

The Alannah
and Madeline
Foundation



Keeping children safe from violence

Response from The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Enhancing Online Safety for Children

March 2014



Table of Contents

Table of Contents2

Executive Summary3

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation’s Principles on Keeping Children Safe Online5

Our Response to Key Election Commitments9

- 1. Establishment of the Children’s e-Safety Commissioner9
- 2. Rapid removal of harmful material 12
- 3. Options for dealing with cyber-bullying under Commonwealth legislation 14

Foundation Contact Details.....16

Appendix A: The Foundation’s Programs.....17

Appendix B: The Foundation’s Patrons, Board, Advisory Board and Ambassadors and NCAB Members19

Executive Summary

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Australian Government's *Discussion Paper on Enhancing Online Safety for Children*.

Our response to this paper is underpinned by the Foundation's mission to keep children safe from violence, and our decade long investment in research, development and implementation of bullying and cybersafety programs. Our learnings are summarised by three fundamental principles, which we believe are critical for sustainable improvement in online safety of children.

These principles are:

1. Children require **greater safeguards** online than do adults. This stems from society's basic responsibility to protect children,
2. Only a **whole-of-community 'cultural change'** can keep children safe online. This is based on our experience in improving cybersafety in over 2,400 schools and public libraries with our eSmart initiatives, and
3. Sustaining such cultural change and the resultant protection of children online, requires **ongoing collaboration between government, industry and the community sector**. This engagement is necessary to achieve genuinely workable, efficient and effective measures to keep children safe in the rapidly changing online environment.

We are supportive of the introduction of an e-Safety Commissioner. We believe, however, that in making its decision, the government should take into consideration the adoption of a model of influence that addresses:

- The Commissioner taking the lead or being part of a forward looking strategy with a national focus on helping to create a collective impact on keeping children safe online,
- The role being one of coordination, rather than overseeing and responsibility for government cybersafety programs,
- The mandate being delivered through partnerships and collaboration with organisations and agencies with appropriate capabilities, and
- The additional programmes and powers being underpinned by a focus on education and prevention in cybersafety and cyberbullying to have an effective impact on the online safety of children.

In relation to the **location of the Commissioner**, our primary interest is in the option that will optimise the online safety for children. We are supportive of the option that:

- Ensures children are better protected,

- Draws on the organisation(s) which have the current capabilities, relationships and positioning to be effective,
- Enables the most important functions of the Commissioner to be established, and managed, in the most effective and timely manner, and
- Will facilitate collaboration between industry, government and the community.

In relation to **the proposed legislative scheme for the rapid removal of harmful material** to children, we believe that the rapid removal of harmful material as quickly as possible is critical.

We will support a scheme for the removal of harmful material that is based on evidence and recommend that the e-Safety commissioner lead a period of research and review before determining the details of any scheme. Any scheme should meet the following criteria:

- The well-being of children is the primary focus,
- There are general standards, guiding principles and measures for industry which are effective in protecting children, but which are also 'workable' for industry, and which seek input from industry in their development,
- The term 'harmful material' is appropriately defined to relate to cyber-bullying as well as other material that may be offensive or traumatic to children,
- The inclusion of current and future sites/organisations that are likely to emerge into the social networking space, and
- It has the flexibility to embrace the rapidly changing technological environment.

Regarding options for **dealing with cyber-bullying under Commonwealth legislation**, the Foundation is supportive of the introduction of a cyber-bullying offence.

We believe that the law plays an important role in setting social norms. As children take their cues from adults, and cyber-bullying is not only confined to children, we believe that the introduction of a cyber-bullying offence sets an important social standard for the Australian community, particular in light of recent high-profile incidents.

We caveat our support for the introduction of a cyber-bullying offence to propose that, for minors, the penalties for the cyber-bullying offence should not include custodial options. Rather, we would expect appropriate diversionary options to be made available to young people.

We also note that at the recent *Bullying, Young People and the Law Symposium*, held by the National Centre Against Bullying in July 2013, young people themselves were supportive of a specific cyber-bullying offence.

