



SCRUTINY
RICHMOND
UPON THAMES

Youth Scrutiny Review
2016
Internet Safety



Contents

• Background to the review	Page 3
• Context	Page 4
• What the Panel Did	Page 5
• Findings and recommendations	Page 6
• Appendix 1 – survey responses	Page 10
• Appendix 2 – table of recommendations	Page 15
• Appendix 3 – notes from interviews	Page 16
• Glossary and Acknowledgements	Page 18

BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

In 2015, Democratic Services and the Achieving for Children (AfC) Youth Service supported the development of the Youth Scrutiny Panel. Following peer research by the Richmond Youth Council, it was noted that a high percentage of young people were concerned about internet safety. Following discussion, it was agreed that Internet Safety would be the focus of the next youth scrutiny project.

Therefore, the Scrutiny Committee commissioned the second Youth Scrutiny Panel to undertake a review into Internet Safety in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

As a result, a group of students from Year 10 at Grey Court School were recruited to the Panel.

The Youth Scrutiny Panel (the Panel) met for the first time on 17th March and a further nine times to receive training, gather evidence, draft the recommendations and agree the report.

The method of research was to conduct interviews with experts (in person and over the phone) and carry out a survey of secondary school students and headteachers in the borough (64 responses received from students, 5 from headteachers).

In conducting this review, the Youth Scrutiny Panel heard from the following:

- Peter Cowley, ICT and E-safety Adviser
- Peter Moorcock, Youth Service Manager
- PC Mitridate, Metropolitan Police School Officer
- Penny Patterson, School Improvement Inspector, London Borough of Havering
- Jonathan Baggaley, Education Team, CEOP (Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre)
- Mrs Nunn, Headteacher, Waldegrave School

The Panel agreed to report back to the Scrutiny Committee on 12th September 2016.

This report gives the main findings and recommendation of the Panel, which are also summarised on page 15.

CONTEXT

Why should this be an issue of concern to the Council?

Young people enjoy using the internet, which due to technical advances, is a fast-changing environment. With all the benefits of access to information, games and social media, come problems, some with far-reaching consequences.

Young people are spending a great deal of time on the internet - the Panel's survey showed that most respondents (95%) used the internet for an hour a day or more than once a day - and parents may not be aware of the dangers they can encounter.

Headteachers responding to the survey noted that they had had pupils being negatively affected through internet use, with one stating it was a weekly, sometimes daily, occurrence.

From the survey, the Panel found noted that one headteacher had mentioned that students still take risks sometimes, despite the internet safety education, another noted the increase in friendship issues with an increase of sending inappropriate images, and one felt it had become worse over the last five years, with group chats becoming vicious and unpleasant, and sexting. One headteacher also noted that social media applications were being used by younger and younger students, and that sexting incidents were now moving to key stage 3 students.

To resolve internet safety issues the Panel found out from the survey that one school uses restorative justice, three involved parents, two had involved the police and one used counselling with advice on how to contact websites to block people.

The Panel heard that it was important for young people to know who to go to with problems and feel confident speaking to teachers and their peer group about issues, that interactive games made players vulnerable to grooming, that young people needed educating to avoid getting criminalised for creating/possessing/distributing images online and that e-safety advice could be old-fashioned.

There are several agencies involved in Internet Safety Education in Richmond, including schools, the police and the youth service. The Youth Scrutiny Panel has engaged with these agencies, and its recommendations are addressed to all groups with a role to play in ensuring young people are safe online.

WHAT THE PANEL DID

The Panel set out to find out what is currently being done to educate young people about internet safety, and to see what improvements could be made. They received evidence from national experts, headteachers, the Police, the Youth Service and also from a survey sent out to secondary schools in the borough.

The Youth Scrutiny Panel met ten times to complete the review of Internet Safety.

On 17th March, they took part in an information gathering session where they watched presentations from; Peter Cowley, ICT and Online Safety Adviser, on the work that is currently carried out in the borough; Michael Connors, on the role of the Youth Engagement Service, and; Hilary Gullen, on an overview of the scrutiny process.

