A different approach to preventative CSE education
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the evidence base that Ariel Trust is developing in relation to the SafeSkills programme. It is our belief that this is of significance for anybody considering the role drama and film-based resources in preventative education as it includes important early evidence of behaviour change across the schools involved in a recent evaluation study. Evidence of behaviour change is not currently available in relation to other prevention programmes. The partners in this report are keen to find ways to further explore these impacts and test whether they can be replicated and improved upon through further development and evaluation.

SafeSkills is the latest in a series of skills-based prevention education programmes that has been developed by Ariel Trust and builds on the learning from evaluation of these previous programmes. The report sets out some of this wider context, as it relates to the development of SafeSkills. Jessica Eaton’s (2018) ‘No More CSE Films’ report was published half way through the SafeSkills section of this work. We address this at the end of this report.

Key Findings

- SafeSkills has largely been delivered as expected by schools (where data was available, all 10 lessons were covered with a fidelity of 83%). Teachers report excellent engagement from children in SafeSkills lessons.
- There appears to be an increase in children's knowledge and awareness of inappropriate adult behaviour of approximately 7% pre and post-test across schools. This is in-line with expected change seen elsewhere (Tutty, 1995), but we can’t yet be sure this is significant.
- There was no observed change in children's confidence to act as bystanders, and neither was there a decrease in trust of others.
- Qualitatively, teachers observe that young people involved in the SafeSkills programme are more open in discussing their risk-taking behaviours than is typical. This openness was replicated across the schools involved.
- These open discussions seem to have led to several individual cases of positive behaviour change in the young people (i.e. removing people from online gaming and social media platforms, discussing online safety with their parents and in one case a direct disclosure to a family member about grooming).
Teachers also identified several safeguarding responses that they had initiated in their schools because of the discussions taking place in the SafeSkills lessons. These included identifying children as ‘at risk’ to the safeguarding leads in their schools, sending alerts to parent about risky behaviours and responding to parents’ request for further information about grooming issues and protecting their children.

The key elements of SafeSkills

The development and roll out of the SafeSkills resource is underpinned by a number of core elements that are fundamental to its ability to deliver behaviour change: -

- A focus on skills-development, that reflects wider academic evidence in relation to prevention education;
- A co-creation process that puts the experiences and feelings of young people, including victims of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), at the centre of the development process;
- Extensive engagement with teachers to ensure the resource can support the curriculum and therefore be delivered in a mainstream education setting;
- A programme of teacher training to support the delivery of the programme and to ensure the content is delivered with fidelity;
- A programme of nine lessons of content that provides opportunity for the practicing and reinforcing of pro-social communication strategies;
- A commitment to the ethical integrity of the approach, which has included the methodology being subject to review by two ethics committees;
Next Steps

The development of SafeSkills is an ongoing cyclical process of testing and evaluation. The evidence collected to date indicates SafeSkills is an intervention with promise, not least because of the levels of engagement from schools, teachers and children. Further development cycles are needed to examine changes more closely, improve its impacts and to demonstrate that they can be replicated and sustained.

Proposals for the next phases of cyclical development include: -

- Share good practice across all schools, especially listening to children about their risk-taking behaviour to conduct more accurate risk assessments and responses to identified risks
- Improve observed effects by increasing integration with a whole school approach involving parents, as well as children and teachers, so that knowledge and skills learnt are reinforced.
- Develop a quantitative measure of children's openness and willingness to communicate risk to either their teacher or parents.
- Use the initial set of SafeSkills monitoring data to examine the programme content relating to areas that have shown no improvement (i.e. bystander defending behaviour).
- Skills taught and developed within the SafeSkills programme are transferable. Much of the content relates specifically to CSE, but the skills of communication, questioning and bystander behaviour are useful across content areas.
- Increase the opportunities for children to practice bystander defending behaviour by linking similar skill-based, behaviour change programmes together. Children could receive multiple opportunities to practice skills during their time in school. For example, two of Ariel's other programmes CyberSense (online safety and bullying) and FaceUp (dating violence in young people) sit either side of the SafeSkills target age and teach similar skills.
- Integrate online data collection and analysis into programme implementation.
• Allow schools and commissioners access to data on SafeSkills progress during delivery.