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation's Principles on Keeping Children Safe Online

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation (the Foundation), is a philanthropic not-for-profit organisation, established in memory of Alannah and Madeline Mikac, aged six and three, who, with their mother and 32 others were killed at Port Arthur, Tasmania on 28 April 1996. It cares for children who have experienced or witnessed serious violence and runs programs that prevent violence in the lives of children. The Foundation has expertise in online safety for children which enables it to respond to online safety issues for industry, Australian children and those in charge of their welfare.

The Foundation has determined that the most common form of violence experienced by children and young people is bullying. The Foundation's work has also extended to include cyber-risks, including cyber-bullying.

The Foundation also works to prevent school-based bullying and is the auspice organisation for the **National Centre Against Bullying (NCAB)**, a peak body made up of experts in the fields of childhood wellbeing and bullying, and chaired by Alastair Nicholson AO, RFD, QC, (former Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia). The Foundation's mission of keeping children safe underpins our response to the proposals outlined in the Australian Government's paper on Enhancing Online Safety for Children.

Our fundamental principles in relation to protecting children in the online world are:

- 1. We believe society has a responsibility to protect children and that children require greater safeguards online than do adults**

In many respects, the Internet is an adult place, with sites, applications and content designed for individuals aged 13 and above. For this reason, and many others, children are more vulnerable online than adults.

We believe that the well-being of the child should be at the centre of any policy efforts to protect children online. As outlined in the Convention for the Rights of the Child (Articles 19 and 26), children have the right to be protected from violence and protected from exploitation. We believe that children have the right to be safe and secure, both in the on or off-line world, and it is our role as adults to protect them.

Consequently, we believe that higher standards of care and safety are needed for children when they are engaged in online activities.

Whilst we recognise the importance of freedom of speech and freedom of access to information for adults, it is a more delicate balance when the welfare of children online is concerned. Although provision of information, education and choice are the precursors for adult online safety, we need to go further for children. We need to consider greater protective measures for children as they relate to access, design, privacy, security and

content and, especially, issue-resolution processes and accountabilities in order to optimise a safe and positive online experience for children.

2. *We believe that a whole-of-community approach is needed to keep children safe online*

The Foundation aims to create cultural change in the community by fostering school, work and home environments characterised by smart, safe and responsible behaviours on and offline.

We recognise that a whole-of-community approach is needed to produce this change. This includes ensuring that legal, legislative, educative and social awareness approaches are aligned to create a collective impact on the safety of children online.

The Foundation has had significant success in developing and implementing online cultural change programs across Australia, through our eSmart systems. Our goal is to create an eSmart Australia where all young people are smart, safe and responsible online. The Federal Government invested significantly in the initial development of eSmart, and its roll-out in Victoria and Queensland has been supported by the Victorian and Queensland State Governments.

eSmart is a roadmap for an organisation to create a positive, respectful and inclusive environment which reduces bullying and cyberbullying, and keeps children safe in cyberspace. eSmart is underpinned by four support mechanisms, which are provided by an in-house team of cybersafety experts from the Foundation. These support mechanisms include:

- a) A framework and set of actions, outlining all the steps required to create a cybersafe environment,
- b) An online system tracking tool, where an organisation monitors and reports on progress,
- c) Relevant and high-quality resources. eSmart triages and guides users to the best available online national and international resources such as tools, templates and information,
- d) Support - one full day of face-to-face training for every organisation participating in eSmart, and access to a helpdesk, online training and webinars, a starter kit and collateral.

eSmart is the largest cybersafety initiative in Australia with over 2000 schools and 450 public libraries participating in the program. All 1500 of Australia's public libraries will be part of the eSmart program by 2018. eSmart is easily scalable to provide support to all schools, libraries and other relevant organisations across Australia.

A recent external evaluation of the eSmart School program, led by the Foundation for Young Australians, demonstrates that a whole-of-organisation approach is essential in keeping children safe online.

