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Abstract

Background

Youth bullying refers to unwanted aggressive behavior(s) deliberately inflicted by a peer or group of peers, intended to cause harm, repeated multiple times or highly likely to be repeated, and characterized by an observed or perceived power imbalance. Bullying in children and adolescents is ubiquitous regardless of developmental level, culture, and national origin. Although prevalence estimates vary and are influenced by distinctions in measurement and definitions, it is generally accepted that bullying comprises a significant problem in schools. Due to its considerable short-term and long-term negative consequences to individuals and society, bullying represents a global public health concern requiring a public health approach. With regard to bullying, the first two stages of the public health approach are well-documented, while the last two stages represent more emerging areas of research. Given the inconclusive efficacy of bullying prevention and intervention programs, it is apparent that these methods are insufficient. Policy approaches to bullying prevention are logical strategies with the potential for substantial impact on bullying behavior.

Purpose, Methods, and Scope

This project was undertaken to provide an in-depth characterization of the status of bullying legislation and policy from an international perspective. An important goal was to identify a “gold standard” for bullying prevention efforts in policy and legislation that could be used as a resource for other nations. The United States served as a reference nation, and was examined along with Denmark, Norway, and Sweden (Scandinavia region), the United Kingdom, and Australia. All countries in Latin America and Europe and the majority of countries in Asia and Africa were reviewed during the preparatory stages of the investigation. English-language searches were conducted using official government websites, scholarly
research databases, and general Internet search engines. Search terms primarily consisted of “bullying” combined with “policy/policies” and/or “legislation” and “law(s).” The search process frequently entailed inspection and consideration of website content in addition to materials obtained from key word searches. Inclusion of countries in the final product was dependent on the presence of legislation and/policy, availability of information in English, and originality of content with respect to other selected nations. Reported results are specific to general school bullying, and do not include subtypes of bullying, bullying targeting specific populations, or behaviors related to bullying. Due to the volume of information obtained, results were also prioritized. Only the most relevant information was discussed in detail.

**Results**

Findings indicated a broad range of antibullying policy and legislation across the countries examined. Of these countries, only the United Kingdom has enacted national legislation related to bullying prevention, and only Australia current has a national antibullying policy. According to the most recent data, 49 out of 50 states in the United States have antibullying legislation (41 of which also have antibullying policies). The eight Australian states and territories reflect considerable diversity in utilization of the national policy and provision of additional regional policies and resources. Comparatively little information was obtained regarding current national approaches to bullying prevention in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. No gold standard was identified among the examined countries. Instead, the existing foundation of evidence regarding recommended components of antibullying programs and policy was consolidated across scholarly, practical, and government sources. A created rubric of integrated policy considerations and components can function as a future proxy for a gold standard.
Discussion

Limitations of this investigation include the reliance on English-language search terms and resources; sampling bias; information availability; inconsistent or inadequate government website content, structure, and organization; and the restricted range of selected countries. Nevertheless, this report enhances the evidence regarding real-world policy approaches for bullying prevention. Future opportunities in research and practice include developing a consensus on model components for antibullying policies and legislation, ascertaining the efficacy of antibullying policies, utilizing interdisciplinary and multi-sectorial collaboration for research and practice, and streamlining the translation of evidence from research to practice.
Introduction

Definition of the Problem

For many years, bullying was commonly viewed as a normal part of the developmental process, a sort of rite of passage for children to experience in childhood and school. Although researchers in the fields of psychology and public health began to appreciate its significance decades ago, the general public was slower to concur. Recently, the frequent cases of youth suicide that have been attributed to bullying may have served to catalyze a widespread understanding of bullying’s potentially devastating impact. Bullying is recognized as a common but unacceptable pattern of behavior\(^1\) in children and adolescents. Research has confirmed the numerous detrimental short-term and long-term outcomes for individuals involved in bullying, which are well-documented in the literature.\(^2,3,4\)

Bullying of children and adolescents extends across cultures and national origins.\(^5,6\) Although prevalence estimates vary (and are affected by the type of measurement), bullying appears to be ubiquitous worldwide. Beyond the individual, it has negative impacts on all levels of the social ecology including families, schools, communities, and society at large. Bullying is a significant public concern\(^7\) requiring a public health approach.\(^8,9,10,11\) A robust body of research has characterized the “who, what, where, when, why, and how much” of bullying and documented the myriad of associated factors and consequences. Such efforts represent coverage of the first two stages of the public health approach – problem definition and identification of causes.\(^12\) Although progressing, research corresponding to the last two stages of the public health approach – intervention development/implementation/evaluation and extending the reach of effective policy and programs\(^12\) – has not achieved the same results. Prevention and intervention are not as well understood as other aspects of bullying.\(^13\) A variety of bullying programs (many
of them evidence-based) have been created, and varying levels of success have been demonstrated. However, there is still no consensus of the best course of action, no precise formula to use. No single program or set of strategies have been found to eliminate bullying.\textsuperscript{14} Given that a one-size-fits-all solution is impossible,\textsuperscript{15} the array of options can be overwhelming. Meanwhile, bullying continues to occur, and continues be injurious.

**Bullying and Public Health Policy Rationale**

**Public Health Policy**

A hallmark of public health is a focus on prevention and early intervention (proactive approach) as opposed to the more traditional medical model that emphasizes diagnosis and treatment (reactive approach). Averting a problem is the most efficient and effective method, as it eliminates or mitigates potential negative consequences. The goal is to identify any public health issue as early as possible in order to maximize potential benefit and minimize potential harm. Policy is a conspicuous example of a preventative approach, although it can be designed to address the target behavior at any time. Policy interventions are beneficial because they change the context in which people act and/or make decisions.\textsuperscript{16} Public health policy (laws, regulations, and guidelines) has been demonstrated to have a profound effect on health status.\textsuperscript{17} It is common knowledge that policy change has influenced many public health accomplishments, such as taxes on cigarettes and smoking rates,\textsuperscript{18} required vaccinations and infectious disease rates,\textsuperscript{19} and access to contraception and teen pregnancy rates.\textsuperscript{20} In each situation, the implementation of policy was followed by a measurable change in a behavioral outcome, which in turn resulted influenced a health outcome. Bullying should be no exception.
Rationale for the Use of Policy in Bullying Prevention

Policies have the potential to be a powerful contribution to the field of bullying prevention. They can be broad-based or tailored to specific populations, circumstances, or needs. Policies can be as simple or multifaceted, as flexible or structured as is desirable. Perhaps the most beneficial aspect of policies is that they are capable of being more inclusive than any other form of bullying prevention/intervention. A policy can incorporate numerous evidence-based methods that, when combined, may produce a wider impact than the most comprehensive program or techniques alone.

The use of policy in the prevention of bullying appears to be relatively recent. The term “policy” only emerges in the scholarly research on bullying in the 1990s and appears quite sporadically until 2010. Most of these earlier references to policy denote individual school policies as opposed to policy in a legal sense or on a broader scale more analogous to public policy. In articles published during this period, references to policy were often limited to brief, hypothetical discussions of so-called “policy implications,” rather than concrete examinations of existing or proposed policy. Despite having an increased presence in the literature over the last five years, bullying policy remains an area of emerging research, where much is yet to be learned. As of April 2015, no systematic comparison of national antibullying policy and legislation is present in the literature.
Purpose, Objectives, and Hypotheses

The purpose of this project was to investigate, describe, and analyze antibullying legislation and policy in a selection of countries, using the United States as a reference nation.

The following specific research questions were proposed:

1. For the selected countries, what information exists on national bullying legislation and policy?
2. Characterize the availability of information in the selected countries. What processes are required to obtain the information?
3. What is the quality of information available?
4. How does the obtained information contribute to the knowledge base on bullying legislation and policy?

Part of the motivation for this investigation derived from the sheer diversity in bullying prevention efforts occurring in the U.S., and a perceived lack of a systematic, top-down approach (i.e., originating at the national level). It was anticipated that members of the international community will have enacted specific, meaningful, and inclusive legislation and policies. Once such documents had been identified, the expectation was for a “gold standard” to be extracted that could ultimately serve as a resource for other countries such as the United States. The hope was to identify ideal standards, prototypes, or at a minimum, guidance that is transferable or translatable.
Background

Definitions of Bullying

Bullying of children and adolescents is a global public health concern that extends across cultures, lifestyles, and national boundaries. The term bullying is often used in conjunction with other labels such as peer victimization, peer abuse, harassment, and violence to illustrate the same phenomenon. Although many definitions of bullying exist in the literature, most are in agreement about several necessary components. Bullying is characterized by: 1) deliberate and malicious intent (the behavior is purposeful and the objective of the aggressor/perpetrator is to inflict harm or cause distress in the victim); 2) repeated exposure to the behaviors over time; and 3) an actual or perceived relationship of power inequality (consisting of a dominant aggressor and a vulnerable or weaker victim or group). The power imbalance can be related to size, physical or psychological strength, age, gender, number, and popularity or social status. Additional elements attributed to the bullying definition include actions that are unprovoked by the victim and that take place within a familiar social group such as a chronological peer group. Some researchers assert that the ongoing nature of the behavior may be overlooked in extreme cases, where a single occurrence may be sufficient to constitute bullying. For example, bullying may be present if the victim “continues to feel coerced, degraded, humiliated, threatened, intimidated, or frightened” for a substantial period of time following the event.

Range of Behavior

Depending on the source or context, the term bullying can encompass a variety of actions ranging from physical aggression or violence (pushing, kicking, hitting, stealing), verbal aggression (yelling, teasing, insulting, threatening), and relational or social aggression (isolating, excluding, ignoring, gossiping, manipulating). A distinction is typically made between the
direct and indirect forms of the behavior, with physical and verbal bullying considered direct and relational bullying considered indirect.\(^1\) Direct bullying can be regarded as face-to-face interaction, while indirect bullying often occurs without the presence of the victim. With the materialization of the digital age, cyber bullying has emerged as a new and frequent form of bullying. Cyber bullying (also known as electronic bullying or internet bullying) is classified as bullying via the use of the Internet or a digital communication device.\(^{35}\) It can include activities conducted using a computer or cell phone such as emailing, instant messaging, text or picture messaging, and posting text or photographs on social networking websites.

Despite the diversity in expression of bullying behavior, perpetrators generally hold similar motives. Bullying is described as a goal-directed behavior, and bullies can be influenced by desire for status or dominance within their group or to gain material rewards.\(^{36}\) Distinctions between types of bullies and victims are also found in the literature. Researchers categorize bullying participants as *bullies, victims, or bully-victims*. Such groupings are often utilized in the calculation of prevalence rates and when considering targets for intervention and prevention programs. Whereas bullies and victims are discrete groups, bully-victims are individuals who both victimize others and are victimized themselves.

An additional category of bullying involvement is the bystander, someone who witnesses the behavior but is not directly involved in the bullying either as a bully or a victim. Because bullying is about public abuse or ridicule of another, bullies seek to target their victims in situations when other peers are present.\(^{37}\) Depending on their responses (remaining neutral, encouraging the behavior, or intervening on behalf of the victim),\(^{38}\) bystanders have the capacity to affect bullying bi-directionally. The frequency of bullying in classrooms has been found to be negatively associated with bystander defending and positively associated with reinforcing the
bully, suggesting that bystander responses influence bullying frequency and making them suitable targets for intervention.\(^39\)

**Uniform Definition**

It was necessary to consolidate multiple sources in the above conceptualization of bullying due to the diversity in bullying definitions in both research and practice. For example, both domestically and internationally, variation exists within and between national government organizations and subordinate regional/local authorities (e.g., provinces, states, territories, counties, municipalities) and fields of study (e.g., education, psychology, public health, law). The lack of a systematic, uniform definition for bullying renders comparisons between sources problematic, thus impeding an accurate perception of bullying’s magnitude, scope, impact, and trends. In 2014, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) developed a uniform definition as a tool for organizations, educators, community groups, and public health professionals to improve the consistency and comparability of bullying data collection:\(^40\)

> “Bullying is any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths who are not siblings or current dating partners that involves an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated. Bullying may inflict harm or distress on the targeted youth including physical, psychological, social or educational harm.”\(^40\)

Also included are definitions for modes (direct and indirect) and types (physical, verbal, relational, and damage to property) of bullying, information about the context in which bullying occurs, and a glossary of the bolded key terms.\(^40\)

**Prevalence**

Bullying is a universal presence amongst students of all ages. Results of studies estimating the prevalence of bullying vary depending on the sample utilized (size, scope, and age compositions), inclusion criteria (definitions, questions posed, scope, and levels of severity),
methods of informing or measurement (self-reporting, outside perspectives), and timing (current, ongoing, or previous experiences). Comparison of these rates can be difficult due to this lack of consistency. In the United States, a 2001 examination of national bullying prevalence with a sample of over 15,000 students is frequently referenced in subsequent research. Outcomes demonstrated 29.9% involvement in bullying: 13% as a bully, 10.6% as a victim, and 6.3% as both bullies and victims.\textsuperscript{41} Findings from a 2009 national study of nearly 5,000 children (ages 0 – 17) indicated that 13.2% of the sample had experienced physical bullying and 19.7% had experienced teasing and emotional bullying\textsuperscript{42} although these categories were not mutually exclusive.

Several national surveys include measurements of reported bullying. According to the 2009, 2011, and 2013 Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System surveys, 19.9%, 20.1%, and 19.6% (respectively) of ninth-through-twelfth-grade students reported having been bullied at school during the past year.\textsuperscript{43,44,45} Somewhat higher rates of bullying were reported in the \textit{Indicators of School Crime and Safety} reports, which sourced the perspectives of both students and schools. According to data from the 2007-2008 school year (2010 report), 25% of schools reported that bullying occurred among students on a daily or weekly basis, and 32% of students aged 12-18 reported having been bullied at school during the school year.\textsuperscript{46} In the 2009-2010 school year (2011 report), 23% of schools reported the daily or weekly occurrence of bullying among students, and about 28% of students aged 12-18 reported bullying victimization at school during the school year.\textsuperscript{47} No new rates were provided in the 2012 and 2013 reports. Comparable rates of bullying to the indicator reports were reflected in the 2009 and 2011 \textit{School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey}, which also involved students aged 12-
In the 2008-2009 school year, 28% of students reported being bullied at school, while in the 2010-2011 school year, 27.8% of students reported being bullied at school.

Substantial diversity is also evident in international bullying rates. Multi-national comparisons of bullying prevalence are easily facilitated by studies utilizing data from many countries. A cross-sectional study of 28 nations in Europe and North America produced adolescent bullying rates ranging from 5.1% (girls in Sweden) to 41.4% (boys in Lithuania). A similar investigation compared the prevalence of adolescent bullying and victimization in 40 countries in Europe, Asia, and North America. The combined rate of student involvement in bullying for all countries was approximately 27% (10.7% for bullies only, 12.6% for victims only, and 3.6% for bully-victims), while rates for individual countries ranged from 4.8% to 45.2%. On a slightly smaller scale, a study of bullying in children and adolescents (aged 8 to 18) in 11 European countries produced a bullying rate of 20.6% for the entire sample, including Hungary’s lower limit of 10.5% and the upper limit of 29.6% in the United Kingdom. It should be noted that each of the aforementioned analyses assessed bullying in predominately higher-income countries. An additional examination measured bullying victimization in 19 low- and-middle income countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and South America using data from the Global School-based Student Health Survey for middle-school aged children. The overall prevalence of bullying across these countries was 34.2%; prevalence ranged from 20% to 61% in all nations but Tajikistan, which had a prevalence of 7.8%. Comparable single-nation investigations of bullying prevalence are common in the literature. Selected results are synthesized in Tables 1a and 1b, below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Data Collection Period</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age/Grade/School Level</th>
<th>Bullying Rate</th>
<th>Time Period of Report</th>
<th>Reporting Instrument</th>
<th>Participant Categories/Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (Pelotas)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>6-8 years, 9-11 years</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>Previous month</td>
<td>KIDSCAPE Questionnaire</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (Caxias do Sul)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>11-14 years (6th grade)</td>
<td>Not total provided</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>KIDSCAPE Questionnaire</td>
<td>7.1% B 10.2% V 2.52% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Beijing)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>12+ years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Past month</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Guangdong)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12,439</td>
<td>11-18 years</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>Guangdong Provincial Children’s Health Behavior Survey</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Split)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>9.4-11.9 years (4th grade)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>Multiple options</td>
<td>Aggressiveness, victimization, psychosocial questions &amp; high-risk behavior scale</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>6th grade (ES) First three levels of junior high</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Revised Bullying &amp; Victimization Questionnaire</td>
<td>5.4% B 7.4% V 4.2% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,154</td>
<td>11, 13, 15 years</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>Past couple of months</td>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Bremen &amp; Lower Saxony)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6.5-10.8 years</td>
<td>Total not provided</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Bullying and Victimization Questionnaire for Children, Teachers</td>
<td>3.6% B 37.1% V 34.9% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,137</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (entire country)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>PS, SS</td>
<td>PS: 41.5%</td>
<td>Past 2-3 months</td>
<td>Life in School Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS: 46.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (Thessaloniki)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>10-14 years (5th-8th grade)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Past 3 months</td>
<td>Revised Olweus Questionnaire</td>
<td>5.8% B 1.1 % B-V V unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Karnataka)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8-14 years</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Maharashtra)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8-12 years</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Mazandaran)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>8th, 9th grade (mean 15 years)</td>
<td>No total provided</td>
<td>Past 2 or 3 months</td>
<td>Olweus Bullying Questionnaire</td>
<td>5.4% B 22.1% V 11% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>11, 13, 15 years</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>Past couple of months</td>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Data Collection Period</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age/Grade/School Level</td>
<td>Bullying Rate</td>
<td>Time Period of Report</td>
<td>Reporting Instrument</td>
<td>Participant Categories/Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong>&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>11, 13, 15 years</td>
<td>11.6% Physical, 52% Verbal, 47.9% Relational, 18.5% Sexual, 9.4% Racist</td>
<td>Last 2 months</td>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>B, V &amp; B-V aggregated for each type of bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya</strong>&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>63.2–81.8%</td>
<td>Past 6 months</td>
<td>Olweus Bullying Questionnaire</td>
<td>V (several domains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latvia</strong>&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>11, 13, 15 years</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>Past couple of months</td>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>B, V, B-V combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithuania</strong>&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>11, 13, 15 years</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>Past couple of months</td>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>B, V, B-V combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malawi</strong>&lt;sup&gt;70&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>12+ years</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong>&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,223</td>
<td>11-16 years</td>
<td>No total provided</td>
<td>Past 12 months</td>
<td>Young Person’s Behaviour and Attitude Survey</td>
<td>8.1% B, 17.2% V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nigeria</strong>&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>SS (10-19 years)</td>
<td>67.2% combined</td>
<td>This (school term)</td>
<td>Bullying Behaviour Questionnaire</td>
<td>B &amp; V (not mutually exclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong>&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>12-15 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Past 6 months</td>
<td>Youth and Mental Health Study</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oman</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Muscat)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;74&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>Past 12 months</td>
<td>Researcher-created questionnaire</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong>&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>Years 2-4 of HS</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>Past 12 months</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade, 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>36.3% combined</td>
<td>Past 12 months</td>
<td>Unspecified adolescent risk behavior survey</td>
<td>8.2% B; 19.3% V, 8.7% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Anyang &amp; Seoul)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;77&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>7th grade, 8th grade</td>
<td>40% combined</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Korean Peer Nomination Inventory</td>
<td>17% B, 14% V, 9% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Kwanju)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;78&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>10 years (4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade)</td>
<td>24% combined</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Peer-Victimization, Bullying Behavior Scales</td>
<td>12% B, 5.3% V, 7.2% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Basque region)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;79&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5,983</td>
<td>10-16 years (PS, SS groups)</td>
<td>5.8% PS; 3.8% SS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>School Violence Questionnaire</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seychelles</strong>&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>11-17 years</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taiwan</strong>&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>No total provided</td>
<td>At least 2 or 3 times a month</td>
<td>School Bullying Scales items</td>
<td>10.9% B, 10.7% V, 5.5% B-V, 29.9% W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong>&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>7-13 years</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong>&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>12+ years (7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade)</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkey</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Istanbul)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;84&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>17% combined</td>
<td>Past 6 months</td>
<td>Determination of Peer Bullying Scale</td>
<td>5.3% B; 5.9% V, 5.8% B-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venezuela</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(Barinas)&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;85&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>13-15 years (7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade)</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zambia</strong>&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>12+ years (7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade)</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>Past 30 days</td>
<td>GSHS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certain studies presented above may not have necessarily have met the level of rigor necessary for inclusion due to limitations in aspects of the study such as sample size or representativeness, scope of measurement, specificity, currentness of the data, or intent of the research (e.g., not designed as a prevalence study). However, such studies were incorporated in order to be as comprehensive as possible, especially given that data on some nations is scarce. The above table effectively illustrates the inherent challenges in attempting to interpret heterogeneous data. Differences in demographic characteristics, definitions of bullying involvement, time frame for measurement, and type of data categorization are only a few examples of the numerous discrepancies that can occur. Hopefully, with the new uniform definition in place, such limitations can be minimized in the future.

Stability

Conflicting evidence exists regarding the stability of bullying roles in childhood and adolescence and persisting into young adulthood. Research has demonstrated continuity between being a bully, victim, or bully-victim in elementary school, high school, and college. However, results of a different evaluation indicated a “general decline in the overall prevalence patterns of bullying and victimization with age.” While the disparity in results may be partially attributable to differences in study design and measurement, it is likely that bullying is fluid as opposed to static, and dependent on contextual factors. Results of a longitudinal follow-up study suggest that, although both bullying and victimization are less common at age 16 than at age 8, they are persistent behaviors.
Causes/Explanations

Risk Factors and Correlates

Risk factors and correlates for bullying involvement comprise a sizeable research base. Risk factors signify that certain individuals (due to their experiences or innate characteristics) have greater vulnerability than others. Correlates are connected factors; however, the direction of the association may not be ascertained and causality or a predictive relationship cannot be inferred. Associations have been found between bullying perpetration and frequent television viewing, lack of parent and teacher support, presence of peer emotional support, previous victimization status, unfavorable school environment, and a lower parent and teacher expectations for school performance. Parental alcohol overuse is associated with bullying perpetration among boys, and victimization itself is a predictor for future bullying perpetration overall.

Correlates of bullying victimization include physical weakness, poorly developed social skills, internalizing difficulties, low academic ability and achievement, low peer acceptance and high peer rejection, and having few friends. Other factors in children and adolescents that have been strongly associated with being bullied are apparent mental health problems, sadness and emotional instability, and poor social support. Certain populations have been demonstrated to have greater risk for peer victimization, including students with special educational needs, disabilities or chronic illnesses, special health care needs, and those classified or perceived as overweight or obese. For such students, bullying may occur based on a perceived difference from the perpetrators or peer group as a whole. The notion of multiple victimization, pertaining to the exposure to several types of victimization (e.g., domestic violence, physical or sexual abuse, community violence) is recurrent in the literature. Students experiencing multiple types of
victimization may be at risk for higher levels of peer victimization than students for whom peer victimization is the primary form of victimization.\textsuperscript{96}

Generally, there are distinct predictors of bullying perpetration and bullying victimization, although some overlap is present. For example, parental maltreatment and conflicting relationships are risk factors for both bullies and victims, while punitive parenting is a risk factor for victimization alone.\textsuperscript{97,98} The presence of intimate partner violence is predictive of both victimization and bullying perpetration in children,\textsuperscript{99} and pre-teen alcohol use was found to be significantly associated with both perpetration and victimization among adolescents in the state of Georgia.\textsuperscript{100} Negative school perceptions (including social climate, rules, and student-teacher relationships) have been strongly associated with bullying involvement as a bully, victim, and bully-victim in 40 countries.\textsuperscript{101} Both bullying and being bullied are associated with violence-related behaviors including carrying weapons in and out of school, physical fighting, and being injured in a physical fight.\textsuperscript{102} Additional uncertainty occurs when risk factors and correlates of bullying involvement are intertwined with outcomes. It can be difficult to determine if a certain feature results in bullying, if bullying produces the attribute in question, or whether the connection is bidirectional.

**An Ecological Framework**

Like all patterns of behavior, bullying does not occur in a vacuum. Rather, it is the result of the interaction of multiple factors across multiple contexts. The social ecological model suggests that there exist “multilevel systems of mutual influence and interaction, moving from the individual level through linkages to larger social networks”.\textsuperscript{103} An ecological framework for bullying is well-grounded in the scholarly literature. Under this perspective, instances of bullying can be attributed not only to the individual characteristics of the participants, but also to the
actions of peers and teachers/other school staff, the physical school environment, and influences from the family and the larger community.\textsuperscript{104} An emerging body of research has explored how bullying behavior can be affected by factors within the classroom (including social networks), school, family, and community. Classroom-level influences on bullying behavior include classroom management and social structure,\textsuperscript{105} amounts of classmate support\textsuperscript{59} and teacher support,\textsuperscript{106} classroom norms,\textsuperscript{107} and negative peer influences.\textsuperscript{108} Family-level variables impacting rates of bullying include limited adult supervision,\textsuperscript{108} parental physical discipline,\textsuperscript{108} and exposure to domestic violence.\textsuperscript{109} An authoritarian parenting style may increase the risk for bullying perpetration, while a lack of adequate parental nurturing may increase vulnerability for victimization.\textsuperscript{110} At the community level, the occurrence of school bullying may also be influenced by levels of community violence\textsuperscript{111} and neighborhood safety concerns.\textsuperscript{108}

While school-level factors related to bullying can include such characteristics as school size,\textsuperscript{109} the majority of these factors can be categorized as elements within the \textit{school climate}. School climate signifies the prevailing culture and character of school life. It is based on patterns of experiences, and reflects norms, goals, values, structure, support, and engagement.\textsuperscript{112} Four essential dimensions of school climate include safety, teaching and learning practices, interpersonal relationships, and environmental-structural features.\textsuperscript{113} Constructs related to school climate (e.g., school engagement, attachment, and connectedness) often have their own definitions and associated terminology.\textsuperscript{112} School climate is inextricably connected to bullying behavior. Bullying is a product of damaged relationships, while school climate is grounded in healthy, positive, and connected relationships.\textsuperscript{114} Insofar as bullying produces a climate of fear, mistrust, and intimidation, supportive, fair, and respectful school climates engender norms, behaviors, attitudes, and values that are incompatible with damaging behaviors such as
bullying.\textsuperscript{115,114} Therefore, school climate is a critical component in bullying prevention and intervention programs. According to the National School Climate Center, true bullying prevention is the same as school climate improvement.\textsuperscript{114}

**Protective Factors**

The presence of protective factors can buffer the risk of bullying involvement. Examples of individual-level protective factors negatively associated with bullying victimization and perpetration are effective problem-solving, coping, and social skills, and strong academic performance.\textsuperscript{98,116} Associated family-level protective factors include parental involvement and emotional support, maternal warmth, a stable family environment, and appropriate parent-child attachment.\textsuperscript{117,116} Protective factors at the school and/or community level include the presence of positive adult role models\textsuperscript{117} and supportive friends.\textsuperscript{116} Additional research has been conducted on the role of protective factors in moderating the adverse effects of bullying victimization and perpetration, particularly those related to mental health. Variables such as positive home atmosphere and support from teachers, classmates, and schools have been shown to protect against negative outcomes for victims,\textsuperscript{118,119} while factors such as high parental monitoring and consistent parental discipline can promote positive outcomes for perpetrators.\textsuperscript{116} Less information is available regarding the influence of protective factors on the incidence of bullying compared to risk factors, possibly because findings related to protective factors are generally consistent with the literature on youth resilience.\textsuperscript{116}

**Outcomes**

Bullying produces consistently detrimental outcomes for both victims and perpetrators. Multiple studies have documented the relationship between victimization and resulting psychosocial and psychological consequences. Recurrent victimization has been found to be
predictive of symptoms of anxiety and depression in girls.\textsuperscript{120} Bullying involvement has a negative impact on psychosocial adjustment compared to non-involvement; specifically, resulting in lower self-esteem and decreased life satisfaction, higher levels of perceived stress, and greater loneliness.\textsuperscript{121} Past experiences with victimization and perceived risk of subsequent victimization are predictors of nonspecific psychological distress.\textsuperscript{122} Involvement in bullying in the bully-victim role has been shown to be associated with a greater prevalence of psychiatric diagnoses (attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, and depression) and increased likelihood of mental health service treatment than non-involved peers.\textsuperscript{123} Findings from the Finland 1981 Birth Cohort Study revealed that frequent victim status in females predicted later psychiatric hospital treatment and use of antipsychotic, antidepressant, and anti-anxiety medications.\textsuperscript{124} Psychiatric effects appear to have long-term sustainability, as indicated by the presence of bipolar disorder and antisocial, paranoid, and histrionic personality disorders in adults with a childhood history of victimization.\textsuperscript{125} In addition, the association between bullying, severe depression, and suicidal ideation and behavior in adolescents and adults has been established by a number of studies.\textsuperscript{126,127} Lower income students have been found to have a greater susceptibility to depression following bullying exposure,\textsuperscript{128} suggesting that higher socioeconomic status is a potential moderator in the relationship between bullying and adverse outcomes.

In addition to generating harmful psychosocial and psychological consequences, bullying involvement is also a predictor for negative indicators of physical health. Interestingly, the presence of somatic complaints often co-occurs with psychological symptoms in the literature, suggesting that mental and physical health are connected and may be equally impacted by the injurious effects of bullying involvement. In a sample of Canadian adolescents, harassment and
victimization were associated with poor self-reported health status, which is related to future onset of disability and mortality. Similarly, a multinational examination of bullying and health symptoms in adolescents yielded a strong association between bullying and each of the physical and psychological health symptoms (such as headache, stomachache, fatigue, dizziness, nervousness, loneliness, and short temper) in all 28 of the participating countries. Among elementary school students, being bullied was linked with a significantly higher risk of developing new symptoms during the school year, including bedwetting, abdominal pain, sleeping problems, poor appetite, headache, feeling tired, and feeling tense. Clusters of these particular co-occurring symptoms - headache, stomachache, fatigue, sleep-and-appetite-disturbances, and bedwetting - are known as “psychosomatic problems” due to their frequent association with psychosocial processes such as bullying. A recent meta-analysis of six longitudinal studies and 24 cross-sectional studies has confirmed the intersection between physical and psychological health by demonstrating that children and adolescents who are bullied have a significantly greater risk for psychosomatic problems than their non-bullied classmates.

Bullying produces numerous negative life consequences pertaining to behavior, achievement, and poor choices. Adverse behavioral outcomes associated with bullying involvement include substance use and abuse, risky sexual behaviors, lifetime alcohol and marijuana use, nicotine dependence, disordered eating habits, and becoming a teenage mother. School-related achievement outcomes associated with bullying involvement are seen primarily in victims and bully-victims. These include lower academic engagement (victims), poor academic performance and attainment (victims), frequent absences and disciplinary problems (victims) and high school dropout (female bully-victims).
Bullying perpetration is related to negative achievement outcomes in adulthood, such as lower income, long-term unemployment, and criminal offenses.\textsuperscript{140,141,142}

Involvement in bullying across participant roles has specifically been found to be associated with engagement in risky behaviors during adolescence. A 2013 study of high school students revealed that bullies and bully-victims reported higher rates of casual sex and sex while under the influence of alcohol or drugs compared to bullying victims and individuals not involved with bullying.\textsuperscript{143} Similarly, bullies and bully-victims in middle school and high school have also been found to engage in higher rates of substance use (cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana) compared to victims and non-involved students.\textsuperscript{144} It appears that engaging in one deviant behavior may increase the risk of engaging in other deviant behaviors, although the exact mechanisms are not understood at this time. In addition, the results of a meta-analysis of 45 studies indicates that adolescents involved in bullying as bullies, bully-victims, and victims are more likely to report carrying weapons (knives and/or firearms) than peers not involved in bullying.\textsuperscript{145}

**Prevention/Intervention Programs**

A range of interventions to reduce or prevent school bullying are found in the literature. They can be classified into two broad categories: classroom intervention programs and whole-school or universal programs. Some programs are aimed to increase coping and response mechanisms in victims, while other programs are intended to impact the behavior of the bullies themselves. Universal or whole-school programs consist of strategies that are implemented across the entire curriculum and are present in the school culture and policies. Classroom interventions are those that are intended to be primarily implemented by the teacher in individual classrooms, sometimes within the context of adoption by the entire school.
Classroom Programs

An example of a classroom intervention is Bully Busters, a psychoeducational prevention program intended to facilitate teachers’ “acquisition of skills, techniques, and intervention and prevention strategies specifically related to problems of bullying and victimization.” Bully Busters consists of staff development training workshops including content relating to bullying and victimization, recommended interventions, prevention strategies, classroom activities, and stress-management techniques presented in seven modules. Teachers are given an instructional manual that serves as an educational guide and a classroom curriculum resource. Another classroom intervention is the Youth Matters curriculum, the goals of which are to encourage healthy development by encouraging positive relationships between students and adults and promote safe and healthy school norms. Curriculum includes instructional skill modules that address social competency and resistance skills that students can employ to stay out of trouble, build relationships, make good decisions, and demonstrate appropriate behavior. A final example is the Second Step program, a cognitive-based violence prevention curriculum. Second Step is a model that teaches children how to approach and resolve problems rather than providing specific behavioral processes. The curriculum includes units on empathy, impulse control, and anger management and contains role-playing, practice, feedback, and problem-solving activities.
Whole-School Programs

One of the most common and prominent whole-school programs is the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, which “was designed to improve peer relations and promote a safe and positive school environment by fostering school-wide awareness of bullying.” Core components target individuals, classrooms, schools, and the community with a long-term goal of modifying student attitudes and perceptions about bullying. Major program elements include a written antibullying policy that includes clear rules against bullying, regular measurement of bullying behavior via an anonymous student survey, lesson curriculum on bullying behavior and social skills, appropriate supervision, and parent involvement. Steps to Respect is another whole-school intervention program. It is based on the social-ecological model and addresses many areas of the school environment by targeting the school, peers, and individual-level factors. School components focus on fostering a positive school climate and behavioral norms; classroom components are designed to promote social responsibility and behavior and improve individual emotional and communication skills. The Friendly Schools project is a third example of a whole-school program. The goal of the program is to build student social competence and relationships in order to reduce bullying, as well as to minimize bullying’s harmful effects. Friendly Schools also involves family intervention (awareness training and skills-based activities) and classroom interventions (teacher training and teaching and learning support materials).

