any information which may identify any school which may be referred to during the evidence unless the Commission advises otherwise. I make the order which will now be published. A copy of the order will be placed outside the hearing room and is available to anyone who needs a copy. Thank you.
<ANN DEBORAH MOXHAM, affirmed:
[2.07pm]
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\section*{<EXAMINATION BY MS BENNETT:}

MS BENNETT: Q. Would you tell the Commissioners your full name and professional address?
A. Ann Deborah Moxham, and the address is 213A Cambridge Road, Warrane.
Q. Thank you, Ms Moxham. You are the registrar of the Teachers Registration Board of Tasmania; is that right? A. That's correct.
Q. Can you tell us about how you came to have that role and your previous roles?
A. Okay. So, I first joined the Teachers Registration Board in April 2018 as the manager of Professional Standards and Initial Teacher Education accreditation. In 2019, I undertook some work as an acting registrar when the then-registrar was on long service leave, and in 2020 when she went on leave for sickness and various other reasons, I again became the acting registrar until November when I was appointed on a fixed term basis and then again appointed on a fixed term basis, which you might find odd, but the reason for this ongoing process of appointment is because of the review of education regulation. And the idea is that the current registrar role will be subsumed into The Education Director role and a new type of role will exist within the board to run the office.
Q. I see. So, after those reforms are completed, can you tell the Commissioners where you understand your role will sit?
A. I'll either revert to the Manager of Professional Standards role that I was originally appointed to, because that's my substantive position; or in the alternative I may apply for and I may be successful in gaining whatever the new role is going to be called, with whatever its new functions will be, because the actual registrar role or the Executive Officer role as described in the Act will become part of the Director of Education Regulation position, as I understand it.
Q. And that will sit within the Department of Education or in a new department?
A. No. It will sit, as I understand it, reporting to each of the three boards for the regulators.
Q. At present - so we'll talk today about the way things
are now and the way that they have been in the past, and I'd like to talk to you about how things have changed and where they need to change. We'11 do that on the basis of the Act as it exists today, not on the basis of what those reforms might look like. Is that okay with you?
A. Yes. I'll just say that the bulk of our Act isn't being reformed; there's lots of things we'd like reformed, but they're not being fixed this time round.
Q. I'm very keen for to identify what you think needs to be reformed, and so we'll come to that in a moment.

I just want to step back and identify, is it fair to say that the role of the Teachers Registration Board, speaking as a corporate entity, is to prevent, identify, report on and respond to - sorry, let me go back. Its role is to regulate teachers in Tasmania?
A. Correct.
Q. How do you understand, in a summary form, what are you regulating for?
A. The welfare and best interests of students.
Q. That's your paramount --
A. That's our absolute paramount provision in the Act.
Q. And so, you do that by trying to make sure that teachers who gain registration through you are fit and proper?
A. They're of good character, fit to teach, properly qualified; that's correct, yes.
Q. And so, let's just pause there. Are those three tools, are they sufficient for you to capture what you think you need to, to make sure the best interests of children are protected?
A. Theoretically, yes. But some of the provisions within the Act limit our capacity to gain the information we need and, furthermore, to actually apply the sanctions that are a part of our Act.
Q. I'm not going to hold you back anymore from telling us what they are; what is it that's stopping you from getting the information that you need, Ms Moxham?
A. Primarily, it's the fact that the Personal Information Protection Act is interpreted narrowly by other bodies from whom we would expect to get prima facie evidence. The Act
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itself allows us to receive from employers section 31 notifications which tell us that they've undertaken a disciplinary proceeding, but they don't have to provide us with the evidence that they've accumulated in undertaking that disciplinary proceeding, and they very often don't. That's changed recently for one of the employer groups, but it's not the case for the Department of Education.
Q. So, let's start with the Department of Education, given the focus of this week, and the focus of your office indeed. What's your experience of the provision of information from the Department of Education through to the Teachers Registration Board?
A. It's patchy. It sometimes depends upon individuals communicating with individuals in my office, but primarily the information that comes to us, because I believe and understand there was Solicitor-General advice to the Department of Education that said that they cannot provide to us information they've collected in the course of their enquiries or determinations. And so, it means that we will get to know what the allegations were and what the decision of an ED5, for example, was. But we don't get the actual information we need to delve into, and so we have to carry out our own investigation. And my concern for young people is that sometimes that requires re-interviewing children.
Q. So, you can't get access to the records of interview that children have given to the Department of Education as part of the --
A. Not in all cases. In fact, in most cases, no.
Q. And is that true as we sit here today?
A. That is true as we sit here today. In fact, we've had - in my time in the registrar's role, we've had a meeting to try and overcome some of these issues. One of the things that came out of that is that pre-employment checks are now done at the Department of Education, but the things we wanted around getting the information haven't come to pass.
Q. Let's return to that in a moment, but let me come back to the investigation. Do I understand correctly that so far as you understand your role, if the Department of Education carries out an investigation - let's just say something happens on 1 January 2020, it is investigated by the department and they conclude their investigation by 30 June 2020; at what point do you get notified that
there's an issue?
A. Well, the Act says that it has to be notified to us within 28 days, and generally speaking that will be complied with. But it's not always the case.
Q. Within 28 days of?
A. Of the investigation being concluded and they've got something to tell us about.
Q. So, if an allegation is made of child sexual abuse on 1 January, you don't need to hear about it until 28 July; is that fair? Assuming that the investigation concludes on 30 June?
A. That could be the case. Very often they're more happy these days to alert us earlier than that.
Q. But so far as - and I'm just trying to understand systemically. I'm not asking at the moment about what the practice is; I'm just trying to understand what the system is there's no requirement for you to be notified of the allegation but you often are; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the obligation to notify you kicks in at the conclusion of the investigation; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then they get 28 days to notify you?
A. Yes, that's what the Act says.
Q. And often it's done quicker than that?
A. Sometimes it's done quicker than that.
Q. Sometimes it's done slower than that, I'm going to suggest?
A. I believe so, although those notifications don't come to my personal attention; they go to the officers of the board who deal with conduct matters. And they complain about the slowness, so ...
Q. So when you are then told of the outcome of the investigation, you are told whether the investigation has been substantiated? What are you told about the investigation outcome?
A. Generally speaking, if we're notified about an investigation after it's concluded, we'll be told what the conclusion was that was drawn by the investigation done by
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the department.
Q. So, you will know the allegations and the conclusion? A. Yes.
Q. But you won't know the evidence that sits between those two propositions?
A. Maybe some overview statements in some cases, but definitely not the prima facie evidence.
Q. Is it fair to say that, as you understand it, the purposes of the department's processes are to determine, generally, there's been a Code of Conduct breach; your processes are directed towards determining if the person is fit to teach, those three limbs that you gave to us earlier?
A. Good character and fit to teach.
Q. Those are prospective matters; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And they will often be informed by the past conduct of that individual?
A. Well, I have to say that our Act entitles us to look at conduct more broadly than in the employment workplace.
Q. Yes.
A. So we will look at matters relating to a whole raft of things that are not taken into account in an ED5, for example, which is only about workplace behaviour.
Q. Yes. It seems to me, Ms Moxham, that it's matter of concern to you that you're not getting the investigation materials; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Can you tell the Commissioners why that's matter of concern to you?
A. Well, because there's several reasons: one of the key ones for us is that we don't wish to unnecessarily impact people who have already been potentially through trauma, so we don't really want to be in a position where we are interviewing children, young people, who have been through difficult circumstances.

Then, in addition to that, it's the fact that we have a very small office with very little in terms of
resourcing, and we have to go out and re-investigate the entire matter from the beginning, and that can take a very long time.
Q. And you're investigating, aren't you, from later in time. And so, is it fair that as a general proposition the quality of the evidence might not be --
A. Yes, I'm sorry, I should have included that.
Q. Don't apologise. No, that's okay. Is that one of your concerns as well?
A. Definitely.
Q. The quality of the evidence might have degraded, given the effluxion of time?
A. Definitely the case.
Q. And that concerns you in terms of being able to properly fulfil your functions?
A. Indeed, it does.
Q. And your primary concern in doing that is the best interests of students?
A. That is correct, and their welfare.
Q. You regulate around, if I look at table 1 of your statement at paragraph 3.1 on page 3 , it seems to have varied between about 11,500 and just over 12,000 teachers in Tasmania; is that fair?
A. That is correct.
Q. What's your full-time equivalent staff to do that?
A. Right at this moment?
Q. As we sit here today?
A. I have to look at that.
Q. No, no. I think it is --
A. Sorry, we have about 15 people in the office but they're not all on full-time salaries, so --
Q. If I could direct you to page 7 of your statement, it says:

During 2018 the TRB office operated an overall FTE staffing of 12.8. There were on average 14 persons employed with
part-time loads.
And then I think it goes slightly up from there following at 2020, 14 persons employed with a part-time load, meaning 12.8 FTE. Let's call it 12 to 15 ; is that fair?
A. Yeah, so definitely not 15 . It would be somewhere between 12 and 13.5 , something like that.
Q. And that includes your administrative support right up to your role as the registrar itself?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And is it fair to say that that's not a level of staffing that's capable of carrying out a lot of investigations independently?
A. Well, I should make clear that that total staffing only includes two investigators, a person who deals initially with applications, and so does the initial looking at good character and fitness to teach based on the national criminal history checks and on the declarations made by the individuals, and may take on some of those matters if they're relatively straightforward. The other two, the investigators, take on all the big investigations; they are both full-time.

The other person that works in our conduct team is largely there to undertake Right to Information requests recently and also to do trends reports for heads of agency to help them understand the sorts of things that are going wrong in the teaching profession across Tasmania, and address them, and in addition to that reports to the board and also to sort out which matters are going to be handled by which investigators. So, the team there is four people and at the moment it's 3.9 and one of those people isn't really trained; we've had to - we were unable to get someone to replace a maternity leave position, and so we've promoted a band 4 clerk, basically, into that role. She's doing a great job.
Q. Under what sounds like difficult circumstances; is that fair?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You said before that your understanding, and you can't speak for the Department of Education, but they tell you they can't provide you with this investigation material
because of legal advice they've received?
A. Correct.
Q. What about your power to share information? Are you similarly constrained if you have concerns?
A. We're able to share information with all other regulatory bodies around Australia. We are able to share certain types of information in accordance with different sections of the Act, and it's quite partitioned, so please excuse me if I don't actually give you the sections that go with which bits, but we are certainly able to provide information to employers. We're able to provide information to individuals who seek that information, but it is fairly limited in terms of, for example, a member of the public can ask for the board's minutes. However, under Right to Information, which we've really only had in the time that I've been at the TRB. So, to the best of my knowledge and belief we've only had three RTI requests in the last two years, so that information can be requested.

