



**Response from Glastonbury Child and Family Services  
to the National Child Protection Framework**

We would like to congratulate the Federal Government, the Minister Jenny Macklin and the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs for recognising the need for a national child protection framework and for working toward making children's safety, stability and development a national priority.

Glastonbury Child and Family Services has been serving the communities of Geelong and the Barwon South Western region in Victoria for over 150 years; providing out of home care for children and intensive support for families who are experiencing a broad range of stressors. Glastonbury is an active participant in relevant peak bodies and we seek every opportunity to provide a mechanism to hear the voices of the children, young people and families with whom we work.

We consider the current move toward a National approach as an overdue but extremely welcome development in the move toward a fair and just society. However, we would encourage the Federal Government to move beyond thinking in terms of a framework to considering the need for a National Child Protection Strategy or Plan which clearly states roles, responsibilities and levels of resourcing. This is a critical issue where there is joint responsibility for providing services or a system that is totally reliant on two tiers of government – as experienced with regard to the provision of health services.

While we acknowledge that State sensibilities may be a practical issue in the development of an effective strategy we believe protecting the Nation's children and strengthening the communities in which they live is a more pressing issue than jurisdictional interests. Consequently, National leadership is essential if we are to avoid the quoted 'lowest common denominator' outcomes which seem more likely to occur under a framework where there is some capacity for 'opting in or opting out'.

This has been particularly brought to light with numerous recent sad events in other states.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Judy Wootley".

**Chief Executive Officer**  
Glastonbury Child & Family Services  
222 Malop St  
Geelong Vic 3220  
Phone: (03) 5222 6911  
Fax: (03) 5222 6933  
Mobile: 0417 358 431  
Email: [jwookey@glastonbury.org.au](mailto:jwookey@glastonbury.org.au)

**Geelong** 222 Malop Street, Geelong VIC 3220  
**Colac** 4 Miller Street, Colac VIC 3250  
**Email:** [admin@glastonbury.org.au](mailto:admin@glastonbury.org.au)

**P 03 5222 6911**  
**P 03 5231 4740**  
**Web:** [www.glastonbury.org.au](http://www.glastonbury.org.au)



## Response from Glastonbury Child and Family Services to the National Child Protection Framework

Please note: as requested we have maintained the format of the discussion paper (in black font) but have deleted original material where we have not made comments or where deletions do not affect the context of our comments.

### 1. Stronger prevention focus

To prevent child abuse and neglect, we need to be clear about what we are trying to achieve not just what we are trying to stop.<sup>13</sup> If the goal is the wellbeing of Australia's children (including those with disabilities who are not currently counted amongst Child protection statistics – as stated on p.15 of the discussion paper), the focus needs to be on the full range of services and supports that assist Australian families, including tertiary end child protection systems. It would also be beneficial to examine the factors that might currently prevent or hamper the existing services from providing the kind of assistance that they need to: demand exceeding resources; workforce dynamics including high turnover, low remuneration for work expected, inexperienced staff etc; and overall organisational capacity. Having a baseline understanding of the critical factors that negatively impact on outcomes would help us to get the strategy right.

Strategies to prevent child abuse and neglect need to be part of broader strategies to tackle social disadvantage and promote social inclusion and wellbeing. Some of the key risk factors are poverty, parental alcohol and substance abuse, domestic violence, intergenerational abuse and mental illness. The challenge is to ensure that primary and secondary intervention services are meeting the needs of vulnerable families in particular. In line with the previous comment, the "challenge" may be to ensure not that services are meeting the needs but that they can. To examine whether they are implies a unidirectional examination of services (an audit mind-set): examining whether they can opens the process out to include an examination of structural impediments and is more in keeping with the spirit of true partnership and collaboration.

The Australian Government funds a substantial amount of prevention and early intervention work, including family relationship services and community development programs; service program areas such as child care, playgroups and other early childhood programs; and initiatives such as the New Directions for Indigenous Children and early intervention services for children with autism spectrum disorders. More targeted assistance is available through the Commonwealth's Special Child Care Benefit. This is available for children at risk of serious abuse or neglect where attending child care or increasing attendance would improve the child's situation. We would see it as absolutely essential that all the relevant departments implicated here have active representation in working up the new Strategy as well as maintaining an ongoing commitment. We are concerned that Federal departmental divisions (not to mention state divisions) would work against the effective implementation of the new Strategy.