In the introductory session, Peter Cowley informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that the main priorities (from the Local Safeguarding Children Board) were:

- Online bullying – and how to empower young people
- Personal safety – relating to apps, meeting people
- Sexting and webcam abuse – how to adopt a common sense approach

and that the main issues were:

- The service at present is *reactive*, not *proactive*
- Those most in need are least likely to engage
- Secondary schools are under-represented

The following session, on 19th April, was an opportunity for the Youth Scrutiny Panel to develop their questioning skills with an external trainer, Steve Curtis. This formed part of the requirements to enable the Panel members to gain an AQA qualification in Interviewing and Communication Skills (71770).

The Youth Scrutiny Panel held a scoping session on 3rd May, and on 10th May, received training from the Richmond Community Engagement and Accountability Team on how to produce a survey.

A question planning session was held on 24th May to enable the Panel to begin a series of interviews. On 17th June they interviewed Peter Moorcock Youth Service Manager and PC Mitridate, Schools' Officer. On 30th June they carried out telephone interviews with Penny Patterson, School Improvement Inspector, London Borough of Havering, and Jonathan Baggaley, Head of Education, CEOP. On 13th July they were able to interview Mrs P Nunn, Headteacher, Waldegrave School, also by phone.

Fifteen copies of the survey for students were sent to every secondary school in the borough, and a modified version sent to each headteacher. The Panel received 69 responses - 64 student responses and 5 headteacher responses.

FINDINGS

The Panel heard that while there was a great deal of internet safety education being carried out (78% of respondents to the survey had received training), there was some inconsistency in delivery across the borough. There were several agencies providing internet safety education, and there was too much work to be done for any one agency to manage alone. A lack of communication between agencies resulted in the education young people received being inconsistent.

The Panel heard from Penny Patterson that online safety should have the same status as safeguarding, and that the statutory guidance needs strengthening.

The Panel also heard that schools needed to engage with internet safety education and co-operate with each other regarding how to resolve issues.

Recommendation One:

Internet Safety Champion

We recommend that Richmond Council designates a lead officer to be the Internet Safety Education Champion for young people under the age of 18.

The Panel's other findings fell into four different groups: Staff Training; Delivery of Internet Safety Education; Resources and; Raising Awareness.

Staff Training

During the interviews, the Panel heard that staff training varied, for example; six members of staff in the Youth Service had completed internet safety training, some part-time staff had had briefings, but that some were not trained. The Panel heard that the Police Schools' Officers had no specific training for their role.

Penny Patterson had explained that something needs to be produced to demonstrate what good quality e-safety education looks like and that this needs to be looked at critically and in consultation with teachers.

Recommendation Two:

Consistency:

We recommend that Richmond Council works with other agencies, ie the police, AfC and Youth Service, to ensure consistency of training for all staff involved with young people across the borough and that guidelines for training are produced ie for frequency/content etc

Delivery of Internet Safety Education

The Panel heard that internet safety projects were not delivered consistently across the service, for example: some schools invited the Police Schools' Officers or expert guest speakers in, some schools held special internet safety sessions, some used CEOP resources in curriculum time, one used Youtube clips in tutor time and some lesson time, some incorporated it into the IT curriculum, some the PHSE curriculum, but that it was not embedded in the curriculum for all schools. The amount of time dedicated to the subject also varied, with some using tutor time and one having a themed week.

In response to what changes were needed, one respondent suggested more skills based education, and less scare-mongering, and one felt that parents needed education, as open and honest conversations should be occurring at home. One teacher suggested internet safety education needs to be more about making responsible choices and the online footprint/presence and less about 'scare tactics'.

The panel heard there was a need to not only focus on safety but also how to manage and negotiate potentially harmful situations. The Panel also heard how some students do not make the link between actions and repercussions of those actions and that sometimes bespoke training was required to match the issues.

From the survey, it was seen that 83% of respondents received their internet safety education from school, with social media, youth clubs and other sources being mentioned by a few students. Nearly all those who had received training felt it was helpful or satisfactory (77%). The main elements of the training were cyber-bullying and being safe online, but sexting and grooming had also been covered. A few respondents noted that other topics could include safety on consoles, and information about hackers, viruses, spam emails and passwords.

The additional comments were that most students generally feel safe online and with one comment each on the following: it is patronising, not everyone listens, you can't just give a crash course, and that it is only for people on the internet 24/7.

