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Preface

On Friday 11 January 2013, the Governor-General appointed a six-member Royal Commission to inquire into how institutions with a responsibility for children have managed and responded to allegations and instances of child sexual abuse.

The Royal Commission is tasked with investigating where systems have failed to protect children, and making recommendations on how to improve laws, policies and practices to prevent and better respond to child sexual abuse in institutions.

The Royal Commission has developed a comprehensive research program to support its work and to inform its findings and recommendations. The program focuses on eight themes:

1. Why does child sexual abuse occur in institutions?
2. How can child sexual abuse in institutions be prevented?
3. How can child sexual abuse be better identified?
4. How should institutions respond where child sexual abuse has occurred?
5. How should government and statutory authorities respond?
6. What are the treatment and support needs of victims/survivors and their families?
7. What is the history of particular institutions of interest?
8. How do we ensure the Royal Commission has a positive impact?

This research report falls within theme two.

The research program means the Royal Commission can:

- Obtain relevant background information;
- Fill key evidence gaps;
- Explore what is known and what works;
- Develop recommendations that are informed by evidence, can be implemented, and respond to contemporary issues.

For more on this program, please visit www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/research.
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Glossary

*Child protection education:* This term is used in school systems to refer to a specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in use.

*Child safety education:* This term is used in some school systems to refer to a specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in use.

*Child sexual abuse prevention education:* This is the term used in this report to describe educational experiences, activities and materials developed for the purpose of increasing children’s knowledge about child sexual abuse, and skills in responding to threats.

*Curriculum:* This is defined as the core knowledge, understandings, skills, capabilities and dispositions students should learn and acquire as they progress through school (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2009). Curriculum is developed by school authorities and is designed to be taught within the teaching time available during the school day/term/year and with the resources provided by school authorities and made available at individual schools.

*Policy:* This is defined as a public statement expressing what a government intends to do – or not to do – to address a problem or a set of problems (Birkland, 2005; Pal, 2009). The terms policy and/or policies are used in this report to mean the substance of official texts: in this case, school system policy and education curriculum that outline school authorities' actions in relation to child sexual abuse prevention education.

*Protective behaviours:* This term is used in two ways: (i) to refer to a specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum known as the Protective Behaviours Program™ delivered in Australian schools under the auspices of the organisation known as Protective Behaviours Australia and its state branches; and (ii) somewhat problematically, as a synonym for *child sexual abuse prevention education*. The problematic nature of this latter usage is further addressed in this report.

*School authority(ies) or school system(s):* These are terms used interchangeably to refer to Australian state and territory departments of education, and Catholic diocesan education offices.
Executive summary

In late 2013, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse sought an audit of primary school–based sexual abuse prevention policies and curricula for children aged five to 12 years relative to the current international evidence base.

An audit tool for this project was developed based on a comprehensive search of the literature on guidelines for effective school-based child sexual abuse prevention education. Academic databases, agencies and institutions, and grey literature were searched. No guidelines were found. The audit tool was adapted from evidence-based frameworks in related areas including primary prevention, health promotion, and safe schools. Ten criteria and relevant guiding questions were distilled.

The audit was conducted against the 10 criteria, from January to April 2014, by searching:

(i) Publicly-accessible text including print documents traceable via electronic means located on 32 school system websites (eight state and territory departments of education; and 24 Catholic Education Offices representing 28 Catholic education dioceses); and

(ii) Documents provided to the Royal Commission by the ACT, NT and SA government departments of education in response to a Notice to Produce pursuant to subsection 2 (3 A) of the Royal Commission Act 1902 (Cth).

(iii) Documents provided to the Royal Commission by the NSW, Qld, Tas, Vic and WA government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices and Catholic Education Commissions through the Truth and Justice Healing Council in response to a request for information.

A total population sampling frame was used. We sampled all Australian state government departments of education, and all Catholic diocesan education offices in a type of purposive sampling approach. The audit, therefore, includes the two largest schooling bodies in Australia, comprising almost 90% of Australian schools (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The audit excludes non-government independent schools.

Policy

Not all audited Australian school systems have a child protection policy. A child protection policy could not be located (via any means using publically-available search tools, or by carefully hand-searching websites) in approximately one-third of the audited school systems. A small minority of school systems promote the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education by including directives within the base child protection policy and, via this mechanism, demonstrate commitment to its compulsory inclusion in the school curriculum. No school system has a standalone child sexual abuse prevention education policy. Policies contain varying amounts of detail about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, and this information generally lacks clarity.

Curriculum

The teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education is typically located within the curriculum learning area of Health and Physical Education. However, school curriculum documents developed

---

1 Twenty-eight Catholic Dioceses were represented by 24 Catholic Education Offices. Catholic Education South Australia represented two dioceses: Adelaide and Port Pirie. Catholic Education Office of Western Australia represented four dioceses: Broome, Bunbury, Geraldton and Perth. A full list of the 32 school systems examined in this audit can be found in Appendix 3.
by state and territory statutory authorities do not have an explicit approach for detailing child sexual abuse prevention content to be taught. Rather, there is an implicit approach where content may be inferred as appropriate within the scope of the curriculum. There is significant variation in the extent to which child sexual abuse prevention education may be taught in the various school systems. Some systems have up to five possible layers or “tiers” of curriculum in which child sexual abuse prevention content may be taught. There is little information about how the curriculum can be differentiated for children considered at greater risk of child sexual abuse.

**Curriculum and pedagogical support**

Curriculum support (manuals, lesson and unit plans, teaching materials and resources) and pedagogical support (teacher training, professional development) is most comprehensive in school systems that have developed a specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum. These are: SA’s *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* (also used by South Australia Catholic Education); NSW’s *Child Protection Curriculum* (although this curriculum is now dated); and Qld’s *Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum*. The ACT and WA are currently developing new *Protective Behaviours* curricula.

**Assessment and evaluation**

In the majority of school systems, there were no specifications for assessment of primary school student learning about child sexual abuse prevention education. In regard to curriculum evaluation, only the *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* has undergone evaluation by an external body (KPMG, 2010). No gold standard rigorous experimental studies have ever been undertaken with any curricula currently used in Australian primary schools.

**Information for parents and communities, children and young people**

Some, but not all, school systems have an online interface specifically dedicated to communicating with parents and communities. A small minority of school systems have publicly available information, directed towards parents and communities, about institutional responses to child sexual abuse including processes for reporting known or suspected child sexual abuse by a school staff member, volunteer or member of the clergy. Few school systems, however, have a public interface for communicating with children and young people. None of the school systems provided information, specifically crafted for children and young people, regarding child sexual abuse prevention or institutional responses to child sexual abuse (including reporting processes).

**Referral to support agencies**

None of the school systems disclosed formal partnerships, agreements or contracts with referral and/or support agencies relevant to victims of child sexual abuse and their families. In some instances, services listed were not relevant to treatment of child sexual abuse.

**Conclusion**

This policy and curriculum audit finds that provision of child sexual abuse prevention education occurs unevenly across school systems. This results in the potential for substantial inequity in Australian children’s access to learning opportunities in child abuse prevention education as a part of their standard school curriculum.
Report overview

This report has four volumes:

1. Volume 1: Key findings;
2. Volume 2: Tables;
3. Volume 3: Raw data; and
4. Volume 4: Raw data and tables for the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10).
Executive summary by criteria

An executive summary of findings for each criterion is presented below. A list of the 32 school systems examined in this audit of school primary school–based sexual abuse prevention policy and curriculum can be found in Appendix 3.

**Criterion 1: Base child/student protection policy**

- Twenty-one of the 32 school systems (65.6%) had a locatable child protection policy. Eleven of the 32 school systems (34.4%) did not have a locatable or reasonably distinguishable child protection policy.
- Half of the NSW Catholic Education Offices did not have a child protection policy. Three-quarters of the Vic Catholic Education Offices did not have a child protection policy. No school system in Tas had a child protection policy.
- Fourteen of the 32 school systems (43.8%) had a clear navigable electronic pathway from the school system’s home page to the child protection policy (that is, it could be located in two or three steps via a general “policy” link on the departmental or diocesan website).
- School systems generally failed to identify all documents that were essential for policy implementation (for example, procedures, guidelines). Only two of the 32 school systems (6.3%) listed this information clearly within the base child protection policy. Typically, school system policies included reference to numerous other related documents (37 documents in one extreme example) creating potential for confusion amongst policy users.
- Twenty-six of the 32 (81.3%) school systems had guidelines for institutional responses to child sexual abuse where the suspected perpetrator was a school employee, volunteer or member of the clergy. In eight of the 32 school systems (25%), guidance was provided in the base child protection policy; in most of these policies, information was limited. In 15 of the 32 school systems (46.9%), guidance was provided in a separate policy, procedure, protocol or other document(s); in the majority of these instances information was more detailed. In three of the 32 school systems (9.4%), guidance was provided in both the base child protection policy and a separate document. In six of the 32 school systems (18.8%) we could find no guidance regarding institutional responses to child sexual abuse in any document.
- Teaching child sexual abuse prevention education is specified in the base child protection policy in four of the 32 school systems (12.5%). SA is the only state or territory to approach universal provision with both state and Catholic diocesan school systems making this commitment in systemic policy. This commitment is driven by recommendations from the *Layton Child Protection Review* (Layton, 2003).

**Criterion 2: Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education**

- None of the 32 school systems examined had a specific or standalone policy regarding the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education.
- Provision of child sexual abuse prevention education within the school curriculum is compulsory in only four of the 32 school systems: ACT Department of Education, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia.
- In these four school systems, the policy directive can be found in the base child protection policy rather than a standalone policy.

**Criterion 3: Location in the curriculum**
In this audit we identified five “tiers” or levels of curriculum within which child sexual abuse prevention may be taught as depicted in Figure 1. Tier 1 curriculum is compulsory and broadest in scope, and Tier 5 is voluntary and narrowest in scope.

All school systems have a compulsory Tier 1 curriculum. Most school systems have more than one curriculum tier in place. For example the Qld Department of Education, Employment and Training has Tiers 1, 3 and 5; the SA Department for Education and Child Development has Tiers 1 and 3; the Catholic Education Office Diocese of Wollongong has Tiers 1, 2 and 3; and the Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn Catholic Education Office has Tiers 1 and 5. This means that school systems use an array of inter-related compulsory and non-compulsory curricula to teach child sexual abuse prevention.

1. **School curriculum** refers to syllabuses developed by statutory authorities in each of the Australian states and territories. Child sexual abuse prevention education subject matter is located within the learning area known as Health and Physical Education (HPE) in all school systems except NSW, where this learning area is known as Personal Development and Physical Education (PDHPE), and Tas, where it is known as Health and Wellbeing (H&W). The extent of coverage of the topic varies substantially across school systems. Coverage can be explicit (as in ACT, NSW, SA and WA) or implicit (as in NT, Qld, Tas and Vic).

2. **Catholic school curriculum** refers to syllabuses developed by Catholic school systems in some, but not all, dioceses. These syllabuses provide a “Catholic perspective” on the curricula developed by state and territory curriculum authorities. These were in use in nine of the 24 Catholic school systems, mostly in NSW, where the key differences between the Catholic school curriculum and the statutory PDHPE curriculum exists in the content areas of sexuality, personal development and relationships education.

3. **Specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum**. These curricula have typically been developed by government departments of education or Catholic Education Offices to specifically target child sexual abuse prevention education or child protection. Specific child sexual abuse prevention education curricula were in use in eight of the 32 school systems (12.5%), including the four systems where provision of child sexual abuse prevention...
education within the school curriculum was compulsory via policy, and four of the NSW Catholic school systems (by virtue of the wide availability of the NSW Child Protection Curriculum (first published in 1997 and now dated). The most comprehensive of these curricula is the SA Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.

4. **Other child sexual abuse prevention program curricula (internal)** are non-compulsory child sexual abuse prevention programs developed internally by school systems. These curricula may include some child sexual abuse prevention subject matter, but may also incorporate broader topics such as sexuality and relationship education, and personal safety education (including prevention of bullying, cyber safety, drug and alcohol misuse, etc). These curricula were in use in 11 of the 32 school systems (34.4%).

5. **Other child sexual abuse prevention program curricula (external)** are non-compulsory programs and curricula typically developed by non-government organisations that specifically target child sexual abuse prevention. These programs were typically delivered by staff from non-government/community agencies and 18 of the 32 school systems (56.3%) reported using one or more of these external curricula.

- Child sexual abuse prevention education is not explicitly mentioned in the *Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10)*. The curriculum does not specifically nominate child sexual abuse prevention education as a teaching topic within any age band. The introduction of the *Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10)* does not substantially change the status quo in regards to the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education in Australian primary schools. The inclusion of child sexual abuse prevention education remains largely implicit rather than explicit within the curriculum.
- The most comprehensive curricula (with implementation manuals, guidelines, lesson plans and teaching resources and materials) were found in the school systems with specific child sexual abuse prevention education curricula in place. These were:
  - SA: *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* – current and comprehensive, used by State and Catholic school systems;
  - NSW: *Child Protection Curriculum* – now dated, used by state and some Catholic school systems;
  - WA: *Protective Behaviours* – currently under development, to be used by state schools; and
  - The ACT has a *Protective Behaviours* curriculum in place (according to policy), but we were unable to locate a copy of the curriculum.
- Another example of a comprehensive curriculum, although its use is not enshrined in policy is Qld’s recently developed *Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum*.

**Criterion 4: Inclusion, relevance and cultural sensitivity**

- Although all curricula contain overarching statements or have guiding principles about inclusivity and respect for diversity, we found very little detail (practical strategies, advice, recommendations) to assist teachers with the task of differentiating the curriculum for groups of children who may be considered at greater risk of child sexual abuse, such as children of different ages, gender or cultural backgrounds, including children of refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds, Australian Indigenous children, children with disabilities, children in out-of-home care, same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children.
- Curriculum differentiation advice was more common in school systems having specific child sexual abuse prevention curricula in place, mainly by virtue of the level of detail possible in these

---

2 Volume 4 of this report presents a detailed examination of the content of the *Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education* with respect to child sexual abuse prevention education.
curriculum documents (that is, implementation manuals, guidelines, lesson and unit plans, teaching resources and materials). NSW’s Child Protection Education and SA’s Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum were the most comprehensive in this respect, containing guidance for children of different ages, genders, Australian Indigenous children and children with disabilities.

Criterion 5: Curriculum support

- **Curriculum** is the content that should be taught – that is, topics, concepts, knowledge, skills and dispositions. In this audit, **Curriculum support** is defined as the materials developed for teachers to assist them with delivering the curriculum such as manuals, lesson and unit plans, teaching materials and resources. Curriculum support helps teachers know what to teach.
- Curriculum support materials were available, or under development, in nine of the 32 school systems (28.1%). In all other school systems (71.9%), curriculum support materials were not provided or were unable to be located.
- Curriculum support materials (in the form of published manuals, guidelines, lesson and unit plans, teaching resources and materials) were most detailed in school systems having a specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in place, the use of which is directed in policy in some school systems. The most comprehensive materials were found NSW’s Child Protection Education and SA’s Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum (also used by Catholic Education South Australia).
- Qld’s recently-developed Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum (the use of which is not directed in policy) also has comprehensive curriculum support materials.
- None of the 32 school systems provided curriculum support materials to assist in teaching about child sexual abuse perpetrated by school staff, volunteers, and members of the clergy. We found no manuals, lesson plans, unit plans or teaching guidelines detailing institutional responses to child sexual abuse that might be covered in lessons with children and young people, nor strategies for managing the risks associated with child sexual abuse prevention material being taught by potential perpetrators.
- Much of the development of curriculum support appears to be left up to the knowledge, skill and motivation of individual teachers, meaning that teachers “are still the ultimate arbiters of the ‘delivered’ curriculum, that is, the actual curriculum that students encounter over time” (Johnson, 2012, p. 9).

