

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE A MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON TUESDAY 22 OCTOBER, 2024

INQUIRY INTO DISCRIMINATION AND BULLYING IN TASMANIAN SCHOOLS

The Committee met at 9.00 a.m.

CHAIR (Ms Dow) - I start by saying that we will be in-camera for this first part of proceedings today.

Welcome to today's hearing of the Government Administration Committee A's Inquiry into Discrimination and Bullying in Tasmanian Schools. We thank you very much for your submission to this committee and we've read it with great interest.

I'm Anita Dow, the chair of this committee. With me in person today, I have Vica Bayley and Kristie Johnston. We have Miriam Beswick online joining us from Braddon. We have apologies from Rob Fairs and Mark Shelton.

Would each of you state your name and the capacity in which you are appearing before this committee, please?

Mr CHEN - Kim Chen. I'm an advocate.

Dr HINDMARSH - Trish Hindmarsh. I'm a member of Concerned Catholics Tasmania (CCT) and a former Catholic educator.

Mr FLINT - Peter Flint. A witness to a significant occasion.

Mr SMITH - Chris Smith. A member of Concerned Catholics Tasmania.

CHAIR - Can I confirm that each of you have received and read the guide that's been sent to you by the committee secretary, Fiona?

Witnesses - Yes.

CHAIR - This hearing is covered by parliamentary privilege which allows individuals to speak with freedom without fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. This protection is not accorded to you of statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the parliamentary proceedings.

This hearing is in camera. This means that it's not broadcast to the public, as per your request. The hearing will be transcribed, but the transcript will only be available to committee members, committee staff, and yourself. Following the hearing, you will be provided a copy of the transcript. Should you feel that any of the information could be made public by either anonymising the content or via redaction, you will be given that option also. Alternatively, you can keep it confidential.

We are now joined by Josh Willie, who is also a member of our committee.

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Each of you will have a copy of the statutory declaration before you. Would you mind each reading that please?

Mr KIM CHEN, ADVOCATE, Dr TRISH HINDMARSH, MEMBER, Mr PETER FLINT, WITNESS, Mr CHRIS SMITH, MEMBER, CONCERNED CATHOLICS TASMANIA, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED

CHAIR - Thank you very much. I assume, Kim, that you will be making an opening statement. Would you like to make an opening statement to the committee?

Mr CHEN - We've given permission to - this is in camera?

CHAIR - Yes.

Mr CHEN - Thank you for that.

CHAIR - This is the confidential part of the hearing.

Mr CHEN - Yes, okay. I have a copy here of what I would like to speak to, which I can provide to each of you. You have already read the beginning because it is the introduction of us and the reasons, too, you will probably understand if you have read the letter to the chairman.

Since lodging our submission, we have received reports of three incidents which illustrate how CET senior management use a modus operandi that can be best described as devious and unconscionable, and how school leaders, because of fear of retribution, feel obliged to engage in subterfuge to circumvent central office edicts in order to properly discharge their responsibility for the welfare of students.

We can go through those incidents of late. One of those incidents, Brother Peter was witness to. I'll get him to let you know what he's said.

If I might, because of time limitations, go straight into that. I'm starting on page 2(a); the Gender Dysphoria policy and procedure, our disquiet regarding the CET [Catholic Education Tasmania] gender dysphoria policy and procedure and set forth in our submission.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Given the duplicity employed by CET senior management in promulgating that policy, there's much irony in the principals' responses. Manipulating - so submissions and evidence to the committee.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The demand that each school write to the CET describing the high level of inclusiveness in their school as evidence to support the CET submission to this inquiry. It was this demand that angered the principals, given the various directives coming to them from Church authorities, in particular the archbishop's letter in May, entitled *We Are Salt to the Earth*, that seemed to them to be so contrary to inclusion and welcome for all.

On a different occasion about 12 months ago, I was asked to engage in enriching conversation with a girl with a very high IQ. The principal was aware that this girl may have gender dysphoria. The principal told me that in the meeting with CET management and principals, a written instruction was distributed to them requiring them to refer to the CET for counselling any student with gender dysphoria. All copies of the instruction had to be returned before the end of the meeting. Fortunately, that student gained a scholarship with a non-Catholic school. When her mother told me, I replied with the worst statement I have ever had to make about Catholic education, 'She'll be safe there'. Thank you.

