

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional
Legislation Committee

Disability Discrimination Amendment
(Education Standards) Bill 2004

December 2004

© Commonwealth of Australia 2004

ISBN 0 642 71466 5

This document was printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate,
Parliament House, Canberra

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Members

Senator Marise Payne, **Chair**, LP, NSW
Senator the Hon. Nick Bolkus, **Deputy Chair**, ALP, SA
Senator Brian Greig, AD, WA*
Senator Joseph Ludwig, ALP, QLD
Senator Brett Mason, LP, QLD
Senator Nigel Scullion, CLP, NT

Substitute Member

* Senator Aden Ridgeway, AD, NSW to replace Senator Brian Greig for matters relating to the Indigenous Affairs portfolio

Participating Members

Senator the Hon. Eric Abetz, LP, TAS	Senator Gary Humphries, LP, ACT
Senator G. Barnett, LP, TAS	Senator Linda Kirk, ALP, SA
Senator Andrew Bartlett, AD, QLD (for DIMIA)	Senator Susan Knowles, LP, WA
Senator Mark Bishop, ALP, WA	Senator Kate Lundy, ALP, ACT
Senator George Brandis, LP, QLD	Senator Ross Lightfoot, LP, WA
Senator Bob Brown, AG, TAS	Senator Sue Mackay, ALP, TAS
Senator Geoff Buckland, LP, QLD	Senator Julian McGauran, NPA, VIC
Senator George Campbell, ALP, NSW	Senator Jan McLucas, ALP, QLD
Senator Kim Carr, ALP, VIC	Senator S Mackay, ALP, TAS
Senator Grant Chapman, LP, SA	Senator Kerry Nettle, AG, NSW
Senator the Hon R Colbeck, LP, TAS	Senator Robert Ray, ALP, VIC
Senator Stephen Conroy, ALP, VIC	Senator the Hon. Nick Sherry, ALP, TAS
Senator Alan Eggleston, LP, WA	Senator Ursula Stephens, ALP, NSW
Senator Christopher Evans, ALP, WA	Senator Aden Ridgeway, AD, NSW
Senator the Hon. John Faulkner, ALP, NSW	Senator Natasha Stott Despoja, AD, SA
Senator Alan Ferguson, LP, SA	Senator Tsebin Tchen, LP, VIC
Senator Jeannie Ferris, LP, SA	Senator John Tierney, LP, NSW
Senator Brian Harradine, IND, TAS	Senator John Watson, LP, TAS
Senator John Hogg, ALP, QLD	

Secretariat

Ms Kelly Paxman	Acting Secretary
Ms Sophie Power	Principal Research Officer
Ms Marina Seminara	Executive Assistant

Suite S1.61	Telephone: (02) 6277 3560	Fax: (02) 6277 5794
Parliament House	E-mail: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.....	iii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Key Provisions of the Bill	1
Conduct of the Inquiry.....	2
Acknowledgment.....	2
Note on References.....	2
CHAPTER 2	3
ISSUES	3
Context of the Bill	3
Key issues raised in submissions.....	4
Other issues.....	14
The Committee's views.....	14
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY SENATOR GREIG ON BEHALF OF THE AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS.....	15
APPENDIX 1.....	19
ORGANISATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT PROVIDED THE COMMITTEE WITH SUBMISSIONS.....	19

ABBREVIATIONS

AACS	Australian Associations of Christian Schools
AEU	Australian Education Union
AFDO	Australian Federation of Disability Organisations
ALDA	Australian Learning Disability Association
DDA	Disability Discrimination Act 1992
DEST	Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
HREOC	Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
MCEETYA	Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs
PIAC	Public Interest Advocacy Centre
PC report	Productivity Commission Inquiry Report No. 30, <i>Review of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992</i> , 30 April 2004
PWD	People with Disability Australia
The Act	Disability Discrimination Act 1992
The Bill	Disability Discrimination Amendment (Education Standards) Bill 2004
WA DET	Western Australian Department of Education and Training

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 1 December 2004, the Senate referred the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Amendment (Education Standards) Bill 2004 to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 7 December 2004. On 7 December 2004, the Senate agreed to extend the reporting date to 8 December 2004.