Criterion 6: Pedagogical support

- **Pedagogy** is the various methods by which the curriculum should be taught, that is, teaching strategies, instructional approaches, training, coaching etc. In this audit, **pedagogical support** is defined as those measures provided to assist teachers with developing teaching strategies, methods and approaches including teacher training, professional development, and continuous professional learning. Pedagogical support helps teachers know how to teach.
- The provision of child protection training for school staff was specified in the child protection policies for 10 of the 32 school systems (31.3%). However, the extent to which this training covered the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education was unclear. There was no training indicated in 17 of the 32 school systems (53.1%), and in five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) provision of training was unclear.
- Four of the 32 school systems (12.5%) provided information about pedagogical support (in the form of training, professional development, continuing education or learning) specifically for the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention. However, there was little detail about the nature and extent of this training, except in SA for the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.
- SA has the most comprehensive approach to training for school staff. The SA Department of Education and Child Development provides full day/seven-hour face-to-face training in the
Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum which is compulsory for school staff to undertake if they will be delivering the curriculum in their classrooms. Teachers cannot have access to curriculum support materials (books containing lesson plans, unit plans, and teaching guidelines) unless they have completed the training. Online refresher training is planned to begin in 2014.

- Catholic Education South Australia follows the model provided by SA Department of Education and Child Development and provides access to staff to the full day/seven-hour face-to-face training in the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.
- The WA Department of Education has a dedicated Child Protection portal which houses child protection professional learning (CPPL) which seems an innovative model, although there is no empirical evidence in the literature to date regarding the effectiveness of online training for teachers to prepare them for teaching child sexual abuse prevention education.

Criterion 7: Assessment and evaluation

- In regard to student assessment, in the majority of school systems, there were no specific directives for assessment of primary school student learning about child sexual abuse prevention, beyond the general requirement for learning within the school curriculum to be assessed.
- In 28 of the 32 school systems (87.5%) primary school student learning about child sexual abuse prevention knowledge and skills could possibly be assessed as part of student learning generally. In three of the 32 school systems (9.4%) there was no information publicly available regarding intentions to assess student learning. In only one of the 32 school systems was it clear that student learning about child sexual abuse prevention would be assessed: in SA’s Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum, assessment of the accuracy and depth of student learning is considered vital. Strategies and criteria for student assessment are provided in curriculum support materials.
- In regard to curriculum evaluation, only SA’s Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum has undergone evaluation by an external body (KPMG, 2010). No gold standard rigorous experimental studies have ever been undertaken with any curricula currently used in Australian primary schools.

Criterion 8: Information for parents and communities

- Twenty-two of the 32 school systems (68.8%) had a parent tab/link/button on the departmental or diocesan website providing access for parents to important information.
- Five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) provided easily accessible, publicly available information to parents about the school system’s (institutional) responses to child sexual abuse, including statutory requirements reporting known or suspected child sexual abuse by a school staff member, volunteer or member of the clergy.
- Twelve of the 32 school systems (37.5%) provided information to parents about their involvement in child sexual abuse prevention education. These 12 school systems include those having a specific child sexual abuse prevention education or other (internal or external) child sexual abuse prevention program in place, indicating greater attention to detail in these specialist curricula.
- Parental permission for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education was required in in two of the 32 school systems (6.3%), not required in three of the 32 school systems (9.4%), and in 27 of the 32 school systems (84.3%) there was no information or conflicting information.

Criterion 9: Information for children and young people
Eight of the 32 school systems (25%) had a student tab/link/button visible on the departmental or diocesan website providing access for children and young people to important information.

None of the 32 school systems had information directly provided to children and young people regarding institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected child sexual abuse by a school staff member, volunteer or member of the clergy.

None of the 32 school systems provided information to children and young people about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school.

**Criterion 10: Partnerships with community services and agencies**

None of the 32 school systems disclosed formal partnerships, agreements or contracts with referral and/or support agencies in policies or procedures documents, websites, or in submissions directly to the Royal Commission.

Seventeen of the 32 school systems (53.1%) nominated one or more referral and/or support agencies. Fifteen of the 32 school systems (46.9%) provided no information at all regarding referral and/or support agencies.

In some instances, recommended support and/or referral services were not relevant to child sexual abuse.
Introduction

In developed countries such as Australia, primary schools are a universal service providing access to learning for virtually all children. The most recent annual *The State of the World’s Children* report (UNICEF, 2014) shows that the primary school enrolment ratio for Australian children, averaged from 2008 to 2011, was 97% for boys and 98% for girls. Schools are, therefore, viewed as key agencies for addressing a range of social issues impacting children’s learning and development (World Health Organization, 1998). Child sexual abuse prevention is one such issue. School systems and school staff are essential components in the network of professionals involved in the prevention of child sexual abuse, and child protection.

The most widely used strategy for child sexual abuse prevention is the provision of school-based primary prevention programs, which focus on preventing abuse before it actually occurs by addressing malleable factors such as social norms, situational/contextual risks, and individual knowledge and skills. School-based prevention initiatives have capacity to “reach large numbers of diverse children in a relatively cost-efficient fashion” and to “eliminate the stigma of identifying specific children or families as being at risk for sexual abuse” (Wurtele & Kenny, 2010, p.108).

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse provides a unique and important context in which to take stock of the scope and nature of system-level school-based child sexual abuse prevention education in Australian school systems. This audit takes a forensic approach to auditing the content of 32 school systems and provides a comprehensive attempt to describe the “state of the nation” in this particular domain of child sexual abuse prevention.
Research brief

Background

The Royal Commission sought an audit of primary school–based sexual abuse prevention policy and curriculum for children aged five to 12 years relative to the current international evidence base. This research was conducted in two stages.

Stage 1: Develop system-level audit tool

Building on the findings from Australian Research Council Discovery Project 1093717, to develop a system-level audit tool to assess state/territory child sexual abuse prevention content provision in government school policy and curriculum. This involved:

(i) Adapting a policy and curriculum evaluation matrix comprising 10 key criteria and descriptors, recently published by Walsh et al (2013) in the *Oxford Review of Education*;
(ii) Expanding the matrix to include the *Australian National Curriculum for Health and Physical Education* (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2014); and
(iii) Formatting the tool for use in an auditing exercise.

Stage 2: Conduct system-level audit

This stage involved using the audit tool from Stage 1 to analyse materials provided to the Commission from the states and territories:

(i) Conducting the audit using materials made available to the Commission from the states and territories; and
(ii) Preparing an audit report.
Methodology

The following sections detail the project methodology comprising four elements:

(i) Royal Commission procedure for obtaining information about school-based child sexual abuse prevention education from Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices;
(ii) Development of the policy and curriculum audit tool;
(iii) Audit methods;
(iv) Data collection procedure for each criterion.
Royal Commission procedure for obtaining information about school-based child sexual abuse prevention education from Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices

This section provides an overview of the procedure undertaken by the Royal Commission to obtain information about school-based child sexual abuse prevention education from Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices including:

- Background;
- Procedure for obtaining information.

Background

Prior to engaging the audit researchers, the Royal Commission began a consultative process of requesting information from Australian school authorities about the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education. The procedure began in October 2013 and had steps as outlined below.

Procedure for obtaining information

In October 2013, prior to engaging the audit researchers, the Royal Commission consulted with Australian school authorities about what information was available that related to the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education. Consultations were held with nine Australian jurisdictions (Commonwealth government plus eight states and territories) as well as the Truth Justice and Healing Council (TJHC) on behalf of the Catholic diocesan offices in Australia.

The Royal Commission sought information via a Notice to Produce from the ACT, NT and SA government. The Royal Commission did not exercise compulsory powers to seek information from NSW, Tas, WA, Qld, Vic and TJHC. Details about the information sought from each jurisdiction is detailed at Appendix 1. Generally, jurisdictions were asked for:

- Overarching frameworks and/or the curriculum and/or programs currently used that are directed to primary school students with the aim of reducing the likelihood of children being vulnerable to sexual abuse in institutional settings;
- Memoranda, policies or procedures that provide advice to schools on how these are to be delivered;
- Implementation or other support documents that support teachers or others to implement these frameworks, deliver the curriculum or programs;
- Documents concerning any evaluations that may have been conducted on the effectiveness of these curriculum areas or programs; and
- The number of primary school students enrolled in schools, as a total, at a specific point in time in 2013, who had received training/education aimed at reducing the likelihood of these children being vulnerable to sexual abuse in institutional settings.

Responses were digitally stored on a secure password-protected electronic file storage system accessible only to Royal Commission staff and, following security clearance, the researchers and monitored by information security protocols.
Development of the policy and curriculum audit tool

This section provides an overview of the process for development of the policy and curriculum audit tool including:

- Background; and
- Procedure for developing the audit tool.

Background

In developing this tool for auditing school-based policy and curriculum in relation to child sexual abuse prevention education, we drew upon a national curriculum and policy scan comparing provision of child sexual abuse prevention initiatives in primary schools within Australian state and territory government departments of education (Walsh, Berthelsen, Nicholson, Brandon, Stevens & Rachele, 2013). The curriculum and policy scan was part of an Australian Research Council Discovery Project (DP1093717) Making Prevention Matter: Establishing Characteristics of Effective Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programs (MPM), undertaken during the period 2010–2012.

Procedure for developing the audit tool

Version 1

Comprehensive searching of databases, agencies and institutions, and grey literature, did not uncover any existing guidelines on the characteristics of effective school-based child sexual abuse prevention education. Therefore our strategy, which was first adopted in the original scan mentioned above (Walsh et al., 2013), was to adapt overarching frameworks from related areas including primary prevention, health promotion and safe schools. To design an analytic framework for development of an audit tool, we drew upon principles in the following three publications:

1. *Spectrum of prevention* (Cohen & Swift, 1999), a framework for primary prevention;
2. *A National framework for health promoting schools 2000–2003* (Australian Health Promoting Schools Association [AHPSA], 2000), containing a set of action areas to inform the promotion of health in schools; and

From these frameworks, 10 key criteria relevant to the provision of school-based child sexual abuse prevention education were distilled. Each criterion was operationalised with several sharply defined descriptors comprising guiding questions for data collection. Appendix 2 Table 1 displays these 10 criteria and descriptors. For the purpose of this report, the original matrix is labelled Version 1.

Version 2

The audit requested by the Royal Commission required an expanded matrix with additional detail to answer more specific questions related to the Terms of Reference. To this end, a further five sources were identified as relevant to the theoretical and empirical underpinning of the audit tool. These were:
4. Respective relationships education: Violence prevention and respectful relationships education in Victorian secondary schools (Flood, Fergus, & Heenan, 2009), report commissioned by the Victorian government to detail best practice for provision of school-based violence and prevention and respectful relationships education;
5. Framing best practice: National standards for the primary prevention of sexual assault through education (Carmody et al., 2009), report on a commissioned project detailing six national standards;
6. Guidelines for programs to reduce child victimization: A resource for communities when choosing a program to teach personal safety to children (National Center for Missing and Exploited Children [NCMEC], 1999), developed by a US-based large non-profit organisation, comprising a “curriculum scorecard” based on a commissioned literature review, prepared by Ruth Luna and David Finkelhor from the University of New Hampshire’s Crimes Against Children Research Centre, and expert consultation (note: this document is no longer publicly available);
7. International guidelines on sexuality education: International guidelines on sexuality education: An evidence informed approach to effective sex, relationships and HIV/STI education (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2009), commissioned by the UN and UNESCO, comprising a comprehensive set of standardised age-specific learning objectives for sexuality education; and
8. What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs (Nation et al. 2003), nine general prevention principles derived from a review of reviews in the areas of substance abuse, risky sexual behaviour, school failure, and juvenile delinquency and violence.

Appendix 2 Table 2 provides a table detailing all eight publications including author, country of origin, publication title and a short resume, and nomates the document sections most applicable to the audit criteria. As evident in the table, each of the publications generated a set of recommended approaches, albeit differently labelled. Across the eight documents, some common approaches were identified across strategy levels (Cohen & Swift, 1999), key action areas (AHPSA, 2000), key elements (MCEEDYA, 2011), criteria (Flood et al., 2009), standards (Carmody et al., 2009), guidelines (NCMEC, 1999), characteristics (UNESCO, 2004), and principles (Nation et al., 2003). Importantly for this project, there was common emphasis in the areas of policy and curriculum development. Whilst not inclusive of all possible relevant frameworks, the use of these eight frameworks provided ample scope for developing and enhancing an audit tool for objective assessment of school policy and curriculum in the area of child sexual abuse prevention education.

For the purpose of the present audit, the original matrix in Version 1 was extended to encompass a broader range of school systems and the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (the umbrella curriculum area under which child sexual abuse prevention education can be taught). The criteria required rewriting to account for the focus on institutional responses to child sexual abuse. This required finer grained guiding questions within some criteria. Version 2 of the policy and curriculum evaluation matrix was developed encompassing the following changes to Version 1:

- Original Criterion 3 (commitment) was incorporated into criterion 4 (location in the curriculum);
- Original Criterion 7 (assessment) was expanded to incorporate evaluation;
- Original Criterion 8 (parental permission) was expanded to incorporate parental involvement; and
• New Criterion 4 (inclusion, relevance, and cultural sensitivity) was added to assess strategies for curriculum differentiation for specific groups of children, including those at greater risk of child sexual abuse.

Version 2 of the audit matrix is shown in Appendix 2 Table 3. Version 2 was delivered in a milestone report to the Royal Commission and critically reviewed by two academics with extensive research expertise in the field of school-based child sexual abuse prevention interventions. Feedback was incorporated and Version 3 was developed.

**Version 3, the final audit tool**

Table 1 overleaf displays the final version of the policy and curriculum audit matrix. The following changes were incorporated:

- **Criterion 4**: Add to guiding questions “Are curriculum and/or programs presented in languages other than English? If so, indicate which language(s).”
- **Criterion 7**: Add to guiding questions “(for example, are children’s knowledge, skills or behavioural changes measured)” and “Was follow-up evaluation conducted?”
- **Criterion 8**: Change criterion label to “Information for parents and communities”. Add to guiding questions “including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?”; and “(for example, is information publicly available to parents/communities)”?
- **Criterion 9**: Change criterion label to “Information for children and young people”. Adapt guiding questions to reflect this focus. Add to guiding questions “including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?” and “(for example, is information publicly available to children and young people?)”.

The policy and curriculum matrix for this study has 10 criteria and a more detailed set of expanded guiding questions. It was used as a standardised instrument (audit tool) for collecting data on sexual abuse prevention education in Australian school systems as specified by the Royal Commission, including government and Catholic diocesan school systems.
Table 1: Final version of the policy and curriculum audit matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expanded guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Base child/student protection policy | • Does a child protection policy exist? Identify the policy by name, provide universal resource locator (URL), document identification details, date of publication, and date policy was last updated, total number of pages in the policy.  
  • Is there a navigable pathway to the policy from the department home page? Record the pathway from the home page to the policy, and the number of steps involved.*  
  • Does the home page search feature locate the policy using the terms “child protection”, “student protection”, or “child abuse” within the first five to 10 hits?*  
  • Can the policy be downloaded as a single document?*  
  • Does the policy need to be read in conjunction with other documents? If so, identify these documents by title and record the number of pages in each document.*  
  • What specific guidance is provided for situations of suspected institutional abuse? Identify section numbers and page numbers to pinpoint where this information is provided. Record broad categories of information provided.*  
  • Is the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education specified in the policy? Insert representative quotes and sources (including section number and page number).  
  • What related documents are listed? Record the total number of documents listed, record the titles of the documents most relevant to child protection. |
| 2. Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education | • Is there a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education? Identify the policy by name, provide URL, document identification details, date of publication, and date policy was last updated, and total number of pages in the policy.  
  • Is child sexual abuse prevention education optional or compulsory? Describe approach.*  
  • If compulsory, how do schools report on compliance? Describe reporting mechanisms.*  
  • Does the policy specify evidence-based approaches? List any research cited in the policy. Does the policy specify updating in response to new research?*  
  • Does the policy address the potential for child sexual abuse to occur in child-related institutions (such as schools) by individuals employed by or otherwise engaged by the institutions and by other children within the institution? If so, describe.* |
| 3. Location in the curriculum | • Is child sexual abuse prevention education named in the primary school curriculum?  
  • Where is child sexual abuse prevention education located in the primary school curriculum (that is, which parts of the school curriculum relate to child sexual abuse prevention education)? Indicate if this is explicit or implicit. Nominate learning area/subjects, strands, learning outcomes.  
  • What recommendations are made for specific programs, timing, frequency, or intensity of sexual abuse prevention education?*  
  • What recommendations are made for personnel in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education (for example, who will teach it and why? What qualifications or expertise are required?)* |
<p>| 4. Inclusion, relevance, and cultural sensitivity* | • What strategies are recommended for schools and/or teachers in differentiating the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education for different groups of children (for example, for children of different ages, gender, cultural backgrounds including children of refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds, Australian Indigenous children, children with disabilities, children in out-of-home care, same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children)?* Are curricula and/or programs presented in languages other than English? If so, indicate which language(s).* |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expanded guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Curriculum support            | • What curriculum support is provided to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education?  
• Which specific programs or materials are suggested for use?*  
• What agencies are involved in providing child sexual abuse prevention curriculum support to teachers? Are contractual or other arrangements in place?*  
• Do materials and resources acknowledge the potential for institutional child sexual abuse to occur and provide support for teaching about this?* |
| 6. Pedagogical support           | • Is training specified in the child protection policy?  
• What training is provided to school staff in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? Describe training provisions, formats, duration and frequency.*  
• Which specific internal/external training agencies are involved and how?*  
• Which specific training programs or materials are used and why?*  
• Are contractual or other arrangements in place between school systems and other agencies (for example, preferred providers) for the delivery of staff training? If so, describe.* |
| 7. Assessment and evaluation*    | • Is primary school student learning in child sexual abuse prevention education assessed? If so, how (for example, are children’s knowledge, skills or behavioural changes measured)? Describe.  
• Has child sexual abuse prevention education/curriculum been evaluated? If so, who conducted the evaluation? When? What approach was used? What data were collected and from whom? Was follow-up evaluation conducted?*  
• Were evaluation findings implemented?* |
| 8. Information for parents and communities | • What information is provided to parents about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?*  
• What information is provided to parents and/or communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school (for example, is information publicly available to parents/communities)? Describe.  
• Are parents involved in school-based child sexual abuse prevention education? If so, how?  
• Is parental permission required for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education at school? If so, how? Describe. |
| 9. Information for children and young people | • What information is provided to children and young people about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?*  
• What information is provided to children and young people about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school (for example, is information publicly available to children and young people)? Describe. |
| 10. Partnerships with community services and agencies | • What links are evident with relevant community services or agencies for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List and describe the nature of these partnerships (for example, formal/informal) especially in relation to support services.* Located in policy/procedures documents and websites? Located on websites generally? Located in royal commission submissions? |

*Indicates change from original.
Audit methods

This section provides an overview of the audit methods in relation to each of the 10 audit criteria, including:

- Introduction;
- Scope;
- Methods;
- Limitations;
- Strengths;
- Data collection procedure for each criterion.