Evaluation of Programs

Research on bullying prevention is still developing, and the benefits of many school-based programs are not yet known given that such programs, despite being widely implemented, are not always evaluated. Given the number and range of bullying prevention
and intervention programs available, systematic reviews and meta-analytic investigations are the most effective means of analyzing the programmatic strengths and weaknesses. A 2004 study synthesizing the quantitative effects of 14 whole-school antibullying approaches indicated that the majority of programs “have yielded nonsignificant outcomes on measures of self-reported victimization and bullying, and only a small number have yielded positive outcomes.”\textsuperscript{154} A 2007 systematic review included 10 curriculum studies and 10 whole-school interventions. Among the curriculum studies, 40\% decreased bullying, and three of those four demonstrated improvement only in certain populations. The whole-school approach appeared to be more successful, as 70\% of these studies indicated decreased bullying.\textsuperscript{155} A 2008 meta-analysis examining 16 studies revealed that while meaningful positive effects were produced in about one-third of the variables, “the majority of the outcomes evidenced no meaningful change, positive or negative.”\textsuperscript{156} The authors also asserted that, according to their results, school bullying interventions were more likely to affect knowledge, attitudes, and self-perceptions than bullying behaviors.\textsuperscript{156} Finally, a 2011 meta-analysis investigating 44 studies concluded that school-based antibullying programs are effective overall. In these studies, bullying decreased by 20-23\% on average, and victimization decreased by 17-20\% on average.\textsuperscript{157}

Despite the presence of many bullying prevention and intervention programs, current empirical evidence regarding their utility and positive results is inconclusive.\textsuperscript{158} Although comprehensive, broad-based methods appear to be most successful, definitive conclusions cannot be drawn concerning the single best approach to target bullying. Comparison and generalizability among studies are weakened by the variability in age groups, study methodology, program components, and theoretical frameworks. Additional research is necessary in order to produce truly meaningful outcomes.
Methods

Scope

This report is intended as a broad overview of international legislation and policies related to school bullying. Specific types of bullying will not be considered as a primary focus (i.e. cyberbullying), nor will bullying based on sexual orientation, race, religion, national origin, physical appearance, disability status, or other individual-level factors. Moreover, workplace bullying is not relevant to this investigation. At times, such topics may be mentioned briefly in this report, typically when discussing search results. The presence of particular concepts does not constitute emphasis, nor does absence represent omission. The tendency for bullying to be linked with broader constructs such as violence, aggression, harassment, and discrimination will be discussed throughout this report. While these subjects are discussed when appropriate, they are not of primary interest. Policy not directly related to bullying (e.g., harassment policies) will only be discussed if there are no other, more relevant policies available. Finally, antibullying policies for schools and school districts are much too specific to consider at this time.

For the purposes of this report, “bullying” and “school bullying” are considered synonymous. Any occurrence of the word “bullying” can be assumed to be referring only to school bullying unless other specified. Similarly, there is no distinction between the variants “antibullying” and “anti-bullying” that may be encountered in the report. In addition, references to “bullying policy/legislation” should be considered equivalent to “anti-bullying/antibullying policy/legislation.”

Search Techniques

For each country, the search began at the official government website. Typically, the main government website was a means to locate the Department/Ministry of Education (or
equivalent agency), where the bulk of the exploration would occur. Although it was assumed that most relevant policies would be provided by the respective Departments of Education or equivalent, this was not found to hold true in all cases. Policies, laws, and related documents were occasionally discovered on or via general government websites instead of a specific Department or Ministry. When applicable, the next step was to perform an analogous search of smaller divisions (e.g., states, territories, etc.) The same techniques were utilized with the main government websites and corresponding divisions.

Next, the search was broadened beyond official government websites to associated websites (usually national, and often linked from the applicable government websites). Finally, searches of scholarly literature and general Internet queries ensued. Results obtained from academia, journals, press releases, public and private websites, and news media were utilized as appropriate. In conjunction with the discussion of results, the process by which policy/legislation was or could be obtained was also considered. If policy and legislative documents and other resources are not publically accessible or are difficult to locate, their utility is compromised.

**Types of Searches**

*Government searches.* Common searches utilized for government websites were key word searches and topical or subject searches. Topical searches were preferable because they usually produced fewer, and more relevant results. However, many websites only had the capacity for key word searches. Key word searches were less likely to be accurate. They usually generated results if the key word appears anywhere on a page – even if multiple pages linked to the same item, or if multiple versions of the same page or document were present. Consequently, key word searches often yielded hundreds or even thousands of results with varying levels of relevance. Whenever possible, search results were sorted or narrowed to achieve a more
manageable total. If these options did not exist, results were too numerous to appraise, and alternative approaches ensued:

1. Inspecting a select number of results:
   Results are often arranged in order of relevance; therefore this entailed examining the beginning pages of the results. The exact number of pages or results examined would depend on the total number of pages or results.

2. Utilizing the “Find” function (Control + F) to identify materials related to key words:
   This was typically undertaken on webpages containing long lists of materials, resources, etc.

3. Conducting a manual inspection/exploration of website content:
   Examining headings and/or menus to identify items/sections potentially relevant to bullying. If this was unsuccessful, in-depth examination of the website took place.

When appropriate, these alternative approaches were utilized in addition to topical and key word searches.

**External searches.** To supplement obtained government resources (and sometimes, to compensate for a lack therein), external Internet search engines were also utilized. Variations on key word searches (usually with the addition of a country, state, or territory) were conducted along with queries for specific documents that had not yet been located. In this way, news sources, websites, reports, and other documents were acquired. Academic databases were also utilized to identify relevant scholarly literature.

**Search Terms**

The terms “bully,” and “bullying,” were utilized when searching government websites, including (but not limited to) Departments or Ministries of Education. Supplementary words such as “harassment,” “discrimination,” and “victimization” were employed in select cases when no results were obtained for “bully” or “bullying.” Broadening the search was preferable to abandoning it altogether. This tactic was employed only in countries without English as a native language, and was inconsistently productive. When necessary in government websites, the terms
“policy” and “legislation” were utilized in combination with “bully” and “bullying” (e.g., in cases when website sections pertaining to these topics could not be logically located).

In external searches, the words “bully,” “bullying” “policy,” “policies” “law(s)” “legislation” were utilized in combination with the particular entity of focus (e.g., name of country/state/territory). External searches often involved the word “school” in front of or accompanying the words “bully” and “bullies” in order to filter out results pertaining to other types of bullying. This strategy was not typically necessary during government searches, given that the Department or Ministry of Education served as the point of focus for the search. However, on occasions when general government websites were searched or when the search function on Department/Ministry websites yielded results from the entire government, the word “school” was sometimes utilized as a search term or a limiting term to narrow results.

It is important to consider that, while documents in other languages were located, this investigation was limited to English-language documents and resources. Information existing in a country’s native language would not be accessible without the ability to comprehend and translate said language, and translations of websites by search engines and internet service providers are unreliable.

Rationale for Search Terms

The focus of this report is bullying legislation and policy; therefore the main search terms consisted of “bully/bullying” alone or combined with “legislation, law(s)”, and/or “policy/policies.” It is important to distinguish between bullying prevention and intervention programs and bullying policy/law/legislation. The former may be small-scale or broad-scale initiatives implemented in a variety of approaches (home-school partnerships, classroom-based, whole-school approaches, school districts, community partnerships, etc.) and may be but are not
necessarily mandated by law or driven by policy. Prevention and intervention programs may be undertaken formally or informally, and may be uniform or diverse within a specific country, region/territory, municipality, or even school district. Thus, the myriad of research on bullying prevention and intervention programs may not be relevant to this examination. Legislation or policy designating the use of a specific prevention or intervention might exist, but the use of such a program does not necessarily indicate that a policy is in place.

Results Compilation

Due to the already large scope of this report, policies and other resources were logically assessed for relevance and value. Only the findings judged to be the most relevant were considered in depth. Bullying policies took precedence over broader behavior policies, which had priority over more general materials/resources on bullying, behavior, etc. Sources selected for inclusion and the length of discussion for unit (country, state, territory) depend on the amount and quality of information obtained. Although consistency of presentation and content was attempted, the diversity of resources were not typically conducive to a particular standard. The information obtained guided the way results were reported. For example, particular heading and sections may be found in results for certain countries/states/territories but not others. It should be noted that a lack of sufficient, meaningful, and original content (compared to that already discussed) that would advance the research goals often resulted in countries being excluded from the report entirely. Further details are provided in the following section.
Justification for Selected Countries

United States

The United States was selected as an informal reference nation to which other nations could be compared. Proficiency with the language, familiarity with the culture and government, and nearly unhindered access to research and resources made it an ideal (and obvious) choice.

Scandinavia

Considerable bullying research is conducted in Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland (which, for the purpose of this report, shall be collectively referred to as “Scandinavia”). Scandinavia was arguably decades ahead of the rest of the world in terms of recognizing and researching school bullying. This prescience can be at least partially attributed to Dan Olweus, considered by many to be the father of bullying research. Olweus’ pioneering work began long before the term “bullying” was consistently employed.\textsuperscript{159,160} His early results were published in Sweden in 1973 and in the United States in 1978.\textsuperscript{161} The first version of the now-ubiquitous Olweus Bullying Prevention Program was developed in Norway in the early 1980s,\textsuperscript{161} paving the way for a veritable antibullying empire ranging from cross-cultural program implementation\textsuperscript{162} to associated assessment tools.\textsuperscript{163} Today, the name Olweus is nearly synonymous with bullying.

Aside from Olweus, the Scandinavian presence in early bullying research is documented in the literature.\textsuperscript{164,165} This tradition continued over the following decades and has not subsided. Scandinavia as a region continues to be at the forefront of bullying research. Any scholarly database search for bullying will produce an abundance of results from these countries. Finland in particular is known for its longitudinal studies on bullying.\textsuperscript{127,135,166,124} Given the long-term commitment to bullying research, it stands to reason that Scandinavia might also be at the forefront for bullying policy and legislation. It is possible that support for particular research
endeavors may be an indicator as to the amount of government/societal emphasis on these topics. Furthermore, Scandinavia also has a historical precedent – legislation pertaining to bullying was established in Norway and Sweden in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{161} Although it was anticipated that all four Scandinavian countries would be profiled, as per the aforementioned criteria in the Results Compilation section, Finland was not included in the report due to a paucity of overall content and no policies or legislation related to bullying.

**Additional Countries**

With the purpose of producing a thorough representation of antibullying legislation and policy, it was necessary to supplement the research in the United States and Scandinavia. Initially, the plan was to represent countries from six of the seven world continents (with the obvious exception of Antarctica). The intention was to let the results guide the process rather than seek a predetermined number of nations. It was expected that the total $n$ would be relatively small (i.e., less than 10) given the in-depth nature of this examination.

Insofar as the selection of the United States and Scandinavia was systematic and logically-grounded, the same cannot be said for the other countries that were ultimately included (the United Kingdom and Australia). Australia was a deliberate selection given that it is both a country and one of the seven world continents. However, the United Kingdom was a national equivalent of a convenience sample that arose once all other options had been exhausted. All other European countries, all of Latin America, the majority of nations in Asia and Africa, and several Caribbean countries were examined and rejected for insufficiencies (mostly a lack of content available in English). After these options had been eliminated, the United Kingdom was added (it had not been preferable given that several native English-speaking countries were
already represented). Further discussion about the selection process is provided in the Limitations section of this report.

**Terminology Caveats**

Consistency in terminology was attempted when reporting and discussing results. However, it was necessary to utilize the individual country’s common terminology, which might differ from the typical American spelling. The most obvious example of this is the spelling of the word “behaviour” rather than “behavior” for the United Kingdom and Australia. For the sake of precision, it is appropriate to utilize the original spelling during discussion of source materials. It would have been confusing to switch back and forth between alternate spellings within and between sections of the report. Therefore, the spelling of “behaviour” was employed throughout the applicable sections (United Kingdom and Australia). Any other cultural/regional variant in spelling found in this report (e.g., victimization/victimisation; program/programme; organize/organise; center/centre) should be found only in quotes/paraphrasing/direct discussion of source documents. On all other occasions, the accepted American spelling is utilized.

**Policy and Legislative Terminology Discussion**

Before undertaking this investigation, it was important to develop clear conceptualizations of ideas and operationalizations of terminology with regard to policy and legislation. This was necessary because such frameworks can impact process as well as results. However, this process proved challenging; an expectation of identifying universal, concrete definitions was unrealized. Reliable sources for the definitions were limited, and discrepancies in specificity and clarity were evident. Definitions and use of terms also appeared to be domain-specific – that is, contingent upon the location, organization, or field. As a result, a variety of sources were consulted and compiled in order to establish a comprehensive understanding of the
topical area. Of primary concern was the distinction (or lack thereof) made between the terms “legislation” and “policy” (For the purpose of this section, the terms “legislation” and “policy” will be considered synonymously with “law” and “public policy,” respectively.) This is essentially a measurement issue. Without confirmation that items being compared are in fact classified analogously, any resultant analysis may not be meaningful. It is apparent that there is little consistency in the convergence/divergence of these terms. The range of possibilities encountered in Internet resources is consolidated into three categories as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition A: Policy as an overarching concept encompassing law/legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University Department of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Civic Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition B: Policy and Law/Legislation as distinct concepts with a particular relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training Unit (ETU) for Democracy &amp; Development, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Condition C: Policy and legislation as complementary or equivalent concepts (indirectly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition, Distinction, or Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Guide to Community Preventive Services | • Laws and policies can effect population health and reduce long-term medical costs  
• The Community Guide can be used to:  
  o Identify what laws and policies promote public health and at what cost  
  o Draft evidence-based policies and legislation\(^ {172} \) |

The deviations among Internet sources is consistent with a documented lack of consensus in defining public policy in even within the field itself\(^ {173,174} \). Therefore, this report will strive to be as inclusive as possible by considering an array of definitions for policy that are contextually-appropriate. As an additional resource, a glossary for various terms related to policy and legislation (although, primarily legal in nature) is provided in Appendix A. This appendix also includes definitions for particular types of policy.
United States

Background and Government

The United States (U.S.) was examined first in order to serve as a point of reference for bullying legislation and policy. It should be noted that this is not meant to suggest that the United States would be at all internationally superior in this regard. On the contrary, it was expected that other nations would set the standard for bullying prevention. Before examining legislation and policy, it is important to consider the nature of the U.S. government, defined by the Central Intelligence Agency as a “constitution-based federal republic” with “strong democratic tradition.” This means that the U.S. operates under an authoritative document (constitution) that establishes a system of fundamental laws and principles determining the functions and limits of the government. Due to the U.S. also being a federal republic, the central government’s powers are restricted and the states maintain a measure of self-government. Specifically, the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that the federal government only has those authorities specifically granted by the Constitution; any others (unless prohibited by the Constitution) are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people. Finally, in both federal republics and democracies, the people possess sovereignty which they exercise by voting for government representatives.

In practice, this particular system of government is typified by an often lively and sometimes contentious relationship between state governments and the federal government. Politically, the presence of a two-party system confounds this relationship. Pervasive polarization between Democrats and Republicans can affect legislative outcomes and inhibit progress. Although this may be a generalization, Democrats favor more regulation and government involvement. They are willing to sacrifice some personal liberties to assure the
common welfare. Republicans prefer more state/local authority with a smaller federal government, and value individual and states’ rights.

**Current Federal Legislation**

**Legislative Search.** The United States Department of Education (ED) served as the starting point in searching for federal legislation or policies pertaining to bullying. A key word searching for “bullying” was performed on the main page of the ED website (www.ed.gov). Quite atypically, the number of search results was unspecified, and only one results page number was visible at a time. It was unrealistic to conduct more than a cursory examination of the results, given that there was no way to determine the time investment that would be necessary. Options to narrow the search included “Federal Register” and “regulations,” neither of which produced any results for “bullying.”

Next, the Laws & Guidance page was accessed from the “Laws” heading on the main ED page. Bullying was not listed among the highlighted legislation, regulations, guidance, or other policy documents. Links were provided for an external website, the Electronic Code of Federal Regulations and for other ED pages including significant guidance documents and recent federal register documents. It was discovered that the Laws & Guidance page was also accessible from the “How Do I Find?” menu on the ed.gov homepage (selecting **More → Policy and regulations** heading **→ Policy by topic → Elementary secondary education**). Unfortunately, this yielded many pages of results without any logical organization.

While none of the above avenues were useful, ED’s Federal Register page did link to the official Federal Register website. A search for “bullying” within the Federal Register revealed 286 results, many of which were associated with government departments or agencies other than ED. Luckily, there was an option to narrow results by agency; 48 results pertained to ED. The
results display helpfully presented, below each document title/link, the frequency of the key words’ appearance in the respective document. Therefore, a document’s relevance could be ascertained without examination. The majority of documents mentioned bullying only once (in passing), and nearly all of the multiple-occurrence documents were grant-related. Although it is encouraging that bullying received relative emphasis in funding announcements and funding priorities, no legislation, regulations, or guidance were found at this time.

**Laws and guidance relevant to bullying.** Many sources are in agreement regarding the current lack of federal bullying legislation. Although no laws directly address bullying, legislation indirectly related to bullying behavior has often been discussed. This includes:

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI)**
  Prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin

- **Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX)**
  Prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex

- **Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504)**
  Prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability

- **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**
  Students with disabilities are entitled to free and appropriate public education (FAPE); disability harassment may be a denial of FAPE

- **No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)**
  Has provisions allowing students attending persistently dangerous schools to transfer

- **Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act**
  Sets forth criteria for federal funding to support school violence prevention programs

- **18 U.S.C. § 245**
  Criminalizes the use of force or threat of force to prevent someone from engaging in federally protected activities such as attending school

  Criminalizes the will causing of bodily injury to any person (or the attempting to cause bodily harm) because of actual or perceived race, color, religion, or national origin or that person's
**Dear colleague letters.** A series of letters issued by the ED pertained to several of above-mentioned federal laws. Although housed on ed.gov, the letters had discovered via subsequent internet search queries (not during the previous inspection of the ED website). These “Dear Colleague” letters and accompaniments are guidance about bullying prevention and intervention on behalf of select vulnerable populations. The following is a summary of this content:¹⁸³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Originator(s)</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2000</td>
<td>“Dear Colleague” letter</td>
<td>Jointly: Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS)</td>
<td>Disability harassment</td>
<td>Section 504, Title II, IDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2010</td>
<td>“Dear Colleague” letter</td>
<td>OCR</td>
<td>Bullying and/or harassment based on race, color, national origin, sex, gender, or disability</td>
<td>Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, Title II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>“Dear Colleague” letter</td>
<td>OSERS</td>
<td>Bullying of students with disabilities</td>
<td>IDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>Enclosure</td>
<td>OSERS</td>
<td>Effective evidence-based practices for preventing and addressing bullying</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>“Dear Colleague” letter</td>
<td>OCR</td>
<td>Disability discrimination</td>
<td>Section 504, Title II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be surmised by the descriptions and applicable laws, much of the letters’ content coincides. The one item with clear relevance to this investigation is the six-page enclosure accompanying the 2013 letter. Whereas the letter pertains specifically to students with disabilities, its enclosure describes evidence-based strategies that can be applicable to the entire school. Recipients are encouraged to “carefully consider” the recommended practices:

- Use a comprehensive multi-tiered behavioral framework
- Teach appropriate behaviors and how to respond
- Provide active adult supervision
- Train and provide ongoing support for staff and students
- Develop and implement clear policies to address bullying
- Monitor and track bullying behaviors
- Notify parents when bullying occurs
- Address ongoing concerns
- Sustain bullying prevention efforts over time¹⁸³
Attempted Federal Legislation

Unlike the lack of success with government sources, a broader internet search revealed an abundance of information/discussion about federal bullying legislation. However, much of the content pertained to advocacy efforts to promote such legislation, documentation of failed attempts to pass legislation, and a range of opinions about the rationale for and potential impact of the legislation itself (hypothetical as it may be). A major resource was the govtrack.us website. Searchable by topic and key word, this website provides a comprehensive database of all legislation, including that which had only been proposed as well as that had been passed by Congress. When a search for “bullying” was conducted here, 176 federal results were obtained. Some of these bills and resolutions could be included or excluded by title alone, while others required keener examination of the text to determine relevance. Documents were judged on an individual basis. Those with minimal references to bullying (usually occurring as an example) were generally discarded, and a few select results were retained due to their subject matter (e.g., safe, successful schools, conflict resolution) despite not mentioning bullying. A list of all applicable bills and resolutions dating from 2000 to 2015 is provided in Appendix B. The pieces of legislation were divided into three categories, each of which was displayed in its own table.

1. Traditional school bullying - the emphasis of this investigation
2. Broader topics under which bullying is comprised
3. Other forms of bullying (e.g., cyber-, LGBTQ-) beyond this investigation’s scope

Some titles initially appeared broad (second category), but further inspection indicated that bullying was in fact the primary focus. Thus, titles can be misleading and do not necessarily accurately reflect content.

With this legislation consolidated, a very different picture emerges than what had been portrayed by the ED search results. Based on the lack of current or past antibullying laws, it would be easy make an incorrect inference and believe that bullying is not a priority issue for
members of Congress. However, the evidence from govtrack.us reveals the truth - that antibullying legislation has been attempted regularly since 2002. These bills have been presented biennially, annually, or even twice a year on some occasions. A total of 28 bills (24 House; 4 Senate) and five resolutions (all House) were identified as having bullying as a primary or secondary focus. The first piece of such legislation appeared in 2002, and the last three as recently as January, 2015. Bullying has been represented as an individual topic, as a concurrent one with gangs and/or harassment, or incorporated under broader headings such as safety, crime, and violence. At times, several bullying-related bills were presented in the same time period, while lag periods have also occurred. For example, multiple bills have been presented on the same day, successive days, or with less than a month separation; gaps of a year or more have also been noted. The motivation behind such strategies is unclear, as there are likely many nuances in the legislative process that are not known to the general public.

Outcomes for each piece of legislation are also included in Appendix B. When determining a quantitative measure of success/failure, the most recent three pieces of legislation (1 House bill; 1 Senate bill; 1 House resolution) cannot be included because their fates have not yet been decided. Therefore, of the 33 bills and resolutions (28 and five, respectively), 30 remain in consideration - 26 bills (23 House; 3 Senate) and four resolutions (all House). Unfortunately, the calculation was simple because all bills and four of the five resolutions died in committees. The sole success was a 2007 simple House resolution for supporting the goals of National Bullying Prevention Awareness Week. The rate of success for bullying-related legislation would then be 1 out of 32, a dismal 3.1%. Prognosis of enactment/agreement was provided for the two bills and one resolution currently in committee (1% and 0% for the bills and 22% for the resolution). The six bills more indirectly related to bullying fared no better, as none were enacted
While the finer details of all legislative attempts are available in Appendix B, the highlights of the most relevant bills and resolutions are summarized below:

**Table 2. Bullying-Related Bills Introduced in United States Congress, 2002-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Variant Titles</th>
<th>Initial Year</th>
<th>Other Years</th>
<th>No. of Attempts</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>School Safety and Violence Prevention Act</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rep. Maloney (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Sánchez (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bullying and Gang Reduction for Improved Education Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Anti-Bullying and Harassment Act of 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Sánchez (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Davis (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen. Casey (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Safe Schools Against Violence in Education Act</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2011, 2013, 2015</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2010; 2011(2); 2013(2); 2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rep. McCarthy (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen. Casey (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Sánchez (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bullying Redress and Verified Enforcement ACT (BRAVE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rep. Cartwright (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table, groupings were designated to aid in organization and comprehension. A unique bill was given a unique group letter, while a bill having more shared than disparate elements with a previous bill would be considered a variant of that original bill. The one exception is Group E, which is somewhat similar to Group B, but has enough different elements to warrant its own category. As illustrated above and in Appendix B, the bullying-related bills tended to be clustered around a few recurring themes – bullying/gang/harassment prevention programs (including grant funding); guidelines for bullying prevention/management; bullying reporting; violence prevention; and school safety. Several bills have essentially been recycled over many years, with slight modifications in titles/content but comparable main ideas. Like the
bills themselves, their proponents seem to be consistent. The 27 bills presented from 2002-2015 were shared among only eight sponsors, and four sponsors (Sánchez, Davis, Casey, and Lee) accounted for 21 of the 27 bills (77.8%). These bills also demonstrate clear preferential patterns in terms of originating chamber and political party representation – 85.2% (23 out of 27) of the bills originated in the House, and 95.6% (25 out of 27) of the bills were championed by Democrats. The resolutions in the chart below cannot be fairly compared to the bills due to a much smaller n. However, a similar ratio of Democrat-to-Republican sponsors is evident (80% vs. 20%). It can also be noted that all five resolutions originated in the House.

**Table 3. Bullying-Related Resolutions Introduced in United States Congress, 2003-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Initial Year</th>
<th>Other Years</th>
<th>No. of Attempts</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing the achievements of SUPERB (Students United with Parents and Educators to Resolve Bullying) …..</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rep. Wexler (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the goals of National Bullying Awareness Prevention Week</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rep. McCarthy (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week ….</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rep. Ros-Lehtinen (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing support for designation of October 2013 as “National Anti-Bullying Month”</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rep. Honda (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to speculate around the reasons behind the legislation’s near-absolute failure. A great number of variables are likely in play, the majority of which are unknown or incomprehensible. With pure conjecture, several theories can be formulated. Members of Congress (MOCs) may have opposed the cause, may not have been convinced of the necessity for legislation, or may have sensed opposition from their constituents. The legislation may not have been presented in a compelling manner, and/or the sponsors may not have been able to garner enough preparatory support/momentum. Other agendas may have interfered with the presentation and/or deliberations among MOCs. Without comparing these select pieces of legislation to all others considered over the last 13-15 years and examining the voting records for
all MOCs during that same period, it is impossible to characterize the nature of biases, priorities, or other potentially influential factors. While far from provable, the idea of general opposition from MOCs may have merit simply owing to the frequent dissonance between political parties. The fact that Democrats comprised the vast majority of sponsors may be indicative of a two-fold effect. One, it is conceivable that enough Republican MOCs voted against these pieces of legislation simply because of the sponsoring party. Perhaps more realistically, bullying legislation may be one of those issues that evokes certain fundamental ideological differences in members of both parties (discussed earlier). Those who disagree with the federal government exerting control over state-run institutions such as education might vote no purely on those grounds, regardless of the bill or resolution’s substance or intent. Exploring these notions any further exceeds the scope of this investigation.

Constituent disapproval may be the most viable theory. However, exclusive of public opinion survey data or a systematic qualitative analysis of publically available resources (e.g., scholarly sources; periodicals; news sources; private websites), prevailing opinions/beliefs around bullying cannot be adequately characterized. Information gathered in this investigation is insufficiently thorough or representative to even postulate. However, one can get a vague sense of the range of perspectives by merely surveying headlines acquired through internet searches. Anti-bullying legislation and policy appear to be quite divisive issues, with those in favor and against espousing their beliefs with seemingly equal enthusiasm and fervor. Supporters seem to be fueled by a relatively unified position, asserting that legislation/policy are key not only for promoting student safety, wellbeing, and achievement, but also forestalling or tempering bullying’s numerous negative consequences. The incidence of youth suicide, especially among bullying victims, is a frequently-cited rationale for their endorsement. In contrast, detractors
appear to fall into several camps – those who believe federal legislation would be a violation of
the Constitution and/or individual rights; those who think such legislation would be ineffective;
those who deem it pointless; and those who are suspicious of intentions/goals. Common
arguments include:

- It is not the federal government’s job to regulate school activities/behaviors – this is state jurisdiction
- Antibullying legislation violates freedom of speech
- Antibullying legislation is unreasonable/unfair/intrusive/harmful to school staff/students/parents
- This is a slippery slope/hidden agenda to/for even more regulation – when will it end?
- Legislation will not do anything for bullying – needs to be addressed by schools/at the school level
- Bullying is typical childhood behavior/is not a crime/should be handled on a case-by-case basis

Naturally, these divergent opinions seem to coalesce with the fundamental distinctions in
motivating principles between the two political parties.

**State Antibullying Legislation and Policy**

State legislation against school bullying has been in effect since 1999; Georgia was the
first state to adopt a bullying-related law.\(^{185}\) Georgia’s 1999 law required schools to implement
character education programs specifically addressing bullying prevention.\(^{185}\) Since that time,
there has been a steady increase in the number of bullying-related laws enacted annually at the
state level.\(^{185}\) It is important to consider that many states have multiple laws in effect that pertain
to narrow aspects of the issue, ranging from conduct to discipline, reporting, and curriculum.\(^{186}\)

One of the first scholarly articles appraising state antibullying legislation was written by
Limber and Small and published in 2003. As of the publication date, 15 states had passed laws
addressing student bullying, most which had gone into effect since 2001.\(^{187}\) In addition to GA,
the early adopters included CA, CO, CT, IL, LA, NH, NJ, NY, OK, OR, RI, VT, WA, WV.\(^{187}\)
Only nine of the 15 states had defined “the scope of behaviors that [constituted] bullying”, and
these definitions were of varying consistency with each other and with those generally
acknowledged by researchers.\(^{187}\) The authors also identified common elements among the laws:
- A requirement of or encouragement for school leadership to develop a policy prohibiting bullying
- An encouragement for schools to implement bullying prevention programs
- Provisions for employee training on bullying prevention or encouragement that training be offered
- Provisions for the development of model antibullying policies
- Provisions requiring or encouraging that school bullying incidents be reported to authorities
- Discussion of the importance of establishing disciplinary procedures for bullying perpetrators
- A need to develop protection plans for bullying victims
- Stressing the importance of improving bullying-related communication among staff and students

Source: (Limber & Small, 2003)

It should be noted that not every element is contained in every law examined, and some elements were encountered only rarely. However, the exact itemization of the number of states adopting each element was not reported.

A 2008 study by Srabstein, Berkman, and Pyntikova explored the degree to which state antibullying laws had incorporated public health policy. Their data (current as of June 2007) revealed that 35 states had enacted legislation to reduce or prevent bullying and/or harassment, indicating an increase of 20 states or 133.33% since 2003. However, given that only the 2008 study specified the inclusion of harassment, this cannot be concluded as a fair comparison (i.e., some of the 2008 laws may not be relevant to bullying). The authors created a framework based on the core functions of public health policy (assessment, policy development, and assurance) with which they evaluated each law’s elements. This framework “represents an ideal collection of the legal elements necessary for an effective bullying program.” From this list, four variables were selected as nonnegotiable components of antibullying laws. These variables, along with the number of states in which they have been adopted, are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of “Yes” States</th>
<th>Approximate Percentage of Total (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of bullying</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of bullying’s connection to health or safety</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit language forbidding bullying</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of prevention and treatment programs is either mandated/funded or encouraged</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress from the 2003 results is demonstrated by the increased number of states with antibullying statutes and the overall favorable proportion of states meeting each criterion. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement. Only 16 states out of 35 had met all four criteria. The authors also advocated that antibullying legislation should include a range of penalties for bullying behavior that should be regarded not as punishments, but as ways to protect victims.¹⁸⁸

In 2010, the ED released guidance (Anti-Bullying Policies: Examples of Provisions in State Laws) intended to provide technical assistance for stakeholders seeking to revise or modify antibullying policies or legislation.¹⁸⁹ This guidance identified key components (including school district policy subcomponents) present in state antibullying laws as of December 2010 (although the number of states with antibullying laws was not provided). These sixteen components have been arranged into eleven categories:

I. Purpose Statement
II. Statement of Scope
III. Specification of Forbidden Conduct
IV. Enumeration of Specific Characteristics
V. Development and Implementation of Local Education Authority (LEA) Policies
VI. Components of LEA Policies Prohibiting Bullying
   A. Definitions
   B. Reporting Bullying
   C. Investigating and Responding to Bullying
   D. Written Records
   E. Sanctions
   F. Referrals for Counseling or Other Mental Health Services as Needed
VII. Review of Local Policies
VIII. Communication Plan
IX. Training and Preventive Education
X. Transparency and Monitoring
XI. Statement of Rights to Other Legal Recourse

A follow up report, Analysis of State Bullying Laws and Policies, was issued by ED in December 2011. As of April 2011, 46 of the 50 states had antibullying laws,¹⁸⁵ a 31.4% increase
over the 2008 figures. Forty-five of the 46 laws instructed school districts to establish policies related to bullying,\(^\text{185}\) and 41 states had created model bullying policies (although 12 of these had not been required by law).\(^\text{185}\) Besides updating previous research, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do states’ bullying laws cover ED-identified key legislative and policy components?
2. To what extent do states’ model bullying policies cover ED-identified key legislative and policy components?
3. To what extent do school districts’ bullying policies cover ED-identified school district policy subcomponents?
4. How are state laws translated into practice at the school level?