Key Provisions of the Bill

1.2 The Disability Discrimination Amendment (Education Standards) Bill 2004 (the Bill) seeks to amend the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (the DDA) to ensure that the provisions of the draft Disability Standards for Education (the draft Education Standards) are fully supported by the DDA.¹ In particular, the Bill will amend the DDA to:

- introduce and define the term 'education provider' (subsection 4(1));
- provide that it is unlawful for 'education providers' to discriminate on the ground of disability in the development or accreditation of curricula or training courses (subsection 22(2A));
- provide that education providers may be required to develop strategies and programs to prevent the harassment and victimisation of students with disabilities (subsection 31(1A));
- extend the defence of 'unjustifiable hardship'² in education to post-enrolment situations (subsection 22(4)); and
- clarify that disability standards made under section 31 may require reasonable adjustments to be made in order to avoid unlawful discrimination on the ground of disability (subsection 31(1A)).

1.3 The Explanatory Memorandum states that:

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Act in these minor areas to ensure that the draft Education Standards are fully supported by the Act, so they can be formulated by the Attorney-General as soon as possible, to improve the position of people with disabilities in the area of education and training.³

1 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

2 'Unjustifiable hardship' is defined in section 11 of the DDA.

3 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

Conduct of the Inquiry

1.4 The Committee contacted over 30 individuals and organisations by email and/or telephone, inviting input by Monday 6 December 2004. Details of the inquiry, the Bill and associated documents were placed on the Committee's website.

1.5 The Committee received 17 submissions and these are listed at Appendix 1. Submissions were placed on the Committee's website for ease of access by the public. The Committee did not hold any public hearings.

Acknowledgment

1.6 The Committee thanks those organisations and individuals who made submissions to this inquiry.

Note on References

1.7 References in this report are to individual submissions as received by the Committee, not to a bound volume.

CHAPTER 2

ISSUES

2.1 This chapter briefly outlines the broader context relating to the Bill, followed by a discussion of key issues and concerns raised in submissions.

Context of the Bill

2.2 The stated objects of the DDA are:

- (a) to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination against persons on the ground of disability in a range of areas, including education;
- (b) to ensure, as far as practicable, that persons with disabilities have the same rights to equality before the law as the rest of the community; and
- (c) to promote recognition and acceptance within the community of the principle that persons with disabilities have the same fundamental rights as the rest of the community.¹

2.3 Section 31 of the DDA gives the Attorney-General the power to formulate disability standards in certain areas, including education of persons with a disability. Under subsection 31(2), standards made by the Attorney-General must be tabled in parliament. Standards can be amended by parliament under subsection 31(3). The Explanatory Memorandum explains that the purpose of standards is 'to clarify and elaborate the obligations in the Act'.² Under section 32 of the Act, it is unlawful to contravene a disability standard made under the Act. At the same time, under section 34, compliance with a disability standard is a defence to a complaint made under the Act's general provisions.³

2.4 In his second reading speech introducing the Bill, the Attorney-General stated that the Bill is 'an important precursor to the formulation of disability standards for the education of people with disabilities'.⁴ The Attorney General explained that the government released a final draft of proposed Education Standards in June 2004.⁵

2.5 These draft Education Standards have been developed over a long timeframe. The starting point was in 1995, with an agreement of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) to establish a

1 DDA, section 3.

2 p. 2.

3 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 2.

4 The Hon. Mr Philip Ruddock, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 12 August 2004, p. 32510.

5 *Ibid.*

taskforce to oversee the development of disability standards for education under the DDA.⁶ According to the joint submission from the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), the draft Education Standards have been the subject of extensive consultation.⁷

2.6 The draft Education Standards and proposed amendments have also been the subject of a number of previous inquiries and reports. In December 2002, the Senate Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee report into *Education of Students with Disabilities* recommended that Disability Standards for Education should be formulated, and that the Commonwealth 'take the necessary legislative action to put the education standards beyond legal challenge'.⁸

2.7 The Productivity Commission also conducted a recent review of the DDA, which reported earlier this year. This review was wide-ranging, and included consideration of disability discrimination in the education sector.⁹

2.8 Aspects of these reports will be considered as relevant below.

Key issues raised in submissions

2.9 Some submissions were supportive of the proposed amendments contained in the Bill,¹⁰ and indeed some were keen to see the Bill passed as soon as possible.¹¹ Other submissions felt that the Bill had significant problems and would fail to achieve the stated aim of fully supporting the draft Education Standards.¹² Many submissions raised broader issues relating to the draft Education Standards and their implementation.