Introduction

From January to March 2014 we undertook an audit of school policies and curricula in relation to child sexual abuse prevention education. The objective was to develop a comprehensive picture of the measures taken by Australian state and territory departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices to address child sexual abuse prevention via school policies and curricula that may have implications for reducing the likelihood for child sexual abuse in institutions. The target school systems for the audit were:

- State and territory departments of education (eight departments); and
- Catholic education offices (24 offices representing 28 Catholic dioceses)\(^3\).

Scope

This audit pertains to policy and curriculum applicable in Australian primary schools, that is, from Preschool or Kindergarten (children aged four to five years) to Year 6 or Year 7 (children aged 11–12 years)\(^4\).

Methods

Content analysis

We used a directed content analysis technique (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) to uncover the extent, range and nature of child sexual abuse prevention education in school policy and curriculum in Australian government primary schools and Catholic diocesan primary schools. The research was also focused on comparing provision across the systems to identify strengths and weaknesses in school-based child sexual abuse prevention initiatives. Our primary purpose was to identify and qualitatively describe the existence, scope and configuration of policy and curriculum content.

\(^3\) Twenty-eight Catholic Dioceses were represented by 24 Catholic education offices. Catholic Education South Australia represented two dioceses: Adelaide and Port Pirie. Catholic Education Office of Western Australia represented four dioceses: Broome, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Perth. A full list of the 32 school systems examined in this audit can be found in Appendix 3.

\(^4\) SA is the only state/territory to have Year 7 as part of the primary school.
Content analysis is a commonly used family of qualitative research techniques that can be flexibly applied to examine text data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Krippendorff & Bock, 2009). Directed content analysis is a specific type of content analysis, guided by a structured process in which researchers identify key concepts or variables as initial coding categories with working definitions for each category determined by theory and/or relevant research findings (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). In this research, the large volumes of electronic data to be collected demanded a format to enable standardisation, organisation and comparison. For this reason, a policy and curriculum matrix was developed as outlined in the previous section comprising 10 key criteria operationalised in the form of expanded guiding questions (see Appendix 2: Table 4).

**Sampling strategy**

A total population sampling frame was used. We sampled all Australian state government departments of education, and all Catholic diocesan education offices in a type of purposive sampling approach. The audit, therefore, includes the two largest schooling bodies in Australia, comprising almost 90% of Australian schools (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The audit excludes non-government independent schools.

**Data collection**

The internet was used as the primary research medium for data collection (Lee, Fielding & Blank, 2008). The data corpus included:

1. Publicly accessible text including print documents traceable via electronic means located on 32 school system websites (eight Australian state government departments of education, and 24 Catholic education offices);
2. Documents provided to the Royal Commission, by the ACT, NT and SA government departments of education in response to a Notice to Produce pursuant to subsection 2 (3 A) of the Royal Commission Act 1902 (Cth).
3. Documents provided to the Royal Commission by the NSW, Qld, Tas, Vic and WA government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices and Catholic Education Commissions through the Truth and Justice Healing Council in response to a request for information.

**Limitations**

There are four limitations of the above approach in relation to data collection that must be made clear at the outset. These are detailed in Table 2 along with potential issues arising and mitigation strategies applied in the research.

**Table 2: Limitations, issues and mitigation strategies applied in the research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Mitigation strategies applied in the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The audit researchers did not have input into the questions provided to</td>
<td>The audit takes in a broader scope than the questions provided to</td>
<td>Extensive searches were conducted of the websites of Australian state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian state government departments of education and</td>
<td>Australian state government departments of education and</td>
<td>government departments of education and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Twenty-eight Catholic dioceses were represented by 24 catholic education offices. Catholic Education South Australia represented two dioceses: Adelaide and Port Pirie. Catholic Education Office of Western Australia represented four dioceses: Broome, Bunbury, Geraldton and Perth. We searched websites of 24 Catholic school systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholic diocesan education offices.</th>
<th>Catholic diocesan education offices.</th>
<th>Catholic diocesan education offices to capture as much relevant information as possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices did not have the opportunity to respond expressly to the audit criteria.</td>
<td>Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices may have responded differently, had they been able to provide answers against each criterion.</td>
<td>The data collection process took into account the difference between questions provided to Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices, and the audit criteria. Search terms were used that reflected those used by school authorities in their responses to the Royal Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian state government departments of education and Catholic diocesan education offices provided different levels of detail in response to the requests for information.</td>
<td>The audit researchers had varying levels of detail upon which to base the audit with some school systems providing detail on a spectrum from full detail to very little detail.</td>
<td>Extensive searches of school system websites were used to supplement material provided to the Royal Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School system websites are constantly changing, evolving and being updated.</td>
<td>The audit captures information available on school system websites during the period from January 2014 to March 2014. In this way, it provides a snapshot, somewhat like a cross-sectional survey of website content.</td>
<td>The report acknowledges that websites may have been updated since data were collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**

The strengths of the approach used in the audit lies in its broad scope and fine-grained detail. In all, school authorities’ and school systems’ websites were searched multiple times for each guiding question within each of the 10 criteria. Submissions made to the Royal Commission were also searched multiple times in answering guiding questions for each criterion. In most criteria, searches were conducted initially and validated in replicated searches.
Data collection procedure for each criterion

**Criterion 1 search methods: Base child/student protection policy**

The Criterion 1 audit was conducted in January 2014. Data were collected by searching the publicly accessible areas of each state and territory education department website (eight in total) and Catholic diocesan education office website (24 in total). We hand-searched for base (or general) child or student protection policies and extracted detail therein. The content analyses for Criterion 1, therefore, were generated entirely from publicly available sources. Box 1 below provides the list of expanded guiding questions used for data collection for Criterion 1. Websites were initially searched by KW and LB working independently. Findings for each state and territory were compared. Disagreements were resolved via search repetition and discussion. This approach was undertaken to minimise the potential for researcher bias.

Box 1: Base child/student protection policy

- Does a child protection policy exist? Identify the policy by name, provide universal resource locator (URL), document identification details, date of publication, and date policy was last updated, total number of pages in the policy.
- Is there a navigable pathway to the policy from the department home page? Record the pathway from the home page to the policy, and the number of steps involved.
- Does the home page search feature locate the policy using the terms “child protection”, “student protection”, or “child abuse” within the first five to 10 hits?
- Can the policy be downloaded as a single document?
- Does the policy need to be read in conjunction with other documents? If so, identify these documents by title and record the number of pages in each document.
- What specific guidance is provided for situations of sexual abuse by individuals employed by or volunteering at the institution? Identify section numbers and page numbers to pinpoint where this information is provided. Record broad categories of information provided.
- Is the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education specified in the policy? Insert representative quotes and source (including section number and page number).
- What related documents are listed? Record the total number of documents listed, and record the titles of the documents most relevant to child protection.

**Criterion 2 search methods: Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education**

The Criterion 2 audit was conducted in February 2014. Data were collected by searching the publicly accessible areas for each state and territory education department website (eight in total) and Catholic diocesan education office website (24 in total). We hand-searched for the presence and nature of policy information specifically in relation to child sexual abuse prevention education. Information not publicly available, obtained on Notice to Produce by the Royal Commission, were also searched yielding helpful information in relation to the compulsory or voluntary nature of child sexual abuse prevention education. Box 2 below provides the list of expanded guiding questions used for data collection for Criterion 2. Websites and Royal Commission files were searched by KW and checked by LB with disagreements resolved via search repetition and discussion.

Box 2: Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education

- Is there a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education? Identify the policy by name, provide URL, document identification details, date of publication, date the policy was last updated, and total number of pages in the policy.
- Does the policy specify evidence-based approaches? List any research cited in the policy. Does the policy specify updating in response to new research?*
- Does the policy address the potential for child sexual abuse to occur in child-related institutions (such as
schools) by individuals employed by or otherwise engaged by the institutions and by other children within the institution? If so, describe.

- Is child sexual abuse prevention education optional or compulsory? Describe the approach.
- If compulsory, how do schools report on compliance? Describe reporting mechanisms.

**Criterion 3 search methods: Location in the curriculum**

The Criterion 3 audit was conducted in February 2014 and repeated in March 2014. Data were collected in an iterative process by searching and researching the publicly accessible areas of each state and territory education department website (eight in total) and Catholic diocesan education office website (24 in total). Searches also extended beyond these websites to state curriculum authorities (such as the New South Wales Board of Studies, Teaching and Educational Standards, and the Queensland Studies Authority). Full texts of all relevant documents provided to the Royal Commission, including those provided via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Catholic Education Commissions were also searched.

As will be described in the findings, we identified five “tiers” of curriculum provision in which child sexual abuse prevention education could be located: (i) State and territory school curricula; (ii) Catholic school curricula; (iii) specific child sexual abuse prevention education curricula; (iv) other internal child sexual abuse prevention program curricula; and (v) other external child sexual abuse prevention program curricula. As depicted in Figure 1, Tier 1 curriculum is compulsory and broadest in scope, and Tier 5 is non-compulsory and narrowest in scope.

Box 3 below provides the list of expanded guiding questions used for data collection for Criterion 3. Websites and Royal Commission files were initially searched by KW and augmented by LB and LK as data collection for other Criteria revealed further information.

**Box 3: Location in the curriculum**

- Where is child sexual abuse prevention education located in the primary school curriculum (that is, which parts of the school curriculum relate to child sexual abuse prevention education)? Indicate if this is explicit or implicit. Nominate learning area/subjects, strands and learning outcomes. Refer to (i) School curriculum; (ii) Specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum; (iii) Other child sexual abuse prevention program curriculum (internal); and (iv) Other child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum (external).
- Is child sexual abuse prevention education named in the primary school curriculum?
- What recommendations are made for specific programs, timing, frequency, or intensity of sexual abuse prevention education?
- What recommendations are made for personnel in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education (for example, who will teach it and why? What expertise or qualifications are required?)

**Criterion 4 search methods: Inclusion, relevance and cultural sensitivity**

The Criterion 4 audit was conducted in March 2014. The qualitative software package NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used for the content analysis. Full texts of all relevant documents provided to the Royal Commission, including those provided via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Catholic Education Commissions were used as the data corpus. Additionally, copies of state and territory health and physical education curricula, specific child sexual abuse prevention education curricula, and other relevant internal curricula used in schools were converted...
into searchable text and entered into NVivo for analysis. Box 4 below provides the list of expanded guiding questions used for data collection for Criterion 4. Six separate searches of the documents were conducted using keywords as detailed in Table 2 below. Searches were initially conducted by LB. Search results were verified by KW with random checks made of NVivo searches.

Box 4: Inclusion, relevance, and cultural sensitivity

- What strategies are recommended for schools and/or teachers in differentiating the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education for different groups of children (that is, for children of different ages, gender, culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds including refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds, Australian Indigenous children, children with disabilities, children in out-of-home care, same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children)
- Are curricula and/or programs presented in languages other than English? If so, indicate which language(s).

Table 2: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 4 searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender differences</td>
<td>“girl”*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds including refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds</td>
<td>“culturally diverse” OR “cultural diversity” OR “cultures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Indigenous children</td>
<td>“Indigenous” OR “Aboriginal” OR “ATSI” OR “Torres Strait islander”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>“special needs” OR “disability” OR “impair”* OR “disabilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in out-of-home care</td>
<td>“foster care” OR “foster home” OR “foster parent” OR “substitute care” OR “residential care” OR “out-of-home care” OR “out of home care”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children</td>
<td>“gay” OR “lesbian” OR “LGBQ” OR “LBGT” OR “LGBTIQ” OR “same-sex attracted” OR “SSA” OR “same-sex” OR “homophobia”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 5 search methods: Curriculum support

The Criterion 5 audit was conducted in March 2014. The content analysis for this criterion was a more iterative process than for other criteria and necessitated considerable refinement of the guiding questions to ensure data extraction was consistent with the purpose of content analysis for this criterion. Box 5 displays the guiding questions used for data collection in Criterion 5. NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used for the content analysis. The data corpus comprised full texts of all relevant documents provided to the Royal Commission, including those provided via Notice to Produce from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Australian Catholic Education Commissions. NVivo searches were conducted using search terms listed in Table 3 below. Results were cross-checked against each submission to the Royal Commission with particular attention to the way in which “institutional abuse” was addressed and curriculum support provided to teachers. Finally, NVivo
searches were cross-checked against departmental/diocesan websites for provision of curriculum support. Searches were initially conducted by LK. To maintain construct and interpretive validity, raw data were reviewed in context by KW.

Box 5

- What curriculum support is provided to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education?
- Which specific programs or materials are suggested for use?
- What agencies are involved in providing child sexual abuse prevention curriculum support to teachers? Are contractual or other arrangements in place?
- Do materials and resources acknowledge the potential for institutional child sexual abuse to occur and provide support for teaching about this?

Table 3: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 5 searches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training provided to teachers, what programs / materials are suggested and agencies involved</td>
<td>“training”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for institutional abuse acknowledged</td>
<td>“institutional”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 6 search methods: Pedagogical support**

The Criterion 6 audit was conducted in March 2014. The content analysis for this criterion was also an iterative process as outlined in Criterion 5. Box 6 displays the guiding questions used for data collection in Criterion 6. NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used for the content analysis. The data corpus comprised full texts of all relevant documents, including documents provided to the Royal Commission via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Australian Catholic Education Commissions. NVivo searches were conducted using search terms listed in Table 4 below. Results were cross-checked against each submission to the Royal Commission with particular attention to the way in which respondents addressed any training or support offered to teachers with regard to any particular child sexual abuse prevention curriculum or program. Finally, NVivo searches were cross-checked against departmental/diocesan websites with a particular focus on identifying policies and curricula. Documents were scanned for specific references to training. Searches were initially conducted by LK. To maintain construct and interpretive validity, raw data were reviewed in context by KW.

