



kjr:jcm Queensland Law Reform Commission

29 April 2025

Matthew Corrigan
Executive Director
Queensland Law Reform Commission
PO Box 13312
George Street Post Shop
Brisbane QLD 4003

By online submission: <https://www qlrc.qld.gov.au/reviews/review-of-particular-criminal-defences/submission>

By email: qlrc-criminaldefence@justice.qld.gov.au; [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Corrigan

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS REGARDING THE REVIEW OF PARTICULAR CRIMINAL DEFENCES
PURSUANT TO THE *CRIMINAL CODE ACT 1899* (QLD)**

Background

1. The Queensland Teachers' Union ('**QTU**') provides additional submissions in response to the Queensland Law Reform Commission's ('**QLRC**') consultation paper dated February 2025 on its review of particular criminal defences ('**the Review**').
2. The QTU relies upon its prior submissions dated 31 January 2024, which concerned the potential amendment to or repeal of the domestic discipline defence for schoolteachers or masters, as outlined in section 280 of the *Criminal Code Act 1899* (Qld) ('**CC**'). For reference, a copy of these submissions is **enclosed**.
3. The QTU is the professional and industrial voice of Queensland's teachers and school leaders in state schools and TAFE institutes and other educational facilities. We have promoted and protected public education throughout the state of Queensland for 135 years, advocating for our members and actively shaping policy and legislative reforms. These submissions are made in support of our members, students, and the wider education community.
4. The QTU considers that amending or appealing the domestic discipline defence could have extreme impact on our members, and this merits special attention. In submitting

predominantly on this matter, the QTU believes that we can make a unique contribution to the Review.

5. As a prominent advocate for Queensland's educational workforce, we welcome the opportunity to provide a response to issues raised by the Review in relation to the domestic discipline defence.
6. The QTU's response to the consultation paper are by necessity, brief and focused on issues concerning the teaching profession, rather than in totality that is subject to the Review. Accordingly, our submissions are focused on paragraphs 390 to 444 of the consultation paper and the following question marked as Q21:

"Question 21: Do you support:

(a) Option 1: Repeal section 280 of the CC; or

(b) Option 2: Limit the application of section 280 (and if so, how); or

(c) Some other approach?"

7. The principal contact for the QTU in relation to this inquiry will be [REDACTED], who can be contacted on [REDACTED].
8. The QTU appreciates the opportunity to provide this submission for consideration and is ready and able to further contribute to support the work of the QLRC.

Preliminary submissions in relation to the consultation paper

9. The QTU acknowledges the significant relationship between domestic and family violence (**DFV**) and the defences subject to this Review. We recognise that the intersection of DFV and criminal defences is a critical issue that requires careful consideration, especially in terms of the impact on individuals and the community.
10. However, we urge the review to consider the impact of a repeal, without replacement, on ordinary interactions in a teacher/student context.
11. It is the position of the QTU that the domestic discipline defence (or a replacement equivalent, specifically applied to teachers) *should* operate as shield to charges of assault against those who work in the teaching profession. Should the defence be repealed, an act that would otherwise be an innocent act of positive encouragement by a teaching professional, could potentially carry culpability.
12. The preliminary findings provided at page 74 of the consultation paper focus on decisions by the Queensland Police Service (**QPS**) to not charge a parent. We urge the Review to give due consideration to teaching professionals, rather than limiting consideration to parents.
13. We submit that it is relevant for the Review to consider the QPS's application of the defence in matters involving teachers. When a teacher is criminally charged with unlawful assault of a student, it triggers regulatory action (in relation to a teacher's registration with the Queensland College of Teachers (**QCT**)), employment disciplinary proceedings, and Blue Card processes. It may also give rise to civil claims for damages under the *Personal Injuries*

Proceedings Act 2002 (Qld). Any such charge results in immediate suspension of the teacher's registration and employment without pay, even where the charge has not been proven to the relevant legal standard.