2.10 The following key issues were raised in submissions and will be considered in turn below:

- the extension of the defence of 'unjustifiable hardship';
- funding and costs relating to implementation of the Education Standards;

6 Attorney-General's Department and Department of Education, Science and Training, *Submission 9*, p. 2.

7 *Ibid*, pp. 2-3.

8 Senate Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee, *Education of Students with Disabilities*, December 2002, p. 118.

9 Productivity Commission Inquiry Report No. 30, *Review of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992*, 30 April 2004 (PC report), Volume 1, p. 377.

10 See, for example, Royal Blind Society, *Submission 1*, p. 1; Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Submission 10*; Australian Federation of Disability Organisations, *Submission 6*.

11 Australian Federation of Disability Organisations, *Submission 6*, p. 2.

12 See, for example, Family Advocacy, *Submission 12*, p. 2; Public Interest Advocacy Centre, *Submission 8*, p. 3; People with Disability Australia, *Submission 13*, p. 3.

-
- the process for finalising the draft Education Standards;
 - the content of the draft Education Standards; and
 - other issues.

'Unjustifiable Hardship'

2.11 Some submissions raised concerns with the proposed subsection 22(4), which would extend the defence of 'unjustifiable hardship' in education to post-enrolment situations.¹³ Currently, the defence of 'unjustifiable hardship' can be claimed in relation to refusing or failing to accept a person's application for enrolment, but not in relation to post-enrolment aspects of education to which the DDA applies.¹⁴

2.12 The Australian Learning Disability Association (ALDA) was particularly concerned about this amendment and its possible impact on students with learning disabilities not apparent at enrolment:

Learning disability is identified only within a learning environment and frequently well after enrolment. Currently learning disability does not come within the State schools sector's definition of disability eligible for funding. Therefore students who are assessed as having a learning disability whilst in an education setting could become even more vulnerable ... ALDA is concerned about what will happen to these students if unjustifiable hardship provisions are extended beyond the post enrolment period.¹⁵

2.13 On the other hand, the Australian Federation of Disability Organisations (AFDO) felt that, while the extension of the unjustifiable hardship defence would lead to a reduction in the rights currently enjoyed by people with disabilities, the change would also:

... facilitate the introduction of the Education Standards which will result in greater protection of people with disabilities by setting out the obligations of education providers in complying with the Act at enrolment and throughout participation in education.¹⁶

2.14 In support of the amendment, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) argued that the Bill and proposed Standards do not substantially alter existing rights and obligations under the DDA.¹⁷ HREOC also submitted that the extension of the defence of unjustifiable hardship simply 'removes a

13 See, for example, Royal Blind Society, *Submission 1*, pp. 1-2; Family Advocacy, *Submission 12*, p. 2; Public Interest Advocacy Centre, *Submission 8*, p. 3; People with Disability Australia, *Submission 13*, p. 3.

14 Subsection 22(4); *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 5.

15 *Submission 5*, pp. 1-2.

16 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

17 *Submission 10*, p. 1.

source of confusion arising from a defect in drafting, rather than substantively altering the existing law'.¹⁸

2.15 During his second reading speech, the Attorney-General pointed to the Productivity Commission's recommendations in its review of the DDA.¹⁹ The Productivity Commission found that the current limited scope of the unjustifiable hardship defence might actually:

... create incentives for educators to avoid or discourage the enrolment of students with disabilities, in case those students might need adjustments that would impose an unjustifiable hardship later in their education.²⁰

2.16 The Productivity Commission concluded by recommending that the DDA 'be amended to allow an unjustifiable hardship defence in all areas of the Act that make discrimination unlawful', including in education.²¹

2.17 The Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC), Family Advocacy and People with Disability Australia (PWD) opposed the extension of the defence of unjustifiable hardship. The first concern of these organisations was that the provisions need to make it clear to education providers that they:

... must provide non-discriminatory treatment up to the point of unjustifiable hardship and if there are measures that will provide for less discriminatory access short of those that impose unjustifiable hardship, such measures must be implemented.²²

2.18 To address this concern, these organisations suggested the insertion of the word 'necessarily' between the words 'would' and 'impose' in proposed subsection 22(4).²³

A duty to make reasonable adjustments?