Box 6: Pedagogical support

- Is training specified in the child protection policy?
- What training is provided to school staff in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? Describe training provisions, formats, duration and frequency.
- Which specific internal/external training agencies are involved and how?
- Which specific training programs or materials are used and why?
- Are contractual or other arrangements in place between school systems and other agencies (for example, preferred providers) for the delivery of staff training? If so, describe.
Table 4: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 6 searches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is training specified in policy, what training is provided and who provides training?</td>
<td>“training”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 7 search methods: Assessment and evaluation**

The Criterion 7 audit was conducted in March 2014. Box 7 displays the guiding questions used for data collection in Criterion 7. NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used for the content analysis. The data corpus comprised full texts of all relevant documents provided to the Royal Commission, including documents provided via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Australian Catholic Education Commissions. NVivo searches were conducted using search terms listed in Table 5 below. Results were cross-checked against each submission to the Royal Commission with particular attention to the way in which respondents answered the Commission’s question concerning any evaluations that may have been conducted on the effectiveness of curricula or programs. Searches were initially conducted by LK and reviewed by KW.

**Box 7: Assessment and evaluation**

- Is primary school student learning about child sexual abuse prevention assessed? If so, how?
- Has child sexual abuse prevention education/curriculum been evaluated? If so, who conducted the evaluation, when and how (what approach was used)? What data was collected and from whom?
- Were evaluation findings implemented?

**Table 5: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 7 searches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is primary school student learning assessed?</td>
<td>“assessment” OR “assessed” OR “assess”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the program been evaluated? (that is, When? Using what approach/methodology? What data collection methods were used? Were findings implemented?)</td>
<td>“evaluated” OR “evaluation” OR “evaluate”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 8 search methods: Information for parents and communities**

The Criterion 8 audit was conducted in February and March 2014. Box 8 contains the guiding questions for Criterion 8. A combination of hand-searching and searching with NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used. First, school system websites were extensively hand searched for information directed towards parents. To be included data must have: (i) included content with parents and communities as the target audience, though the information may have also had other audiences such as teachers; (ii) included content that directly addressed parents; (iii) included content that needed to be actually applicable to parents and communities. Second, information provided to the Royal Commission, including information provided via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Australian Catholic Education Commissions were searched using NVivo with search terms displayed in Table 6. Third, documents were hand searched using the term “permission” to answer the final guiding question listed in Box 8. Searches were initially conducted by LB and reviewed by KW.
Box 8: Information for parents and communities

- Is there a parent navigation tab visible on the website homepage?
- Is information provided to parents about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?
- Is information publicly available to parents/communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school?
- What information is directed towards parents specifically about their involvement in child sexual abuse prevention education?
- Is parental permission required for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education at school?

Table 6: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 8 searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information for parents</td>
<td>“parents information” (words within five words of each other)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 9 search methods: Information for children and young people

The Criterion 9 audit was conducted in February and March 2014. Box 9 contains the guiding questions for Criterion 9. A combination of hand-searching and searching with NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2012) was used. First, school system websites were extensively hand searched for information directed towards children and young people. To be included data must: (i) target children and/or young people as the main audience, though the information may have also had other audiences such as parents or teachers; (ii) include content that directly addressed children and/or young people in some way; (iii) be relevant and applicable to children and/or young people. Second, information provided to the Royal Commission, including information provided via Notice to Produce, from Australian state government departments of education, Catholic diocesan education offices, the Truth and Justice Healing Council, and Australian Catholic Education Commissions was searched, using NVivo with search terms displayed in Table 7. Searches were initially conducted by LB and reviewed by KW.

Box 9: Information for children and young people

- Is there a student navigation tab visible on the website homepage?
- What information is provided to children and young people about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?
- What information is provided to children and young people about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school?

Table 7: Terms and keywords used in Criterion 9 searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Keywords used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information for young people</td>
<td>“students information” (words within five words of each other)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 10 search methods: Partnership with community services and agencies

The Criterion 10 audit was conducted in March 2014. Box 10 contains the guiding questions for Criterion 10. Data were collected by searching and re-searching the publicly-accessible areas for each state and territory education department website (eight in total) and Catholic diocesan education office websites (24 in total). Searches initially focused on school system policies and...
procedures, and related documents (as nominated in Criterion 1). Searches extended to searching for any references to partnerships around child protection broadly, before focusing more narrowly on relationships with agencies relating specifically to child sexual abuse prevention education and referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education. School system submissions, including those provided via Notice to Produce to the Royal Commission, were also hand searched for references to partnerships and referral relationships.

Box 10: Partnership with community services and agencies

- What reference is made in policy and procedures documents (for child protection, child sexual abuse prevention, and/or mandatory reporting) to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?
- What reference is made on departmental or diocesan websites to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?
- What reference is made by departments or diocese, in submissions to the Royal Commission, to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?
Findings

This section presents the findings of the audit of primary school–based sexual abuse prevention policy and curriculum for each criterion, and for each guiding question with each criterion. These findings summarise the raw data presented in Volume 3 and the summary tables presented in Volume 2. The structure of this findings section is:

- Criterion 1: Base child/student protection policy
- Criterion 2: Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education
- Criterion 3: Location in the curriculum
- Criterion 4: Inclusion, relevance and cultural sensitivity
- Criterion 5: Curriculum support
- Criterion 6: Pedagogical support
- Criterion 7: Assessment and evaluation
- Criterion 8: Information for parents and communities
- Criterion 9: Information for children and young people
- Criterion 10: Partnerships with community services and agencies
Findings
Criterion 1: Base student/child protection policy

Do school systems have a child protection policy?

- This audit examined 32 school systems: eight state and territory departments of education and 28 Catholic dioceses (represented by 24 Catholic Education Offices)\(^6\).
- We used the term “base child protection policy” as a label for this policy to indicate the significance of this document as a driver for what school systems intend to do (or not do) in relation to child protection.
- Twenty-one of the 32 school systems (65.6%) had a child protection policy.
- Seven of the 32 school systems (21.9%) did not have a locatable child protection policy. Those systems without a locatable policy included: Department of Education Tas, Catholic Education Office Sydney (NSW), Catholic Education Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes (NSW), Catholic Education Office Ballarat (Vic), Catholic Education Office Diocese of Sale (Vic), Catholic Education Sandhurst (Vic), and Tasmanian Catholic Education Office.
- Four of the 32 school systems (12.5%) did not have a document that could reasonably be distinguished as a child protection policy (that is, it did not contain the word “policy” in the title, or it did not contain the level of detail typically found in child protection policies). Those systems without a reasonably distinguishable policy included: Catholic Education Office Bathurst (NSW), Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (NSW), Catholic Education Office Diocese of Wollongong (NSW), and Catholic Education Office Diocese of Darwin (NT).
- In all, 21 of the 32 school systems (65.6%) did have a child protection policy and 11 of the 32 school systems (34.4%) did not have a child protection policy.
- Half of the NSW Catholic Education Offices (that is, five out of the 10 Catholic Education Offices) either did not have a child protection policy or did not have a reasonably distinguishable child protection policy.
- Three-quarters of the Vic Catholic Education Offices (that is, three out of the four Catholic Education Offices) did not have a child protection policy.
- In Tas, no school system had a child protection policy.

**Incidental findings**

- There was considerable variation in the type and extent of administrative detail present and missing from published policies enabling policy users to establish policy currency. Publication, implementation, and revision dates were often missing (see Volume 2, Criterion 1, Tables 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9).
- Three of the 32 school systems (0.9%) had a dedicated child protection portal (that is, a specific and easily accessible website). WA Department of Education had a dedicated Child Protection portal as a “one-stop-shop” for child protection information and training. It is currently set up with a simple URL: [http://det.wa.edu.au/childprotection/](http://det.wa.edu.au/childprotection/) providing a very effective way for teachers to access child protection policy information. Child protection portals have also been developed by the Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta

---

\(^6\) Twenty-eight Catholic Dioceses were represented by 24 Catholic Education Offices. Catholic Education South Australia represented two dioceses: Adelaide and Port Pirie. Catholic Education Office of Western Australia represented four dioceses: Broome, Bunbury, Geraldton and Perth.
and Catholic Education South Australia, however the latter operated more like a fileshare facility from which staff may download resources relating to child protection than as a dynamic, interactive information-sharing facility.

- Although it was beyond the scope of this study, differences were noted in: operational principles underpinning policy (for example, policies underpinned by the best interests of children as opposed to institutional protection); types of abuse and neglect required to be reported under policy (for example, whether or not policies are consistent with state or territory legislation and whether or not reporting sexual abuse is required by law); reporting duties and processes depending on the identity of the suspected perpetrator (that is, differences for intra-familial perpetrator, extra-familial perpetrator, or school staff perpetrator); the “state of mind” required to activate the reporting duty (for example, reasonable suspicion, or reasonable belief); reporting thresholds regarding the level of harm suspected (that is, harm or significant harm); the temporal features of the suspected abuse (that is, whether the duty applies only to suspected past and presently occurring cases, or if it also applies to suspected risk of future abuse); reporting chains (that is, to whom should reports be made and the number of steps in the process); the roles of principals and other school employees in reporting; and detail about the protections provided for school staff who report (see also Mathews & Kenny, 2008; Mathews, Walsh, Butler, & Farrell, 2010). Differences were also noted in the extent to which policies and procedures were combined into one overarching document.

Is there a navigable pathway to the policy from the school system’s home page?

- Fourteen of the 32 school systems (43.8%) had a clear, navigable electronic pathway from the school system’s home page to the child protection policy (that is, it could be located in two to three steps via a general “policy” link). The remaining 18 of the 32 school systems (56.3%) did not have a locatable policy, or the pathway to the policy was difficult to navigate or was convoluted (that is, more than three steps were required to locate the policy via indirect links not labelled as “policy”).
- Qld was the only state in which all school systems had navigable electronic pathways to child/student protection policies.
- Search engines or search tool facilities on school system homepages were able to locate the child protection policy within the first 10 hits in only nine of the 32 school systems (28.1%).

**Incidental findings**

Putting ourselves in the shoes of a school staff member seeking information about child protection policy, procedures, processes or requirements, we found that teachers searching for information would face challenges including:

- Insider information would be needed about how school system websites were structured, where to find policy documents on the website, or the exact name of the policy. For example, in the NSW Department of Education and Communities, a user would need to know that the child protection policy was located under the heading “wellbeing” policy category or would need to know that the policy title began with “P” for “Protecting” in order to locate the document. In the NT Department of Education, a user would need to know that the policy title began with “S” for “Safeguarding” in order to locate the document. In Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, a user would need to know that the child protection policy was located under information “for principals and administrators” and not under information “for teachers and support staff”. This issue was more prevalent in the larger state and territory departmental
websites, than in the smaller diocesan Catholic Education Office websites as indicated by the examples given.

- Policies could be idiosyncratically named. For example the NSW Department of Education and Communities policy is entitled *Protecting and supporting children and young people policy*, the NT Department of Education policy is entitled *Safeguarding the wellbeing of children – Obligations for the mandatory reporting of harm and exploitation*, the Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba policy is entitled *Our commitment to the safety of all students: Student protection policy and procedure*, and the Catholic Education South Australia policy is entitled *Policy for the care, wellbeing and protection of children and young people*. Finding idiosyncratically named policies would be difficult for busy staff.

- Multiple navigable pathways to policy documents could be taken in some cases, meaning that different information is stumbled upon depending on the navigation route taken. This is problematic if it leads to fragmentation, inconsistency or access to dated or inaccurate information.

**Can the policy be downloaded as a single document?**

- In 18 of the 21 school systems with locatable child protection polices, the policy was available in downloadable/printable (PDF) format. The NSW Department of Education and Communities, the Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, and Catholic Education Melbourne did not provide downloadable/printable formats; the policy was available in online format only. Provision of the policy in online format, although helpful for version control and conscientious for environmental reasons, may be problematic to the extent that all school staff may not readily have access to the online format, and online formats cannot be read “on the run”. This may not serve the best interests of children.

**Does the policy need to be read in conjunction with other documents?**

- Of the 21 school systems with a locatable child protection policy, 18 contained lists of other related documents such as legislation, related policies, procedures or guidelines. Uniquely, in the case of the SA Department of Education and Child Development the list extended to the international human rights instrument, the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

- The mean number of other related documents listed in 21 school system child protection policies was 6.6, with a range of 0-37 documents. Long lists of related documents without indication of which were essential for policy implementation are problematic as there is risk that school staff may overlook crucial information (for example, interagency guidelines or details about report decision-making tools). Long lists of related documents may also be an indicator of policy complexity.

- School systems generally failed to identify which other related documents were essential for policy implementation. Only two school systems provided this information explicitly, but in different ways. The ACT Education and Training Directorate provided a visible paragraph, highlighted in a box, stating “This policy should be read in conjunction with …”, and clearly listing two sets of guidelines essential for policy implementation. The Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta used the term “head policy” to describe the overarching child protection policy with the presumption that other documents were subordinate.

**What specific guidance is provided for situations of suspected institutional abuse?**
There was substantial variation in the amount of information provided in school policy documents in relation to school system responses to child sexual abuse where the suspected perpetrator was a school employee, volunteer or member of the clergy.

Twenty-six of the 32 (81.3%) school systems had some extent of specific guidance for institutional responses to child sexual abuse where the suspected perpetrator was a school employee, volunteer or member of the clergy.

In eight of the 32 school systems (25%), specific guidance for institutional responses to child sexual abuse was provided in the base child protection policy. In these policies, information was limited. Only one school system provided detailed information in the base child protection policy, Catholic Education Office, Diocese of Toowoomba.

In 15 of the 32 school systems (46.9%), specific guidance for institutional responses to child sexual abuse was provided in a separate policy, procedure, protocol or other document(s). In the majority of these documents information was detailed. The Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn Catholic Education Office provided information in separate documents that were recently updated (that is, subsequent to data collection for this audit). The Catholic Education Office Bathurst (NSW), had detailed information in a separate document that appeared to be out-of-date. The Catholic Education Offices of Wollongong (NSW), Sandhurst (Vic), and Darwin (NT), and the Tasmanian Catholic Education Office provided detailed but unclear information.

In three of the 32 school systems (9.4%) specific guidance for institutional responses to child sexual abuse was provided in both the base child protection policy and a separate document. These school systems were: SA Department of Education and Child Development, and Catholic Education Offices of Melbourne (Vic) and Parramatta (NSW).

In six of the 32 school systems (18.8%) we could find no information regarding institutional responses to child sexual abuse in any document. These school systems were: Department of Education Tasmania, Catholic Education Offices of Sydney (NSW), Wilcannia-Forbes (NSW), Townsville (Qld), Ballarat (Vic), and Sale (Vic).

Specific guidance on institutional responses to child sexual abuse was most detailed in NSW school systems. However these procedures were also, comparatively, very complex, multifaceted and lacking in clarity. Reporting processes and chains were particularly problematic. This is because a number of agencies are charged with receiving reports depending on the nature of the allegations and the identity of the alleged perpetrator. Unless flowcharts were provided, it would be very difficult for school staff to determine the correct pathway for reports. Moreover, the role of Police in receiving reports seems unclear.

In some documents, reporting flowcharts were provided as a supplement to guidance provided in text. The combination of text and flowcharts appeared to offer greater clarity than text alone.

*Incidental findings*

We noted that some child protection policies did not have page numbers and/or section numbers. It seemed striking that this level of basic detail would be omitted from policy documents.

Detailed analysis of reporting chains was beyond the scope of this study. However we noted a broad range of approaches to describing reporting requirements, including complexity in explanations of reporting chains. This may be an artefact of specific jurisdictional requirements;

---

2 Despite the level of detail provided in the Catholic Education Office, Diocese of Toowoomba base child protection policy entitled *Our commitment to the safety of all students: Student protection policy and procedure* (updated April 2013) information about responding to allegations of child sexual abuse where the suspected perpetrator is a school staff member, volunteer or member of the clergy, is complex and imprecise. This is made more difficult owing to the use of three categories of interventions depending on the extent of harm and the identity of the perpetrator.
however it may also be an artefact of document design. This highlights an important future direction for research on school systems’ child protection policies.

**Is the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education specified in the policy?**

- Four of the 32 school systems (12.5%) provided a directive within the base child protection policy for the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education. These systems were: ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia. Such a directive provides a greater level of institutional commitment to prevention.

- SA is the only jurisdiction to approach universal commitment to provision of school-based child sexual abuse prevention education across school systems. This provision is driven by recommendations from the *Layton Child Protection Review* (Layton, 2003).