We provide information to the Department of Justice for RWVP purposes, but we don't get anything back when we ask for anything, and we provide information to Child \& Family Services - or that's probably not their name now but we don't get anything back from them either.
Q. Just to pause, when you say you don't get anything back, let's go back to Justice and the Working With the Vulnerable People register. So, if somebody reports something to that agency for the purposes of considering their vulnerable person registration, do you receive notification from Justice about that?
A. We receive a written notification if they are taking action, so if they're going to suspend or they're going to remove their RWVP. We don't receive in that notification any information about why.
Q. And so you then have to initiate your own investigation into that person to determine --
A. Well, because we've now got section 17BA, as soon as they suspend we can suspend.
Q. You suspend on the basis of that suspension? It's automatic; it comes across?
A. Well, it's not quite automatic because the Act says "the board may" instead of "the board will", and so we've had to send some of these to the board initially, so that
we'11 be in a position to now say, "These are the conditions under which the board just simply says that it requires it to happen." So, I think the drafting of the Act was a little astray in that section.
Q. And so, those were some recent amendments, I think, that allowed that to happen?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you remember roughly when those amendments went through?
A. I think they went through in 2019.
Q. So, you're not notified about any notifications to that agency which are dismissed?
A. No.
Q. And what about through the ARL? Do you get notifications through the Advice \& Referral Line --
A. No.
Q. -- of any concerns about any individuals?
A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
Q. So the sources of information for you are from the public?
A. Yes.
Q. People can make complaints to you directly?
A. Yes.
Q. From the Department of Education?
A. And other employers, yes.
Q. And other employers. So any school?
A. Yes, that's correct. In fact, they're required to under certain situations.
Q. But you don't have other integrity bodies providing referrals to you?
A. TAS Police.
Q. TAS Police do?
A. TAS Police do, but we would like that to happen every night instead of once a month. So, for example, in Victoria they have a system where their register is updated every night so that all the information from police in
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Victoria updates on a daily basis instead of a monthly basis, which is our situation.
Q. So, police get a report about a person who, on the weekend, so outside entirely, has been involved in a violent incident --
A. Correct.
Q. -- or an incident of sexual abuse?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's say that comes in on 1 January; your notification will come to the Teachers Registration Board on 30 January?
A. It may slightly different, because it's actually related to the cycle, so yes.
Q. Yes. So, it won't be more than 30 days; it could be two days if you're lucky?
A. Yes.
Q. We've had some evidence that these are matters that ought not be left to luck, but it seems to me that is a matter of --
A. A lot of luck.
Q. Really? In what other respect is the regulation of teachers in Tasmania left to luck?
A. We11, a number of our co-regulators in other states and territories are required also to notify other regulators, but some are not. And in other - and sometimes they are actually unable to do so about certain matters because their Acts are different from ours.

In addition to that, in New South Wales the largest employer of teachers in the country, NESA - sorry, I can't think of what the acronym stands for, but NESA is sort of an equivalent to us. They're an accrediting body; they're not truly a regulator or a registering body, if you see what I mean. They do not conduct enquiries and disciplinary processes; employers do that in New South Wales. And so, if a teacher comes here and they've been under a disciplinary process in New South Wales, we would have to ask that teacher for their permission to go and get the information from their employer. We can't just get it from the regulator.
Q. Can you decline to register them until they give you that permission?
A. No, because the Mutual Recognition Act requires us if we can't get the information within 30 days, requires we run out of time. We're required to register them.
Q. Does that cause you some concern?
A. Yes, it does. And the Automatic Mutual Recognition Act will make that worse.
Q. Can you tell the Commissioners why that will make that worse?
A. Well, there's several reasons: the first of those is that I'm awaiting to find out whether Treasury and Finance in Tasmania are going to give us a notification capability, which would mean that anyone intending to come and work in Tasmania would have to notify us that they were intending to come here. If that doesn't happen when we take on the Act, then we won't know they're even in the state but they'11 be deemed under the Mutual Recognition Act to be on our register, even though we don't know they're here. That will create a lot of problems for employers and obviously, if we don't know they're here, we won't know we need to carry out any kind of disciplinary processes.

Then, secondly - I think I've lost track - oh, secondly, the automatic mutual recognition is the case that once they are here and working here they, as I said, they're deemed to be on our register, in other words, they're registered teachers in Tasmania. And the only thing that protects Tasmanians is that they will have to get RWVP, so we won't be able to carry out our good character and fitness to teach test, which is broader, much broader than the RWVP.
Q. Much broader in terms of things you can take into account?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And also more specific on the other side that you can take into account for people's fitness to teach?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Which could be a health matter in terms of mental health, which is very much an increasing area of risk, or it could indeed be fitness to teach in terms of
qualifications and all of that.
Q. So, those are issues that you foresee and are concerned about under mutual recognition in the future? A. Yes.
Q. As we sit here today, there appear to be additional gaps, or gaps that concern people transferring from interstate; is that right?
A. That's already an issue both for interstate and from New Zealand, because there's also a Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Act, and so there are risks in terms of both from other states and territories and also from New Zealand.
Q. So, if someone comes to Tasmania from Victoria, I take it a not unusual happenstance --
A. No.
Q. -- and they want to work as a relief teacher in the Tasmanian system; what checks do they have to go through as far as you're concerned?
A. So, we need to check that they actually are registered in Victoria. And if they are registered in Victoria and the information they've provided us about their name, address, birth date, all of that sort of thing checks out, then they become "deemed". And we need to do that within seven days, and then we have a further 30 days in which to check on other things that we might have concerns about as a result of our initial checks.
Q. And any disciplinary actions that have been taken by the Victorian Regulator, are they visible to you?
A. Not necessarily. Victoria does display disciplinary matters on their website, but they don't name people, of course. We do have very good relationships with other regulators, and we can contact them and ask them about issues. We do get information about conditions that are on people's registration, and that can trigger our interest in what might be behind those conditions.

We have up until recently been carrying out international criminal history checks, but under the Mutual Recognition Act we're actually not entitled to do that, so we're ceasing doing that.
Q. All right.
A. But that was the Andriotis case.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Can I just check: You talked about TasPol provides you information?
A. Yes.
Q. But Child Protection don't provide you information?
A. That's correct; they don't provide us with information.
Q. So you could potentially have a report go through to the ARL about concerns about a teacher in their parenting capacity that maybe doesn't reach the criminal threshold, not reported to TasPol; you wouldn't know about that? A. That's correct, unless the teacher did the right thing and declared the matter on their declarations when they were undertaking either registration or renewal. And those things, if you hold provisional registration you need to re-apply for registration every five years; if you hold full registration, you apply for renewal every five years. So we really only get a chance to look into you carefully every five years. And in the alternative, if you fail to pay your registration on time, which is by 31 December, you then have to re-apply, and so we again get a chance to have a look at that time.

In addition, if you're moving from provisional to full registration, we get a chance to get you to do declarations and have a look at you in terms of Tasmania Police at that time as well.

MS BENNETT: What you get to have - sorry, Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: No, I was saying thank you.
MS BENNETT: Q. What you get to have a look at is what your four staff have time to have a look at, don't they? A. Well, yes. But they're very thorough, and so the issue is that we get rather large backlogs of matters, which is in itself a huge risk.
Q. Yes. I think I've made the point a number of times that your primary concern is for the welfare of children, but you'd accept, wouldn't you, Ms Moxham, that child sexual abuse is one of the most significant risks presented for which you regulate?
A. Definitely. Very concerning.
Q. And it goes without saying that people who present risk of child sexual abuse are not fit to teach?
A. They're not of good character, for sure.
Q. Yes.
A. And yes, you're right, the line between good character and fit to teach is grey.
Q. On either limb, this is a cohort of people that you're trying to weed out; is that correct?
A. Correct. Yes, that's right.
Q. And it sounds to me as though you're being hampered in that effort by information flow; is that right?
A. That is right.
Q. From both inside Tasmania and nationally; is that fair?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You're being hampered by a lack of funding and personnel to actually carry out proactive regulation; is that fair?
A. Yes, I think that's true. I think the addition to that is that we started out much smaller than we are now. And in fact, we've only had two investigators and the other two people in our office that I mentioned for the last, approximately, three years; before that we have had a situation where there was one point - it varied - people working in this area when the office was a lot smaller. And so, yes, there's been a great deal of under-resourcing, which has meant that a lot of the policy procedure and process work and the leveraging of our technological solutions is lagging behind other parts of our office, primarily the registration part of our office, for our Professional Conduct Team. And I've actually engaged an office - a person to work on a policy project that includes those preparations for our new customer records management system.
Q. Just to pause there, while we're talking about personne1, you talk at pages 6 to 7 of your statement about your funding structure. Am I right to understand that the bulk - the substantial bulk of your funding comes from teacher registration fees; is that fair?
A. Yes, up until 2017 it was all from teacher
registration fees unless we got some small grants from AITSL and the like.
Q. And at about 2017 you started getting some revenue from government?
A. That's correct.
Q. So until then you had teacher registration fees of about \(\$ 1.3\) million from which to run your operations?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you started getting revenue from government of about \$150,000 in 2017; is that right? It's not a memory test; it's at page 6 of your statement.
A. So we - that's not the funding that I'm really talking about.
Q. Sorry, tell me what's the funding that you're talking about?
A. So we got \(\$ 600,000\) during the period that they thought it would take to undertake their review of education regulation. But also in relation to some solicitors advice, our board had taken some considerable trouble to put together a paper to say that all teacher registration fees needed to go up significantly, which the Department of Education rejected - and I can understand why - and said, "Instead, let's have a look at the functions and powers of the board and see which ones are most properly registration and which are 'other'."

And so, professional conduct, the area we're talking about here today, was deemed to be outside of the central role of registration. And so, 5.14 FTE of staff were deemed to be part of the registration functions or the functions of the Teachers Registration Board that government should pay for. And so, there's kind of a duality around why we got that money. And it's indexed, so it goes up each year. But we don't know whether it's going to continue to be that amount or something different after the review of education regulations are finalised.
Q. And then you can see that that tracks through on pages 6 and 7 with increases over time, but fairly closely pegged to that general formula; is that right?
A. Yes, and we have had a special project grant for highly accomplished and lead teacher pilot that's being operated in the state, so that's been an additional amount
of money.
Q. I want to understand a little bit more about some of the information that you receive. At any given moment, can you tell where a particular teacher is teaching?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. So, John - poor Johns - but John Smith, you can't tell where he is teaching on any given day?
A. I couldn't be certain that I knew where he was, no.
Q. And, why is that? Is a teacher's registration not tied to a particular school?
A. No, that's right. So, we're not required under the Act to collect that information. Teachers are not required under the Act to update us whenever they change schools, only if they change address and they don't even always do that, and there's some limitations with our Act about actually pursuing them over those matters. But the school that they're teaching in is not a requirement.