The Australian Government's investment should be complementary to the work of State and Territory Governments and not duplicate other efforts. Any investment should only be complementary to services that are achieving best practice. An investment that

complements flawed systems would be reinforcing systemic problems. Hence the need for a baseline understanding of what works, what doesn't and the reasons why.

We would not want the Federal Government to shy away from adopting an overarching, governance and operational role where that was seen to be the best means of achieving the goals of the Strategy.

The Government is examining its existing investment in parenting and family support early intervention and prevention programs to align it to systematically support goals of preventing child abuse and neglect and enhancing wellbeing. These programs should build upon, not replicate, existing service platforms, like maternal and child health services, preschools or child care centres, and schools. Family Services – specifically Families First in Victoria - have historically provided a valuable early intervention service often while the risks facing children are still quite small. In Victoria, the introduction of Child FIRST has re-aligned support services to families most at risk. The lack of capacity to accommodate lower risk families that still require services in a timely fashion leads to deterioration in their circumstances and the need for intensive, longer term remedial intervention as opposed to less intrusive and timely preventative work. Contrary to preventing children from experiencing cumulative harm this system actually ensures the likelihood of experiencing more traumatic events before they and their families reach the threshold for receiving support. We believe that more work needs to be done earlier and in a preventative capacity, in different environments and at critical and important life stages as opportunities for support emerge.

Changes to child care assistance could be considered to provide more developmental support for children at risk and respite for parents under stress. "Respite" as a term has certain connotations and can even problematise the child as being one from whom the parents need an 'official' break. In 'mainstream' families, parents would never talk of needing respite from their children but many parents will organise for their child to spend time with a friend or relative. Strengthening families and their communities can provide avenues for client-families to access the same kinds of informal supports enjoyed by other members of the community.

Further consideration could (must) also be given to improving the capacity of services for newly arrived migrants and refugees where there has been a high level of parental trauma, (We would see this as a priority. In our region there is a significant Karen refugee resettlement program. Currently, there are no Karen translators and interpreters available) in order to assist them in adjusting to parenting in a new land where child rearing laws and norms may be very different from those in their homelands. We welcome any consideration toward improving capacity at any and all levels.

Family Relationship Centres (FRC's) may be able to provide a wider range of services beyond those to separating couples, for example where extended family members are in conflict with parents over contact and other issues. There is certainly scope to broaden the range of services within the FRC.

Options could be considered for building capacity in Centrelink to facilitate early intervention with vulnerable families. It would appear relatively simple for Centrelink staff in Victoria to make referrals to Child FIRST; in our region this is not commonplace. However, as stated above Child FIRST has already increased demand on limited service options; if Centrelink started referring every client where they felt issues exist the current system would not be able to manage the demand. Having said that, in many respects Centrelink is ideally placed to be a National platform for this Strategy however there would be many issues (and perceptions) to deal with and barriers to overcome before Centrelink could be accepted as the ideal public face for a successful Strategy.

It may be also appropriate to re-examine the Youth Case Management Protocol to ensure that assessments and referrals are working well in the interests of young people. Will

simply examining the Protocol be able to determine the efficacy of the system on the ground?

A key issue impacting on the capacity of parents and families to provide appropriate care for children is substance abuse, including alcohol. This is undeniable and it is important that the Strategy does not lose sight of the impact of all substances and instead focus almost entirely on alcohol (as this document tends to). While alcohol may be the drug of choice in some communities, this is not the case with all members of all communities.

In conjunction with other support services, targeted evidence-based campaigns using a public health model could help promote good parenting and prevent families falling into patterns of behaviour which end up requiring tertiary interventions. The Families First service has achieved this very effectively in the past and continues today under dramatically increasing demand pressures. While public health models have obvious strengths, we see Family Services as having complementary strengths that broaden the suite of service delivery. We would go even further and argue that Families First is actually infinitely more effective than public health campaigns in engaging with the target group and supporting them to work through their challenges.

## 2. Better collaboration between services

To ensure that families and children receive the best assistance it is vital that all parties work together better. There is considerable room to improve collaboration within and between governments and non-government organisations. We strongly support this assertion. Further to this we would argue for a re-assessment of the idea of "partnership" between government and NGOs where NGOs often feel like very inferior members of the collective. As examples:

- NGOs (in Victoria) are often subject to stringent compliance regimes where government departments appear to be immune from the same rigorous expectations.
- NGOs do not have equality in the partnership as exemplified by the inflexibility of regional funding negotiations.

