



## Child Safety Research Agenda: Consultation Outcomes Paper

This paper summarises the key themes of submissions received in response to the Child Safety Research Agenda (CSRA) consultation paper. The CSRA is being developed in response to *National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse (2021-2030)* (National Strategy) First National Action Plan Measure 23. Over a three-week period during October and November 2022, the National Office for Child Safety (National Office) sought submissions from key stakeholders to provide feedback on a draft version of the CSRA Model and Principles. The National Office contacted the following groups for feedback:

- ▶ the National Strategy Research, Evaluation and Data Working Group
- ▶ the National Strategy Advisory Group
- ▶ the National Clinical Reference Group
- ▶ the Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation (ACCCE) Research Working Group
- ▶ the National Centre for Action on Child Sexual Abuse
- ▶ relevant teams within the Attorney-General's Department
- ▶ other select academics and research bodies, government agencies and international stakeholders.

The National Office received 27 written submissions and one verbal submission in response to the paper. A range of stakeholders participated in the consultation process, including academics, law enforcement and government agencies. A list of agencies, organisations and individuals who provided submissions is at [Appendix A](#).

The CSRA consultation paper asked 6 specific questions, and provided an opportunity for further, non-question related input. This document reports on submissions' responses to each of the 6 questions, and provides an overview of additional feedback. It also articulates how NOCS will action the feedback we have received via CSRA Model and Principles design.



## Question 1: Working group

### Should the National Office establish an advisory/working group to advise on Child Safety Research Agenda implementation, or should we leverage existing groups?

Forty-three per cent of submissions supported the creation of a new advisory group (25% did not support and the remainder partly supported or provided no comment). Some of the main advantages of this approach included:

- ▶ the ability to establish an appropriate membership consisting of cross-disciplinary expertise (4 submissions)
- ▶ the ability to drive the direction of the group, including setting meeting agendas and influencing outcomes (3 submissions).

Stakeholders recommended that the new group include members from nine key cohorts:

1. leading researchers, including:
  - academic researchers (3 submissions)
  - clinical researchers (2 submissions)
2. policy makers across jurisdictions (5 submissions)
3. varied subject matter experts, including experts in:
  - sexual abuse prevention, intervention and response (2 submissions)
  - child protection (1 submission)
  - health and public health (1 submission)
  - criminal justice (1 submission)
  - technology (1 submission)
  - mental health (1 submission)
4. service providers and practitioners, including:
  - clinicians (3 submissions)
  - those who work with young people who have engaged in harmful sexual behaviours (2 submissions)
  - social workers (1 submission)
  - lawyers (1 submission)
  - those who provide support to non-offending partners (1 submission)
  - those who work with adults concerned about their own sexual thoughts (1 submission)
  - those who provide mental health support and interventions (1 submission)
5. representatives from relevant organisations, including:
  - child sexual abuse non-government and research organisations (3 submissions)
  - other key working groups (2 submissions)
  - sports organisations (1 submission)



# National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

6. representatives of priority groups, including:

- victims and survivors of child sexual abuse (4 submissions)
- First Nations people (4 submissions)
- people with disability (2 submissions)
- culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities (1 submission)
- LGBTQIA+ people (1 submission)
- children and young people with lived experience of the children and family legal system (1 submission)

7. advocates for children and victims and survivors (2 submissions)

8. law enforcement (2 submissions)

9. international representatives and experts (1 submission).

Key recommendations and considerations for creating a new group included:

- ▶ avoiding duplication with existing working groups (4 submissions)
- ▶ creating sub-working groups for key cohorts (3 submissions), for example non-government stakeholders, researchers and First Nations representatives
- ▶ developing clear Terms of Reference (2 submissions)
- ▶ focusing on:
  - research translation (3 submissions)
  - current ongoing research (3 submissions)
  - advice on developing evidence-based policy and practice (1 submission).

Other submissions raised significant concerns about establishing a new group, including:

- ▶ existing groups already being suitable for this purpose (7 submissions)
- ▶ overcommitment of individuals and organisations who are already members of existing working groups (2 submissions)
- ▶ potential challenges in establishing an appropriate membership due to overcommitment of key stakeholders, and limited time or insufficient resources to adequately map stakeholders (2 submissions).