Specifically:

- Over 80% of school principals believe that eSmart Schools is effective in changing school culture in relation to cybersafety, technology use and bullying,
- 90% principals are satisfied with the eSmart Schools online system and framework, and
- 90% of principals surveyed agree that eSmart assists schools to:
 - Embed smart, safe and responsible online behaviours across the curriculum,
 - Improve teacher, student and parent understanding of expected online behaviours,
 - Develop better cybersafety policies and procedures, and
 - Improve awareness and management of online incidents.

3. Within this whole-of-community approach, we believe that collaboration between government, industry and the community sector is crucial to keeping children safe in the rapidly changing online environment.

Stemming from our belief that “it takes a village to raise a child,” we believe that everyone has a role to play in keeping children safe within the rapidly changing online environment.


We note that, to date, there has been considerable collaboration between industry, government and the community on this issue. We also acknowledge that the commitment, and response, to online child safety by industry has improved significantly over recent years, particularly from some of the larger global organisations.

Nevertheless, we also recognise there are still some issues that need to be addressed in how industry and government cooperate to keep children safe. These issues relate particularly to the transparency, accountability and speed of resolving problems.

We believe that government, industry and the community need to work together to ensure there is a genuinely workable, efficient and effective set of mechanisms to keep children safe online.

It is worth noting that the Foundation has had considerable success in partnering with different stakeholders within the cybersafety community to collaborate to keep children safe online. For example:

- **Government:** We have a five-year partnership with the Victorian Department of Education to implement eSmart in all government schools in Victoria,
- **Corporate:** We have a six-year partnership with the Telstra Foundation to roll-out eSmart in all public libraries nationally,

- 
- **Industry:** We have, and do partner with the key social media providers on a variety of major cybersafety initiatives,
 - **Not-for-profit:** We bring together key academics, practitioners and experts in bullying and cyberbullying through the National Centre Against Bullying and hold a conference on bullying, cyberbullying and cybersafety every two years. The Foundation is also member of the Young and Well Cooperative Research Centre and actively contributes to the YAW-CRC's research agenda.
 - **International:** The Foundation is the only Australian member of the United Nation's Dynamic Coalition of Online Child Safety and has a broad network amongst the international cybersafety community.
 - **Community:** We are deeply connected with the community through are relationship with over 2,000 schools and 450 public libraries.

Our Response to Key Election Commitments

1. Establishment of the Children's e-Safety Commissioner

Policy proposal - Functions of the e-Safety Commissioner:

- 1. Implement the proposed scheme for the rapid removal of material that is harmful to a child from large social media sites,*
- 2. Work with industry to ensure that better options for smartphones and other devices and internet access services are available for parents to protect children from harmful content,*
- 3. Establish an advice platform with guidelines for parents about the appropriateness of media content,*
- 4. Establish a research fund to consider the effects of internet use on children, how support services can be provided online and how to mitigate children's online risks,*
- 5. Establish a voluntary process for the certification of online safety programmes offered within schools,*
- 6. Establish a funding programme for schools to deliver online safety education.*

Policy proposal - Options for establishing the e-Safety Commissioner:

- Option 1: Establishment of an independent statutory authority*
- Option 2: Establishment of an independent statutory office, with administration support from an existing government agency*
- Option 3: Designation of a Member of the ACMA as the Commissioner*
- Option 4: Designation of a non-government organisation with expertise in online child safety*

Q1: What existing programmes and powers should the Commissioner take responsibility for?

We are supportive of the introduction of the e-Safety Commissioner. We also believe that there are some further questions that need to be answered to ensure the Commissioner will have the greatest impact on the online safety of children.

Before outlining these questions, we would like to emphasise that we believe that education and prevention in relation to cybersafety and cyberbullying should underpin the activities of the e-Safety Commissioner. We propose that the eSmart approach could be a key input to support the e-Safety Commissioner to execute his/her mandate and keep Australian children safe in the online world.