Only the first two questions are relevant to this investigation; the other two pertain to a much narrower frame of reference. The key legislative and policy components referenced in these questions originated from the 2010 ED report, discussed above. Researchers coded and analyzed state bullying laws and statutes using a “systematic coding framework to describe the content and expansiveness of legislation” that supported “quantifiable measurement of key components” and enabled consistency in comparing and contrasting the laws in spite of “a high degree of diversity” in structure and substance.\(^\text{185}\) A two-part approach was utilized to synthesize findings from the first two research questions. The first used the codes to determine whether each component was present or absent, and also compared states on their total number of components present. The second measured “expansiveness” (reach) by systematically rating each component’s thoroughness on a scale from zero to two, with zero being the most limited and two the most extensive.\(^\text{185}\)

The charts below depict the number of states whose legislation incorporated each of the legislative components and policy subcomponents (Exhibit C); the number of components/subcomponents contained in state bullying laws (Exhibit D); and composite scores representing the state bullying laws’ overall level of expansiveness in terms of quality of
coverage for each of the components/subcomponents (Exhibit 16) from report pages xii, xiv, and 40, respectively.\textsuperscript{185}
As illustrated in Exhibit C above, the individual rates of coverage of the 16 components within the 46 state antibullying laws are diverse, ranging from 28.3% of states for mental health referrals to 97.8% of states for mandatory district bullying policies. The median rate of coverage across all 16 components is 72.8% of states and the mean across the 16 components is 67.1% of states. Half of the components had at least 98.7% coverage, while the other half less than 45%.

Exhibits D and 16 are more straightforward. In Exhibit D, the number of the 16 components and subcomponents covered in state antibullying laws are grouped into five categories. The first two categories comprising the greatest number of components (13–16 and 9–12 components, respectively) also contain the highest number of states – 17 each (37%), meaning that 74% of state laws cover at least nine components and subcomponents. Exhibit 16 depicts the range of expansiveness ratings that had been calculated by summing the individual component ratings for each state’s antibullying law. A rating of 32 was the maximum possible (which would indicate a score of 2 for each of the 16 components). Here, only 26% of the state laws achieved an expansiveness rating of 21 or better (corresponding to at least 65.6% of the maximum score). An expansive rating between 15 and 20 (between 47% and 62.5% of the maximum score, respectively) was attained by 34.8% of the laws, while 26.1% of laws earned ratings between 9 and 14 (between 28.1% and 43.8% of the maximum score, respectively).185
Additional comparisons were made between terms used to frame state bullying legislation, definitions of bullying and associated harm present in the legislation, requirements for incident reporting, and the extent of jurisdiction over bullying behavior identified in the statements of scope. One of the most obvious discrepancies was in the way the concepts of bullying and related terms were combined or differentiated in legislation (e.g., some legislation pertained to bullying only, some to bullying in a combined category with terms like harassment or intimidation, and others considering bullying and harassment as separate behaviors, yet conceptually related). Less diversity was identified in the distinct classifications of harm through direct and indirect actions (e.g., general, threats, physical, psychological, hostile environment) yet inconsistencies were still present. Surprisingly, 52.1% of states ($n = 24$) did not require students nor staff to report instances of bullying. While it is known that reporting should not be the primary feature of a bullying response approach, it is still beneficial when implemented within a comprehensive school-wide approach. In terms of jurisdiction, the vast majority (95.7%; $n = 44$) of laws maintained that schools had authority bullying occurring on school property, during school-sponsored events (89.1%; $n = 41$), and on school buses (80.4%; $n = 37$). However, the other possible areas (e.g., bus stops; locations off-campus or adjacent to campus) were included in statements of scope less than 42% of the time.

Several approaches regarding the structure of model policy requirements were identified, indicating diverse perspectives. Differences were evident in the amount of discretion permitted and the value placed on mandatory/explicit policy requirements versus optional, less prescriptive policies. Four categories of model policies were created to capture the range of approaches:

1. Mandated with specific requirements, implementation obligatory
2. Mandated with specific requirements, implementation voluntary
3. Mandated without specific requirements, implementation voluntary
4. Discretionary without specific requirements, implementation voluntary
The number of policies in each category was not provided, making it difficult to assess or even estimate the relative contribution of each type (and each element) to the whole. This in turn limits the ability to draw conclusions and make interpretations, thus compromising the information’s utility. Without known tallies, it is not possible to characterize certain features as common or uncommon, or to determine how many and perhaps even which states might be labeled as successful or in need of improvement in this area. Regardless, the two most compelling features are the dichotomies of mandatory/optional policy development/policy implementation. Whilst directives for school districts to develop a policy appear in three of the four types, only one of the four requires schools to actually implement such a policy. This disconnect is alarming for several reasons. First, it is logically unsound. It is counterproductive to invest time and resources into the creation of a policy that may never get put into practice. Although it may be unfair to conclude that school districts will only do what is required, the appeal of the path of least resistance cannot be ignored. Pragmatism often wins over idealism. Second, this approach can be viewed as contradictory and even hypocritical. If the state wants to allow school district autonomy, why set a requirement at all? Conversely, if the state wants school districts to adopt antibullying policies, why not make it compulsory? One cannot help but wonder if the emphasis is on impressions over reality – fulfilling a regulation or expectation rather than actually addressing bullying. Even if the intentions are genuine, a lack of follow-through (in the form of implementation) can undermine efforts and progress.

Data provided for the 41 state model policies often mirrored that of laws, especially regarding the number of key components and subcomponents covered in policy documents and their corresponding expansiveness ratings (illustrated in Exhibits 20 and 22, below).
Similar to the earlier process, the total number of components/subcomponents addressed in model policies was arranged into categories (although this time four instead of five). Exhibit 20 corresponding to Exhibit D above, depicts the results. As before, considerably more states were contained in the first two groupings (12-13; 9-11 components) encompassing the higher numbers of components than in the remaining groupings.  

Thirty-one-point-seven-percent of model policies \((n = 13)\) included 12-13 components, and 58.5% of policies \((n = 24)\) covered 9-11 components. Like Exhibit 16 earlier, Exhibit 22 displays expansiveness ratings for model policies (rather than for laws, as in Exhibit 16 above), with comparable results. Only 17.1% of model policies achieved ratings between 21 and 25 (corresponding to 65.6% to 78.1% of the maximum score). The greatest proportion of policies \((41.5\%; n = 17)\) received a rating between 17 and 20 (between 53.1% and 62.5% of the maximum score), while the expansive ratings for
the second largest proportion of policies (26.9%; \( n = 11 \)) were between 13 and 16 (between 40.1% and 50% of the maximum score).

A 2012 working paper, *An Overview of State Anti-Bullying Legislation and Other Related Laws*, issued by Harvard’s Berkman Center for Internet & Society provided an overview of state antibullying laws as of January 2012. Data from the previous report was current through April 2011. Two more states had passed antibullying legislation during those nine months, bringing the total to 48. While reflecting similar content relating to the components (e.g., definitions, differentiating characteristics, response procedures), this paper extended the previous analysis and discussion in several areas. Criminalization of bullying behaviors and educational provisions, received greater emphasis in the working paper than the report. It had been observed in the report that states had progressively introduced “statutes [imposing] criminal sanctions for youth bullying,” but no elaboration was included. According to the working paper, all 48 states had criminal laws that could be applied to some bullying behaviors. In addition, three states’ antibullying laws defined new crimes and five states’ laws modified existing criminal laws to target bullying behaviors. Only educational provisions for students and school staff had been mentioned in the report; the working paper included information on parent education. Bullying education or prevention programs for parents were required in nine state laws and encouraged in seven state laws. Sources of funding to assist in the execution of antibullying legislation were identified in 11 states, of which “six [provided] for appropriation” and “five [relied] on private donations.” Discrepancies between these two documents were also noted in the numbers of states said to embody certain components, suggesting inconsistent inclusion criteria and methods of evaluation.
The stopbullying.gov website, established in 2010, provides comprehensive information on state antibullying laws and policies. As of the last content update (March 31, 2014), 49 states had enacted antibullying policies and 41 states had both laws and policies in place. The following map is a pictorial representation of this data:

**Figure 1 State Antibullying Laws and Policies as of March 31, 2014**

In the map above, Montana is the only state without an antibullying law. Antibullying laws had been introduced in most legislative sessions in Montana since 2005, but failed due to debate and controversy over victim definitions. A new antibullying bill (HB 284) was proposed in the Montana legislature on January 21, 2015 and was signed by the governor on April 21, 2015.
Scandinavia Results

Denmark

In Denmark, the Ministry of Education\textsuperscript{193} was the only entity that contained information regarding bullying. Just three results were obtained from a key term search for “bullying”. Specifically, bullying was first mentioned in a document explaining in detail “the Folkeskole,” or the “Danish municipal primary and lower secondary school” system.\textsuperscript{194} In the “Educational Environment and Bullying” section there is general discussion of the Act on the Educational Environment for Students. The act specifies that leaders of schools must produce a written evaluation of the educational environment, including “an overview of the school’s physical, psychological, and aesthetic educational environments, descriptions and evaluations of possible education-environmental problems, a plan of action for solving the problems, and suggestions for guidelines designed to follow up on the action plan.”\textsuperscript{194} This evaluation may identify the extent that bullying is occurring at the school. The municipal board has the responsibility of ensuring that schools are in compliance with all provisions in the Act on the Educational Environment for Students. No further information was contained in the Act itself\textsuperscript{195} that had not been previously discussed in the “Educational Environment and Bullying” section.

Furthermore, an Executive Order from the Minister of Education contained guideline regulations regarding student disciplinary actions that schools can legally administer, such as in situations of bullying. Individual school boards establish rules of order for the schools and have the authority to “determine the principles for the use of disciplinary action” if rules of order have not been enforced.\textsuperscript{194} Unfortunately, this document could not be located in English.
An initial search of Norway’s Ministry of Education and Research yielded minimal results related to bullying. The search was therefore expanded to include other government ministries. The key term “bullying” produced 6 results in the Ministry of Education and Research and 46 results within the entire Norwegian government, for a total of 52 documents. Unfortunately, search results were often convoluted and difficult to navigate due to quantity, inconsistent use of language (in some cases, a mixture of English and Norwegian terms), various types of documents, duplication of documents, versions of documents in multiple formats (e.g., PDF, HTML, text), and the inclusion of both official and unofficial and current and obsolete documents. Furthermore, certain documents referred to others that were not contained in the original search results, necessitating additional searches. This process was occasionally repeated when newly obtained documents also mentioned still more documents, leading to seemingly ceaseless searching. Documents located included federal acts, reports, action/strategic plans, national strategies, reports, political platforms, news releases, articles, and speeches/addresses.

Search results were carefully examined to determine whether the topic of bullying had significance or relevance within the documents, or if the term “bullying” was merely discussed in passing. Results were also compared for redundancy/duplication, before finally being classified as irrelevant/minimally relevant, possibly relevant, or likely relevant. Unfortunately, the first two categories comprised the majority of results. Minimally relevant documents were characterized by at least one of the following conditions:

1. “Bullying” occurred as a key word, but was not discussed in any level of detail
2. “Bullying” was mentioned broadly, with no unique information provided beyond what was available in other, more comprehensive, documents
3. The document was an unofficial source of information not sanctioned by the government (e.g., political platforms, radio addresses, etc.)
4. The document was no longer valid (e.g., archived versions of reports, etc.)
Possibly relevant documents were those that had a broader scope than school bullying, but referenced bullying with regard to related concepts such as gender equality, LGBTQ status, special needs or disability status, human rights, discrimination, protection of minorities, and overall health and wellbeing. These documents, while beyond the purview of this examination, could prove to be useful in future research. Historical documents (such as policy statements that have since been amended or revised) were also placed in this category. Other documents considered to be possibly relevant were those written primarily as research summaries rather than policy or legislative statements.

Documents classified as relevant contained specific information about bullying in Norway and/or discussed government programs, policies, or plans to prevent bullying. These included the Manifesto against bullying, the Education Act, and the national strategy to combat violence and sexual abuse against children and youth.

**Manifesto against bullying.** The Manifesto against bullying (or, the Anti-Bullying Manifesto, as it is sometimes called) was first signed on September 23, 2002 by the Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities, the National Parents Committee for Primary and Lower Secondary Education, the Ombudsman for Children, and the Prime Minister. United by a common vision (zero tolerance for bullying among children and youth), these parties committed to promote the goal and to actively support local and regional initiatives (e.g., local manifests) designed to achieve it. All adults – including parents, school personnel, after-care employees, and employees in public leisure activities – were expected to actively fight bullying in their respective environments. Schools were required to implement an antibullying campaign (supervised by the local school authorities) and to develop a written plan describing their chosen campaign. The government recommended and supported two antibullying
programs under the Manifesto – the *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* (developed by Olweus) and the ZERO program\(^{199}\) (developed by the University of Stavanger Centre for Behavioural Research).\(^{200}\)

An evaluation of this first Manifesto was undertaken to analyze bullying prevalence in the different settings and to describe local, regional, and national measures to combat bullying occurring in these same settings.\(^{198}\) The English-language version of the report summary\(^{198}\) was difficult to interpret due to unusual syntactical and grammatical devices and atypical word usage. For example, the discussion of measures consisted only of general terms without a clear representation of activities, roles, and contexts.

The first Manifesto was active from 2002-2004;\(^{199}\) subsequent versions were in effect from 2005-2009\(^{199}\) and 2009-2010.\(^{201}\) Incidentally, the existence of the Manifesto was first discovered via brief mentions in several government-issued reports that did not directly pertain to bullying, and the existence of the later versions was discovered only in secondary, non-governmental sources. The Manifesto is scarcely discussed on the English-language Norwegian government website, and it is not known whether additional versions were created after 2010. This lack of information may be attributable to the language barrier, yet is still surprising, given the fact that this is presumably an ongoing national plan. The few resources obtained about the Manifesto included the summary evaluation report of the first Manifesto (mentioned above), three journal articles,\(^{202,200,199}\) and a 2012 United Nations report,\(^{201}\) all of which were obtained from external Internet searches. Since the original Manifesto was never located, its components cannot be explained in any greater detail, nor compared with content from successive versions.

A summary of the 2009-2010 Manifesto (from a secondary source) is provided below:\(^{201}\)
The Education Act. Norway’s Education Act (or the Act of 17 July 1998 no. 61 relating to Primary and Secondary Education and Training) is valid as of August 1, 2014. The most recent version available was enacted August 1, 2013. Although no content pertaining to bullying was included in the original act, a section on the psychosocial environment (section 9a-3) was added in 2002 (by the act of December 20, 2002 no. 112) and implemented on April 1, 2003. This section requires schools to make active and systematic efforts to promote environments where students feel secure and have a sense of social belonging. School employees must quickly investigate incidents of offensive language or acts “such as bullying, discrimination, violence or racism,” notify school leaders, and intervene directly if it is necessary and feasible. Measures concerning the psychosocial environment, including measures against offensive
behavior (bullying, discrimination, violence, or racism) must be provided in a timely manner to students or parents upon request. Schools must make formal decisions in these matters within a reasonable amount of time. Considering the timing, it is likely that the psychosocial environment section was added to the Education Act due to the influence of the first Manifesto.

**National strategy to combat violence and sexual abuse against children and youth (2014-2017).** Bullying is intermittently discussed in Part 1 (Strategy) and is sprinkled throughout the chapters in Part 2 (Knowledge Base). According to the Norwegian Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion, bullying is a form of violence and should be included in discussions of abuse and harassment. In Part 1, it is noted that the Norwegian government appointed a committee to assess how to create a positive school psychosocial environment that minimizes the occurrence of bullying and other undesirable behaviors. The committee was established on August 9, 2013 and is to submit recommendations by June 1, 2015. The remainder of the document was not as useful as it first appeared. Brief overviews of bullying and cyberbullying were provided along with brief discussions of prevalence and consequences. Social media and digital/online bullying were emphasized over school-based bullying. Examples of children and youth programs were next discussed, a few of which pertained to bullying and the rest to more general behavioral topics. Much of the bullying-related content was repetitive, while the majority of the document was more broadly focused on violence and abuse.
Sweden

A search of Sweden’s Ministry of Education and Research\textsuperscript{206} revealed negligible results using the key term “bullying.” (The search terms “discrimination,” “harassment,” and “victimization” yielded no relevant information). Of the five results obtained, only one was pertinent to this investigation. Among the other four results, two were press releases, one was a speech, and the last was an article discussing an upcoming international forum. No information about bullying was contained within any other government ministries or the national government.

Bullying was mentioned in passing under the “Education and Research” policy area, in a section entitled “Security for school students and children.” This section named two separate pieces of legislation – the *Education Act* (SFS 2010:800) and the *Discrimination Act* (SFS 2008:567). A summary paragraph indicated that terms of the *Education Act* are intended to “hinder and prevent degrading treatment, such as bullying, that is not directly attributable to any particular grounds of discrimination.”\textsuperscript{207} The *Discrimination Act* averts prejudicial treatment based on specific characteristics of the victim (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability) that might take place during activities under the authority of the *Education Act*.\textsuperscript{207} Based on this information, it appears that the Swedish government differentiates between victimization derived from particular identifiable motives (labeled “discrimination”) and mistreatment that cannot necessarily be categorized in this manner (labeled “bullying”). This is an interesting distinction given that bullying frequently is broadly conceptualized, and encompasses discriminatory actions, aggression, harassment, and other related behaviors.}

Unfortunately, additional detail to supplement these vague descriptions could not be acquired because neither of the documents were available in English.
The United Kingdom (UK) includes the countries of England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. This section is intended to discuss legislation and policy pertaining to the United Kingdom as a single entity. With respect to resources distinguishing between England and other UK countries or between the UK as a whole and individual countries therein, only the information pertaining to England and/or the UK (combined category) was utilized. The UK government functions in a unique manner compared to some of the other nations examined. Each of the 25 ministerial departments collaborates with additional agencies and public bodies, all of which are answerable to the respective ministers. Nine agencies and public bodies support the Department for Education (DfE), including two non-ministerial departments - the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) and the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted). The DfE’s online presence consists of a section of the main UK government website (gov.uk) rather than a separate website. As such, it was only feasible to search the government as a whole and not the DfE directly. The following methods were utilized: 1) key word search for “bullying” in UK legislation; 2) key word search for “bullying” in main search box; 3) Policy search; and 4) Publication search.

Legislation

The legislation search was conducted on the UK statute law database (legislation.gov.uk). An advanced search for “bullying” as a content key word revealed 34 results, with no option to narrow or sort results by topic or department. As such, all titles were examined for relevance. Twelve of the 34 titles contained the word “education” or “school”; however, four concerned specific UK countries besides England (Northern Ireland and Wales) and were therefore
excluded. The references to bullying in the eight remaining pieces of legislation are summarized as follows:

**Table 4 United Kingdom Legislation Mentioning Bullying, 1998-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference to bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 c. 31</td>
<td>School Standards and Framework Act 1998</td>
<td>The head teacher must determine measures that encourage good behaviour and respect for others and, in particular, prevent all forms of bullying among pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 No. 1910</td>
<td>The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2003</td>
<td>The school will create and effectively implement a written policy to prevent bullying, which corresponds to guidance (<em>Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 c. 40</td>
<td>Education and Inspections Act 2006</td>
<td>The head teacher of a new school must determine measures that encourage good behaviour and respect for others and, in particular, prevent all forms of bullying among pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 No. 1124</td>
<td>The School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012</td>
<td>Footnote reiterates reference from 2006 c. 40 above, verbatim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 No. 3283</td>
<td>The Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014</td>
<td>Schools must reasonably attempt to prevent bullying by creating and implementing an effective anti-bullying strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School-based prevention of bullying has been required in UK legislation since 1998, and the use of specific departmental guidance in bullying prevention efforts was required from 2003 until 2012. Although the references to bullying are generally brief and generic, it is still encouraging that bullying is mentioned consistently in legislation. For a complete account of each piece of legislation’s bullying-related content, please see Appendix C.
Policy and Guidance

Following the legislative search, the remainder of the searches were conducted on the main UK government website. Each of these searches allowed for some degree of results filtering or other means of limiting the results. Firstly, a search for bullying on the gov.uk main page revealed 290 results, which could be narrowed by organization. Thus, a total of 73 results were considered – 64 originated from the DfE and nine originating from the Ofsted. It was not known whether this was a topical or key word search, nor even a reasonably comprehensive search. Most (but not all) items included the word “bullying” in the title and/or content, and the publication search (to be subsequently discussed) provided unique bullying-related results that should have been located in the broader “bullying” search. Speeches, press releases, and new stories comprised 46 of the 73 results. Although the majority of these were not useful, several revealed the presence of additional resources that had not been contained elsewhere in the results list. Secondly, the 227 UK government policies linked from the gov.uk main page were examined. When filtered by department, 21 were found to be affiliated with the DfE, and only 1 result (a behaviour/attendance policy) was determined to be relevant. To be certain that nothing was overlooked, the titles of the remaining 226 policies were examined for relevance and were subsequently excluded. Thirdly, the more than 73,000 UK government publications were reduced to 2,575 (DfE-affiliated) via filtering by department. It was necessary to narrow the results via key word searching (“bullying,” “behaviour,” and “discipline”) given that the filtering options of publication type, topic, and official document status were not suitable. The “behaviour” key word search yielded several additional results. Resources can be classified into several categories – policy, guidance, and research reports.
The single relevant policy, *Improving behaviour and attendance in schools*, was initially published on April 22, 2013 and updated on August 5, 2014. Whilst the policy had not been created until 2013, the consistent presence of behaviour-related resources over the previous decade (located during the website searches and denoted in the legislation) are indicative of the DfE’s ongoing commitment to creating school environments incompatible with bullying. The policy is quite brief, with a focus on background and supporting resources (primarily pertaining to behaviour). Its two main aims are to assure that teachers have necessary authority to maintain discipline, and to improve school attendance. Preventing and dealing with bullying is listed as a disciplinary approach. Measures taken to address school behaviour include a series of guidance documents to support teachers and governing bodies. The DfE classifies these types of resources as either “statutory guidance” or “departmental advice.” Statutory guidance has a legislative basis and must be followed “unless there is good reason not to do so” although it is unclear what justification might qualify as “good reason.” Departmental advice is recommended but is not required by law.

Guidance about behaviour and discipline in schools comprises two documents, the first of which is statutory in nature (intended for headteachers and governing bodies) and the other which is departmental advice (for school leaders and staff). The statutory document (published July 17, 2013) justifies the need for behaviour policies, introduces basic components, and discusses the roles of governing bodies and headteachers in developing their school behaviour policies. School behaviour policies should include elements on screening and searching pupils; the power to use reasonable force or make other physical contact; and the power to discipline outside the school gate. The advice document (published July 16, 2013 and updated September 12, 2014) assists school staff in creating school behaviour policies and clarifies the
staff’s authority and responsibilities regarding school discipline.\textsuperscript{220} Although individual schools are expected to develop their own best practices and this content is not required, this document is more comprehensive than the statutory guidance. It outlines considerations for the behaviour policy’s design and features, and describe key points related to the concepts of discipline, punishment, and sanctions.\textsuperscript{220} School behaviour policies should be clear, well-understood by staff and pupils, and uniformly and fairly applied. In addition, behaviour policies should reflect key aspects of school practice that promote good behaviour, previously identified by the 2005 \textit{Report of the Practitioners’ Group on School Behaviour and Discipline}.\textsuperscript{221} These include:

- A consistent approach to behaviour management
- Strong school leadership
- Classroom management
- Rewards and sanctions
- Behaviour strategies and the teacher of good behaviour
- Staff development and support
- Student support systems
- Liaison with parents and agencies
- Managing student transition
- Organization and facilities\textsuperscript{220}

Bullying is mentioned only briefly in these two documents. All such references reiterate the legislative requirements (discussed above), with no additional insight provided. A third guidance document (published August 22, 2013 and last updated November 17, 2014) is designated for the prevention and management of bullying. However, original and meaningful content about bullying is minimal. This advice describes the legislative basis in detail and provides an inventory of resources schools can utilize to “develop their own approaches to different issues which might motivate bullying and conflict.”\textsuperscript{222} A list of actions in which so-called “successful schools” engage comprises the only specific information in this document. Incorporating verbose and often vague language, this content is varied, inconsistent, and seemingly lacking in a unifying focus or purpose. Some of the recommendations can be
perceived as bullying interventions, while others appear to be general behavioural strategies.

These suggestions are paraphrased and streamlined as follows:

- Ensure parental awareness of school’s stance on bullying and procedures to follow
- Ensure student understanding of the school’s approach and their roles in preventing bullying
- Regularly evaluate and update approaches to account for developments in technology
- Implement disciplinary sanctions for bullying
- Openly discuss differences between people that could motivate bullying
- Use specific organizations or resources for help with particular problems
- Provide effective staff training for antibullying policies
- Work with the wider community to address bullying occurring outside school
- Make it easy for pupils to report bullying
- Create an inclusive environment where pupils can openly discuss bullying
- Celebrate success

A fact sheet (published March 2014 and updated October 2014) offering advice and information for school staff to support bullying victims was created to supplement the bullying guidance. It describes qualities of students who may be vulnerable to bullying and reviews methods of support for students severely impacted by bullying.

**Research**

Several research reports were published prior to the creation of the policy. A 2010 report (DFE-RR001) assessed the prevalence of bullying in UK schools, examined various characteristics of bullying victims, and attempted to link specific risk factors (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion, special education need, disabilities, social position, and family structure) with bullying frequency and persistence. Data were obtained from a representative cohort of 14-to-16-year-old students attending English secondary schools between 2004 and 2006, included in the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England. It was determined that many risks factors were associated with previously vulnerable groups, and that, within the range of risk factors, all bullying victims typically had some form of perceived difference from the peer group at large. These results indicated a need for future policy initiatives to target vulnerable groups as well as
to increase understanding and tolerance of diversity within the classroom setting. Additional research examining bullying prevalence included a 2014 data release comparing the estimated rate of bullying among year 9 pupils in 2004 and 2013.

A 2011 report (DFE-RR098) exploring the utilization and efficacy of school antibullying strategies was conducted by the Unit for School and Family Studies at the University of London from September 2008 through November 2010. The project goals were to identify common strategies and rationale for their use, to illustrate the patterns of strategy use by sector and type of bullying, and to evaluate various strategies in terms of effectiveness. Data collection methods included a national survey of 1,378 schools and individual case studies of 36 selected schools. Findings revealed the presence of three main approaches – proactive strategies, peer support strategies, and reactive strategies. A major shortcoming of this research was evident in the evaluation and recommendations. Strategies were appraised individually and by category (i.e., proactive, reactive). However, there was no between-group and limited within-group comparison of efficacy, nor were there recommendations regarding which category (or specific strategies therein) should be utilized above others.

Selected Archived Guidance and Resources

Previous resources and guidance were identified during gov.uk searches and examination of legislative instruments (discussed above) as well as via references in other materials. One such document was a 2007 report issued by the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, which identified a general chronology of antibullying approaches undertaken in the UK from approximately 2000 through 2006.
Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence.

Originally titled Don’t Suffer in Silence: An Anti-Bullying Pack for Schools, this resource was published in 1994 based on findings from the Sheffield Anti-Bullying Project, funded by the then-Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) from 1991-1994. A revised edition, retitled as Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence, was issued in 2000 by the then-Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and was updated in September 2002. According to legislation (previously discussed), this version functioned as required guidance from 2003 until 2008.

The revised edition of Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence appears to be intended primarily as a school resource rather than departmental guidance. Materials included sections on whole-school bullying policies; pupils’ experience of bullying; collecting and interpreting data on bullying; strategies to address bullying; parental involvement; bullying beyond the classroom; school case studies; and advice for students, parents, and families. While informative, much of the content was either general in nature (e.g., describing bullying conceptually) or highly specialized (e.g., discussing various tailored intervention approaches). However, a stepwise process for establishing a whole-school bullying policy was extracted:

Stage 1 – Awareness raising and consultation

- The antibullying policy should be short, succinct, and written in accessible language. It should include:
  - A definition of bullying
  - Aims and objectives
  - Procedures to follow – reporting/recording incidents, sanctions, etc.
  - Intervention techniques, curriculum support, training policy (dependent on resources)
- The antibullying policy should be integrated with the school’s behaviour policy

Stage 2 – Implementation

- The policy should be promoted so that students and staff understand expectations
- Direct action should remind pupils that all forms of bullying are unacceptable and will not be tolerated
- Accurate records of bullying incidents and the school’s response should be kept
- Short-term and long-term follow-up after incidents must occur to determine if the bullying has resumed

Stage 3 – Monitoring

- Identifies progress and enables follow-up; demonstrates the policy’s degree of efficacy

Stage 4 – Evaluation

- Data from monitoring and feedback from staff, students, and families should be used to review and update the policy at least once per school year
Bullying: effective action in secondary schools.

This 2003 Ofsted report discussed the findings of a 2001-2002 survey of schools and local authorities that had been conducted to identify measures being utilized to fight bullying. Consolidated features of good practice in combatting bullying are highlighted below:

- A school culture that promotes tolerance and respect, including respect for difference and diversity
- Positive leadership on dealing with bullying within the overall behaviour policy
- An agreed-upon code of conduct that defines unacceptable behaviour and provides distinct rewards and sanctions accordingly
- A clear policy statement about bullying developed with input from school leaders, staff, parents, and students which includes examples of how bullying incidents will be handled
- A planned curricular approach for bullying in a context promoting self-esteem, assertiveness, and confident relationships
- Regular staff training to raise and maintain awareness, alert staff to indicators of bullying, and provide methods of responding to bullying
- Periodic consultation with students to characterize what, when, where, and by whom bullying occurs
- Efficient supervision of schools sites where bullying is most likely to take place
- Confidential, varied, and minimally risky means for reporting instances of bullying
- Procedures for supporting victims include the involvement of peers
- Procedures for punishing perpetrators include methods to curtail future behaviour
- Prompt and thorough investigation of reported incidents with clear and consistent consequences
- Provisions for sustained follow-up with bullying perpetrators and victims
- A system to record bullying incidents to facilitate analysis of patterns (e.g., students involved, type, time, and/or location) in order to set targets and inform policy and practice

These suggestions are advantageous for their collective breadth as well as the level of specificity present at the item level, and could easily serve as blueprints for an antibullying policy.

Bullying – a charter for action.

An Anti-bullying Charter for Action (also known as Bullying – A Charter for Action and heretofore referred to as “the Charter”) document was issued by the DfES in November 2003. Since 2004, all schools have been encouraged to sign the Charter and enact its principles to demonstrate that bullying will not be tolerated. The Report of the Practitioner's Group on School Behaviour and Discipline recommended that the DfES collaborate with professional
associations to promote the Charter by reissuing it to schools every two years and endorsing it at regional events. The document’s key points are ideas for schools to consider when responding to bullying, including: discussion, monitoring, and review; support for everyone in the school community to identify and respond to bullying; ensuring that children and youth are aware that all bullying concerns will be managed sensitively and effectively; ensuring that parents and caregivers expressing concerns about bullying are taken seriously; and learning from effective antibullying work elsewhere.\textsuperscript{230} The Charter’s current status is not known.