• Iterate the evaluation and monitoring data collected based on qualitative feedback so that it is investigated quantitatively in the next round of delivery.

Ariel is committed to the cyclical approach to development, testing and improvement of resources that is outlined in this report and is keen to implement the actions outlined above and to make SafeSkills the most effective programme that it can be. However, as a small organisation, Ariel cannot deliver this without the support of a range of partners and they are keen to identify organisations who can work with them in support of this objective.
INTRODUCTION

Ariel Trust is an educational charity with a mission to "improve the quality of education. We will develop models of best practice based on multimedia projects tackling social themes. At the heart of our work is an evidence-based approach designed to motivate and engage young people changing their attitudes, behaviour and levels of achievement".

Ariel has been developing prevention education programmes responding to a range of social issues since 2007. The programmes take a skills-based approach, which is based on evidence from the United States. Studies have concluded that awareness raising alone does not change behaviour and that developing, and practicing skills is the most effective approach. Foshee & Langwick (2004) - “programmes focusing exclusively on attitudinal or educational components will likely not be effective in changing behaviour as such the skills building component... is a crucial component of the chain of events that can lead to positive outcomes”.

The programme is supported and co-ordinated through a steering committee that identifies the priority themes that the software resources address. The steering group currently includes representative from Liverpool City Council (Children’s Services, Community Cohesion, Health and Culture), Merseyside Police and Merseyside PCC Office, St Helens Public Health and Wirral MBC. In 2015 this group identified child sexual exploitation as an important issue facing young people in Merseyside, this was based on a growing number of referrals to the five local authorities. The Public Health departments from the five areas came together to fund the development of the SafeSkills resource alongside support from a number of trusts & foundations. Merseyside Police, Police & Crime Commissioner and Liverpool Community Safety have also invested in the teacher training programme that supports the resource.

Ariel aims to make SafeSkills the most effective CSE prevention tool that it can be, and is committed to a cyclical process of evaluation and improvement of the programme. This report sets out the results of the first cycle of this testing and identifies the next steps of innovation and improvement that are planned.
THE EXISTING EVIDENCE BASE FOR PREVENTION EDUCATION

There are few universal school-based prevention programmes available to tackle child abuse or child sexual exploitation (PSHE Association, 2016; Kingston University, 2009; Axford et al, 2018). This is the space that SafeSkills occupies. Prevention efforts have been targeted at known victims or else been based entirely around films to raise awareness (Eaton, 2018). As such there is little in the way of best evidence to draw on, especially in relation to changing behaviour.

There is broad agreement that if we only aim to help children to understand, identify and raise awareness of CSE then we are not doing enough to change children's risk-taking behaviour. “A range of research agrees that primarily non–interactive strategies, or those based on knowledge alone are not effective.” (UNODC, 2004; Jones et al., 2014b; Thomas et al. 2015; Foshee & Langwick, 2004). There is a clear need for a strategic approach to the development of educational strategies that move beyond this to influence behaviour change. There is also clear evidence that sets out what more we need to do.

Ariel's skills-focused approach to preventative education builds on academic evidence gathered through randomised controlled trials and independent evaluation of similar programmes in the USA. For instance, Safe Dates – a US prevention programme for teenage relationship violence and abuse – is effective primarily because it takes a skills-based approach rather than simply a knowledge-based approach (Foshee & Langwick, 2004).

A review of the best available literature suggests that there are certain characteristics that increase the likely effectiveness of education-based prevention activities. These are largely drawn from small scale evaluations looking at prevention across a range of issues, such as bullying victimisation and intimate partner violence.

Firstly, children should be involved in the process of co-designing the materials used (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016; Kingston University, 2009). This is to make sure they are based in the reality children experience and communicate with children in way that is engaging for them.

Secondly, prevention should not simply be about awareness raising but involve skill building activities such as role-plays, group discussion and modelling.
Thirdly, that a routine system of evaluation focusing on child reported outcomes beyond knowledge and awareness should be in place (Kingston University, 2009; Eaton, 2018).

Fourth, that prevention should not focus solely on the child - programmes should seek to engage the whole school and wider community (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016; Axford et al, 2018).