14. It is important for the Review to recognise that the defence acts as a critical safeguard by preventing unnecessary prosecution and protecting teachers from career-ending consequences in circumstances where prosecution may not be warranted.
15. The QTU appreciates the Review's recognition that the lack of clear legislative guidance on what constitutes reasonable force and how to effectively distinguish between corporal punishment and physical abuse is a significant issue for frontline QPS. However, we respectfully submit that existing case law and internal training may provide useful direction in these matters.
16. The exercise of discretion by investigating police, the prosecution, and the judiciary is crucial in managing criminal complaints against teachers that might otherwise result in conviction. This discretion is an essential and valuable safeguard for the teaching profession, particularly given the pressures on the relevant workforce resulting from the current shortage.
17. The QTU acknowledges that so far, the Review has found *"broad support for the defence of domestic discipline where a teacher used very low levels of force for the purpose of management or control but not for the purposes of discipline or correction"*. The QTU also highlights that the Review's research on attitudes and opinions showed that *"participants did not favour a criminal justice response in cases involving minimal force"*.
18. The Australian Principal Occupational Health, Safety and Wellbeing Survey, compiled by ACU's Institute for Positive Psychology and Education, reveals that workload, violence, and mental health challenges continue to escalate within the profession.¹ Instances of physical violence have increased by 81.6 percent since the survey began in 2011, with threats of violence also at their highest point. In this context, the need for the defence of domestic discipline to remain as a protection for teachers cannot be overstated.

Submission as to incorrect "opinion" material in consultation paper

19. At paragraph 406, the consultation paper provides that *"during police interviews, we were told of an example where a magistrate dismissed assault charges brought against a teacher involving use of a 'choke hold' against three primary students"*. Drawing on this, the paper suggests that the defence may excuse an unreasonable use of force.
20. We are aware of the factual matrix of the matter that is referred to at paragraph 406. We respectfully submit that the characterisation set out in the consultation paper is incorrect. Further, we submit that it is not appropriate for the Review to place weight on a police officer's opinion of a case. A police officer's view is necessarily limited to their role in investigating the matter (assuming that they were involved in the matter, which is unclear in this specific example in paragraph 406). It does not reflect the findings of the court, which are made after hearing all admissible evidence and considering the full factual context.

¹ <https://www.acu.edu.au/about-acu/news/2025/march/principals-navigate-growing-challenges-as-anxiety-depression-increase>

Relying on a mere opinion, without more, risks misunderstanding or mischaracterising the proper application of the law.

21. The matter referred to by the officer was unreported. It was accepted that section 280 of the CC was fairly raised on the evidence. The Court was not persuaded that the prosecution had established beyond reasonable doubt that the defendant teacher's conduct was not reasonable by way of management and control having regard to the circumstances that prevailed. Reference was made to the need for a teacher to ensure safety of all students and that physically engaging with a student could be reasonable for the protection of other students in the room, particularly when the student was "rampaging around" the classroom.
22. Nothing in the prosecution's evidence led the Court to conclude that the defendant teacher's actions were other than reasonable. The Court recognised a general aversion to use of any force on children, but when considering all of the circumstances that confronted the defendant teacher, the Court was unpersuaded that, on any occasion, the actions of the defendant teacher were not reasonable.
23. However, for the reasons we articulated in our prior submissions dated 31 January 2024, the defence of domestic discipline is effectively moderated by the requirement that the use of force be "reasonable". The example at paragraph 406 risks alarmism by drawing conclusions without providing all of the relevant facts. Whilst interviews provide material for the QLRC's consideration, the opinion expressed at paragraph 406 is just that: an opinion. It does not touch on the issues that were before the Court and cannot be relied upon.
24. It would be highly improper for the QLRC to draw any inferences from a police officer's recollection of a case, without having regard to all the facts and legal issues accepted by the Court during the proceedings, nor without having regard to the relevant judgement.

Position in relation to Q21

25. It is the QTU's position that the defence of domestic discipline should not be repealed or amended in the first instance.
26. For the purposes of assisting the QLRC with the Review, the QTU has provided the below response in relation to each of the proposed actions.

Submissions in relation to the proposed repealing of the defence and introduction of diversion, and other supporting measures

27. The QTU does not support the full repeal of the domestic discipline defence under section 280 of the CC.
28. While we acknowledge concern about the use of corporal punishment in both domestic and education settings, and the importance of child protection, the repeal of this defence without adequate safeguards for teachers could disproportionately impact individuals who may not pose any risks to children, especially teachers.

29. We appreciate that the QLRC is minded to consider calls for the greater protection of children from physical punishment and Australia's obligations under international human rights treaties.