Three submissions suggested a combination of both options – establishing a new group, while also leveraging existing groups. Submissions suggested this could be achieved via a sub or joint-working group within existing groups, such as the Research, Evaluation and Data Working Group (which is a National Strategy officer-level governance group).

## **If we should leverage existing groups, which groups would be most appropriate?**

Some submissions heavily supported leveraging existing groups, including:

- ▶ the Research, Evaluation and Data Working Group (5 submissions)
- ▶ the ACCCE Research Working Group (2 submissions)
- ▶ Operation Griffin (1 submission)



# National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

- ▶ the National Clinical Reference Group (1 submission).

## **National Office response:**

The National Office will engage with existing working groups to explore opportunities to advise on CSRA development and implementation. This will be done in a way that avoids duplication, and reduces overburdening government and non-government stakeholders.



## Question 2: Scoping review

### Is a scoping review the best way to map existing literature and identify gaps and limitations in Australia's child safety evidence base?

A majority of submissions (54%) raised concerns about a scoping review's ability to fully capture existing gaps and limitations across Australia's whole child safety evidence base. Some identified limitations of this approach included:

- ▶ the field being too broad for a single scoping review (3 submissions)
- ▶ scoping reviews need a narrow focus to provide meaningful results (2 submission)
- ▶ traditional literature review methodologies may struggle to capture evidence in certain sectors (2 submissions), including:
  - policy and practice spaces (1 submission)
  - sport, educational and religious entities (1 submission)
- ▶ scoping reviews often focus on capturing what is in the evidence base, rather than what is not (i.e. may not identify gaps) (1 submission)
- ▶ scoping reviews do not analyse the quality of evidence (1 submission).

Some submissions suggested alternative methodologies, including:

- ▶ using rapid evidence reviews instead of, or to supplement, a scoping review (6 submissions)
  - 4 submissions suggested basing the reviews around a matrix or framework of primary, second and tertiary prevention and response evidence
- ▶ using an Evidence and Gaps Map (EGM) methodology (3 submissions + 1 suggesting general gaps mapping)
  - however, one submission noted an EGM would take too long to be fit for purpose for the CSRA.

Some submissions provided some general considerations for any type of review:

- ▶ make the review iterative, by conducting similar reviews at regular intervals to help identify emerging issues (6 submissions)
- ▶ conduct consultation and learn from recently completed and ongoing reviews to identify review focus areas (6 submissions)
- ▶ ensure sufficient time is allowed for designing the review, identifying key stakeholders and end users, and identifying gaps and limitations (2 submissions)
- ▶ recruit multiple subject matter experts to capture the breadth of the field (1 submission)
- ▶ adopt an intersectional lens (1 submission)
- ▶ ensure any unpublished research that informs the review is included when distributing results (1 submission)
- ▶ produce a Data Development Plan to highlight areas for which data is lacking (1 submission)
- ▶ build on material from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (1 submission).



**If you believe a scoping review is the best way, we anticipate it would need to be narrowed to particular focus areas that government and non-government stakeholders believe require prioritisation over the next 3-4 years. This would result in the review identifying gaps and limitations within those narrower focus areas. What topics / issues / areas would you recommend as key for the scoping review?**

Submissions suggested a wide variety of focus areas, indicating a range of broader evidence and knowledge gaps. Suggestions have been categorised by their relevance to the National Strategy's five themes. A more detailed breakdown of the suggested topics is included in [Appendix B](#).

Many submissions suggested multiple focus areas and provided extensive detail about gaps in the evidence base. For example, one submission suggested a number of specific research gaps relating to the broader theme of offender characteristics. To adequately reflect this, this section details the total quantity of suggested focus areas, rather than the number of submissions supporting each focus area. This approach was taken to ensure that our synthesis and analysis of stakeholder feedback was meaningful and captured the full breadth of stakeholder suggestions.