We suggest there needs to be some further discussion of the following questions relating to the role and powers of the e-Safety Commissioner:

- a) **Accountability versus Coordination.** Is it necessary for the e-Safety Commissioner to be responsible for existing cybersafety programs? Given the range of programs that exist both inside and outside government, would it be more efficient, and more appropriate, for the Commissioner to play a coordination and reporting role? How could this work?
- b) **Collective Impact.** Industry, government and the community need to work together to keep Australian's children safe online. Is there, and should there be, a role for the Commissioner in helping to set a national strategy for online child safety? What should that national strategy consist of?
- c) **Collaboration.** What are the options and advantages of using partnerships with organisations with relevant capabilities to deliver key aspects of the Commissioner's portfolio?
- d) **Impact.** How will the impact of the Commissioner be measured?
- e) **Resourcing to ensure effectiveness.** How will the e-Safety Commissioner be resourced to ensure he/she can have a real impact? Cybersafety is a key issue in the community, and likely to become even bigger. The office of the Commissioner therefore needs to be resourced appropriately to ensure it can make a real difference in keeping children safe online.
- f) **Relationship to Children's Commissioner.** What is the nature of relationship between the e-Safety Commissioner and the Children's Commissioner? Given a child's online and offline worlds often merge, how can, and should, these Commissioners work together effectively?
- g) **Other vulnerable groups.** Cybersafety has an impact on the whole of the community, not only children. Ensuring vulnerable groups (such as seniors and the CALD community) are safe online is important to creating a cybersafe community. What role can, and should, the Children's e-Safety Commissioner play in helping to keep other vulnerable groups in Australia safe online?

Q2. Considering the intended leadership role and functions of the Commissioner, which option would best serve to establish the Commissioner?

Our primary interest is the option that will optimise the online safety for children.

Whilst we recognise that each of the four proposed options has both advantages and disadvantages, we are supportive of the option that:

- Will ensure that children can be better protected,
- Enables the most important functions of the Commissioner to be established, and managed, in the most effective and timely manner,
- Draws on the organisation(s) which have the current capabilities, relationships and positioning to be effective, and
- Will facilitate collaboration between industry, government and the community.

Furthermore, we expect that each option will be evaluated against criteria such as: implementation difficulty, operational complexity, efficiency of activity and independence (actual and perceived).

We observe that the location of the e-Safety Commissioner is less critical than ensuring the Commissioner can effectively execute his or her mandate. This is dependent on numerous factors, some of which have been outlined earlier. Similar to the thoughts proposed in the submission by the Hon. Alastair Nicholson, Chair of NCAB, we believe that the government needs to make a significant investment to ensure the e-Safety Commissioner is set up for success, both in terms of adequate resourcing, but also in terms of his/her location.

We also encourage the consideration of an option where the e-Safety Commissioner may draw on a range of organisations to execute upon his/her accountabilities.

2. Rapid removal of harmful material

Policy Proposal – Introduction of a scheme, backed by legislation, to enable the rapid removal from a large social media site of material targeted at and likely to cause harm to a specific child. The proposed scheme will provide an independent and impartial third party to consider such disagreements between social media sites and individuals on content complaints, where the content relates to a specific child in Australia.


As a principle, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation advocates for a response which enhances the protection of children. We believe that rapid removal of harmful material to children from the internet is critical to minimising harm. We have seen firsthand the devastating impact that prolonged exposure can have on the young people subjected to this material.

We understand that the government is proposing to legislate the rapid removal of content, which is a considerable change from the current *Protocol for the Cooperative Arrangement for Complaints Handling on Social Networking Sites*.

From our perspective, we acknowledge that there are elements of the current Protocol that currently work well (e.g. cross-industry collaboration, education, introduction of better online safeguards and tools). We also recognise that there have been issues as a result of the current protocol, with serious ramifications for some children.