We do - we've created a workaround, which is a Watched Registrations list that we have created for the employer. But it's only as good as the employer keeping it up-to-date, so on any given day you couldn't be certain that the information you hold is accurate.
Q. So, if a teacher is moving around a lot, is that something that, in an ideal world, could trigger your interest and investigation?
A. If we were aware of it, yes.
Q. You don't have a way of being aware of it necessarily?
A. No. I mean, obviously at times we get to know that people are relief teachers, and sometimes we even have Learning Services, for example, contact us and say that schools have been talking about that person, and that would trigger our interest in why they don't want them to come back to their school.
Q. And you get those informal, it sounds like, communications?
A. So, just telephone calls usually. Not to me, to the offices.
Q. And what does that trigger at your office?
A. Generally, trying to find out if there's information
in other sectors or information from other schools within the Department of Education that would alert us to the need to, at the board's own motion, undertake an enquiry. That can be very difficult though, because for the board to do that, they need a certain amount of original evidence for them to understand exactly what's going on.
Q. And are there additional barriers to knowing where relief teachers are and how long they're teaching in a particular place?
A. It's almost impossible. It's pretty scary, isn't it?
Q. Well, it is. What's happening in response to what you're describing as "scary"?
A. How do you mean?
Q. What do you want - well, is there a move to - how is this being fixed? Is it being fixed?
A. Well, I don't see that it's being fixed other than, as I say, some schools, one of the sectors, and some individuals who have good connections with our staff, those people will contact us - and you would call it an ad hoc basis, but they will contact us and say, "We've had these things take place", and that will start to form a picture. But, as I say, our own technological solutions that would help us to track that more efficiently, because of lack of funds I guess - I couldn't say for certain 'cos some of this predates my time even at the TRB, let alone in the Registrar's Office, some of those systems aren't allowing us to actually put together - you know, draw the dots together in the way that you might like to. We are getting a new customer records management system, but it's only just going to tender now.
Q. When do you expect that tender to be completed?
A. Well, we are hopeful that it would be within the next 12 months, but we have to follow all the normal government processes and Treasurer's instructions.
Q. Ms Moxham, I have an impression, and I'd like to see if you share it: it seems to me that there is a lack of urgency around fixing the issues that you've identified generally in the Tasmanian Government. Do you see a lack of urgency?
A. Well, it's certainly very frustrating that the PIP Act is rolled out to explain why we can't be given information that would help us to protect children.
Q. You say "it's rolled out" - no, well, Ms Moxham you've been very frank and I appreciate the frankness with which you are giving evidence to this Commission. You say it's rolled out; do you see it as being used to constrain the provision of information?
A. Well, I certainly do because I believe there is a provision in that Act that would allow all these bodies to share information with us, because the purpose for which this information's being shared with us is one that's covered by that provision in the Act.
Q. And that is the regulation provision?
A. Yes.
Q. You're acting as a regulator?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't do anything unless you're regulating?
A. Correct.
Q. And in some circumstances, the nature of the regulation is to prevent people who are at risk of abusing children, you're trying to prevent them from having access to children?
A. That is right, yes.
Q. And would be it be fair to say you find it difficult to see how an Act could be construed in a way that's so inconsistent with that beneficial purpose?
A. Yes, I mean, I appreciate that there are balances that need to be in place because individual human being's lives can be ruined by inappropriate information being shared in an inappropriate manner, but we are not in the habit of sharing information anywhere other than where it's needed to conduct our regulatory function and protect children.
Q. And I say, "construed", but it could be that that's the way the Act operates, in which case your position would be it needs to be amended; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. How long - have you been advocating for that amendment?
A. Yes. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been advocacy from our office for changes to our Act in all sorts of different sections of the Act for well over

10 years.
Q. And what sort of response do you get when you say we need greater access to information?
A. Well, I was going to say to you that - because I thought your follow-on was about that 10 years - we generally get told that, "The Act will be looked at, please keep a list of all the things, and when we get to the next time we're reviewing it, we'11 look at it." And it's been reviewed for information sharing, for purposes that have nothing to do with our regulation. It's to do with sharing information for projects and research, and the ATWD was the main thing, that's the Australian Teacher Workforce Dataset. That was the main reason for us getting a change to information sharing within our Act, but it's not the information sharing we need.

The other change that was made was for the RWVP sections that were changed at the same time as that information, but we really haven't had any traction at all on the other changes that we require.
Q. You say that you take a different view of the PIP Act.

Are you able to get advice other than from the Solicitor-General's office?
A. No we're not.
Q. Are you required to go to the Solicitor-General's office?
A. Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Excuse me. Ms Moxham, do the independent and Catholic schools interpret that legislation in the same way?
A. So, Catholic Education under its current workforce or workplace team give us everything.
Q. Right.
A. They didn't use to. I don't know whether I really want that in a public record, because they give us everything whether they're allowed to or not.
Q. I think you just put it in a public record.
A. But independent schools, it just varies completely between one school and another school. Some schools don't even notify us under section 31 , the notifications they're required to notify us under. We might find out about it
later on. I think sometimes they say they don't know that that's a requirement, but \(I\) do know that a large part of the first probably 10 years of the operation of the TRB was spent on a program of trying to inform schools of their responsibilities, and I think we probably need to refresh and renew that process again.

Like, it's not that we stopped telling them things, but we used to have a newsletter that went out all the time, and there were complaints about us using our resources in that manner, because we were using teacher fees, and so I think our board got a bit gun shy of publications. And so, they closed down that section of our office, and I've been campaigning for us to re-open it.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. Are there any consequences for a school that doesn't comply or consistently doesn't comply?
A. Allegedly, the Act has consequences for offences against the Act, but they have never been pursued. And the main reason, I'm told, is because the only process by which we can do that is to take the matter to the Magistrates' Court, the administrative division of the Magistrates's Court, and the time, energy, effort and resources to undertake that process has mitigated against the board ever taking any of those matters. So, we write letters, but you can imagine that if you've got a school that regularly offends and they've had five letters and a visit from us no teeth. It's something that should be fixed in our Act. So, we have some regular offenders who employ unregistered teachers, and they do it every year.
MS BENNETT: Q. You say you lack the power to take any
steps in response?
A. Well, the Act says that it's an offence and it lists
the number of units for a fine, but there's no mechanics in
the Act for actually levying that fine. I note that the
RWV Act does have the necessary mechanics for that
process, and I also note that the RWVP Act has the power
given to the registrar to obtain any information that it
requires, and I would like that in our Act.
Q. Ms Moxham, I feel like I've been barely holding back
the dam of your concerns. I don't want to hold them back,
so can I ask you - because I want to ask you about some
matters that took place in some cases that have been the
subject of some evidence this week, and I want to do that
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so that there can be some public acknowledgment and accountability for those matters, but I don't want to get in the way of your airing of concerns. So, please don't feel constrained. We have your statement, so you don't have to say it now, but can you identify for the Commissioners what else is getting in your way of protecting children in the state as the Teachers Registration Board Registrar?
A. I don't know whether this is "getting in our way" per se, but I do see that in South Australia, the South Australian Teachers Registration Board has a requirement that all teachers have to undertake mandatory notification training in regards to abuse and neglect. And I was registered in South Australia at one time, and so I went through that training. And they cannot be registered until they've completed that training, and I think that that would be a good addition to our registration processes or something like that.

I also note that Victoria and a couple of other jurisdictions have recently had created for whole-of-government frameworks, Child Safety frameworks. That, particularly the Victorian one, looks like it will be very successful in assisting in making sure that all the different agencies and regulators receive all the necessary notifications and information, and that we can also feed into that framework. So I would recommend something like that be put in place in Tasmania as well, but I don't know if I've answered your question
Q. Well, no. My question was really an opportunity for you to tell the Commissioners what else needs to change for you to protect children insofar as it's relevant to your role. We have the benefit of your statement, and I might come back about one or two small issues in a moment, but I want to make sure that I identify in your statement you were asked to set out for us, if you like, the process in relation to somebody that we are referring to as "John".

Commissioners, John is the person who is subject of the matters raised by Ms Kerri Collins on Monday. I understand, Ms Moxham, you weren't able to watch the evidence on Monday, but you've received a high level briefing; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right. I was moving house. I'm sorry about that.
Q. That's all right. You've provided what appears attached to your statement as an outline of what I assume to be steps concerning John which are extracted from the TRB database; is that right?
A. Well, that is correct. From our records of this particular individual's matters, yes.
Q. Were you personally involved in this individual's matters at any stage?
A. No, I was not.
Q. I think, Commissioners, you'11 recall and the records reflect that there were police investigations in '91 in response to the allegations made by four children. This appears, Commissioners - I'll tell you the document reference not for the sake of it going on screen but just so that the Commissioners can identify it. It appears as an attachment to Ms Moxham's statement, and I believe is identified as Attachment 17. It is
TRFS.0014.0036.0002-0001. I'm not asking for that to be put on screen. And, it's page 1 of 13.

So, the first page, Ms Moxham, simply recounts what I understand to be a summary of what is recorded in the TRB records. It is not that this was provided to the TRB at the time it's recorded here. Indeed, the TRB did not exist in '91, did it?
A. No, that's correct. The TRB does not exist until 2002.
Q. So, it records as matter of the record that there was an investigation following allegations by four female students; they did not result in charges at the time. In 2001 as a result of police investigation, the DoE removed John from his teaching role and placed him at another office so he did not have contact with students. A. \(\mathrm{M}^{\prime} \mathrm{hmm}\).
Q. In '02 he was arrested and charged with four counts of indecent assault. Now, just to pause there, that was just before the TRB commenced; is that right? A. No, the TRB commenced in 2002. So it would have been right on the --
Q. Right on the start? Okay.
A. And I will just mention for everybody's benefit that at that time, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the

TRB invited employers to send all matters, all disciplinary matters and so on, to the TRB that had occurred pre our existence. And I will note that a huge number of them obviously were never forwarded to us until recently, the end of last year.
Q. Do you mean by that, that the end of last year you received a substantial number of notifications of matters that had not until then been notified to you by the Department of Education?
A. That is correct.
Q. And they're the matters we've been referring to as the stand down matters?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. I don't think the Department of Education refers to them that way, but following from the review by Professors Smallbone and McCormack there was a review carried out by the Department of Education and that led to a substantial disclosure to the Teachers Registration Board?
A. That's right. I mean, we did know about some of them, like John, for example, because obviously we do have information on our records about John and about a number of the others, but we didn't know about some of the more contemporaneous ones, and we didn't know about all of the matters that came to us and are still coming to us.
Q. And, I take it from what you've said earlier that the investigation files have not followed the notifications?
A. In some instances they have, but that's usually where we've asked for them and someone's been prepared to provide them. Parts of them. I think that's an accurate statement.
Q. Al1 right. Returning to John for the moment in 2018 a review of the board's records prompted by the suspension of John's Working with Vulnerable People registration found the following: that on , the board received an application for registration as a teacher from John. The board decided it needed further information, including information from the Crown Prosecutor. That's in \(\square\) 2004. Do you see that?
A. I'm just lost track of where you're looking.
Q. So, page 2 of 13 in Attachment 17 to your statement. Do you have that?
A. I do.
Q. And then there was a board meeting in \(\quad\) of '04, where the chair and the members expressed concern -A. Yes.
Q. -- that four unidentified young women had not had an opportunity to know that the board was considering John's application for registration. The board requested the executive officer seek advice from the Solicitor-General on how to achieve this?
A. Yes.
Q. And then there's a range of correspondence and documentation when the board was considering John's application for registration?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then, on 2005, the DPP wrote to each complainant in the matter to explain that it would not proceed to the Supreme Court. And did you receive a copy of that correspondence, do you know?
A. I don't know, I'm sorry.
Q. That's okay.
A. It may well be in the original tranche of documents that were requested by the Commission.
Q. I'd like to just skip - there seems to have been another attempt in 2004 with a meeting with the Solicitor-General, and was it - where your office was advised to contact prosecution services to ask for assistance to contact the four young women.
A. (Witness nods).
Q. And then that contact appears to have been made --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and three of the four agreed to speak to the board?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you received, on 2004, a letter of support regarding John from the Department of Education? A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And you saw me put that letter on the screen earlier today with Mr Bullard?
A. I did.
Q. You say there it's a letter of support. Is that how it was read and understood by the TRB so far as you see it?
A. I expect it had two connotations to be drawn from it.
Q. Yes.
A. One being a degree of pressure on the TRB, and the other one being support for the individual.
Q. And in both instances you view that as inappropriate?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Then in , just skipping over a little bit, the board considered all information available and determined to grant John registration?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you say then - can I draw your attention over the page, you say:

Looking at this information in 2002 it is difficult to understand board reasoning in 2004. The onus of proof is always on the applicant and the burden of proof is on the balance of probabilities rather than the criminal standard. It is unclear why the evidence available was not sought until 2006.