We value the concepts of partnership and collaboration and appreciate the potential benefits that could flow to our communities but we need to make the partnerships work (perhaps by utilising continuous quality improvement principles).

State and Territory Governments are largely responsible for tertiary interventions, such as out-of-home care, statutory child protection family support systems and their direct role in services delivery, like policing, education, and health services, means they are best placed to continue this role. All levels of government invest in a range of primary and secondary intervention services. Scope exists for better integration and collaboration of primary and secondary interventions at different levels of government. We welcome governments' ongoing role in a better integrated and more collaborative context. While States and Territories may be "best placed to continue [their roles]", if they continue to operate in future as they do now then a National Strategy will be severely limited in the scope of goals that it can achieve; while the system may 'look' different it would essentially be the same. States and Territories need to achieve some conformity and standardisation in approach otherwise everything from the data we collect to the protection of children in transient families will be inconsistent and prone to error.

Community expectations are that children will have access to basic (or does the community expect better than 'basic') health and safety, nurturing and education.

The Australian Government is actively developing ways to use the family payments and income support system to encourage and support changes to inappropriate parenting behaviours. The Australian Government believes that assistance to parents should be directed to the best interests of children. Several models are being developed across different parts of the country to ensure that these payments are directed at meeting the

needs of children. To date none of the trials seem to have an educative function with regard to developing parent's skills in handling money or giving them an option to "co-manage" their income. Research findings and our experience in working with people indicates that punitive measures develop resentment and resistance as opposed to sustained and positive behaviour change.

In cases of neglect, income management can provide another option before resorting to more drastic sanctions such as removal of a child from a family. As indicated above, alternative educative methods need to be trialled before initiating any punitive strategies (including income management). This may be particularly appropriate where parents have the desire but lack the capacity to change detrimental behaviours in cases such as drug addiction or gambling. It is debateable that quarantining payments will be truly effective in assisting clients who "lack the capacity to change behaviours". There is a high probability that people with entrenched, addictive behaviours will continue seeking to 'gratify' their needs and that quarantined income will direct parents down alternative and undesirable income-supplementation paths thus exposing their children to even greater risks. The potential flow-on effects exist in terms of increased pressure on the criminal justice, child protection and community support areas. It is possible that income quarantining may provide some beneficial outcomes in very small rural/isolated communities but whether these benefits are generalisable to larger urban settings would appear to be highly contentious. The effectiveness of income management will be enhanced by close collaboration with a range of other parenting support services. While this untested premise may be true there is an enormous body of work embedded in this statement; the nature, scope and operation of such collaboration (in the context of income quarantining alone) will be quite unique and require a whole new way of thinking and operating.

The Australian Government will give State and Territory child welfare authorities (if this includes CSOs – see following comment) the power to advise Centrelink to manage government payments (such as Newstart, Family Tax Benefit and the Baby Bonus) to ensure that in certain circumstances, parents with children at risk of neglect provide basic necessities such as food, clothing and shelter for their children. Previous comments notwithstanding, giving CSOs the power to recommend income management is a bold measure that gives CSOs quasi-judicial powers (prosecution, judgement and sentencing) which would need strict guidelines and criteria (as acknowledged in the discussion paper). While Job Network providers have been required to institute "breaches" for some years (with mixed success), introducing this role to Child and Family CSOs will have an undeniably fundamental impact on the worker/client relationship.

The mechanism is being developed with appropriate parental support services, as well as checks and appeal processes to ensure that people are not unfairly disadvantaged. Sector experience indicates that the capacity of this client group to effectively utilise checks and appeals processes in an effective and timely manner (before experiencing disadvantage) is highly questionable.

The experience in these communities will better inform strategies for the rest of the country. We look forward to hearing from the community members in these 'pilot' areas.

The Australian Government will shortly be announcing a National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and Children which will oversee a consultation process to develop a national plan to better protect women and children from domestic violence and sexual assault. We welcome the development of the National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and Children and agree it is an essential element in protecting children and young people from harm.

