



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE SCENARIOS

Overview

The following hypothetical scenarios illustrate how various kind of disciplinary issues and interpersonal conflict would be dealt with in accordance with the following relevant policies:

- Safeguarding Children and Young People Policy
- Member Protection Policy
- Code of Conduct
- Complaints, Disputes and Discipline Policy (including Case Categorisation Model)
- Personal Grievances Policy

Copies of these policies and further information and resources, including how to submit a report or formal complaint, are available on the Australian Dragon Boat Federation [sport integrity webpage](#).

Clubs and State Associations should seek advice from the Australian Dragon Boat Federation National Integrity Manager before taking any action under these policies: integrity@ausdbf.com.au.

Interpretation

Abbreviations and acronyms used in this document have the following meanings:

AusDBF	Australian Dragon Boat Federation
MPIO	Member Protection Information Officer
NIM	AusDBF National Integrity Manager
NST	National Sports Tribunal
SIA	Sport Integrity Australia



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

Scenario 1 (Child Safeguarding)

John (club president) sees Tom (10 year old athlete) get into a car with David (adult committee member) after training. John calls David that night and asks him to explain. According to David, Tom was waiting alone and said his parents would be an hour late, so he decided to give him a lift home because it was on his way and he didn't want Tom to be left by himself.

John tells David that it is safer to avoid one-on-one unsupervised situations with children and written parental consent is required to transport children; next time, he should check the emergency contact list to call or text Tom's parents. John tells David that he is required to notify SIA. John submits a *Report* to SIA, which evaluates the matter as in-scope and categorises the matter as Category 1 under the Case Categorisation Model, on the basis that it is a single occurrence and presents a relatively lower risk of harm.

SIA writes to David encouraging him to familiarise himself with child safeguarding responsibilities. SIA notifies John and the NIM of the outcome. At the next committee meeting, John directs all committee members to demonstrate that they have completed the Child Safeguarding in Sport induction eLearning module.

Scenario 2 (Child Safeguarding)

Alex (parent of a junior National-level athlete) tells the NIM their child raised concerns about Miranda (junior coach) using heavy-handed training techniques like calling athletes fat and refusing requests for water or rest.

The NIM informs Alex that they will be submitting a *Report* to SIA because they have been notified of a potential breach of the Child Safe Practices; and encourages Alex to submit a *Complaint* to SIA, which they do. SIA evaluates the matter as in-scope and categorises the matter as Category 2 under the Case Categorisation Model. SIA notifies Miranda about the *Complaint*, who admits the relevant behaviour but says she was simply trying to improve the athlete's performance.

SIA notifies Alex that the allegation is substantiated and has been referred to the sport to determine the appropriate sanction. AusDBF notes Miranda's good disciplinary record as a mitigating factor and issues a *Breach Notice* proposing that Miranda be formally reprimanded, apologise to the junior athletes, and complete relevant professional development training. Miranda accepts the *Breach Notice*.

Scenario 3 (Child Safeguarding)

Julia (parent of a junior State-level athlete) submits a *Complaint* to SIA alleging that Scott (employed by the State Association as a physio) engaged in inappropriate touching while providing massage treatment to her child.

SIA evaluates the matter as in-scope and categorises the matter as Category 3 under the Case Categorisation Model. SIA refers the matter externally (to law enforcement, the State child protection agency and the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency) and puts its investigation on hold.



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

SIA notifies AusDBF and the State Association for the purpose of considering Provisional Action. The State Association stands down Scott until the matter is finalised. Scott applies for review of this Provisional Action, which AusDBF refers to the NST. The NST determines that this Provisional Action is disproportionate, and the State Association agrees to allow Scott to continue working under supervision and with adult athletes only (revised Provisional Action).

Following confirmation that there will be no further action taken by police and other external agencies, SIA resumes its investigation and finds that the allegation is unable to be substantiated. The Provisional Action is lifted, and the matter is finalised.

Scenario 4 (Child Safeguarding)

Phil (parent of a junior club-level athlete) tells Veronica (club MPIO) he discovered private social media messages between his child and Molly (club coach) which suggest a secret sexual relationship. Veronica informs Phil that she will be submitting a *Report* to SIA because she has been notified of a potential breach of the Child Safe Practices; and encourages Phil to submit a *Complaint* to SIA, which he does and notifies law enforcement.

SIA evaluates the matter as in-scope and categorises the matter as Category 3 under the Case Categorisation Model. SIA notifies Molly about the *Complaint*, as well as the NIM which shares the information with the State Association and club for the purpose of considering Provisional Action. AusDBF provisionally suspends Molly's coaching accreditation, and the club stands Molly down until the matter is finalised. SIA also refers the matter externally to the State child protection agency and puts its investigation on hold.