Lastly, the programmes sessions should be spread across several months to enable children to come back to topics raised and practice new skills multiple times To do so programmes should be at least 7 hours in length (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016).
THE DEVELOPMENT OF SAFESKILLS: CONSULTATION AND CO-CREATION

A unique feature of the SafeSkills programme is the extensive co-creation and consultation process that was used to develop the resources. This includes co-creation of creative content with young people and extensive consultation with teachers to ensure the finished programme meets their needs and will therefore be used. Ariel believes that, although time intensive, these elements are critical to achieving the high levels of engagement that have been seen both from schools and from the young people who have used the resource.

Co-creation with young people

The content of the ‘SafeSkills’ programme is structured around six scenarios that are presented as short animations. The scripts for these scenarios were developed through a co-creation process involving young people who had experienced sexual exploitation. These young people were identified by staff from Liverpool City Council’s Targeted Services for Young People, the team responsible for supporting young victims.

Ariel worked with these young people using creative workshops to establish safe spaces where the young people felt comfortable discussing their experiences. This process allowed young people to talk about how the grooming process began in their experience. They talked about grooming that had taken place in parks, how this moved on to invitations to houses and discussed the risks they were taking and how these might have been managed in more positive ways and where support from those around them might have been beneficial. These discussions lead to the development of the scripts that became integral to the final resource - they are used in the animated video clips in the resources.

This co-creation approach ensures that the scenarios included in the programme resource are realistic and relevant to young people. It is done with the support of trained professionals to ensure that young people are fully supported throughout the process.
Consultation with teachers

Consultation with teachers is key to ensuring the finished resource is actively taken up by schools. Ariel worked closely with teachers throughout the development process for SafeSkills to pilot content. This ensured that the content developed was age appropriate, a concern in developing a child sexual exploitation resource aimed at a primary school audience, and also that it supported teachers to deliver key curriculum priorities. Ensuring the content supports the curriculum and the requirements of Ofsted is important in enabling schools to commit time to delivering the content.
SAFESKILLS: BUILDING THE EVIDENCE BASE

Ariel has been through a prolonged period of change based on research and evaluation. This section briefly describes the three forms this has taken and how each has shaped Ariel’s thinking and practice.

1. Programme Implementation Readiness (FaceUp)

Ariel were part of an initial group of 25 organisations working with children and young people to reduce youth offending funded under the Realising Ambition project (2011) by the Big Lottery Fund. The first part of this project was to examine Ariel’s current logic model for a domestic violence and coercive control prevention programme called FaceUp, assess it against the current evidence base and help implement changes based on the findings. SafeSkills logic model is built on the same principles as FaceUp. The key elements are described below.

Figure 1: SafeSkills Logic Model
**Improve norms about what is unacceptable behaviour**

SafeSkills aims to create a space in which children talk openly about their risk-taking behaviour, especially online risks. Teachers are then able to listen carefully to children's experience and engage them in a process of risk assessment. Managed peer to peer discussions about real risk-taking behaviour are designed to improve norms about what unacceptable behaviour is, particularly questioning the unacceptable behaviour of others and exploring how to manage associated risks. These discussions have often focused on online risk taking especially behaviour associated with online grooming.

**Increase resilience to grooming**

Having identified risky situations SafeSkills asks children to use role play in order to practice communication skills that can be used to actively manage these situations. The skills practiced include:

- Asking questions to test the motivations and intentions of others
- Asking for help
- Communication skills that might be used by a bystander to intervene

**Increased likelihood of bystander intervention**

SafeSkills focuses on the important role of bystanders and aims to increase the likelihood of bystanders taking action to protect and support their peers.

**Unintended consequences**

Possible unintended consequences include:

- Decreased trust in adults - the programme teaches children to question the motivation of those they don't know and could enforce a very negative view of others (e.g. that no-one can be trusted, and strangers are always a danger).
- Reawakening trauma in children who have experienced abuse – given the prevalence of abuse and the programmes universal prevention approach it is likely some children will have already experienced the scenarios and abuse covered in the programme.
- An increase in disclosures to teachers or parents as children become more aware of what is and is not acceptable behaviour.
2. Pilot Randomised Control Trial (FaceUp)

During the second stage of the Realising Ambition project, Ariel's programme FaceUp was one of three programmes selected to be evaluated using a randomised control trial design (RCT). The pilot RCT ran for a year, across five schools and involved approximately 1,100 students. Its primary purpose was to test whether a full scale RCT would (a) fit with Ariel's programmes (b) that large scale data collection was possible in this setting and (c) be acceptable to schools using the materials. Whilst the RCT was conducted on only one of Ariel's programmes, the learning from it is applicable to all their programmes.