We will support a scheme for the removal of harmful material that is based on evidence and recommend that the e-Safety commissioner lead a period of research and review before determining the details of any scheme to ensure the following criteria are met:

- Ensures harmful material is removed as quickly as possible (with as few intermediaries as necessary),
- Takes the perspective of the child and his/her carer, and is designed to be simple and visible to these groups,
- Lays out some common standards and guiding principles for industry and requires transparency and accountability from industry on key measures, such as incidence rates and resolution times and rates,
- Is 'workable' for industry, and which seeks input from industry in its development,
- Appropriately defines 'harmful material' to relate to cyber-bullying as well as other material that may be offensive or traumatic to children (e.g. explicit violence),
- Is inclusive of current and future sites/organisations that are likely to emerge into the social networking space, and includes organisations/sites that offer or operate platforms which have a social networking function. This could include:
 - Those companies that may be located outside Australia but have platforms which are accessed by Australian children,

- 
- Not distinguishing companies by size of social media platform or number of users, and
 - Could include organisations/sites that operate or offer platforms that are accessed through different types of devices, rather than solely through websites,
 - Is flexible to the rapidly changing technological environment, and
 - Can be efficiently implemented with minimal additional costs to the community.

3. Options for dealing with cyber-bullying under Commonwealth legislation

Policy proposal - Three options:

A. Cyber-bullying Offence

- 1. Leave the existing offence unchanged and implement the education and awareness-raising measures to better explain the application of the current offence,*
- 2. Create a separate cyber-bullying offence covering conduct where the victim is a minor (under 18 years), with a lesser maximum penalty such as a fine, and*


B. Commonwealth civil penalty regime

- 3. Create a separate civil enforcement regime to deal with cyber-bullying, modelled on the New Zealand "Approved Agency" approach.*

Before we comment on the most appropriate option, we note that cyber-bullying has not been defined within the Government's policy. A precursor to the introduction of any cyber-bullying laws must be a commonly understood, and agreed, definition of cyber-bullying itself.

The Foundation is in agreement with the submission by the Hon. Alastair Nicholson in his discussion on the definition of bullying and cyber-bullying. Whilst we do not wish to replicate the full content of his discussion, we would like to note several points about the nature cyberbullying:

- There are four kinds of bullying – physical, verbal, covert and online (cyber) bullying
- Cyber-bullying consists of overt or covert bullying behaviours using digital technologies such as computers and smartphones and software such as social media, instant messaging, texts and websites as the medium. Young people usually do not refer to it as cyber-bullying and often do not distinguish it from other sorts of bullying.
- Cyber-bullying includes abusive or hurtful texts emails or posts, images or videos, deliberately excluding others online, nasty gossip or rumours, and imitating others online or using their log-in.
- Bullying is when someone or a group of people with more power **repeatedly** and **intentionally** cause hurt or harm to another person or group of people who feel helpless to respond.
- However, the notion of repetition is a complex one in relation to cyber-bullying. For example, the ability to disseminate a single image or post online multiple times to a wide online audience is a different take on the traditional notion of repetition. This needs to be considered when developing a definition of cyber-bullying.



We also believe that we need to consider the views of young people in determining whether a new cyber-bullying law for young people is an appropriate step.

At the National Symposium on *Bullying, Young People and the Law* in July 2013, held by the National Centre Against Bullying and The Foundation, young people themselves were proponents of the introduction of a specific offence for cyber-bullying. Young people commented that:

- A specific cyber-bullying offence was important to set the visible standards of behaviours for themselves and their peers and act as a deterrent,
- There was limited awareness of the range of laws available under which an individual could be charged with cyber-bullying. Existing laws were confusing and did not refer to events or activities that young people could relate to (e.g. use of a carriage service),
- Whilst a specific offence was important, it needed to be designed and implemented in a way that did not involve custodial penalties for young people.

Supporting the submission of the Hon. Alastair Nicholson, we also believe that the current range of State and Federal offences applicable to cyber-bullying are confusing and that there is a general lack of awareness on what these offences mean and how they can, and should, be applied.

We also believe that the law plays an important role in setting social norms and acting as a deterrent for anti-social behaviour. As children take their cues from adults, and cyber-bullying is not only confined to children, we believe that the introduction of a cyber-bullying offence sets an important social standard for the Australian community, particularly in light of recent high-profile incidents.

We caveat our support for the introduction of a cyber-bullying offence to propose that, for minors, the penalties for the cyber-bullying offence should not include custodial options. Rather, we would expect appropriate diversionary options to be made available to the young person. This is also in alignment with the views put forward by the Hon. Alastair Nicholson. We refer you to his submission for a more detailed discussion of the options for dealing with cyber-bullying under Commonwealth legislation.