\textbf{Safe to learn: Embedding anti-bullying work in schools.}

The guidance \textit{Safe to Learn: Embedding Anti-Bullying Work in Schools} was issued in 2007 by the former Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and was active until 2011. This guidance seeks to define the legal requirements for school responses to bullying and to advise schools on creating and implementing whole-school antibullying policies for preventing and responding to bullying.\textsuperscript{231} It also emphasizes the importance of reporting and recording bullying incidents, addressing staff training and development needs regarding bullying, and communicating the policy via a multi-faceted approach.\textsuperscript{231} Antibullying work should be considered a school improvement issue, whereby a specific process is followed to include auditing, consultation, prioritization, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and celebration of success.\textsuperscript{231}

Schools are encouraged to utilize the Charter principles as a framework when developing and evaluating antibullying policies and in advertising the school’s commitment to counter bullying.\textsuperscript{231} These principles tailor expectations of and expectations for specific parties including victims and perpetrators of bullying, school staff and leadership, parents, and other members of the school community.\textsuperscript{231} Designated elements include a range of personal characteristics (e.g.,
knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, feelings, behaviour, and assumptions) as well as system-level actions and responses (e.g., cooperating, teaching, modeling, promoting, reviewing, assessing, etc.) which can be regarded as prerequisites of effective antibullying practices. The various roles and expectations are illustrated in Appendix D.

School antibullying strategies and intervention systems should have the following aims: preventing, deescalating, and/or suspending harmful behaviour; reasonably, proportionately, and consistently reacting to bullying incidents; protecting and supporting students who have experienced bullying; and applying disciplinary sanctions and providing educational support for students who have bullied others. The following table presents a variety of recommended preventative and reactive strategies for bullying:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prevention</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reaction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Clear and effective pupil reporting systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of curriculum opportunities</td>
<td>Use of sanctions and learning programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness</td>
<td>Use of reward and celebration strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil voice</td>
<td>Developing roles pupils can play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured data gathering</td>
<td>Adult mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the school environment</td>
<td>Engaging parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Multi-agency collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with local authorities or other schools</td>
<td>Alternative schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-police partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia

National Government

Australia’s government websites served as the starting point for the investigation. The first step was examining the “ComLaw” website, a government-run repository providing online access to Australian national legislation and related documents. Neither an advanced search using the key search term “bullying,” nor an examination of all legislation within the “Education” portfolio yielded results concerned with school bullying. Next, the national Department of Education and Training was searched using the key term “bullying.” Of the 10 yielded results, two were relevant – The National Safe Schools Framework (NSSF) and the Safe Schools Hub. The majority of remaining items were subsections or links from these sections. The following discussion also includes additional national programs/initiatives/resources – Bullying! No Way., and the National Centre Against Bullying – both cited in the NSSF.

The NSSF (originating in 2003 and revised in 2010) is a resource providing all Australian schools with “a vision and a set of guiding principles [to] assist school communities [in developing] positive and practical student safety and wellbeing policies.” It is intended as a collaborative effort between the national government and state and territory governments. Championing a whole school approach to safety and wellbeing, the NSSF includes a “comprehensive range of evidence-informed practices to guide schools in preventing and responding to incidents of harassment, aggression, violence and situations of bullying.” Its vision, guiding principles, and elements are presented below.

2. Vision

The National Safe Schools Framework is based on the following overarching vision:

All Australian schools are safe, supportive and respectful teaching and learning communities that promote student wellbeing.
3. Guiding Principles

The vision is underpinned by the following guiding principles that represent fundamental beliefs about safe, supportive and respectful school communities. These guiding principles emphasise the importance of student safety and wellbeing as a pre-requisite for effective learning in all school settings.

Australian schools:

- affirm the rights of all members of the school community to feel safe and be safe at school
- acknowledge that being safe and supported at school is essential for student wellbeing and effective learning
- accept responsibility for developing and sustaining safe and supportive learning and teaching communities that also fulfill the school’s child protection responsibilities
- encourage the active participation of all school community members in developing and maintaining a safe school community where diversity is valued
- actively support young people to develop understanding and skills to keep themselves and others safe
- commit to developing a safe school community through a whole-school and evidence-based approach

5. Elements of the Framework

1. Leadership commitment to a safe school
2. A supportive and connected school culture
3. Policies and procedures
4. Professional learning
5. Positive behaviour management
6. Engagement, skill development and safe school curriculum
7. A focus on student wellbeing and student ownership
8. Early intervention and targeted support
9. Partnerships with families and community

The nine elements are then each further divided into a number of key characteristics. Those characteristics containing the word “bullying” and/or referring to policy (as well as certain aspects of positive behaviour management) have been extracted and presented below along with the elements to which they correspond:

Element 1: Leadership Commitment to a Safe School

1.7 Ongoing data collection (including incidence and frequency of harassment, aggression, violence and bullying) to inform decision-making and evaluate effectiveness of policies, programs and procedures.

Element 3: Policies and Procedures

3.1 Whole school, collaboratively developed policies, plans, and structures for supporting safety and wellbeing

3.2 Clear procedures that enable staff, parents, [caregivers] and students to confidentially report and incidents or situations of child maltreatment, harassment, aggression, violence or bullying
3.3 Clearly communicated procedures for staff to follow when responding to incidents of student harm from child maltreatment, harassment, aggression, violence, bullying or misuse of technology

Element 4: Professional Learning
4.1 Evaluation of the current level of staff knowledge and skills related to student safety and wellbeing and their capacity to respond effectively and sensitively to possible situations of child maltreatment, harassment, aggression, violence and bullying

Element 5: Positive Behaviour Management
5.1 Careful selection of evidence-informed positive behaviour management approaches that align with the school community’s needs
5.2 The promotion and recognition of positive student behaviour
5.3 A clear understanding and consistent implementation by all staff of the school’s selected positive behaviour management approaches within both the school and classroom context

Element 6: Engagement, Skill Development and Safe School Curriculum
6.3 Teaching of skills and understandings to promote cybersafety and for countering harassment, aggression, violence and bullying

It is evident that the NSSF is comprised of broad-based principles that regard bullying as being a member of a larger category of harmful behaviours/situations (e.g., child maltreatment, harassment, aggression, and violence). In fact, these items are always discussed collectively in the Framework itself and are only differentiated in the accompanying resource manual (a more comprehensive document designed to support implementation). While this unification of concepts is not necessarily inaccurate/inappropriate, the lack of emphasis on bullying as an individual concept detracts from the NSSF’s overall utility. If bullying is not presented as a unique construct, it may be unrealistic to assume that derived policies will effectively capture it.

The resource manual extends the NSSF by comprehensively highlighting key actions and effective practices for each of the nine elements and its associated key characteristics; supplying an audit tool to use for progress assessment; providing a glossary of commonly used terms and definitions; and offering constructive resources published or endorsed by national and/or state/territory governments.236 It also includes a reference-supported literature review on bullying that seeks to answer the following questions.236
Only question eight is directly relevant to this investigation. To answer this question, the manual summarizes the results of various research studies on bullying prevention/intervention. These are then consolidated into a list of features likely to be effective in preventing and reducing bullying:

- A universal whole-school approach of long duration that takes a multi-faceted approach rather than focusing on one single component.
- An increased awareness of bullying in the school community through assemblies, school forums and student-owned plans and activities.
- A whole-school detailed policy that addresses bullying (including cyberbullying).
- Effective classroom management and classroom rules against bullying.
- The promotion of a positive school environment that provides safety, security and support for students and promotes positive relationships and student wellbeing.
- Effective methods of behaviour management that are consistently used, non-hostile and non-punitive; they should arouse empathetic concern for the person bullied, encourage problem-solving and positive action and that involve monitoring future developments.
- Mobilisation of all students (and especially bystanders) to respond negatively to bullying behaviour and to support students who are bullied.
- Social skill development within teaching and learning activities (e.g. through the use of cooperative learning).
- Enhancement of the school physical environment and its supervision.
- Teacher professional development.
- Classroom curriculum units that address bullying and related issues (e.g. values education) and include the use of video materials.
- Counselling for individual students and collaboration with other appropriate professionals to provide support.
- Parent partnerships and education.

The above list may contribute to a foundation for antibullying policies – in essence helping to lay the necessary groundwork from which such policies can eventually spring to life. The suggestions are not sufficiently specific, comprehensive, nor operationalized to be able to lead directly to antibullying policies. The literature review as a whole can be construed as background/contextual information (more reactive) rather than concrete, focused suggestions for
action (proactive). This alone does not rectify the weaknesses of the bullying-harassment-violence amalgamated category

The Safe Schools Hub (the Hub) is a government-sponsored collection of information and resources about safe school strategies to assist teachers and school leaders, students, and parents. The Hub seeks to empower school community members to “[nurture] student responsibility and resilience; [build] a positive school culture; [foster] respectful relationships; and [support] students impacted by anti-social behaviour, including bullying.” A major component of the Hub is the Safe Schools Toolkit, a resource expressly created to clarify and reinforce the NSSF through case studies; activities and strategies; lesson plans; expert interviews; and professional learning modules. Sections for parents and students and a resource gallery are also offered on the Hub website.

Bullying. No Way! is a national initiative involving education representatives from the national government, states and territories, and national Catholic and independent schools. It is essentially an online repository for strategies and resources tailored to teachers, students, and parents. These materials are intended as general guidelines and principles and correspond to those from the NSSF and the Hub. Bullying. No Way! sponsors a National Day of Action Against Bullying and Violence, a voluntary annual event that will be held for the fifth time in 2015. This annual event offers opportunities for “schools to promote their own antibullying messages and programmes to their [communities].”

The National Centre Against Bullying (NCAB) is an organization acting to “advise and inform the Australian community on the issue of childhood bullying and the creation of safe schools and communities.” Its membership consists of subject-matter experts collaborate with school communities, governments, and the private sector to increase awareness about bullying
behaviour and responses. The NCAB website includes an advice center for students, parents, and schools; a storehouse for selected research; and assorted practical resources covering bullying and associated topics. Much of the NCAB content appears to be similar if not identical to that of the NSSF and the Safe Schools Hub.

State and Territory Governments

Australia is comprised of six states (New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Western Australia, and Victoria) and two self-governing territories (Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory).

Figure 2. Map of Australian States and Territories

Each of these states and territories has its own government and respective department of education with authority over that state/region’s public schools, known as “state schools.” In addition to bullying, policies on topics such as racism, sexual harassment, homophobia, equity, inclusion, welfare, discipline, and safety were identified. Due to the already large scope of this investigation, policies and other resources were logically assessed for relevancy and value. Only the findings judged to be the most relevant were considered in depth. Bullying policies take precedence over broader behaviour policies, which have priority over more general
materials/resources on bullying, behaviour, etc. Sources selected for inclusion and the length of discussion for each state or territory depend on the amount and quality of information obtained.

Moreover, many if not all of the states and territories have separate governing entities for Catholic schools and independent schools. Only the central state/territory governments were examined in this investigation. A list of links to state and territory policies on the Bullying. No Way! Website244 and the Australian Department of Education website245 served as the starting points. While some of these links were useful, they were not sufficiently comprehensive. Therefore, the process was supplemented by searches of individual state and territory government websites for “bullying” (key word) and for policies/procedures related to behaviour, wellbeing, conduct, student support, and other associated concepts.

**Australian Capital Territory**

Australian Capital Territory (ACT), a tiny region within New South Wales, is one of the two self-governing territories. A key word search for “bullying” on the ACT Government Information Portal (main website) revealed 2,605 results - far too many to inspect. The same search conducted on the ACT Education and Training Directorate website revealed 113 results, only a few of which were concluded to be relevant. Many of the extraneous results were duplicates and/or pertained to employees rather than students. Although not extensive, information about bullying was easy to locate within the Education and Training Directorate – a dedicated bullying page. Bullying was linked from the “School Education” heading on the main site. On this page was a list of applicable policies describing “the code of conduct for acceptable behaviour” in ACT schools.246 Two of the policies were applicable to bullying, and the remaining two covered sexual harassment and racism.
The two enumerated ACT policies concerning bullying were both published in 2007. The first, *Providing Safe Schools P-12* (SSP200704), functions as an overarching framework encompassing distinct policies on bullying, racism, and sexual harassment) as well as school suspension, exclusion, and transfers. Specifically, it is stated that the Education and Training Directorate will provide the aforementioned policies and monitor their implementation in ACT schools. Echoing the NSSF, SSP200704 asserts that ACT schools will collaborate with students and parents to develop procedures that “promote and seek to provide a supportive environment in which all students can expect to feel safe.” These procedures must be consistent with the bullying, racism, sexual harassment, and suspension/exclusion/transfer policies. Next, SSP200704 provides a glossary for key terms (schools, parents, workplace, racism, bullying, harassment, violence, conflict, sexual harassment, and critical incidents). Although the wording is not identical, it is evident that these definitions have been developed to mirror those from the NSSF resource manual. Finally, SSP200704 discusses general responsibilities for principals and teaching staff to undertake with regard to fostering student well-being and a safe and supportive environment. For example, principals are expected to report on each of the NSSF key elements annually, and to report critical incidents of bullying, harassment, violence, racism, and sexual harassment within 24 hours.

The second policy, *Countering Bullying, Harassment and Violence in ACT Public Schools* (CBG200704), primarily reiterates elements of SSP200704 (and, in turn, the NSSF). The introduction of original content is minimal, which possibly undermines the need for two discrete policies. The CBG200704 policy statement and rationale are as follows.
Section 3 consists of definitions for key terms (bullying, harassment, violence, conflict, and critical incident) directly reproduced from SSP200704. Only a few terms present in SSP200704 have been omitted, presumably due to lack of relevance. Section 4 designates additional mandatory procedures for school to undertake. They must differentiate between acts of bullying, harassment, and violence (and respond to each accordingly), identify patterns of repeated offending, and inform parents/caregivers about their programs. These, too, are clearly sourced from the NSSF resource manual, often with nearly duplicate phrasing.

Like the NSSF, CBG200704 initially clusters bullying, harassment, and violence into a unified grouping. These concepts are not separated until the last section, and then only fleetingly. Once again, this lack of an independent focus on bullying is an unquestionable weakness. Bullying is sufficiently complex by itself without grouping it with other intricate behavioural patterns.
New South Wales

The state of New South Wales (NSW) is located in the southeastern portion of mainland Australia. An initial key term search for “bullying” on the Department of Education and Communities (DEC) website revealed over 1,000 results (an unrealistic quantity to review). Accordingly, an examination of DEC policy documents classified as policy, guideline or procedure seemed to be the next logical step. Thirteen of the 398 policy documents contained the key word “bullying” (including two sets of duplicate policies). Of the remaining 11 results, three pertained to the workplace, one concerned online conduct, and one was a general statement regarding homophobia in NSW schools. Therefore, six documents remained – two policies (student discipline and bullying) and four associated guidelines and procedures.

The Student Discipline in Government Schools Policy was an overview of rules and expectations for student behaviour which emphasized respect, responsibility, wellbeing, and safe and secure environments. Bullying was mentioned directly in two items, and alluded to in a third item. Under Section 3 (Context), it was stated that learning environments must be “free from bullying, harassment, intimidation and victimization” and that all schools must develop and implement antibullying plans consistent with the DEC bullying policy (to be subsequently discussed). In Section 4 (Responsibilities and delegations), student responsibilities include showing respect for teachers, peers, staff and visitors and “not [engaging] in any form of harassment, victimization or intimidation.” The accompanying support materials, although more comprehensive, did not provide additional content about bullying.

The focal policy, entitled Bullying: Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools Policy (PD/2010/0415/V01) was implemented March 2011 and updated November 2014. Accompanying this policy were three guidelines – Bullying: Preventing and Responding to
Student Bullying in Schools Guidelines; Bullying: Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools Planning Document; and Anti-Bullying Plan Template (all updated October 2014).251 The policy statement indicates that the DEC rejects all forms of bullying directed towards students, employees, parents/caregivers and community members. The policy applies to bullying occurring not only in NSW government schools but also happening off school premises and outside of school hours “where there is a clear and close relationship between the school and the conduct of the student.”252 Subsequent sections define and describe bullying behaviours, outline expectations for principals/school staff/students/parents and caregivers/the school community, and briefly mention monitoring, evaluation, and reporting requirements.

Principals are assigned the majority of the responsibility for the development and implementation of school antibullying plans (a snapshot of which is presented below):252

Principals must ensure that the school implements an antibullying plan that:
- is developed collaboratively with students, school staff, parents, caregivers, and the community
- includes strategies for:
  - developing a shared understanding of bullying behaviour that captures all forms of bullying
  - developing a statement of purpose that outlines individual and shared responsibilities of students, parents, caregivers and teachers for preventing and responding to bullying behaviour
  - maintaining a positive climate of respectful relationships where bullying is less likely to occur
  - developing and implementing programs for bullying prevention
  - embedding antibullying messages in each curriculum area and in every year
  - developing and implementing early intervention support for students who are identified by the school as being at risk of developing long-term difficulties with social relationships
  - developing and implementing early intervention support for students who are identified at or after enrolment as having previously experienced bullying or engaged in bullying behaviour
  - empowering the whole school community to recognise and respond appropriately to bullying, harassment and victimisation and behave as responsible bystanders
  - developing and publicising clear procedures for reporting incidents of bullying to the school
  - responding to incidents of bullying that have been reported to the school quickly and effectively
  - matching a planned combination of interventions to the particular incident of bullying
  - providing support to any student who has been affected by, engaged in or witnessed bullying behaviour
  - providing regular updates, within the bounds of privacy legislation, to parents or caregivers about the management of the incidents
  - identifying patterns of bullying behaviour and responding to such patterns
  - monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan
  - reporting annually to the school community on the effectiveness of the plan
In addition to guaranteeing that the above-listed bullying plan strategies are instituted, principals must also confirm that the plan includes appropriate procedures for incident reporting, is publicized and readily available within the school community, and is re-appraised at least every three years. Students are required to adhere to the school antibullying plan, act as responsible bystanders, and report any bullying incidents. School staff, parents, and the school community at large are also expected to support the antibullying plan via actions such as: acquiring knowledge of the plan (staff/parents); modeling and promoting appropriate behaviour/positive relationships (staff/community); collaborating with the school to resolve bullying incidents as they occur (parents/community); and quickly responding to bullying incidents (staff).\textsuperscript{252} The policy in its entirety is provided for reference in Appendix E.

The associated guidelines first provide context for the policy by introducing its central focus on “protection, prevention, early intervention and response strategies for student bullying.”\textsuperscript{253} The subsequent explanation/description of these concepts will comprise the main elements/sections of school antibullying plans. An included pictorial representation of the relationship between these concepts is presented here:\textsuperscript{253}

**Figure 3. Stages of Bullying Response in NSW Schools**
In terms of appearance, this diagram appears analogous to the social-ecological model
commonly utilized in the field of public health. However, in terms of content, the graphic
more closely resembles the public health stages of prevention (i.e., primary, secondary, tertiary)
with the addition of a fourth stage. In the remainder of the document, the policy is further
elucidated with a comprehensive stepwise process for developing and reviewing school
antibullying plans. Each step is supplemented by instructive statements, key ideas for
consideration, and focus questions, as summarized below:

**Step 1: Form a school team**
- Who are the key stakeholders in our school community?
- How will you ensure representation from the whole school community?
- What expertise is required to assist the team to successfully complete its task?
- How should the team members be selected?

**Step 2: Develop a shared understanding of bullying behaviour, including online bullying**
- Are all aspects of the current school antibullying plan consistent with the DEC bullying policy and other relevant DEC policies and plans?
- Which school trend data should be considered?

**Step 3: Engage the school community**
- How will you achieve a whole school approach that engages all school community sectors?
- At what stages throughout the process will the school community be consulted?
- What data will be presented?
- What questions should be asked to facilitate understanding and generate ideas?
- How will perceived concerns be addressed?

**Step 4: Develop a ‘statement of purpose’**
- What principles should underpin the school’s antibullying practices?
- What outcomes does the community want the school antibullying plan to achieve?
- Do all policies, programs, practices within the school work together to achieve these outcomes?

**Step 5: Develop or revise the school antibullying plan to include protection, prevention, early intervention and response strategies for student bullying**
- Do the strategies support and reflect the aims and beliefs articulated in the ‘statement of purpose’?
- Are there strategies for each of the areas for action required by the DEC bullying policy?
- Does the plan include processes to evaluate and review each strategy and the plan as a whole?

**Step 6: Publication and promotion of the plan within the school community**
- How will you publish and promote the plan within your school community?
- Into which community languages should the plan be translated?

**Step 7: Review**
At each review (occurring at least triennially):
- Forward a copy of the plan to the School Education Director
- Provide plan copies to students and parents
- Publish and promote the new plan and place a copy on the school website
Protection, prevention, early intervention, and response are revisited and further refined in the planning document, where they become the four broad classifications – termed “action areas” under which all goals/steps/procedures are categorized. For each action area (and its associated components), schools must identify an expected outcome, strategies, targets, responsibility, and evaluation/review of strategy. Charts provided for documentation and tracking facilitate easy translation of the components into the actual plan. Finally, the bullying plan template explicitly outlines the expected attributes of school antibullying plans. Aside from the statement of purpose, the four action areas of protection, prevention, early intervention, and response serve as the categorical headings under which all the plan substance should be contained. A copy of the template is included in Appendix F.

This policy and its accompanying guidelines are commendable for broadness of scope, high level of specificity, strong degree of tangibility, a solid factual as opposed to conjectural basis; and emphasis on evidence-based practices (e.g., data collection and analysis; monitoring and evaluation, etc.). Concepts are clearly operationalized, and the process by which plans are developed is logically described. Unlike the commonly-encountered, generic, policy-requiring-a-policy rhetoric, the information is useful in enumerating who should be involved, identifying what should be accomplished and how such objectives can be achieved, and justifying why certain pieces are necessary. Significantly, schools are not simply given a directive and subsequently left to fend for themselves – they are supported throughout the process. The only criticism is that much of the policy content is derived from the NSSF. The policy would have greater applicability if it had been modified specifically for NSW schools.

The final step was manually searching the DEC website for additional bullying information that might compliment the obtained policies (given that results from the “bullying”
key word search were too plentiful to be realistically studied). Other than the aforementioned policies, nothing about bullying could be found on the main DEC website. Various DEC pages conspicuously linked to a separate website, Public Schools NSW. For example, from the DEC main page, the Our services heading → Explore our department section provided an alphabetical listing of departmental programs and functions. All topics selected/explored based on perceived relevance (e.g., antibullying, behaviour programs; student behaviour; student wellbeing) were located on the Public Schools NSW website, although the majority were irrelevant to bullying. Content applicable to bullying was not extensive. The majority of materials were intended for consumption by parents and were therefore of a general nature and relatively basic/straightforward. These included a series of videos conveying practical advice (e.g., bullying truths/myths; how to help/get help for bullied children; actions to take if you suspect your child is bullying others) and a few parent information sheets.

Northern Territory

Northern Territory (NT) is located in the north-central portion of mainland Australia. A key word search for “bullying” conducted on the main NT government website yielded 1,765 results – a number so overwhelming as to render them fundamentally useless. Thus, the focus shifted to the NT Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS), which hosts a user-friendly website with links to a wide selection of topics on the main page. The same key word search of the DECS website yielded 20 results (22 with two set of duplicates/near replicates), thirteen of which were germane. The seven less relevant results applied to the National Day of Action, Cybersafety pages, archived news releases, and frequently asked questions. Pertinent results included a bullying policy (to be subsequently discussed) and two distinct pages linking to a bullying parent tip sheet supplied by the NT Department of Children and Families. This tip
sheet defined bullying, described characteristics of perpetrators and victims, briefly mentioned
effects of bullying, provided tactics to use when responding to bullying, and listed a few
resources to be consulted for more information.261

The remaining pertinent results were associated with Safe Schools NT, a territory-specific
framework established in order to help NT schools build safe environments through
implementation of the NSSF. On individual pages linked from the Safe Schools NT main page,
each of the NSSF’s nine key elements is distilled into short, manageable concepts.262 Links to
applicable local, national, and/or international resources are provided on every page. Additional
“behaviour resources and support” are found on a page also linked from the main Safe Schools
NT page.263 Relative to the other content, the Safe Schools NT Code of Behaviour is the most
comprehensive resource. Designed for students, teachers, parents, and the wider school
community, this document highlights their unique roles “in a partnership to create and maintain
schools as safe and supportive teaching and learning communities.”262 Expectations for school
community members (students; parents/caregivers; unspecified) and school/district employees
(teachers and school staff; principals; DECS staff) are succinctly outlined.264 Examples of
unacceptable behaviour and its consequences are briefly provided along with objectives that
must be achieved through the delivery of such consequences.264 The Safe Schools NT Code of
Behaviour mentions bullying only once, stating that NT schools seek to produce “learning
environments free from bullying, aggression and violence in any form.”264 Content in this
document appears to be an extension of the NSSF as opposed to a restatement of it.

Although it is claimed that Safe Schools NT actually implements the NSSF,262 minimal
evidence was found to support this assertion. Compared to the quantity and quality of
information available in the NSSF resource manual, the usable content provided by Safe Schools
is quite limited. These materials alone would be inadequate for Northern Territory schools to effectively put the NSSF into practice. It would appear that schools, rather than the DECS, would shoulder the majority of the burden in interpreting and implementing the NSSF.

Following the key word search, the next step was an inspection of NT policies (accessible via link from the DECS website’s main page). Given that policy content could not be directly searched, it was necessary to manually inspect the policy list to determine which items might be relevant. Of the 93 total DECS policy instruments, five were selected for further consideration based on their titles (even though for several, the probability/likelihood of relevance was tenuous). Bullying was only mentioned in two of the five policies (Bullying, Harassment & Violence and Social Media); the remaining policies were evaluated for relevance to bullying. Accordingly, one policies was discarded (Safeguarding the Wellbeing of Children – Obligations for the Mandatory Reporting of Harm and Exploitation), while the other two were retained due to potential or obvious associations with Safe Schools NT.

Based on their titles, the Bullying, Harassment & Violence policy (2009/06788) and the Code of Conduct for Schools policy (DOC2011/01139) initially appeared promising. However, once examined, it was quickly apparent that neither was of any use. The former was aimed at preventing workplace bullying among DECS employees, and contained no discussion of schools, students, or children/adolescents. Similarly, the latter identified expected conduct for adults (school employees and/or visitors) as opposed to students. While they were more relevant than the previous policies given that they pertained to students, the Social Media in Schools policy (EDOC2014/20003) and accompanying guidelines and procedures (EDOC2014/20002) unsurprisingly mentioned only cyberbullying, not so-called “traditional” bullying. As was noted previously, cyberbullying is beyond the scope of this investigation.
The final document, *School Wellbeing and Behaviour*, was labeled a policy guide rather than a policy (the distinction of which was not explained). Since this document and its associated template were presented as *Safe Schools NT* materials, it is unclear why they were found only in the policy list and not linked from the *Safe Schools NT* website. The *School Wellbeing and Behaviour* policy guide identifies and clarifies required sections in the soon-to-be-created policy:

- Rationale
- Core Principles of Best Practice
- School Beliefs about Behaviour and Learning
- Creating Positive Learning Communities
  1. Promoting wellbeing and positive behaviour (relate to Code of Behaviour when possible)
  2. Acknowledging and rewarding exemplary and improving behaviour
  3. Programs to promote positive learning communities
- Consequences for Unacceptable Behaviour
  1. Being clear about unacceptable behaviour
  2. Our school’s responses to unacceptable behaviour
  3. Students with high behavioural support needs
- Student Support Networks
- Related Legislation, Policies and Links
- Further Attachments

The accompanying *School Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy Management Plan* template’s stated purposes include achieving consistency in policy development and implementation throughout the territory, aligning with the *Safe Schools NT Code of Behaviour*, and facilitating the creation of a policy “focusing on maintaining a supportive school environment and developing responsible behaviour in all students.” However, the same could be said for the policy guide itself. Regardless of these purported functions, the template primarily reiterates the policy guide’s content and generally fails to expand upon it. The only unique information provided in the template is a few principles student behaviour programs and practices should fulfill:

- Embracing a health-promoting approach to create a safe, supportive, and caring environment
- Embracing inclusiveness and adapting for different student potentials, needs, and resources
- Placing the student at the center of the education process
Queensland

The state of Queensland is situated in the northeastern region of mainland Australia. Queensland’s Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE) hosts a tremendously detailed website that provides information on all departmental functions. Due to the level of detail, it was at times challenging to analyze the information, determine relevancy, extract useful elements, and synthesize findings.

**Policy instruments.** The main area of the DETE website explored was the “Policy Instruments” section within the “Policy and Procedure Register.” According to the DETE, policy is created either through law or government action. The former is designated as legislation, while the latter consists of the following categories: 1) Policy, 2) Directives, 3) Standards, 4) Procedures, 5) Delegations and authorities, 6) Guidelines, 7) Supporting documents, and 8) Forms. Given the absence of a search function, it was necessary to manually review “Policy and Procedure Register” content to determine whether bullying-related materials were present. An exhaustive inspection was nearly impossible due to the excessive volume of information. Therefore, the “Find” function for the key word “bullying” was utilized within the document lists and descriptions for policy and government action categories. In addition, the “Find” function was also performed within certain documents selected for further review based upon the perceived relevance of the titles. To further narrow the focus, only the “School Education” sections were inspected among the government action categories containing multiple sections. It is recognized that these methods may be insufficient. Bullying may be discussed in documents without the key term of “bullying” being present in the description, and the titles may not be reliable indicators of the likelihood of bullying being discussed in the documents. However, this was judged as the most efficient approach.
While no Queensland legislative instruments contained information regarding bullying, a number of policies, standards, procedures, guidelines, and supporting documents pertaining to bullying and/or related concepts were discovered. For a complete list of documents located and examined, please see Appendix G. Only the most pertinent documents will be discussed. Interestingly, much of the content of each distinct policy instrument mirrors that of the others to a large degree. As such, these instruments can be described as circular.

The notion of wellbeing is a unifying concept under which the majority of the documents can be categorized. Although not presented as such, the Learning and Wellbeing Framework (LAWF) (published 2012) and A Whole School Approach to Support Student Learning (WSASL) policy (published 2014) appear to function in concert as overarching policies encompassing the majority of the other policy instruments. The LAWF emphasizes the interconnectedness of student wellbeing and learning outcomes, and is designed to help schools identify and coordinate programs that support wellbeing. An optimal learning environment utilizes consistent, explicit school-wide rules and consequences that are developed collaboratively, are enforced in a positive manner, and that reward good behavior. Curricula must embed personal and social competencies in self-and-social awareness and management. In addition, schools are expected to encourage students to actively confront bullying, prejudice, and other behaviours that negatively impact wellbeing. The WSASL policy concentrates on reinforcing the learning needs of a diverse student population via differentiated, explicit, focused, and intensive teaching methods. It also affirms the reciprocal relationship between student learning, achievement, and behaviour, which additional policy instruments (discussed below) consider in greater detail.

If the policy instruments were arranged as a conceptual map, the notions of safe and supportive school environments (essential ingredients of the NSSF) would be the next
(sequential) elements. According to the DETE, all Queensland schools should develop school-wide positive approaches to create safe, supportive, and disciplined environments that maximize student learning and achievement. The Statement of Expectations for a Disciplined School Environment policy (SEDSE) complements the previous two policies (LAWF and WSASL) by echoing the reciprocity between academic success and social behaviour and reiterating the requirement for a school-wide behaviour plan. This plan is described as an “evidence-based approach to promoting positive behaviour and maintaining teaching and learning environments that support learning and wellbeing for all students” - a statement which perfectly illustrates the policy instruments’ circular nature. Each school’s plan must be developed, implemented, and evaluated while considering and adapting to the school community’s distinctive cultural and contextual characteristics.

Core elements to be reflected include principal leadership, parent/community engagement, data informed decision making, clear and consistent behavioural expectations, and explicit teaching of appropriate behaviour to all students.

No directives relevant to bullying were identified. The sole relevant standard, The Code of School Behaviour (The Code), delineates responsibilities of and consistent behavioural criteria for students, staff, administration, and parents within each school community. The Code once again relies upon (based on) the ideals of safe, supportive, and disciplined school environments. Requirements of The Code include the provision of positive support to foster high achievement and behaviour standards, and consistent and well-defined responses and consequences for inappropriate behaviour. This standard also highlights two additional policy instruments – the Safe, Supportive, and Disciplined School Environment procedure and the Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students document - with accompanying guidelines.
The Safe, Supportive, and Disciplined School Environment (SSDSE) procedure is designated by the SEDSE policy and supported by The Code. This procedure requires all Queensland schools to create a Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students (to be subsequently discussed) and to apply disciplinary consequences when necessary. In addition, SSDSE provides for the use of time out as a proactive and behaviour management strategy, and for the use of physical restraint in special circumstances (prevention of self-injury or harm to others) as an immediate or emergency response. Disciplinary consequences can include suspension, cancellation of enrollment (standard consequences) as well as detention, discipline improvement plans, and community service interventions (optional consequences). Schools have autonomy to determine which behaviour management strategies and disciplinary consequences they apply. The SSDSE procedure also designates responsibilities for school principals, teachers, and school staff.\textsuperscript{278}

Within the “Policy and Procedure Register,” the Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students is a supporting document defined by guidelines. Responsible behaviour plans are designed to promote positive learning environments and to encourage appropriate student behavior.\textsuperscript{279} They are developed within each school community to address its own unique needs. A template, guidelines, and an exemplar are provided to assist schools in consistent plan development and implementation.\textsuperscript{280} Content is expected to align with related policy instruments previously discussed, and must be communicated to staff, students, and families. The following sections are mandatory:

1. Purpose
2. Consultation and data review
3. Learning and behaviour statement
4. Processes for facilitating standards of positive behaviour and responding to unacceptable behaviour
   • Universal, targeted, and intensive behaviour support
5. Emergency responses or critical incidents
Bullying was mentioned only briefly in the guidelines. It was stated that universal behaviour support approaches (section 4) should incorporate the “implementation of programs to address bullying and inappropriate online behavior.” Descriptions of consequences for unacceptable behaviour (section 6) must contain well-defined procedures for staff and students for “preventing and responding to all forms of bullying behaviour (including cyberbullying).” These vague statements can be categorized under the “policy-stating-the-need-for-policy” umbrella.