Insights from the RCT

Ariel's programmes are not fixed entities. Randomised control trials are still the gold standard of evaluation. However, a programme that is being constantly tailored is not the ideal candidate for a trial. Continuous evaluation through routine data collection may be more appropriate.

- Randomisation is not acceptable to many schools. Schools are not particularly happy being in a control group, not receiving the programme but having to collect data anyway. High control group drop-out and poor data completion was observed during the RCT.
- Delivering the programme in secondary school, where there is no protected PSHE time, makes 10-hour weekly lessons almost impossible for schools to deliver. As a result, there was low fidelity to the lesson structure or plans and low programme completion.
- Data collection needs to be pragmatic and focused. Schools are not used to collecting data in the way required for many evaluations. Schools cannot fit an extra lesson in to allow children time to complete long outcome data surveys. Data collection must fit at the beginning of the first lesson delivered and the end of the last session if it is going to be completed by the majority.
- Role-plays, a vital part of the programme and logic model, were one of the least implemented parts of the programme by teachers. Two reasons for this became apparent through teacher interviews. Firstly, teachers were not comfortable delivering this segment and reported it was outside of their skillset. Secondly, 13 and 14-year olds were reluctant to engage in role-plays in front of their peers.
3. Preparing the ground for Rapid Cycle Testing

Ariel's latest evaluation work, funded through the Centre of expertise on child sexual abuse, is primarily focused around the SafeSkills programme. Based around the insights from the earlier pilot RCT, the stages below summarise the works stages.

1) Review the available outcome measures and developing new data surveys

There are few evaluated prevention programmes that target child sexual abuse, exploitation or grooming. As such, there are few measures available that are suitable for a programme working in this setting. For example, there is no measure of a child's current or future risk of grooming outside of tools developed and used in one-to-one clinical settings with victims. Measures needed to meet three criteria to be considered for inclusion:

I. Standardised and validated – they must have been used on similar populations and been tested for their ability to measure the construct of interest;

II. Ability to detect change – they have been used as a pre and post measurement (at least) in an evaluation setting and been shown to be sensitive to change.

III. Pragmatic – they must be appropriate to primary school aged children and be of a suitable length.

Given the SafeSkills logic model, the first area requiring robust measurement is knowledge and awareness of inappropriate adult and peer behaviour. The Children's Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire Revised (CKAQ-R) was designed to evaluate elementary school-aged children's learning of the key child abuse concepts taught in US schools (Tutty, 1995). It is one of the only published instruments designed to test children's knowledge of abuse prevention concepts that has substantial evidence of reliability on a wide age-range of children (8 to 14-year olds). One half of the scale consists of questions about inappropriate touching by adults that was outside the bounds of SafeSkills. The other half of the scale covers general inappropriate behaviour which constitutes grooming, which fits well with the aims and content of SafeSkills.

SafeSkills strength is the focus on skill acquisition and teaching children to be good bystanders. If these elements of the programme are working as intended then an increase in reported confidence to act as a bystander should be seen. Research from bullying prevention has been drawn upon to provide a measure of a child's perceived ability and confidence to act as a bystander. The Bystander Defender Behaviour measure has been used widely in the evaluation of bullying.
programmes delivered in the school setting (Pöyhönen et al, 2010; van der Ploeg et al 2017). Although the measure was designed around bullying behavior, small tweaks to the language make it suitable for other types of inappropriate behaviour as the underlying constructs measured are similar. This is not a perfect measure and measures a child's confidence to act as a bystander and not their actual behaviour. Ideally, actual behaviours would be measured as this is the ultimate end goal of the programme. In the absence of this, intermediary outcomes such as skill acquisition must be measured instead.