Foundation Contact Details

Dr Judith Slocombe

Chief Executive Officer

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Level 1, 256 Clarendon Street

PO Box 5192

South Melbourne VIC 3205

Phone: (03) 9697 0666

Mobile: 0409 881 108

Email: judith.slocombe@amf.org.au

Dr Fiona McIntosh

General Manager, Programs

The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Level 1, 256 Clarendon Street

PO Box 5192

South Melbourne VIC 3205

Phone: (03) 9697 0666

Mobile: 0417 190 172


Email: fiona.mcintosh@amf.org.au

Appendix A: The Foundation's Programs

This submission reflects the role of The Foundation in the implementation of institutional culture change programs designed to prevent violence on and offline:

- As bullying and other forms of personal attack started to move to cyberspace, our prevention efforts also moved to address cyberbullying and broader issues of cybersafety and wellbeing - **eSmart**.
 - eSmart's overarching aim is to equip people with the knowledge and skills to get the best out of technology while avoiding the pitfalls and taking on a range of ethically informed behaviours.
 - eSmart is focused on educating individuals about the smart, safe and responsible use of digital technologies, but within a setting where organisational operations support a culture of appropriate behaviour.
 - **Our eSmart Schools** initiative is a whole-school change program that helps schools enhance wellbeing, manage cybersafety and reduce cyber-bullying and bullying. The initiative is currently being implemented in 2000 schools across Australia.
 - We are currently implementing a similar program in public libraries - **eSmart Libraries**. An eSmart Library operates under a framework for embedding cybersafety into its policies, procedures and teaching/support of library users. eSmart Libraries is being currently being implemented in 450 public libraries across Australia, with a plan for all libraries to be participating by 2017.
- The **Better Buddies Framework** is a peer support initiative designed to create friendly and caring primary school communities where bullying is reduced. Older children buddy up with younger children and learn the values of caring for others, friendliness, respect, valuing difference, including others and responsibility. This occurs through formal and informal activities in the classroom and beyond. Better Buddies enables younger students to feel safe and cared for while older students feel valued and respected in their role of mentor and befriender.

The Foundation works to prevent school-based bullying and is the auspice organisation for the **National Centre Against Bullying (NCAB)**, a peak body made up of experts in the fields of childhood wellbeing and bullying and is chaired by the Hon. Alastair Nicholson AO, RFD, QC, (former Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia). NCAB works with school communities, Government, media and industry to reduce bullying and minimise its harm to young people.



The Alannah and Madeline Foundation is also a provider of the following care services to children, youth and their families:

- Our **Children Ahead** program is a case management program that helps children by focusing on what they need to recover from traumatic events or violent circumstances. We work collaboratively with relevant agencies to make sure children who are suffering the effects of violence, and their families, have the community connections needed for immediate and long term support.
- Our **Refuge Therapeutic Support Program** funds group therapy including art, pet and music therapy to help children who are residing in refuges and are distressed or traumatised by their experience of serious violence.
- In Australia, thousands of children are placed in emergency foster care or domestic violence refuges each year, often with nothing but the clothes they are wearing. The **Buddy Bags** program provides these children with a back-pack full of essential items including toiletries, pyjamas, socks, underwear, a teddy bear, photo frame and pillow slip. Buddy Bags provide personal belongings and help restore a sense of security in these children's lives.
- **Children 365: Celebrate them every Day** was developed in memory of 4-year-old Darcey Freeman, who was killed on 29 January 2009. This initiative encourages adults to take the time to think about why children in their lives are important and how they can spend time together. Through an annual calendar and a range of activities, Children 365 gives people practical suggestions for ways they can engage positively with children. Children 365 begins each year on the last day of Children's Week.