2.19 Further, PWD pointed out that the Productivity Commission's recommendation to extend the defence of unjustifiable hardship was made in conjunction with a recommendation to amend the DDA to expressly provide for a general duty to make reasonable adjustments.²⁴ PWD argued that:

18 *Submission 10*, p. 3.

19 The Hon. Mr Philip Ruddock, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 12 August 2004, p. 32510.

20 PC report, Volume 1, p. 206.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 211.

22 Family Advocacy, *Submission 12*, p. 2; see also Public Interest Advocacy Centre, *Submission 8*, p. 3; People with Disability Australia, *Submission 13*, p. 3.

23 *Ibid.*

24 *Submission 13*, p. 3; see also PIAC, *Submission 8*, p. 4; PC report, Volume 1, p. 196.

The Productivity Commission saw the two issues as linked, referring to the extension of the unjustifiable hardship defence as a 'check and balance' to the proposed and even more fundamental general duty to provide reasonable adjustments.²⁵

2.20 PIAC, Family Advocacy and PWD also pointed out that the Bill would introduce the term 'reasonable adjustment' into the DDA,²⁶ but this term would not be defined in the Act. They therefore suggested that a number of definitions be included in the Bill, including 'adjustment', 'reasonable adjustment' and 'substantive equality'. They noted that these definitions were drawn from the draft Education Standards (both the current draft and the draft dated July 2002), and, again, that the Productivity Commission had recommended that the concept of 'reasonable adjustments' be defined in the DDA.²⁷ These organisations argued that without such definitions in the Act itself, the Bill would not achieve its primary goal of ensuring that the draft Education Standards were fully supported by the DDA.²⁸

2.21 There was also debate in some submissions as to whether or not there is an implied duty to make reasonable adjustments in the DDA. In its submission, PWD claimed that the decision of the High Court in *Purvis v New South Wales (Department of Education and Training)*²⁹ (*Purvis*) had resulted in 'substantial doubt as to whether there is any duty to provide reasonable adjustments'.³⁰ The PWD argued that the concept was of 'such fundamental importance' that it should be defined within the Act itself 'to ensure the duty is clear and to avoid later legal arguments...'.³¹

2.22 However, HREOC pointed to the decision in *Purvis*, and a more recent decision of the Full Federal Court in *Catholic Education Office v Clarke*,³² which it suggested:

... confirm that under the existing provisions of the DDA, a requirement for reasonable adjustments to accommodate students with disabilities may arise from the prohibition on indirect discrimination, rather than direct discrimination. As a result, these obligations are already qualified by the concept of reasonableness.³³

25 *Submission 13*, p. 3.

26 See subsection 31(1A).

27 PC report, Volume 1, p. 196.

28 People with Disability Australia, *Submission 13*, p. 4; Family Advocacy, *Submission 12*, p. 2; Public Interest Advocacy Centre, *Submission 8*, p. 4.

29 [2003] HCA 62 (11 November 2003).

30 *Submission 13*, p. 3; see also PC report, Volume 1, pp. 186-187.

31 *Submission 13*, p. 3.

32 [2004] FCAFC 197 (6 August 2004).

33 *Submission 10*, p. 1.

Funding and costs

2.23 The Explanatory Memorandum states that 'it is not anticipated that the passage of this Bill will have any financial impact'.³⁴ However, an area of considerable dispute in most submissions related to the costs associated with implementation of the draft Education Standards supported by the Bill.