So, just to pause there, do I understand correctly, Ms Moxham, that the evidence that was before the Supreme Court was not provided to your office when --
A. We have to apply to get information from the Supreme Court.
Q. And you didn't ask for it?
A. Apparently not, no.
Q. And you see that as a failing of your office?
A. I do. We wouldn't have that situation occur today.
Q. How do we know it wouldn't occur today, Ms Moxham?
A. You really only have my word for it, m'mm.
Q. Would you agree with me that we need to have some systems and processes in place that mean that whoever is at
the top, whatever their priorities, that information makes it to where it needs to be?
A. So, we do have processes that make it clear that that has to happen within our office, but to be honest with you, they're not published anywhere. So you wouldn't - that's why I said you'd have to take my word for it. So, probably on the new website and - because we're also getting a new website - we will be having a look at the voluntary disclosures that we might be able to make. But there's still considerable work to be done in our office, as I was alluding to earlier, to get those things into a useful format for the public.
Q. So, I want to be fair to you and to others mentioned in this chronology, and I'm conscious of the time, but over the page the Children's Commissioner, then David Fanning, wrote to the Minister for Education raising concerns about the processes which led to John's registration; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And that triggered a review; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that review led to a change in the way that the processes and procedures of the TRB operated; or did it? A. The review actually made additions to our Act. So at that time we didn't have section 17 K in regard to fitness to teach. We also didn't have some of the aspects that are currently in our section 12 and 13A applications, section 19 complaints, or sections 20 to 24 enquiries: they all only came into effect in 2010. And so, once they came into effect then new procedures and processes followed in the board.
Q. It didn't change John's registration status though?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. That's very difficult to understand. It could well have been to do with what I was mentioning before in regard to if an individual maintains their payment for a five-year period, we don't automatically get an opportunity to review their good character and fitness to teach.
Q. Ms Moxham, it was raised though that there had been significant gaps in relation to the way that this person
had been reviewed. Those gaps led to amendments to the Act but never a review of his actual registration to teach; how is that possible?
A. To be honest with you, I don't know; I think it's really unforgivable and I can't say anything else.
Q. It's unforgivable: has that been reviewed? Has anyone ever looked into why there was that really substantial failure?
A. Not to my knowledge. I certainly haven't taken it on.
Q. Is that something - and I understand what your evidence is about how stretched your office is, but are there lines for accountability around how people manage to be registered for a substantial period without the substance of their suitability being tested?
A. There's probably a number of ways to answer that. The board can of its own determination commence an inquiry: why it hasn't been done in this instance, I really don't know.
Q. And ultimately, it was registration to work with vulnerable people that triggered his suspension as a teacher?
A. That is correct.
Q. It's an entirely unsatisfactory chronology, isn't it?
A. It is.
Q. And, Ms Collins who gave evidence --
A. It is a really nasty black mark on our record, and I think our board is quite - our current board is quite upset and concerned that this took place.
Q. Are you in a position, assuming that Ms Collins is watching today or will read a transcript of today, are you in a position to offer an apology for that?
A. Yes, I am. I am really sincerely sorry that the board has failed in this situation, and I --
Q. Sorry, please don't let me cut you off. I don't want to at all.
A. And I know that our board would also join me in that apology.
Q. Again, conscious of the time, I want to deal briefly with the matter of the person we refer to as - can you just give me one moment?

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. Whilst you're doing that, I think the registration of John ended in 2020 ?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you.
A. Actually, I think it's only suspended. And that's another issue with our Act. We could take someone's registration away, and the very next day they could re-apply for registration. And then our resources would have to go to the task of determining good character, fitness to teach and all of that over again.
Q. Thank you.
A. Suspension's better; it can go on and on.

MS BENNETT: Q. In relation to the person we've been referring to as "Wayne", do you want to have a look at that pseudonym list and see the person we're referring to as "Wayne"?
A. Yes.
Q. This has got a long and complex history and I don't want to go through the full outline of it now, but it's fair to say that you received an application from Wayne in 2007. You weren't proactively notified by anybody about concerns about Wayne?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And then you made enquiries about Wayne's appropriateness to be registered with the Department of Education?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you present for the part of the examination of Mr Bullard where \(I\) was discussing the registration of Wayne?

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: I think you mean, "Ms Moxham".
MS BENNETT: Q. Were you present, Ms Moxham, for the examination of Mr Bullard when I was discussing the registration of Wayne?
A. I think I may have been for part of it, yes.
Q. There were some materials that I suggested to

Mr Bullard that some correspondence from the Department of

Education had been capable of misleading the Teachers Registration Board; were you present for that part of the examination?
A. I can't recall, I'm sorry.
Q. I think it might be unfair for me to put that to you in this way, I think I won't take that any further. It's fair to say though, that Wayne was ultimately the subject of quite a lengthy process --
A. Yes.
Q. -- at various hearings through the Teachers

Registration Board, and that ultimately you declined his request for registration?
A. Yes.
Q. And what happened next?
A. I'd have to refer to my notes, I'm sorry.
Q. Yes, have a look at your notes there, I think it's down at page 2, you declined in 2008. He lodged an application for registration and numerous references?
A. Yes.
Q. You granted a registration for a period of one calendar year until 2009?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then after that, what happened?
A. He was required to provide professional and character references with his next application, and the - I've lost track, I'm sorry.
Q. No, that's okay, it goes over the page. The next page, these are again from your records: there's a request from the Department of Justice, the Registration for Working with Vulnerable People to provide documentation about Reportable Conduct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then a request for historical information is made in of 2021?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And then you were notified that Wayne had been suspended as at \(\square\) of 2021?
A. That's right.
Q. And, so far as you're aware, then he's resigned at some stage?
A. Yes. The - yes, he had been suspended on full pay while there was an investigation undertaken by the Department of Education and we were notified of that, and the board became aware of a possible third victim which we notified the Department of Education about, and then we wrote to the Office of the Solicitor-General to seek advice regarding legalities of investigating historical matters, and a reminder email was sent to the Office of the Solicitor-General, and we still haven't received a response.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Q. Can I just have those dates again? So that, you asked the Solicitor-General for advice when? A. 2021.
Q. Thank you. And you have not yet received a response?
A. So I'm informed, yes. It would not have come to me, but I'm informed by the person to whom it would have come that we have not received.
Q. And the advice related to your ability to look at historical matters?
A. Yes, the legalities of investigating historical matters, yep.

MS BENNETT: Q. Just for context, that comes in the wake of having received a large volume of his notifications of historical matters; is that right?
A. That's correct, but in this instance as well, it's actually related to the fact that there was a third victim that we hadn't known about previously, and so it's like re-opening the investigation, yes.
Q. Ms Moxham, are you independent of government?
A. We're meant to be, yes. Shall I explain it this way: the board itself is. All of the employees in the office are state servants, and hence, we come under the Department of Education.
Q. Do you need greater independence to do your job?
A. Well, that's what we put forward in the Review of Education Regulation, that we believe that we should be funded directly from the public purse and not be seen as part of the Department of Education, but in fact the Review
of Education Regulation will bring us more clearly under the Department of Education.

MS BENNETT: Please, Commissioners, those are the matters for Ms Moxham.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Moxham. Any questions? COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: No, thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. Yes, just to be clear, you talked about the value of suspension as against deregistration.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you seek powers to deregister for a period - for a long - or do you already have the powers to deregister for a period of time?
A. No, we don't have any powers to deregister someone for a set period of time. So, if we take someone off the register they can re-apply the next day. What we would seek is to be able to have a period of time that they're not able to re-apply for registration, that's correct, and it might be that the Act would allow us, our board or whomever the decision maker is, to decide on different lengths of time depending on whether there's some chance of rehabilitation in the period or whether in fact it's for life, and other regulatory authorities do have the capacity to take someone off the register for life.
Q. And presumably there'd be some provision to come back if there are a marked change of circumstances or something along those lines, is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. The other thing you raised early in your evidence was, you were making Right to Information requests. Are they promptly and effectively responded to generally?
A. So, I was really talking about people making Right to Information requests --
Q. You --
A. To us.
Q. Sorry, I misheard your evidence.
A. And we find it extremely difficult to meet the timelines that are in the Act because we have such a small
workforce, and in fact the most recent one that we have had is the subject of some of these case studies here, and we are very much delayed in responding to that one, because the key member of staff has had to have serious surgery and has been on a return-to-work plan, and you might say, why isn't somebody else in the office trained to do it? And the reality is, they aren't and we need to find some way to get that done, but with the huge volume of historical matters that have now descended upon us that makes it even more problematic to sort out those sorts of issues for our office.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you very, very much indeed, Ms Moxham, for your very frank and helpful evidence.

MS BENNETT: Sorry to interrupt. Could I just impose on the Commissioners that we could perhaps sit until 4.15 to complete the evidence today?

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes. Thank you.

\section*{SHORT ADJOURNMENT}

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Norton.
MS NORTON: Commissioners, our final session this afternoon is a plaintiffs' solicitor panel. Ms Sdrinis and Mr Strange are here to speak about their experiences dealing with the State of Tasmania in litigation and civil redress, and if the witnesses can be sworn in, please.
<ANGELA SDRINIS, affirmed and examined:
[3.34pm]
<WARREN GEOFFREY STRANGE, sworn and examined:
<EXAMINATION BY MS NORTON:
MS NORTON: Q. Ms Sdrinis, if I'll start with you, if you can again state your full name, please.

MS SDRINIS: Angela Sdrinis.
MS NORTON: And your professional address and occupation.

MS SDRINIS: 239 Park Street, South Melbourne. I'm a solicitor.

MS NORTON: Ms Sdrinis, you've prepared a statement to assist the Commission. That's a statement dated 5 May 2022?

MS SDRINIS: Correct.
MS NORTON: Have you recently reviewed that statement?
MS SDRINIS: I have.
MS NORTON: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

MS SDRINIS: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Ms Sdrinis, you're a director of the firm, Angela Sdrinis Legal, and you have offices in Hobart and Melbourne?

MS SDRINIS: Correct.
MS NORTON: Would you like to just briefly outline for the Commissioners the work that your Hobart office does?

MS SDRINIS: We're a specialist institutional abuse practice, mainly historical sexual and physical abuse claims.

MS NORTON: I think you say in your statement you've been advising clients in Tasmania in relation to institutional abuse in government settings since 2015; is that right?

MS SDRINIS: Correct, yes.
MS NORTON: And you've had an office since \(2018 ?\)
MS SDRINIS: That's correct.
MS NORTON: And you've advised in that capacity over 300 clients?

MS SDRINIS: Yes, that's right.

MS NORTON: Mr Strange, can you state your full name for the Commissioners.

MR STRANGE: My full name is Warren Geoffrey Strange.
MS NORTON: And your professional address and occupation.
MR STRANGE: Our office in Brisbane is 144 Edward Street. I'm a lawyer and I'm the Chief Executive Officer of knowmore Legal Service.

MS NORTON: Mr Strange, you have also prepared a statement dated 28 April 2022?

MR STRANGE: I have.
MS NORTON: Is that a document you have reviewed recently?
MR STRANGE: It is, yes.
MS NORTON: And it is true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

MR STRANGE: Correct.
MS NORTON: Mr Strange, you just made reference to knowmore Legal, would you like to explain for the Commissioners the work that knowmore does, particularly in relation to Tasmanian clients?

MR STRANGE: We're a national community legal centre, we were established in 2013 to assist survivors who were thinking about or engaging with the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Following the completion of that Royal Commission we've continued to assist survivors around the country, including in Tasmania, with advice about their redress options including under the National Redress Scheme. We also assist with other services including financial counselling and we also now have some funding to assist people with the territories, the Commonwealth territories Stolen Generation Redress Scheme.

MS NORTON: And, Mr Strange, you don't have an office in Tasmania; how is it that knowmore provides services to Tasmanian clients?

MR STRANGE: Yes, we have not been able to establish an office in Tasmania, so we provide services remotely; we have telephone and other remote means of communicating with clients. We come to Tasmania on an outreach basis. In our current COVID world we're aiming to do that every two months on a regular basis of coming to the state and meeting with partner services and engaging with clients and any other stakeholders around the State.