Molly is convicted of an offence 18 months later in relation to the matter. SIA relies on the conviction to find the allegation substantiated without further investigation. In collaboration with the State Association, AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing to permanently deregister Molly's coaching accreditation and revoke her State Association membership for 3 years. Molly accepts the *Breach Notice*. AusDBF and the State Association publish the sanctions on their websites.

Scenario 5 (Child Safeguarding)

Chen (State Association team manager) becomes aware that Harry (19 year old State-level athlete) is selling illegal drugs to a 17 year old squad member. Chen submits a *Report* to SIA. SIA decides to manage the matter under the Complaints process and categorises the matter as Category 3 under the Case Categorisation Model.

SIA refers the matter to law enforcement; however, no charges are laid. SIA investigates and finds the allegation substantiated.¹ SIA notifies Harry and the NIM, who notifies the State Association and the applicable club. AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice*, which is rejected by Harry. An internal tribunal upholds the finding and sanctions, which are published on the State Association and club websites.

¹ Note the Standard of Proof is "balance of probabilities", which is lower than the criminal standard of "beyond reasonable doubt".



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

Scenario 6 (Member Protection)

Fiona (club member) tells the NIM that she feels bullied by Sally (club member) spreading nasty rumours about her. The NIM encourages Fiona to submit a *Complaint* via the AusDBF reporting tool and, on review of the information provided, categorises the matter as Category 1 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed by the club.

The NIM provides the information to the club, which obtains Fiona's consent to notify Sally. Fiona and Sally agree to participate in mediation run by a local community service. Sally tells Fiona that she has reflected on her behaviour and provides a written apology. Fiona accepts Sally's apology and the matter is resolved.

Scenario 7 (Member Protection)

Rowena (member of club 1) tells Marion (president of club 1) she feels harassed by Sam (member of club 2) repeatedly sending unrequited social media requests and messages. With Rowena's consent, Marion submits a *Complaint* via the AusDBF reporting tool. The NIM categorises the matter as Category 1 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed by club 2.

The NIM provides the information to club 2, which obtains Rowena's consent to notify Sam. Club 2 directs Sam in writing to stop contacting Rowena, along with a reminder about the Member Protection Policy, which Sam agrees to comply with. Club 2 confirms the outcome to the NIM, who shares it with Rowena and Marion.

Scenario 8 (Member Protection)

Jialing (club member) submits a *Complaint* via the AusDBF reporting tool about being told by Simon (club captain) that she was not selected because a pregnant athlete might jeopardise the team's performance. The NIM advises Jialing that SIA is responsible for managing alleged Discrimination and encourages her to submit the *Complaint* to SIA, which Jialing does.

SIA evaluates the matter as in-scope and categorises the matter as Category 2 under the Case Categorisation Model. SIA notifies Simon about the *Complaint*, who admits making the comment but says he was not aware that this was improper. SIA notifies Simon, Jialing and the NIM that the allegation is substantiated and the NIM provides SIA's findings to the club to determine the appropriate sanction.

Noting that Simon has a good disciplinary history and cooperated with SIA, AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing that Simon be reprimanded and required to complete the Harassment and Discrimination eLearning module and apologise to Jialing. Simon accepts the *Breach Notice* and the NIM notifies Jialing about the outcome.

Scenario 9 (Member Protection)

Max (coach of club 1) and Narod (volunteer from club 2) observe a group of members from club 3 verbally insult and physically intimidate two members of club 1 at a competition. Max submits a *Report* via the AusDBF reporting tool. The NIM categorises the matter as Category 2 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed under the Complaints process by the SSO.



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

The NIM provides the information and details of internal tribunal panel members to the SSO. The SSO convenes an internal tribunal which finds the allegation substantiated and determines to suspend the bullies from participating in the next competition. The SSO notifies Max and the NIM of the outcome.

Scenario 10 (Member Protection)

Mohammed (club member) submits a *Complaint* via the AusDBF reporting tool about insensitive racial jokes by Reg (life member of the State Association and the club president's husband). The NIM categorises the matter as Category 2 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed by the State Association, due to a conflict of interest at the club level.

The NIM provides the information to the State Association, which obtains Mohammed's consent to notify Reg. Mohammed tells the NIM that Reg confronted him and threatened to make his life difficult if he didn't drop the Complaint. The NIM informs the State Association, which appoints one of its directors to investigate the allegations of racial abuse and victimisation altogether, and suspends Reg's membership in the interim by way of Provisional Action.