Finally, to monitor at least one of the potential unforeseen consequences, a measure of trust in others was sought. SafeSkills teaches children that not all interactions with adults are good and not all adults motivations are well intended. A measure of trust is intended to perform two functions. First, act as a baseline measurement of whether SafeSkills is necessary. If children report very high distrust before delivery, it is less likely SafeSkills would provide additional benefits. Secondly, it would be a negative outcome if SafeSkills was to push children towards being inherently untrustingly of all others. The measure should act as a test of this. Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994) provide a short trust scale covering the individual's general belief in others.

Increased communication of risk between children and adults is expected. However, no pragmatic measures of improved communication skills were identified. It is difficult to see how this would be possible within a purely pre/post-test evaluation. The new version of the child survey can be found in Appendix A.

2) Develop an online data collection system

The new pre and post child report surveys and teacher fidelity monitoring survey have been moved to an online data collection system integrated with Ariel's other online resources. Schools are simply given a link to the child and teacher data collection tools. Surveys are available in paper format too. This option remains important due to IT restrictions in some schools. The main advantage of collecting data online is that child data can be collected completely anonymously (there is no opportunity to enter identifiable information) and the resource need to collect and process the data is reduced (printing and data input time is reduced).
3) Test the new evaluation and monitoring approach

Ariel have engaged seven primary schools from across Merseyside over the previous six months. These seven schools have been trained to deliver the SafeSkills materials and have completed the delivery of the programme to at least one class within their school. Schools were eager to deliver the programme and have had little problem collecting data on outcomes and fidelity. All schools have completed before and after data collection. However, most schools still felt more able to complete paper copies of the data than use the online portal. Often children did not have individual access to a computer each for the SafeSkills sessions, making online data collection extremely difficult. There were no issues when the online portal was used. Preliminary results are shown in the next section.

4) Build capacity for continuous evaluation across Ariel programmes through data analysis and reporting

Analysis of data by Ariel has moved towards being routinised, freeing time to develop programme monitoring dashboards (see preliminary results) and disaggregate the data to provide schools with individual reports after delivery. Data analysed and presented in this way decreases the time between programme delivery and evaluation making data more useful to Ariel’s continuing programme development. An immediate view of what appears to be going well, and what may require course correction, opens the possibility of rapidly redesigning elements of SafeSkills before the next round of delivery. This rapid cycle approach will allow Ariel to test and refine SafeSkills with each new round of delivery in schools. Because each period of delivery and evaluation is short, SafeSkills does not have to remain unchanged for long periods of time as in an RCT. Such a flexible system allows for different delivery contexts to be tested against one another within Ariel to determine the best environment for programme delivery.

Rapid cycle testing is not intended to completely replace other forms of evaluation, but rather refine SafeSkills to the point of being ready for more traditional evaluation (e.g. is stable, consistently delivered and shows promise).
Results from the first round of evaluation and monitoring

The results from the initial evaluation data are shown below and cover a 6-month period of delivery. The data is presented in the summary below and is an early prototype of a dashboard that could be integrated into the routine monitoring of SafeSkills delivery.
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**SAFESKILLS: ALL PRIMARY SCHOOLS (N = 7)**

1. **Implementation (352 children)**
   - Lessons Delivered
     - Five schools delivered **10 of 10** SafeSkills lessons. Each was 48 minutes long.
     - Two schools did not submit implementation data.
   - Materials Delivered
     - Teachers delivered **83%** of the SafeSkills material across the lessons completed.
   - Child Engagement in class
     - On average, children were very interested throughout the SafeSkills lessons.

2. **Outcomes (309 children)**
   - Knowledge & Awareness
     - Children's knowledge and awareness of exploitation increased by **7%** directly after participating in SafeSkills.
   - Bystander defending behaviour
     - Children’s bystander defending behaviour didn’t change after participating in SafeSkills. There is an even spread of scores.
   - General Trust
     - Children’s general trust in others did not change after participating in SafeSkills. There is a even spread of scores.
SafeSkills has been delivered fully in 7 schools to date with 352 children having completed the programme and completed post-test data (n=309). Implementation has been good. Five of seven schools submitted a full set of implementation data. All schools with implementation data delivered the full set of 10 lessons, either weekly or over a condensed period. The average time spent delivering the programme was 6.6 hours in total. This is slightly lower than the hour per lesson required, at 48 mins per lesson, and probably reflects that many schools do not have hour long slots in their daily timetables. Schools where the full 10 hours were delivered, implemented SafeSkills in deliberately lengthened lessons, either 2 hour, half day, or full day sessions. This is likely to be a common occurrence and SafeSkills lessons could be condensed to fit with likely Primary school timetables. Teachers delivered most of the programme as intended (83%), although given the slightly reduced time available some of this content may well have been shortened to fit with delivery times. Teachers have reported that children were very engaged and interested in the content and exercises (4.7 out of 5).