Incidentally, bullying was discussed more frequently in the exemplar than in the guidelines from which it would purportedly have arisen. One of the document appendices was devoted to a “School policy for preventing and responding to incidents of bullying (including cyberbullying)” which can be viewed in Appendix H. It was not clear whether this was meant as a sample policy or if it was intended for inclusion in all school responsible behaviour plans. This policy appeared to focus on supplying background information on bullying and reiterating aspects of the schoolwide positive support process at the expense of providing meaningful components unique to (designed for) bullying (i.e., not previously discussed in a more general behaviour policy). The policy also included a brief summary of “student curriculum modules of the anti-bullying process” without introduction or any prior mention. Like the policy itself, it was unclear if these were merely examples of possible tactics, or whether it was expected that such curricular approaches be standard for all schools. Unfortunately, because the referenced curricula had been neither adequately described nor attached, there was no process by which its content could be ascertained or attributed to a source.
Supplemental materials. Given that bullying curriculum had not been mentioned in any other policy instruments, subsequent searching was conducted in an attempt to resolve this inconsistency. While nothing pertinent regarding curriculum was obtained, a multitude of additional resources were uncovered accidentally during random exploration of the DETE website (the repercussions of which will be discussed in the “Implications” section to follow). Specifically, a “Behaviour” domain was discovered after clicking on the following headings: Students → Health and wellbeing → Further resources → Preventing bullying and violence.\(^{282}\)

A variety of documents were housed under here, including materials developed by Dr. Ken Rigby (a recognized Australian authority on bullying) during a 2009 consultation with the Queensland DETE. Dr. Rigby had created six video podcasts (called “vodcasts”) designed to educate school staff about bullying. Topics covered include the nature of bullying, school response to bullying, addressing bullying in the classroom, various methods of intervening, working with parents, and evaluating antibullying procedures.\(^{283}\) Five case studies were also provided to concretely illustrate how selected Queensland schools were managing bullying using positive, whole school approaches. Strikingly, although these were merely intended as training materials, they provided more suitable, tangible, bullying-specific policy guidance than any of the actual policy instruments. The following is a summary of information gleaned from the vodcasts:

What is needed before you can respond to bullying at your school?
1. Evidence of bullying
   - The prevalence
   - The kinds of bullying
2. Among whom is it happening
   - In what years or classes
   - In what areas of the school
3. How students are feeling about it
   - Those victimized
   - Other students
4. An antibullying policy
   - Based on an understanding of the situation at your school
Four components of an antibullying policy:
1. To declare the school’s intention to address bullying
2. To explain why the school is doing so
3. To provide an outline in general terms about how the school is tackling the problem
4. To inform all members of the school community about what the school is committed to doing

Suggested Elements of an antibullying policy:
1. A strong statement about the unacceptability of bullying at school and a resolve to prevent it from happening
2. A clear definition of bullying and what it can involve
3. An assertion of the rights of members of the school community NOT to be subjected to bullying and an acceptance of responsibility to deal with it the best we can
4. A list of the things the school has agreed to do to prevent bullying;
   - Provide good surveillance of student behaviour
   - Discuss with students issues related to bullying
   - Help students to develop attitudes and values that will guide them toward relating positively with others – and skills to help themselves – and others – when bullying occurs
5. A general description of what the school will do when cases of bullying arise
6. A resolution to revisit the policy and revise it (if necessary) in light of evidence every few years

Two aspects of the problem:
1. Universal preventive: what is needed to reduce the likelihood of bullying
2. Focused interventive: what needs to be done when cases arise

Based on one of Dr. Rigby’s recommendations in a published consultancy report, Enhancing Responses to Bullying in Queensland Schools, the Queensland Schools Alliance Against Violence (QSAAV) was established in 2010. It was formed to independently advise the government on “best [evidence-based] practice measures to address bullying and violence in Queensland schools” which were to be sourced nationally and internationally. Vital resources developed by the QSAAV (and also located in the “Behaviour” domain) include the “Working Together” series on bullying, which serves as a framework from which schools can address bullying.

The primary resource - Working Together: A toolkit for effective school based action against bullying – was designed to be an evolving collection of practical strategies. Applying principles from the United Kingdom’s Safe to Learn publication, the toolkit describes the roles, expectations, and commitments of/for various members of the school community (e.g., bullying perpetrators/victims, school leaders/staff, and parents) as well as for the school as a whole.
The toolkit also advocates that schools employ a compiled list of essential elements of whole school antibullying approaches (synthesized from Australian national and international research and program reviews, including Rigby’s research) and subsequently explains them in detail.

The elements are as follows:

Elements of effective school based action against bullying
1. Create a caring, respectful, inclusive and supportive school culture
2. Establish a clear whole school definition of bullying
3. Establish a clear antibullying policy developed in collaboration with staff, students and parents/carers, which addresses all forms of bullying
4. Collaboratively develop procedural steps to respond appropriately to bullying incidents that are clearly documented and define the roles and responsibilities of staff, students and parents/carers
5. Establish teaching and learning programs that promote personal development and address all forms of bullying through the teaching of language skills, social-cognitive abilities, social skills, assertiveness, coping strategies, group mechanisms, motives for bullying and being effective bystanders
6. Provide professional development to assist school staff to understand the antibullying policy, implement teacher and learning programs, and to provide support for students at high risk and in high risk settings
7. Consult students regularly to monitor and determine the types of bullying behaviour and in what school and social contexts bullying occurs
8. Create physical environments in the school and staff supervision practices that limit the incidences of bullying
9. Support and engage families by maintaining regular, clear communication and through systematic parent awareness raising and skill building
10. Establish a process for regularly reviewing and celebrating the effectiveness of school policies, programs and procedures

Collectively, these features and elements point towards valuable considerations during/for policy creation, review, and evaluation, and may even function as the building blocks of antibullying policies and practices. The toolkit also includes sample staff/student/parent fact sheets and surveys, evaluation checklists, links to further resources, and even an example antibullying policy (provided in Appendix I).

The “Working Together” series also consists of a community alliances starter kit, case studies of effective school based actions, and a report of student consultation. Community alliances strive to “facilitate cooperative work across schooling sectors and other key stakeholders to address bullying and violence in school communities.” Their responsibilities include increasing knowledge/comprehension of effective strategies, improving local school responses via information-sharing, and monitoring and reviewing local school trends or patterns.
of bullying and violence.\textsuperscript{288} Provided to illustrate good local practice in Queensland state, independent, and Catholic schools,\textsuperscript{289} the case studies encompass five “whole school approaches”, two “restorative practice approaches”, and five “social and emotional approaches.”\textsuperscript{290} Student consultation was undertaken in order to characterize students’ perspective as valuable and insightful stakeholders in the antibullying process. Participants were queried and provided feedback about the nature and impact of bullying, the development and implementation of school antibullying policies, and bullying response procedures.\textsuperscript{284} In addition to reviewing the findings, the consultation report seeks to provide a model for schools to use when adopting the student consultation process.\textsuperscript{284}

**Implications of support materials and the process by which they were obtained.**

After these additional resources were located and reviewed, several major concerns/criticisms became evident. Firstly, these supplemental materials contained more and better policy-related guidance than any of the actual DETE policy instruments (which focused more generally on appropriate behaviour and positive learning environments). The vodcasts, intended only for school staff, specified prerequisites for bullying response as well as chief aims of and precise necessary ingredients for antibullying policies. The “Working Together” series (for which the anticipated audience was not as apparent) expanded upon these essential elements, highlighted potential intervention approaches, and identified supportive practices that may broaden the policy’s impact. This discrepancy seems difficult to justify.

Based on the Rigby consultancy and QSAAV formation (2009 and 2010, respectively), it is clear that the DETE recognizes the significance of bullying and consequently, the importance of instituting formalized bullying prevention and intervention measures. Many of the existing policy instruments may have even been developed after 2010 (suggesting a direct influence from
Rigby/QSAAV), although because not all dates are available, this cannot be confirmed. It makes no sense that official departmental positions would be so broad-based, while optional materials would be so focused and constructive. Why is there no official antibullying policy, or even a mandate for such a policy? Why invest the time/resources without seeing the process through to fruition? While it can be argued that fostering consistent standards and expectations for behaviour is antecedent to bullying prevention, it is not sufficient. A case can be made for the quantity of available information being a liability. Emphasis on depth/breadth over substance can overwhelm the recipients and may result in confusion and an inability to separate/prioritize importance (diminishing returns). A more streamlined approach might be advantageous.

Secondly, the search exposed a considerable limitation in the DETE website’s organization and structure. The term accidental was used above to describe the process by which the “Behaviour” subdomain was found because this particular sequence of actions might not be easily replicable. This subdomain\(^{291}\) had never before been encountered despite the fact that much of the linked content on its main page (behaviour policy instruments) had been repeatedly accessed. These key documents had all been located in the education.qld.gov.au/behaviour domain – a minute yet critical distinction. Moreover, this domain had not been revealed during prior searches using “bullying” as a key term (338 results on DETE main page), nor in conjunction with any of the DETE website sections explored during the policy instrument review. Numerous subsequent targeted attempts to access this “Behaviour” domain plausibly from the main DETE webpage were also unsuccessful. Crucially, if this supplemental search had not been conducted, it is likely none of these resources would have been discovered. There did not seem to be a way to access the main “Behaviour” webpage through any logical link from the main “Education” webpage, which is of concern. It is odd that such useful resources would be so difficult to locate,
rather than being highlighted or emphasized on the main webpage. At the very least, this demonstrates a weakness in organization, and may also indicate inappropriate resource prioritization for antibullying efforts.

**South Australia**

South Australia is located in the south-central portion of the Australian mainland. The policy homepage of South Australia’s Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) served as the starting point. A keyword search for “bullying” yielded 927 results, subsequent browsing of which revealing that the majority were not policy documents. Instead, the list of 202 policies, procedures, and documents was manually examined, and items were chosen for further review based on perceived relevancy of their titles. Of the 11 items selected, 10 mentioned bullying, but only two proved to be both pertinent to school bullying and to possess meaningful content.

The first of the applicable results was a brochure for parents and caregivers about school bullying and harassment. It was neither policy nor procedure and was of a general nature. The second was a school discipline policy statement (updated March 2007) that broadly mentioned bullying on a few occasions. According to this policy, South Australia learning communities are expected to be bullying-and-harassment free; school staff will manage “sexual and racial harassment and bullying” to facilitate student respect and responsibility; and teachers will create classroom management tactics that “deal effectively with sexual harassment, racism and bullying.” While encouraging, this information was inadequate.

Next, a key word search for “bullying” was conducted on the DECD main page and, oddly, yielded the identical 927 results as the policy search. A thorough appraisal of these results would have been inefficient and perhaps unfeasible. Therefore, a logic-based inspection ensued,
whereby the DECD site was perused at length. Bullying-related content was primarily found to be contained within the “Child and Student Wellbeing” section. Potentially germane topical headings included behaviour management; bullying and harassment (becoming “bullying, harassment and violence once clicked”); and cyber safety (out of scope with this study). The behaviour management subsection was minimal. It linked to the other two sections and failed to include anything pertinent that was not also provided in the other two subsections.

The “Bullying, Harassment and Violence” subsection confirmed the authority of the School Discipline Policy over DECD schools, and cited a requirement for all schools to have antibullying and harassment policies, “either as [individual statements] or as part of [school] behaviour [codes].” Definitions and examples of bullying, harassment, and violence were presented, and links to national resources (e.g., Safe Schools Hub, Bullying. No Way!) were provided. Sourcing the NSSF, this subsection also concisely catalogued bullying consequences and protective factors, discussed the relationship between wellbeing and bullying, and outlined “approaches, strategies, and components [to prevent and reduce] bullying in schools” (contained below):

- A universal whole-school approach of long duration that takes a multi-faceted approach rather than focusing on one single component.
- A whole-school detailed policy that addresses bullying.
- Effective classroom management and classroom rules.
- The promotion of a positive school environment that provides safety, security and support for students and promotes positive relationships and student wellbeing.
- Effective methods of behaviour management that are consistently used, are non-hedda and non-punitive.
- Encouragement and skill development for all students (and especially bystanders) to respond negatively to bullying behaviour and support students who are bullied.
- Social skill development within teaching and learning activities (e.g. through the use of cooperative learning).
- Enhancement of the school physical environment and its supervision.
- Teacher professional development and classroom curriculum units that address bullying and related issues.
- Counselling for individual students and collaboration with other appropriate professionals.
- Parent partnerships and education.

Additional evidence-informed approaches that have been identified as having significant potential include:
- Addressing boredom and disengagement both in class and the playground.
- Values education with a focus on respect for the rights and feelings of others, acceptance of diversity, compassion, fairness, cooperation and inclusion.
- The use of the Method of Shared Concern or the Support Group Approach.
- The use of the Restorative Practices approach.
- The use of Positive Behaviour Support.
- The use of “social architecture” i.e. redesigning students’ social interactions and facilitating social opportunities within a class or year-level context.
- Early intervention with students identified as being at-risk for bullying others or being bullied in order to provide them with developmental support.

The above recommendations are general, which is unsurprising considering their origin (the NSSF). Most of the links lead to the Safe Schools Hub. In fact, it was discovered that this
entire section was verbatim NSSF language, with no modifications or adjustments whatsoever. Whereas utilizing national resources is obviously desirable from the perspective of the national government, this reliance can also be viewed as a significant shortcoming from a critical standpoint. Besides the fact that the recommendations are general, everything is replicated from the national perspective, which undermines the purpose of a regional government. Regional governments should use national materials as starting points, not ending points.

Arguably the most relevant item in the “Bullying, Harassment and Violence subsection was the Anti-Bullying Policy – School Audit Checklist and Support Information document available for download. This document serves a dual function of providing both policy guidelines/support and a self-assessment tool to evaluate the presence and quality of specified policy components and/or support mechanisms. The school audit checklist is presented first, containing the following sections:298

- Statement
- Definitions
- Reporting and Responsibilities
- How to recognize a student is being bullied
- Other considerations
- Actions
- Prevention, intervention and coping strategies
- Training and development
- Distribution list
- Review date
- Documented processes
- Further information

The remainder of this document is contained under the heading, “Support information for a school’s anti-bullying policy.”298 Essentially, these pages explain.describe each section from the preceding school audit checklist. This information can be interpreted as guidelines and foundation for the development of school antibullying policies; Appendix J includes this section in its entirety. This document is a crucial antibullying resource that should have been displayed
prominently on the main website (like in other provinces), or at least logically linked for easy access. Assuming bullying is taken seriously and antibullying work is a priority, the challenge here is understanding why this guidance was provided only in a supplemental document and not emphasized anywhere else on the website. It was not easy to find and could have been overlooked. The same concerns discussed in the section on Queensland (above) are relevant.

**Tasmania**

The island of Tasmania, located off of Australia’s southern coast, is the only Australian state or territory not situated on the mainland. Compared to some of the other states and territories, Tasmania’s main government website\(^299\) was challenging to navigate. Given that no search function was readily visible, it was necessary to locate an alternative website\(^300\) to facilitate searches of all Tasmanian government organizations. A search using the key term “bullying” produced 100 results, the majority of which were irrelevant, repetitious, or pertained to workplace bullying rather than school bullying. Of the limited results relating to school bullying, information on cyberbullying and cyber-safety significantly outnumbered that on so-called “traditional” school bullying. Media releases and announcements were also common. An additional search was conducted within the Department of Education Tasmania (DoE)\(^301\) with the hope of obtaining supplementary useful results. However, no unique results (items not previously located) were detected. The term “bullying” was not found in Tasmania’s DoE site map, nor were any documents specifically and exclusively pertaining to bullying present in the sections for DoE forms, framework, guidelines, policies, procedures, or statements.\(^302\) Furthermore, a search of Tasmania’s consolidated legislation online\(^303\) using “bullying” as a key word did not yield any results.
Tasmania’s *Education Act of 1994* was mentioned in a number of documents but did not appear to be available on the Department of Education website. A copy of the law was subsequently located on the Tasmanian legislation website. Rather than providing a downloadable or full-text HTML version of the act, the site required each part, division, and section of the act (approximately 100 total) to be accessed individually. Therefore, the titles were scanned and anything possibly relevant to bullying was selected; the only item meeting this condition was Division 4 (Discipline) of Part 3 – State Education. The following information was provided for unacceptable behaviour:

36. **Unacceptable behaviour**

(1) A student of a State school is to behave in a manner acceptable to the principal.

(2) Behaviour which is not acceptable includes behaviour which—

(a) constitutes refusal to participate in the education programme; or

(b) constitutes disobedience of instructions which regulate the conduct of students; or

(c) is likely to impede significantly the learning of the other students of that school; or

(d) is likely to be detrimental to the health, safety or welfare of the staff or other students of that school; or

(e) causes or is likely to cause damage; or

(f) is likely to bring that school into disrepute; or

(g) constitutes any other behaviour that the Secretary determines.

Bullying is a behaviour that can impede student learning and may be detrimental to students’ health, safety, or welfare (corresponding to items (c) and (d), above). The word “bullying” was not mentioned in the *Education Act*, nor any other piece of legislation on this website.

Next, several procedures, policies, and guidelines were examined for potential relevance to bullying:

- Guidelines for Supporting Sexual and Gender Diversity in Schools and Colleges
- Health and Wellbeing Policy Driver
- Learner Health Care and Safety Policy
- Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy
- Student Engagement and Retention Policy
- Student Behaviour Procedure
The most useful of these documents was the *Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy*, which appears to be modeled after the NSSF. A number of previously-discussed NSSF features common to other state and territory policies are evident. Among the stated purposes of this policy are to provide safe and inclusive learning environments, and to support DoE values of equity, respect, and relationships.\(^{305}\) Definitions are provided for key terms including whole school approach, bullying, and harassment. Responsibilities for schools, staff, Department administrators and managers, principals, teachers, parents/families/caregivers, and learners are delineated. Unlike many of the other states and territories, this policy was intended not only for school-aged bullying, but also early childhood and higher education settings.

Several of the remaining policy documents are consistent with the *Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy* and/or the NSSF. The *Student Behaviour Procedure* was the most comprehensive, in fact far exceeding the length of the *Learning Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy*. With a stated purpose of providing safe and inclusive learning environments, this procedure highlights unacceptable student behaviour and the range of consequences (detention, suspension, exclusion, expulsion, and prohibition) that can be imposed by DoE administrators and school principals.\(^{306}\) Several documents meant to accompany this procedure could not be accessed due to password protection. The *Health and Wellbeing Policy Driver* echoes the DoE core values and statement of intent, while also asserting that health, wellbeing, and safety are “essential conditions for successful learning.”\(^{307}\) Although the *Learner Health Care and Safety Policy* is most closely associated with physical health and medical care, its discussion of protection from harm and promotion of safety are familiar.\(^{308}\)

The *Guidelines for Supporting Sexual and Gender Diversity in Schools and Colleges* were somewhat less pertinent to the *Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy* due to a narrower
scope. Discrimination, harassment, and bullying based on sexual orientation and/or gender identity were discussed. Least relevant was the *Student Engagement and Retention Policy* which centered on attendance and participation for the promotion of educational attainment. It did not relate to bullying or to the *Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy*.

Apart from the above guidelines, policies, and procedures, Tasmania’s DoE provided little other content about bullying. Based on the presence of multiple news releases (covering topics such as antibullying video competitions), it is clear that Tasmania recognizes bullying as an issue warranting serious concern. Therefore, it is all the more puzzling that this awareness has not been translated into specific policies or procedures regarding the prevention of and/or responses to bullying.

**Victoria**

The state of Victoria is located in the southeastern portion of the Australian mainland. Initial searches on the main government page (hereby referred to as vic.gov) using the key term “bullying” revealed over 17,000,000 results. A subsequent key word search for “bullying” conducted on the Victoria Department of Education and Training, or DET (formerly the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development prior to January 1, 2015) website yielded 660 results. Therefore, a manual inspection of DET website content was required in order to (hopefully) locate bullying-related content. Limited information was contained on the DET website main page compared to the other states and territories, making it necessary to delve deeply into the headings and subsequent menus. This exploration was of considerable duration due to the level of convolution and multiple redundancies that were encountered. A website for Victorian legislative and parliamentary documents was also accessed, but nothing relevant was obtained from “bullying” key words searches of both acts and laws. An illustration/depiction of
the time-intensive tactics employed in this search can be found in Appendix K. Unfortunately, the majority of content surveyed was determined to be of little value. The “Find” function was utilized for the key word “bullying” in all potentially relevant pages, headings, sections, documents, and links. Only a fraction of these mentioned bullying, and even fewer did so other than merely in passing. A full day’s search produced only a handful of useful resources (eight DET webpages including several policies, three annual reports, and one document). Countless other pages, sites, and documents had been examined and rejected.

**Webpages.** The most valuable item was the collection of DET webpages devoted to *Bully Stoppers*, a Victorian bullying prevention campaign launched in March 2013. *Bully Stoppers* is an online toolkit providing user-friendly, interactive, and printable resources designed to help students, parents, teachers, and principals. Materials consist of advice sheets, learning modules, activity guides, case studies, and videos. Content for students included topics related to bullying victims and perpetrators, reasons for being bullied, bullying witnesses, and Cybersafety. Content for parents included warning signs of bullying, reasons for victimization and/or perpetration, and talking to the school. Content to teachers included identifying and addressing bullying, individual and classroom strategies, and behaviour support plans. Content for principals was the most comprehensive and most useful in terms of proactive rather than reactive methods. Distinct pages pertained to the role of schools (i.e., characteristics of safe/respectful schools), legal duty of care, incident response, reporting systems, vulnerable students, and data collection (surveys). The page on reporting systems cited an additional resource not contained in *Bully Stoppers* - a *Respectful Communities Practice Guide* document from the “Click on Wellbeing” DET-affiliated website that was unfortunately only accessible to
DET employees/affiliates. A final *Bully Stoppers* webpage (regarding considerations for bullying prevention policy) will be discussed in the policy section (below).

Another relevant item was a parent-focused webpage (*School ➔ For Parents ➔ Child Health and Safety ➔ Child Health and Wellbeing ➔ Bullying*) that provided general information on bullying (definition, types, inclusive/exclusive behaviours, signs of bullying, and suggestions for action).313 A webpage in the *School ➔ For Teachers and School Staff* section overviewing “Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance” cited the need for a bullying prevention policy to be developed collaboratively by all members of the school community314 but included no further detail. A webpage in the *School ➔ For Principals and Administrators* section (but also linked from the *School ➔ For Parents* and *School ➔ For Teachers and Support Staff* sections) briefly mentioned bullying and peer relationships, touching on the NSSF and *Bully Stoppers*. The remaining webpages pertain to policy, and are discussed below.

**Policies.** It is important to note that, unlike the majority of the Australian states and territories, no repository of policies was found on the DET website nor vic.gov. A key word search on the DET website main page using the words “policy” and “policies” revealed 1,900 and 650 results, respectively. Since these results were too numerous to inspect, the Victorian government main website was the next option. A key search for “policy” and “policies” here revealed 197,000,000 and 196,000,000 results, respectively. When “education policy” was selected from a list of related searches, 232,000,000 results were revealed, and the subsequent selection of “school policy” from another related search list revealed 712,000,000 results. The number of results defy reason and common sense. First, it is logically if not mathematically impossible that narrowing a search would produce **more** results than the original search. Second, it is entirely improbable that a territory government website could possibly produce hundreds of
millions of results. Google searches for popular topics don’t approach to that number. Even if the search function was somehow internet-wide instead of website-wide (mistakenly defined), producing that volume of results would still be highly unlikely. Another search from the main government page (For Victorians heading → Education → Education sector & policy → Educational policy) provided only two results, neither of which was a policy and both of which link back to the DET (see Appendix L for more details).

Five policies (two of which are included among the seven useful webpages) were discovered only after/because the DET website was examined almost in its entirety. They were housed within the standard website menus, with no special emphasis and typically at quite low levels, requiring the user to select many superordinate items to reveal them. With even slightly less time and persistence, these policies could have easily been overlooked. Aside from a section heading entitled “Purpose of this policy,” the pages were nearly interchangeable with co-located pages in terms of format and appearance. This refuting evidence makes one question whether policy may have been used a descriptive term rather than a legal/procedure term. These webpages were located within the School Policy & Advisory guide (School → For Principals and Administrators → School Policy & Advisory Guide). Identified policies related to student engagement; bullying; child protection – reporting obligations; health and wellbeing services; and student support services. Only the first two policies were relevant to bullying.

Initially, the bullying policy (School Policy & Advisory Guide → Student Safety → Protection and Support → Bullying) appeared to be most applicable. However, this belief was challenged from the beginning. Its stated purpose to “support schools to create safe and respectful school environments and prevent bullying, cyberbullying and other unacceptable behaviours” is an obvious replication of the NSSF rather than a clearer, more precise objective. The policy’s utility
was further diminished when it was noted immediately thereafter that schools must have “a statement about bullying and behaviours in their Student Engagement Policy” (to be subsequently discussed). Incredibly, there is no actual requirement for a bullying policy. Although it was (reasonably) assumed that the page would outline components of a mandatory, individual anti-bully policy, it instead briefly described what is only required to comprise one sentence within a different policy. Such ambiguity and leniency elicits questions as to whether DET recognizes bullying as a substantial issue necessitating its own policy. Also included in this webpage is a condensed section of general bullying information (concise definition; bullying categories/examples; and identification of related behaviours/terms not classified as bullying), all of which is consistent with the parent information page content. The final (brief) section identifies six potential approaches for schools to utilize; the five most relevant are listed below:

- Promote/support safe/respectful environments where bullying is not tolerated
- Put in place whole-school strategies/initiatives as outlined in the Department’s antibullying policy
- Develop a Student Engagement Policy including processes/strategies to prevent/respond to incidents of bullying/other forms of unacceptable behaviour
- Work in partnership with parents to reduce and manage bullying
- Take a whole-school approach focusing on safety and wellbeing

It is evident that the above suggestions are of a general nature. They neither supplement nor extend NSSF content and are in fact much less useful by comparison given the NSSF manual that delves more deeply. The second item raises a significant concern by referencing “the Department’s anti-bullying policy.” It had been assumed that this webpage was the DET bullying policy. Considering the exhaustive search of the DET website and infrequent bullying references therein, it can be said with assurance that any other existing bullying policy would have been located. The only possible explanation is the Bully Stoppers bullying prevention policy webpage, which states that all schools should develop a bullying prevention policy. Consistent with the
“School Advisory & Policy Guide” bullying page, it is stated here that the bullying policy can form part of the Student Engagement Policy for government schools. The following is a summary of actions for schools to take when writing a bullying prevention policy:

- Acknowledge the need to develop a shared understanding across the whole school community that all forms of bullying are unacceptable
- Provide clear definitions of what/what is not bullying, including descriptions of bullying subtypes
- Provide clear advice on the roles and responsibilities of students, parents, caregivers and teachers for preventing and responding to bullying behaviour
- Include strategies for developing and implementing whole school bullying prevention programs
- Support the whole school community to recognise and respond appropriately to bullying, harassment, and victimization when they see it
- Include clear procedures for students, teachers, other staff, and parents for reporting bullying incidents to the school
- Recognise the importance of consistently responding to all incidents of bullying that have been reported to the school, and ensure that planned interventions are used to respond to these incidents
- Ensure that support is provided to any student who has been affected by, engaged in, or witnessed bullying behaviour
- Provide regular updates to parents or caregivers about the management of incidents
- Seek to identify, and respond effectively to, patterns of bullying behaviour
- Seek to identify ‘hot spots’ for bullying in the school environment and find ways to address them
- Develop a communications plan to promote the policy and ensure the whole school community understands the school’s bullying prevention practices
- Ensure the policy is easily accessible within the school community and published on school website
- Review the policy annually with the school community
- Monitor bullying in the school community, and if necessary, review and modify the policy accordingly
- Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the policy and make adjustments when needed

Like other states and territories, most of these recommendations are obviously derived from the NSSF. Once again, this has both positive and negative implications – good for consistency and adherence, bad from the perspective of tailoring, increasing specificity, and extending. Ironically, this bullying policy guidance far surpasses the almost nonexistent corresponding content of the “School Advisory & Policy Guide”. If this is considered the DET antibullying policy, additional concerns arise. It is strange that the antibullying policy would be a part of Bully Stoppers rather than the “School Advisory & Policy Guide”, and also curious that the “School Advisory & Policy Guide” would refer to a departmental policy but not identify it,
provide it, or even link to it. Whether indicative of mere carelessness or a more fundamental weakness in organization or prioritization, these inconsistencies are nonetheless alarming.

Considering that bullying prevention policies can be subsumed by the Student Engagement Policy, it is surprising that bullying is barely mentioned in it. Instead, this policy employs a more general focus, seemingly describing many of the strategies and approaches common to school-based policies as well as the NSSF. After examining the other states and territories, the content is quite familiar. Coinciding with the NSSF, it is stated that the Student Engagement Policy will provide the basis for schools to “develop and maintain safe, supportive, and inclusive school environments.” Emphasized concepts include utilizing a range of universal (school-wide), targeted (population-specific), and individual (student-specific) evidence-based strategies; collaborating with the wider school community; developing plans for implementation and monitoring/evaluation; and using data to inform content.

Annual Reports and documents. From the DET main website, annual reports were located via the following headings: About the Department ➔ Our Departments ➔ Annual Reports. It should be noted that annual reports were not typically consulted in this investigation. Victoria’s scope far exceeded that of the other states and territories due to the scarcity of available bullying content in the more logical/expected places. Thirteen years of DET annual reports (2001-2002 through 2013-2014) were downloaded and scanned for references to bullying. Eight of these reports either contained no references, only references to workplace bullying, or references too minute/derivative to be worthy of greater consideration. The remaining four reports were more relevant, but only three justified inclusion in the discussion. Their utility was that they served as a gateway to additional resources that would not otherwise have been discovered.
The 2001-2002 annual report referred to a multi-phase strategic plan to address bullying, harassment, and violence in schools. The identified phase one (a resource package for schools including a comprehensive interactive website) and phase two (a community partnership program to prevent bullying) resources could not be located either on the DET website or through external internet queries. It is possible that these resources are inaccessible because they are no longer current. However, a search for the latter revealed the presence of a 2003 research report co-authored by Dr. Rigby, entitled *How Australian schools are responding to the problem of peer victimization in schools*. The purpose of the study was to provide crucial information about tactics Australian schools were using to counter bullying (which to that point had been unexplored). While this data may be irrelevant today, the report provides context for the state of Australian bullying prevention efforts over the last decade. It may not be coincidental that the NSSF was created in 2003, the same year that this report was issued. In addition, certain aspects of the report are still applicable, including the following encapsulation of school antibullying policy components and considerations:

- Value statements related to bullying
- How schools defined bullying
- Types of bullying identified
- Schools’ responses to cases of bullying
- Bullying detection, reporting, and record-keeping
- Encouragement appropriate student reactions to bullying
- Provision of education or training to students about bullying
- Supporting victims
- Involving parents
- Promotion of prosocial behaviours
- Policy availability
- Evaluation and review of existing policies
- Justification for antibullying policies

It is fair to characterize these elements as being among the cornerstones of the NSSF, which of course became the foundation for systematic bullying prevention policies across the country.
The 2005-2006 and 2010-2011 annual reports revealed additional past resources (*Safe Schools Are Effective Schools* and *Building Respectful and Safe Schools: A resource for school communities*, respectively). The former was ultimately replaced by the latter, which was described as a supporting document to the *Effective Schools are Engaging Schools: Student Engagement Policy Guidelines*. In turn, these guidelines were supplanted by the current *Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance* (mentioned in Appendix K).

**Western Australia**

Western Australia occupies at least one-third of the total mainland area. Within its government, there were two distinct departments relating to education – the Department of Education and the Department of Education Services. The relationship between the two appears to be similar to Ofqual and Ofsted supporting the Department for Education in the United Kingdom. In this case, the Department of Education Services supports the Department of Education. Information on bullying was generally limited and was primarily contained in the subsection “Safe and Supportive Schools” within the “Behaviour and Wellbeing” section of the Department of Education website. Resources primarily consisted of links to external websites, webinars, and podcasts. The only document of interest was entitled *Preventing and Managing Bullying: Guidelines for Schools*. Following a review of its content, subsequent exploration was required to obtain the one main and one subordinate policy (*Behaviour Management in Schools* and *Managing Student Behaviour*, respectively) from which the guidelines arise.