Immediate initiatives under the National Plan include:

► White Ribbon Day education activities in rural and regional communities to promote culture-change around violence against women - [While signature events are worthwhile, we would argue that community education needs to be broadly based and ongoing in order to achieve wide spread attitudinal change. Public Health and Road Safety campaigns have been effective in raising awareness and changing specific behaviours. Similar approaches are needed to combat family violence, child abuse and neglect.](#)

The broad range of services that currently have contact with families experiencing difficulties are well placed to identify children who may be at risk of abuse and neglect. For example, drug and alcohol services, mental health services, homelessness services, some settlement services and family violence services all treat the adult as the primary client but have significant opportunities for early identification of children's needs. Currently, they are often inadequately resourced to respond to these needs. [We approached our regional health service provider for the number of children in our community whose parents have significant neurological and/or cognitive impairment. This particular health provider does not collect family composition data where the adult is the 'patient'. We then approached services that deal with the specific impairments we were interested in. They too, neglect to obtain information regarding numbers of children in affected families. This situation is not a matter of "inadequate resourcing"; it has more to do with the perceived relevance of children to the case at hand and the parameters of data collection.](#)

[Agencies will be prevented from working together in the interests of children if the children are not of interest \(to certain agencies in specific circumstances\). The primary opportunity to identify children in need must be preceded by identifying that children are actually present in the first place.](#)

The Australian Government is providing additional funding to tackle the serious levels of violence and increased reporting of child abuse, by providing \$1.5 million for extra workers to ensure that vulnerable children's needs are met. [While any increase in funding is welcomed, \\$1.5 million is not as significant an increase as the situation would appear to warrant; we anticipate that this is an initial funding increase.](#) The child support workers will be placed into program areas that traditionally focus on supporting the parents, rather than their accompanying children. The intention is to trial this concept with programs that are considered prime "first to know" agencies. [See the statement on information gathering/sharing above. In terms of economies of scale and service specialisation it would seem that the resourcing for these new workers should go to services that already support children. It is debateable that a sole child support worker situated in a mental health service would be as effective as if they were placed in an existing specialist service. The priority issue for the "first to know agencies" should be that they establish the presence of children in the situation and that they know where and how to refer on. Obviously some isolated communities may not have specialist children's services to refer to and their circumstances would need to be taken into account.](#)

### **3. Improving responses for children in care and young people leaving care**

The development of national standards and monitoring of the out-of-home care system and transition arrangements for children and young people leaving care could help to ensure parity across jurisdictions and consistent levels of safety and wellbeing of all such children and young people. [In Victoria we would welcome a National framework of minimum standards, monitoring and reporting. We would request that such a framework holds the work done with children and families as the central priority and does not impose an unreasonable administrative burden on CSOs. Specifically we would ask that the National framework supersedes and is not in addition to the State framework. CSOs \(and regional DHS Child Protection Offices\) are currently seriously stretched in terms of staff and other resources. As an example of this, consider the Looking After Children \(LAC\) framework: this framework has better than theoretical value but it is difficult to achieve](#)

within its own timelines and achieving compliance with the current DHS Registration Standards for CSOs is equally challenging.

The Victorian approach has a number of strengths and many elements that have strong potential for achieving positive outcomes if there is additional investment, however the elements are not unified as effectively as one might expect in a single 'framework'. Therefore in developing a National approach we would caution against adopting much of the Victorian framework without first conducting a thorough review of all its facets and how they interface.

A key priority for any National approach is to ensure that the selected client database (singular) is effective, efficient and worker friendly. If we continue to have a multitude of databases then the nature and quality of the data we collect and analyse will be so varied as to be rendered close to meaningless in many instances; an apples and oranges scenario that would undermine everything from effective planning to service delivery.

The single most important request we would have is that any new Standards, Implementation and Monitoring framework is practical and workable on the ground – for that reason, consultations must include practitioners as much as possible because they are the ones who will, or won't, translate ideas into action.

It is anticipated that this could include standards around the support for children and young people in short term care accommodation; competencies of foster carers; arrangements for case management of both foster carers and children in care; access to oversight and grievance procedures for foster carers and children in care; case review processes; case management arrangements and planning and follow-up support for children leaving care. Overarching standards that examine these elements in broad terms, inclusive of Kinship Care, would be most welcome. Proscriptive standards that delve into the minute detail of case practice add unnecessary burden to CSOs reporting and compliance regimes and add little to continuous quality improvement at the casework level.