The Panel noted that PC Mitridate emphasised the importance of holding sessions in small groups to reduce embarrassment.

Recommendation Three:

Curriculum:

We recommend that all schools (including free schools and academies) adhere to the Ofsted requirements for Internet Safety education - that it is a core part of the school curriculum - and that there is an emphasis on skills-based training.

Resources

The Youth Scrutiny Panel noted that resources were scattered and that schools and other interested parties struggled to keep abreast of information. The Youth Scrutiny Panel noted there were excellent resources available from, for example, the Child Exploitation and Online Protection organisation, www.thinkuknow.co.uk/. The Panel also heard how it is difficult for those involved to keep up with advances in technology and how it would be helpful to have regular associated activities to help pull in ideas from a variety of people. Respondents to the survey were split fairly equally (39%/42%) about whether the current training resources were outdated, with most still feeling they were helpful.

Under 'Other Comments' in the survey, one headteacher noted it would be good to have a parent information forum/evening/booklet to be circulated.

Recommendation Four:

Resources:

We recommend that resources for Internet Safety Education which are currently available from the Local Safeguarding Children Board website clearly signposted for all potential users and that a brochure is produced to circulate to parents and young people with key information.

Raising Awareness

The Panel heard that parents were largely unaware of the importance of internet safety issues. In interviews the Panel had heard that there was a need to educate parents, as some still felt that drugs were more of a problem than internet safety issues. One respondent to the survey had suggested parent information evenings or forums could help raise awareness, and another pointed out that 'open and honest' conversations should be taking place at home. One felt that more should be done to make families aware of the risks.

Recommendation Five:

Raising Awareness:

We recommend that Richmond Council has an action plan to raise awareness of Internet Safety with employees of agencies involved with young people, identifying which aspects of training should be a mandatory, core element for everyone to complete.

The Panel heard that some resources could be out-dated and that young people need to be involved in the design of the solutions. One respondent commented that, 'the things they teach us are related to older social medias or older phones so modern videos should be made'.

It was also highlighted that young people need to feel confident in speaking to their peer group about internet safety issues.

Recommendation 6:

Peer to peer training

We recommend that a pilot Internet Safety Peer Training group be set up which would provide basic internet safety to year 6 pupils

Appendix 1

Survey responses - Headteacher survey:

<p>How many times a year do you have a specialist internet safety programme for your students?</p>	<p>all Y7 and 8 have regular study through their IT curriculum. The other students receive tutor activities and assemblies over the year</p> <p>e-safety programme is built into the computing curriculum, each year group cover age appropriate aspects</p> <p>2 in our founding year</p> <p>Every year group has something on internet safety each term</p> <p>At least once - e-safety week (5 days) plus most years have a least once during curriculum time years 3,5 6,7,9,10</p>
<p>what form does the internet safety teaching take in your school</p>	<p>As above</p> <p>Within lessons, Youtube clips in tutor time</p> <p>Robin Clandon PC, computer science lessons</p> <p>Y7, 10 and L6 have guest expert speakers. Other year groups have lessons on internet safety within each term</p> <p>Varies according to year. All years have e-safety week with activities in room time and at home with parents, CEOP lessons in curriculum time</p>
<p>Have you noticed any trends regarding internet safety issues (increase or decrease over the years)?</p>	<p>students still sometimes take risks despite specific education activities</p> <p>increase in friendship issues, increase of sending inappropriate images which then get shown</p> <p>N/A personally it has gotten worse over the last 5 years Group chats becoming vicious and unpleasant, sexting</p> <p>Primary kids with smart phones so social media apps are being used younger and younger. Pupils are using more/different apps year on year. Sexting moving to KS3 years.</p>