MS NORTON: And, Mr Strange, despite not having a bricks and mortar office in Tasmania you say in your statement, and it's at paragraph 45, that "the State of Tasmania is over-represented in knowmore's client base". Can you just explain to the Commissioner the extent of that over-representation and perhaps some of the reasons why you think it exists?

MR STRANGE: That's historically been the case throughout the lifetime of our service, that our percentage of clients who come from Tasmania sits generally around 4 to \(5 \%\) of our total client group, which, as you would know, is proportionately above the population of the - or Tasmania's contribution to the overall population of Australia.

We think one of the reasons for that is the past abuse in care scheme that operated in Tasmania. We've seen in other states, and particularly Queensland, that have had those types of schemes, that survivor communities tend to be better connected with support services and with each other, so they tend to be communities that are more cognisant of their rights and their opportunities to engage and exercise legal rights.

Tasmania has also had some significant institutions, and the Ashley Detention Centre comes to mind; we've had quite a number of clients from that institution and I know it's featured in media reports and other commentary about this inquiry as well.

MS NORTON: Thank you, Mr Strange. Now, in addition to your experience as a solicitor which is detailed in your statement, you also have experience as the Assistant Commissioner For Misconduct within the Queensland Crime and Misconduct Commission?

MR STRANGE: That's right, yes; I held a number of roles within the Crime and Misconduct Commission and its
predecessor, the Criminal Justice Commission.
MS NORTON: Thank you. I might ask you while I'm with you, Mr Strange, you talk in your statement at paragraphs 15 and following about the particular difficulties - well, I'll take a step back.

It's difficult for any survivor of abuse to come forward and speak of their experiences, but in your statement you talk about the particular difficulties that survivors of institutional child sexual abuse face. Would you like to explain to the Commissioners a bit about that experience?

MR STRANGE: I think, to try and explain that in simple terms, they are a population of clients who are very distrustful of institutions and authority and officials in general because - understandably because of their experience with institutions and with officials as children where they suffered abuse and all the consequences of that and often made complaints that were not acted upon or believed, and that tends to resonate with them throughout their lives; they've often had very negative experiences, some of them with lawyers and with the courts; some of them with police when they have sought to report complaints.

Going back historically, there have been very few outcomes through the Justice system for those people, so that they tend to be very distrustful of institutions. It's hard to tell their story for many survivors because of the legacy of complex trauma that they have, and engaging with institutions with that distrust, there's often, aside from the distrust, an element of, "What is the benefit of telling my story? What is this going to do? I've told my story before and no-one has acted on my story". That's quite a common theme.

MS NORTON: I'd like to talk about the importance of trauma-informed responses, but before I do so, just picking up on some things you've said there, Mr Strange, about the difficulties that survivors of institutional abuse face in coming forward.

You talk in your statement, it's at about 78 and 79 , of the difficulty or concerns that knowmore has about the current National Redress Scheme, in particular the fact that it's limited to abuse prior to 2018 and to claimants
who come forward within the 10-year 1ife-span.
Against the background of those concerns, and bearing in mind that this Commission has heard, and unfortunately will continue to hear about abuse going on beyond 2018, do you think there's a need for the lifetime of that scheme to be extended?

MR STRANGE: Very much so, in my view. In my current role, I'm somewhat removed from direct client work, but when I was - held the role of principal lawyer with knowmore I dealt with a number of clients who had had possible options of engaging with a Redress Scheme in Queensland that followed what was known as The Forde Inquiry in that state, and a Redress Scheme ran for a number of years but it had a closing date, and you would often have conversations with survivors about, why didn't you apply? And the answers would be things like, "It just wasn't the right time. It wasn't safe for me, I didn't have any support, I had other things in my life that were happening".

So, we know it takes a long time, and at least 22 years on average for survivors to make a disclosure about their experience of child sexual abuse, often longer. There will be people who are eligible to apply for the National Redress Scheme, and it won't be the right time for them or they won't have the supports or the safety to apply during its life. There will be people who are eligible to engage with your Commission of inquiry who won't come forward for those same reasons, and I feel very much that these people need to have justice options available into the future that are appropriate for them and suit their timing rather than the timing of what we or what governments might impose.

MS NORTON: Would you agree that the imposition of a deadline on the lines of the current 10-year deadline isn't really a very victim-centric approach to scheme design?

MR STRANGE: There is a review clause, a further review clause in the National Redress Scheme legislation, and we would hope to see the case made for the scheme to be extended by whatever government or governments because of the state involvements as well, whatever governments are in place at that time. But, if it closes, there will be survivors who are potentially eligible who will not have
had the opportunity to engage through absolutely no fault of their own or no responsibility of their own, it's just simply not the time for them and we need to recognise that.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. What about the date around 2018? This Commission is hearing from survivors of institutional child sexual abuse whose abuse occurred post 2018?
A. That was the date the National Redress Scheme commenced, so that was the date set in the legislation for effectively the eligibility provisions; it required abuse to occur before the starting date of the scheme. I think part of the thinking around that was also, the recognition of the changing landscape around civil litigation and that that may be a more preferable option for people who've experienced more contemporaneous abuse to be investigating.

MS NORTON: Can I then come to civil litigation, Ms Sdrinis, is there anything you'd like to add to Mr Strange's reflections on the reasons why institutional abusers - sorry, people who have been abused in institutional settings face particular difficulties coming forward?

MS SDRINIS: I absolutely agree with Warren, that's been my experience with survivors over some 25 years of working with them, and even though the National Redress Scheme has got some very, very significant flaws, what I find is that survivors need options, and whilst it is certainly the case that civil litigation options have opened up and can deliver significant compensation in the right cases, I think survivors need to have options that suit them and that it is important on that basis for the National Redress Scheme to continue beyond 2028.

MS NORTON: And indeed, one of the principles of trauma-informed practice, as I understand it, is the giving of options as a way of empowering victim-survivors; would you agree with that?

MS SDRINIS: Absolutely.
MS NORTON: And I'11 throw this open to both of you to discuss: both the importance of a trauma-informed practice, the difference that that makes for your clients and the impact on your clients when trauma-informed principles are not observed?
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MS SDRINIS: In my experience, it's not always about the money for survivors. The money's important because that's the tangible acknowledgment of wrongdoing, but when survivors go on a journey where they're listened to, where they're believed, where the right amount of compensation is offered - and that's not always more money - it's about an amount of money that the survivor feels is adequate recognition, where there's an apology, a proper apology at the end of that process, and I'11 say it again, most importantly where the survivor feels listened to and believed, then that is trauma-informed practice and I've seen it change survivors' lives; like, completely change their lives.

Where it's an adversarial, litigious, you have to prove every allegation, when we know in historical abuse cases that that's virtually going to be impossible, where technical legal defences are raised, you know, where survivors have to sit there and listen to what's wrong with their claims and why they're going do fail, and why they don't deserve a lot of money, that can actually destroy survivors; and, when that happens, you look at the redress option and say, "Well, that's not great, a lot of things are wrong with it but you know what, it would have been a whole lot better than this alternative".

MS NORTON: Just picking up on a few things you've said there, Ms Sdrinis, you've said it's not always about the money and you talked about the life changing effect that being listened to and believed can have. It sounds from what you're saying that a trauma-informed practice has the ability to be part of a healing process?

MS SDRINIS: Absolutely, yes, I've seen it.
MS NORTON: And that, would you agree that defendant lawyers can play a part in that healing process, and clients obviously, if they follow a trauma-informed approach to litigation?

MS SDRINIS: Yes, I agree with that.
MS NORTON: Government parties are bound by model litigant obligations, and it seems to me, and I'd be interested in your views, on whether and to what extent there's a crossover or whether you see trauma-informed principles
represented in some model litigant obligations?
MS SDRINIS: Yes. I mean, the Mode1 Litigant Guidelines include that defendants should not deny things they know to be true, that there should be consistency of approach, that liability should be admitted, and matters assessed if the liability issues are clear; they are consistent with trauma-informed practice.

Now, nobody would deny any defendant the right to defend a claim in the most appropriate way, you know, none of us are saying that governments shouldn't defend these claims; of course, they've got the right to defend them. But I think there needs to be a recognition that historical child abuse claims, particularly when it was the government which had the care of that child, and it is the government which has passed the laws over long periods of time, including limitation periods which existed in Tasmania in child abuse claims until 2018, there has to be a recognition that the relationship between government and a child which was in the government's care is quite a different relationship to someone who wants a fisheries licence, for example, and the government is saying, no, you don't meet the criteria.

So, I think that that recognition of that unique relationship has been somewhat lacking in the way the Tasmanian Government at least initially responded to these child abuse claims, and I think we've gone on a bit of a journey as to how best to acknowledge that relationship and respect it, whilst at the same time, you know, defending the claims or at least talking about legitimate legal issues when discussing the claims.

MS NORTON: I'd like to hear more about the journey you've just referred to, but before we get there, before civil litigation can take place or a redress claim often there's a need to obtain information from government departments.

Mr Strange, can I ask you to speak to knowmore's experience of dealing with Tasmanian Government departments in relation to Right to Information requests?

MR STRANGE: Yes, and we've addressed this in my statement and also in our earlier submission to the Commission. The response of the Tasmanian Government to record requests is often less than desirable. Requests take a long time to
process, and we've seen from the past scheme that operated in Tasmania requests for records from that scheme can take up to 18 months. And that can just exacerbate distress and trauma for survivors.

Records are particularly important, not just in the context of exercising legal rights such as a common law claim or a redress claim, they can assist with proof of those types of claims, but they're inherently and fundamentally important to survivors, many of whom were taken into care as young children and separated from their families. We've seen - we've all met survivors that were taken into care as young children and separated from siblings, and it took 30,40 or 50 years to reconnect with those siblings. And then, for those people in that situation to bring a records request and then to be met with a response that takes so long to get those records and then to have significant redactions that take out, for instance, the name of those family members, it is viewed as perpetuating the abuse that happened to them as children and the negative experiences of being placed in an institution; they see that as re-traumatising, that it took them so long to try and reconnect with their family and here is the government or the state trying to keep information from them about their family again and using the sort of third party provisions that exist in RTI legislation, applying them in a very black and white way to make those redactions.

MS NORTON: You've spoken about issues with delay and redactions; are they problems that you encounter - knowmore encounters to the same degree in other jurisdictions?

MR STRANGE: They are national problems, but Tasmania's position is probably worse than the majority of other jurisdictions in that respect in terms of the particularly the delay of meeting timeframes and turning those requests around.

MS NORTON: And from what you've said just now, it seems that not only is the delay, the redactions, a matter of frustration, but they can in fact be re-traumatising for your clients?

MR STRANGE: Very much so.
MS NORTON: Ms Sdrinis, do you have anything to offer on

Mr Strange's reflections?
MS SDRINIS: I agree with Warren's comments, and my assessment is, the situation in Tasmania is worse than what we see in other states.

MS NORTON: Ms Sdrinis, in your statement you speak about your engagement with dealings with the Department of Education in relation to RTI requests; would you like to explain a bit about that experience?

MS SDRINIS: Well, earlier on we were - records requests were being met much more promptly by the Department of Education, actually, as compared to the Department of Health and Human Services, for example, but over time the timelines with the Department of Education have blown out, taking over 12 months now to get responses to RTI requests, and we're seeing very regular requests for extensions to provide the records that we are requesting.

MS NORTON: I'd like to go now - Ms Sdrinis, you spoke before about the special relationship that exists in circumstances where a plaintiff, a victim-survivor, has brought civil proceedings against the state in circumstances where they say they've been abused in state care, whether that be in Out-of-Home Care, Education, any of those settings. I'd like you to speak to the Commissioners, please, about your experience about the extent to which the State of Tasmania, the various government departments, conduct civil litigation in a manner that recognises that unique relationship?