The impact of a criminal charge on teachers' livelihoods and the need for protection

30. Having regard to the reporting obligations imposed on teachers and the effects a criminal charge may have on a teacher's employment status, as well as the need to reduce the burden on the judicial system, the QCT is of the view that in order for a diversionary scheme to have any real benefit, it must operate at a level below the courts and on a completely confidential basis.
31. This is because even if a charge does not progress to conviction, the mere existence of a charge significantly impacts a teacher's professional standing and livelihood.
32. Under section 68 of the *Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005* (Qld) (**Education Act**), any change in criminal history must be immediately disclosed to the QCT. This encompasses every charge and conviction of every type of offence, including if no conviction is recorded.
33. Under section 65 of the Education Act, once aware of a criminal charge or conviction, the QCT is empowered to request information from the Commissioner of Police, including details of a teacher's criminal history or the circumstances surrounding any charges.
34. Under section 48 of the Education Act, if a teacher is charged with a "serious offence", their registration or permission to teach is immediately suspended by the QCT as soon as the QCT becomes aware of the charge.
35. Although the offences to which a teacher may be exposed, absent the protection afforded by the defence of domestic discipline, do not meet the statutory threshold of a "serious offence" (defined by reference to section 15 of the *Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000* (Qld)), it is nonetheless pertinent for the QLRC to be aware that, under section 49 of the Education Act, the QCT retains a discretionary power to suspend a teacher's registration or permission to teach if it reasonably believes the teacher poses an unacceptable risk of harm to children.
36. In practice, this provision grants the QCT a broad scope of authority, enabling it to suspend a teacher's registration or permission to teach even in circumstances where the charge is of a relatively minor nature. Without the continued operation of the domestic discipline defence as a protective safeguard, teachers may be subject to disciplinary suspension in cases involving low-level offences, or allegations that are without merit.
37. Suspensions are dealt with after criminal charges are resolved, which as the QLRC would be aware, is a lengthy process. This length of time where a teacher's registration remains suspended while awaiting resolution of their criminal matter, in itself, can significantly affect their career progression, reputation and mental health.
38. A criminal charge may also give rise to employment-related consequences, with the effect that a teacher could face suspension from their employment in addition to the suspension of their registration to teach.

39. Section 82 of the Education Act provides that:

82 Only approved teachers may be employed as teachers

(1) The employing authority for a prescribed school must not employ a person as a teacher in the prescribed school unless the person is an approved teacher.

Maximum penalty—200 penalty units.

Note—If a corporation commits an offence against this provision, each executive officer of the corporation may be taken, under section 228, to have also committed the offence.

(2) The employing authority for a prescribed school must not allow an approved teacher to teach in the prescribed school if the person's registration or permission to teach is suspended by the college or QCAT.

Maximum penalty—200 penalty units.

Note—If a corporation commits an offence against this provision, each executive officer of the corporation may be taken, under section 228, to have also committed the offence.

40. The term “approved teacher” is defined in schedule 3 of the Education Act to mean a person who is a registered teacher, or who holds a permission to teach.
41. The effect of section 82(2) of the Education Act is that, whilst a teacher’s registration is suspended, there is a prohibition against their employment allowing them to teach in a prescribed school.²
42. We appreciate that Parliament’s primary intention in enacting these provisions was the protection of children. For example, the Explanatory Note to the *Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Bill 2005* recognises that the suspension of a teacher’s registration can have significant consequences their livelihood, as it prevents them from engaging in the profession during the period of suspension.³ Nevertheless, it follows that, due to the close relationship teachers have with children, certain offences are deemed serious enough to justify automatic, non-discretionary suspension upon being charged.
43. However, the types of charges envisaged by Parliament at the time did not include the lower-level offences to which teachers may become vulnerable should the defence of domestic discipline be repealed; namely, charges such as common assault or assault occasioning bodily harm.
44. We refer the QLRC to the material we provided on 20 June 2024, which included further information regarding the nature of charges, the defences raised, case outcomes, and the role of the defence in these contexts. This material is particularly relevant as it demonstrates that the offences most commonly at issue, namely, common assault and assault occasioning

² Under section 74 of the Education Act, the meaning of the term “prescribed school” includes a state school or non-state school, in addition to another institution or place, or part thereof, offering an educational program based on the national curriculum or a syllabus developed, revised or purchased by the state authority.

³ <https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/Work-of-the-Assembly/Tabled-Papers/docs/5105T4121/5105t4121.pdf>, pages 4-5.

bodily harm, are the offences that should be considered by the QLRC when assessing the continued operation of the defence.

