



SEPTEMBER 2025

What We Heard Report

Teachers Registration Act 2000 Consultation

Table of Contents

Version 1 – 22/09/2025

Contents

Purpose	3
About the review	3
Consultation process	3
Feedback summary	5
Objective 1 – Children are safe while they learn	7
Objective 2 – Teachers, including those in early childhood education and care, are high quality and meet professional standards	11
Objective 3 – The legislative framework reflects modern regulatory practise and is fit for purpose	20
Further information.....	23

Purpose

This report summarises the feedback received during the Discussion Paper consultation period for the *Teachers Registration Act 2000* Review. The Steering Committee for Teachers Registration Act Review is providing this report to the Minister for Education as part of its commitment to ensuring stakeholder feedback contributes to any recommendations it makes.

About the review

The *Teachers Registration Act 2000* (*the Act*) provides the framework for teacher registration in Tasmania. Teacher registration plays a vital role in ensuring that teachers, as skilled professionals, meet high standards of safety, competency, and quality.

Since the Teachers Registration Act was first introduced in 2000, much has changed in the child safety and regulator space, including the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings (COI) making recommendations regarding teacher registration, the update of the Framework for Teacher Registration in Australia and the Tasmanian Government's commitment to the registration of teachers in early childhood education and care settings. Among other developments, these changes have meant it is timely to take the next step in modernising education regulation in Tasmania to ensure it better meets the needs of children and young people.

The objective of the Review is to review the *Teachers Registration Act 2000* and make recommendations to ensure:

- children are safe while they learn
- teachers, including those in early childhood education and care, are high quality and meet professional standards
- the legislative framework reflects modern regulatory practice and is fit-for-purpose.

To achieve these objectives, the Minister for Education, Hon Joanne Palmer MLC, appointed a cross-sectoral skills-based Steering Committee to drive the Review. Full Terms of Reference can be found on the Review website: <https://www.decyp.tas.gov.au/about-us/policies-legislation-data/legislation/teachers-registration-act/>.

Consultation process

Consultation on the Discussion Paper was open from 7 March to 12 April 2025.

During this time, the Discussion Paper and information regarding the Review was provided to:

- the Teachers Registration Board (TRB)
- teachers and educators across all educational sectors (government, non-government schools and ECEC)
- employers across all educational sectors (government, non-government and early childhood education and care)
- education regulators (including the Education and Care Unit in DECYP)

- professional associations and unions
- national statutory authorities and bodies – these include the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), the Australian Children’s Education and Care Quality Authority (ACECQA) and the Australian Skills and Quality Authority (ASQA)
- the general public through publication on the Review website and via social media
- the media and public via press release
- community groups, advocacy groups and peak bodies
- academic institutions including the University of Tasmania
- other government agencies
- Aboriginal organisations.

Face-to-face briefings were offered to all stakeholders during this period.

In total, the Steering Committee received 18 written responses as well as 85 responses to online questionnaires. The project team held 18 face-to-face sessions across the state with key stakeholders.

A second consultation process focussed on proposed legislative reforms will be conducted to inform finalisation of a Bill prior to its introduction into Parliament.

Targeted Early Childhood Education and Care consultation

The Review is the mechanism by which the Government is introducing its commitment to the registration of early childhood education teachers in the early childhood education and care sector (ECEC), extending teacher registration to a cohort of teachers that was previously not regulated. It was, therefore, critical there was targeted consultation with the ECEC sector to understand and fully unpack the issues surrounding implementation of early childhood teacher registration.

Over the course of the TRA Review consultation period, the project team conducted nine consultation sessions with the ECEC sector, including both online and face-to-face formats. Participants included Tasmanian peak bodies, ECEC employers (small and large approved providers operating locally, regionally, and nationally), as well as leaders and early childhood teachers (ECTs) at various career stages, from pre-service to experienced professionals, including those nearing retirement. Teachers from school settings also contributed insights into the intersection of teacher registration processes across the school and ECEC sectors.