Appendix B: The Foundation's Patrons, Board, Advisory Board and Ambassadors and NCAB Members

International Patron

Her Royal Highness Crown Princess Mary of Denmark

National Patron

The Hon. Tony Abbott MP, Prime Minister of Australia

Founding Patron

Walter Mikac

Board of Directors

John Bertrand AM, Chairman, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Peter Blunden, Victorian Managing Director – Editorial, News Limited

Richard Broug, General Manager, Global Retail Business, Paspaley Group

Dr Michael Carr-Gregg, Child and Adolescent Psychologist

Steve Chiodo, Managing Director, Peter Stevens Importers

Terry Hearity OAM, Former National Sponsorship Manager, Australia Post

Launa Inman, Former Chief Executive Officer and Managing Director, Billabong

John Murphy, Managing Director Australian Beverages, Coca-Cola Amatil

Holly Kramer, Chief Executive Officer, Best & Less

Dr Judith Slocombe, CEO, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Greg Sutherland, Chief Marketing Officer, Australia Post

Paul Waldren, Managing Director, The Health Consultancy

Ambassadors

Robert 'Dipper' DiPierdomenico, Brownlow Medallist and Hawthorn Football Club Premiership player

Aaron Blabey, award-winning children's author and illustrator

International Advisory Board

Dr Edward de Bono, Founder, World Centre for New Thinking

Advisory Board and Partners

John Atkins, WA Chairman, ANZ

Tony Beddison AO, Chairman, The Beddison Group

Frank Gullone, Managing Director, Gullone Group

Russel Howcroft, Executive General Manager, Ten Network Holdings

Martin Jolly, CEO, IMG Australasia

Robert Masters, Principal, Robert Masters & Associates

Eddie McGuire AM, President Collingwood Football Club

Neil Mitchell AO, Media Presenter, 3AW Southern Cross Broadcasting

The Hon. Alastair Nicholson AO RFD QC, Former Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia

Ross Oakley, Chairman, Oakley Enterprises

Stuart Painter, Partner, Ernst & Young

Tony Phillips, General Manager, Property, Sponsorship and Events, Coles Group

John Steven, Partner, Minter Ellison

Ian Thorogood, Management Consultant

Christine Nixon APM, Former Chief Commissioner, Victoria Police

National Centre Against Bullying (NCAB) Members

The Hon. Alastair Nicholson AO RFD QC – Chairman

Marg Armstrong AM, Education Consultant, Just Practices

Dr Pamela Bartholomaeus, Lecturer, Flinders University

Elida Brereton, Former Principal, Camberwell High School

Professor Marilyn Campbell, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology


Dr Michael Carr-Gregg, Adolescent Psychologist and Author

Sandra Craig, Manager, National Centre Against Bullying

Professor Donna Cross, Professor, Child and Adolescent Health, Child Health Promotion Research Centre, School of Exercise, Biomedical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University

Anita Davidson, Senior Consultant, Department of Education and Children's Services

Maree Davidson AM, Manager, Davidson Consulting



Evelyn Field, Psychologist, Author and Speaker, specialises in school and workplace bullying

Dr Andrew Fuller, Fellow of the Department of Psychiatry and the Department of Learning and Educational Development, University of Melbourne

Coosje Griffiths, Manager, State-wide Student Services, Department of Education, Western Australia

Professor Sheryl Hemphill, Australian Catholic University

Gabrielle Leigh, President, Victorian Principals' Association

Professor Helen McGrath, Adjunct Professor, School of Education, RMIT University

Robert Masters, Director, Robert Masters & Associates

Professor Toni Noble, Adjunct Professor, School of Educational Leadership. Faculty of Education Australian Catholic University

Professor Ken Rigby, Adjunct Professor, University of South Australia

Professor Phillip Slee, Professor Human Development School of Education, Flinders University South Australia

Dr Sonia Sharp, Deputy Secretary at the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development in Victoria

Dr Barbara Spears, Co-Director of the Citizenship and Wellbeing Research Group of the Centre for Research in Education, School of Education, University of South Australia

Maree Stanley, Manager, Better Buddies, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Dr Judith Slocombe, CEO, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

Irene Verins, Senior Project Officer, Mental Health and Wellbeing; VicHealth