The State Association finds both allegations substantiated and AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing that Reg's life membership is revoked, his State Association membership be cancelled for 2 years and he must apologise to Mohammed and complete anti-racism training before re-applying for membership. Reg does not respond to the *Breach Notice* within time and is deemed to have accepted the sanction.

Scenario 11 (Code of Conduct)

Maria (club captain) submits a *Report* via the AusDBF reporting tool alleging that Finn (club member) was excessively drunk and engaged in obnoxious behaviour at a club regatta. The NIM categorises the matter as Category 1 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed by the club.

The NIM provides the information to the club, which obtains Maria's consent to notify Finn. Noting that Finn has a good disciplinary history, the club reprimands Finn and requests he apologise to the club committee. Finn does so and the club notifies Maria and the NIM. The club also includes a reminder in its next newsletter about responsible service and consumption of alcohol.

Scenario 12 (Code of Conduct)

Bob (member of club 1) raises concerns with the State Association about inappropriate social media commentary by Ed (member of club 2). The State Association finds a comment in a Facebook group it manages in which Ed calls club 1 "cheats".

The State Association arranges for the comment to be removed and AusDBF issues Ed a *Breach Notice* proposing that Ed be formally reprimanded and removed from the Facebook group for one month. Ed does not respond to the *Breach Notice* within time and is deemed to have accepted the sanction. The NIM notifies Bob, club 2 and the State Association, which removes Ed from the Facebook group.



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
0418 480 731
info@ausdbf.com.au
www.ausdbf.com.au
@AusDBF1
@ausdbf

Scenario 13 (Code of Conduct)

Tony (club committee member) submits a *Complaint* via the AusDBF reporting tool and provides documents which indicate that Sophie (club committee member) defrauded the club by directing payment of a government grant to her personal bank account. The NIM categorises the matter as Category 3 under the Case Categorisation Model and confirms that it will be managed by the club.

The club refers the matter to law enforcement and notifies Sophie that it has taken Provisional Action to suspend her from the committee, pending criminal investigation. Sophie is found guilty of a criminal offence, which the club relies on to find the allegation substantiated (without further investigation) and shares this finding with the State Association and AusDBF.

AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing to expel Sophie, which is not accepted (Sophie argues that the sanction is too harsh). AusDBF refers the matter to the NST, which determines that the appropriate sanction is a 3-year suspension of membership and lifetime ban from holding a formal role in the administration of the sport. AusDBF, the State Association and club publish the sanctions on their websites.

Scenario 14 (Personal Grievance)

Kumar (club member) tells Sandra (club president) that Mick (club member) damaged his equipment and is refusing to pay. Sandra invites Mick and Kumar to participate in a discussion facilitated by Travis (club committee member), whom the club considers sufficiently independent of the parties and capable of facilitating a discussion to resolve personal grievances.

Travis leads a discussion and encourages each party to listen to the other's perspective and compromise to resolve the issue, but Mick and Kumar are unable to reach agreement. Sandra informs Mick and Kumar that the club's facilitation process is concluded, but reminds them to behave appropriately towards each other as there are consequences for misconduct.

3 weeks later, Kumar and Mick have an argument at the club facilities. Sandra observes Mick swear and shout aggressively at Kumar in front of other members including juniors. Sandra asks Mick to leave immediately. In collaboration with the club, AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing that Mick be reprimanded and not attend the club at certain times when Kumar is there. Mick accepts the *Breach Notice* and the NIM notifies Sandra, who informs Kumar.

Scenario 15 (Personal Grievance)

Joel (club president) and Dorothy (club committee member) have not been getting along during committee meetings. Dorothy thinks that Joel doesn't appreciate her ideas and is always shutting them down in front of others. Joel believes that Dorothy is not being a team player and is only interested in doing things her way. Lily (club committee member) tells the State Association that the issue is affecting the committee and Joel has threatened to resign if Dorothy remains.

The State Association offers Joel and Dorothy mediation through an independent service, which they agree to participate in. Joel and Dorothy attend mediation, each share their perspective, and promise to be more considerate moving forward.



OUR MISSION

To connect people with dragon boating across Australia.

- 📍 PO Box 3463, Putney, NSW 2112
- ☎ 0418 480 731
- ✉ info@ausdbf.com.au
- 🌐 www.ausdbf.com.au
- 🐦 @AusDBF1
- 📘 @ausdbf

At the next committee meeting, Dorothy verbally abuses Joel, who reports it to the State Association. The State Association makes inquiries and finds the allegation substantiated. AusDBF issues a *Breach Notice* proposing that Dorothy be removed from the committee for 3 months. Dorothy accepts the *Breach Notice* and resigns from the committee. The NIM notifies the State Association.