Mr CHEN - Further, we're aware of an email sent at 10.05 a.m. on Friday 26 July by John Wilson, the new Director of Schools, to principals in these terms:

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Subject one, further inquiry request.

Dear Principals, thanks for the time you have given during your very busy days to work on the two-page narrative submission to the government bullying inquiry. The individual submissions from each school will provide a strong and coherent message about the welcoming and inclusive culture of Catholic schools and the wide range of programs and structures in place to support students and their families.

I have one further request to assist with our overall CET submission, that a member of your team please provide me with the total number of bullying incidents recorded in your school across the 2023 school year. This is just the high-level number of incidents you have determined and recorded as bullying based on the CECT definition below, not the complaints you have received last year about bullying.

It is noteworthy that, in addition to what appears to be a strategy to fudge the figures, no information is sought about the other heads of inquiry in the committee's terms of reference, in particular, discrimination.

Wellbeing and engagement survey: we understand that the Executive Director of Catholic Education, Dr Gerard Gaskin, has resisted the government's efforts to obtain objective, systematic survey data from students. Further, CET has had a contract from the Department of Education, Children and Young People since September 2023 to conduct a student welfare and engagement survey. That survey was delivered in all DECYP schools. However, as CET did not sign off the contract, the survey was not conducted in Catholic schools.

Additional information on episodes in the original submission: Case B, our source of information is Dr Drasko Dizdar. Drasko is willing to be contacted and his contact details can be provided to this committee if need be. Drasko reported the matter to the Archbishop Julian [Porteous], and Dr Gaskin issued an apology. The person subjected to Dr Gaskin's inappropriate conduct did not want to take the matter further and remained employed in Tasmanian Catholic Education Office in proximity to Dr Gaskin.

Case C: the position description should be head of junior campus, not principal. The Independent Education Union Victoria Tasmania and Mr Dino Ottavi: we have been told we are involved in that case.

Case F: we have been told that this policy and procedure was employed at St Brendan-Shaw College in Devonport. I have two documents that are helpful to us in that they demonstrate that we have raised these matters before: our letter to the Equal Opportunity Tasmania and the response from it, Sarah Bolt. I think this is helpful in that it indicates the limitations of Sarah's power and also a lack of resources. She says in her letter that she really did not have the resources to pursue what we would have liked.

I will get back to where I was. So, that is confidential evidence that relates to that. The reason for it being in-camera is that it was marked private and confidential to us, so we do not want it to become a matter of public knowledge.

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

In conclusion, CTT, in its vision statement on our website refers to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse and states; ‘throughout the hearing, the lack of transparency and accountability, the absence or limitation of competence, participation and leadership, and the culture of secrecy and non-disclosure were shown to be characteristic of Catholic Church administration and governance. Such behaviours are inconsistent with the Church's social teaching and its emphasis on human dignity, solidarity and subsidiarity’, and we can explain any of those things if you want.

As a committee, we realise that wise discernment is needed in judging the validity of claims that come to your attention. However, we believe we are justified and be particularly vigilant when evidence is provided to us by parties who are dependent for their continued employment on the care of children in Catholic schools.

Upon decisions and actions taken by CET senior management, who are in turn answerable to the Archbishop, it pains CCT to have to say this. Whilst this committee should perhaps be sceptical of the promoters of causes generally, we believe it needs to be particularly vigilant when it comes to the evidence provided by anyone who may be subject to undue influence from CET senior management or [the] Archbishop.

We remind the committee of our concern that some of this additional material, if it were divulged to the public, many would regard it as scandalous and sensational. That would distract from our principal purpose, which is seeking changes which will benefit CET, the people who work within it, and Tasmania in general. Some of those changes were suggested by the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute and in its recommendations relating to bullying. In particular, those suggested changes which relate to the workplace would address the concerns raised above.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Kim. It is very comprehensive. We can understand entirely why you would want that presented to us in camera. Thank you for sharing your experiences, particularly Peter, so candidly with the committee.

Mr FLINT - I am in between hearing aids.

CHAIR - Oh, that is alright. I was just just thanking you very much for speaking so candidly with our committee about your experiences.

Obviously, many of you have been involved in Catholic Education for many, many years and would have seen a lot of change during that time. From the evidence that you have presented to this committee, it would appear that you attribute a lot of that to changes at Catholic Education Tasmania. I wondered if there is something in particular that you can pinpoint that to and, particularly, what has driven you to get to this point.