MS SDRINIS: Well, I said before it had been a bit of a journey, and it has been. When I first approached the Tasmanian Government and suggested to them - and this was in 2015 before 1 imitation periods had been abolished in historical child abuse claims - I suggested to them - and before we had a Redress Scheme as well, of course - I suggested to the government that it was important that we develop a settlement protocol, a trauma-informed protocol, where the government would not automatically rely on limitation periods, where the government would not necessarily put claimants to proof of every allegation or require, you know, medical records and criminal records and all the sorts of things that, if you're running a trial, the government legitimately might request. That was in 2015. I really had no response until 2017, when I had a
meeting with the Solicitor-General's office and a government representative.

The government at that point seemed to be open to a type of settlement protocol, although wouldn't really commit to any detail. There were some positives coming out of that meeting: the Solicitor-General's office indicated that it wouldn't require statements of claim, for example, which the Victorian Government required in our informal protocol; indicated that they might cover the cost of some joint medical examinations to relieve some of the financial burden for survivors.

But really, not much more came out of that meeting, and in fact we still weren't able to get the government to the negotiating table, probably until 2019, where we scheduled a day of settlement conferences which were actually a disaster. The government was very aggressive, the Solicitor-General's office was aggressive in the way in which it approached the three matters that we were going to try and resolve that day. One matter settled against advice because the client was quite traumatised by the responses that we were getting.

MS NORTON: Can I just stop you there. When you say it settled against advice, do you mean by that that your client settled against your advice?

MS SDRINIS: Correct, strong, my strong advice that the matter should not resolve. We had the second settlement conference where we had a similar sort of approach, response from the Solicitor-General's office: that client accepted advice and the matter didn't resolve. And we rang the third claimant and said, "Don't even come, this is not going to be a good experience. We have no expectation that there will be any offer which we could recommend and, frankly, it will just be traumatising to you".
Now, after that --

MS NORTON: Can I just stop you. I know you've been on a journey and I want to get to the end of the journey, but can I just stay at the point at which you're at now: you talk in your statement about the Office of the Solicitor-General insisting that your clients attend opening sessions in mediations; is that something that you generally experience in other jurisdictions in plaintiff
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MS SDRINIS: No. Other governments that we deal with, and indeed private institutions, don't require that. Some claimants want to be present at the opening session and, when they do, of course, it should be up to the claimant whether or not they are present at the opening session.

MS NORTON: For the benefit of the Commissioners and others listening today, can you just explain why being required to attend an opening session at a mediation could be a very traumatic event for one of you're clients?

MS SDRINIS: The opening session is where each party puts forward its arguments where we discuss the facts and the law, and the Commissioners will appreciate that in these historical child abuse claims causation, what events actually caused a claimant's loss and damage, is a very big issue and can be very confronting to claimants.

People who are abused as children often develop self-destructive behaviours post the abuse. In ward of state claims we have situations where children probably experienced trauma or at least neglect, because that's why they've gone into care, so to sit there and hear government lawyers analyse those life experiences in a way which is designed to support an argument that compensation should be reduced or minimised because of non-related trauma, can obviously be very hurtful to a claimant.

MS NORTON: Thank you. Mr Strange, I just invite you at this point to offer any reflections you might like to on that.

MR STRANGE: Just going back to what we were talking about with the re-traumatising of survivors: that's the language they use often to describe legal processes. We have to all bear in mind that we are dealing with someone who is a victim of child sexual abuse who is going back bringing a claim against the institution that was responsible for that child sexual abuse. It's not a motorvehicle accident, it didn't happen by accident, it's not a breach of contract claim, it's somebody's experience of childhood sexual abuse and they are engaging with that same institution.

And, when institutions take - whether it's the government or other institutions - when they take a hard
line or aggressive line in responding to those claims, it just can take the survivor back to their childhood experience, and they use language of, I've heard survivors talk about mediations and using words like, "It took me back to that 5 -year-old boy again, the way they treated me", when they're lined up against a table full of officials from an institution.

So, the Model Litigant Principles need to be adhered to, but they need to be underpinned with an understanding of trauma-informed practice; understanding what the consequences of some of those actions will have for survivors, such as delay, such as the type of language used, such as taking those technical legal points that Angela has spoken about; they need to understand what impact that is going to have upon a survivor and the trauma that they have as a result of their childhood experience.

MS NORTON: And, can either of you identify a legitimate need for a victim-survivor to be present in an opening session? Is the opening session compromised in any way by the absence of that victim-survivor?

MS SDRINIS: I don't believe so, because competent legal representatives will convey - you know, obviously we convey to our clients what is said in an opening session, but we can do that through a filter of - a kind of filter, if you like, it's not brutal. It's still hard for claimants to hear it and, as I said, I don't deny that the government has every right to raise causation issues or legal issues in these abuse claims, but the bottom line is, the adversarial legal process is not great; it's a very blunt and cruel tool to be using in these historical abuse cases, you know, which is why from very early on I tried to get the Tasmanian Government to consider other ways of doing things. And, if you can't resolve a matter, yes, we've got the independent umpire, we can litigate, but that shouldn't be the first option.

MS NORTON: Ms Sdrinis, another concern that you discuss in your statement is the Office of the Solicitor-General taking a technical and legalistic approach to litigation, civil litigation. Can you explain your concern in that respect?

MS SDRINIS: Well, a very recent example. I've talked about going on a journey but the journey hasn't been
perfect, and we obviously haven't arrived at the end of it. A very recent example is where, in defences filed by the state in sexual abuse claims involving a female child who you might say was in a relationship with an older male. The defence was made that, because the claimant consented to the relationship, then it could not be regarded as abuse for the purposes of the Limitation of Actions Act, so that limitation period still applied to that part of the conduct.

That's a pretty technical defence in matters where the child was in the care of the older male, either as a teacher or in a de facto sense as a ward of the state, and I raised on a couple of occasions with the Solicitor-General's office that I thought that defence was repugnant, inappropriate, and frankly wrong at law, but it really wasn't until we went to the media - which I advised the Solicitor-General's office I would do, just out of frustration - and, of course, the Attorney-General, Elise Archer, within 24 hours made it very clear that that defence would no longer be relied upon in circumstances where I can't be sure that she was even aware that the defence was being put forward by the Solicitor-General's office.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Q. Can I just follow up on that one because I'm aware of that example. It seemed to me that that particular "alleged offence" was completely wrong in law.

MS SDRINIS: I agree.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS NORTON: Just to pick up on President Neave's point there, would you say that it's an argument - reliance on that defence represents an entirely outdated understanding of consent?

MS SDRINIS: And a very sexist understanding of consent, because we've got cases where there was adult male on boy abuse, where the boy thought he was in love with the perpetrator, and where equally there was a relationship which developed: that defence was never put forward in a male on male situation.

MS NORTON: Can I go back to something you said earlier,

Ms Sdrinis. You said there was media attention on this issue and then within a very short period of time the approach was changed, defences were amended, that defence was no longer relied on, and you said you're not sure whether the Attorney-General knew that those defences were being taken in litigation being conducted on behalf of the state?

MS SDRINIS: Obviously - I mean, I didn't hear Elise Archer make a statement to that effect, but my impression was that she was blind-sided by the information, and the reversal was so immediate that one would have thought - and I'm speculating, of course - but, if she'd known about it, you would have thought that earlier on there would have been a direction to say, "Our government does not condone this type of defence".

MS NORTON: Let's just assume - and I take your point that you can't speak to Ms Archer's state of mind at the moment, but is it the case by reference to general practice that, in order to plead a limitation defence, a lawyer generally requires instructions from a client?

MS SDRINIS: Yes, I would absolutely assume that the Solicitor-General's office would get instructions about the defences pleaded.

MS NORTON: And is it the case, and I appreciate that you're a plaintiff lawyer, not a defendant lawyer, but are you able to comment on whether limitation defences are pleaded as a matter of course when they're available or whether in some cases a client might instruct solicitors not to rely on a limitation defence even when it's open?

MS SDRINIS: Yes, that's happened in the past. It's not as relevant since limitation periods have been abolished.

MS NORTON: Of course.
MS SDRINIS: But I have had institutional defendants in the past instruct their lawyers not to take a limitations defence. Mind you, on the other hand, some institutions are still instructing their lawyers to rely on delay and a judge's common law discretion to stay or strike out a matter if the delay means that a fair trial can't be had. That's not a defence that the State of Tasmania has raised in any of our matters.

MS NORTON: Yes. But in any event, whether a defence, a limitations defence is either pleaded or not pleaded, that's a decision for the client, isn't it?

MS SDRINIS: I would assume so, yes.
MS NORTON: Is it a decision that you would expect lawyers representing the client to make?

MS SDRINIS: No.
MS NORTON: This Commission has heard evidence which raises a question about the extent to which the Solicitor-General's office is responsible for decisions, not only in relation to the day-to-day management of civil litigation, but in relation to more fundamental decisions in relation to the conduct of litigation.

Now, I'11 throw this open to both of you as experienced lawyers: would it be a matter of concern for you to have a lawyer effectively given decision-making power in relation to all aspects of civil litigation?

MS SDRINIS: That would be entirely inappropriate and completely misunderstanding the solicitor/client relationship. Clients give instructions, solicitors give advice: that's it.

MS NORTON: Mr Strange?
MR STRANGE: I agree, absolutely.
MS NORTON: I'11 just invite you, and you may not have anything further to add, but why is it - apart from the fact that it is just the way the relationship must work, why is it so problematic for solicitors, lawyers, to be making decisions on fundamental matters concerned with litigation rather than clients?

MS SDRINIS: Because the solicitors don't have to wear the consequences of those decisions; clients have to wear the consequences, and it's just a fundamental tenant of our common law system that clients give instructions, solicitors give advice.

Clients do not have to follow solicitors' advice. If
they don't want to follow solicitors' advice they can sack them, they can, you know, tell them "no, we're not doing that". A prudent client will follow solicitors' advice, but it seems to me that when the solicitors are making the decisions, not the client, then that is really a complete topsy-turvy situation.

And I guess the concern is that, you know, in solicitors making those decisions, probably they are seeking to protect the client, but again, that is not how the solicitor/client relationship should work.

MS NORTON: Can I just unpick that a little bit because, would you agree that, subject to responsibilities that lawyers have to courts, it is the duty of the solicitor to act in the best interests of their clients.

MS SDRINIS: Of course, yes.
MS NORTON: To protect their clients' interests; that's not a problem. The problem, would you agree, arises where a person whose obligation it is to limit or protect the interests of a client is also making decisions about the conduct of litigation?

MS SDRINIS: Yes.
MS NORTON: Is that where the problem arises?
MS SDRINIS: That's where the problem is, if indeed that is what has been happening.

MS NORTON: Yes, and we don't know, I'm just interested in exploring this with you. You said one of the problems is that solicitors don't live with the consequences of litigation, that's for the client. Would you also agree that the solicitors aren't - they didn't create the problem; the solicitors are not responsible for the system in which, in these instances, children were abused in state care. Would you agree with that?

MS SDRINIS: Yes.
MS NORTON: And so, you've got solicitors making decisions on this hypothetical in circumstances where they're not accountable for the conduct?

MS SDRINIS: Yeah, it's what I said before: the client has to live with the decisions that are made and it is the client who was responsible for the conduct which gives rise to the circumstances in the first place.

MS NORTON: Mr Strange, has there been any experience of these sorts of difficult issues in Queensland?

MR STRANGE: There has, and before I address that I just wanted to make the observation that the context you're talking about is not one where the client is unsophisticated in terms of legal capacity or understanding of the issues.