- The SA Department of Education and Child Development has the most comprehensive approach to provision of child sexual abuse prevention education with the following five characteristics: (i) the base child protection policy specifies that school students will engage in learning from an approved child protection curriculum that teaches them explicitly about personal safety, their right to personal safety, help-seeking and self-protecting behaviours; (ii) school staff engaged in teaching the approved child protection curriculum (known as the *Keeping Safe Child Protection Curriculum*), must receive approved training, and ongoing professional development and support; (iv) the curriculum is to be taught only by staff with training in its use; and uniquely, (v) the approved child protection curriculum is to be reviewed periodically in response to emerging evidence (SA Department of Education and Child Development, 2011, section 6.12–6.14).

- The ACT Education and Training Directorate also provides a policy directive albeit less comprehensive with the following two characteristics: (i) it is the principal’s responsibility to ensure lessons in protective and safe behaviours are taught, and protective behaviours programs are implemented in their schools; and (ii) the policy specifies that the department must provide professional learning for school staff to effectively teach these lessons (ACT Department of Education and Training, 2010, section 4.8–4.10).

- The WA Department of Education provides a policy directive with three different characteristics: (i) school principals must implement the preventive curriculum as part of the overall health and wellbeing curriculum for all students; (ii) principals must collaborate directly with other agencies (for example, Department of Child Protection, Police, Corrective Services) to implement prevention programs; and (iii) the Department of Education is required to report compliance on this directive to government (WA Department of Education, 2009, section 4.19).

**Incidental findings**

- We noted a common misuse of the term “protective behaviours” in child protection policy documents, on school system websites and in other child sexual abuse prevention resources. The term “protective behaviours” was frequently mistakenly used in school systems as a synonym for child sexual abuse prevention education. This is problematic because *Protective Behaviours* is a trademark name for a specific child sexual abuse prevention education program (or group of programs developed by the organisation known as Protective Behaviours).
Findings
Criterion 2: Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education

Is there a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education?

- None of the 32 school systems had a specific or standalone policy on the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education.
- As reported in Criterion 1, only four of the 32 school systems (12.5%) (ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia) have any kind of directive for the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education which exists not in a standalone policy but in these systems’ base child protection policies.

Does the policy specify evidence-based approaches?

- As noted above, no school system had a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education.
- Distinctively, the SA Department of Education and Child Development’s base child protection policy, specified that: “The approved child protection curriculum will be reviewed in response to emerging evidence about child abuse and violence prevention programs.” (SA Department of Education and Child Development, 2011, Section 6.14, p.6). This is an exemplary approach.

Does the policy address the potential for child sexual abuse to occur in child-related institutions?

- As noted above, no school system had a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education.
- As reported in Criterion 1, 26 of the 32 school systems (81.3%) had some kind of policy guidance for situations of suspected institutional abuse. In many instances this information lacked clarity.

Is child sexual abuse prevention education optional or compulsory?

- Teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education was compulsory in four of the 32 school systems (12.5%): ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia.
- The policy directive for compulsory teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education may be more accessible, clear and effective when located in the base child protection policy as it is for ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia.
- The wording of the directive is important. For example in base child protection policies for the ACT Education and Training Directorate and the WA Department of Education we found explicit statements such as “Directorate staff will provide ...” and “The principal must implement preventive curriculum for all students”. In the base child protection policy for the SA Department of Education and Child Development and Catholic Education South Australia, directives were conveyed implicitly using statements such as “Children and young people will engage with curriculum which explicitly teaches them about ...”, and “All children and young people in DECD preschools and schools will access ...”. There is a clear difference between the explicit and implicit approach. For example, the directive is communicated more strongly when oriented
towards what school systems and staff “will” or “must” do (as the onus is on adults). It is weaker when oriented towards what children should learn or “engage” with (as children will have little capacity to decide what is taught and not taught in the curriculum). Although a child-centred focus is important, directives about the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education should be as clear and explicit as possible.

- Teaching child sexual abuse prevention education is optional (non-compulsory) in 18 of the 32 school systems (56.3%). For example in the NT Department of Education, it is considered “embedded” in curriculum, and in the Qld Department of Education, Employment and Training, it is “encouraged” and “aligned with relevant curriculum”.
- In five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) we were unable to determine whether teaching child sexual abuse prevention education was optional or compulsory. These systems were: NSW Department of Education and Communities, Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton, and Catholic Education Melbourne.
- No information was available for four school systems (12.5%): Catholic Education Diocese of Townsville, Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn Catholic Education Office, Tasmanian Catholic Education Office, and Catholic Education Office of Western Australia.

**If compulsory, how do schools report on compliance?**

- Of the four school systems in which teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education was compulsory (ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, and Catholic Education South Australia), only SA Department of Education and Child Development addressed accountability structures via a newly implemented *Curriculum, Pedagogy, Assessment and Reporting Policy for Reception – Year 10* (Royal Commission reference: SA4.1 Item 1d – DECD Report on Evaluation Actions to KPMG Report, p.1). The specific reporting mechanisms, however, were not detailed.
- Additionally, the SA Department of Education and Child Development maintains a database of teachers trained to deliver the *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* (Royal Commission reference: Royal Commission reference: SA4.1 Item 1e–2 Annual Circular to Regional Site Leaders, p.1).

**Incidental findings**

We noted a vast array of terms used by school systems to denote child sexual abuse prevention education. Terms used included:

- Child protection education; protective and safe behaviours; protective behaviours education; protective behaviours; child safety education; child safety and child protection; personal safety and wellbeing; relationships and sexuality education; and sexuality education.
Findings
Criterion 3: Location in the curriculum

Is child sexual abuse prevention education named in the primary school curriculum?

- The term “child sexual abuse prevention education” is not explicitly used in any of these curriculum documents (nor is the term “child sexual abuse prevention” or the term “prevention of child sexual abuse”). However, as reported in Criterion 2, a wide array of synonyms were used including: child protection education; protective and safe behaviours; protective behaviours education; protective behaviours; child safety education; child safety and child protection; personal safety and wellbeing; relationships and sexuality education; and sexuality education.

- School curriculum documents developed by state and territory statutory authorities do not have an explicit approach to addressing child sexual abuse prevention content. Rather, there is an implicit approach where content may be inferred as appropriate within the scope of the curriculum. Hence, there is significant variation in the extent to which child sexual abuse prevention education may be interpreted as appropriate in the various school systems.

- In the newly released Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10), child sexual abuse prevention education is not explicitly named. The curriculum does not explicitly nominate child sexual abuse prevention as a teaching topic within any age band (note: further detail can be found in Volume 4 which deals explicitly with the content of the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education).

Where is child sexual abuse prevention education located in the primary school curriculum (that is, which parts of the school curriculum relate to child sexual abuse prevention education)?

- Child sexual abuse prevention education is located within the learning area of Health and Physical Education (HPE) in all school systems except NSW, where this learning area is known as Personal Development and Physical Education (PDHPE), and Tas, where it is known as Health and Wellbeing (H&W).

- Six of the 32 school systems (18.8%) appear to have no child sexual abuse prevention content taught in schools other than that which may be covered implicitly and in a very broad sense within the scope of the statutory state or territory curriculum documents: Tas Department of Education; NSW Catholic Education Dioceses of Bathurst, Maitland-Newcastle, and Wagga Wagga; Catholic Education Office Diocese of Darwin; Tasmanian Catholic Education Office. This is especially problematic for school systems in the NT and Tas as their school HPE curricula have much less explicit coverage of child sexual abuse-related topics, and teaching prevention knowledge and skills could easily be missed.

- Approaches to teaching child sexual abuse prevention education, if at all, vary considerably among the 32 school systems. There are five “tiers” or layers of curriculum within which child sexual abuse prevention may be taught: (i) school curriculum; (ii) Catholic school curriculum; (iii) specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum; and (iv) other curriculum (internal); (v) other curriculum (external), which are further described below. As depicted in Figure 1, Tier 1 curriculum is compulsory and broadest in scope, and Tier 5 is non-compulsory and narrowest in scope.

- The newly developed Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10) will add another tier or layer of curriculum. To date, it is unclear how the different documents comprising the various tiers of curriculum will be adapted to account for the implementation of the Australian Curriculum.
**Tier 1: School curriculum**

- Tier 1: *School curriculum* refers to Health and Physical Education syllabuses developed by statutory school curriculum authorities in each of the Australian states and territories. We examined school syllabus content for school students from Foundation (also variously known as Kindergarten, Preschool, or Reception) to Year 6 or Year 7.
- Child sexual abuse prevention education is not specifically named in any school curriculum.
- Four of the eight states/territories (ACT, NSW, SA and WA) have a more explicit and more comprehensive approach to nominating content. Four have a less explicit approach and less comprehensive approach (NT, Qld, Tas, Vic).
- The most detail can be found in NSW’s *Personal Development and Physical Education* (PDHPE) curriculum, and in SA’s *R-10 Health and Physical Education* curriculum.
- Suggested curriculum content in jurisdictions having a more explicit and comprehensive approach is, arguably, less likely to be subject to interpretation. A clear example is the following explicit statement in NSW: “Identifying private and non-private body parts” (Stage 1, p.41) compared with the less explicit statement in Tas: “Identify parts of the body” (Stage 1, p.28). Another example of more explicit learning statements can be found in the ACT where students should have opportunities to: learn about and understand appropriate and inappropriate touching (12.EC.10); recognise safe and unsafe situations (12.EC.12); and respond to situations that make them feel unsafe and identify people who can help (12.EC.14) (*Early Childhood Band of Development*, p.63). Compare this with less explicit detail in Qld where students may learn to: follow guidelines to apply safe practices (*Essential Learnings by the end of year 3*, p.1).
- In the lower primary school (up to and including Year 3), the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education tends to be located within topics associated with safety education. In the upper primary school (Year 4 and above), it can also be located within topics associated with sexuality education, personal development and healthy relationships education.

**Tier 2: Catholic school curriculum**

- Tier 2: *Catholic school curriculum* refers to syllabuses developed by Catholic school systems in some, but not all, dioceses. These syllabuses provide a “Catholic perspective” on the curricula developed by state and territory curriculum authorities. These additional curriculum documents were in use in nine of the 24 Catholic school systems: in NSW (by Catholic Education Offices: Armidale, Broken Bay, Lismore, Parramatta, Sydney and Wollongong), Qld (by Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba), the Tasmanian Catholic Education Office, and the Catholic Education Office of WA.
- There does not appear to be a coordinated approach within Catholic school systems regarding the use of this additional layer of curriculum documents. The development of such documents seems to have originated in 1993 with the Catholic Education Commission of NSW developing and endorsing the use of the *Towards Wholeness* curriculum, which was allowed by the then NSW Board of Studies (Catholic Education Commission, NSW, 2003). Over the years, this curriculum has been adapted for use in other Catholic school systems. Differences between the *Towards Wholeness* document and the NSW *Personal Development, Health and Physical Education* curriculum can be found mainly in the content areas of sexuality, personal development and relationships education. This is relevant to child sexual abuse prevention education as content is located in these areas.

---

8 SA is the only state/territory to have Year 7 as part of the primary school.
Incidental findings

- With respect to the Catholic perspective which overlays the state and territory school curricula, particularly in NSW, we noted that teachers in Catholic schools are required to teach the Health and Physical Education curriculum in ways that are consistent with specific Catholic values and doctrines. These values and doctrines are referred to in Catholic School Curriculum and support materials and include for example: fidelity to God’s intention and plan, the sanctity of life, sexuality as a gift from God, chastity as a moral virtue, abstinence of sexual activity until after marriage, masturbation as an intrinsically and gravely disordered action, homosexual genital activities as morally wrong and contrary to natural law (see for example Growing Towards Wholeness; Towards Wholeness; Sexual Health Matters: A Resource for Catholic Secondary Schools).
- We noted in curriculum and support documents, a tendency for behaviours such as “lust, masturbation, fornication, pornography, prostitution, rape and homosexual acts” to be expressed as offending “against the dignity of marriage” rather than against the rights of the child to protection from sexual abuse and exploitation.
- In some dioceses, we noted that the use of outside agencies or guest speakers was not recommended unless the focus was on natural family planning in the teaching of sexuality education.

Tier 3: Specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum

- Tier 3: Specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum refers to a program of materials developed by government departments of education or Catholic Education Offices for the specific purpose of child sexual abuse prevention education. Tier 3 curricula are intended to be taught by school staff rather than external agencies, and their implementation can be directed in the school system’s base child protection policy and can, therefore, be considered compulsory.
- Specific child protection curricula were found to be available for use in eight of the 32 school systems (25%).
- Specific child protection curricula exist in three of the state/territory education departments: NSW Department of Education and Communities (Child Protection Education: Curriculum material to support teaching and learning in Personal Development, Health and Physical Education – now dated); SA Department of Education and Child Development (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum – current and comprehensive); and WA Department of Education (Protective Behaviours P-Year 10 – currently under development).
- ACT Education and Training Directorate have a specific child protection education curriculum in place, but we were unable to find specific details. This curriculum does not appear to have published detail comparable to that provided in SA or NSW, and appears to be planned for delivery by an external agency rather than by school staff. We have, therefore, included the ACT Protective Behaviours curriculum below as a Tier 5 curriculum.
- In NSW Catholic Education Offices, four of the 10 systems have developed and/or aggregated materials from a range of sources, including parts of the specific Child Protection Education curriculum. These four systems included: Catholic Schools Office Diocese of Broken Bay (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (untitled aggregation of curricula); Catholic Education Office Sydney (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); and Diocese of Wollongong Catholic Education Office (Child Protection Education for Students, Diocesan Curriculum Resource for Child Protection Education in the Context of Catholic School Pastoral Care, Personal Development and Christian Values).
In SA, Catholic Education South Australia (representing the Dioceses of Adelaide and Port Pirie) has adopted and is currently using the specific Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.

No specific child protection curricula were available in any of the Catholic Education Offices in dioceses in ACT, NT, Qld, Vic, Tas or WA.

**Tier 4: Other curriculum (internal)**

Tier 4: Other curriculum (internal) refers to programs and materials developed internally by government departments of education or Catholic Education Offices, sometimes in collaboration with non-government organisations and community agencies, for the specific purpose of child sexual abuse prevention education. Implementation of this curriculum tier is not enshrined in policy and can, therefore, be considered non-compulsory. These child sexual abuse prevention curricula are typically delivered by school staff or by school staff in collaboration with staff from non-government organisations/community agencies.

Eleven of the 32 school systems (34.4%) reported using some form of “other internal” curriculum with at least some child sexual abuse prevention content. These include: Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment (Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum – current and comprehensive); Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Catching On Early – current, comprehensive but more broadly focused on sexuality education and having limited child sexual abuse prevention content); Catholic Schools Office Lismore Diocese (Digital Citizenship – limited to child sexual abuse prevention online); Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (Sexuality Education Kit; Protective Behaviours Kit); Brisbane Catholic Education Office (Feeling Safe poster program); Catholic Education Diocese of Cairns (Social Emotional Learning – not dealing specifically with child sexual abuse); Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton (Protective Behaviours – unclear if this was used as a generic term or specific program); Catholic Education Diocese of Townsville (Kids Feel Safe – unclear if this is a program for teachers or primary school students); Catholic Education Ballarat and Catholic Education Office Diocese of Sale (Education in Sexuality within Catholic Schools – more broadly focused on sexuality education and having limited child sexual abuse prevention content).

The Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum developed by the Qld Department of Education and Training has a level of detail comparable to other Tier 3 curricula; however, its use is not enshrined in policy.

Vic differs from all other states and territories, having the unique approach of locating child sexual abuse prevention education within broader sexuality education for all primary school year levels.

**Tier 5: Other curriculum (external)**

Tier 5: Other curriculum (external) refers to programs and materials developed externally by non-government organisations and community agencies for the specific purpose of child sexual abuse prevention education. Implementation of this curriculum tier is not enshrined in policy and is therefore voluntary (or non-compulsory). These child sexual abuse prevention curricula are typically delivered in schools by staff from non-government organisations/community agencies.

Eighteen of the 32 school systems reported using some form of “other external” child sexual abuse prevention education curricula or program. A range of different curricula and non-government agencies were noted. Most refer to “protective behaviours”, although it is unclear if this term is used as a synonym for child sexual abuse prevention education, or to mean the specific Protective Behaviours programs developed by the Australian Protective Behaviours
organisations (including Protective Behaviours Australia Inc; Protective Behaviours Consultancy Group of NSW; Protective Behaviours WA). Other commonly cited programs include those delivered by Bravehearts, NAPCAN, and Children’s Safety Australia.