The *Behaviour Management in Schools* policy (effective January 28, 2008 and last revised April 9, 2013) is located under the headings Policies → School Management → Behaviour Management. It begins with a policy statement asserting expectations for school principals: to create and maintain safe and positive learning environments, and to develop processes for
successful student behaviour management. Preventative approaches that promote prosocial behaviour and self-discipline, focus on early intervention, and contain provisions for ongoing or serious misbehaviour must be utilized. Preventing and managing forms of bullying is considered one of the “essential elements within school behaviour management planning.”

Requirements for bullying prevention and management are below:

3.1.3 PREVENTING AND MANAGING BULLYING

Principals must have a strategy for the prevention and management of bullying as part of their school's behaviour management planning.

This will include:

- the rationale which comprises:
  - a statement outlining the school's commitment to prevent and manage bullying and an acknowledgment that everyone in the school community has a responsibility to prevent bullying.
- the Department's whole-school community statement of rights and responsibilities of students, staff, parents and the wider community in relation to bullying in schools.
- the Department's common understandings of bullying issues including:
  - the definition of bullying;
  - an explanation of the types of bullying;
  - the roles of bystanders; and
  - the use of terminology.
- appropriate evidence based strategies and procedures to prevent and effectively manage bullying including:
  - whole school prevention;
  - targeted early intervention; and
  - intervention for bullying incidents.
- processes to review and monitor the schools strategy to prevent and manage bullying.

Like many of those previously discussed, this policy identifies mandatory elements without specifying/directing how the elements should be formulated. Concrete examples and/or suggestions for these declarations, strategies and procedures, and processes for reviewing/monitoring are crucial for a policy to be sufficiently comprehensive and precise. Definitions for bullying subtypes and related terminology, while helpful, do not eliminate the need for greater detail and guidance. More information is provided in the Preventing and Managing Bullying document, discussed below.

Managing Student Behaviour is also located under the headings Policies ➔ School Management ➔ Behaviour Management. Although it is housed under “policies,” the accompanying
description classifies it as a statement by the Director General. In addition, the term “initiative” was used as a descriptor in the document itself. Regardless of its categorization, Managing Student Behaviour explains school characteristics and strategic approaches that can promote responsible student behaviour. First, the likelihood of good behaviour can be increased by facilitating an environment where students feel respected and capable. Second, schools have flexibility in how they support classroom teachers in behaviour management, such as limit-setting, consequences, modeling and teaching good behaviour, and handling conflicts in an authoritative manner. Third, the Department of Education will assist school leaders in establishing consistent, well-articulated school-wide approaches to managing bullying and other inappropriate behaviours. Fourth, teachers should respond to extreme student behaviour with a goal of effective engagement in learning as opposed to merely eliminating misconduct. Fifth, the Department will support early intervention programs that have been demonstrated to develop social/personal skills which are the building blocks of future learning-compatible behaviours. Sixth, schools with more challenging student behaviours and less readiness to learn will receive higher levels of support. Finally, to ensure student behavioural progress, a broad, cooperative intervention approach that includes collaboration with families and relevant agencies will be utilized.\textsuperscript{324}

Preventing and Managing Bullying functions as school guidelines intended to be utilized in conjunction with Behaviour Management in Schools and Managing Student Behaviour. First, schools are required to create a school plan outlining their school community visions, emphasizing safety, respect, and supportiveness.\textsuperscript{325} The guidelines are structured in such a way that at times it was difficult to differentiate between what might be required sections for the school plan, and what might simply be a heading utilized for emphasis in the instructions. No
obvious distinction was made between sections schools are expected to include, explanatory language directed to the schools from the Department (not meant to be carried over into the plan), and optional suggestions. For the following sections, non-italicized text is assumed to be required, while text in italics is assumed to be optional:

- Rationale
- Definitions
- Rights and Responsibilities of School Community Members
- School Strategies to Prevent and Manage Bullying
  - Whole-School Prevention Strategies
  - Targeted Early Intervention Strategies
  - Intervention for Bullying Incidents

Precise and thorough sample content is provided for all of these sections, such that schools could conceivably create a plan by copying and pasting. This level of support is refreshing compared to some of the documents previously discussed.
Summary and Interpretation

As was previously stated, it was anticipated and desired that this investigation would produce a “gold standard” for bullying prevention efforts in policy and legislation. According to this researcher, a gold standard would be a unification of legislative and policy efforts that is evidence-based, sufficiently comprehensive (breadth) yet appropriately detailed (depth), consistently implemented, and regularly evaluated; and achieves a balance between research and practice. In addition, a gold standard would be developed through interdisciplinary collaboration of experts in multiple pertinent fields such as education, psychology, public health, and government. Despite a degree of subjectivity present in these criteria given the lack of an explicit formula, a gold standard would be recognizable if encountered. None of the examined countries achieved this elusive gold standard, nor even approached this admittedly-lofty benchmark. The United Kingdom and Australia combined would be the closest approximation to an ideal model of antibullying legislation and policy. To a certain extent, one provides what the other lacks. Each country’s results are summarized below.

United States

The United States has no national legislation or policy about bullying, despite recent attempts by a select group of legislators. As of April 21, 2015, all 50 states have antibullying laws (of which 42 also have antibullying policies). Montana’s antibullying law was just signed by the governor on April 21, 2015. Scholarly analysis of state laws and policies reveals considerable diversity in content, coverage, and specificity. Collectively, it can be concluded that there are more differences than similarities among states’ approaches to bullying prevention. Without unifying federal policy, this diversity is likely to continue.
Scandinavia

It was expected that Scandinavian countries would demonstrate the greatest accomplishments in national antibullying legislation and policy relative not only to the other countries examined, but to the entire world. At the outset, this assumption appeared reasonable based upon the region’s collective reputation of progressiveness combined with these countries’ longstanding dedication to bullying research and practice. However, the expectations were not realized. It is important to consider that the English-only searching undoubtedly impacted the amount and quality of information acquired. It is therefore not known what proportion of the actual content has been discovered, and how much remains obscured due to language. This issue will be further explored in the Limitations section.

Minimal information was available for Denmark and Sweden. For Denmark, an act regarding the educational environment for students was the only relevant item located. It was of a general nature and not particularly meaningful. Similar results were obtained for Sweden. Two acts – regarding education and discrimination, respectively – comprised the relevant items. Unfortunately, only the descriptions of the acts were accessible; the acts themselves were not available in English. Based on these descriptions and the key term search results, it is unlikely that these acts contained specific references to bullying. No policies, other legislation, or national strategies or initiatives pertaining to bullying were found for either country.

Compared to Denmark and Sweden, information about Norway was more useful and plentiful. However, much of this content had been obtained not through the Norwegian government website, but via Internet searches and scholarly literature. The three main relevant results were the Manifesto against Bullying (Manifesto), Education Act, and its national strategy against child-and-youth violence and sexual abuse. The Manifesto is indicative of a national,
multilevel commitment to bullying prevention. However, the lack of availability of the original Manifesto or its subsequent iterations (and thus, the reliance upon descriptions/discussions of the Manifesto in secondary sources) compromises any interpretive value. Similar to those of Denmark and Sweden, Norway’s Education Act generally outlines requirements for behavior and the school environment without expressly targeting bullying. The national strategy to combat violence and sexual abuse against children and youth contains specific references to bullying, yet maintains a universal approach that concerned violence and abuse more so than bullying.

United Kingdom (UK)

The UK’s obvious strength in bullying prevention is its decades-long commitment to legislation against bullying. Unlike the other nations, the UK has enacted legislation referencing bullying both specifically and repeatedly. A total of eight separate pieces of education legislation (passed between 1998 and 2014) mention bullying. Within these instruments, bullying is discussed related to school leadership, school policies and strategies, and government guidance documents. The UK is the only country among those considered that prohibits bullying by law.

Interestingly, this legislative strength is accompanied by a relative policy weakness. Although legislation existed since 1998, the official (and brief) antibullying policy was not created until 2013. It can be argued that in lieu of policy, the presence of multiple guidance documents helped to bridge the gap. Nonetheless, current guidance documents are primarily concerned with behavior in general rather than bullying specifically and lack specificity and breadth. In contrast, the previous guidance documents of Bullying: Don’t Suffer in Silence, Bullying: effective action in secondary schools, and Safe to Learn: Embedding anti-bullying work in schools jointly present comprehensive strategies for bullying prevention that could easily be adapted into functional school antibullying policies. The UK’s antibullying charter appears to
be somewhat comparable to Norway’s Manifesto, although in this case the physical document was acquired. Like the Manifesto, the Charter’s current status could not be ascertained. It should also be noted that the majority of previous guidance is archived (meaning that it not housed within the main government website, thus rendering it more difficult to find) and was located through external Internet searches. Significantly, the archived guidance documents are far superior to the current guidance in terms of depth and applicability, thus begging the question why they were replaced. With regard to concrete antibullying policies, this decision seems to be a regression rather than a progression.

**Australia**

**National government**

Australia has no national antibullying legislation but has a national policy in the National Safe Schools Framework (NSSF), created in 2003. The NSSF is intended as a collaboration between the national government and state and territory governments to provide a whole-school approach to the provision of safe and supportive learning environments. Bullying is presented in conjunction with harassment, aggression, and violence, and all recommended procedures and strategies (of which there are many) combine bullying with these related behavioural concepts. This consolidation of concepts may compromise the NSSF’s utility as a foundation for creating state and territory antibullying policies. Overly broad conceptualizations of bullying and a lack of distinction between other behaviours including aggression and harassment are not advisable and may even be problematic due to the disparate disciplinary responses and intervention strategies required for the separate behavioural patterns.\(^{326}\)

The eight Australian states and territories demonstrate considerable diversity in their interpretation and adaptation of the NSSF, level of emphasis placed on bullying compared to
other concepts, and degree to which bullying-related policy development and implementation was supported. Substantial differences were also present in the overall amount of material assistance and online content delivered by the respective Departments of Education, and the quality of such resources. Additionally, the organizational structure of government websites and the process and ease by which information could be obtained from those websites also varied. For example, certain useful materials were located randomly and without intention, whereas significant time and effort was required to pinpoint other, purposely sought resources. Most of the states and territories delivered useful – if often divergent – substance. The frequent challenge was filtering through vast quantities of extraneous content to isolate meaningful elements.

**Australian Capital Territory (ACT)**

ACT has enacted two policies related to bullying – *Providing Safe Schools P-12* and *Countering Bullying, Harassment, and Violence in ACT Public Schools*. These policies are dedicated to the promotion of a safe and supportive environment while once again considering bullying in concert with other behavioural concepts. No original content is provided beyond what had been presented in the NSSF.

**New South Wales (NSW)**

The government of New South Wales has two policies - *Student Discipline in Government Schools; Bullying and Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools*. The discipline policy is a general overview of expectations for student behaviour, while the bullying policy provides specific criteria for the development and implementation of school antibullying plans through a detailed stepwise process. A focus on protection, prevention, early intervention, and response strategies underlies all of the procedures. Compared to most of the other states and territories, NSW’s policy is impressive for its scope, specificity, and operationalizations.
**Northern Territory (NT)**

The main resource from the NT government was the *Safe Schools NT* (a territory-specific framework intended to help NT schools implement the NSSF) *Code of Behaviour*. Although moderately detailed, this code of behaviour contains little information specific to bullying. Another *Safe Schools NT* document, the *School Wellbeing and Behaviour* policy guide, outlines a yet-to-be-created policy for promoting positive behaviour and wellbeing and discouraging unacceptable behaviour. Taken together, these resources are heavily reliant upon the NSSF and do little to establish bullying as an important behaviour necessitating policy creation.

**Queensland**

Queensland developed a range of instruments regarding learning and wellbeing, disciplined school environments, and responsible behaviour. Included among these was a sample school policy for preventing and responding to incidents of bullying that contained general behavioural principles rather than bullying-specific strategies. The most valuable resources from Queensland turned out to be accidentally-discovered supplemental materials instead of “official” policies and procedures. Such materials contained instructions and recommendations for school-based actions against bullying and for the planning and creation of antibullying policies.

**South Australia**

Two policies were identified from South Australia. The *School Discipline Policy*, sourced from the NSSF, contained general content about bullying and related concepts along with broad-based school strategies to address behaviour. In contrast, the *Anti-Bullying Policy – School Audit Checklist and Support Information* document was extremely useful. Detailed examples of recommended policy sections and components, rationales for inclusion, and explanations of
requirements were carefully outlined. This document could be quickly translated into a serviceable policy with little additional effort.

**Tasmania**

In Tasmania, the *Learner Wellbeing and Behaviour Policy* and the *Student Behaviour* procedure were the main relevant documents. With a stated purpose of providing safe and inclusive learning environments (consistent with the NSSF), these documents identify unacceptable behaviours and describe a range of consequences for said behaviours that can be imposed. Bullying is not a central focus of either resource.

**Victoria**

Policies were located for Victoria only after the Departmental website was scrutinized, as they were not housed in a logical fashion and could easily have been overlooked. Only two identified policies were relevant to bullying. The bullying policy simply replicated NSSF content and failed to provide any unique information about bullying. In effect, its main function was to state the requirement for a policy. The student engagement policy barely mentions bullying, instead reiterating NSSF content regarding strategies to develop and maintain safe, supportive, and inclusive school environments. The most useful information – a list of actions for schools to take when writing a bullying prevention policy - was derived from *Bully Stoppers* (a Victorian bullying prevention campaign).

**Western Australia**

In Western Australia, relevant resources included the *Preventing and Managing Bullying: Guidelines for Schools* document and the two associated policies (*Behaviour Management in Schools* and *Managing Student Behaviour*) from which the guidelines were created. The former policy echoes NSSF content but also includes helpful, if somewhat vague, requirements for
bullying prevention and management. The latter policy, through a series of steps, explains school characteristics and strategic approaches that can promote responsible student behaviour. The guidelines document is a template that schools can utilize, in whole or in part, when creating a school plan for bullying prevention and management.
Supplemental Analysis

Given the diversity of content encompassed in antibullying policies and legislation in the United States, Scandinavia, the United Kingdom, and Australia, it would be advantageous to have a practical, concrete means for assessment. However, such a metric could not be located. Within the already-limited scholarly research base on bullying policy, there is little consensus regarding what constitutes an appropriate antibullying policy, and minimal empirical guidance on recommended policy components. Moreover, systematic evaluations of the efficacy of antibullying policies do not appear to exist. Instead, such research is primarily descriptive in nature – discussing, comparing, and contrasting elements found in existing policies and legislation. In the ratio of research to practice, the balance is heavily skewed in favor of practice. Without a standard of best practices or evidence-based requirements for antibullying policies, it was not feasible to provide a scientific appraisal of the policies and legislation in this report.

Research gaps notwithstanding, some of this disconnect may be attributable to the potential overlap between antibullying programs and policies. As was discussed earlier in this report, policies can include the use of programs, even though the implementation of programs does not necessarily constitute policy. Elements of policy can – and often do – align directly with program elements. Research characterizing commonly-encountered (and, occasionally, the purportedly essential) features of antibullying programs is more readily available than comparable policy research. The following section attempts to consolidate a reasonable sampling of the existing evidence about policy and programming. This evidence, along with relevant aspects of the previously presented policy and legislative content, can be utilized to produce increasingly unified and structured guidance for the development of antibullying legislation and policy. A framework of integrated considerations for antibullying legislation and policy has been
created as a result of this approach (Appendix M) and can serve as a proxy for a gold standard. As is illustrated below, the recommendations comprise an assortment of sources and disciplines and vary in design, organization, inclusiveness, focus, and perspective. Key words are denoted by an underline to facilitate comparison and to indicate significance.

**Scholarly Resources**

In their review of best practices for preventing or reducing school bullying, Whitted and Dupper (2005) provided practical, multilevel prevention strategies:

**School-level components**
- A questionnaire is used to assess the nature of bullying and raise awareness
- The principal provides a leadership role in program implementation
- Administrators make a long-term commitment to changing school culture and climate
- Anonymous reporting procedures are established
- All areas of the school are well supervised
- A school-based team including all stakeholders (parents, students, staff) is involved in the development, implementation, maintenance, and evaluation of the program
- A discipline policy is developed and consistently enforced and provides a code of conduct with strict antibullying policies
- Ongoing training for all school staff and parents is provided to develop skills for creating and sustaining a safe school environment
- An evaluation component is included

**Classroom-level components (involving teachers and other adults)**
- Regular classroom meetings to discuss bullying
- The concept of bullying is integrated into the curriculum
- All school personnel model appropriate behavior
- Adults encourage the reporting of bullying incidents
- Adults swiftly and consistently respond to students needing support
- Adults send clear messages that bullying is not tolerated
- Adults encourage students to include all peers in activities
- Consistent enforcement of non-punitive, graduated consequences for bullying behaviors are used
- Parents are encouraged to contact the school if they suspect their children are involved in bullying

**Student-level components (designed to help victims, bullies, and bystanders)**
- Victims are taught social skills and problem-solving skills
- A support system is established for students targeted by bullying
- Students learn skills to intervene and provide assistance to victims
- Consequences for bullying behavior are immediate
- Serious talks are held with parents and students involved with bullying
- Pro-social behaviors are immediately reinforced
- Mental health professionals assist students involved in bullying incidents
Nickerson and colleagues (2013) reviewed research-informed practices for effective bullying prevention efforts, from which they distilled six key, interlinked elements to be included in state and local bullying policies:

1. **Assess** the prevalence of bullying:
   - Across grade levels, gender, racial/ethnic groups
   - **Types** of bullying taking place
   - **Locations** where bullying occurs
   - Information related to **school climate**
   - Initial survey can serve as baseline data; can be used to measure **progress**
   - Survey should be **repeated** at least annually

2. **Develop a schoolwide antibullying policy**
   - The following features are recommended:
     - A clear, firm statement regarding the **unacceptability** of any forms of bullying behavior
     - A **definition** of bullying incorporating all **forms** of bullying, with examples
     - The **rights and responsibilities** of all school community members
     - Explicit **guidelines** for staff, students and parents for what they should do when they become aware of bullying incidents, including **reporting procedures**
     - Relevant **consequences** for bullying behaviors
     - Prevention and intervention strategies
   - **Implementation and relevance** may be more important than the mere existence of a policy
   - **Policy development** should be **guided** by the input of parents, teachers, staff, and students
   - The policy should be **widely disseminated** to school staff, students, and parents
   - Procedures should be established to **monitor progress** in order to **evaluate** the policy’s effects and **revise** it as necessary

3. **Provide** schoolwide staff training
   - Common components of training
     - **Definition** of bullying
     - Bullying **prevalence**
     - Signs of, contributing factors to bullying and victimization
     - Impact of bullying on educational, social-emotional outcomes
     - **Strategies** for prevention and intervention
   - Teachers and school staff can increase adult **supervision** in areas where bullying is likely to occur

4. **Implement evidence-based prevention programming**
   - **Comprehensive**, **multi-component**, and **intensive** programs have the greatest impact
   - Successful implementation depends on careful **selection**, **planning**, and **preparation**

5. **Build strong leadership** for bullying prevention
   - School principals should strive to build a common, **shared vision** among staff that links programming to school values
   - **Acceptance** can be fostered from teachers and other stakeholders through consistent involvement in the planning process

6. **Use effective disciplinary practices**
   - School personnel should **meet individually** with students who bully to communicate its **unacceptability**
• Harsh and punitive discipline practices are counterproductive; zero tolerance policies (automatic, equal punishment to all students) are ineffective
• Restorative justice approach increases support to all children involved in bullying. Consequences are tailored to the circumstances.
• Method of shared concern and support group approach are other models of discipline
• Support for victims is imperative, including reassurance, encouragement, and promotion of coping strategies

Practical Resources

Anti-Defamation League (ADL)

The ADL’s Bullying/Cyberbullying Prevention Law: Model Statute and Advocacy Toolkit provides concrete advice to help states “ensure that their anti-bullying statues are complete, effective, constitutional, and implemented.” Relevant recommended elements of a comprehensive antibullying law are provided below:

1) Require each school district adopt an antibullying policy
   • The bill should require that school districts work with parents, teachers, schools, law enforcement and other community stakeholders in the creation and implementation of the policy

2) A strong definition of bullying is necessary
   • Definitions will notify school administrators, students and teachers exactly what is unacceptable
   • Definitions should not be overly broad or vague – they must not punish constitutionally-protected speech. They should also be limited to areas in which the school administration has the authority to act

3) Enumerated characteristics must be included in any definition of bullying
   • Naming certain categories provides clear guidance to those who must apply the standard
   • Inclusion of enumerated characteristics does not affect protection for other students

4) Establish a process within the school for reporting and investigating bullying
   • Students and witnesses should know a safe place to come to report incidents
   • There should be a point person in the school responsible for receiving reports of bullying and communicating with appropriate personnel for investigation

5) Establish a systematic process by which the school reports to the school district, and the school district reports to the state

6) Establish consequences for unacceptable activity
   • Establishing consequences is important to put students and staff on notice that inappropriate behavior will not be tolerated and will be taken seriously

7) Mandate training for faculty and students
   • Thorough training of school administrators, teachers and counseling staff is essential to ensure that the Model Policy is properly implemented and enforced
8) Include counseling for victims and perpetrators

9) Give notice to parents and guardians
   • The bill should ensure the presence of procedures for broadly publicizing the policy

**Rutgers Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Project**

One such tool is the Rutgers Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Project, which yielded numerous specific antibullying policy and programmatic recommendations applicable for school-level bullying policy and practice coordination. Despite being tailored to local school leadership, this content is useful from a broader perspective and can contribute to a framework for considering state/territorial and national antibullying policies (which are of course intended to trickle down to local schools). While maintaining the content’s integrity and meaning, certain items have been restuctured and categories have been combined to enable logical categorical composition and presentation. The following components are recommended:

**Written/Underlying Components**
- A definition of bullying (including bullying occurring outside of school grounds)
- A statement that bullying is not permitted
- A procedure for reporting an act of bullying, including anonymous reporting
- A requirement that all bullying reports be investigated by a school administrator
- A statement that retaliation by bullies who are reported will not be tolerated
- A requirement that any victim of bullying receive protection and support
- An expectation that anyone aware of bullying must report, including bystanders

**Action Components**
- **Annual assessment** of school bullying behaviors
  - Identify locations and times of day where/when bullying most often occurs
  - Recognize repeat perpetrators or victims
  - Track incidents to identify any existing patterns
  - Become aware of incidents motivated by distinguishing characteristics
- **Responses to Bullying**
  - Act promptly on reports from witnesses, including thorough investigations
  - Provide support for victims, including protection and mental health services
  - Deliver consequences to any person who perpetrates bullying and remedial actions (punitive measures and positive behavioral interventions) to prevent future bullying
- **Programming**
  - Use evidence-based programs and curricula
o Ensure that bullying is addressed through character education, social emotional learning, and safe and drug-free school initiatives

o Implement multilevel (e.g., classroom, school, and district) interventions

- Environment/School Climate
  o Promote schoolwide social norms that witnesses to bullying should report incidents
  o Increase monitoring for places where bullying most often occurs

- Teachers and Staff
  o Include information on bullying in new-teacher orientation programs
  o Conduct an annual discussion about the antibullying policy among staff members and administrators
  o Ensure there is a mechanism for staff members to discuss concerns and solve problems about specific student bullying behavior
  o Provide staff members with training or other professional development activities that enable them to effectively implement the bullying prevention program

- Students
  o Ensure that there are opportunities to discuss the antibullying policy with students, highlighting the definition of bullying, school policies and procedures, and expectations of witnesses

- Collaboration/Understanding/Clarification
  o Ask students and staff to provide input on policy contents
  o Ensure the reporting and investigating procedures are clearly understood by students and staff

National Education Association (NEA)

The NEA’s position is that school staff and administrators should be trained to handle bullying at the school level, and that all stakeholders should collaborate on bullying prevention policies and programs. The following specific recommendations are made:

- Establish strong antibullying policies that include:
  o Definitions of bullying
  o Clear consequences for bullying behaviors
  o Procedures for reporting bullying incidents
- Provide training for all school employees in the prevention and intervention of bullying behaviors
- Provide professional development materials and resources to school employees
- Conduct an annual school climate survey
- Develop and implement educational programs to help students recognize, understand, prevent, oppose, and eliminate bullying

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)

NASP has provided several guidance documents pertaining to bullying prevention and intervention, two of which are relevant here: Bullying Prevention and Intervention: Information for Educators (2010) and A Framework for School-Wide Bullying Prevention and Safety (2012).
Bullying prevention and intervention: information for educators.

The following strategies for prevention and intervention are included:

- Increase awareness and knowledge of bullying and dispel myths among school personnel, parents, and community stakeholders.
- Survey all students using an anonymous questionnaire to determine the bullying problem at each school (what, where, how many, etc.).
- Develop a bullying coordinating committee to develop school antibullying policies and oversee implementation of antibullying programs.
- Develop an effective antibullying school policy and establish clear and enforceable rules and sanctions. Make sure that school policies are consistent with local rules and state statues.
- Consider having students sign a pledge, promising not to bully, to help others who are being bullied, and to include all students in school activities.
- Provide comprehensive training to all teachers and staff about bullying prevention/intervention.
- Use survey results to make necessary changes to the school environment to create a safe and more supportive school climate.
- Develop a variety of methods students can use to report bullying to adults. Investigate every report, provide follow-up, and take administrative actions as necessary.
- Increase adult supervision in areas identified as problematic in the survey.
- Intervene consistently and immediately when bullying occurs.
- Hold separate follow-up meetings with bullies and victims.
- Hold class meetings where students can discuss peer relations and any problems with bullying.
- Provide support and protection to victims. If possible, involve parents in the process.
- Consider adopting a structured bullying prevention curriculum that teaches students, especially witnesses and victims, how to intervene when bullying occurs.

A framework for school-wide bullying prevention and safety.

This framework provides steps to effective school-and-district-wide bullying prevention:

1. Conduct an assessment of the school’s environment to:
   - determine perceived safety and supportiveness of the school among students, staff, parents
   - identify specific strengths and needs of the school
   - identify specific at-risk groups of students
   - identify where and how bullying occurs

2. Identify existing resources and efforts in the school by:
   - incorporating bullying prevention strategies into classroom learning
   - determining the existence of initiatives in the school that should be coordinated with antibullying efforts (e.g., positive behavior support)
   - working and communicating with families and related organizations (e.g., PTA)

3. Create a school safety team that maintains responsibility for:
   - identifying a lead person to deal with bullying prevention and school safety
   - establishing and communicating the roles and responsibilities for administrators, teachers, students, and parents in developing and maintaining a safe and supportive school environment
   - ensuring compliance with state laws and school board policies
4. Incorporate the school safety and bullying prevention efforts into the school’s or district’s official policy on student and employee conduct, including:
   - clear and defined boundaries for appropriate behavior
   - protocols and mechanisms for reporting concerns or violations, and maintaining records of reports
   - guidelines for investigating bullying incidents or other threats to school safety, including those that occur after hours, off campus, or through digital media
   - guidelines for responding to reports of bullying behavior or other threats to student safety (avoiding overly harsh and punitive discipline such as zero tolerance)
   - access to prevention and intervention services provided by school mental health professionals to remediate bullying behaviors and support victims, bullies, and bystanders as needed

5. Establish positive discipline policies and practices that:
   - are fair, clearly understood, and consistent
   - identify and consider contributing factors to student misbehavior
   - teach all students alternative, prosocial behaviors
   - incorporate family involvement to the greatest extent possible

6. Engage the entire school community by communicating policies with students, staff, parents, and other stakeholders. This communication should include:
   - open avenues for input and feedback
   - transparent access to data
   - dialogue to ensure consistency of policies and responses to bullying across settings

7. Regularly assess the school climate to determine effectiveness. This process should be transparent and engage effective data analysis that helps inform evidence-based practice.

Government Resources

Effective Evidence-based Practices for Preventing and Addressing Bullying (2013)

This guidance was issued by the Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services as an attachment to the August 2013 “Dear Colleague” letter (previously discussed). The following recommendations were provided:

- Use a comprehensive multi-tiered behavioral framework that:
  - Engages the whole community
  - Establishes and maintains positive, safe, and nurturing school environment
  - Provides clear and formal instruction for all students and staff on how to behave in respectful and responsible ways across all school settings and activities

- Teach appropriate behaviors and how to respond
  - What behaviors are expected at school and during school activities
  - What bullying looks like
  - How to appropriately respond to any bullying that does occur
• **Provide active adult supervision**
  o Adults should move around continuously and have **positive interactions** with students, in order to:
    ▪ **Teach and model expected behavior**
    ▪ **Notice and reward appropriate behavior**
    ▪ **Intervene early** so minor rule violations are handled effectively before problematic behaviors escalate

• **Train and provide ongoing support** for staff and students
  o All personnel should receive training, ongoing professional development, and support on the use of effective evidence-based strategies for responding to inappropriate behavior (including bullying)
  o All students should receive **clear, explicit instruction** on how to respond to and report bullying

• **Develop and implement clear policies to address bullying**
  o Policies should be **consistent** with federal, state, and local laws
  o Schools should widely disseminate their antibullying policies and procedures to staff, parents, and students, as well as post them in the school and on the school’s website
  o Staff, parents, and students should receive **ongoing training** on school antibullying policies and procedures so that everyone in the school community is **aware** that bullying behavior will not be tolerated
  o When bullying occurs, school personnel need to **respond quickly**, to act in accordance with school policies and procedures, and to **document** the incident in writing

• **Monitor and track bullying behaviors**
  o Data should be collected from **multiple sources**, including surveys of students, to help establish an accurate understanding of bullying behaviors occurring in school and school activities
  o Data collection should be **linked** to existing data systems (e.g., attendance, discipline) when possible
  o Data collection should include information such as the **frequency**, **type**, and **location** of bullying behavior, other contextual factors, adult/peer responses, and **perceptions** of safety and school climate

• **Notify parents when bullying occurs**
  o **Clear and accurate communication** should occur to inform parents/guardians of any reports of bullying where their children are either the target of, or engaged in, bullying behavior
  o Parents and guardians should be encouraged to work with teachers and other school personnel to determine the steps that need to be taken to address the bullying and prevent its recurrence

• **Address ongoing concerns**
  o If a school suspects that bullying is becoming a problem schoolwide, a team-based and data-driven problem-solving process should be initiated
  o Such an approach should examine discipline and performance data to determine:
    ▪ **How often, when, and where** specific bullying incidents occur
    ▪ **How many and which students** are involved
  o Based on the data, a common strategy should be outlined to address the settings and situations in which bullying frequently occurs
  o The strategy should include certain steps that will be taken for the **whole school** (e.g., consistent rules and rewards for good behavior), **more intense** steps that will be taken for **groups of students** exhibiting at-risk behavior, and **individual services** that will be provided for students who continue to exhibit problematic behavior

• **Sustain bullying prevention efforts over time**
  o **Prevention** of bullying should be **ongoing**, and accepted as an **integral component** of the school’s overall behavioral framework that delineates a school’s environment and routine operation

This resource was developed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) with grant support from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice. A set of tactics for antibullying programs is provided in the document, from which the following recommendations were obtained:

1. Clearly define what constitutes bullying activity using input and involvement from all members of the school community.
2. Communicate the created definition to students, teachers, school staff, and parents/guardians.
3. Establish specific rules prohibiting bullying activity and corresponding consequences for such activity as part of a comprehensive school code of conduct.
4. Establish a reporting mechanism by which incidents of bullying can be reported and recorded immediately after their occurrence.
5. Ensure reporting procedures address with whom and under what circumstances information will/will not be shared. Care should be taken to:
   a. Protect witnesses and victims from retaliation
   b. Meet applicable standards for confidentiality
   c. Ensure that involved personnel have the necessary information to work with victims and bullies
   d. Protect the accused from false accusations
6. Notify the parents/guardians of both the victim(s) and perpetrator(s) whenever a report of bullying is filed. Establish a policy regarding the circumstances under which parents/guardians of bullies and victims should be called in for a conference.
7. Continually monitor the number of reported bullying incidents. Document what action was taken for each incident.
8. Regularly conduct a survey assessing the prevalence, location, and kind of bullying activities occurring. Include students, parents/guardians, teachers, and staff. Also address bullying activities occurring on the way to/from school.
9. Consider holding focus groups to discuss the nature of the bullying problem and ways to solve it.
10. Identify community resources that can be used to intervene immediately and from which to develop intervention and prevention programs.
11. Take actions to identify bullies and victims and to promote intervention at the classroom level and at other student contact points in schools. Develop a program that provides victims with immediate support services and referrals and teaches avoidance techniques and coping skills. Refer offenders to available support services.
12. Advise teachers and staff to record events and the interventions/strategies implemented to address instances of bullying.
StopBullying.gov

According to StopBullying.gov, school-based bullying prevention should consist of assessment, parent/youth engagement, creating policies and rules, building a safe environment, and educating about bullying. These five approaches are explained as follows:

- **Assessment**
  - What assessment can do:
    - Learn the true picture
    - Target efforts
    - Measure results
  - What can be measured
    - Frequency and types of bullying
    - Adult and peer response
    - Locations of occurrence, including “hot spots”
    - Staff perceptions and attitudes about bullying
    - Student perception of safety
    - School climate
  - Developing and implementing an assessment:
    - Can be accomplished through a schoolwide survey

- **Engagement**
  - Student contributions
    - Provide views about and experiences with bullying
    - Help develop rules and policies
  - Parent contributions
    - Parent-teacher association, volunteering
  - School staff contributions
    - Keep parents informed, make them feel welcome, treat them as partners
  - School Safety Committee
    - A strategy to engage parents, youth, and others in bullying prevention.
    - Primary activities could be to plan bullying prevention and intervention programs, set measurable and achievable goals, and implementing a bullying prevention effort

- **Policies and Rules**
  - Types of rules and policies
    - Mission statement (establishes the vision for the school)
    - Code of conduct (sets behavioral standards; describes expected positive behaviors)
    - Student Bill of Rights (positive things students can expect at school)
  - Integrating rules and policies into a school’s culture
    - Rules and policies should be consistent with state laws and school district rules, policies
    - Include staff, parents, students when developing rules and policies
    - Train school staff on enforcing school rules and policies and responding to bullying consistently and appropriately
    - Incorporate rules and policies into daily school interactions
  - Establish a reporting system
    - Clear procedures for reporting rule violations so that reasonable consequences can be enacted
    - Reporting systems help track incidents/responses and trends over time
Reporting system should be easy, confidential, and private. Students should be encouraged to report violations without fear of retaliation.