MS NORTON: Yes.
MR STRANGE: I don't know exactly how the system works here, but I would anticipate that the Crown Solicitor is not being instructed by junior public servants but more senior people who should have a full understanding of the issues that are being litigated and the policy considerations and the position of the relevant government entity and they should be well capable of providing instructions to guide Crown Law's actions in a matter.

I was thinking when I was listening to the previous witness, it's quite reminiscent in some respects of a debate or a focus that's happening in my home state of Queensland at the moment around public sector integrity. That witness was talking about a lack of resources, failure to have the proper powers to do her job in the way that it sounded to be necessary and the consequences of that.

We've had similar issues ventilated in the media in Queensland about the public service, including some former senior public servants and one current senior public servant who have raised similar issues, have raised a concern about public servants tailoring their advice to Ministers and others in order to make it palatable, not tell them things that they don't want to hear, protecting them, those sorts of things, and the ultimate response to that has been, the government has established a review into the culture and accountability of the public sector that's being conducted by Professor Peter Coaldrake who's had a long history in public administration in Queensland and nationally I understand, and he's undertaking that review at the moment into, in effect, the culture and
accountability of the Queensland public sector.
MS NORTON: Thank you. I have just one final question. Ms Sdrinis, I said I'd come back to the journey, it's Thursday afternoon, let's end on a slightly more positive note. You adverted to the fact that things have improved in terms of your interactions, I'll just give you an opportunity to finish that.

MS SDRINIS: In 2021 we started seeing a much more cooperative situation with the Solicitor-General's office; happy to meet and talk about issues. We were seeing real efforts, I think, to provide us with documentation as much as is possible. We do have a silo situation in Tasmania as the previous speaker alerted to. We've also got another situation where, on the one hand, the Solicitor-General says, "Oh, we can't get this documentation from the department", on the other hand they seem to have free rein about what they can get, so there's a little bit of contradictory stuff going on there.

But certainly by late last year we were resolving matters, we were resolving matters for amounts commensurate with what we see on the mainland; there was good cooperation. You know, still some issues maintaining privilege over independent medical examinations that the Solicitor-General's office has obtained, which we say is completely inappropriate in child abuse matters, where the assessment can be very traumatic for the claimant, and then to be told, "Well, we're going to maintain privilege over this report, we're not going to give it to you", is pretty triggering and I think inappropriate in this environment.

Certainly, at law they're entitled to do it, but I think it's wrong.

MS NORTON: Is it the case that it's a blanket maintenance of the privilege, or is there a somewhat inconsistent approach?

MS SDRINIS: Yeah, on some occasions we've been told, "Well, we're maintaining privilege over the report and we're not giving it to you. But by the way, doctor so and so says this, that and the other and we say this goes to these facts", and that's both frustrating because you haven't seen the whole report, and again, I would say triggering and traumatising to our clients, because the
assumption is, if privilege is maintained over the report, on the whole it would have been supportive of the client, so that can be frustrating and really traumatising in some cases.

MS NORTON: Mr Strange, I'll just give you a final opportunity if there's anything you'd like to raise with the Commissioners before I finish?

MR STRANGE: No, I don't think there's anything additional to what I've said in my statement and our earlier submission, thanks.

MS NORTON: And I should say, there is a lot of additional information in the statements, we've just gone to some key matters this afternoon. Commissioners?