A strategy to build foster care and Kinship Care nationally could be developed. It could include consideration of case management support, financial and other incentives and disincentives to providing and continuing high quality foster care, as well as consideration of options for improved financial support and access to services such as child care for grandparents, relatives and other people providing informal care to at-risk children. Any efforts to offset the (specifically financial) competing demands that redirect potential carers away from Foster Care will be most welcome. Foster Care, as it is currently conceived, is in danger of being a vocation whose time has gone. If we seriously consider this form of care to be a realistic contemporary option then we need to be realistic about how we ensure its ongoing existence in the contemporary social and economic environments. There is a persistent gap between the systemic view of Foster Carers as volunteers and the systemic requirement that Foster carers be accountable, reliable and outcome driven quasi-professionals. Until this gap is recognised and addressed there will be ongoing tensions and difficulties in recruiting and retaining Foster Carers.

Support for young people as they move out of care and from childhood to adulthood needs to reflect the complex issues confronting them. Leaving Care needs to be a normalised part of our young people's lives as it is for children in the mainstream. Gaining independence is a process and not an event and should be treated accordingly within the system. We agree that improvement needs to be made in this area. Particular support is needed when young care leavers themselves become parents. Options include clearer pathways to further education and training (making HECs a more appealing option), and more sustained individual support to prevent homelessness, early pregnancy or substance abuse. Consideration could be given to the enhancement of the Transition to Independent Living Allowance (TILA).

We would like to think that the better the experience of living in the care and protection system the better the leaving care experience which together combine to improve longer term outcomes.

#### **4. Improving responses to Indigenous children**

We feel that it would be inappropriate for us to comment too broadly on issues of significant importance to indigenous communities although we have identified some specific concerns below. We would imagine it is a given, though not explicitly stated here, that Aboriginal community involvement will be a fundamental element of all these actual and possible reforms, in line with the principles of self determination.

All jurisdictions and NGOs, as they review both their mainstream and Indigenous-specific programs, could monitor the effectiveness of interventions in improving Indigenous children's safety, with a view to improving performance. **More work needs to be done on developing reliable and valid outcomes assessment tools for all populations within the child protection system.** In Victoria we have the Victorian Child and Adolescent Monitoring Framework but there is no plan to have that data linked in any meaningful way to the outcomes data that CSOs could provide via LAC. The Canadians have managed to achieve the utilisation of LAC data and nationwide data to obtain meaningful comparative measures for children in out of home care.

State to State protocols could be developed to enable Indigenous children to be placed with family interstate when this is in their best interests. **State to State protocols are a priority for development as they are an essential component of an effective National Strategy for all children.** It is the absence of such protocols that is a driving force behind the need to develop the Strategy.

#### **5. Attracting and retaining the right workforce**

Ensuring an adequate supply of well trained people in each of the primary, secondary and tertiary areas of intervention is critical to improving outcomes for children. **Strategic targeting of new University entrants is required as a primary intervention to address our workforce issues.** There needs to be a concerted and ongoing campaign to sell the benefits of working in Community Services. Potential workers are being lost at the point of choosing their undergraduate courses on the basis of salary, career opportunities, status and personal risk (amongst other things).

A national strategy requires attention to the optimal overall design of protection and support systems for children. While a key issue is how to encourage, support and resource protective workers, experience in this and similar fields suggests that focusing only on increasing supply will not be successful. Focus is required on the structure of child protection and support systems, including how the protective task itself is undertaken, opportunities for professionalisation and development, and resourcing. **We strongly support this approach and read "protective workers" as inclusive of all workers involved in Child and Family work in both government and non-government organisations.**

A national strategy could address workforce shortages and capacity issues across each part of the system including the government and non-government sectors, with a particular focus on Indigenous specific services. Such a strategy could build on work already undertaken in this area and also in related areas such as the health and child care workforces. It should consider how to restructure the approach as well as the workforce, so the issue does not always focus on numbers of statutory workers **(nor should it ignore the number of workers).**

Creative options around restructuring both the workforce and the protective task itself are required. Key elements could include:

- ▶ looking at the way protective and support functions are currently designed and staffed to examine whether roles can be managed differently and enriched;

- ▶ promoting the development of appropriate competencies (including cultural competency in managing issues for culturally diverse and Indigenous children) in the training of child protection and welfare workers;
- ▶ ongoing professional development, including to manage stress and promote resilience; and
- ▶ agreeing on a national program of training for secondary service providers to ensure they are competently and consistently supporting at risk groups.