2.24 The joint submission from the Attorney-General's Department and DEST maintained that:

... if providers are compliant with their existing obligations under the DDA, the cost of providing for students with disabilities should not increase once the Standards are implemented.³⁵

2.25 However, the submission also noted that:

Notwithstanding this, some providers have persistently raised concerns about the potential for increased costs of providing for students with disabilities once the Standards are implemented.³⁶

2.26 The submission pointed out that, to address these concerns, DEST commissioned a cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of the draft Education Standards, as part of the preparation of the Regulation Impact Statement for the Standards.³⁷ The analysis identified a 'huge variation' in the maximum marginal costs claimed by the States and Territories, but concluded that the 'overall benefits of the Standards would exceed their associated costs'.³⁸ This analysis also concluded that:

- the principal impact of the Standards would be to provide increased clarity for education providers, as to their obligations under the DDA, and for students with disabilities, as to their entitlements under the DDA; and
- professional development to support the introduction of the Standards would be the only reasonable cost attributable to the Standards.³⁹

2.27 Consistent with this last conclusion, the Attorney-General's Department and DEST stated that:

In line with his offer at the 2003 MCEETYA meeting, the Minister for Education, Science and Training will contribute to the development of

34 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

35 *Submission 9*, p. 4.

36 *Ibid.*

37 *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

39 *Ibid.*

professional development materials to support the implementation of the Standards.⁴⁰

2.28 The submissions from the ACT Department of Education and Training and the Tasmanian Department of Education agreed with the cost-benefit analysis prepared for DEST.⁴¹ In the view of the Tasmanian Department of Education:

... the Standards serve to clarify requirements under the Act and do not impose any additional responsibilities on education providers. In fact, the Standards have advantaged education providers by extending the application of 'unjustifiable hardship' beyond enrolment.⁴²

2.29 The Tasmanian Department of Education agreed that 'the main costs associated with the implementation of the Standards relate to professional learning to increase awareness among education and training providers of the requirements detailed in the Standards'.⁴³ The Department noted that the Tasmanian Government had provided:

... additional funding over the next triennium to support professional development for all school staff relating to compliance with the Act through the Education Standards.⁴⁴

2.30 Other state governments disputed the analysis prepared for DEST. For example, the Western Australian Department of Education and Training (WA DET) argued that the projected cost for the implementation of the Standards estimated by the Commonwealth was 'manifestly inadequate'.⁴⁵ According to the WA DET, the implementation costs would go well beyond professional development.⁴⁶ The WA DET also said that:

The Standards will increase the expectations for provision of support and services by people with disabilities and their guardians. The implementation of the Standards is likely to have the effect of increasing self-identification of parties as being disabled.⁴⁷

2.31 Similarly, the Northern Territory Department of Employment, Education and Training felt that there would be a number of transitional costs associated with the implementation of the Bill and associated Education Standards. The Department cited, for example, costs associated with infrastructure enhancement, professional

40 Ibid, p. 9.

41 *Submission 11*, p. 1; and *Submission 7*, p. 1.

42 *Submission 7*, p. 1.

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid.

45 *Submission 4*, p. 3.

46 Ibid, p. 1.

47 Ibid.

development, provision of special equipment, information provision and monitoring of implementation.⁴⁸

2.32 Other submissions expressed the view that the Bill and associated Standards would not result in significant additional costs.⁴⁹ As outlined earlier, HREOC argued that the Bill and proposed Standards do not substantially alter existing rights and obligations under the DDA. It also noted that 'very closely equivalent rights and obligations' are provided for in legislation in each State and Territory.⁵⁰ HREOC recognised that 'additional support from all governments for equal educational opportunity for students with disabilities is desirable'. However, HREOC submitted that:

... we do not consider that arguments for significant additional support can be soundly based on additional costs said to arise from the introduction of Disability Standards in this area.⁵¹

2.33 The Centre for Special Education and Disability Studies noted that most major education providers 'are likely already meeting most or all of the proposed standards' and that, in its opinion, 'the implementation of the standards will not result in the need for significant changes in school-based or system-wide practice.'⁵²

2.34 The AFDO disagreed that there would be costs associated with professional development requirements.⁵³ In contrast, ALDA agreed that adequate funding should be made available for professional development 'to ensure that the Education Standards are well understood by all education sectors'. The ALDA believed that this was needed particularly because of low awareness of the DDA, and of the fact that learning disability is regarded as a disability under the DDA.⁵⁴

2.35 More general funding issues were also raised relating to the education of students with disabilities. For example, the Australian Associations of Christian Schools (AACS) was concerned about the funding differential between government and non government schools.⁵⁵ The AACS argued that:

These cost differentials will be exacerbated with the introduction of the Disability Standards for Education into the DDA 1992. While non government schools may be able to sustain cases of 'unjustifiable hardship'

48 *Submission 14*, p. 1.