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you so much, Ms Sdrinis and Mr Strange, that was really very helpful evidence, very interesting.
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\] & direction [10] - & 974:4, 1030:44, & documentation [4] - \\
\hline \[
997: 1,1043: 18
\] & determinations [3] - & 917:11, 918:14 & \[
1036: 15,1037: 40
\] & 1016:15, 1021:37, \\
\hline department's [7] - & 943:28, 976:10, & 925:19, 929:13, & discussed [9] - & 1043:13, 1043:17 \\
\hline 932:1, 935:17, & 995:20 & 931:38, 931:39, & 926:27, 927:7, & documents [6] - \\
\hline 935:19, 935:21, & determine [6] - & 957:14, 960:32, & 934:27, 944:9, & 917:7, 934:30, \\
\hline 942:30, 944:27, & 917:32, 918:31, & 988:20, 1039:15 & 953:5, 955:16, & 937:4, 951:47, \\
\hline 997:12 & 921:35, 941:33, & Directions [2] - & 989:23, 992:24 & 952:26, 1016:26 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { departmental [1] - } \\
& 947: 26
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
997:12, 1000:39 \\
determined [2] -
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
990: 15,991: 11
\] \\
directly [2] - 1001
\end{tabular} & discussing [3] 1020:36, 1020: & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{DoE}_{[1]}-1014: 34 \\
& \operatorname{dog}_{[1]}-918: 32
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Departmental [1] - & 943:40, 1017:15 & \[
1022: 46
\] & 1032:33 & dolls [1] - 977:46 \\
\hline 951:28 & determining [2] - & director [1] - 1025:20 & discussion [4] - & done [19]-926:20, \\
\hline departments [3] -
1032:38, 1032:41, & \[
997: 14,1020: 11
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Director [2] - 993:26, } \\
& 993: 39
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 927: 28,936: 11, \\
& 956: 40.987: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & 927:37, 932:32,
938:18. 940:25. \\
\hline 1034:30 & 1034:40, 1036:21 & \[
\begin{gathered}
993: 39 \\
\text { dirty [3] - } 9
\end{gathered}
\] & discussions [2] - & 940:26, 949:29, \\
\hline dependent [3] - & developed [2] - & 934:2, 934:41 & 965:23, 988:26 & 960:1, 971:41, \\
\hline 958:22, 963:36, & 931:42, 1038:44 & disappears [1] - & disenfranchised [1] - & 987:40, 987:41, \\
\hline 970:36 & development [1] - & 956:44 & 968:21 & 995:37, 996:31, \\
\hline deployed [1] - 964:28 & 983:34 & disappointment [1] - & disgruntled [1] - & 996:32, 996:34, \\
\hline depth [1] - 969:9 & dictating [1] - 979:25 & 968:42 & 968:21 & \[
996: 47,1018: 10
\] \\
\hline deregister [3] - & difference [6] - & disaster [1] - 1035:18 & dismissed [2] - & 1019:19, 1024:8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1023:16, 1023:17, } \\
& 1023 \cdot 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 927: 19,942: 8, \\
& 942: 47,950: 15,
\end{aligned}
\] & discharged [1] 966:10 & \begin{tabular}{l}
929:11, 1001:15 \\
disorganised [1] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { dots [2] - 965:34, } \\
& \text { 1009:30 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline deregistration [1] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 942:47, 950:15, } \\
& 988: 47,1030: 45
\end{aligned}
\] & discharging [ & \[
952: 32
\] & doubt [2] - 919:19, \\
\hline 1023:13 & different [26]-915:41, & 968:29 & dispersed [1] - 989:28 & 966:40 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { descended }[1] \text { - } \\
& 1024: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 916: 47,917: 4, \\
& 921: 28,923: 37
\end{aligned}
\] & disciplinary [10] - & display [1] - 1004:34 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { down [21] - 923:32, } \\
925: 8,928: 33,
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1024:9 } \\
& \text { describe }[2]-980: 5,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 921: 28,923: 37, \\
& 926: 13,926: 40,
\end{aligned}
\] & 976:29, 976:32, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { displayed [2] - 930:46, } \\
& \text { 977:43 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 925: 8,928: 33, \\
& 929: 38,933: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1036:37 & 926:43, 953:7, & 1002:41, 1002:43, & displaying [1] - & \[
937: 8,938: 23,
\] \\
\hline described [3] - & 954:30, 970:5, & 1003:24, 1004:32, & 979:28 & 944:6, 945:11, \\
\hline 964:35, 964:37, & 978:2, 982:31, & 1004:34, 1015:1 & disposition [1] - & 946:45, 947:44, \\
\hline 993:38 & 983:44, 985:32, & disclose [1] - 984:33 & 958:40 & 952:14, 966:30, \\
\hline describing [1] - & 990:15, 990:16, & disclosed [2] - & dispute [2]-951:32, & 971:26, 971:27, \\
\hline 1009:14 & 1000:8, 1002:15, & 918:33, 965:40 & 952:41 & 972:35, 976:19, \\
\hline deserve [1] - 1031:22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1002:33, 1007:39, } \\
& \text { 1010:47. 1011:23. }
\end{aligned}
\] & disclosure [15] - & disrepute [6] - 920:38, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 988: 4,1012: 13 \\
& 1015: 14,1021: 2
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { design [2] - 984:10, } \\
& \text { 1029:39 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1010:47, 1011:23, } \\
& \text { 1013:25, 1023:25 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 933:41, 934:38, & 920:46, 929:29, & \[
\begin{gathered}
1015: 14,1021: 2 \\
\text { DPP } 2]-965: 45,
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline designed [1] - & 1032:22 & 949:30, 949:44, & distinction [5] - & 1016:19 \\
\hline 1036:27 & differently [2] & 950:1, 971:15, & 928:17, 929:33, & draft [1] - 942:34 \\
\hline desirable [1] - & 932:32, 949:25 & 971:19, 975:18, & 931:34, 939:30, & drafted [2] - 931:44, \\
\hline 1032:47 & difficult [10] - 952:34, & 84:23, 984:41, & 962:33 & 959:19 \\
\hline despite [1] - 1027:10 & 997:44, 999:41, & 987:20, 1015:21, & distress [2] - 945:42, & drafting [1] - 1001:3 \\
\hline destroy [1] - 1031:22 & 1009:4, 1010:28, & 1029:24 & 1033:3 & Drake [1] - 988:14 \\
\hline destructive [1] - & 1017:23, 1018:40, & disclosures [9] - & distressed [1] - & dramatic [1] - 966:24 \\
\hline 1036:22 & 1023:46, 1028:8, & 933:13, 933:16, & \[
935: 25
\] & draw [8] - 914:47, \\
\hline detail [5]-917:22, & 1042:7 & \[
934: 37,934: 45
\] & distrust [2] - 1028:32, & 927:45, 928:28, \\
\hline 925:4, 968:15, & difficulties [4] - & \[
937: 46,963: 12
\] & 1028:33 & 947:2, 951:20, \\
\hline 973:33, 1035:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1028:6, 1028:10, } \\
& \text { 1028:41, 1030:22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
986: 37,987: 12
\] & distrustful [2] - & 980:3, 1009:30, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { detailed [2] - 933:19, } \\
& \text { 1027:41 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1028:41, 1030:22 } \\
\text { difficulty }[1]-1028: 45
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1018:9 \\
discomfort [3] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 1028:17, 1028:29 } \\
\text { disturb [1] - 963:26 }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1017:19 } \\
& \text { drawing }[2]-924: 45,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline details [1] - 936:16 & digression [1] - & 985:8, 985:9 & division [1] - 1012:23 & 929:8 \\
\hline Detention [1] - & 991:20 & discontinued [3] - & doctor [1] - 1043:43 & drawn [2] - 996:47, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1017:5 & 995:12, 995:18, & employ [3] - 981:24, & 950:40, 957:3, & 1004:44, 1043:34 \\
\hline drive [1] - 983:3 & 995:28, 995:37, & 986:40, 1012:30 & 975:28, 983:19, & entitles [1] - 997:24 \\
\hline drunk [3] - 919:11, & \[
995: 44,999: 46
\] & employed [7] - & 987:4, 988:8, & entity [3] - 940:2, \\
\hline 919:25, 919:39 & 1001:32, 1007:26, & 960:18, 960:26, & 1015:5, 1015:7, & \[
994: 15,1042: 23
\] \\
\hline drunkenness [1] - & 1009:2, 1011:35, & 960:30, 981:10, & 1031:10, 1035:42, & environment [5] \\
\hline 920:13 1007:37 & 1015:10, 1015:17, & 981:28, 998:47, & 1038:1, 1043:5 & 930:38, 949:9, \\
\hline duality [1] - 1007:37 & 1015:20, 1016:43, & 999:4 & end" [1] - 942:36 & 963:15, 988:3, \\
\hline due [1] - 943:7 & 1018:17, 1020:32, & employee [12] & ended [1] - 1020:3 & 1043:32 \\
\hline duelling [1] - 974:35 & 1021:1, 1022:6, & 917:40, 920:31, & endured [1] - 966:7 & environments [1] - \\
\hline duplication [1] - & 1022:8, 1022:41, & 920:45, 921:33, & energy [5] - 961:11, & 987:20 \\
\hline 952:31 & 1022:45, 1022:47, & 922:2, 948:35, & 961:18, 961:28, & equally [1] - 1038:43 \\
\hline during [9] - 914:21, & 1023:1, 1023:2, & 960:30, 979:47, & 961:30, 1012:24 & equip [1] - 991:29 \\
\hline 928:8, 971:7, & 1034:9, 1034:14, & 980:2, 980:7, 981:5, & engage [4] - 973:47, & equivalent [2] - \\
\hline 971:13, 992:24, & 1034:16, 1034:26 & 981:24 & 1027:31, 1029:30, & 998:32, 1002:38 \\
\hline 992:40, 998:45, & \begin{tabular}{l}
Edward [1] - 1026:8 \\
effect [6] - 933:33,
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
employees [10] - \\
923:41, 931:37
\end{tabular} & & \[
\operatorname{err}[1]-985: 12
\] \\
\hline 1007:20, 1029:29 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\text { effect [6] - 933:33, } \\
\text { 1018:32, 1018:33, }
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
923:41, 931:37, \\
943:28, 946:8,
\end{tabular} & engaged [5] - 936:35, & error [1] - 936:38 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { duty }[3]-923: 32, \\
961: 14,1041: 15
\end{array}
\] & 1031:30, 1039:10, & 960:24, 966:46, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 976: 32,976: 41, \\
& 988: 31,1006: 37
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { escalate [2] - 970:16, } \\
& 970: 25
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & 1042:47 & 968:28, 981:16, & engagement [3] - & escalated [4] - 958:12, \\
\hline \(E\) & effectively [4] 951:12 1023: & \[
983: 12,1022: 39
\] & 958:18, 986:3, & 979:24, 979:30, \\
\hline & 1030:11, 1040:22 & 961:38 & engaging [6] - 958:1, & \begin{tabular}{l}
982:45 \\
escalating [1] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline early [6] - 932:44, & efficiently [1] - & employer [6] - 990:14, & 1026:33, 1027:7, & 979:37 \\
\hline 933:7, 969:38, & 1009:26 & 995:6, 1002:36, & 1028:31, 1029:13, & establish [1] - 1027:1 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 987:6, 1023:36, } \\
& \text { 1037:34 }
\end{aligned}
\] & effluxion [1] - 998:15 & 1002:45, 1008:23 & 1036:44 & established [5] - \\
\hline easy [4] - 928:16, & effort [5] - 961:12 & \[
008
\] & enjoyed [1] - 972:7 & 920:26, 959:5, \\
\hline 965:10, 982:19, & \[
1006: 15,1012: 24
\] & 1000:12, 1001:33, & enquire [1] - 926:16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 991:7, 1026:32, } \\
& \text { 1042:42 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 982:47 & efforts [1] - 1043:13 & 1001:35, 1002:41, & enquiries [4]-995:20, & et [3]-969:31, 976:6, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ED [2] - 990:18, } \\
& \text { 991:23 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { either [13] - 929:40, } \\
& 930: 4,935: 10,
\end{aligned}
\] & 1003:22, 1015:1 employing [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1002:40, 1018:31, } \\
& \text { 1020:30 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 983:18 \\
\hline ED4 [1] - 923:34 & 948:16, 985:28, & \[
981: 17
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1020:30 \\
enquiry [4]-919:16,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { event [2] - 1036:12, } \\
& 1040: 2
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline ED5 [23]-916:13, & 985:29, 993:32, & Employment [3] - & 919:39, 919:45, & events [3] - 965:29, \\
\hline 917:8, 917:25, & 1000:25, 1005:17, & 917:3, 990:15, & 1009:3 & \[
977: 37,1036: 17
\] \\
\hline 917:26, 917:32, & 1006:10, 1037:19, & 991:11 & ensure [15] - 924:15, & eventually [1] - 929:44 \\
\hline 918:13, 918:17, & 1038:12, 1040:3 & employment [25] - & 926:28, 927:26, & evidence [84] - 914:8, \\
\hline 918:30, 919:27, & element [3] - 964:20, & 916:12, 917:41, & 943:26, 945:44, & 914:10, 914:13, \\
\hline 920:19, 937:47, & 985:13, 1028:33 & 918:44, 919:23, & 958:32, 959:46, & 914:21, 916:26, \\
\hline 957:8, 960:22, & elements [3] - 953:37, & \[
920: 9,920: 34
\] & 963:47, 964:32, & 918:1, 922:31, \\
\hline 960:26, 972:38, & 964:13, 991:27 & \[
921: 33,923: 12
\] & 965:6, 968:29, & 923:33, 923:44, \\
\hline 972:44, 973:33, & eligibility [1] - & 929:42, 930:9, & 968:33, 969:27, & 924:2, 924:5, \\
\hline 984:28, 984:46,
986:7, 990:7, & 1030:11 & 930:18, 930:27, & 986:42, 988:30 & 925:34, 925:37, \\
\hline 986:7, 990:7,
995:22, 997:29 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { eligible [3] - 1029:26 } \\
\text { 1029:29, 1029:47 }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 931:17, 931:19, } \\
& 931: 31, ~ 931: 40,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ensuring [9] - 957:47, } \\
& 958: 31,961: 19,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 925: 43,926: 11, \\
& 926: 31,928: 2,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline education [5] - & Elise [2] - 1038:19, & 932:2, 932:4, & 961:31, 963:41, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 926: 31,928: 2, \\
& 928: 7,929: 32,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 959:40, 963:45, & 1039:9 & 932:16, 932:21, & 964:16, 964:17, & 931:47, 932:11, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 993: 24,1007: 21 \\
& 1007: 40
\end{aligned}
\] & elsewhere [1] - 983:3 email [15] - 935:43, & 932:34, 960:32, & 968:31, 986:18
enter [1] - 982:19 & 932:31, 932:43, \\
\hline Education [53] - & email [15] - 935:43
935:46, 936:4, & 997:25 & \begin{tabular}{l}
enter [1] - 982:19 \\
entered [1] - 977:23
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 933: 32,934: 17, \\
& 934: 31.934: 33
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 916:36, 917:30, & \[
937: 3,937: 39
\] & empower [1] - 987:14 & entering [1] - 924:13 & \[
942: 35,943: 32
\] \\
\hline 920:42, 937:30, & 937:47, 938:1, & empowering [1] - & entire [2] - 962:40, & 953:9, 954:28, \\
\hline 938:38, 943:40, & 939:3, 939:17, & 1030:38 & 998:2 & 956:36, 957:24, \\
\hline 946:19, 946:35, & 940:4, 941:14, & encompass [2] - & entirely [11] - 923:27, & 962:3, 962:22, \\
\hline 948:22, 949:44, & \[
950: 45,960: 46
\] & 918:9, 957:21 & 937:13, 946:30, & 965:26, 965:39, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 950: 38,951: 31, \\
& 952: 37,955: 4,
\end{aligned}
\] & 963:11, 1022:11 & encounter [1] - & 952:28, 967:43, & 967:5, 968:39, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 952:37, 955:4, } \\
& 959: 7,960: 1,964: 6,
\end{aligned}
\] & embed [2] - 964:38, & 1033:31 & 968:4, 968:6, & 969:22, 969:26, \\
\hline \[
966: 3,966: 33,
\] & 968:24 & encounters [1] - & 1002:5, 1019:26, & 969:28, 971:14, \\
\hline 993:16, 993:26, & emphasising [1] - & end [15] - 924:30, & 1038:37, 1040:25 & 971:21, 973:8, 973:17 978:19 \\
\hline 993:39, 993:42, & 988:17 & 941:27, 943:23, & 955:7, 968:4, & 979:33, 980:3, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1007:25, 1012:12 & 954:7, 967:21, & 1015:18, 1015:39, & 930:41 & funds [2] - 973:46, \\
\hline feet [1] - 976:46 & 999:20, 1003:33, & 1026:34, 1028:5 & Free [1] - 977:26 & 1009:27 \\
\hline felt [2]-925:35, & 1003:41, 1003:47, & forced [1] - 963:13 & free [2] - 980:27, & furthermore [1] - \\
\hline 963:24 & 1018:28, 1018:44, & Forde [1] - 1029:14 & 1043:18 & 994:39 \\
\hline female [4] - 978:10, & 1020:12 & fore [1] - 964:1 & fresh [2] - 941:35, & future [5] - 939:1 \\
\hline 978:35, 1014:32, & fits [1] - 990:8 & foresee [1] - 1004:3 & 62: & 946:16, 986:43, \\
\hline 1038:3 & five [13] - 916:23, & foreshadowing [1] - & FRIDAY [1] - 1044:23 & 1004:4, 1029:33 \\
\hline ferocity [2]-931:25, & 923:3, 941:8, 966:1, & \[
964: 1
\] & friend [1] - 936:24 & \\
\hline 931:26 & 966:20, 974:24, & forgive [2] - 927:33, & friendships [1] - & G \\
\hline few [3]-952:15,
1028-27,
1031 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1005:19, 1005:20, } \\
& \text { 1005:22, 1012:28, }
\end{aligned}
\] & form [9]-918:17 & front [4]-914:39, & gain [2] - 994:28, \\
\hline fifth [1] & 1018:42 & 19:2, 919:32 & 971:3 & 994:3 \\
\hline figures [1] - 956:13 & five-year [1] - 1018:42 & 921:4, 935:13 & frontline [1] - 976:7 & gaining [1] - 993:35 \\
\hline file [10] - 935:25, & fix [3] - 958:28,
\(982 \cdot 15,982 \cdot 1\) & \[
994: 20,1009: 24
\] & frustrating [3] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gaol [1] - 972:6 } \\
& \text { gaps [4]-1004:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 938: 12,941: 33, \\
& 952: 30,952: 32,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\text { fixed }[7] \text { - 993:21, }
\] & formal [1] - 963:27 formally [1] - 97 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1009:45, 1043:4 \\
1044:3
\end{tabular} & 1018:47, 1019:1 \\
\hline 969:33, 969:37, & 993:22, 994:8, & format [1] - 1018:12 & frustration [3] - 966:7, & gather [1] - 923:33 \\
\hline 982:16, 984:8, 985:1 & 1009:18, 1009:19, & formed [3] - 930:3 & 1033:42, 1038:19 & \begin{tabular}{l}
gathered [1] - 936:16 \\
gathering [1] - 919:18
\end{tabular} \\
\hline filed [1] - 1038:2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1012:29 \\
fixes [1] - 982:37
\end{tabular} & \[
940: 12,953: 29
\] & FTE [3] - 998:46, 999.5, 1007.33 & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { files }[2]-982: 38, \\
1015: 30
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
fixes [1] - 982:37 \\
fixing [1] - 1009:42
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { former [2] - 936:41, } \\
& \text { 1042:35 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 999:5, 1007:33 } \\
\text { fuck }[1]-925: 15
\end{array}
\] & \[
926: 28,927: 3
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