- Safe environment\textsuperscript{341}
  - Create a safe and supportive environment
    - Establish a culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students
    - Make sure students interact safely. Monitor bullying “hot spots” in and around the building.
    - Enlist all school staff to look for bullying and help set the tone at school with consistency.
  - Manage classrooms to prevent bullying
    - Create ground rules with students
    - Reinforce the rules
  - Classroom meetings
    - Provide a forum to discuss school-related issues. They can help teachers stay informed and students to feel safe and supported
    - Meetings work best in classrooms where a culture of respect is already established.

- Education\textsuperscript{342}
  - Activities to teach students about bullying
  - Evidence-based programs and curricula
  - Staff training on bullying prevention
Limitations

Methodological Limitations

English-language search terms and resources.

The reliance upon English-language search terms and English-language resources (related, yet distinct ideas) was a significant limitation in this investigation. Information existing in a country’s native language was not accessible without the ability to comprehend and translate said language. Translations of websites by search engines and internet service providers are unreliable, and were not considered. Only a fraction of non-English-speaking countries examined provided English-language versions of their government websites. Among those English-language website versions located, some had no meaningful content, and others with content were not comparable to their native language counterparts. Even the more comprehensive English-language versions of websites (and materials therein) were not always without error (e.g., periodically contained native-language words or phrases). Thus, the English-language resources might only represent a mere fraction of content offered in native languages.

The use of English-language search terms also potentially restricted the number of results obtainable through searches of government websites from non-English-dominant nations. It is possible that, even among documents or entire websites translated into English, the native language terms describing bullying and related behaviors might not have been translated. This would make certain potentially relevant results basically invisible (i.e., not revealed in a search).

Sampling bias.

Due to the nature of this investigation, bias was unavoidable. Although many countries were examined, those ultimately included in the discussion are inherently predisposed towards certain characteristics. The following is a list of exclusionary criteria:
1. Sufficient educational infrastructure to enable mandatory schooling
2. Sufficient resources and motivation to address school bullying
3. Sufficient economic and technological infrastructure necessary to develop and maintain government websites
4. Ability/desire to provide access to bullying-related materials on government websites;

and, for those countries who do not have English as a native language:

5. Ability/desire to create English-language versions of government websites
6. Ability/desire to translate pertinent documents/materials into English
7. Ability/desire to assure that English-language versions of government websites are comparable to the original versions

Countries meeting the above criteria would be few in number. They were most likely to be English-speaking, to have stable governments, and to be at a high levels of economic development. These characteristics may co-occur. Thus, the resulting sample is neither random nor representative.

**Website content and coverage.**

Additional limitations are present with regard to the features of particular nations’ government websites. Certain governments seemed to be exceptionally transparent, as demonstrated by the volume of information and level of detail contained on the government websites. Conversely, other government websites’ content was much more limited in scope and specificity. This could be indicative of fewer resources, a greater selectivity in determining website content, a decreased ability or desire to maintain higher-complexity websites, or a desire for greater levels of privacy/control over government materials (such as through employee intranet, password protection, etc.). The optimal level of content is somewhere in the middle of these two extremes. Websites with excessive content can be overwhelming and time-consuming, and valuable resources may be overlooked. Sparser websites may not contain sufficient information or relevant information.
Website structure and organization

Website organization was also found to be a potential obstacle to information retrieval. The means by which content was organized (e.g., the presence or absence of logical relationships between co-located items; the presence or absence of apparent prioritization of content) and the overall structure of websites (e.g., menus, outlines, headings, search functions, sections) directly impacted the obtained materials. In several of the Australian states and territories, vital resources were located either coincidentally or only after levels of resource expenditure (time and effort) far exceeding that which was required for the other states, territories, and nations. Weaknesses in organization or structure can result in information being excluded from consideration, which can affect the breadth of findings along with any ensuing interpretation and deductions. Information may have been overlooked in the current investigation, and such omissions could also occur in subsequent comparable investigations.

Limitations in Reporting/Inclusion

As was previously asserted in the Methods section, only the content judged to be most pertinent was included in this report. This criterion, along with a desire to minimize replication and to provide as much comparable content as possible, resulted in a small sample size (n = 6) and lack of adequate representation of world regions (n = 3) and development status (only Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries). While the selected countries together produced more than enough content to qualify this report as a comprehensive investigation, the ensuing scope was narrower than had been originally desired. Most of the other countries examined in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America had no meaningful, English-language information about bullying available on their respective government websites.
However, a small number of countries could have been included in the discussion, but were excluded due to one or both of the following reasons:

- **Lack of sufficient coherence with content from the already-selected countries**
  This criterion refers not to divergences in bullying policy content (which would have been welcomed), but in the type of sources available where bullying was mentioned. For example, Denmark and Sweden had no appreciable legislation or policy related to bullying, and might not have been included had it not been for the specific selection of Scandinavian countries owing to their research and practical traditions. Countries whose bullying-related information was limited to brief mentions in sources such as annual reports, codes of conduct, fact sheets, or education statutes were deemed unworthy of inclusion in the present investigation.

- **Lack of original content compared to the already-selected countries**
  This criterion denotes countries whose governments had meaningful antibullying legislation and/or policy, but, either the content therein was too similar to the content of one or more of the already-selected countries, or the country or countries in question were from a region that was already well-represented in the report. For example, Ireland was excluded due to having comparable content to the United Kingdom, being a neighboring country to the United Kingdom, and its status as a native English-speaking country. Canada was excluded due to its proximity to the United States, its similar geographical and governing structure to Australia (i.e., large landmass consisting of a relatively finite number of territories and provinces), and its status as a native English-speaking country.

The exclusion of countries restricts the scope of the report, which may compromise its generalizability.
Conclusion and Future Directions

School bullying of children and adolescents is a global public health problem with long-term negative consequences. The effectiveness of school-based bullying prevention and intervention programs is inconclusive. Policy has demonstrated efficacy in achieving desired public health outcomes, and has potential as an approach to bullying prevention. This project was undertaken to characterize the state of bullying legislation and policy from an international perspective. English-language searches were conducted using official government websites, scholarly research databases, and general Internet search engines. The intent was to present information from as many continents as possible so as to demonstrate range and balance. Countries investigated included the United States, Australia, all of Latin America and Europe, and the majority of nations in Africa and Asia. Nations included in the final product were the United States, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Due to the volume of information obtained, results were prioritized, and only the information most pertinent to the research goals was reported.

A unifying purpose of this research was to identify a so-called “gold standard” for bullying prevention policy and legislation – a superior example that could function as a paradigm for future attempts and a model against which all other versions could be judged. Unfortunately, no such standard could be located in the scholarly literature, nor in a myriad of government source documents examined for the United States, Scandinavia, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Significant variability was encountered in state antibullying policies and legislation in the United States. Comparatively limited information was obtained regarding current national approaches to bullying prevention in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. The United Kingdom and Australia each seemed to supplement the other’s weaknesses. Together, these two nations would
come the closest to achieving a best practice scenario, yet they still would fall short of an ideal approach. Australia has a comprehensive national behavior policy (encompassing bullying) that has been implemented inconsistently across its eight states and territories, and has no national legislation pertaining to bullying. The United Kingdom has a strong tradition of bullying-related legislation for the last several decades, yet only adopted a national behavior policy (minimally related to bullying) in 2013.

To date, few antibullying policy and legislative comparisons have been published and/or disseminated. No prior international examination of antibullying policy and legislation appears to have been conducted at this magnitude. Accordingly, despite its limitations, this investigation enhances the existing evidence on bullying prevention by providing insight into current real-world practice in several prominent nations. However, this investigation also illuminates the need for additional research and practice-oriented activities to augment our understanding of effective policy approaches to bullying prevention.

Given the limited and uneven research base about antibullying policy and legislation, there are numerous opportunities to expand upon this topic. Additional research must be conducted regarding the ideal or fundamental components of and considerations for antibullying policies and legislation. This would entail not only systematic reviews of scholarly research on bullying policy, but also systematic, cross-national examination of practice (i.e., current policies and legislation) beyond what has occurred in this report. Multilingual researchers and additional monetary and intellectual resources would likely be required to achieve linguistically and culturally balanced results that are more broadly applicable. Corresponding directly with national governments is another avenue for obtaining information about bullying legislation and policy. Continued research on evidence-based programs will also be useful, seeing as program
components often feed into policy. Like the uniform definition of bullying developed by the
CDC, standardized conceptualizations of appropriate policy and legislative components would
be a significant step for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. Besides providing tangible
guidance, they would hopefully eliminate or at least reduce potential obstacles caused by
information overload and/or insufficient background knowledge.

Research must also be conducted on the efficacy of antibullying policies. However, such
research is challenging from both scientific and practical perspectives. Firstly, analyzing the
impact of policy can be amorphous and uncertain. Bullying policies in particular are often
multifaceted, because they are trying to affect elaborate patterns of behavior. Such complexity
does not easily lend itself to clear-cut evaluation methods. Decisions would need to be made
about the components of the policies and the specific behavioral indicators (e.g., incidence,
prevalence, attitudes, perceptions) to consider. Secondly, determining criteria for success would
be difficult. Would a policy be considered successful only if it produced a certain percentage
reduction in bullying behavior within a given time frame? What if it was associated with high
rates of acceptability from the school community, changes in the school climate, decreases in
self-reported internalizing symptoms, or improvements in other areas such as school attendance,
achievement, and disciplinary consequences? Thirdly, like bullying, policy does not exist in
isolation. Policies typically encompass and are implemented concurrently with programming
(e.g., initiatives, campaigns, curriculum). They also exist within the larger society and may be
influenced by an array of social, cultural, economic, and political factors as well as current
events. Since policies cannot be separated from programming and societal influences, any results
cannot be solely attributed to the policy and would be at best correlational. Despite these
challenges, validation of the utility of antibullying policies is crucial, not only to provide
evidence for the above-mentioned goal of standardization, but also to achieve greater consistency in the adoption of policy for bullying prevention.

Furthermore, collaboration is essential to continued progress in many fields, and bullying is no exception. In the United States, continued efforts for multi-disciplinary, multi-agency, and multi-sectoral cooperation should occur in research and practice. Collaboration between state and-federal government entities (an often-avoided or neglected practice) is also recommended. Detractors notwithstanding, an issue as important as bullying should not be a casualty in political or ideological battles. Increased collaborative efforts should also occur internationally. Such partnerships already occur in academia (demonstrated in the scholarly literature) and in government (e.g., World Health Organization, European Union); it is therefore surprising that practice-oriented partnerships are not as evident. The information age and globalization have enabled innumerable societal advances. As a global phenomenon, bullying could benefit from improved communal approaches.

Finally, translation of evidence from research to practice is important but often-neglected aspect of the process. Any new evidence should be disseminated broadly in as accessible a manner as possible. Concrete formats such as toolkits, handbooks, and user-friendly websites would be preferable to policy briefs and research summaries due to perceived (if not actual) disparities in comprehensibility. In accordance with the public health principle of equating the desired behavior with the default behavior, information should be proactively distributed with the “bottom line” clearly discernable. From a governmental standpoint, current requirements should be regularly distributed, accompanied by ongoing opportunities for clarification and guidance via multiple mediums (e.g., in-person training, videoconferencing, dedicated telephone lines, online chats, etc.).
References


34 Wolke, D., Woods, S., Bloomfield, L., & Karstadt, L. (2000). The association between direct and relational bullying and behavior problems among primary school


153


173


Appendix A. Legislative Terminology and Policy Definitions

Part I. Glossary of Legislative and Related Terminology
The following definitions were compiled from Black’s Law Dictionary (www.thelawdictionary.org), FindLaw’s dictionary (http://dictionary.findlaw.com/legal-terms/l.html), and the National Conference of State Legislatures (http://www.ncsl.org/research/about-state-legislatures/glossary-of-legislative-terms.aspx)

**Act:**
- The formal product of a legislative body
- The formally declared will of a legislature
- A decision or determination of a sovereign, a legislative council, or a court of justice (FindLaw)

**Bill:** Draft of a proposed law presented to the legislature for consideration (NCSL)

**Code:**
- A compilation of laws and their revisions according to the subject matter (usually arranged by title, chapter, and section): the official publication of the statutes (NCSL)
- One that serves as a model for legislation but is not itself a law (FindLaw)

**Guidance document:** Guidelines written to give broad advice on procedure instead of precise requirements and standards (Black's Law)

**Guideline:** a practice that allows flexibility in its interpretation (Black's Law)

**Legislation:**
- The making or giving of laws
- The enactments of a legislator or legislative body (FindLaw)

**Policy:**
- The general principles by which a government is guided in its management of public affairs, or the legislature in its measure (Black's Law)
- An overall plan, principle, or guideline (Find Law)

**Regulation:**
- A rule or order prescribed for management or government; a regulating principle; a precept (Black's Law)
- An authoritative rule – a rule or order issued by a government agency and often having the force of law (Find Law)

**Resolution:** A document that expresses the sentiment or intent of the legislature or a chamber, governs the business of the legislature or a chamber, or expresses recognition by the legislature or a chamber (NCSL)

**Statute:** An act of the legislature; a particular law enacted and established by the will of the legislative department of government, expressed with the requisite formalities (Black's Law)
Part II. Types of Policy (Koné, Zurick, Patterson, & Peeples, 2012)

**Legislative policy**: laws or ordinances created by elected officials

**Regulatory policy**: created by administrative agencies through rules, regulations, orders, and procedures designed to promote policy goals enacted by legislation. Responsibilities for implementing and enforcing regulations may be delegated by legislatures to regulatory agencies.

**Organizational policy**: rules or practices established within an agency or organization; also called “internal policies.”
## Appendix B. Bullying-Related Bills Proposed in the United States Congress

### Table 1. Bills Directly Related to Bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Introduced</th>
<th>Last Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107th (2001-2002)</td>
<td>Rep. James Maloney (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 4774</td>
<td>School Safety and Violence Prevention Act</td>
<td>To direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States to establish antibullying Programs</td>
<td>5/20/2002</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108th (2003-2004)</td>
<td>Rep. Robert Wexler (D)</td>
<td>H.Res. 363</td>
<td>Recognizing the achievements of SUPERB (Students United with Parents and Educators to Resolve Bullying) and its founders Jeremy and Sharon Ring to address the growing problem of bullying in the Nation’s schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9/9/2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108th (2003-2004)</td>
<td>Rep. John Shimkus (R)</td>
<td>H.R. 4776</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7/7/2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 3132</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2007</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs.</td>
<td>7/23/2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Rep. Carolyn McCarthy (D)</td>
<td>H.Res. 762</td>
<td>Supporting the goals of National Bullying Prevention Awareness Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/22/2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Agreed To (Simple Resolution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 1589</td>
<td>Bullying and Gang Reduction for Improved Education Act</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to authorize the use of grant funds for gang prevention, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>3/18/2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez</td>
<td>H.R. 2262</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2009</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs.</td>
<td>5/5/2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Danny Davis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 5184</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/39/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Sen. Robert “Bob” Casey (D)</td>
<td>S. 3739</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2010</td>
<td>A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs</td>
<td>8/5/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 6542</td>
<td>Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2010</td>
<td>To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require the Attorney General to establish guidelines to prevent and address occurrences of bullying, to provide for grant funding to States for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying, and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program</td>
<td>12/17/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 83</td>
<td>Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011</td>
<td>To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require the Attorney General to establish guidelines to prevent and address occurrences of bullying, to provide for grant funding to States for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying, and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program</td>
<td>1/5/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Sen. Robert “Bob” Casey (D)</td>
<td>S. 506</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2011</td>
<td>A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students</td>
<td>3/8/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Rep. Danny Davis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 975</td>
<td>Anti-Bullying and Harassment Act of 2011</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs</td>
<td>3/9/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 1648</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2011</td>
<td>To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students</td>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 5770</td>
<td>Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act</td>
<td>To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the use of Juvenile Accountability Block Grants for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program</td>
<td>5/15/2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 6019</td>
<td>Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act</td>
<td>To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the use of Juvenile Accountability Block Grants for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program</td>
<td>6/26/2012</td>
<td>6/28/2012</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th</td>
<td>Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 10</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week in bringing attention to name-calling of all kinds and …</td>
<td>.. providing schools with the tools and inspiration to launch an on-going dialogue about ways to eliminate name-calling and bullying in their communities</td>
<td>1/25/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th</td>
<td>Sen. Robert “Bob” Casey (D)</td>
<td>S. 403</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2013</td>
<td>A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students</td>
<td>2/28/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 1199</td>
<td>Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2013</td>
<td>To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students</td>
<td>3/14/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress (Year)</td>
<td>Sponsor (Primary)</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Introduced</td>
<td>Fate</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 2585</td>
<td>Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013</td>
<td>To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the use of Juvenile Accountability Block Grants for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program</td>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Michael “Mike” Honda (D)</td>
<td>H.Res.398</td>
<td>Expressing support for designation of October 2013 as “National Anti-Bullying Month”</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Danny Davis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 3911</td>
<td>To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/16/2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Matthew Cartwright (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 4756</td>
<td>BRAVE Act or Bullying Redress and Verified Enforcement Act</td>
<td>To require reporting of bullying to appropriate authorities and assist with equal protection claims against entities who fail to respond appropriately to bullying, and for other purposes</td>
<td>5/29/2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114th (2015-2017)</td>
<td>Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 8</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week in bringing attention to name-calling of all kinds and providing …</td>
<td>…. Schools with the tools and inspiration to launch an on-going dialogue about ways to eliminate name-calling and bullying in their communities</td>
<td>1/21/2015</td>
<td>1/21/2015</td>
<td>* Referred to committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 33 pieces of legislation (28 Bills; 5 Resolutions) Of 29 Bills (24 House; 5 Senate) Of 5 Resolutions (4 House; 1 Senate)
### Table 2. Bills Indirectly Related to Bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Introduced</th>
<th>Last Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106th (1999-2000)</td>
<td>Rep. William “Bill” Clay (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 4346</td>
<td>Safe and Successful Schools Act</td>
<td>To modernize public schools, reduce class sizes, increase access to technology, enhance school safety, improve teacher quality and strengthen accountability for academic results, and for other purposes</td>
<td>5/2/2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2013)</td>
<td>Sen. Thomas “Tom” Harkin</td>
<td>S. 919</td>
<td>Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students Act of 2011</td>
<td>A bill to authorize grant programs to ensure successful, safe, and healthy students</td>
<td>5/29/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Barbara Lee (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 808</td>
<td>Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2013</td>
<td>To establish a Department of Peacebuilding</td>
<td>1/25/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Bruce Braley (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 3122</td>
<td>Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students Act of 2013</td>
<td>To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote student physical health and well-being, nutrition, fitness, and for other purposes</td>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 6 pieces of legislation (6 Bills)  
Of 6 Bills (4 House; 2 Senate)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Introduced</th>
<th>Last Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R)</td>
<td>S.Res. 205</td>
<td>A resolution designating June 2007 as “National Internet Safety Month”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/16/2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Agreed To (Simple Resolution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 3577</td>
<td>To direct the Attorney General to provide grants for Internet safety education programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9/18/2007</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Rep. Eliot Engel (D)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 328</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence with respect to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/15/2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Sen. John Kerry (D)</td>
<td>S. 3016</td>
<td>Internet Crime Prevention Act of 2008</td>
<td>A bill to direct the Attorney General to provide grants for Internet crime prevention education programs</td>
<td>5/14/2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Rep. Linda Sánchez (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 6120</td>
<td>To direct the Attorney General to provide grants for Internet crime prevention education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/21/2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Bill Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Introduced</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Eliot Engel (D)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 92</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/1/2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Steve Driehaus (D)</td>
<td>H.Res. 547</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of “National Internet Safety Month”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/15/2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Rep. Jared Polis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 4530</td>
<td>Student Nondiscrimination Act of 2010</td>
<td>To end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, or for other purposes</td>
<td>1/27/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>Sen. Alan “Al” Franken (D)</td>
<td>S. 3390</td>
<td>Student Nondiscrimination Act of 2010</td>
<td>To end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, or for other purposes</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2013)</td>
<td>Sen. Alan “Al” Franken (D)</td>
<td>S. 555</td>
<td>Student Non-Discrimination Act of 2011</td>
<td>A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes</td>
<td>3/10/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2013)</td>
<td>Rep. Jared Polis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 998</td>
<td>Student Non-Discrimination Act of 2011</td>
<td>A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes</td>
<td>3/10/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2013)</td>
<td>Rep. Eliot Engel (D)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 40</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/13/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Jared Polis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 1652</td>
<td>Student Non-Discrimination Act of 2013</td>
<td>To end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes</td>
<td>4/18/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Rep. Eliot Engel (D)</td>
<td>H.Con.Res. 33</td>
<td>Supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/18/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2015)</td>
<td>Sen. Alan “Al” Franken (D)</td>
<td>S. 1088</td>
<td>Student Non-Discrimination Act of 2013</td>
<td>A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes</td>
<td>6/4/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114th (2015-2017)</td>
<td>Rep. Jared Polis (D)</td>
<td>H.R. 846</td>
<td>Student Non-Discrimination Act of 2015</td>
<td>To end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes</td>
<td>2/10/2015</td>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
<td>Assigned to congressional committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong> 23 pieces of legislation (13 Bills; 10 Resolutions)</td>
<td>Of 13 Bills (8 House; 5 Senate)</td>
<td>Of 10 Resolutions (8 House; 2 Senate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossary of Terminology ([www.govtrack.us](http://www.govtrack.us))

**H.Con.Res.**
This is a House concurrent resolution in the United States Congress. A concurrent resolution is often used for matters that affect the rules of Congress or to express the sentiment of Congress. It must be agreed to by both the House and Senate in identical form but is not signed by the President and does not carry the force of law.

**H.R.**
This is a House of Representatives bill in the United States Congress. A bill must be passed by both the House and Senate in identical form and then be signed by the President to become law.

**H.Res**
This is a House simple resolution in the United States Congress. A simple resolution is used for matters that affect just one chamber of Congress, often to change the rules of the chamber to set the manner of debate for a related bill. It must be agreed to in the chamber in which it was introduced. It is not voted on in the other chamber and does not have the force of law.

**S.**
This is a Senate bill in the United States Congress. A bill must be passed by both the House and Senate in identical form and then be signed by the President to become law.

**S.Res.**
This is a Senate simple resolution in the United States Congress. A simple resolution is used for matters that affect just one chamber of Congress, often to change the rules of the chamber to set the manner of debate for a related bill. It must be agreed to in the chamber in which it was introduced. It is not voted on in the other chamber and does not have the force of law.

Note: Prognosis is listed on the title page for the bills in question
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## Appendix C. Bullying-Related Legislation Passed in the United Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 c. 31</td>
<td>School Standards and Framework Act 1998</td>
<td>Chapter V Staffing and conduct of schools</td>
<td>4)The head teacher shall determine measures (which may include the making of rules and provision for enforcing them) to be taken with a view to—&lt;br&gt; (a)promoting, among pupils, self-discipline and proper regard for authority;&lt;br&gt; (b)encouraging good behaviour and respect for others on the part of pupils and, in particular, preventing all forms of <strong>bullying</strong> among pupils;&lt;br&gt; (c)securing that the standard of behaviour of pupils is acceptable; and&lt;br&gt; (d)otherwise regulating the conduct of pupils.&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 No. 1910</td>
<td>The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2003</td>
<td>SCHEDULE THE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS STANDARDS</td>
<td>3.—(1) The welfare, health and safety of pupils at the school meets the standard if the requirements in sub-paragraphs (2) to (9) are met.&lt;br&gt; (2) The school shall draw up and implement effectively a written policy to—&lt;br&gt; (a)prevent <strong>bullying</strong>, which has regard to DfES Guidance “Bullying: don't suffer in silence;”&lt;br&gt; (b)safeguard and promote the welfare of children who are pupils at the school, which complies with DfES Circular 10/95 “Protecting Children from Abuse: the Role of the Education Service”;&lt;br&gt; (c)safeguard and promote the health and safety of pupils on activities outside the school, which has regard to DfES Guidance “Health and Safety of Pupils on Educational Visits”; and&lt;br&gt; (d)promote good behaviour amongst pupils and set out the sanctions to be adopted in the event of pupil misbehaviour.&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 c. 40</td>
<td>Education and Inspections Act 2006</td>
<td>Part 7 Discipline, behaviour and exclusion</td>
<td>1)The head teacher of a relevant school must determine measures to be taken with a view to—&lt;br&gt; (a)promoting, among pupils, self-discipline and proper regard for authority,&lt;br&gt; (b)encouraging good behaviour and respect for others on the part of pupils and, in particular, preventing all forms of <strong>bullying</strong> among pupils,&lt;br&gt; (c)securing that the standard of behaviour of pupils is acceptable,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Paragraph/Section</td>
<td>Amendment/Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 No. 3253</td>
<td>The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008</td>
<td>6. In paragraph 3 of the Schedule— (a) in sub-paragraph (2)(a)….</td>
<td>(d) securing that pupils complete any tasks reasonably assigned to them in connection with their education, and (e) otherwise regulating the conduct of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 No. 1124</td>
<td>The School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
<td>2006 c.40. Section 89 sets out the responsibilities of the head teacher for establishing and maintaining a behaviour policy which contains measures for promoting self-discipline and proper regard for authority among pupils; encouraging good behaviour and respect for others; preventing bullying; securing that pupils complete tasks reasonably assigned to them; and otherwise regulating the conduct of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 No. 3283</td>
<td>The Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014</td>
<td>SCHEDULE PART 3 Welfare, health and safety of pupils</td>
<td>10. The standard in this paragraph is met if the proprietor ensures that bullying at the school is prevented in so far as reasonably practicable, by the drawing up and implementation of an effective anti-bullying strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. United Kingdom Anti-Bullying Charter Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Roles and Expectations</th>
<th>Bullying Victims</th>
<th>Bullying Perpetrators</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know how to report bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to rebuild confidence/resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know how to obtain support from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are confident in the school’s ability to manage bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are held accountable for their actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to behave properly in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to repair the harm they have caused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand roles they can take to prevent bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Roles and Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire School Community</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are aware of the school’s anti-bullying stance</td>
<td>- Participate in relevant professional development</td>
<td>- Promote school climate where bullying is unacceptable, cannot flourish</td>
<td>- Are aware of procedures to use if concerned about bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are fully engaged in developing and reviewing anti-bullying procedures</td>
<td>- Understand their roles in preventing and responding to bullying</td>
<td>- Review school anti-bullying policy every two years and update policy and procedures as necessary</td>
<td>- Are confident that the school will take complaints seriously and will investigate/resolve as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understand the importance of modelling positive relationships</td>
<td>- Utilize data systems to monitor and evaluate effectiveness of current policy/procedures; share data with school community</td>
<td>- Understand their roles in complementing the school’s anti-bullying policy, procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collaborate with parents, community partners to promote safe communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. New South Wales Preventing and Responding to Bullying in Schools Policy

Part I: User-friendly format

Bullying:
Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools Policy (2011)

The NSW Department of Education and Communities rejects all forms of bullying. No student, employee, parent, caregiver or community member should experience bullying within the learning or working environments of the Department.

Bullying behaviour can be:
- verbal eg name calling, teasing, abuse, putdowns, sarcasm, insults, threats
- physical eg hitting, punching, kicking, scratching, tripping, spitting
- social eg ignoring, excluding, ostracising, alienating, making inappropriate gestures
- psychological eg spreading rumours, dirty looks, hiding or damaging possessions, malicious SMS and email messages, inappropriate use of camera phones.

The term “bullying” has a specific meaning. The school’s Anti-Bullying Plan sets out the processes for preventing and responding to student bullying. The school has a range of policies and practices, including welfare and discipline policies that apply to student behaviour generally.

School staff have a responsibility to:
- respect and support students
- model and promote appropriate behaviour
- have knowledge of school and departmental policies relating to bullying behaviour
- respond in a timely manner to incidents of bullying according to the school’s Anti-bullying Plan.

In addition, teachers have a responsibility to:
- provide curriculum and pedagogy that supports students to develop an understanding of bullying and its impact on individuals and the broader community.

Students have a responsibility to:
- behave appropriately, respecting individual differences and diversity
- behave as responsible digital citizens
- follow the school Anti-bullying Plan
- behave as responsible bystanders
- report incidents of bullying according to their school Anti-bullying Plan.

Parents and caregivers have a responsibility to:
- support their children to become responsible citizens and to develop responsible online behaviour
- be aware of the school Anti-bullying Plan and assist their children in understanding bullying behaviour
- support their children in developing positive responses to incidents of bullying consistent with the school Anti-bullying Plan
- report incidents of school related bullying behaviour to the school
- work collaboratively with the school to resolve incidents of bullying when they occur.

All members of the school community have a responsibility to:
- model and promote positive relationships that respect and accept individual differences and diversity within the school community
- support the school’s Anti-bullying Plan through words and actions
- work collaboratively with the school to resolve incidents of bullying when they occur.
Part II: Additional Policy Components

**Bullying: Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools Policy**

*This policy sets out the requirements for preventing and responding to student bullying in NSW government schools.*

**2. Audience and applicability**

2.1 The policy applies to all NSW government schools and preschools.

2.2 The policy applies to all student bullying behaviour, including cyberbullying, that occurs in NSW government schools and preschools, and off school premises and outside of school hours where there is a clear and close relationship between the school and the conduct of the student.

**5. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements**

5.1 Principles are responsible for:

- implementing the policy within the school
- submitting a copy of the school’s Anti-bullying Plan to the Director, Public Schools whenever it is reviewed
- reporting annually to their school community on the effectiveness of the school’s Anti-bullying Plan

5.2 Directors, Public Schools are responsible for monitoring the local implementation of this policy and reporting to the regional director.

5.3 Executive Directors, Public Schools are responsible for ensuring the regional implementation of the policy
Appendix F. New South Wales Anti-Bullying Plan Template

Our School Anti-Bullying Plan

This plan outlines the processes for preventing and responding to student bullying in our school and reflects the Bullying: Preventing and Responding to Student Bullying in Schools Policy of the New South Wales Department of Education and Communities.

Explain how representation from the whole school community has been ensured. Explain how and at what stages you have/you will engage the school community in developing, implementing, evaluating and reviewing this plan.

Statement of purpose

Enter a statement of purpose that outlines the key beliefs or principles about bullying behaviour and the aims of the school on which this Anti-bullying Plan is based.

Protection

Detail the strategies the school will implement to maintain a positive climate of respectful relationships where bullying is less likely to occur.

Prevention

Detail the strategies and programs the school will implement for bullying prevention.

Detail how the school is embedding anti-bullying messages into each curriculum area and in every year level.

Early Intervention

Detail the early intervention strategies and programs your school will implement for students who are identified as being at risk of developing long-term difficulties with social relationships and those students who are identified at or after enrolment as having previously experienced bullying or engaged in bullying behaviour.

Response

Detail the strategies your school will implement to empower the whole school community to recognise and respond appropriately to bullying, harassment and victimisation and behave as responsible bystanders.

Detail the procedures for reporting incidents of bullying at your school. Detail how these procedures will be publicised to your school community.

School Anti-bullying Plan – NSW Department of Education and Communities
Detail the procedures and timeframes that your school will implement when an incident of bullying is reported to the school.

Detail the processes that will be used at your school to match planned combinations of interventions to the particular incident of bullying.

Detail the strategies and programs your school will implement to support any student who has been affected by, engaged in or witnessed bullying behaviour.