Peak bodies consulted included Early Childhood Australia (Tasmania Branch), the Australian Childcare Alliance (Tasmania Branch), Early Childhood Educators of Tasmania (ECET), and the Northern Early Years Group. Participating providers and organisations included Goodstart Early Learning, Discovery Early Learning, Lady Gowrie Tasmania, Carlton St Child Care Investments Pty Ltd, Adventure Patch, Orenda Circle, Thrive Group Tasmania, Devonport Childcare Centres Inc, Independent Schools Tasmania, and Catholic Education Tasmania.

Stakeholder feedback from this cohort was also collected via online questionnaires. Of the 85 total responses, eight were from the ECEC sector, with an additional 63 respondents contributing to the ECEC section, including representatives from government and non-government education, VET, higher education, regulation or policy, parents, and others.

Publication of submissions

In accordance with the Tasmanian Government Public Submissions Policy, submissions will be treated as public information and will be published on the Teachers Registration Act Review website. No personal information other than an individual's name or the organisation making a submission will be published unless requested otherwise.



Feedback summary

Overall, submissions received indicated a high level of understanding of the issues with the current *Teachers Registration Act 2000*, and general support for changes that will improve outcomes for children and young people in educational settings.

Consultation revealed that stakeholders were particularly interested in the following areas:

- the provisional to full registration process
- the registration of early childhood teachers in the early childhood education and care sector
- professional development requirements for registered teachers.

The provisional to full registration process was a significant focus area for teachers. From the online survey for teachers, we heard 21 respondents say yes and 35 say no when asked if the provisional to full process should be mandatory. Both groups cited the need for process changes to the way teachers become fully registered. With the potential introduction of ECTs to the teachers' registration system, the provisional to full process for this sector of teachers was also a key discussion point. Kindergarten teachers believe that the transition is currently perceived as harder for those working with younger age groups, indicating that transitioning from provisional to full registration in the ECEC sector will require an adapted pathway that reflects the application of the

Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APSTs) to younger age-groups as well as the unique nature of ECEC employment.

While the inclusion of ECTs in the existing register was widely supported, stakeholders emphasised in fact the need for context-specific pathways and support systems, acknowledging that ECTs often work in isolation and may not have access to registered teachers or mentors.

The professional development of teachers was another area that saw strong feedback. From teachers we heard consistent concern about lack of resourcing of professional development and lack of relief teachers for twenty hours per year, per teacher. Throughout consultation there was moderate support for implementing a mandatory requirement of 100 hours of professional learning over five years, with flexibility for those on approved leave or in specific roles (relief teachers for example). Additionally, stakeholders noted that employer-mandated professional learning is already in place, often meeting the threshold of 20 hours of professional learning per year, which should be recognised as meeting the requirements for registration renewal. Stakeholders highlighted that access to professional development in the ECEC sector is inconsistent due to variability in employer support and resourcing. To ensure equity and quality, professional development should be:

- ongoing
- delivered by trusted, external providers
- supported through government funding, rather than being solely employer dependent.

The recommendations from consultation and the broader review process have been considered by the Steering Committee and have informed the Final Report that will be put to the Tasmanian Minister for Education for consideration. DECYP and the Steering Committee would like to thank all those who participated in the review process. Your submissions will help shape the future education landscape in Tasmania and improve the safety of children and young people.

Objective 1 – Children are safe while they learn

“A nonjudgmental workspace where it is encouraged to ask questions when you don’t understand something.”

- Young Person – Online Survey Response when asked “What makes a classroom a safe and comfortable place for you?”

Information sharing

“Please consider all areas of a child's life and those responsible for their safety be given a pathway to share information in an objective and secure way about any abuse.”

- Teacher – Online Survey Response



Nearly all submissions indicated support for information-sharing measures to help ensure the safety of children. Submissions reflected the complex nature of information-sharing and the need to ensure that, where information sharing occurs, the right protections are in place.

In its submission, the Teachers Registration Board (TRB) called for further powers to ensure it has the information required to undertake its role. The TRB also called for coercive powers, the use of authorised officers and for offence provisions to be included, allowing the TRB to enforce information requesting powers.

The TRB submitted that its preference was for joint investigations to not be mandated in *the Act*. It notes that where the same conduct is the basis for an allegation being investigated by an employer and the TRB, the different statutory regimes, tests and considerations of the investigations will in most cases not align.