The most common suggested focus was offender prevention and intervention (National Strategy Theme 4), particularly:

- ▶ identifying and understanding emerging offending forms and trends (17 suggestions)
- ▶ characteristics of offenders and potential offenders (12 suggestions)
- ▶ early intervention and prevention of potential offending (10 suggestions).

*Note: this focus area may reflect the high number of offender-focused perspectives among submitters, noting many submissions were received from law enforcement or from academics specialising in offender prevention and intervention.*

The second most common focus was supporting victims and survivors (National Strategy Theme 2), particularly:

- ▶ understanding victims and survivors (18 suggestions), including:
  - determinants and risk factors leading to abuse (5 suggestions)
  - how child sexual abuse affects victims and survivors throughout their lifetimes (5 suggestions)
- ▶ improving service delivery, particularly trauma-informed support (11 suggestions).

Beyond the National Strategy themes, submissions recommended a strong focus on online and technology-facilitated abuse, particularly:

- ▶ new and different technologies being used to target children (10 suggestions)
- ▶ characteristics of children being targeted online or with technology (3 suggestions), particularly:
  - dating apps (2 suggestions).

Other common suggested foci included:

- ▶ focus on the National Strategy's priority groups<sup>1</sup> (14 suggestions)

---

<sup>1</sup> Victims and survivors of child sexual abuse and their advocates, children and young people and their support networks, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, CALD communities, people with disability, LGBTQIA+ people, and people living in regional and remote communities.



## National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

- ▶ improving research and using appropriate methodologies (7 suggestions)
- ▶ identifying and utilising data (7 suggestions)
- ▶ understanding children displaying harmful sexual behaviours, including both early signs and trajectories (6 suggestions)
- ▶ intersections with other forms of abuse and violence (4 suggestions).

### **National Office response:**

The National Office will commission rapid evidence reviews that are informed by an evidence framework/matrix, rather than undertaking an initial scoping review (as originally proposed). This approach will involve the following high-level steps:

1. Development of an evidence framework/matrix that maps prospective gaps in the evidence base. This will be informed by the suggested areas of focus that stakeholders provided through this consultation, and could be validated and refined through further stakeholder consultation (as required).
2. A series of rapid evidence reviews to determine the amount of literature in these areas, and to validate whether they are gaps in the evidence base (as opposed to knowledge dissemination gaps).
3. Using the validated gaps to inform CSRA research priorities and identify areas of focus for future, iterative reviews.



## Question 3: Emerging trends

### How can the Child Safety Research Agenda be responsive to emerging child safety-related trends and issues?

The most common suggestion (11 submissions) was to leverage working groups (whether new or existing) to identify emergent trends and issues, potentially through a standing agenda item. Other suggestions included:

- ▶ regular consultation with:
  - leading child safety non-government and research organisations, police and service providers (9 submissions)
  - policy areas and data custodians (4 submissions)
  - communities, particularly priority populations (2 submissions) and sporting communities (1 submission)
- ▶ calling for submissions from stakeholders on emerging trends (4 submissions)
- ▶ hosting research forums and workshops that focus on identifying and discussing emerging trends and issues (4 submissions)
- ▶ conducting regular scoping reviews and rapid evidence reviews (2 submissions)
- ▶ revisiting and validating existing research projects that identified evidence gaps (1 submission)
- ▶ placing National Office staff as observers on international forums and working groups focusing on child sexual abuse research (1 submission)
- ▶ dedicating a National Office staff member to identifying emerging trends (1 submission)
- ▶ leveraging PhD students, who tend to focus their research on gaps and emergent issues (1 submission).

### Should we have a dedicated emergent trends and issues research stream?

A majority of submissions (64%) supported the inclusion of a dedicated CSRA emergent trends and issues research stream. However, several submissions flagged considerations if adopting this approach, including:

- ▶ a need to define what constitutes an 'emerging trend or issue' (1 submission)
- ▶ mitigating bias that could direct focus towards certain topics. For example, stakeholders from more prominent fields could overstate the significance of a trend or issue, meaning fields with less visibility are overlooked (1 submission). Some submissions suggested that a cross-disciplinary advisory group could help mitigate this risk.

### How often should the Child Safety Research Agenda be reviewed to ensure it is responsive to emergent trends and issues?