Outcome data is mixed but shows some promising movement. Children's knowledge and awareness scores improved by an average of 7% pre to post test. Whilst the start point is relatively high (74%), this is roughly comparable with where other studies report this age group of children to be in the general population and without intervention (Tutty, 1995).

This potential positive change is supported by the qualitative evidence collected so far. One group of children from King David Primary School began to use language to describe grooming in more mature ways than other children of a similar age. After completing the SafeSkills programme a Year 6 group took part in an external workshop about CSE run by Catch-22. One of the workshop leaders reported:

“The children from King David who had been through the SafeSkills project were much more aware and much more articulate about online grooming than any other similar age group”.

Richard Grindley, Catch-22

The school confirmed that this high level of knowledge and confidence in discussing issues was most likely as a result of the SafeSkills programme, as it was the only related initiative that they had delivered.

However, there has been no observed change in bystander behaviour scores, indicating that children may not be confident using new skills or may not have fully learnt the new skills, despite the module being reported by teachers as especially engaging.
“The materials for part 3 (bystander module) of Safe Skills were really well received by our children and we felt as staff that empowering the bystander is one of the most important messages for children aged 9 and 10”

“Especially the empowering the bystander section. It has also helped the children to communicate their worries and anxieties as well as providing them with some skills they previously may not have had”.

There are two potential reasons for the lack of observed change and at this point it is not clear which is relevant, or whether it is a combination of both.

The lack of measurable impact may be due to using an impact measure that is not a good fit with the programme. The aim was to use existing, validated measures for the evaluation and, as previously described, there are very few measures designed for programmes designed to prevent grooming and sexual exploitation. The bystander measure that was used contains language that does not fit well with the programme, for example two of the five questions refer to ‘victims’ and yet SafeSkills is very careful to focus on the early stages of grooming and to not portray young people as victims. Another two questions refer to ‘pressuring’, again this is not directly relevant because the grooming process relies more on building trust and manipulation rather than direct pressuring. It is possible the measure used is not accurately reflecting the impacts delivered and requires refinement.

However, it is important not to dismiss the lack change by simply dismissing the measurement tool and a review of the content is also important as part of a cycle of improvement. Ariel plans to review the content of this module to identify areas for improvement. It is also important to consider whether one three lesson module is sufficient to deliver impacts and to consider ways in which schools might increase the ‘dose’ delivered. One option might be reinforcing the messages through other programmes, including programmes that Ariel already offers in relation to other themes.

General trust has not changed either, indicating that children do not seem to have been made overly fearful of others due to the content of SafeSkills. This was a possible unintended consequence foreseen from the outset. Neither was trust particularly low at the start of delivery, indicating the children were not overly distrustful of others to begin with.
Qualitative evidence of behaviour change

SafeSkills aims to build young people's skills and confidence and therefore the ultimate aim is to see changes in young people's behaviour. This is something that is very hard to assess through quantitative analysis. Interviews and focus groups with teachers have captured indications of positive behaviour change.

a) Communication of risk-taking behaviour

In all the schools involved in this evaluation, teachers reported that children were more open about their existing risk-taking behaviour, especially the risks they take online. For example, one teacher reported:

“All staff felt that the children may not have previously disclosed the information they shared within the ‘SafeSkills’ sessions. For example, many of the children spoke openly about their online habits and worryingly, 29 of the 57 (51%) of the children in Y5 admitted to befriending an unknown person online (often through online gaming), with little or no understanding of the hidden agendas that these people may have”.