Laurel House suggested that legislation should include provisions that protect the identity and consent of victim-survivors where possible. The TRB called for protections for those who share

information and exemptions from the *Right to Information Act* and *Personal Information Protection Act*, similar to the Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Register.

Other submissions reflected the need to define and educate on all levels of abuse and trauma, not just child sexual abuse. Further submissions reflected that information-sharing should not expose or interfere with police investigations.

From the online survey of teachers, we heard that:

- teachers need protecting when allegations are made but not yet proved
- we need to ensure that the consequences reflect the severity of offences
- it is very important that the identity of minors named are protected within any relevant *Act*
- there is a need to define and educate teachers on all levels of abuse (not just sexual abuse) and trauma.

1.1.1 Transparency and accuracy

“Let’s get the leadership in each education institute to show awareness of who is in their schools/buildings at any given time. Especially offer an easy way to document part time and relief staff.”

- Teacher – Online Survey Response

The TRB noted in its submission that the current method of gathering data on place of employment via the Annual Return is undertaken by principals. This is a requirement under section 32 of the current *Teachers Registration Act 2000*. The TRB suggested this process would be simplified once the new IT system has been developed and implemented.

TRB supported more flexibility to request information on where teachers are teaching at any given time. The Commission of Inquiry recommended that employers advise TRB of the date of a commencement and departure of a teacher. It also proposed that the TRB should have the power to require an employer to confirm who is teaching at a school at any time. An employer/teacher should also be required to provide their work status – full-time or part-time and hours worked. TRB noted that its new registration system is intended to simplify the data entry process.

Independent Schools Tasmania’s view was that teachers are best placed to advise TRB of their employment status and place of employment. It also proposed that TRB provide schools with summary details of all teachers on the register assigned to their school for confirmation rather than requiring schools to develop lists from scratch.

There was widespread recognition that it will be challenging to record the place of employment for relief teachers who can work across schools and sectors on any given day.

The survey of teachers included several suggestions to reduce the administrative burden, including:

- logging place of employment changes through the RWVP system
- data exchange between TRB and large employers

- using a system like NSW Working with Vulnerable People arrangements where anyone entering school premises needs to log on with their phone through a reader at the school entrance. This allows a school to access the names of all teachers (and others) on campus on any given day.
- teachers to confirm their details are up-to-date by linking this to their annual registration payment.

AITSL proposed that TRB should collect information of the subjects/learning areas that teachers have undertaken as part of their ITE qualification. It pointed to associated benefits for workforce planning.

Some submissions suggested that many teachers are potentially unaware of the requirement to notify change of address and/or when they are charged with specific offences. One respondent mentioned a promotional campaign to remind teachers of this requirement under *the Act* could be useful.

Enforcement measures and suspension of registration

“I think once charges are laid of a serious offence, then a registration suspension needs to be in place till charges are proven or disproven.”

- Teacher – Online Survey Response

Submissions showed general support for increased board powers to impose suspensions and issue infringement notices.

The TRB recommended it be given powers which enabled it to:

- issue infringement notices
- immediately suspend registration if a teacher poses a risk to students
- suspend registration where a teacher is charged with a serious offence.

Some stakeholders advocated for broader suspension powers, including cases involving credible allegations that suggest harm to children, while others warned against defining serious offences too broadly and emphasised the need for fair investigation procedures and clear suspension timeframes. Conditional registration and appeal mechanisms were also suggested to ensure due process while safeguarding students.

TASSO suggested that where a teacher is charged with a serious criminal offence, there must be mechanisms within the registration framework to impose immediate, proportionate conditions.

In defining serious offences that would allow the TRB to suspend a person’s registration or Limited Authority to Teach, we heard that *the Act* should align serious offences with child protection laws and consider offences from other jurisdictions. The TRB suggested categories of offences should not be detailed in *the Act* but remain a matter of judgment for the TRB.

The TRB agreed that *the Act* should enable it to issue infringement notices. It views these as more effective than prosecution via the courts.