Mr CHEN - Trish, you are a former director.



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CHAIR - I am going to open it up to other members of the committee because I'm conscious of time. We've only allocated 45 minutes and we will move back into open session.

Mr BAYLEY - I have a question that sort of directly flows from that. From a governance perspective, the appointment of the director, can you talk us through the process of that and who is the actual decision maker? Does it literally rest just with the Archbishop, or is there a committee, or an oversight governance panel that makes these decisions? Could you talk us through that? You're putting a lot of emphasis on one individual in particular, two individuals, of which one is chosen. How does that happen?

Dr HINDMARSH - In my experience in human resource best practice in Catholic Education nationally, there was always an open, transparent process of advertisement. Sometimes there are companies used to do the scouting, of course, but the whole process, generally in my experience, has been one that's professional and transparent. In this case, I can't speak from personal experience, but from what I have been told, the decision to employ Dr Gaskin in the first place came directly from the Archbishop's influence, and then Dr Gaskin was progressed through the system to the point of being the preferred candidate for the position. That's as much as I can say for the executive director position.

Mr BAYLEY - But who makes the actual decision? Is it just the -

Dr HINDMARSH - The Archbishop.

Mr BAYLEY - Just the Archbishop - literally one person makes decisions?

Dr HINDMARSH - The Archbishop is the absolute final authority in making an appointment such as the executive director of Catholic Education.

Mr BAYLEY - Thank you.

Dr HINDMARSH - The panel puts the recommendation to him. He can say yay or nay.

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Ms JOHNSTON - Thank you very much for your evidence today. I can see how difficult it is to provide this evidence for you personally.

I want to touch on a few aspects of the things you provided today. The first one is in regards to the influence at Catholic Education over principals and their conduct. I'm wondering if perhaps you've identified in your statement earlier about what you believe is manipulation of evidence and submissions to the committee in terms of directing or requiring principals to provide certain evidence. Are you aware of any further examples where Catholic Education has required or demanded that principals provide information to Catholic Education [schools for] public dissemination at all or?

Dr HINDMARSH - There is the example of the *We Are Salt to the Earth* letter, which was required to be sent out to all families via students. That was deemed by certainly the parents at your children's schools, I believe, Kristie, as not a fair or just way to operate, to have that letter in the hands of young people. Of course they're going to open it even though they're told not to.

Young people, especially secondary students who have identified as LGBTIQ, would feel and did feel, and judging by the submission from that young man from the north-west who submitted to your inquiry, whose inquiry is very supportive of ours - that young man, who went to a Catholic college, he said that he wasn't there for that letter, but he was there for *Don't Mess with Marriage*, which was the other document that was absolutely required to be sent home. He described his own personal devastation on reading that letter. They're the two examples I can think of, the two official letters that were required to be distributed and distributed by students to every family.

Ms JOHNSTON - The repercussions that principals are concerned with, I think you've identified their concern that they might not have their contracts renewed. Are there any other repercussions that have been expressed to you, perhaps Peter, through principals at that retreat, what they're concerned about might happen to them?

Br FLINT - I wasn't expecting to be here and I wasn't expecting for the issues that were raised to be raised. I am caught off guard a little bit. I was surprised and concerned at the depth of passion from the staff. It just came out of the blue. Individual staff approached me. It was variations of when I said I was part of Concerned Catholics, 'Tell them what it's like for me,' 'Tell them what it's like for us.' I know, in relation with that particular girl that I mentioned there, the principal was determined to hide it from the Catholic Education Office. I was glad when she got a scholarship out of the system. That's about all I can say, I think.

Mr SMITH - I think there's a cultural issue here. There are rules and there is conscience. Whereas it's quite right for someone in authority to be able to say, 'Well, these are the rules, you must follow them,' on the other hand, if that person following the rules is put in the position the instruction is either against the law of the land (discrimination legislation) or against what they would consider the pastoral care and mental and physical wellbeing of their students, then obviously they're going to be torn by that and would want to return to their conscience, which is 'I don't think this is the right thing to do, if I send this out.' However, as has been said, that can be detrimental to their career possibilities.