45. These are not the kinds of offences that were contemplated by Parliament when the suspension provisions were introduced. If the legislation is amended to remove the protection of the defence of domestic discipline, teachers will face the real risk of significant professional and financial consequences, in addition to criminal, for conduct arising in high-risk and often complex environments.
46. Supply teachers will face heightened vulnerability, as their paid entitlements are limited to the length of their contracts, with no guaranteed income beyond that period. Furthermore, a notice of further consideration may be recorded on their employment file, potentially restricting future employment opportunities.
47. This risk is particularly pronounced if the defence of domestic discipline is repealed without adequate safeguards. Teachers could face the suspension or loss of their teaching registration based solely on student complaints, irrespective of the veracity or context of those complaints. This scenario is especially concerning in environments where teachers may need to implement corrective measures to ensure safety and discipline. We refer to our prior submissions in this regard.
48. It is similarly imperative that any diversionary scheme include confidentiality provisions to protect educators from unwarranted professional repercussions.
49. For teachers, maintaining confidentiality is crucial to prevent damage to their careers from unsubstantiated or vexatious allegations. Without such protections, teachers could face permanent harm to their professional reputations, even if allegations hold no merit.
50. Accordingly, we submit that, in these circumstances, the QLRC must give careful and primary consideration to the importance of confidentiality in relation to any proposed diversionary scheme. This is particularly relevant in light of the potential employment-related consequences for teachers. For those in the public service, this includes the risk of suspension from both their employment and their registration should any reporting obligations arise. The broader impact on the teaching workforce, particularly in the context of an existing teacher shortage, must also be weighed with due seriousness.
51. It is with these concerns in mind that the QTU has considered paragraphs 417 to 420 of the consultation paper. It is with these concerns in mind that we cannot agree with the QLRC's preliminary view that the use of force in circumstances such as when physical interaction may be required between teachers and masters to manage or control students in challenging circumstances, such as when a child poses a risk to others, is already (sufficiently) protected by law (excluding the operation of section 280).
52. Given the significant impact that criminal charges can have on a teacher's career, it is imperative to establish clear legal protections that allow educators to perform their duties without undue fear of prosecution.
53. We refer the QLRC to an article published in the July 2020 issue of the *Queensland Teachers' Journal* regarding a case where an innocent "tap" to the arm of a student from a teacher

demonstrating proper behaviour to a class led to a QTU member defending criminal charges of assault. This case is just one example of how minor incidents, when unfairly escalated to criminal charges, can have devastating and disproportionate consequences for teachers.⁴

54. The way in which the defence of domestic discipline operates as a bar to prosecution provides teachers acting within the bounds of their professional responsibilities with a feeling of confidence and safety that cannot be undermined.
55. The concept of "reasonable force," as currently defined in the law, offers a framework that aligns with community standards and expectations. This framework empowers teachers to manage classroom behaviour effectively while minimising the risk of legal repercussions. Ensuring that teachers can rely on these protections is vital, especially considering the increasingly challenging environments they face, including rising occupational violence and a shortage of qualified professionals.
56. Without the defence of domestic discipline, teachers are left defenceless.
57. Further, in the absence of a measured diversionary framework, the repeal of the defence of domestic discipline risks exposing teachers to a rigid and binary regime: one in which any physical contact, regardless of context or intent, may result in criminal proceedings. Such an approach is not only impractical but counterproductive.
58. In fact, we submit that such an approach would result in significant and entirely avoidable costs on the education system and the broader economy by exacerbating existing workforce shortages, both by deterring prospective teachers from entering the profession and by suspending or criminalising teachers for conduct that would be better addressed through guidance and support. The reputational and professional harm to teachers, as well as the impact on their livelihoods, would be profound, all while offering little demonstrable benefit in terms of deterrence or improved child protection.
59. It is our view that diversion schemes which operate at a level below the courts can provide a timely, proportionate, and rehabilitative response to low-level offending, ensuring that allegations are dealt with meaningfully without defaulting to the full weight of the criminal justice system. They do not diminish the seriousness of the conduct.
60. Repealing the defence without any diversion would be, in effect, punitive formalism as it would produce outcomes that are neither fair nor functional, particularly in the low-level or context-sensitive matters that arise in an educational setting.