There are particular issues for recruitment and retention of staff in regional and remote areas including housing and safety. The approach also needs to include training and development for other groups that play a critical role in the lives of children, such as GPs, magistrates and workers in the court system.

Training and ongoing professional development are essential features of work in this field and this is specifically evident when major systemic changes are implemented in the sector. Most CSOs are acutely aware of the need to keep their workforce attuned with the latest developments and practice approaches. There is considerable tension between the requirement to provide ongoing training and the financial capacity to resource this necessary staff development.

Within the overall staffing problem, there is an identified need to increase training places and training supports for child protection workers and child and family support workers to ensure they have expertise in dealing with Indigenous children. As part of this, jurisdictions could investigate ways to strengthen the child protection training model for Indigenous workers, and link with universities and training institutions. Human services generally and this sector specifically is currently incapable of attracting potential new graduates in sufficient numbers to stave off the aging of the workforce. While training, development and overall structure are important these aspects alone will not attract new staff to the sector. In Victoria there is a significant disparity between the pay rates of Public Sector versus NGO employees. Unit price funding to CSOs (NGOs) is insufficient to provide competitive salaries and also adds an element of strain to staff at all levels in terms of their not having the capacity to achieve identified tasks and goals. Consequently it is not uncommon for CSOs to lose staff to the public sector, while the challenges and impediments to filling the subsequent vacancies remain.

It is surprising and disturbing that this document does not acknowledge rates of pay as a serious issue for the sector; it remains the most significant issue in relation to future workforce viability. If this is not addressed as a matter of urgency then the rhetoric, and processes required to achieve the Strategy's goals, will not be matched by the reality. In line with pre-election commitments the protection of children requires a serious investment in all levels of the service system.

## **6. Improving child protection systems**

Each Australian child protection system operates under the auspices of separate legislation. Across the eight systems there is variation in the grounds for intervention, in what is substantiated and in the response to families who do not meet the threshold for the statutory system but where there are concerns about the welfare of children. This means that families in different parts of the country with similar circumstances may receive a different response depending on where they live. Inequality in the care and protection of children runs counter to the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Being a signatory to this convention adds weight to the argument that the federal government needs to take a stronger lead in overseeing nation wide service delivery. A Strategy that sets out clear goals and timeframes for achieving national consistency in all aspects of the system is essential. As stated before, the level of state and territory variability will make consistent reporting, planning, service delivery and review impossible to achieve irrespective of any attempts to overlay consistent national standards. CSOs would be examining their performance through entirely different 'lenses',

guided by whatever practice realities prevail in their state, territory or even region. Therefore, consistent standards can only be derived from consistent national legislation.

This work would involve developing national child protection definitions, standards, and jurisdiction level performance indicators. It would require investment in aligning approaches to data collection to ensure we are able to compare and measure approaches in line with commonly agreed standards (see the comments above about information gathering and databases).

An independent mechanism could be developed to monitor ongoing performance of child protection systems nationally, analyse results, and report publicly about outcomes and areas requiring further action. Again, as stated numerous times, measurement and analysis will only be meaningful and useful if the capacity exists to measure the same things across jurisdictions.



**Nick Collins**  
**Director - Organisational Development**  
Glastonbury Child & Family Services  
222 Malop Street  
Geelong Vic 3220  
Phone: (03) 5222 6911  
Fax: (03) 5222 6933  
Mobile: 0417 358 431  
Email: [ncollins@glastonbury.org.au](mailto:ncollins@glastonbury.org.au)  
Web: [www.glastonbury.org.au](http://www.glastonbury.org.au)



**Tony Meagher**  
**Quality & Registration Manager**  
Glastonbury Child & Family Services  
Phone direct: (03) 5226 8965  
Phone Reception: (03) 5222 6911  
Fax: (03) 5222 6933  
Email: [tmeagher@glastonbury.org.au](mailto:tmeagher@glastonbury.org.au)  
Web: [www.glastonbury.org.au](http://www.glastonbury.org.au)