- The ACT Education and Training Directorate has a commitment, enshrined in the system’s base child protection policy, to “delivering lessons for children and young people in protective and safe behaviours”. In information we were able to access it appeared that this curriculum will be delivered by an external agency (Protective Behaviours) rather than by school staff. We have, therefore, included the ACT Protective Behaviours curriculum as a Tier 5 curriculum.

- Three of the 10 NSW Catholic Education Dioceses claim to have used an external program: Armadale (Protective Behaviours), Parramatta (Protective Behaviours), and Sydney (Bravehearts).

- Three of the five Qld Catholic education dioceses have indicated their intention to use the Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum (Brisbane, Cairns and Rockhampton).

- Vic’s Catholic education systems have a strongly espoused model of devolution to individual schools. Although all four school systems indicated externally provided child sexual abuse prevention programs had been used, the actual extent of delivery cannot be known given the reporting mechanisms used.

**The Australian curriculum**

Findings on our audit of the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical education (F-10) can be found separately in Volume 4 of this report. Key points are repeated here for completeness.

- Child sexual abuse prevention education is *not explicitly mentioned* in the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10). That is, the curriculum does not specifically nominate child sexual abuse prevention education as a teaching topic within any age band.

- The teaching of child sexual abuse must be inferred or interpreted within the scope of the curriculum. For example, within content for the Foundation (pre-school/kindergarten) age band, children may learn about “identifying and labelling private parts of the body and understanding contexts when body parts should be kept private” (ACARA, 2014, p.20). This content is typically found in specialist child sexual abuse prevention education programs. Another example can be found within the content for Years 3 and 4 age band, where children may learn about “indicating on a local map the location of safe places and people who can help” (p.30). Help-seeking strategies and personnel are also typically taught in specialist child sexual abuse prevention programs. Some content, however, is much broader and open to interpretation. For example, in content for Years 7 and 8 age band, students may learn about “proposing and practising strategies for celebrating safely, including assertiveness, refusal skills, planning travel arrangements and contingency plans” (p.42).

- State and territory curriculum authorities will be responsible for implementing the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10) and for developing teacher curriculum support materials and pedagogical supports (for example, teacher training).

- It is not known if state and territory curriculum authorities and Catholic school systems will make the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education less subject to interpretation as they progress through the implementation phase.

- SA is the only jurisdiction that has begun the process of mapping their existing specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum, the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum, against the Australian Curriculum. SA is also the only jurisdiction to have made an explicit commitment to continuing to use the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum alongside the Australian Curriculum.
The introduction of the *Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (F-10)*, does not substantially change the status quo in regards to the provision of child sexual abuse prevention education in Australian primary schools. The inclusion of child sexual abuse prevention education remains largely implicit rather than explicit within the curriculum. Hence, teaching this content by teachers in schools remains largely discretionary or voluntary (analysis of the *Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education* can be found in Volume 4 of this report).

Based on the implicit rather than explicit nature of the content, it is highly likely that teachers will continue to exercise discretion in their teaching of this material unless there are additional system-led directives (for example, policy directives) for the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education (as is the case in ACT, SA and WA). Policy directives of this type are beneficial in that they are typically accompanied by compulsory teacher training initiatives, and the development of evidence-based and user-friendly curriculum support materials to assist in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education (as is the case in SA with the *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum*).

What recommendations are made for specific programs, timing, frequency, or intensity of sexual abuse prevention education?

- It is important to note that six rigorous systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the effectiveness of child sexual abuse prevention programs have been conducted over the past 20 years (Berrick & Barth 1992; Davis & Gidycz, 2000; Heldotting, Keiffer, & Soled; 1994; Rispens, Aleman, & Goudena, 1997, Walsh, Zwi, Woolfenden, & Shlonsky, forthcoming; Zwi, Woolfenden, Wheeler, O’Brien, Tait & Williams, 2009). None have been able to pinpoint the most effective program timing, frequency, or intensity.

- Three of the 32 school systems make recommendations relevant to this question. Timing for lessons are generally not specified so that schools and teachers can determine when and how the curriculum is implemented during the year. There are very few recommendations made for lesson duration, length or frequency.

- The *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* (a Tier 3 specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum) developed in SA, recommends the following with respect to frequency and intensity: (i) frequency: the curriculum is presented at least once to each learner at each Band level; (ii) intensity: all four focus areas (the right to be safe; relationships; recognising and reporting abuse; protective strategies) must be covered at each year level (iii) intensity: the curriculum is reinforced by whole-school behaviour codes with two themes: “We all have the right to be safe” and “We can help ourselves to be safe by talking to people we trust”; and (iv) intensity: there are 11 “non-negotiable” aspects to the curriculum.

- The *Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum* (a Tier 4 “other internal” child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum) developed in Qld, recommends the following with respect to timing and intensity: (i) intensity: six lessons are taught at each stage and lessons are sequentially structured to gradually build students’ knowledge and skills; (ii) intensity: adhering to the lesson sequences and key themes found within lesson scripts so that students do not miss critical content (iii) intensity: taking opportunities to consolidate lesson concepts; and (iv) timing: starting early in the school year.

- The *Child Protection Curriculum* (a Tier 3 specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum) developed in NSW, and now dated, has a useful *Scope and Sequence* chart which provides an overview of curriculum delivery across the school years.

What recommendations are made for personnel in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education?
• No recommendations were found regarding the specific skills, knowledge, qualifications, certifications or training required for staff who will teach child sexual abuse prevention education.
• More data on the extent and nature of teacher training can be found in Criterion 6.
Findings
Criterion 4: Inclusion, relevance and cultural sensitivity

What strategies are recommended for schools and/or teachers in differentiating the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education for different groups of children (for example, for children of different ages, gender, children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds including children of refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds, Australian Indigenous children, children with disabilities, children in out-of-home care, same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children).

**Differentiation in the school curriculum**

- There were few strategies articulated in any of the state or territory or Catholic school curriculum documents specifically in relation to differentiating the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education for different groups of children.

**Differentiation in the specific child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum**

- Curriculum differentiation was more evident in school systems having a specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in place.
- To reiterate from Criterion 3, specific child sexual abuse prevention curricula were available for use in eight of the 32 school systems (25%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (Child Protection Education: Curriculum material to support teaching and learning in Personal Development, Health and Physical Education); SA Department of Education and Child Development (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum); WA Department of Education (Protective Behaviours P-Year 10); Catholic Schools Office Diocese of Broken Bay (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (untitled aggregation of curricula); Catholic Education Office Sydney (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); Diocese of Wollongong Catholic Education Office (Child Protection Education for Students, Diocesan Curriculum Resource for Child Protection Education in the Context of Catholic School Pastoral Care, Personal Development and Christian Values), and Catholic Education South Australia (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum).
- Curriculum differentiation was also evident, albeit to a lesser extent, in school systems having an “other internal” curriculum in place.
- To reiterate from Criterion 3, other (internal) curricula having some child sexual abuse prevention content were available for use in 11 of the 32 school systems (34.4%): Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment (Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum); Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Catching On Early); Catholic Schools Office Lismore Diocese (Digital Citizenship); Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (Sexuality Education Kit; Protective Behaviours Kit); Brisbane Catholic Education Office (Feeling Safe poster program); Catholic Education Diocese of Cairns (Social Emotional Learning); Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton (Protective Behaviours); Catholic Education Diocese of Townsville (Kids Feel Safe); Catholic Education Ballarat and Catholic Education Melbourne (programs based on Protective Behaviours); and Catholic Education Office Diocese of Sale (Education in Sexuality within Catholic Schools).
- The NSW Child Protection Curriculum and SA’s Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum were clearly the most detailed in terms of articulating strategies for curriculum differentiation. Even so, the notion of identifying specific groups of children who may be considered at greater risk of
child sexual abuse received insufficient attention, and the articulation of specific differentiation strategies was limited.

**Children of different ages**

- The main strategy for differentiating the curriculum for children of different ages is to develop implementation manuals for each year level or groups of year levels.

**Gender differences**

- The main strategy identified for differentiating the curriculum for boys and girls is the teaching of separate classes for boys and girls for some content. However, it remains unclear which specific content would be best suited to this approach; and which age levels would benefit most.

**Children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds including refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds**

The main strategies identified for differentiating the curriculum for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, including refugee and asylum-seeking backgrounds, included:

- In relation to teaching self-protection, emphasising for teachers that there may be culturally specific ways of demonstrating assertiveness; in relation to teaching private and non-private (public) body parts, highlighting for teachers that these will differ for some religious and/or cultural groups; in relation to teaching correct names for body parts, recommending that teachers also use anatomically correct terms specific to languages used in the school community; in relation to teaching personal networks and help seeking, highlighting for teachers that these students may require additional practical assistance in identifying and growing their personal networks; in relation to student disclosures of child sexual abuse, highlighting for teachers the difficulties these students may experience in making disclosures to school staff; in relation to student experiences of past trauma, highlighting for teachers that a child protection curriculum cannot replace individual therapy.
- School systems having curricula in place which provide some or all of the above-mentioned strategies include nine of the 32 school systems (28.1%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (*Child Protection Curriculum*); Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment (*Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum*); SA Department of Education and Child Development (*Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum*), Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (*Catching On Early*); Catholic Schools Office Diocese of Broken Bay
The Layton Child Protection Review (Layton, 2003) recommended updating child sexual abuse prevention education programs in schools with regard to addressing the needs of children and young people from different cultures (Recommendations 137). These materials have been developed and implemented by the SA Department of Education and Child Development.

**Australian Indigenous children**

The main strategies identified for differentiating the curriculum for Australian Indigenous children included:

- In relation to teaching the curriculum generally, recommending that teachers team teach or work alongside Indigenous Education Assistants, and community language teachers to deliver lessons; in relation to teaching correct names for body parts, highlighting for teachers the need to check with local community elders regarding correct terms that are permissible to use in Aboriginal languages; in relation to teaching resources, emphasising to teachers that Indigenous specific support materials are used; in relation to identifying supportive networks, stressing for teachers that local Indigenous services, including health services are discussed, and where possible involved in teaching; in relation to Indigenous student disclosures of child sexual abuse, highlighting for teachers the difficulties these students may experience in making disclosures to school staff particularly given Indigenous Australians’ negative past experiences and damage to trusting relationships.

- School systems having curricula in place which provide some or all of the above-mentioned strategies for differentiating the curriculum for Australian Indigenous children include four of the 32 school systems (12.5%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (*Child Protection Curriculum*); SA Department of Education and Child Development (*Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum*), WA Department of Education (*Health and Physical Education Curriculum*); and Catholic Education South Australia (*Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum*).

- The WA Department of Education in collaboration with the non-government organisation, Protective Behaviours, has developed supplementary resources for teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

- The Layton Child Protection Review (Layton, 2003) recommended increasing and improving child sexual abuse prevention education programs in schools with specific emphasis on Indigenous children (Recommendations 9 and 137). Information within the *Keeping Safe Child Protection Curriculum* stated these materials were currently being developed by the SA Department of Education and Child Development (see for example p.12 *Early Years Band: Ages 3–5*), however we were unable to locate these resources and they were not provided in submissions to the Royal Commission.

**Children with disabilities**

The main strategies identified for differentiating the curriculum for children with disabilities include:

- In relation to teaching the curriculum generally, highlighting for teachers the need to adapt the curriculum for use by primary school students with verbal or communication disorders, and where appropriate to maximise participation in whole class activities, use of small group activities or individual instruction to ensure key messages are understood; also in relation to general teaching, emphasising that teachers use case study examples including primary school
students with a range of disabilities; in relation to teaching private and non-private (public) parts of the body, and correct terminology, highlighting for teachers that children with physical disabilities and chronic illnesses may have a greater number of adults assisting with personal and medical care necessitating greater focus on body integrity; in relation to clarity in teaching about different types of touching, highlighting for teachers the need to cover this material with students in small groups with similar needs; in relation to teaching assertiveness, highlighting for teachers that this material will require modification (for example, the NO-GO-TELL sequence should be adapted for students with physical and communication difficulties); in relation to teaching personal networks, highlighting for teachers the need to modify these activities; in relation to teaching the concept of early warning signs, stressing to teach teachers that children with sensory disabilities and histories of trauma may require adaptation and greater sensitivity.

- School systems having curricula in place which provide some or all of the above-mentioned strategies for differentiating the curriculum for children with disabilities include five of the 32 school systems (15.6%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (Child Protection Education); Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment (Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum); SA Department of Education and Child Development (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum); and Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Catching On Early), and Catholic Education South Australia (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum).

- The Layton Child Protection Review (Layton, 2003) recommended increasing and improving child sexual abuse prevention education programs in schools with specific emphasis on children with special needs (Recommendations 9 and 137). Information within the Keeping Safe Child Protection Curriculum stated these materials were currently being developed by the SA Department of Education and Child Development (see for example p.12 Early Years Band: Ages 3–5), however we were unable to locate these resources and they were not provided in submissions to the Royal Commission.

**Children in out-of-home care**

- The main strategies for differentiating the curriculum for children in out-of-home-care include: in relation to teaching child sexual abuse prevention education generally, teachers are advised to take particular care, respect the rights of children and young people not to participate in activities that may be especially sensitive for them and/or not to share their work; and for teachers to include case studies and teaching resources depicting children living in foster or kinship care.

- School systems having curricula in place with these strategies include three of the 32 school systems (9.4%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (Child Protection Education); SA Department of Education and Child Development (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum); and Catholic Education South Australia (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum).

**Same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children**

- The main strategy for differentiating the curriculum for same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children was to take a clear, positive, broad and inclusive stance in relation to gender and sexual diversity.

- Only one of the 32 school systems had curricula in place to address the above-mentioned strategy (3.1%): Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Health and Physical Education curriculum; Catching On Early).

- The lack of attention to recognising the vulnerability of same-sex attracted and gender-questioning children and young people and providing specific strategies to address their specific
needs is problematic. This is especially so, given that a substantial volume of the cases of child sexual abuse of interest to the Royal Commission involve a perpetrator and victim of the same gender. Boys in particular would seem especially vulnerable, with additional vulnerabilities for individuals who are questioning their gendered or sexual identity.

- In Victoria, the unique stance on inclusiveness and respect for sexual diversity extends far beyond the school curriculum generally and sexuality education in particular to a whole-of-system approach which also encompasses overt signs of gender and sexual diversity on school premises, professional development for all school staff, anti-bullying policies, procedures and programs, access for students to information about gender diversity and diverse sexualities, and inclusive sexuality education.

**Are curriculum and/or programs presented in languages other than English? If so, indicate which language(s).**

- We found no evidence that curriculum and/or programs in relation to child sexual abuse prevention were presented in languages other than English beyond the above-mentioned suggestions for using culturally relevant terms for teaching public and non-private (public) body parts.
Findings
Criterion 5: Curriculum support

Note: Curriculum is the content that should be taught; that is, topics, concepts, knowledge, skills and dispositions. In this audit, Curriculum support is defined as the materials developed for teachers to assist them with delivering the curriculum such as manuals, lesson and unit plans, teaching materials and resources. Curriculum support helps teachers know what to teach.

What curriculum support is provided to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education?

- Curriculum support materials were more comprehensive in school systems having specific child sexual abuse prevention curricula in place.

- Curriculum support materials were available in the form of published documents (for example, manuals, lesson plans, unit plans, teaching guidelines) in seven of the 32 school systems (21.9%): NSW Department of Education and Communities (Child Protection Education); SA Department of Education and Child Development (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum); Catholic Schools Office Diocese of Broken Bay (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta (untitled aggregation of curricula); Catholic Education Office Sydney (Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Systemic Schools); Diocese of Wollongong Catholic Education Office (Child Protection Education for Students, Diocesan Curriculum Resource for Child Protection Education in the Context of Catholic School Pastoral Care, Personal Development and Christian Values), and Catholic Education South Australia (Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum).

- In two further school systems (6.3%) curriculum support materials were under development: ACT Education and Training Directorate (Protective Behaviours Program), and WA Department of Education (Protective Behaviours P-Year 10).

- In one school system (3.1%) curriculum support materials were comprehensive even though the use of the curriculum was not specified in policy: Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment (Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum).

- In all other school systems, curriculum support was provided only in the form of school curriculum documents. School curriculum documents developed by school system authorities in the states, territories and Catholic school dioceses do not provide detailed teaching support materials at the level of lesson plans or unit plans.

Which specific programs or materials were suggested for use?

- Specific curriculum materials were reported to be used in the state and territory school systems as presented in Criterion 3. No information regarding specific programs was found in ACT Education and Training Directorate, and the Tas Department of Education.

