

## Submission ID: 311928

---

### Part 1: Preliminary

1. Do the objects, principles and definitions in the Act better reflect human rights and inclusion?

Yes

---

### Part 2: Disability Inclusion Planning

2. Will the Disability Inclusion Planning requirements contribute to the advancement of human rights and inclusion?

Yes, but I am unsure on the difference between Accessible Island framework and the Disability Inclusion Plan.

---

### Part 3: Disability Inclusion Advisory Council

3. Are there any changes you would make to the proposed functions or the structure of the Disability Inclusion Advisory Council?

No, I think it's great that it specifies that it must consist of PwD. Perhaps adding some guidance on maximum terms served on this Council would be a good idea. Adding in a specification on age representation would be great- I would like to see more young peoples voices added to these councils. I am also not convinced that advertising in newspapers is the most inclusive way of advertising. What about people with vision impairments or younger people who are less likely to read the newspapers?

---

### Part 4: Tasmanian Disability Inclusion Commissioner

4. Are the proposed functions and powers of the Disability Inclusion Commissioner sufficient to promote inclusion and improve quality and safeguarding protections?

Yes.

---

### Part 5: Disability Services Standards

5. Is it important to retain a requirement for all providers to follow the National Standards for Disability Services and is it clear who these standards apply to?

Yes, but I am concerned that they do not cover GP's. There's a real lack of understanding on what constitutes chemical restraint from GP's and I think this needs to be addressed.

---

Part 6: Senior Practitioner, Part 7: Regulation of Restrictive Practices, Part 8: Appointed Program Officers and Part 9: Independent Persons

6. Will the authorisation of restrictive practices process, and roles and functions of the Senior Practitioner, Appointed Program Officers and independent persons provide better quality, protections and safeguards for people with disability?

I love the idea, but I don't understand who would be an independent person that may be appointed by the Senior Practitioner? Is this an Advocate or a random member of the community? I don't understand this.

---

Part 10: Funding

7. Are the conditions for the Minister to fund activities in relation to the objects of this Act clear?

I actually didn't understand this bit very well.

---

Part 11: Authorised Officers

8. Do you think the role, functions and provisions made for Authorised Officers are clear?

Nope! I did not understand that role at all!

---

Part 12: Appeals, Part 13: Offences and Part 14: Miscellaneous

9. Are there any provisions made in Parts 12-14 that require further clarification?

No, this was great.

---

10. If you have any other comments, suggestions, or concerns about the Bill please let us know.

I think it needs to include more on the authorisation of restrictive practices and specify something on the use of chemical restraint and the need for health professionals to engage with behaviour support practitioners to work on fade out plans for this. It seems to be a gap and a common issue I see in the community.