Ms JOHNSTON - The other question I had in relation to your evidence was in Example A: additional evidence around gender dysphoria policy and procedure. Am

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

I understand correctly that your concern is that Catholic Education require students experiencing gender dysphoria to go to a particular Catholic Education selected counsellor rather than to an evidence-based practitioner who might be able to assist the student with their general wellbeing?

Dr HINDMARSH - That is the case. The Catholic Education Office would appoint its own counsellor to counsel that child. We wouldn't know what the credentials are of that counsellor. They might be impeccable, they might not. We have justification in terms of theological integrity that underlies these attitudes on behalf of leadership. We have reason to suspect or fear that that counselling would include conversion therapy or a variety of that.

Ms JOHNSTON - Thank you for sharing.

Mr SMITH - In other words, 'Let's fix the problem.'

Ms JOHNSTON - What you're suggesting is that, if I understand it correctly, principals aren't being informed that deputy principals are managing the situation within the school community, not to the knowledge of principals, technically. The students can still participate, but they're not caught in the system that Catholic Education require them to be.

Dr HINDMARSH - They'll still be served by counselling services, but of the school's authority rather than the system's appointment.

Ms JOHNSTON - Do you have any evidence about how that impacts on the school community itself? With the teaching staff, obviously there's a tension there between the principals and the deputy principals, and then I imagine the remainder of the teaching staff, but also the school community, the Catholic school community, what that does?

[REDACTED]

Ms JOHNSTON - So, it is an act to protect the welfare of the child because the principal is so concerned about what might happen to that child. Thank you.

Mr WILLIE - Thank you and apologies for being late this morning, I have three young children who have to get to school on Tuesdays. I am not sure what discussion took place around the in-camera evidence, but just a question on whether there is any of this evidence that we could potentially make public. It is very difficult for the committee to use any of the evidence provided in camera. We cannot report on it. We cannot make recommendations on it.

Mr CHEN - I think we can have a look at that later. In particular in relation to a meeting, which people attended, they can be in the dates, they can be asked where were you on this day? What were you doing? So, there are people who are in jeopardy and particularly, I think, school principals and staff are in jeopardy if we were to disclose some of it, not all. Some of it could, but not all of it, I do not think.

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Mr WILLIE - I guess my question is whether you could reflect on it and maybe have a think about what we could make public. Having served on lots of committees, it is very challenging to use anything that is provided in-camera because you do not want to reveal identities or -

CHAIR - We are moving into open at the end, just for a little while to get some other remarks on the record.

Mr WILLIE - Good, so apologies for that.

Thank you for this submission, too, and for sharing your experiences. There is one aspect to what you have presented today that I might be able to provide some clarity on because that question about bullying incidents recorded in schools was a question on notice that I asked. The context for that was that the state system records incidents and I requested the same sort of information from Catholic Education. I did not request the complaints, but I do not believe the complaints are recorded in the state system either. There might be some clarity there. Thank you for the submission because there are some matters there that we could follow up. Yes, if there are recordings of complaints too and we could delve into the discrimination issue a bit more, but that may provide some clarity to you. It was a question that I asked.

Ms JOHNSTON - Obviously you would have seen that we have received a large number of submissions to our inquiry and a lot of those from Catholic schools, I would say probably in a sort of similar format in terms of their information that they provide, about their inclusion policies and their data that you have obviously identified. It is problematic, I suppose, for us to hear from those school principals seeing how we have to decide who we have present to us and I think 20-odd were from Catholic schools.

We are in a tricky position where we want to hear from principals about what their experience is, and we realise that not every Catholic school is the same. There are some schools that did not send out the *We Are Salt to the Earth* letter; for instance, Dominic College was one of those that did not send it out; Mount Carmel sent it out but with a covering letter. So there are different approaches.

Is there any anyone in particular you can suggest that we speak to, to get a picture of what it is like in their schools? I recognise that you indicated concerns about their welfare of principals, but is there anyone you can suggest that we might like to speak to, provide evidence under oath to this committee to get a fuller picture of what the situation is? We might be able to speak to them in-camera, obviously, but is there a particular school that you feel we need to speak to?

Dr HINDMARSH - It is a difficult one because we are aware of some schools that have had particular incidents that have required investigation, challenges to the principal and the staff. I doubt if any principals working now would be prepared to speak out in a way that would be revealed in public. [REDACTED]

We could approach a couple of other principals to see if they would be willing. I do know a couple, and others may know people too, but I'd have to say I doubt if they would be willing to speak publicly. The consequences would be too difficult. Even in terms of ostracising or

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

having a negativity regarding the interventions that CET, the Catholic Education Office, needs to make to support their school could be jeopardised. Relations might be impaired. Even with staff working at a lower level.