49 See, for example, Royal Blind Society, *Submission 1*, p. 2; People with Disabilities Australia, *Submission 13*, p. 5.

50 *Submission 10*, p. 1.

51 *Ibid*, p. 2.

52 *Submission 15*, p. 2.

53 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

54 *Submission 5*, p. 1.

55 *Submission 2*, pp. 1-2.

it is inconsistent with both the purpose and intention of Christian schooling as well as the Act that students with disabilities should be treated differently to other students.⁵⁶

2.36 The AACCS concluded that 'funding for students with disabilities should follow an individual student with a disability if he or she changed to, or enrolled in, a government or non government school'.⁵⁷

Process for finalising the education standards

2.37 Another concern raised in submissions related to the process and timing for finalising and tabling the Education Standards in parliament.

2.38 As noted earlier, the Commonwealth government has released a final draft of the Education Standards. However, some submissions were concerned that there was no specific timeframe for introducing the Standards into parliament, and no guarantee that the Standards would remain intact and unamended in that time. For example, the ALDA submitted that:

Within the disability community there is a cynical belief that the Education Standards will never happen. There is a further belief that those with a vested interest will keep trying to delay the promulgation of the Standards, thereby giving time to 'water them down'. ALDA is concerned about the ongoing delays and the fact that there is no timeframe for when the Standards will be introduced.⁵⁸

2.39 Similarly, the Royal Blind Society supported the content of the final draft of the Education Standards and noted that it 'would be concerned however if the draft standard was to be weakened in order for it to be adopted by Parliament'.⁵⁹

2.40 On the other hand, the AFDO submitted that, while they would have preferred the Standards to be introduced into parliament at the same time as the Bill:

... the Commonwealth Government has assured our members that the Standards will be introduced as drafted at the earliest opportunity and a delay in the passage of the Bill would be unnecessary and a disadvantage to the benefits the Standards provide people with disabilities and their families.⁶⁰

56 *Submission 2*, p. 2.

57 *Submission 2*, p. 2; see also PC report, Volume 1, p. 444.

58 *Submission 5*, p. 1.

59 *Submission 1*, p. 2.

60 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

2.41 The AFDO concluded by urging the Senate to 'ensure the tabling of the Standards as quickly as possible to allow their passage as delegated legislation through Parliament.'⁶¹

2.42 The Committee notes that the Explanatory Memorandum states that 'the Government intends that the Attorney-General will formulate and table the draft Education Standards in Parliament immediately following the passage of this Bill.'⁶² This commitment was reiterated in the joint submission from the Attorney-General's Department and DEST.⁶³

Content of the standards

2.43 Many submissions also commented on the content of the final draft of the Education Standards. As outlined above, some strongly supported the final draft of the Education Standards.⁶⁴ For example, the AFDO submitted that the proposed Standards are:

... historic and once accepted by Parliament will clarify for students with a disability and their families their rights under the Act to participate and learn in any Australian education institutions without discrimination. After eight years of development and consultation, people with disabilities are excited and relieved that the Standards are ready to be introduced.⁶⁵

2.44 On the other hand, People with Disability Australia (PWD) noted that, while they supported the draft Standards in the form they took in July 2002, they felt that the Bill and current draft Education Standards 'are seriously flawed'.⁶⁶ PWD believed that the balance had 'tipped too far towards the interests of education service providers'.⁶⁷

2.45 Similarly, PIAC and Family Advocacy outlined a number of concerns with the current draft Education Standards, and in fact suggested that the Committee should expand its terms of reference and time for submissions to enable consideration of the purpose and content of the draft Education Standards.⁶⁸ Family Advocacy even concluded that:

61 *Submission 6*, p. 2.

62 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 2.

63 *Submission 9*, p. 8.

64 See, for example, Royal Blind Society, *Submission 1*, p. 2; ACT Department of Education and Training, *Submission 11*, p. 1; Department of Education, Tasmania, *Submission 7*, p. 1; Centre for Special Education and Disability Studies, University of Newcastle, *Submission 15*, p. 2.