<p>Do you think the internet safety training sessions have been successful?</p>	<p>Largely, though not wholly</p> <p>Yes, relevant issues are brought up ie Apple Cloud hacking when in the news. Students are aware of the dangers</p> <p>Yes in terms of educating students, more needs to be done to make families aware</p> <p>Up to a point. Students understand dangers and risks but still make mistakes on occasion</p> <p>In some sense yes, pupils are very knowledgeable about risks and where to turn to for help. However, it doesn't stop pupils doing impulsive things.</p>
<p>If no, what would you want to change?</p>	<p>Take their phones away</p> <p>See above</p> <p>More skills based and less scare-mongering</p> <p>Educate parents – open and honest conversation should be occurring at home</p>
<p>Have any of your pupils been affected negatively through any form or internet use</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, weekly, sometimes daily occurrence</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, cyber bullying</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>If yes, how did you resolve the issue (if resolved)</p>	<p>students are good at telling the teachers about different issues. We then practice a restorative justice approach</p> <p>ask for parents to get involved, police have been involved in serious incidents, pastoral support team get involved</p> <p>Private and confidential, however, parents and police involved at previous post</p> <p>restorative justice, punishment</p> <p>counselling, advice on how to contact websites to block people, educate parents</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>would be good to have a parent information forum/evening/booklet to go out</p> <p>It needs to be more about making responsible choices and online footprint/presence and less about scare tactics</p>

Student Survey Responses – 64 in total

Questions	responses
Have you had internet safety training? Yes/no	Yes - 50 No - 14
If no, do you think it would have been useful to have internet safety training? Yes/no	Yes - 9 No - 6
If yes, do you feel it was helpful Strongly agree/agree/OK/disagree/strongly disagree	Strongly agree - 11 Agree - 27 OK - 11 Disagree - 3 Strongly disagree - 0
Which of the following did the training cover: sexting/grooming/cyber bullying/safe online	Cyber-bullying – 50 Sexting – 32 Grooming – 35 Being safe online - 49
What else do you think needs to be covered?	ID theft – 2 Phishing scams – 3 Good passwords – 2 Safety on consoles – 4 Social media safety – 3 Appropriate and inappropriate websites – 2 How to recover from cyber-bullying/grooming etc – 2 What to do if it happens to you – 1 Hackers, viruses and spam emails – 4 What is safe to download/click on – 1 How to stop people accessing pictures etc – 2 Pornography – 2 Grooming – 3 Sexting – 4 Catfishing - 1
How did you receive the internet safety education? Social media/school/own accord/youth clubs/other	Social Media - 3 School – 53 Own accord – 3 Youth Clubs – 2 Other – assembly, TV programmes, parents, scouts
Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we did our training, the resources were outdated • The resources were helpful • Even after training, I don't feel safe online Please state you opinions on answer	Agree – 25, disagree – 27 Agree – 42, disagree – 11 Agree – 9, disagree - 43
Do you believe that your peers have had effective internet safety education?	Yes – 26 Some – 30

Yes/some/very little/none	Very Little – 1 None - 2
How often do you use the internet?	1 hour a day – 20 More than once a day – 41 Once a week – 2 Once a month - 0
Additional comments	It is patronising - 2 Not everyone listens You can't just give a crash course It is only for people on the internet 24/7 Generally feel safe online – 17 It needs to be promoted as important, some students neglect the aid given I think safety training should be in all schools

Sample Monitoring:

Schools responding	Orleans Park School - 13 Teddington - 15 Turing House - 13 Richmond Park Academy - 9 Stanley – 1 Grey Court School - 13
Area	Kew 3 Ham 6 St Margarets 26 Hamptons 7 Heathfield 5 Out borough 15
Age	11 - 5 12 - 19 13 - 17 14 - 14 15 – 8 One not completed
Gender	Male - 40 Female - 20 Other - 4
Ethnicity	White British - 46 Brazilian - 1 Norwegian - 1 American/French - 1 Scandinavian - 1 White American/British - 2 Gypsy/Traveller/Romany - 1 Black British - 1 White E European - 1 Mixed White-Black Caribbean - 3 White Other - 1 Spanish - 1 Black Caribbean – 1 White Hispanic – 1