Mr SMITH - A general comment would be that our schools are inclusive, but they're being instructed to not be inclusive. That's our point. When the schools say they're inclusive, I think they're being very genuine and truthful in that.

Mr CHEN - If it were to be in-camera, then would it be in-camera if they spoke to somebody? Who should they contact?

CHAIR - They would have the option to do that. They should contact the secretary of the committee or write to me as the chair for the consideration of the committee.

Mr CHEN - If they wrote to the secretary, is that in-camera?

CHAIR - We consider each of the submissions or the written correspondence that comes to the committee and make a decision about whether it is published in the public domain. If it was intimated in that letter that they wanted it to be treated confidentially, then we would do that.

Mr CHEN - We can certainly make contact with principals we know and say that that opportunity is available, if that would help the committee.

Mr BAYLEY - Thanks for all this information. It's very welcome to hear that the schools are acting in the best interests of the students despite directions from above and from the system. My question is, does Catholic Education Tasmania know that schools are operating that way and not following their directions? If so, how are they reacting to that? What are they doing about that? Do they turn a blind eye and realise that that's therefore in the best interest and they're just going through the motions with their letters and their directions, or is this a significant cause of tension between principals and Catholic Education Tasmania?

Mr CHEN - Between the devil and the deep blue sea. As soon as they reveal that they're not following the rules, they are going to get investigated. For them, as is demonstrated by that example with gender dysphoria, it is to do what they can without drawing attention to themselves. That's the difficulty.

Mr BAYLEY - Which is basically just keep the principal out of it?

Mr CHEN - Yes. It's not just in this instance, it's in other instances as well. Changes to curriculum, other things that are being force-fed. Their attitude, I think across the sector, is to do what we can. If we make a lot of noise, then the boot comes down more firmly. They choose not to make public issue of it.

Mr BAYLEY - On the issue of the Catholic school submissions, like Kristie said, we received a lot of them. You've given us a warning here to be cautious of the evidence of anybody who is subject to undue influence, in your words. Are you telling us we should be cautious about all those school submissions? It's almost the flip side of the question we asked before, which is which one should we talk to? Should we also be cautious about the blanket

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

nature of the assurances and commitments that are given in those submissions because of this undue influence?

Dr HINDMARSH - From my reading of the submissions, I had a fairly good look at all of them, they actually are truthful in the sense that they are outlining the policies and practices that are established in their schools. They're not relating any of the challenges to their modus operandi.

Mr BAYLEY - Or incidents.

Dr HINDMARSH - They're not relating any challenges. They're being good little girls and boys, so to speak, in doing what they've been requested to do. At the same time, they're not untruthful because they're reflecting the policy and procedures that exist in their school, and they are absolutely geared towards inclusion, acceptance, compassion, et cetera.

Mrs BESWICK - Thanks. I was going to ask this off camera, but I thought maybe you would prefer to answer it now. In your submission, you talked about the concerns of not having ways of raising complaints within the system. I am wondering what you understand about that system. Can you explain that a little bit?

Mr CHEN - Thank you. We have raised matters of concern with the director, with Dr Gaskin. Trish did that and got a very curt and, I think, rude response. We've raised the matters with the Archbishop and he seems to be persuaded by what Dr Gaskin has to say without making inquiry further afield. When we raise questions about Dr Gaskin and the allegations made against him and that we might have evidence and we would like a meeting, he refused to have a meeting. The difficulty with the system is those people in authority - that is Dr Gaskin and the Archbishop - are not prepared to have an open, transparent conversation.

Mr SMITH - One of our suggestions has been an objective assessment of the culture within Catholic Education. We were told that is not necessary because everything's okay, despite what we hear.

Ms JOHNSTON - I had a further query. Building on that, you have raised what I would consider pretty serious concerns about the safety of young people across Catholic education, particularly in the examples that you provided, Peter, and your experience that you heard first-hand from that young woman. I should know this because I have been involved in Catholic education in the past. Surely there is a higher level that, for example, a principal or a board of a school could make an objective representation to about their concerns? There isn't.