Automatic Mutual Recognition (AMR)

Some responses showed support for AMR, with perceived benefits given teacher shortages across the country and a more transient workforce. AITSL suggested that uniform national legislation to implement a national working with children check would help address gaps between jurisdictions and expedite the implementation of AMR.

The TRB submitted that it does not support AMR, citing child safety concerns. The TRB submitted that the current *Mutual Recognition Act 1992* is sufficient in recognising incoming teachers from interstate. The TRB suggested mandatory notification be required before teachers commence work in Tasmania.

Various stakeholders advocated for greater consistency in risk assessments across jurisdictions, better information-sharing on disciplinary histories, and uniform national legislation for working with children checks. Some recommended requiring training for incoming educators and allowing TRB discretion in imposing conditions based on prior conduct.

There was general concern for child safety regarding AMR in Tasmania and the differences between the Tasmanian working with vulnerable people check compared to interstate equivalents.

Objective 2 – Teachers, including those in early childhood education and care, are high quality and meet professional standards



Categories in the Teachers Register

Consultations revealed a strong consensus around the need for a more agile and inclusive teacher registration framework. Key stakeholders, including regulatory bodies, education institutions, and teachers, called for:

- a clear mechanism within *the Act* to allow the creation of registration categories through regulation, supported by targeted consultation
- an approach to teacher categories that can better accommodate the profiles of all teachers, including those working in non-traditional settings, such as community programs, short-term specialist roles, and casual relief positions, through new or refined registration categories.
- teacher categories that reflect the diversity of professional practice to support retention and career progression
- consistency across jurisdictions and alignment with the APSTs, to support mobility and coherence.

Transition from provisional to full registration

“The present (and previous) system creates unnecessary administration burden.”

- Teacher – Online Survey Response

Stakeholders broadly supported the five-year timeframe for transitioning from provisional to full registration but emphasised the need for flexibility in cases such as parental leave, health issues, or remote teaching. The TRB supported legislation that enables it to extend the five-year period in exceptional circumstances.

Tasmanian Association of State School Organisations (TASSO) suggested a three-year timeframe for the transition.

We heard that in 2024 the TRB streamlined the Provisional to Full Registration process. Despite these improvements, many teachers and stakeholders expressed concerns that the current process remains too rigid and demanding, contributing to workload pressures and broader workforce challenges.

TASSO submitted that the high proportion of provisionally registered teachers signals the need for closer examination of support structures and progression pathways. They suggested that extended or indefinite provisional registration risks impacting educational quality and professional credibility.

AITSL recommended shifting the assessment into the workplace, allowing schools to make recommendations to the TRB for its endorsement, and stressed that the process should feel integrated into teaching practice, not like an extra assignment.

ACEQA supported the proposal to require teachers to obtain full registration within 5 years to ensure the continued health, safety and wellbeing of all children.

Most respondents to the teachers' survey were not supportive of the requirement to obtain full registration within five years, citing issues around the current process. Concerns included that the process is inflexible and resource intensive and that it should be a school-based interview/observation process, not a portfolio process.

Continuous Professional Learning

“Teachers should learn more about the present time and not keep their minds stuck in the time that they went to school and how their old teachers taught them.”

- Young Person – Online Survey Response

There was moderate support for implementing a mandatory requirement of 100 hours of professional learning (PL) over five years, with flexibility for those on approved leave or in specific roles (relief teachers for example). Additionally, stakeholders noted that employer-mandated professional learning is already in place, often meeting the threshold of 20 hours of PL per year and that this should be recognised as meeting the requirements for registration renewal.

Consultation participants emphasised the importance of diverse PL content, including child safety, trauma-informed practice, digital literacy, and subject-specific skills. Suggestions included introducing a digital system to track PL, establishing structured professional growth pathways, and mandating child safeguarding training prior to registration.

Laurel House submitted that every teacher seeking registration or renewal should be required to complete mandatory child protection training.

There was limited support for expanding the TRB's role to accredit PL programs, with both the TRB and AITSL advising against it. Teachers raised concerns about limited access to professional development, particularly due to inadequate resourcing, lack of relief teacher availability, and the challenges faced by casual and relief teachers in accessing PL opportunities across multiple settings.

