



Government of **Western Australia**  
Department of **Education**

**PUBLIC**

12/11/12

Your ref : D12/0754364  
Our ref :  
Enquiries :

Hon Giz Watson MLC  
Chair  
Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations  
Parliament House  
PERTH WA 6000



Dear Ms Watson

Please find enclosed the corrected transcripts from officers who gave evidence at the 2011-12 Department of Education Annual Report Hearing on Monday, 22 October 2012.

I wish to clarify some factual information that formed part of my evidence at the hearing.

The first evidence in question appears on page 5 of the transcript, and relates to the Department's FTE ceiling. When answering, I was reading from a briefing note, which stated that our FTE levels at 13 September were 35 494 and our stated ceiling was 34 065. The note from which I read stated that the difference between these two figures was 429, which is the number I gave to the Committee. While checking the transcript, it has come to my attention that the briefing note was incorrect in stating the difference as 429, as correct arithmetic shows it should be 1 429.

The second piece of evidence appears on page 31, and relates to the difference between two types of child protection cases – centrally managed and locally managed with central oversight. I gave an example of a child assaulting another child and indicated, correctly, that an incident such as this would not be reportable to the Corruption and Crime Commission or the police.

However, my response to the question from Hon Ljiljana Ravlich MLC did not strictly answer the question asked. Therefore, I wish to provide a thorough and clear explanation of local management with central oversight. Matters that are categorised as child protection but suitable for local management with central oversight are assessed as being relatively minor in nature and suitable for local resolution and/or performance management, rather than formal disciplinary action. They are also referred to the Corruption and Crime Commission, which retains oversight over how the Department handles misconduct allegations. Examples might include where a staff member shouts at a student in frustration or a staff member uses low level physical contact. The local resolution process involves the staff member and the child and parents in the resolution process.

Yours sincerely

SHARYN O'NEILL  
DIRECTOR GENERAL

Att.

6 NOV 2012