Suggested review timeframes ranged from quarterly to every 5 years. The most popular suggestion overall (41%) was to review the CSRA annually.

### National Office response:

The National Office will:

- ▶ include a CSRA research stream dedicated to emergent trends and issues





## National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

- ▶ formally review the emergent trends and issues stream annually, and the whole CSRA during development of each new National Strategy action plan (approximately every three years). This approach will ensure the review process is responsive, is meaningful, is not overly burdensome and allows sufficient time for research to be undertaken and tested in practice, while still being responsive to the fast-moving nature of child sexual abuse research
- ▶ continue to regularly engage with stakeholders to identify emergent trends and issues, which will primarily be done by leveraging the expertise of relevant working groups
- ▶ regularly consider opportunities to implement stakeholders' other suggestions for ensuring the CSRA is responsive.



## Question 4: Non-financial incentives

### How can the National Office provide non-financial incentives to academics and research organisations to align their research with the Child Safety Research Agenda?

Suggestions for non-financial incentives included:

- ▶ providing opportunities to share research and demonstrate alignment with the CSRA and other government objectives (8 submissions), including:
  - hosting regular conferences (4 submissions)
  - holding regular consultation rounds, including on future iterations of the CSRA (2 submissions)
  - offering representation on appropriate CSRA working group/s (3 submissions)
- ▶ facilitating collaboration opportunities between government, academics (including masters and PhD students), research organisations, non-government organisations and service providers (7 submissions)
- ▶ supporting the writing of financial, grant or ethics applications (4 submissions)
- ▶ working with federal funding bodies, such as the National Health and Medical Research Council, to specify priority for existing funding (3 submissions)
- ▶ helping to improve researchers' reputations (3 submissions), including by:
  - facilitating opportunities for knowledge translation (2 submissions)
  - posting about helpful research on the National Office website (1 submission)
  - flagging when research projects are completed on a research register (1 submission)
  - presenting an award to exceptional research that aligns with the CSRA (1 submission)
- ▶ facilitating access to government data sources and custodians where possible (3 submissions)
- ▶ developing mechanisms to track the impact of research (2 submissions)
- ▶ delivering promotional campaigns for the CSRA and any non-financial incentives (2 submissions)
  - including the National Office promoting the CSRA at conferences (1 submission).

A noteworthy number of submissions (18%) expressed concerns that non-financial incentives would not be sufficient, and that financial incentives will be needed to encourage researchers to align priorities with the CSRA. One submission recommended considering adopting the National Partnership Agreement grants-based model.

### Would an endorsement mechanism that provides researchers with written support for projects be beneficial?

Half (50%) of submissions supported an endorsement mechanism that provides public letters of support for research projects that demonstrate alignment with the CSRA. However, some submissions raised concerns about partiality, primarily the risk or perception of endorsing research based on alignment with the National Office's internal preferences rather than research quality and significance. Three submissions expressed doubt that an endorsement mechanism would have any significant impact on incentivising research.



## National Office response:

The National Office will:

- ▶ work with advisory groups and the sector to indicate support for relevant research proposals to assist with grant applications
- ▶ leverage relevant working groups to support multidisciplinary collaboration and facilitate discussions on how the CSRA can support the writing of financial, grant or ethics applications
- ▶ seek out opportunities to promote the CSRA at conferences, events and stakeholder meetings
- ▶ explore options for incentives, including meeting with federal funding bodies to determine how existing grant processes can be leveraged to achieve CSRA outcomes
- ▶ regularly consider opportunities to implement stakeholders' other suggestions to incentivise alignment with the CSRA.



## Question 5: Storing and reporting research

### How should the National Office store and report on Child Safety Research Agenda-related research already undertaken or underway? Should we have a publicly accessible research register?