Professional certifications for Practising Teachers

Stakeholders strongly supported Highly Accomplished and Lead Teacher (HALT) certification as a valuable mechanism for recognising teaching expertise, promoting career progression, and retaining experienced educators. The TRB's 2020 pilot was viewed positively, with calls to expand the program to the broader teaching workforce once it becomes stable and scalable.

There was clear consensus that for HALT certification to have system-wide impact, it must be both achievable and accessible.

Limited Authority to Teach

Stakeholders acknowledged the important role that Limited Authority to Teach (LAT) arrangements play in addressing workforce shortages, particularly in hard-to-staff schools. Feedback also highlighted the need for clearer parameters to ensure LATs are used appropriately and effectively.

The Australian Education Union (AEU) recommended strengthening the legislative framework by introducing more defined eligibility criteria, clearer supervision requirements, and workload limits. They also proposed establishing a distinct LAT category for pre-service teachers to support practicum integrity and reduce potential conflicts of interest.

Non-Practising Teacher category

Stakeholders generally supported the introduction of a Non-Practising Teacher category as a positive step to support professional continuity and make it easier for teachers to return to the workforce.

They also highlighted the importance of ensuring that non-practising teachers, particularly those who have been out of the classroom for an extended period, are fully aware of their child safety responsibilities before re-entering the profession.

Specialist VET (SpVET) category

The TRB submitted that consideration should be given as to whether Specialist VET registration would be more appropriately provided for as a Limited Authority to Teach. It also queried whether the legislation should be prescriptive in limiting specialist VET teachers to their subjects. It noted that these issues would need further consideration and consultation with stakeholders to inform a final position.



Mandatory requirements in the Early Childhood Education and Care

Support for mandatory registration and national alignment

“Mandatory registration for Early Childhood Teachers (ECTs) in ECEC services ensures consistency, quality, and public accountability. It also affirms the professional status of ECTs and aligns Tasmania with national trends.”

- Peter Underwood Centre Written Submission

Stakeholders expressed strong support for mandatory teacher registration for Early Childhood Teachers working in the ECEC sector. Stakeholders advocated for aligning Tasmania with national standards, noting that the current misalignment signals a lack of value placed on the ECEC sector.

The TRB's preference was that consideration of ECT registration should occur separately to the Review of *the Act*.

Voluntary registration was not widely supported, with the TRB noting that it cannot be effectively regulated. However, stakeholders emphasised the need for flexibility in defining “teaching” and “education settings.” This was seen as essential to reflect the diverse roles of teaching professionals not only in ECEC settings, but also across both school and non-school environments, such as Child and Family Learning Centres (CFLCs). Stakeholders also noted that including broader definitions in *the Act* will also modernise it, allowing it to respond to evolving models of educational delivery.

ACEQA submitted that every early childhood teacher should be registered, no matter the setting they are employed in

Risks and considerations

“Tasmanian ECEC services will require support to transition to a model requiring mandatory registration. This will likely include challenges in administrative capacity and workforce supply. However, mandatory registration is a long-term investment in workforce professionalism and child safety.”

- Peter Underwood Centre Written Submission

While stakeholders broadly supported the introduction of ECT registration, some raised concerns about its potential impact on recruitment and retention, particularly in regional areas, due to added regulatory requirements. Many agreed, however, that these challenges could be addressed through tailored, ECEC-specific registration pathways.

Importantly, stakeholders emphasised that registration must enhance professional practice rather than simply increase compliance. Ensuring that the process adds meaningful value to educators' work will be key to successful implementation.

Registration qualification requirements for Early Childhood Teachers in Early Childhood Education and Care

Inclusion of ACECQA-Approved Qualifications

“The goal of one teaching profession would be undermined by treating teachers with an ACECQA-approved qualification differently to teachers with a Birth to Age 8 or Birth to Age 12 qualification. In addition, the logistics of implementing a differentiated registration scheme would likely be expensive and bureaucratically burdensome.”

- AITSL Written Submission

Stakeholders expressed strong support for including ACECQA-approved qualifications at the ECT level in *the Act* as the recognised qualifications for registration purposes in the ECEC sector.