Submissions in relation to diversion schemes

61. Should the defence of domestic discipline be repealed and replaced by a diversionary framework, it is understandable that concerns may arise regarding accountability. The QTU has had regard to the possibility that there may be a perception that diversion allows alleged offenders to circumvent judicial scrutiny and undermine accountability, which gives

⁴ <https://www.qtu.asn.au/journal/queensland-teachers-journal/queensland-teachers-journal-july-2020/legal-justice-tap>

rise to concerns that violence against children may be met with a leniency incompatible with Australia's international obligations and public expectations.

62. Respectfully, we do not consider that this concern is made out in practice or principle.
63. There is a wide range of scenarios in which the defence of domestic discipline may apply, and a spectrum of offences; this demands a nuanced and proportionate approach.
64. We submit that the QLRC should consider whether a well-designed diversionary model, underpinned by clear operational guidelines and comprehensive police training, may be appropriate to ensure that minor or isolated incidents are not treated the same as serious or repeated conduct, that the courts are not burdened with undue strain, and that teachers are not unjustly exposed to criminalisation.
65. There is robust and consistent evidence across a wide range of jurisdictions that supports the efficacy of diversionary interventions; where low-level conduct is redirected to education and support services, the outcomes are demonstrably more constructive. Such approaches not only address the underlying causes of the behaviour but also mitigate the personal, professional, and economic disruption associated with criminal prosecution.
66. The QTU recommends that the QLRC examine Queensland's existing diversionary frameworks, including as applied by the QPS, to inform its consideration and proposal of any diversionary schemes, as opposed to focussing on a court based diversionary scheme.⁵
67. It is our submission that there is considerable value in resolving minor incidents outside the court system; this is not only to reduce unnecessary strain on court resources, but to mitigate against the disproportionate impact that criminal proceedings can have on an individual's livelihood. If the QLRC is minded to consider the broader policy challenge of retaining capable teachers, and the underlying circumstances that have made protections like section 280 necessary, then we submit that the QLRC must consider the implementation of pre-court diversionary measures in circumstances where section 280 is repealed. It is of paramount importance to the profession that teachers are not unnecessarily exposed to the consequences of criminal prosecution for conduct arising in the context of genuine efforts to maintain safety and manage difficult classroom environments.
68. Accordingly, we ask that the QLRC consider whether a staged diversion process, such as that offered by the QPS pursuant to sections 378C, 379 and 379AA of the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000* (Qld), would offer a more constructive pathway by facilitating opportunities for professional development and re-education, relational repair, and accountability.
69. We also ask that the QLRC have regard to restorative justice conferencing for matters involving teachers, as it may offer a constructive way to address conduct that might otherwise lead to a charge, particularly in complex behavioural management contexts where

⁵ As set out in the QPS' *Operational Procedures Manual (OPM) Issue 105 Public Edition* (effective 14 April 2025), before deciding to commence proceedings against a person, an investigating officer is first to consider whether in the circumstances an alternative to prosecution would be appropriate. See <https://www.police.qld.gov.au/sites/default/files/2025-04/Operational-Procedures-Manual.pdf>, page 369.

physical intervention has occurred – in addition to an opportunity for reflection, education, and the restoration of the relationship between teacher and student.

70. We further submit that any consideration of whether section 280 should be repealed should also include an examination of whether a warning system, similar to adult cautioning, could serve as a measured alternative to prosecution, particularly in cases involving low-level conduct. As it is currently framed, adult cautioning could apply to teachers who would otherwise rely on section 280.⁶ Relevantly, unlike when charges are laid, an adult caution does not trigger mandatory reporting obligations or result in the suspension of a teacher's registration.
71. While it is essential to ensure accountability for actions that breach professional standards, the imposition of a formal criminal charge is not necessarily the most appropriate or constructive response. Employers are tasked with addressing breaches of professional standards and taking appropriate actions to maintain accountability within the workplace. Ensuring that appropriate diversion measures are in place in lieu of prosecution does not diminish accountability.
72. We urge the QLRC to have serious regard to the need for diversion measures should it recommend that section 280 be repealed, given the broader impact criminalisation has both on individual teachers and the profession as a whole. This is a particularly pressing issue given the current workforce challenges that exist in retaining skilled educators and ensuring that they are adequately protected in the course of their duties.