A majority of submissions (71%) were in favour of a research register. However, stakeholders raised some considerations about how it could operate, including:

- ▶ how information would be gathered. For example, whether the register would be populated by researchers themselves or through ongoing audits by the National Office. While most submissions did not specify, the most popular option (2 submissions) was for researchers to self-report their projects
- ▶ whether the register would be publicly accessible or limited to researchers and practitioners. While a majority of submissions (17 submissions) favoured a publicly accessible register, others (2 submissions) noted that public accessibility could limit the information stored on the register
- ▶ how much information is stored and displayed on the register. For example, whether the register includes:
  - both ongoing and completed research projects
  - abstracts/summaries
  - researcher metadata
  - related documentation to research projects (for example, information about speaking engagements and infographics)
- ▶ where the register would be hosted and promoted. While most submissions did not make a recommendation, the most popular option (3 submissions) was for the National Office to host the register. Submissions suggested the register could be promoted through regular reports on research distributed via the National Office website and social media. Others suggested it be hosted by or coordinated with other child safety research bodies, such as the National Centre for Action on Child Sexual Abuse (2 submissions). Some submissions (5 submissions) also called for research to be hosted on multiple locations and linked to ensure maximum accessibility
- ▶ how to encourage use of and engagement with the register. Suggested incentives included:
  - providing guidance and support for users (2 submissions), including from information specialists
  - promotion via social media and multi-media platforms (1 submission)
  - distributing regular snapshots of research in progress (2 submission)
  - providing links to research in documentation about the CSRA (1 submission)
  - establishing linkages with other research projects (2 submissions)
  - providing support costs of open-access publications (1 submission)
  - writing summaries of research for distribution (1 submission)
  - distributing research on the register to industry and communities (1 submission)
- ▶ the functions of the register. For example, search/filter functions and visualisations (2 submissions).

Some submissions raised considerations for the register, including ensuring it is not duplicative with other research registers (for example, the Australian Institute of Family Studies' register) (3 submissions) and that it has sufficient funding to ensure it remains up to date (2 submissions). One submission stated research



## National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

registers are not an effective use of resources and often do not get used or accessed in practice. This sentiment was similarly expressed during a discussion with an internationally recognised US-based academic who stated Google Scholar largely already achieves the same effect as a research register, allowing agencies to focus resourcing elsewhere.

An alternative suggestion to a register was to establish a Clearinghouse (2 submissions). A Clearinghouse is a site that collates, synthesises and disseminates evidence to support policy and practice. Evidence can take a range of forms, including research published in peer reviewed journals, books, grey literature (government reports), policy documents and practice guidelines. Clearinghouses are intended to be practically applied, making evidence available in a comprehensive, appropriate and timely way to assist policy-makers and practitioners make informed decisions.

### **National Office response:**

The National Office will explore opportunities to work with stakeholders on ways to track and catalogue completed, in progress and planned research.



## Question 6: Research principles

### Would overarching principles be useful to guide Child Safety Research Agenda research?

No submissions opposed using overarching principles to guide research aligned with the CSRA. Some submissions provided feedback on how the principles should be used, including:

- ▶ clarifying how the principles are expected to inform research and related activities, and how researchers can demonstrate adherence to the principles (3 submissions)
- ▶ referring to existing research ethics frameworks, such as the National Statement of Ethical Conduct in Human Research, Ethical Guidelines for Research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, and the National Health and Medical Research Council research principles (3 submissions)
  - one submission suggested it may be worthwhile explaining that these principles alone may not be sufficient for child sexual abuse research and should be considered alongside other guidelines and frameworks, particularly noting that academic institutions may have their own code of conduct and ethics approval processes, which may override CSRA principles
- ▶ clearly defining and communicating the meaning of certain terms (e.g. trauma-informed research methods), noting researchers may have different understandings of such terms (1 submission).