Explain the school’s plans for providing regular updates, within the bounds of privacy legislation, to parents and caregivers about the management of bullying incidents that have been reported to the school.

Explain the school’s procedures for reporting incidents involving assaults, threats, intimidation or harassment to the police.

Explain the procedures the school will use with regard to contacting the Child Wellbeing Unit or Community Services where appropriate.

Explain departmental appeal procedures and provide information about the Complaints Handling Policy.

Detail the strategies the school will use to identify patterns of bullying behaviour. Explain how the school will respond to such patterns.

Detail how your school will promote and publicise this Anti-bullying Plan including how it will be made widely available to the school community available on any school website.

Detail the processes your school will use to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of its Anti-bullying Plan.

Explain how your school will report annually to the school community on the effectiveness of the Anti-bullying Plan.

Explain how and when (at least every three years) your school will review this Anti-bullying Plan with the school community.

**Additional Information**

Enter here contact information for the Police Youth Liaison Officer (YLO) and the School Liaison Police officer (SLP) where appropriate.

*The Anti-Bullying Plan – NSW Department of Education and Communities*
Enter here contact information for appropriate support services such as Kids Helpline

Enter any additional text here

Web: Enter here

Principal's comment

Enter a comment from the principal as the leader of the school team that developed the plan.

Enter the names and positions of each member of the school team that developed the plan.

Enter team member and position
Enter team member and position
Enter team member and position
Enter team member and position
Enter team member and position

School contact information

Enter School name
Enter School address
Ph: Enter here
Fax: Enter here
Email: Enter here
Appendix G: Queensland DETE Policy and Procedure Register Documents Examined

Legislation

- Commonwealth Legislation (None)
- Commonwealth Legislative Instruments (None)
- Queensland Legislation
  - Child Protection Act 1999
  - Community Services Act 2007
  - Education and Care Services Act 2013
  - Education and Care Services National Law (Queensland) Act 2011
  - Education (General Provisions) Act 2006
- Queensland Subordinate Legislation
  - Child Protection Regulation 2011
- Education and Care Services Regulation 2013
  - Education and Care Services National Law (Queensland) Regulation 2011
  - Education (General Provisions) Regulation 2006

Policies

- School Education Policies
  - A Whole School Approach to Support Student Learning
  - Learning and Wellbeing Framework (LAWF)
  - National Safe Schools Framework
  - Statement of Expectations for a Disciplined School Environment
  - Supporting Student Health and Wellbeing in Queensland State Schools

Directives (None)

Standards

- Code of School Behaviour

Procedures

- School Education Procedures
  - School Community Procedures
  - Student Protection
  - Student Learning and Wellbeing Procedures
  - Safe, Supportive, and Disciplined School Environment
  - Supporting Students’ Mental Health and Wellbeing

Delegations and Authorisations (None)

Guidelines

- School Education
  - Cybersafety Brochure
  - Guidelines for Developing a Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students
  - Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students – Checklist for Principals, Executive Directors
  - (Schools) and Regional Executive Directors

Supporting Documents

- School Education
  - Individual Behaviour Support Plans
  - Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students
Appendix H. Queensland Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students Example School Policy for Preventing and Responding to Incidents of Bullying

School policy for preventing and responding to incidents of bullying (including cyberbullying)

Purpose
(School name) strives to create positive, predictable environments for all students at all times of the day. The disciplined and teaching environment that we are creating is essential to:
• achieving overall school improvement, including the effectiveness and efficiency of our student support procedures
• raising achievement and attendance
• promoting equality and diversity and
• ensuring the safety and well-being of all members of the school community.

There is no place for bullying in (school name). Those who are bullied and those who bully are at risk for behavioural, emotional and academic problems. These outcomes are in direct contradiction to our school community’s goals and efforts for supporting all students.

Bullying behaviours that will not be tolerated at (school name) include name-calling, taunting, mocking, making offensive comments, kicking, hitting, pushing, taking belongings, inappropriate text messaging, sending offensive or degrading images by phone or internet, producing offensive graffiti, gossiping, excluding people from groups, and spreading hurtful and untruthful rumours.

Bullying may be related to:
• race, religion or culture;
• disability;
• appearance or health conditions;
• sexual orientation;
• sexist or sexual language;
• children acting as carers; or
• children in care.

At (school name) there is broad agreement among students, staff and parents that bullying is observable and measurable behaviour. When considering whether or not bullying has occurred, we will therefore avoid speculation on the intent of the behaviour, the power of individuals involved, or the frequency of its occurrence. Whether bullying behaviour is observed between students of equal or unequal power, whether it occurs once or several times, and whether or not the persons involved cite intimidation, revenge, or self-defence as a motive, the behaviour will be responded to in similar fashion, that is, as categorically unacceptable in the school community.

Rationale
Many bullying behaviours are peer-maintained through the actions of bystanders. That is, peers react to bullying in ways that may increase the likelihood of it occurring again in the future. Reactions include joining in, laughing, or simply standing and watching, rather than intervening to help the person being bullied. Whilst our school would never encourage students to place themselves at risk, our anti-bullying procedures involve teaching the entire school a set of safe and effective responses to all problem behaviour, including bullying, in such a way that those who bully are not socially reinforced for demonstrating it.

The anti-bullying procedures at (school name) are an addition to our schoolwide positive behaviour support processes. This means that all students are being explicitly taught the expected school behaviours and receiving high levels of social acknowledgement for doing so. Adding lessons on bullying and how to prevent and respond to it is a subset of procedures that our students are already accustomed to.
Prevention
Attempting to address specific problem behaviours will not be successful if the general level of disruptive behaviour in all areas of our school is not kept to a low level. Therefore, our schoolwide universal behaviour support practices will be maintained at all times. This will ensure that:

- Our universal behaviour support processes will always remain the primary strategy for preventing problem behaviour, including preventing the subset of bullying behaviour
- All students know the 3 school rules and have been taught the expected behaviours attached to each rule in all areas of the school
- All students have been or are being taught the specific routines in the non-classroom areas, from exiting the classroom, conducting themselves in accordance with the school expectations in the playground and other areas, to re-entering their classrooms
- All students are receiving high levels of positive reinforcement for demonstrating expected behaviours, including those associated with following our routines, from all staff in the non-classroom areas of the school
- A high level of quality active supervision is a permanent staff routine in the non-classroom areas. This means that duty staff members are easily identifiable and are constantly moving, scanning and positively interacting as they move through the designated supervision sectors of the non-classroom areas.

The student curriculum modules of the anti-bullying process consist of lessons taught by all teachers in all classrooms to a schoolwide schedule of instruction. At all times simultaneous instruction is our goal, in order to maintain consistency of skill acquisition across the school.

An initial introductory lesson is delivered, which teaches the 3-step process to be used by all students when experiencing bullying behaviour either as a person being bullied, the person bullying or bystander.

The introductory lesson is followed by several shorter lessons, each of which focuses on one of the bullying behaviours that the school has identified and defined. These lessons include instruction on how to approach adults and also on what reactions and systemic responses they should expect from adults.

Research indicates that a common outcome of anti-bullying programming is an improvement in understanding of bullying but little change in the frequency or nature of actual bullying behaviour. One of the reasons cited for this outcome is the lack of behavioural rehearsal in the programming. The anti-bullying process at (school name) takes care to combine knowledge with practice in a process of active learning, so that students understand by ‘doing’ as much as by ‘knowing’.

(School name) records inappropriate behaviour and uses behavioural data for decision-making. This data is entered into our database on a daily basis and can be recalled as summary reports at any time. This facility allows the school to track the effectiveness of its anti-bullying process, to make any necessary adjustments, and to identify specific bullying behaviours that may need to be revisited or revised in the instructional process.
Appendix I. Sample Anti-Bullying Policy from Queensland Working Together Toolkit

Rationale

All schools in Queensland are committed to taking action to protect students from bullying and to respond appropriately when bullying does occur.

School community beliefs about bullying

It is important that students, staff and parents/carers have a shared understanding of what bullying is, how it impacts on people and how bullying is responded to at <school name>.

Educational Programs

It is important that students, staff and parents/carers understand what bullying is, how it impacts on people and how bullying is responded to at <school name>. At <school name> we use the following educational strategies:

- Xx
- Xx
- Xx

Prevention Programs

Effective social skills and positive relationships act to prevent bullying. At <school name> we promote effective social skills and positive relationships by:

- Xx
- Xx
- Xx

Responses to bullying

Reports of bullying will be investigated and acted upon. Responses to bullying might include support for targets of bullying and perpetrators and/or disciplinary measures.

At <school name> we support targets and perpetrators by:

- Xx
- Xx
- Xx

At <school name> the consequences for bullying might include the following:

- Xx
Reporting and monitoring bullying

At <school name> reports of bullying are taken seriously. Students and parents/carers may report bullying in the following ways:

- Xx
- Xx
- Xx

Reports of bullying will be collated and monitored to inform the school community about the extent of bullying and to identify particular areas of concern for future action.
Support information for a school’s anti-bullying policy

STATEMENT: A clear, firm statement on the school’s stance on bullying, harassment and violence

Example Statement 1
The school will provide a safe, inclusive, supportive and ordered learning environment free from bullying, harassment and violence. Bullying, including cyber bullying, harassment and violence, is not acceptable in this school and will be dealt with seriously and expediently.

The school will work with the school community and other services and agencies to support its students in being responsible and productive members of this community.

Example Statement 2
Bullying, harassment and violence are hurtful and destructive. Physical bullying can be seen. Cyber bullying happens behind the screens. Bullying, harassment and violence continue to be issues of concern for students and their parents/guardians.

Bullying, including cyber bullying and harassment and violence, is not acceptable in this school and will be dealt with seriously and expediently.

The school will work with the school community and other services and agencies to support its students in being responsible and productive members of this community.

DEFINITIONS: Nationally agreed to, Coalition agreed to, and Equal Opportunity agreed to definitions of bullying, harassment, violence, discrimination, cyber bullying and sexual harassment

Definitions should be provided for bullying, harassment, violence, discrimination, cyber bullying and sexual harassment. These definitions should be consistent with examples from Safer DECD schools (DECD 2011). Additional definitions can be found in the National Safe Schools Framework resource manual (MCEEDYA 2011, pp 40–50).

REPORTING AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Consistent with the National Safe Schools Framework Element 3: Policies and Procedures: Characteristic 3.1: Whole school, collaboratively developed policies, plans and structures for supporting safety and wellbeing

The Coalition of South Australian school jurisdictions believes surveying students regularly and developing a report and an action plan for the Governing Council are good ways of monitoring and acting upon student, parent and teacher concerns. A commitment to this in a policy would indicate the school is doing all it can to resolve the issue of bullying.

Reporting of a bullying incident
How is bullying reported?
Students are reluctant to report incidents of bullying so, when a student or parent reports an incident, this should be taken seriously. Other sources may be a school staff member or even a member of the public.

Who to report to?
Parents and students may choose to report incidents of bullying, including cyber bullying, to their class teacher in the first instance and, if the incident is serious or unresolved, to the school counsellor, principal or deputy/assistant principal, or to someone on the school’s staff they have confidence in. It is difficult for the school to follow up on an incident if it is unaware of it and, therefore, reporting of incidents should be made easy and encouraged.
How to report?
Parents and students may find it helpful to write down the details of the incident as a first step. A face-to-face discussion is usually the best way of reporting an incident and, if they are dissatisfied with the outcome, they can follow up with a written statement with the request for a further meeting. If seriously concerned about the manner in which the school is dealing with an incident, a parent can contact his/her local Regional Office for support.

When to report?
Reporting of an incident should occur as soon after the incident as possible. This gives the school the best opportunity to follow up the incident and intervene.

Principals need to provide to the school Governing Council updates each term in relation to school bullying data and trends and any anti-bullying programs/initiatives in place or being considered. This report should be made available to the general school community via the newsletter and be placed on the school’s website for easy access by parents.

Responsibilities of principals, staff, students and parents
The principal will decrease the likelihood of bullying and violence in the school if he/she:
- develops, implements and reviews regularly the school’s anti-bullying policy (ie schools are encouraged to review annually and to involve staff, parents and students)
- surveys regularly all or a random selection of students, parents and teachers, in line with the review schedule for the school’s policy
- provides to the Governing Council updates each term in relation to school bullying data and trends and any anti-bullying programs/initiatives in place or being considered and includes the topic of bullying behaviour as a council meeting agenda item at least once per term
- ensures that new staff and new students and their families are aware of the school community’s negotiated anti-bullying policy and the decision-making procedures open to them if they wish to influence school practice
- ensures the inclusion, as part of the school’s enrolment process, a requirement for parents and/or students to annually acknowledge/agree to the school’s Student Code of Conduct
- provides students with orientation in school policy, at least when they are in transition (eg Years 3 and 8), and particularly in the school’s anti-bullying policy and other relevant behavioural expectations, with follow up at least in Years 6 and 10
- manages the incidents of bullying in a way that is consistent with the DECD School Discipline Policy
- provides in-service training and development to counsellors and other key staff in effective strategies in managing bullying, such as in the Six Methods of Intervention as, described in ‘Bullying in schools: Six methods of intervention’
- ensures ongoing training and development of teachers, induction of students and the provision of information to parents
- manages a whole-school-change approach to ensure the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum is implemented in all year levels
- ensures that all parents
  - have access to the school’s anti-bullying policy, the DECD Bullying and harassment at school: Advice for parents and caregivers leaflet, and information about the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum and related documents, including providing them on the school’s website
  - have access to the reports to Governing Council each term, via the newsletter and on the school’s website
  - are aware of their rights to advocacy and of avenues open to them should they have grievances relating to the school’s management of an incident of bullying.
School staff members will decrease the likelihood of bullying and violence in the school if they:

- develop and foster positive relationships with students and families
- communicate and interact effectively with students and engage in cooperative problem-solving relationships to address issues of bullying
- participate in developing, implementing and reviewing the school’s anti-bullying policy, curriculum and in-service offerings, and the procedures for managing incidents of bullying
- critically reflect on practices and develop the knowledge and skills needed to manage incidents of bullying successfully
- establish, maintain, make explicit and model the school’s expectations relating to bullying
- participate in training and development related to decreasing bullying in schools
- support students to be effective bystanders.

Parents will support the school in maintaining a safe and supportive environment if they:

- keep the school informed of concerns about behaviour, their children’s health issues or other matters of relevance
- communicate in a respectful manner with the school staff about issues of concern soon after these concerns arise
- follow up on these concerns and, if necessary, contact the Regional Office if the concerns are not resolved following intervention by the principal.

Students will support the school in maintaining a safe and supportive environment if they:

- are respectful towards other students, staff and members of the school community
- participate in sessions regarding the school’s anti-bullying policy, the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum, being an effective bystander, and other sessions regarding behavioural expectations
- communicate with an appropriate adult if bullied or harassed or if they are aware that someone else is being bullied or harassed
- learn to be an effective bystander, so that bullying and harassment are discouraged through peer influence.

**HOW TO RECOGNISE A STUDENT BEING BULLIED: Information about the signs of bullying**

Students who are being bullied or harassed may not talk about it with their teachers, friends or with the school’s counsellors. They may be afraid that it will only make things worse or they may feel that it is wrong to ‘tell tales’.

This is why parents and teachers have an important part to play in helping the school and the student deal with bullying. A change in behaviour in students may be a signal that they are being bullied or they have some other concern.

**Signs**

Some signs that a student is being bullied may be:

- unexplained cuts, bruises or scratches
- damaged or ripped clothing
- vague headaches or stomach aches
- refusal to go to school
- asking for extra pocket money or food
- tearfulness, anxiety or difficulty sleeping
- ‘hiding’ information on mobile phones, emails or in comments on their social networking pages.
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Disabilities, guardianship and more

In establishing an anti-bullying policy, it is important to consider students with a disability, gifted students, Special School students, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, students in care (guardianship), and students who are same sex attracted. Schools should include in education plans any issues related to bullying, harassment, violence, discrimination or child protection matters for students with a disability (Negotiated Education Plan), an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander student (Individual Learning Plan) and students under guardianship (Individual Education Plan).

All schools should include, as part of the enrolment process, a requirement for parents and/or students to annually acknowledge/agree to the school’s Student Code of Conduct.

ACTIONS: Responses to incidents, follow-up and reporting to parents

Some flexibility is needed in how incidents are tackled, depending on, for example, the nature, severity and extent of the bullying. When sanctions are applied, they should be appropriate to the severity of the offence. In extreme cases, under the Regulations pursuant to the Education Act, principals can suspend or exclude students from attendance at school if they:

...act in a manner that threatens the safety or well being of a student or member of staff of, or other person associated with the school (including by sexually harassing, racially vilifying, verbally abusing or bullying that person).

Principals can use these Regulations for incidents that occur off-site and/or out of school hours if another student’s safety or well being has been threatened. Therefore, these Regulations can be used for incidents of cyber bullying or violence (see Circular to Principals May 2009).

The student who has been bullied may need support and assistance from the school after the problem has been resolved. This is because the effect of being bullied may result in continued anxiety, which can affect a student’s capacity to learn.

‘Response level and types of behaviour’ provides a guide regarding behaviour descriptors and suitable levels of response.

Follow-up of students who are victims or perpetrators of bullying may be required to ensure they feel safe at school and remain connected to the school following an incident.

The State Government’s response to the Cossey Report (Cossey 2011) requires site leaders to notify parents of the victim of violence at the earliest opportunity.

PREVENTION, COPING AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES: Information about prevention, coping and intervention strategies

Students should be informed of the school’s policy and what students can expect if they are the perpetrator or the victim of bullying. Student coping strategies used by the school should be detailed with a note that these will be different for each individual depending on the circumstances.

The school’s curriculum strategies that strengthen the school’s anti-bullying policy, including implementation of the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum, should be developed, communicated and implemented. These curriculum strategies should also be documented.
TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT: Information about when, how, to whom and by whom training and development is offered

Providing professional learning opportunities for teachers and induction of students are essential if consistent practice is to occur around the prevention of and intervention after incidents of bullying, harassment or violence. Parents should also be provided with information about school policies via the school’s website, in the school’s newsletter, and at information evenings. There is a direct link between schools providing quality staff training and development and student induction and effective implementation of an anti-bullying policy.

As there is also a link between positive classroom practice and a lower incidence of bullying, harassment and violence, teachers within their first five years of employment with DECD should complete a course in *Your classroom: Safe, orderly and productive*. If teachers are interacting with students who have significant behavioural issues, principals should consider if they require training in *Non-violent intervention*, available from the Regional Office.

DISTRIBUTION LIST: Details of when, how, to whom and by whom the policy is communicated

Part of the development and documentation process for a school policy should be the recording of who is provided with the policy, when and by whom, and in what form. The communication of the policy via a newsletter and the school’s website also needs to be noted.

REVIEW DATE: Policy review schedule

All schools are encouraged to review their anti-bullying policy annually, and involve parents and students in this process.

Schools should state the date that the policy was published or reviewed and when the next review is due.

As part of site visits, Regional Directors will sight school anti-bullying policies and report on compliance levels, and the quality of the policy and its integration into the culture of the school.
Appendix K. Victoria DET Website Sections Examined

*This list below does not encompass every section/heading, but only those whose titles might have possible relevance to bullying.

Search box (Main page)
- Bullying: ~ 660 results
- Policy: ~ 1,900 results
- Policies: ~ 650 results

About the Department (Main Page)
- Our Department
  - Annual Reports
  - Legislation and Ministerial Orders
    - Education and Training Reform Act 2006
    - Education and Training Reform Regulations 2007 (had to use separate legislation website)
    - Legislation Administered by the Minister for Families and Children (had to use separate legislation website)
    - Legislation Administered by the Minister for Education
  - Strategic Directions
    - Principles for Health and Wellbeing
    - Building Resilience: A Model to Support Children and Young People
    - Vulnerable Children Action Plan
      - Victoria’s Vulnerable Children: Our Shared Responsibility
  - Strategic Plan
  - Statistics for Victorian Schools

- Programs and Initiatives
  - Health, Wellbeing and Safety
    - Managing Challenging Behaviours
  - Learning and Development

- Research
  - Research Publications
    - Health, Wellbeing and Safety (different from above)
      - Strategies for Improving Outcomes for Young Children – A Catalogue of Evidence-Based Interventions (PDF)
    - Learning and Development (same as above)
    - Child Health Prevalence and Trends
    - Peer Effects and Achievement in Victorian Schools
  - Research and Evaluation Register
    - Found 30 research projects using “bullying” key word search; none were publically accessible

School (Main Page) - For Students section:
- Student Support
  - Student Support Services
  - Support in Schools
  - Bullying (links to Bully Stoppers webpages)
  - Discipline
    - Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance (dead link)
School (Main Page) – For Parents section:

- Behaviour and Attendance
  - Discipline
    - Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance
    - The Student Engagement Policy
      - About Student Engagement
      - What the Policy Should Include
        - Responding to Challenging Behaviour
          - Strategies and Supports Available to Schools
            - Whole School Engagement Strategies and Supports
            - Engagement Strategies for Individual Students
            - Additional Support for Individual Students
            - Support and Resources for Specific Groups of Students
              - Safe Schools Coalition Victoria (focused on same sex attracted, intersex, and gender diverse students)
            - Professional Development
              - Bullying and Cyberbullying (link to Bully Stoppers webpages)
      - Bullying Data Collection Tool (links to Bully Stoppers webpages)
  - Student Behaviour
    - The Student Engagement Policy (same as above)
    - Managing Challenging Behaviour
    - Promoting Positive Behaviours and Preventing Behaviour Issues
    - Responding to Challenging Behaviour
      - Disciplinary Measures
        - The Student Engagement Policy (same as above)
        - Strategies and Supports Available to Schools (same as above)
        - Disciplinary Measures (same as above)
        - The Compact: Roles and Responsibilities in School Education (PDF)
      - Disciplinary Measures (same as above)
    - Student Behaviour
      - Strategies and Supports Available to Schools (same as above)
      - Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance (same as above)
  - Creating Respectful and Safe Communities
    - Statement of Values for Safe Schools (Word document)

- Child Health and Safety
  - Child Health and Wellbeing
    - Child Health and Wellbeing
    - Bullying (links to Bully Stoppers webpages)

School (Main Page) – For Teachers and Support Staff section

- Learning and Teaching resources
  - Physical, Personal and Social Learning
    - Civics and Citizenship
    - Interpersonal Development
    - Personal Learning

- Teacher Support Resources

- Student Health and Wellbeing
  - Bullying (links to Bully Stoppers webpages)
  - Mental Health
    - Promoting Healthy Minds for Living and Learning (PDF File)
- Social and Emotional Learning
- Environments
- Family and Community Partnerships
- Integrated Mental Health Promotion
- Building Mental Health Promotion Capacity
- Victoria Department of Health and Mental Health Promotion
  - Respectful Relationships Education
    - Report: Respectful Relationships Education (PDF)
    - (Publication) Building Respectful Relationships: Stepping Out Against Gender-Based Violence (PDF)
  - Social and Emotional Learning (different page than above)
    - Promoting Positive Relationships (Power Point presentation)
    - Positive Coping (Power Point presentation)
    - Problem-solving (Power Point presentation)
    - Help-seeking (Power Point presentation)
  - Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance (same as above)

**School (Main Page) – For Principals and Administrators** section:
- Student Health and Safety
  - Support in Schools
    - Bullying (links to Bully Stoppers webpages)
  - Prevention and Health Promotion
  - Mental Health (same as above)
  - Critical Incidents
  - Child Protection

- Participation and Engagement
  - Student Engagement and Inclusion Guidance (same as above)
  - Creating Respectful and Safe Communities (same as above)

- Access the School Policy & Advisory Guide
  - School Community
  - Student Health
    - Prevention
  - Student Participation
    - Student Engagement
      - Policy Requirements and Development
        - The Student Engagement Policy (same as above)
        - What the Policy Should Include (same as above)
        - Responding to Challenging Behaviour (same as above)
        - Student Support Groups
  - Student Safety
    - Protection and Support
      - Bullying Policy
      - Health and Wellbeing Services
        - Support in Schools (same as above)
    - Student Support Services Policy
Appendix L. Victoria Main Government Website Searches

Main Page - Search Function

- Search for Policy: ~ 197,000,000 results / Search for Policies: ~ 196,000,000 results
  - Related Searches Menu → Educational policy: ~ 232,000,000 results
    - Related Searches Menu → School policy: ~ 712,000,000 results

Main Page - For Victorians

- Education
  - Education sector & policy
    - Educational policy: 2 results found; neither is a policy, both link to DET website and its pages
    - Research in Education: 3 results; 2 link back to DET website, the other to the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (not relevant)
  - School Education
    - Administration & funding: 8 links, 7 irrelevant
      - School Policy & Advisory guide (same as located on DET website)
    - Bullying & student wellbeing
      - Bully Stoppers page on DET website
      - Cyberbullying (on Bully Stoppers page)
      - Safe Schools Coalition Victoria (previously located via DET website)
      - Student Health and Safety (same as on DET website)
    - School safety & transport: 2 irrelevant links
    - Student resources: 14 irrelevant links
    - Teacher resources: 8 irrelevant links

Main Page – Victorian Government

- Media Releases
  - Search for bullying: 4 irrelevant results
- Publications: 399 results
  - Search Publications for bullying: only one result on workplace bullying
  - Categories – Education: 130 irrelevant entries including the one above
Appendix M. A Framework of Considerations and Components of Anti-Bullying Policies

Preparatory Activities

- Form school antibullying coordinating committee with key stakeholders from school and community that is tasked with the development, implementation, maintenance, and evaluation of the program

- Engage the school community at large
  - Seek input from students, staff, parents, and other community members regarding a mutual/shared understanding of bullying, policy contents
  - Foster ownership and acceptance from stakeholders through consistent involvement in the planning process

- Identify:
  - Existence of current initiative in the school that can be coordinated with bullying prevention efforts (e.g., positive behavior support, Safe & Drug Free Schools, etc.)
  - Community resources that can help reinforce bullying prevention efforts

- Collaboratively Develop/Establish:
  - Definitions of bullying
  - Clear and enforceable rules for behavior
  - Clearly document Procedural steps to respond appropriately to bullying incidents
  - Reporting procedures
  - Guidelines for investigating, responding to reports
  - Protocols for maintaining records
  - Roles and responsibilities of staff, students, parents/caregivers, community members, committee, etc.

- Ensure that:
  - Policies are consistent with applicable local rules, regional statutes
  - Students, staff, and parents understanding and acceptance of the policy and its components - definitions of bullying, the rules of behavior, reporting, investigating procedures, etc.
  - Open avenues for input, feedback are available

Assessment

- Conduct a survey of students and other selected sources (e.g., staff, parents) to measure:
  - Understanding of bullying, attitudes towards bullying
  - Prevalence of bullying
    - If not anonymous, can determine demographic information about who is involved – gender, age/grade levels, racial/ethnic groups,
  - Types of bullying
  - Location of incidents, times of day
  - Contexts/situations
  - Perceived safety and supportiveness of school (school climate)

- Data collection should:
  - be linked to existing data systems (e.g., attendance, discipline) when possible
  - seek to identify patterns of bullying behavior
  - recognize repeat perpetrators or victims (if not anonymous)

Statement/Written Policy

- Mission statement – vision for school

- Code of conduct – clear and defined behavioral standards, expectations
• Firm statement on the unacceptability of bullying, the rights of school community members not to be subjected to bullying, and the school’s commitment to prevent and manage it

• Acknowledgement that everyone in the school community has a responsibility to prevent bullying

• Clear definitions of bullying
  o Inclusion/exclusion criteria
  o Types of bullying
  o Examples of bullying
  o Vulnerable groups

• Rights and responsibilities of all school community members

• Expectation that anyone aware of bullying must report it – explicit guidelines therein

• Statement that retaliation against victims or witnesses will not be tolerated

• List what the school has agreed to accomplish and the strategies to be utilized:
  o Surveillance
  o Student discussions/curriculum
  o Student training – skills to help themselves and others when bullying arises, intervening, etc.
  o Teacher/parent training
  o Prevention/intervention strategies
  o Consequences for bullying

• Descriptions of desirable outcomes, including measurable goals

• Communications plan/strategies, details – when, how, to whom, by whom

• Resolution to revisit policy regularly; establish procedures therein for review/monitoring

**Reporting Procedures**

• Considerations
  o Who can make a report? (e.g., students, teachers, staff, parents?)
  o To whom should the reports be made?
  o Will reporting procedures differ based on the originator?
  o Should reporting be anonymous, confidential, or otherwise?
  o Is there a suggested timeframe for or time limit on reporting?

• Consider establishing a point person responsible for receiving reports of bullying and communicating with appropriate personnel for investigation

**Proactive Strategies**

• Whole school prevention
  o Consider adopting a structured bullying prevention curriculum that teaches students how to intervene
  o Incorporate established rules and policies into ordinary school interactions and all school activities
  o Provide clear, formal instruction on how to behavior in a respectful, responsible manner across all school settings and activities
  o Encourage behavior as responsible bystanders to support victims
  o All school staff should look for bullying, help set tone with consistency
  o Promote collaborative relationships between school, parents, and wider community regarding school-based strategies for bullying prevention
• Classroom
  o Incorporate bullying prevention into classroom learning; integrate into curriculum
    ▪ Classroom rules, classroom meetings/discussions
    ▪ Character education, social-emotional learning
    ▪ Social skills development, assertiveness, group processes

• Enhance the school physical environment and supervision in order to limit the incidence of bullying
  o Restructure the physical environment as needed and possible
  o Assure that all areas of the school are well-supervised with staff members that are easily identifiable and constantly moving, scanning the environment
  o Increase monitoring in places and during times and situations where bullying most often occurs (using assessment data)
  o Address “hot spots” identified from assessment

• Establish and/or maintain a positive school climate of respectful relationships
  o Model appropriate, positive interactions and expected behavior
  o Actively observe behavioral patterns
  o Immediately and positively reinforce prosocial, appropriate, and expected behaviors

**Early Intervention**

• Targeted action for selected groups:
  o Students identified as being at risk of developing long-term difficulties with social relationships
  o Students identified as having previously experienced bullying or engaged in bullying behavior

**Responding to Bullying (Reactive)**

• Utilize evidence-based, schoolwide intervention programs.
  o Comprehensive, multi-component, multi-level, and intensive programs have the greatest impact

• Immediately, appropriately, and consistently respond to reported incidents according to determined procedures
  o Administrator investigation of incidents
  o Documentation of incident, response strategies, follow-up procedures
  o Reporting incidents to parents using clear, accurate communication
  o Follow-up strategies

• Disciplinary procedures/consequences should be:
  o As immediate as possible
  o Graduated (tailored to the particular circumstances)
  o Fair, clearly understood, and consistent
  o Flexible, depending on the nature, severity, and extent of the bullying
  o Consistently enforced
  o As non-punitive as possible, emphasizing remedial actions, problem-solving

• Support strategies:
  o Provide timely support to students affected by bullying, either as victims or as bystanders/witnesses
    ▪ Reassurance, encouragement
    ▪ Provision of counseling, mental health services, referrals as appropriate
  o Ongoing support for victims
    ▪ Coping skills/avoidance techniques
    ▪ Social skills training
    ▪ Problem-solving skills
• Consequences
  o Separate follow-up meetings with bullies and victims, including parents
  o Combined meetings with victims, perpetrators, parents, school personnel

Ongoing/Concurrent Strategies
• Training/Professional Development
  o To introduce, clarify the policy (for school staff, students, parents)
  o To train school personnel on how to identify bullying, how to respond
  o To train school personnel on how to implement teaching and learning strategies (prevention) and provide support for students at high-risk times and in high-risk settings
  o To introduce behavioral expectations to students
  o Skill-building for teachers, parents, students – how to sustain safe school environment
  o To raise awareness of bullying

Review/Monitoring/Evaluation
• Regular follow-up to assure understanding of the policy
• Use reporting systems to track incidents, responses, and trends over time
• Respond to identified patterns, review and modify policy if necessary
• Annual review of antibullying policy, programming – involve parents, school staff, students in the review
• Follow-up assessments as necessary

Communications
• The antibullying policy will be widely disseminated and promoted
• The antibullying policy will be easily accessible for students, staff, parents, and other community members
• Parents will receive regular updates about management of bullying incidents
• Publicize opportunities to influence school practice

Expectations
• All parties
  o Acknowledge the policy and pledge to abide by it

• School personnel
  o Develop and foster relationships with students and families
  o Intervene early so minor rule violations are handled effectively before problematic behaviors escalate

• Parents
  o Keep school informed about any concerns about behavior, policy, etc.
  o Contact the school if they suspect their children are involved in or victims of bullying
  o Respect school’s authority in handling bullying incidents
  o Actively participate in resolving bullying incidents

• Students
  o Behave respectfully towards other students, staff, and members of the school community
  o Are encouraged to include all peers in activities
  o Communicate with an appropriate adult if they experience bullying or are aware of someone being bullied
  o Will be an effective bystander and intervene in situations of bullying