Maria Needham Pastoral Lead & Safeguarding Officer,
Newton-le-Willows Primary School

There is some evidence that this more open discussion of risk-taking behaviour has led to some positive changes in this behaviour; particularly young people deleting ‘friends’ from their online profiles because they were unknown to them. During the sessions in which children practice questioning the motivations of others at St Matthews Primary School, children talked about getting online requests from people they didn’t know asking, “Invite me to the party” and one young person referred to a “Fella who always tries to join our group”. After the SafeSkills ‘motivations and intentions’ sessions 20% of young people reported to their teacher that they had deleted people from their online profiles.

Unfortunately, the evaluation could only capture this after the fact through interviews with teachers and not through the use of data. Further rapid testing of SafeSkills will seek to capture any such changes in a more robust manner.

A change to children’s assessment of the risk associated with adding unknown contacts to online games was also observed:

“At start of the session most thought risky behaviour was OK e.g. adding people they don’t know as ‘friends’. Through peer debate and discussion this view was shifted. It was the peer lead nature of the activity that was important.”

St Michael’s Primary School
As well as talking openly about their risk-taking behaviour with teachers in a classroom, some children went home and discussed this with their parents.

“The school are also aware of a number of children who have spoken to their parents and those parents have come in to school wanting to discuss the issues further”.

Maria Needham Pastoral Lead & Safeguarding Officer, Newton-le-Willows Primary School

b) Increased disclosures of CSE

During the pilot programme, involving seven schools, we have evidence of one direct disclosure as a result of SafeSkills being delivered. In this school the SafeSkills programme was delivered with two Year 6 classes in January 2018, ten sessions were delivered in total. One session focused on practicing the skills to ask for help. During the lesson one young person, who can be hard to engage, was actively participating in the session including asking lots of questions.

That evening they went home and asked to speak to a grandparent. They disclosed that a family friend was grooming them by making them watch porn. The matter has been referred to the police and is now subject to an active prosecution.

The school have clearly indicated that they believe this disclosure was directly linked to the SafeSkills programme and particularly the asking for help role plays practiced earlier in the same day.
What next?

Ariel's evaluation and research efforts to date has set them up well to integrate rapid cycle testing into their programme design, delivery and improvement.

- Use the initial set of SafeSkills monitoring data to examine the programme content relating to areas that have shown little or no improvement (e.g. bystander defending behaviour). Such areas should be changed across Ariel's suite of programmes.
- Integrate online data collection and analysis into programme implementation.
- Allow schools and commissioners access to SafeSkills progress during delivery.
- Iterate data collected based on qualitative feedback. For example, teacher reports of negative consequences such as heightened worry, should be investigated quantitatively in the next round of delivery.
- Measure children's openness and/or willingness to disclose risk to either their teacher or parents.
- Chain similar skill-based, behaviour change programmes together. Children could receive multiple opportunities to practice skills during their time in school. For example, CyberSense (online safety and bullying) and FaceUp (dating violence in young people) sit either side of SafeSkills target age and teach similar skills, in the same manner and on related topics (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016; Eaton 2018).
- Make the best of use of current evidence and improve observed effects by taking the programme beyond the classroom. There is space to design, implement and test a whole school approach involving parents as well as children so that knowledge and skills learnt are reinforced (Topping and Barron, 2009; Kingston University, 2009).
“NO MORE CSE FILMS”: IS SAFESKILLS DIFFERENT?

A comprehensive dissection of the use of child sexual exploitation (CSE) films, for both universal and targeted prevention settings, was published earlier this year (Eaton, 2018) - part way through the current evaluation work relating to SafeSkills. It raises important concerns about the creation, testing and use of such films and documents the harm they can cause to victims of CSE. Consequently, several film providers have withdrawn their materials. This section seeks to clarify the role of SafeSkills in this context.

There are several criticisms levelled at CSE films in general that challenge the format of SafeSkills and Ariel's suite of similar programmes. Firstly, Eaton poses the fundamental challenge that targeting prevention at children lays the onus on the victim to do something or act in a way to avoid becoming a victim. This already has a subtext that the victim can prevent abuse and that if you are abused this may be partially your fault. When done insensitively this can reignite a victim’s trauma and reinforce a victim blaming culture. Universal prevention programmes will reach previous or current victims of abuse and run the risk of re-traumatising them. Films that focus on the victim's behaviour can confirm to victims what many already believe - that they were somehow in the wrong and partially to blame. This is particularly true when such films depict graphic abuse and harm to children.