65 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

66 *Submission 13*, p. 1.

67 *Ibid.*

68 *Submission 8*, pp. 6-7; *Submission 12*, p. 3; see also Australian Lawyers for Human Rights, *Submission 16*; PWD, *Submission 13*, p. 2.

... the draft Standards, as currently worded, reduce the rights of students with disability. We have carefully balanced the onerous nature of the current complaints system against the draft Standards and believe that the absence of a DDA Standard for Education would be vastly more beneficial for students with disability than the promulgation of the current draft Standards.⁶⁹

2.46 Similarly, the Australian Education Union (AEU), while stating that it was a strong supporter of the need for Disability Standards in Education, was 'disappointed' with the Standards in their current form. For example, the AEU was concerned that the Standards would not clarify:

- where any responsibility lies between schools and Departments for meeting the needs of students; nor
- whether a student/parent has the right to insist on a particular school or setting as opposed to the Department nominating the suitable facility.⁷⁰

2.47 In contrast, HREOC supported the draft Education Standards, believing that there would be:

... benefits in standards which set out more fully and clearly the principles to be applied and which give some indications of required performance. There would clearly be some advance in these respects compared to the current position under the DDA if standards were adopted in or close to the form of the draft education standards currently being considered.⁷¹

2.48 HREOC continued:

This form of standards will not resolve all issues itself but it should provide a clearer basis for formation of policies by education providers and for discussions between providers and students or parents in individual cases, so as to reduce the need for access and inclusion issues to result in DDA complaints; and if complaints are made standards should assist in resolving them.⁷²

2.49 HREOC concluded that:

While the Commission considers that the Bill and the proposed Disability Standards for Education do not impose substantial new obligations we also wish to emphasise our view that they do not substantially diminish existing rights and responsibilities.⁷³

69 *Submission 12*, p. 3.

70 *Submission 3*, p. 1.

71 *Submission 10*, p. 2.

72 *Ibid.*

73 *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Other issues

Definition of 'education provider'

2.50 A number of submissions raised concerns that the proposed new definition of 'education provider' in section 4 of the DDA used the word 'means' rather than 'includes' and would therefore be an exhaustive definition rather than an inclusive definition.⁷⁴ PWD believed this could cause 'unnecessary problems for complainants'.⁷⁵ These submissions also noted that this provision was inconsistent with the Explanatory Memorandum, which used the word 'include'.⁷⁶

The Committee's views

2.51 The Committee acknowledges the submissions that were strongly supportive of the Bill and wanted to see it passed as soon as possible. The Committee notes the concerns raised in other submissions, particularly in relation to the extension of the defence of 'unjustifiable hardship'. However, the Committee considers that the concerns raised are not sufficient to prevent the passage of the Bill.

2.52 In relation to funding and costs associated with the implementation of the Bill and the draft Education Standards, the Committee supports the view that the Bill and associated Standards are merely clarifying the existing law. In addition, the Committee recognises the government's commitment to contribute to the development of professional development materials to support the implementation of the Education Standards.

2.53 Finally, the Committee encourages the government to introduce the final Education Standards into parliament as soon as practicable after the passage of the Bill.

Recommendation 1

2.54 That the Bill be passed without amendment.

Senator Marise Payne

Chair

74 See, for example, PIAC, *Submission 8*, pp. 2-3; Family Advocacy, *Submission 12*, p. 2.

75 *Submission 13*, p. 2.

76 *Ibid.*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY SENATOR GREIG ON BEHALF OF THE AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS

1.1 The Australian Democrats fully support the principle of the Disability Discrimination Amendment (Education Standards) Bill 2004, and are keen to see the Bill and its associated Standards introduced in a timely and efficient manner.

1.2 We acknowledge the Standards have been in development since 1995 and that a range of government and non-government education, training and disability sector stakeholders have been engaged in that process.

1.3 The Australian Democrats further recognise that given repeated delays and the continuing uncertainty created by the lack of comprehensive Disability Standards for Education, there is a degree of urgency amongst stakeholders, particularly those within the disability sector, to ensure the Standards' immediate introduction.

1.4 Notwithstanding this urgency, the Democrats have remaining concerns about certain elements of Bill, particularly in relation to the extension of unjustifiable hardship provisions within the Act and the provision of adequate transitional funding for professional development.