Submissions in relation to the introduction of a replacement defence for management and control

73. We refer to the QLRC's request for views as to whether there is a need for additional protections for teachers that would clarify that teachers can use reasonable physical force for some purposes, including to prevent harm or injury, but not for the purpose of discipline or correction.
74. It is the QUTU's position that there must be protections in place for teachers and that section 280 operates effectively in that regard. Should it be repealed, there must be alternative protections in place for teachers.
75. As the QLRC would be aware, the amendments made to section 59 of the New Zealand *Crimes Act 1961* to remove the defence of reasonable force for the purposes of disciplining children occurred in the context of intense debate, public concern and political anxieties.⁷

⁶ Relevantly, adult cautioning is limited in scope to offences that are capable of being dealt with summarily, barring a few exceptions. It excludes more serious offences, including where an injury to the victim constitutes or is more serious than bodily harm as defined in section 1 of the CC.

⁷ Beth Wood, Ian Hassall and George Hook, *Unreasonable Force. New Zealand's Journey towards banning the physical punishment of children* (Save the Children New Zealand, 2008) 57
<https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/pdf/4851.pdf/>.

76. It is within this context that the *Crimes (Substituted Section 59) Amendment Bill* was amended to include a new subsection (4), which affirmed police discretion not to prosecute cases that are so inconsequential, there is no public interest in proceeding with a prosecution.⁸
77. We respectfully submit that, should the QLRC consider introducing a replacement defence relating to the management and control of children, it should do so with regard to the underlying purpose of such a defence. Namely, this is to provide appropriate legal protection to teachers acting in good faith to prevent harm or maintain a safe environment, not left to police discretion.
78. Teachers' need for a defence is particularly acute in the current environment, where incidents of violence against teachers are at their highest and the occupational risk of violence in schools is well recognised. Teachers are increasingly required to manage situations involving heightened behavioural risk and physical aggression, and it is essential that the law protects teachers given the practical realities of the profession.
79. We urge the QLRC to consider these factors carefully should it undertake cross-jurisdictional research and, if a draft replacement defence is developed, we ask that the QLRC ensure stakeholders such as the QTU are provided with an opportunity to review and provide feedback on any proposed drafting.

Submissions in relation to the proposed limiting of the application of the defence

80. The QTU has serious concerns regarding the proposed amendments to and limitation of the defence of domestic discipline.
81. In the first instance, we respectfully submit that it would be wholly inappropriate for the defence to be limited to common assault charges only.
82. At present, section 280 is a complete defence to an offence involving the use of force, which means that, as the QLRC acknowledged, it can encompass more serious offences as assault occasioning bodily harm or choking. This breadth is essential, as such offences can arise in complex classroom contexts where teachers use force to protect themselves or other students in the class. The purpose of this provision and its breadth is not to permit corporal punishment or child abuse.
83. Limiting the defence overlooks the importance of police discretion and reduces section 280 to a blunt instrument, unable to account for the complexity of situations where force is used. This approach risks undermining its purpose of affording protection where it is most needed.
84. The proposal to provide legislative guidance on assessing reasonableness or defining unreasonable conduct raises substantial concerns.
85. We submit that a non-exhaustive list of actions deemed unreasonable, such as the use of force on a child's head, face, or neck, would unduly limit discretion. While these actions may seem clear-cut, there are cases where they may be necessary to protect a child from immediate harm, such as pulling a student by the collar to prevent them from running into

⁸ https://www.austlii.edu.au/nz/legis/hist_sop/cs59ab200727132007107446/

traffic. It would be unfair, to say the least, for such conduct to be automatically deemed unreasonable without consideration given to the context or intent.

86. It is the QTU's preference that the substance of the defence of domestic discipline is not amended, however, the QTU prima facie has no issue with the defence being amended to provide that force used in anger is not for punishment and correction. Having regard to the concerns raised in the consultation paper, we consider that it would be best for further guidance in relation to these "allowable purposes" be made available in the QPS' OPM.
87. The QTU supports the adoption of a definition of "teacher" as provided for in the Education Act.
88. It is the QTU's position that section 280 should remain as is so far as it relates to schoolteachers.
89. We ask that the QLRC to give due weight to the professional realities teachers face and reiterate our previous position that the current legal framework provides a suitable remedy for criminal and disciplinary conduct. It should not be amended, nor should it be repealed. We implore the QLRC to give serious consideration to the risks of unnecessary criminalisation when considering Q21.



Kate Ruttiman
General Secretary
Queensland Teachers' Union