The majority of stakeholders agreed that excluding ACECQA-approved qualifications risks exacerbating existing inequities in professional recognition and standards of practice, while also contributing to workforce shortages in an already stretched ECEC sector.

A small number of participants did not support the inclusion of ACECQA-approved qualifications, often citing comments that reflected misconceptions about the roles, qualifications, and teaching practices within the ECEC sector, including, for example, the mistaken belief that ECTs hold a diploma in ECEC rather than a teaching degree.

In its written response, TRB advocated for an approach that did not “dilute the qualification requirements for registered teachers or that raises questions of equity for teachers in our schools.” Aligning *the Act* with qualification requirements set in the National Teacher Registration Framework will support this position.

Application of the APSTs for ECT registration

“ACECQA supports the requirement of early childhood teachers to maintain their registration and progress their teaching career in line with regular professional development and the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST).”

- ACECQA Written Submission

Most stakeholders supported aligning ECT registration with school-based processes. This included supporting professional teaching practice across all Tasmanian education settings, from ECEC to secondary education, through the consistent application of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers, which provide a common language for early childhood, primary, and secondary teachers across Australia.

The majority of stakeholders supported the contextualised application of the APSTs within ECEC teacher registration processes to enhance teaching practice and advocated for the TRB to leverage existing resources developed by AISL and ACECQA.

Early Childhood Teacher registration modelling

“There is no register for primary or secondary teachers—they are all in the same category. Why should it be different for ECTs?”

- Early Childhood Teacher – Face-to-face ECEC Consultation

“The inclusion of early childhood teachers in the existing Tasmanian teacher register regardless of their setting would promote the professional recognition of all teachers.”

- ACECQA Written Submission

There was also widespread support, including from ACEQA and TASSO, for implementing teacher registration processes in ECEC that mirror those used in school settings. This alignment is viewed as essential to support consistent, high-quality teaching practice across educational settings and to enhance child safety.

The majority of stakeholders favoured including ECTs in the existing teacher registration framework and register, placing them in the same category as schoolteachers. This would require applying the same rigorous processes for full registration and renewal as those used for schoolteachers.

Stakeholders also agreed that if ECTs are required to follow the same rigorous processes as schoolteachers, such as transitioning from provisional to full registration and renewing their registration by providing adequate evidence against the APSTs, then they should be recognised within the same registration category as schoolteachers. It was noted that the register should also include information that reflects sector-specific qualification pathways and scopes of practice, including the qualification approval body (such as TRB or ACECQA) and employment setting eligibility (schools or ECEC).

Stakeholders widely endorsed this approach as it makes teacher specialisations visible across sectors, enables cross-sector mobility for dual-qualified teachers, particularly in remote and regional areas, future-proofs the registration system, and avoids rigid categorisation. Stakeholders also highlighted that such a model would better support responsiveness to evolving education policies, including the transition to Automatic Mutual Recognition (AMR)

“PD is essential to lift teaching and improve practice, this is what research tells us.”

- Registered Teacher & ECEC Leader, Online ECEC Consultation

Stakeholders also strongly supported the requirement to transition from provisional to full registration, along with ongoing professional learning (PL) for registration renewal, as essential measures to maintain high-quality teaching practices. In line with the National Teacher Registration Framework, stakeholders recommended a minimum of 20 hours of PL per year or 100 hours across a five-year cycle to ensure that teaching knowledge and pedagogies remain contemporary and evidence informed. Stakeholders highlighted that PL requirements should be relevant to ECEC practices, flexible, accessible, accredited, and audited. Guidelines should also be developed to clearly articulate what constituted valid PL for registration purposes.



Additional considerations

“In schools, they have mentors and senior teachers, how does that work in an ECEC service where you’re the only teacher?”

- Early Childhood Teacher – Face-to-face ECEC Consultation

Stakeholders highlighted the need for careful consideration of the impact that mandatory teacher registration will have on Tasmanian teachers, ECEC providers, and the sector. ACECQA and AITSL emphasised the importance of flexibility in meeting registration requirements, particularly given the unique supervisory arrangements in ECEC settings. Similarly, ECEC stakeholders more broadly highlighted the need to consider the contextual implications specific to ECEC settings and strongly advocated for the establishment of support mechanisms.