- In the NSW Catholic school systems, specific curriculum materials in the form of kits and resource packs have been developed with materials aggregated from a range of sources, including parts of the specific Child Protection Education curriculum, parts of the Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Diocesan Systemic Schools and other material. In terms of implementation, this is problematic because it means that the integrity of specific curricula cannot be guaranteed. It is unknown if expert advisors were involved in the design of these materials, and which specific materials draw on the different original sources.
In the Qld Catholic school systems, there was no specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in use. A range of other external programs and curricula were reported to be in use on an ad hoc basis such as the Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum, Bravehearts programs, Protective Behaviours; Safe4Kids materials, Qld Police resources, Child Safety Australia lesson plans.

In the Vic Catholic school systems, there was no common specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum in use. Specific materials and/or programs reported to be in use have a broader sexuality education and mental health focus in keeping with the AusVELS school curriculum. Additionally, programs developed by Protective Behaviours and Bravehearts are nominated and are used on an ad hoc basis.

In the Catholic school systems in ACT, NT, Tas and WA, little information was available to identify specific curriculum support materials in use. The Tasmanian Catholic Education Office recommends use of the Growing Towards Wholeness Catholic school curriculum. The Catholic Education Office of Western Australia also mentions use of Protective Behaviours curricula, Keeping Ourselves Safe (a curriculum developed in New Zealand), and the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum (developed in SA). It appears these program materials may be used on an ad hoc basis.

Catholic Education South Australia utilises the comprehensive specific materials provided within the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.

What agencies are involved in providing child sexual abuse prevention curriculum support to teachers? Are contractual or other arrangements in place?

No clear information was available in any of the 32 school systems regarding contractual agreements or other arrangements with other agencies for the provision of curriculum support to teachers.

Do materials and resources acknowledge the potential for institutional child sexual abuse to occur and provide support for teaching about this?

None of the 32 school systems provided information on curriculum support materials or resources to assist in understanding prevention of child sexual abuse perpetrated by school staff, volunteers and members of the clergy. We found no teaching materials or resources detailing institutional responses to child sexual abuse that might be covered in lessons with children and young people, nor strategies for managing the risks associated with child sexual abuse prevention material being taught by potential perpetrators.
Findings
Criterion 6: Pedagogical support

Note: Pedagogy is a term used to denote the various methods by which the curriculum should be taught; that is, teaching strategies, instructional approaches, training, coaching etc. In this audit, pedagogical support is defined as those measures provided to assist teachers with developing teaching strategies, methods and approaches including teacher training, professional development, and continuous professional learning. Pedagogical support helps teachers know how to teach.

Is training specified in the child protection policy?

- The provision of child protection training for school staff was specified (in policy) in 10 of the 32 school systems (31.3%): ACT Education and Training Directorate, SA Department of Education and Child Development, WA Department of Education, Catholic Education Archdiocese of Brisbane, Catholic Education Diocese of Cairns, Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton, Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba, Catholic Education Diocese of Townsville, Catholic Education South Australia, and Catholic Education Office of Western Australia. It was unclear, how much of this training, if any, pertained specifically to child sexual abuse prevention education.
- In five of the 32 school systems (15.6%), it was unclear whether child protection training containing child sexual abuse prevention content was provided: NSW Department of Education and Communities, NT Department of Education, Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, Tas Department of Education, and Catholic Education Office, Diocese of Wollongong.
- There was no training specified or no information about training available in 17 of the 32 school systems (53.1%).

What training is provided to school staff in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? Describe training provisions, formats, duration and frequency.

- Four of the 32 school systems (12.5%) had some information about training in child sexual abuse prevention (or professional development/learning).
- SA Department of Education and Child Development provides a full-day/seven-hour face-to-face training in the Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum. The training is compulsory for school staff if they are delivering the curriculum in their classrooms. Teachers cannot have access to curriculum materials unless they have completed the training. Online refresher training is planned to begin in 2014. SA has the most comprehensive approach to training for school staff.
- Catholic Education South Australia follows the model provided by SA Department of Education and Child Development and provides access to staff to the full-day/seven-hour face-to-face training in the Keeping Safe: Child protection Education Curriculum.
- ACT Education and Training Directorate provides professional learning for staff in “protective and safe behaviours”. School psychologists deliver this training. No detail was provided regarding timing, content, frequency and formats for the training.
- WA Department of Education has compulsory online Child Protection Professional Learning (CPPL). Training in the Protective Behaviours curriculum is planned to begin via CPPL in 2014. No detail was provided regarding timing, content, frequency and formats for the training.

Which specific internal/external training agencies are involved and how?
• Principals Australia Institute is the accredited supplier for the SA Department of Education and Child Development for training that supports the implementation of the SA Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum.

• Other external agencies nominated as providing ad hoc training or professional development for school staff include: Protective Behaviours, Bravehearts, Daniel Morcombe Foundation, Child Safety Australia, Family Planning Queensland, and Safe4Kids.

• Four school systems (12.5%) nominated provision of training by internal personnel including school psychologists or guidance officers, (ACT Education and Training Directorate, Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, Catholic Education Office of Western Australia), school principals and deputy principals (Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment), and the Child Protection Support Team (WA Department of Education).

Which specific training programs or materials are used and why?

• No information about specific training or materials provided by external agencies could be found in 20 of the 32 school systems (62.5%).

• Specific training programs or materials that were nominated by school systems included: Protective Behaviours, Bravehearts “Ditto” program, Daniel Morecombe Child Safety Curriculum, Qld Police resources, Safe4Kids materials, and Children’s Safety Australia lesson plans.

• In NSW Catholic diocesan schools, the Catholic school curriculum known as Towards Wholeness was nominated, along with the Child Protection Resource Manual for Broken Bay Diocesan Systemic Schools which has been adapted for use in many of the NSW education dioceses.

Are contractual or other arrangements in place between school systems and other agencies (for example, preferred providers) for the delivery of staff training? If so, describe.

• No clear information was available in 31 of the 32 (96.9%) school systems regarding contractual or other arrangements with agencies to deliver staff training.

• In the WA Department of Education, it appeared that funding had been provided to Protective Behaviours and Safe4Kids. However, it was unclear whether this funding was for staff training and/or the development of child sexual abuse prevention materials for use in schools.
Findings
Criterion 7: Assessment and evaluation

Is student learning about child sexual abuse prevention assessed? If so, how?

- In only one of the 32 school systems was it clear that student learning about child sexual abuse prevention would be assessed. In the SA Department of Education and Child Development’s *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum*, assessment of the accuracy and depth of student learning is considered vital. Strategies and criteria for student assessment are provided.
- In the majority of school systems, there were no specific directives for assessment of student learning about child sexual abuse prevention, beyond the general requirement for student learning within the school curriculum to be assessed.
- In 28 of the 32 school systems (87.5%) student learning about child sexual abuse prevention knowledge and skills could possibly be assessed as part of student learning generally.
- In three of the 32 school systems (9.4%) there was no information publicly available regarding intentions to assess student learning in this regard.

Has the child sexual abuse prevention education/curriculum been evaluated? If so, who conducted the evaluation, when and how (what approach was used)? What data was collected and from whom?

The Royal Commission specifically asked school systems what evaluation had been undertaken in relation to school-based child sexual abuse prevention. We were able to examine school system responses provided.

- A very broad range of responses was received. Responses were so diverse that it was impossible to develop clear categories to represent the different approaches in use. It was clear that school systems had interpreted the question about evaluation very differently.
- There have been no rigorous experimental studies conducted on any school-based curricula currently used in Australian primary schools.
- Only one of the 32 school systems had a program of ongoing evaluation of its specific child sexual abuse prevention curriculum. The SA Department of Education and Child Development, the *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* was independently evaluated by KPMG in 2010.
- Strategies which were reported by school systems in response to the evaluation question included: use of expert advisory or reference groups to provide feedback to curriculum developers, general school satisfaction surveys in which students, parents and staff may provide their perceptions of student safety at school, audits to check the delivery of syllabus content broadly (not child sexual abuse prevention education specifically), reviews of sexuality education curriculum broadly (not child sexual abuse prevention education specifically), teacher feedback on standard of grades in the HPE curriculum broadly (not child sexual abuse prevention education specifically), awareness of independent evaluation of the content of other external child sexual abuse prevention programs (for example, Safe Start) not specifically designed by school systems, use of the National Safe Schools Framework audit tool, and anecdotal feedback from school staff as an indicator of effectiveness.
- In most responses, the relevance of these evaluation strategies to evaluation of child sexual abuse prevention education was unclear.

Were evaluation findings implemented?
In only one of the 32 school systems were evaluation findings incorporated to improve the delivery of child sexual abuse prevention education. In the SA Department of Education and Child Development, the *Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum* was independently evaluated by KPMG in 2010. The curriculum has been reviewed in response to the findings of this research, and new versions of the curriculum have been developed.

It should be noted that the SA Department of Education and Child Development’s base child protection policy contains a directive for the child sexual abuse prevention education curriculum to be regularly reviewed with regard to the developing evidence base regarding child sexual abuse. Such a directive is not found elsewhere. The directive ensures curriculum evaluation occurs, and that enhancements are made in the light of findings.
Findings
Criterion 8: Information for parents and communities

Is there a parent navigation tab visible on the website homepage?

- Twenty-two of the 32 school systems (68.8%) have a parent tab/link/button on the departmental or diocesan website.
- These tabs have various labels including “parents”, “parents & carers”, “parents & community”, “parent information”, “for families” or “family information”.
- In two of the 32 school systems (6.3%), information for parents and students was combined under one tab: Brisbane Catholic Education, and Catholic Education Melbourne.

Is information provided to parents about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?

- Five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) had easily accessible publicly available information provided to parents about the school system’s (institutional) responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected child sexual abuse by a school staff member, volunteer or member of the clergy: Catholic Education Archdiocese of Brisbane, Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton, Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba, Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn Catholic Education Office, and Catholic Education Office of Western Australia.
- In two of the 32 school systems (6.3%), this information was available, but navigation to its location was difficult or unclear: Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, and WA Department of Education.

Is information publicly available to parents/communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school?

- Five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) had information publicly available to parents/communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school: NSW Department of Education and Communities, Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, SA Department of Education and Child Development, Catholic Schools Office, Diocese of Broken Bay, and Catholic Education Office Diocese of Parramatta.
- In one of the 32 school systems (3.1%), this information was planned but not yet available: WA Department of Education.
- One of the 32 school systems (3.1%) provided information for parents about sexual abuse prevention programs generally, but these programs were not taught in the system’s schools: Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba. The information encouraged parents to teach this content to their children at home.
- In five of the 32 school systems (15.6%), information was available, but navigation to its location was difficult or unclear: Catholic Schools Office Armidale, Catholic Schools Office Lismore Diocese, Catholic Education Office Sydney, Catholic Education Office Diocese of Wollongong, and Catholic Education South Australia.
What information is directed towards parents specifically about their involvement in child sexual abuse prevention education?

- In 12 of the 32 school systems (37.5%), information about parental involvement in child sexual abuse prevention education was available for parents. These were school systems that also reported having a specific child sexual abuse prevention education or other (external) child sexual abuse prevention program in place. Typically, information to parents about their involvement was provided in a letter or brochure to be distributed to parents. In four of these school systems (all from NSW Catholic Education dioceses, 12.5%), information provided to parents was reported to be used, but was unable to be publicly located: Catholic Schools Office Armidale, Catholic Schools Office Lismore Diocese, Catholic Education Office Sydney, and Catholic Education Office Diocese of Wollongong.
- In one of the school systems (3.1%), this information was planned but not yet available: WA Department of Education.
- In one of the 32 school systems (3.1%) information was provided to parents about how they could become involved in child sexual abuse prevention generally, but these programs were not taught in the system’s schools: Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba. The information encouraged parents to teach this content to their children at home.

Is parental permission required for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education at school?

- In two of the 32 school systems (6.3%) parental permission was required: NSW Department of Education and Communities, and Catholic Schools Office Diocese of Broken Bay.
- In three of the 32 school systems (9.4%) parental permission was clearly not required: SA Department of Education and Child Development, Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, and WA Department of Education.
- In two of the 32 school systems (6.3%) it was unclear if parental permission was required: Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, and Tas Department of Education. In the latter school system this was unclear because it appeared parental permission was not required, however parents could opt to withdraw students from these classes.
- In 25 of the 32 school systems (78.1%) there was no information available about whether or not parental permission was required for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education at school.
Findings
Criterion 9: Information for children and young people

Is there a student navigation tab visible on the website homepage?

- Eight of the 32 school systems (25%) have a student tab/link/button visible on the Departmental or Diocesan website: ACT Education and Training Directorate, NSW Department of Education and Communities, NT Department of Education, Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, Tas Department of Education, Vic Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Catholic Schools Office, Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle, and Catholic Education Archdiocese of Brisbane.
- Typically these tabs are labelled “students” or “information for students”.

What information is provided to children and young people about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse?

- None of the 32 school systems have information directly provided to children and young people regarding institutional responses to child sexual abuse, including processes for reporting known or suspected institutional child sexual abuse.
- Two of the 32 school systems (6.3%) have information that may be accessible to students, but not directed towards them: Catholic Education Diocese of Rockhampton, and Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba. This information took the form of an open letter on the Diocesan homepage.
- One of the 32 school systems (3.1%) had a grievance policy specifically directed towards students: Tasmanian Catholic Education Office.

What information is provided to children and young people about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school?

- None of the 32 school systems provided information to children and young people about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school.
Findings
Criterion 10: Partnerships with community services and agencies

What reference is made in policy and procedures documents (for child protection, child sexual abuse prevention, and/or mandatory reporting) to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?

- None of the 32 school systems articulated formal partnerships in policies or procedures documents. Some references were made to agencies, who may receive referrals from school staff, or to whom referrals were recommended or supported, but no formal partnership agreements or contracts were mentioned.

What reference is made on departmental or diocesan websites to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?

- None of the 32 school systems articulated formal partnerships in departmental or diocesan website content. Some references were made to referral and/or support agencies for victims of child sexual abuse and their families, but no formal partnership agreements or contracts were mentioned.

What reference is made by departments or dioceses, in submissions to the Royal Commission, to partnerships with support-based external agencies or community services for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention in schools?

- None of the 32 school systems articulated formal partnerships in submissions made to the Royal Commission. Some references were made to referral and/or support agencies for victims of child sexual abuse and their families, but no formal partnership agreements or contracts were mentioned.

What agencies are nominated to receive referrals in relation to child sexual abuse?

- Seventeen of the 32 school systems (53.1%) nominated one or more support agencies that would be appropriate to receive referrals in relation to child sexual abuse.
- Fifteen of the 32 school systems (46.9%) provided no information at all regarding support agencies to which referrals in relation to child sexual abuse could be made.
- State and territory departments of education provided the most comprehensive listings of support agencies.
- Catholic dioceses provided less comprehensive listings, often including Catholic-specific agencies and counselling services.

Are the agencies predominantly government or non-government agencies?

- Agencies nominated were generally a mix of government and non-government agencies, but predominantly non-government agencies.
Are the agencies nominated of direct relevance to child sexual abuse, prevention education, disclosures, or counselling support?

- The direct relevance of the nominated agencies to serving children who may be victims of child sexual abuse was not always clear as was the depth of expertise of various agencies in providing effective support. For example some school systems simply provided links to other information sources or websites (for example, from child sexual abuse prevention programs, cyberbullying websites, or youth mental health websites) rather than specialist counselling support services.
- Five of the 32 school systems (15.6%) provided a link to KidsHelpline: ACT Education and Training Directorate, NSW Department of Education and Communities, Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, SA Department of Education and Child Development, and WA Department of Education.
- Only two of the 32 school systems (6.3%) provided a link or suggested referral to Bravehearts who operate a victim support service for children and families in addition to their education program: Qld Department of Education, Training and Employment, and Tas Department of Education.
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Appendix 1: Information about child safety policy and curriculum produced by each jurisdiction to the Royal Commission

**New South Wales (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- Curriculum support documents relevant to child protection education;
- Implementation or other support documents for schools relating to the teaching of child protection education for students in government schools;
- Memoranda, policies or procedures that provide advice to schools on how child protection education for students is delivered in government schools;
- The number of students in government schools enrolled in each year for the period;
- A statement confirming child protection education is compulsory for all students;
- Advice on the different programs utilised by schools to supplement or deliver child protection training for students.