Dr HINDMARSH - There isn't because the Archbishop is the ultimate authority within his archdiocese. Even though we have also written to the National Catholic Education Commission expressing some of our difficulties, the commission would always defer to the authority of the Archbishop. That's the position in which we are.

That's where I am wearing my synodality badge today, because Pope Francis is valiantly leading us into a church where there would be far more transparency, accountability, collaboration and oversight. The bishops would also need to have reviews and appraisals, and would have the input of those people they serve in the choice of the next Archbishop, for example. These are all reforms that are being discussed in Rome as we sit here, through the

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

synod. We're really trying to encourage our archdiocese to be, ultimately, that type of archdiocese rather than the top-down authoritarian model we have had for the last 11 years.

Mr CHEN - The other thing, Chair, is that because we can't make much progress through the church structures, we've tried to deal through the Equal Opportunity Tasmania. We're currently dealing with the Non-Government Schools Registration Board. We don't rest easy. We continue to pursue it. As the Pope would say, we need to feel the pain of people. These principals out there are trying to do their job. It's difficult enough without having to protect your back as well as the front.

We do need to be sensitive to what is going on. I'm sure, Kristie, you would know through your recent dealings that people are hurting out there. This is not fun and games. This is serious and it relates to young people, who are the future of us, who need to be careful.

Looking at some of the submissions to this committee, a lot of them come from the evangelical schools. I noticed that many of the submissions have the website at the bottom as to how to prepare such a submission. One of the concerns I have, and we have, is what do you do about discrimination? There's an exemption; there needs to be an exemption. When I was on the board of MultiCap, we had our values in the organisation. Parliament has values outside this room. People need to run an organisation according to values. We don't dispute that. The question is how.

In 2021, there was a committee of the federal parliament about discrimination. Frank Brennan made a number of points about what principles should regulate these things. He said, and this is what we agree with wholeheartedly, there should be no adverse discrimination against children. Religious schools should be able to choose staff with an eye to maintain the school's religious ethos. Should a highly conservative or evangelical school want to be very restrictive in staff selection, that selection should not be on the basis of sexual orientation. It should be based on a published, coherent and moral principle, rigorously and equally applied to all staff regardless of their sexual orientation. That's where we stand.

If you have somebody who's sexual orientation doesn't fit what you say your values are, then if they're going to be the groundsperson, why not? If they're going to be the secretary in the office, why not? That doesn't happen in Catholic Education. You don't want anybody to know your sexual orientation. If it doesn't fit heterosexual married relationships, you're in trouble. We don't like that.

CHAIR - That might be a great place to finish our closed session. Have you got one more question?

Ms JOHNSTON - Just a quick one.

CHAIR - I am conscious of time. We've allocated 45 minutes and we're already at that point and I really want you to have the opportunity to have some comments on the record in open session.

Ms JOHNSTON - I didn't grow up Catholic. I sent my children to Catholic schools. I mentioned there's a difference in some Catholic schools in Tasmania. The Salesians, Dominic College, for instance, is a different structure to Catholic Education. Can you explain that so we understand that there are different kinds of Catholic schools, please?

IN CAMERA – APPROVED TO BE PUBLISHED

Mr CHEN - St Virgil's too.

Mr SMITH - The governance structure is different. Whereas most schools are now owned and governed by the Catholic Education Office, Dominic College and St Virgil's are governed by the Salesians in one case and Edmund Rice Education in the other, which means they are the ultimate authority. However, the [Arch]bishop is still the one who gives permission for the school to operate in the location within a particular state. There are also understandings that principals of those schools would be agreed to by the Archbishop. Not appointed by, but agreed to.

Ms JOHNSTON - So there is a slightly different contractual arrangement for employment for those?

Mr SMITH - Yes, and they are employed by Edmund Rice Education or through the Salesian model.

Dr HINDMARSH - That does allow for greater freedom. I was reading one of the touchstones of Edmund Rice Education again the other day and it says, very explicitly, that students, including LGBTIA - I don't think it was staff mentioned, I'm not sure, Chris - but one of the touchstones is far more explicit than Catholic Education Tasmania would be at the moment in its policy in supporting with equality and with welcome allcomers. They have greater to freedom to do that.

Ms JOHNSTON - That answered my question why Beth Gilligan and Steve Casni seemed to have far more ability to be a bit more assertive about this. Thank you.

The in-camera hearing ended at 9.48 a.m.