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**Objectives/aims**

This paper identifies the gaps within the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum (KS:CPC), and calls for a formal evaluation of the accessibility and inclusivity of the KS:CPC.

**Methods**

Qualitative Policy Analysis

Five-E approach (Kirst-Ashman, K. K. 2017)

One model of policy analysis is the "five-E approach", which consists of examining a policy in terms of:

Effectiveness: How well does it work (or how well will it be predicted to work)?

Efficiency: How much work does or will it entail? Are there significant costs associated with this solution, and are they worth it?

Ethical considerations Is it ethically and morally sound? Are there unintended consequences?

Evaluations of alternatives: How good is it compared to other approaches? Have all the relevant other approaches been considered?

Establishment of recommendations for positive change: What can actually be implemented? Is it better to amend, replace, remove, or add a policy?

**Main findings**

To identify any gaps within the KS:CPC, a rudimentary qualitative policy analysis was conducted on the South Australian Child Protection in Schools, Early Childhood Education and Care Policy. The results revealed: early childhood intervention / transdisciplinary services were omitted. Additionally, there was no mention of access to the KS:CPC for ‘other’ child care related professionals including, allied health practitioners (occupational therapists, speech pathologists, developmental educators, physiotherapists) or qualified-registered educators in non-conventional settings for example playgroups, therapy groups, camps and respite services.