Syllabus information and documentation
- The syllabuses that contain child safety content;
- The Years or Stages of schooling to which the identified syllabuses apply;
- Whether the identified syllabuses are mandatory or elective in nature;
- The specific child safety related content that would be covered in each stage of schooling;
- Any other advice in the syllabus that might impact on the way teachers or schools may address this part of the curriculum;
- Support documents indicating the syllabus area to which the support material relates;
- A broad description of how the support material addresses child safety issues.

**Tasmania (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- The Tasmanian Curriculum Framework with relationships and sexuality embedded;
- K–10 Sexuality and Relationship Education Scope and Sequence;
- The proposed Australian Curriculum Health and Physical Education curriculum;
- Tasmania’s actions to date under the strategy;
- The Corporate Report survey data on the number of schools undertaking Sexuality and Relationships programs pursuant to the strategy and subsequent follow-up data;
- The names of the external programs and providers available for use;
- The numbers of children in government schools in each year group for each year group for each year between 2009 and 2013.

**South Australia (Information sought via Notice to Produce)**

Child Protection Curriculum information and documentation
- South Australia Child Protection Curriculum manuals for each age band width identified below:
  - Early Years Band: Ages 3 to 5;
  - Early Years Band: Years R to 2;
  - Primary Years Band: Years 3 to 5;
  - Middle Years Band: Years 6 to 9;
  - Senior Years Band: Years 10 to 12;
- South Australia Child Protection Curriculum support materials for educators working with learners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds;
- Department for Education and Child Development Overview of the Updated Child Protection Curriculum.

School information
- The total number of public schools within SA for each year;
- The total number of children in the SA education system for each year.

Information on the Strategies for Managing Abuse Related Trauma (SMART) program developed by the Department of Education and Child Development and the Australia Childhood Foundation.
- An overview and history of the SMART program’s development and its purpose;
- An overview of how staff are inducted on the SMART principles;
- Annual Reports for the seven years of the SMART Program’s operation;
- Reports from individual schools regarding their view of the effectiveness of the SMART approach;
- The specific training approach for the SMART Program that is currently being developed for the APY Lands;
- Further collaborative research proposals under consideration;
- What the Mulligan Inquiry identified and recommended about SMART, arising from the Mulligan Inquiry recommendations from the Children on the APY Lands Report.

**Western Australia (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- Relevant information from the Western Australian Health and Physical Education Curriculum Framework that relates to Protective Behaviours;
- A sample of Protective Behaviours curriculum materials across years K to 10;
- A copy of the Child Protection policy that mandates a procedure for implementing protective curriculum;
- Information as to how schools are meeting the policy requirement;
- The current model for state-wide implementation of Protective Behaviours;
- Work being undertaken in Protective Behaviours to prepare for implementation of the Australian Curriculum;
- Other initiatives undertaken by the Department in response to the Blaxell Inquiry;
- Training and support available to teachers;
- An outline of pre-service training provided to undergraduate teachers.

**Australian Capital Territory (Information sought via Notice to Produce)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- Documents describing the ACT curriculum framework and how it is operationalised;
- Documents that set out those parts of the current ACT curriculum framework that relate to protective behaviours and child sexual abuse;
- Documents that set out the school years (or in the ACT, bands) that each aspect of curriculum is delivered to;
- Documents that illustrate examples of teaching strategies in relation to these aspects of the curriculum applicable to protective behaviour development;
- Documents that set out the numbers of children in each school year or band at a school census time who will be taught the protective behaviour development curriculum;
- A list of ACT Education and Training Directorate preferred providers for protective behaviours training in relation to child sexual abuse – this would include Teacher Professional Development and Direct In School training provided by external provider;
- Documents concerning any evaluations that may have been conducted on the effectiveness of these curriculum areas or programs.

**Queensland (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- *Daniel Morcombe Child Safety Curriculum* (DMCSC) for students in Prep–Year 9 in Qld state and non-state schools;
- Support resources for teachers, principals, curriculum leaders and parents are also available to assist implementation of the program in schools.

**Northern Territory (Information sought via Notice to Produce)**

- Documents setting out overarching frameworks, curriculum and programs that are currently directed at students of NT government schools with the specific aim of reducing the likelihood of children being vulnerable to child sexual abuse in institutional settings;
- Documents including memoranda, policies and procedures that provide advice and guidelines to NT government schools on how the frameworks, curriculum and programs identified in paragraph 1 above are to be delivered;
- Documents consisting of implementation document and other documents that support teachers or other school employees, to implement the frameworks, deliver the curriculum and programs identified in paragraph 1 of Schedule A above;
- Documents evaluating or analysing the effectiveness of the frameworks, curriculum and programs identified in paragraph 1 of Schedule A above;
- A document setting out the total number of students enrolled in NT government schools, at a specific point in time in 2013, who were likely to have received training or education aimed at reducing the likelihood of children being vulnerable to child sexual abuse.

**Victoria (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

Curriculum information and documentation
- Towards Level 1 VELS teaching resources;
- Health and Physical Education Curriculum for Prep to Year 10;
- Health and Physical Education Resources and Support;
- Sexuality Education Curriculum Audit Tool;
- Sexuality Education Teaching and Learning resources (several);
- Respectful Relationships Education;
- Bully Stoppers;
- School census data;
- Catching on everywhere: sexuality education program development.

**Truth Justice Healing Council (Information requested by the Royal Commission)**

- Overarching frameworks and or the curriculum and or programs currently used that are directed to students with the specific aim of reducing the likelihood of children being vulnerable to sexual abuse in institutional settings;
- Memoranda, policies or procedures that provide advice to schools on how these are to be delivered;
- Implementation or other support documents that support teachers or others to implement these frameworks, deliver the curriculum or programs;
- Documents concerning any evaluations that may have been conducted on the effectiveness of these curriculum areas or programs;
- The number of students enrolled in Catholic schools, as a total, at a specific point in time in 2013, who were likely to have received training/education aimed at reducing the likelihood of these children being vulnerable to sexual abuse in institutional settings.
Appendix 2 Table 1: Policy and curriculum matrix (Version 1): 10 criteria and descriptors used in the original policy and curriculum scan (Walsh et al., 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Base child protection policy | • Does a child protection policy exist? Identify the policy by name and provide universal resource locator (URL).
• What are the broad categories of content in this base policy? List.
• Is a prevention role ascribed to teachers in this base policy? Describe.
• Is child sexual abuse prevention mentioned in this base policy? Describe.
• Is the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education mentioned in this base policy? Describe.
• What related policies and documents are referred to, nominated or listed? Record as a list. |
| 2 Specific child sexual abuse prevention education policy | • Is there a specific policy about child sexual abuse prevention education? Identify the policy by name, provide URL, and record details. |
| 3 Commitment | • Is child sexual abuse prevention education optional or compulsory? Describe.
• How do schools report on compliance if it is compulsory? Describe the reporting mechanisms. |
| 4 Location in the curriculum | • Where is child sexual abuse prevention education located in the primary school curriculum? Nominate key learning area(s), strands, and specific details.
• Is this positioning explicit/implicit? Clear/unclear? |
| 5 Curriculum support | • What support is offered to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List materials and resources clearly publicly available. |
| 6 Pedagogical support | • What training is offered to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List training opportunities, documents about teaching strategies, materials and resources. |
| 7 Assessment | • Is student learning in child sexual abuse prevention education assessed? If so, how? Describe. |
| 8 Parental permission | • Is parental permission required for children’s participation in child sexual abuse prevention education at school? If so, how? Describe. |
| 9 Information for parents and communities | • What information is provided to parents and/or communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school? Describe. |
| 10 Partnerships | • What partnerships are evident with relevant community services or agencies when schools teach child sexual abuse prevention education in schools? List and describe, especially in relation to support services. |
Appendix 2 Table 2: Frameworks, guidelines, and research synthesis used in developing the criteria for the policy and curriculum audit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frameworks for primary prevention</th>
<th>First author (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Resume of title</th>
<th>Document sections most applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al. (1999)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>The spectrum of prevention: developing a comprehensive approach to injury prevention</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal article outlining the spectrum of prevention which is a tool to assist practitioners and systemic policy level decision-makers to achieve broad-based injury prevention via a series of strategies. Comprising six strategies.</td>
<td>Strategy levels 1, 2, 3, 4 &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHPSA – Australian Health Promoting Schools Association (2000)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>A national framework for health promoting schools (2000–2003)</td>
<td>A framework commissioned by the Australian Commonwealth Department of Health and Family Services in 1997 that was developed in consultation with government health authorities, non-government organisations, academics, and school and parent advocacy groups. Comprising 8 key action areas.</td>
<td>Key action areas 1, 2, 3, 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEECDYA – Ministerial Council on Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (2010)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>National Safe Schools Framework: All Australian schools are safe, supportive and respectful teaching and learning communities that promote student wellbeing</td>
<td>A framework authored by an external consultant and guided by a reference group designed to provide guidance to Australian state schools for the creation of safe and supportive environments promoting the health and wellbeing of students. Comprising nine key elements.</td>
<td>Key elements 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>First author (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Resume of title</th>
<th>Document sections most applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Respectful Relationships Education: Violence prevention and respectful relationships education in Victorian secondary schools</td>
<td>A report commissioned by the Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development reviewing wider violence prevention programs, that was developed via analysis of violence prevention research and interviews with key informants. Comprising five criteria for good</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author (year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Resume of title</td>
<td>Document sections most applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmody et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Framing best practice: National Standards for the primary prevention of sexual assault through education</td>
<td>Commissioned work by National Association of Services against Sexual Violence (NASASV) and the Office for Women, located in the Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, to develop and trial a National Sexual Assault Prevention Education Framework in consultation and collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders. Comprising six standards.</td>
<td>Standards 3, 4 &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMEC – National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (1999)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Guidelines for programs to reduce child victimization: A resource for communities when choosing a program to teach personal safety to children.</td>
<td>Commissioned by the USA non-profit organisation, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to review research on child sexual abuse prevention programs and translate this into criteria for effective programs to reduce child victimisation. Research conducted by Ruth Luna and David Finkelhor, from the Crimes Against Children Research Center at the University of New Hampshire. Approved by US Congress. Comprising 12 skill points, seven awareness points, and 13 presentation points.</td>
<td>Guideline (presentation) 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5 Guideline (awareness) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2009)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>International Guidelines on Sexuality Education: An evidence informed approach to effective sex, relationships and HIV/STI education</td>
<td>Developed by working groups within the UN in collaboration with researchers and a wide range of stakeholders, to assist education, health and other relevant authorities to develop and implement school-based sexuality education programs and materials. Comprising 19 characteristics of effective</td>
<td>Characteristics 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12 &amp; 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author (year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Resume of title</td>
<td>Document sections most applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation et al. (2003)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>What Works in Prevention: Principles of Effective Prevention Programs</td>
<td>Peer reviewed journal article presenting a review of reviews identifying principles common to effective prevention programs in four areas (substance abuse, risky sexual behaviour, school failure, and juvenile delinquency and violence). Comprising nine principles.</td>
<td>Principles 1, 2, 5, 7 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Policy and curriculum matrix (Version 2) adapted for the Royal Commission audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expanded guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Base child/student protection policy | - Does a child protection policy exist? Identify the policy by name, provide universal resource locator (URL), document identification details, date of publication, and date policy was last updated, total number of pages in the policy.  
- Is there a navigable pathway to the policy from the department home page? Record the pathway from the home page to the policy, and the number of steps involved*.  
- Does the home page search feature locate the policy using the terms “child protection”, “student protection”, or “child abuse” within the first five to 10 hits?*  
- Can the policy be downloaded as a single document?*  
- Does the policy need to be read in conjunction with other documents? If so, identify these documents by title and record the number of pages in each document.*  
- What specific guidance is provided for situations of sexual abuse by individuals employed by or volunteering at the institution? Identify section numbers and page numbers to pinpoint where this information is provided. Record broad categories of information provided.*  
- Is the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education specified in the policy? Insert representative quotes and source (including section number and page number)  
- What related documents are listed? Record the total number of documents listed, record the titles of the documents most relevant to child protection. |
| 2. Specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education | - Is there a specific policy on child sexual abuse prevention education? Identify the policy by name, provide URL, document identification details, date of publication, and date policy was last updated, total number of pages in the policy.  
- Is child sexual abuse prevention education optional or compulsory? Describe approach.*  
- If compulsory, how do schools report on compliance? Describe reporting mechanisms.*  
- Does the policy specify evidence-based approaches? If so, describe.*  
- Does the policy address the potential for child sexual abuse to occur in child-related institutions (such schools) by individuals employed by or otherwise engaged by the institutions and by other children within the institution? If so, describe.*  
- What related documents are listed? Record the total number of documents listed, record the titles of the documents most relevant to child protection. |
| 3. Location in the curriculum | - Is child sexual abuse prevention education named in the primary school curriculum?  
- Where is child sexual abuse prevention education located in the primary school curriculum (that is, which parts of the school curriculum relate to child sexual abuse prevention education)? Indicate if this is explicit or implicit. Nominate learning area/subjects, strands, learning outcomes.  
- What recommendations are made for specific programs, timing, frequency, or intensity of sexual abuse prevention education?*  
- What recommendations are made for personnel in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education (for example, who will teach it and why? What qualifications or expertise are required?)*  
- What related documents are listed? Record the total number of documents listed, record the titles of the documents most relevant to child protection. |
<p>| 4. Inclusion, relevance, and cultural sensitivity* | - What strategies are recommended for schools and/or teachers in differentiating the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education for different groups of children (for example, for children of different ages, gender, cultural backgrounds and ability levels. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expanded guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Curriculum support | - What curriculum support is offered to schools and/or teachers in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List agencies, personnel, materials, resources.  
- Which specific internal/external agencies are involved? How?*  
- Which specific programs or materials are suggested for use? Why?*  
- Are contractual or other arrangements in place between school systems and other agencies (for example, preferred providers) for the delivery of child sexual abuse prevention education and/or the provision of materials and resources? If so, describe.*  
- Do materials and resources acknowledge the potential for institutional child sexual abuse to occur and provide support for teaching about this?* |
| 6. Pedagogical support | - What training support is offered to school staff in the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List training agencies, resources, formats, duration, frequency.*  
- Which specific internal/external agencies are involved? How?*  
- Which specific programs or materials are suggested for use? Why?*  
- Are contractual or other arrangements in place between school systems and other agencies (for example, preferred providers) for the delivery of staff training and/or the provision of materials and resources? If so, describe.* |
- Has child sexual abuse prevention education/curriculum been evaluated? If so, who conducted the evaluation? When? What approach was used? What data were collected and from whom?*  
- Were evaluation findings implemented?* |
| 8. Parental involvement* | - Are parents involved in school-based child sexual abuse prevention education? If so, how?  
| 9. Information for parents and communities | - What information is publicly provided to parents and/or communities about child sexual abuse prevention education delivered at school? Describe.  
- What information is provided to parents about institutional responses to child sexual abuse, and its prevention?* |
| 10. Partnerships with community services and agencies | - What links are evident with relevant community services or agencies for referrals arising from the teaching of child sexual abuse prevention education? List and describe the nature of these partnerships (for example, formal/informal) especially in relation to support services.* |

*Indicates change from original
Table 1: List of 32 school systems examined in the audit of primary school–based sexual abuse prevention policy and curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and territory departments of education</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New South Wales diocesan schools</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queensland diocesan schools</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Education Archdiocese of Brisbane</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bne.catholic.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.bne.catholic.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Education Diocese of Toowoomba</td>
<td><a href="http://www.twb.catholic.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.twb.catholic.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Victoria diocesan schools**

| Catholic Education Office, Diocese of Sale | [http://www2.ceosale.catholic.edu.au/](http://www2.ceosale.catholic.edu.au/) |

**Australian Capital Territory diocesan schools**


**Northern Territory diocesan schools**


**South Australia diocesan schools**

| Catholic Education South Australia which encompasses schools in the Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide, and the Diocese of Port Pirie. | [http://www.cesa.catholic.edu.au/](http://www.cesa.catholic.edu.au/) |

**Tasmania diocesan schools**


**Western Australia diocesan schools**

| Catholic Education Office of Western Australia which encompasses schools in the Catholic Dioceses of Broome, Bunbury, Geraldton, and the Catholic Archdiocese of Perth. | [http://internet.ceo.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx](http://internet.ceo.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx) |