### If so, are the draft principles at Attachment B appropriate? What other principles should we consider including?

A majority of submissions (79%) found the draft principles included in the consultation paper appropriate. However, some submissions suggested changes, including:

- ▶ clarifying language, particularly around ethics and intersectionality
- ▶ considering a compassion-oriented approach alongside trauma-informed approaches
- ▶ ensuring accessibility refers to supporting children with disability and diverse populations to participate in/access research
- ▶ including commitments for co-designing research
- ▶ including multi-agency and professional engagement translation activities
- ▶ including multidisciplinary collaborative approach
- ▶ including strength-based research practices and outputs under 'culturally-safe'
- ▶ recommending researchers consider next steps following a research project early on
- ▶ referring to disability awareness and lived experience
- ▶ referring to relevant ethics protocols (e.g. ARC, NHMRC, MRC, AIATSIS Code of Ethics)
- ▶ referring to timeliness of research outputs, and through a number of accessible formats
- ▶ referring to transparency in research and research publications
- ▶ reflecting Indigenous Data Sovereignty Principles
- ▶ reflecting the diversity of lived experience, including the impact on family, friends and other secondary victims, and cycles of abuse
- ▶ splitting 'culturally-safe', 'trauma-informed', 'inclusivity' and 'child-centred' into independent principles.

Some submissions suggested additional principles, including:



## National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse

- ▶ collaborative: research is completed in collaboration with practice and service-delivery
- ▶ innovative research: novel research and dissemination methods
- ▶ practice-centred: research must have practical implications beyond improving knowledge
- ▶ prioritising existing datasets: encouraging researchers to explore and link existing datasets
- ▶ respectful: acknowledge and respect the impact of community and family on a child's sense of wellbeing, particularly for First Nations people.

### **National Office response:**

The National Office has updated the draft Principles based on stakeholder feedback. The National Office will consider how to best implement the Principles as criteria for any financial or non-financial incentives.



## Other feedback

Four submissions provided additional feedback outside of the consultation paper questions. This included suggestions to:

- ▶ consider discontinued but promising programs (e.g. Griffith Youth Forensic Service's Neighbourhood Project)
- ▶ ensure a stronger alignment with Australia's Disability Strategy, the *National Plan to End Violence Against Women and Children 2022-2023*, and related issues by:
  - consulting with the National Disability Insurance Agency
  - referring to the Royal Commission into Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability, Australia's Disability Strategy's Targeted Action Plans for Early Childhood and Safety, the National Disability Data Asset and the National Disability Research Partnership
  - working in partnership with Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS) to co-design and develop research projects
- ▶ ensure all publicly available information is accessible and inclusive for people with disability and older people
- ▶ ensure the CSRA and aligned research considers the over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families in the child protection system
- ▶ establish a mechanism to work in partnership with First Nations people to develop appropriate guiding principles and actions for First Nations-related research
- ▶ leverage research released by ANROWS regarding young people with disability and sexual violence, adolescent violence and domestic and family violence
- ▶ link to Closing the Gap Outcomes and relevant priority reforms wherever possible
- ▶ link to longitudinal studies, such as the Longitudinal Study of Indigenous Children and the Australian Child Maltreatment Study
- ▶ provide greater emphasis on the voices of:
  - people with lived and living experiences
  - First Nations people
  - perpetrators
- ▶ provide information about how ethics committees operate and how they may intersect with the CSRA and any endorsement mechanisms.

### **National Office response:**

The National Office has addressed parts of this feedback in updating the Model and Principles, and will continue to consider how to address this feedback throughout CSRA implementation.





## Appendix A – List of agencies and organisations who provided a submission

1. Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation (ACCCE)/Australian Federal Police (AFP)
2. Australian Centre for Child Protection (ACCP)
3. Australian Capital Territory Government
4. Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC)
5. Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS)
6. Professor Belinda Winder
7. Attorney General's Department (AGD) Child Abuse Policy Section
8. Department of Education
9. Dr Mary Woessner and Dr Aurélie Pankowiak
10. Department of Social Services (DSS) Family Policy and Children's Policy Branch
11. Office of the eSafety Commissioner (eSafety)
12. Dr Gemma McKibbin
13. Hetty Johnston AM
14. Jesuit Social Services
15. Dr Joe Tucci
16. Professor Kerryann Walsh
17. Professor Kieran McCartan
18. National Centre for Action on Child Sexual Abuse
19. National Indigenous Australians Agency (NIAA)
20. New South Wales Police Force
21. Professor James Ogloff
22. Queensland Department of Children, Youth Justice and Multicultural Affairs (CYJMA)
23. Dr Scott Harden
24. South Australia Government
25. Sexual Violence Research and Prevention Unit (SVRPU), University of the Sunshine Coast
26. Tasmania's Department of Justice and Department for Education, Children and Young People
27. Tasmanian Police
28. Victorian Department of Families, Fairness and Housing (DFFH)

## Appendix B – Overview of suggested review focus areas

This table categorises suggested focus areas into topics, organised by National Strategy theme. An explanation of the what the bracketed numbers represent can be found on page 6 within 'Question 2: Scoping review'.