	Not completed - 2
disability	Yes - 1 No - 54 Rather not say – 8 Maybe - 1

Appendix 2

Table of Recommendations

Recommendation 1	Internet Safety Champion	We recommend that Richmond Council designates a lead officer to be the Internet Safety Education Champion for young people under the age of 18.
Recommendation 2	Consistency	We recommend that Richmond Council works with other agencies, ie the police, AfC and Youth Service, to ensure consistency of training for all staff involved with young people across the borough and that guidelines for training are produced ie for frequency/content etc
Recommendation 3	Curriculum	We recommend that all schools (including free schools and academies) adhere to the Ofsted requirements for Internet Safety education - that it is a core part of the school curriculum - and that there is an emphasis on skills-based training.
Recommendation 4	Resources	We recommend that resources for Internet Safety Education which are currently available from the Local Safeguarding Children Board website clearly signposted for all potential users and that a brochure is produced to circulate to parents and young people with key information.
Recommendation 5	Raising Awareness	We recommend that Richmond Council has an action plan to raise awareness of Internet Safety with employees of agencies involved with young people, identifying which aspects of training should be a mandatory, core element for everyone to complete.
Recommendation 6	Peer to peer training	We recommend that a pilot Internet Safety Peer Training group be set up which would provide basic internet safety to year 6 pupils

Appendix 3

Notes from interviews:

Peter Moorcock informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that:

- internet safety projects were not delivered consistently across the service
- six members of staff in the Youth Service had completed internet safety training, that some part-time staff had had briefings, but that some were not trained
- There was a need to educate parents around issues around internet safety
- How best to promote internet safety issues to young people (their Facebook page had only 60 likes out of a potential 6000 service users)
- The importance for young people to know who to go to with problems

PC Mitridate informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that:

- The Police Schools' Officers were not invited to all schools' PHSE lessons or assemblies on internet safety
- That lessons should be held in small groups, to reduce embarrassment for students
- That the schools' officers had no specific training for their role
- That parents thought that drugs were more of a problem than internet safety issues
- That he was impressed with CEOP resources, and how more communication between agencies involved would be helpful
- That it was hard to keep up with advances in technology
- That interactive games made players vulnerable to 'grooming'
- Parents needed to be informed about internet safety issues
- That young people are getting criminalised for creating/possessing/distributing images online
- That there was too much work to be done on internet safety for any one agency to manage alone.

Penny Patterson informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that:

- e-safety advice old fashioned, not enough time devoted to it. Not embedded in curriculum.
- Should be included in PHSE lessons
- Online safety should have same status as safeguarding
- Resources scattered, schools struggle to keep abreast of information.
- Organisations need to champion, statutory guidance needs strengthening.
- Should be a required part of computer curriculum – technically it is, but free schools and academies do not have to follow national curriculum.

- Something needs to be produced to demonstrate what good quality e-safety education looks like. This needs to be looked at critically and in consultation with teachers.
- Resources too scattered – regular associated activities which could help pull in ideas from a variety of people.
- Need everything to be in one place

Jonathan Baggaley informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that:

- Young people need to be involved in the design of the solutions. Everyone's responsibility to be involved in solutions
- Schools need to engage with the issue
- 'Think you know' website is a good resource.
- Pupils need to feel confident speaking to teachers and peer group about issues
- Need to not only focus on safety but also how to manage and negotiate potentially harmful situations.

Philippa Nunn informed the Youth Scrutiny Panel that:

- There had been a trend for students outside school to be involved in cyber-bullying
- Some students do not make the link between actions and repercussions of those actions
- Bespoke training was required to match the issues
- Posting inappropriate images on Instagram/Snapchat had become an issue
- Co-operation was required between schools on internet safety issues and how to resolve them

Glossary:

Sexting:

sending (someone) sexually explicit photographs or messages via mobile phone.

Grooming:

when someone builds an emotional connection with a child to gain their trust for the purposes of sexual abuse or exploitation.

Cyber bullying:

using electronic communication to bully a person, typically by sending messages of an intimidating or threatening nature.

Acknowledgements:

The Youth Scrutiny Panel would like to thank their witnesses; Jonathan Baggaley, Penny Paterson, PC Mitridate, Peter Moorcock and Philippa Nun for kindly giving their time to be interviewed.

The Youth Scrutiny Panel would also like to thank Peter Cowley for his advice and Lee Prichard and David Johnson at Grey Court School for helping to arrange the scrutiny sessions.

For any further information, please contact either:

Hilary Gullen, Governance and Scrutiny Officer, 020 88917048
hilary.gullen@richmond.gov.uk

Michael Connors, Youth Engagement Lead, 020 8288 7511
Michael.Connor@achievingforchildren.org.uk