A contextualised approach to teacher registration

“Support will be needed to support teachers, to help them understand the requirements in place and how the APSTs can effectively improve teaching in ECEC.”

- ECEC Leader, Online ECEC consultation

ECEC stakeholders unanimously recommended targeted registration pathways for ECTs to support their transition from provisional to full registration. This can be achieved through:

- the contextual application of the APSTs to ECEC settings and NQF-approved learning frameworks (such as the Early Years Learning Framework)
- ensuring the TRB and its staff understand the ECEC environment and its challenges, including having dedicated officers with early years expertise, to ensure effective implementation and support for ECTs and services
- simplification of teacher registration processes for all teachers to support efficiency and workforce retention
- the establishment of mentoring systemic support systems for ECTs: (i.e. initiatives such as mentoring and buddy programs, professional networks, and cross-sector forums)

- enhanced access to professional learning opportunities that can support ECTs understanding of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers and their alignment with the NQF.
-

Regulatory transition

According to stakeholders, the transition to a new regulatory framework could be facilitated by:

- a phased approach and a suitable grace period to allow time for the sector to adapt
 - the development of a co-designed pilot program to test and refine the registration process prior to full rollout
 - a deeming clause to facilitate registration of experienced ECTs who have been working in the sector for a significant period and hold relevant qualifications
 - a clear communication strategy outlining the public release of timeframes, including accessible guidelines for ECTs and employers, and direct engagement with Approved Providers (APs) to support understanding and a smooth transition
 - ongoing feedback and review to support continuous improvement as the registration process evolves
 - exploring financial supports to facilitate the transition
 - financial support for the transition, including waiving or subsidising the first year of registration and introducing a sliding-scale fee structure, in recognition of ECTs' pay disparity with schoolteachers
 - increased availability of early childhood-focused teaching degrees in Tasmania, as stakeholders noted current offerings do not meet sector needs, particularly the absence of an ACECQA-approved, three-year early childhood teaching degree at the University of Tasmania.
-

Objective 3 – The legislative framework reflects modern regulatory practise and is fit for purpose

Absence of an objects section

“The TRB considers that the objectives of teacher regulation should include ensuring the safety and well-being of students, maintaining the competence, ethics, and professionalism of teachers, and promoting accountability and public trust in the teaching profession.”

- Teacher Registration Board Written Submission

The TRB advocated for ensuring that student wellbeing remains the paramount consideration in all regulatory functions.

The AEU suggested expanding the scope to include monitoring and reviewing education providers to ensure effective management.

Teachers called for the following to be included in an objects section:

- clarify teaching definition – not counselling, social work, psychologist, health worker
- children are safe while learning
- following the *Child and Youth Safe Organisations Act 2023* standards.

Overall, there was broad consensus that an introduction of an objects section could reinforce *the Act's* purpose and strengthen protections for students.

Principles

“Clear principles support transparent, consistent decision-making and align with contemporary regulatory practice.”

- Peter Underwood Centre Written Submission

There was broad support for the inclusion of principles in *the Act*. The TRB supported maintaining the current principle without additional amendments: that the welfare and best interests of students are of paramount importance (s7A of *the Act*).

The Peter Underwood Centre advocated for Principles to reflect commitments to child safety, professional integrity, continuous improvement, cultural responsiveness (particularly to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities), and collaboration with other parts of the education system.

Teachers called for principles to cover equity, transparency, quality assurance, safety, professionalism, and consistency. They also called for principles to be simple and uncomplicated.



Responses to the TRA Review anonymous survey for Children and Young People showed support for the following themes:

- **Engaging Learning:** Students feel motivated when teachers make classes fun, interactive, and hands-on, rather than relying on textbooks or worksheets.
- **Safe and Supportive Environment:** A classroom feels safe when it is non-judgemental and encourages questions, especially when students don't understand something.
- **Student-Centred Practice:** Students value when teachers give them space to focus and don't speak continuously, allowing time for concentration.
- **Ongoing Teacher Learning:** Young people want teachers to continue learning, especially about the present-day context, rather than relying on outdated methods from their own schooling experiences.
- **Clear and Practical Instruction:** Students would like teachers to clearly explain tasks and show how to do them, rather than just assigning work.