1.5 As a matter of principle, the Australian Democrats are concerned about any reduction in the capacity of the Disability Discrimination Act to protect people with a disability from discrimination, or any watering down of their rights under the Act.

1.6 We acknowledge evidence from disability advocates including the Australian Federation of Disability Organisations (AFDO), Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC), People with Disability Australia (PWD) and the Australian Learning Disability Association (ALDA) that is consistent with these concerns.

1.7 While we note the evidence that an extension of unjustifiable hardship provisions is consistent with recommendations made by the Productivity Commission's Review of the Disability Discrimination Act, we wish to highlight that this recommendation was subject to the inclusion of a reasonable adjustment safeguard within the Act.

1.8 We share concerns that the Bill extends the defence of unjustifiable hardship, thereby removing rights of people with disabilities and extending greater rights to education providers, without providing the balancing check of an express obligation on education providers to make reasonable adjustments *to the point of unjustifiable hardship*.

1.9 The Australian Democrats concur with evidence questioning the adequacy of reasonable adjustment provisions being solely included within the Standards rather than in the Act itself.

1.10 Concerns arising from this omission are further compounded by the Standards' failure to create any direct link between reasonable adjustment and unjustifiable hardship.

1.11 Finally while we note the inclusion of reference to the concept of reasonable adjustment in the amending Bill, there is no corresponding inclusion of a definition.

1.12 The Australian Democrats note support for the Draft Standards from State and Territory Education Departments at the July 2003 MCEETYA meeting being conditional on a Commonwealth commitment to providing new, non-recurrent funding for all professional development costs and the sharing of unforeseen costs arising from the Standards and further, that these costs were regarded by independent consultants engaged by the DEST as legitimately attributable to the Standards' introduction.

1.13 We acknowledge suggestion that the Standards do not create additional obligations upon education providers, but would argue that if the Standards are properly implemented we would expect a greater investment would be needed in both training and provision of services - particularly for those with learning disabilities who currently fall outside the definition used to determine additional Commonwealth funding.

1.14 The Australian Democrats further note evidence provided to this Inquiry by the Australian Learning Disability Association regarding poor overall knowledge about the Disability Discrimination Act, as well as evidence to the previous Inquiry into Education of Students with a Disability regarding funding and training deficiencies, that have left many teachers ill-equipped to properly respond to the needs of students with diverse learning needs.

1.15 On this basis, the Democrats support both one-off funding to support the introduction of the Standards and ongoing funding that is based on a proper assessment of the shortfall in funding to meet those standards. These funds should not be diverted from an already under resourced system.

1.16 Overall the Australian Democrats support the views of the Committee in light of the overwhelming community desire that the standards be introduced as a matter of priority.

1.17 On the balance of this support and the concerns outlined above, the Australian Democrats will not oppose the introduction or passage of the Bill, but make the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

1.18 That the Bill be amended to include a definition of reasonable adjustment;

Recommendation 2

1.19 That the Bill be amended to place an express requirement upon education providers to ensure all reasonable adjustments to the point of unjustifiable hardship are made in the provision of education service to students with a disability; and

Recommendation 3

1.20 That the government provide immediate additional funding, as identified in the Regulation Impact Statement, for professional development and for additional services that will support the introduction of the Disability Standards for Education.

Senator Brian Greig

Australian Democrats

APPENDIX 1

ORGANISATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT PROVIDED THE COMMITTEE WITH SUBMISSIONS

- 1 Royal Blind Society
- 2 Australian Associations of Christian Schools
- 3 Australian Education Union
- 4 Western Australia Department of Education and Training
- 5 Australian Learning Disability Association
- 6 Australian Federation of Disability Organisations
- 7 Department of Education, Tasmania
- 8 Public Interest Advocacy Centre
- 9 Attorney-General's Department and Department of Education, Science and Training
- 10 Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
- 11 Department of Education and Training, ACT
- 12 Family Advocacy
- 13 People with Disability
- 14 Department of Employment, Education and Training, NT
- 15 Centre for Special Education and Disability Studies
- 16 Australian Lawyers for Human Rights
- 17 Department of Education and the Arts