Theme 1: Awareness raising, education, child safe cultures	Theme 2: Theme 2 – Supporting and empowering victims and survivors	Theme 3 – Children with harmful sexual behaviours	Theme 4 – Offender prevention and intervention	Theme 5 – Building the evidence base
<p>Awareness Raising (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Understanding (5)</li> <li>▶ Effective messaging (2)</li> </ul>	<p>Supporting victims and survivors (22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Improving support delivery (11)</li> <li>▶ Minimising risk for victims and survivors (5)</li> <li>▶ Justice system (4)</li> <li>▶ Support for complex situations (2)</li> </ul>	<p>Understanding CHSB (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Determinants of CHSB (6)</li> <li>▶ Outcomes (2)</li> </ul>	<p>Offender trends (21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Types of offending (14)</li> <li>▶ Offender pathways (4)</li> <li>▶ Prevalence (3)</li> </ul>	<p>Research (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Research methods (3)</li> <li>▶ Improving research (2)</li> <li>▶ Child and victim and survivor centred (2)</li> </ul>
<p>Education (1)</p>	<p>Understanding victims and survivors (18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Victims and survivors after abuse (8)</li> <li>▶ Determinants of child sexual abuse (5)</li> <li>▶ Victims and survivors of specific offences (5)</li> <li>▶</li> </ul>	<p>CHSB treatment and support (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Improving treatment and support (5)</li> <li>▶ Secondary victims (1)</li> <li>▶ Support usage (1)</li> </ul>	<p>Offender prevention (19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Potential offenders (6)</li> <li>▶ Population-based prevention (4)</li> <li>▶ Risk management (3)</li> <li>▶ Preventing re-offending (3)</li> <li>▶ Intersections with other forms of violence and abuse (2)</li> <li>▶ Evaluations (2)</li> </ul>	<p>Data (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Overarching prevalence, victimisation and perpetrator (3)</li> <li>▶ Civil, statutory and criminal (3)</li> <li>▶ Cost benefit analysis (2)</li> <li>▶ Information sharing (1)</li> </ul>
	<p>Victim and survivor trends (8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Online trends (3)</li> <li>▶ At risk victims and survivors (3)</li> <li>▶ Reporting (1)</li> <li>▶ Views of perpetrator prevention (1)</li> </ul>	<p>CHSB causes (1)</p>	<p>Understanding and identifying offenders (12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Offender determinants (5)</li> <li>▶ Offender risk factors and intersections with other forms of abuse (4)</li> <li>▶ Identifying and sentencing (2)</li> <li>▶ Understanding (1)</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluation (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Interventions and early interventions (2)</li> <li>▶ Child-centred (1)</li> <li>▶ First Nations and regional and remote programs (1)</li> </ul>
		<p>CHSB prevention (1)</p>	<p>Offender treatment and support (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Disruption and re-offending (5)</li> <li>▶ Online treatment (1)</li> <li>▶ Early intervention/prevention (1)</li> </ul>	



## Other subjects

A number of submissions suggested the following additional research topics:

- ▶ Priority group focus (14)
  - Overall focus (2)
  - First Nations people (5)
  - CALD communities (3)
  - Victims and survivors (2)
  - People with disability (2)
  - Children and young people (2)
  - People from rural and remote communities (2)
  - LGBTQIA+ people (1)
  - Adopted children (1)
  - Non-birth family settings (1)
- ▶ Intersections with other forms of violence abuse and maltreatment (4)
- ▶ Cost benefit analysis (2)
- ▶ Agency collaboration (1)
- ▶ Public health approaches (1)
- ▶ Impact of the Voice of the Child (1)
- ▶ Sports (1)