Function definitions for the Board

“This is something that I feel strongly about. When we first were told about the TRB and its functions I was excited about the promotion of the teaching profession part, but feel that has not been undertaken to any real degree and it is essential!”

- Principal/Head of school – Online Survey Response

The TRB and other key stakeholders advocated for the removal of function in section 6 A (c): *‘To promote the teaching profession’* as they believe it conflicts with the role of the regulator. AITSL believes, however, this function should remain in *the Act* as ‘registration is a critical tool in promoting the profession of teaching.’

The TRB also had the following recommendations:

- retain the function to develop and improve professional standards in broad terms
- consideration be given to including powers to initiate disciplinary action where a teacher has demonstrated serious incompetence or a significant breach of professional standards
- the function of the TRB in accrediting ITE programs include the current powers and functions with the addition of functions to 'monitor, evaluate, audit and report on the quality of ITE programs,' and the power for the TRB to issue 'conditional accreditation' of ITE programs where appropriate.

From the teachers' survey we heard views for and against removal of the function 'to promote the teaching profession.' Those supporting removal cited that nothing had been done by TRB in this regard, and that financial resources were better applied elsewhere. Those supporting retention noted the need to raise the profile and esteem of the profession in the community.

Conflicts in Board powers

The TRB supported removal of the Board's power to direct and control individuals appointed to it as this is in conflict with their role as State servants.

Teacher workload

"The process to determine whether teachers move from provisional to full registration is predominantly carried out in the workplace. This would result in a recommendation on the transition from provisional to full made to the TRB for endorsement. Meeting the requirements for full registration should not take the form of an 'assignment' or require additional work on top of a teaching load."

- AITSL Written Submission

The TRB submitted that its revised provisional to full registration model provides an appropriate balance of rigour without being onerous. It noted that its new Client Relationship Management system, when implemented, will further simplify teacher registration and reduce workload. The Board submitted that, given these initiatives, additional legislative measures are not required to simplify registration processes.

The AEU highlighted concerns about excessive workload pressures discouraging teachers from completing full registration. This was supported by responses to the Teacher Survey, which included strong themes that the process should be streamlined. The Teacher Survey also revealed support for reducing the administrative burden on teachers so they can focus on teaching.

For ECTs, ACECQA recommended that professional learning be recorded against the relevant Standards of the APST in already established frameworks.

Need for updates to reflect electronic documentation

Two submissions were received on this issue, with both the TRB and Independent Schools Tasmania supporting the transition to electronic documents.

Clarity and accountability

In its submission, the TRB recommended *the Act* be amended to provide for it to preclude a person from reapplying for a period when their registration is cancelled or refused.

Teacher registration – timing

In its submission, the TRB supported additional flexibility for the Board in respect of registration fees and timing.

Miscellaneous amendments to ensure efficient regulations

Through its submission the Teachers Registration Board also raised a number of minor issues with *the Act* that are inhibiting its administration. The Board recommended several minor amendments, some of these would:

- enable the voluntarily removal of someone from the Register of teachers
 - include the explicit provision of internal review for persons affected by a decision under *the Act*
 - change the terminology from LAT to AAT in line with National Framework
 - amend sections of *the Act* that refer to ‘appear before the board’ to allow for representations to be made to the board, this would allow written submissions etc.
 - amend section 20 to substitute ‘and’ to ‘or’ to clarify that inquiries can be held for each individual situation listed
 - increase penalty units in section 36 – false or misleading statements
 - allow immediate cancellation of registration if it has been obtained fraudulently
 - assess penalty units to ensure they deter non-compliance with *the Act*.
-

Further information

Further information regarding the Review of the Teachers Registration Act 2000 can be found at the website [Teachers Registration Act 2000 Review - Department for Education, Children and Young People](#).

Alternatively, any queries or questions can be directed to: legislation@decyp.tas.gov.au.