These general criticisms are both important and fair, and reflect concerns identified by Ariel in the early stages of the development process for SafeSkills. They reflect a key reason why the co-creation of SafeSkills with young victims was a fundamental part of the development process. The aim of the SafeSkills films was to develop an approach that is different from this description of CSE films in a number of ways. Firstly, the films do not portray victims or any form of abuse; the CSE context of the scenarios is not explicit. The aim is to focus on everyday scenarios that may indicate early signs of risk and to focus on developing a broad set of resilience skills that leave young people less vulnerable to a range of risks, including CSE. Whilst we recognise that any prevention programme working with children in this area is focused on empowering potential victims rather than addressing perpetrator behaviour, and therefore risks victim blaming, we feel this risk is minimise by intervening early both in terms of the age of the audience and the stage of the grooming process. In addition, SafeSkills is an extended programme rather than a one-off film or talk and has high levels of engagement with, and support, from teachers.

The SafeSkills materials are focused around the children, their knowledge and their skills and behaviours. Abusers are not targeted. But, SafeSkills does not
show abuse or harm to children. The materials show the insidious behaviour abusers may exhibit and highlight risky situations children may find themselves in. They also make it clear that these kinds of behaviour are unacceptable and are not a result of the victim’s behaviour. For example, one cartoon follows two girls on their walk home from school through the local park. They are stopped by a group of older boys who invite them to a party, offer them drink and cigarettes. They avoid answering any of the girls’ questions but ask many prying questions of their own. The focus of the cartoon is to encourage children to think about why someone may offer them gifts; that you cannot always be sure of someone’s motivations and that one-sided conversations where the other gives nothing back is not a good behaviour. The point is not simply for children to passively observe this and learn that it is bad. The cartoons are used as the basis for teaching children, through group discussion and role-plays, skills to test or extract themselves from risky situations.

The second major criticism is that many CSE films are available, either from NGO’s or private companies, which have no evidence base but are marketed to schools on the basis they will help with OFSTED ratings. SafeSkills does slot into a school need to teach children about abuse and does not yet have a large evidence base to support change in outcomes. As outlined above, Ariel has sought independent expertise to ensure their logic model and resources are built around the current best available evidence and are delivered to high standards. Namely:

- Children have been involved in the process of co-designing the materials used (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016; Kingston University, 2009);
- The ten sessions are spread over a term to ensure the material can be properly explored (Bovarnick and Scott, 2016);
- Teachers are the ones delivering the programme, have a pre-existing relationship with the children and have natural follow-up with them;
- Teaches skills rather than passively raising awareness (Topping and Barron, 2009; Kingston University, 2009; PSHE Association, 2016; Finkelhor, 2009; Zeuthen & Hagelskjaer, 2013);
- Has a routine system of evaluation focusing on child reported outcomes beyond knowledge and awareness (e.g. skill acquisition) and teacher reported fidelity and engagement (Eaton, 2018).

Ariel are committed to evaluation and learning. First through the Big Lottery Realising Ambition pilot RCT, and now through their rapid cycle testing work with the Centre for Excellence for Child Sexual Abuse. SafeSkills implementation and outcome data is being used to learn whether (a) it is possible to deliver a
programme this way (b) there are any early signs of outcome change. Outcome measures are linked to parts of the programme, so that they can inform which parts of the programme may need altering. These are not solely focused on the positive, unintended negative outcomes are also measured routinely. This is being used alongside qualitative data from teachers focusing on negative consequences to inform programme refinement.

The final criticism concerns ethics. No film Eaton (2018) identified had gone for ethical review. Most did not gain consent from parents or inform them they were taking place. Ariel provides schools with materials to send home to parents, both to inform them that the programme is taking place and allow them to withdraw their child. They also provide information on the programme content. Both evaluations have passed through independent ethics committees to ensure their design and content do not pose harm to the children involved. Children are required to consent to data collection at both pre and post-test data collection and data are completely anonymous. Note that data collection, analysis and dissemination all occurred before the new GDPR legislation was introduced in May 2018.

**Ariel Trust is committed to the ongoing evaluation and monitoring of SafeSkills delivery to deliver outcome change for children and avoid unintended consequences. The rapid nature of this data collection and analysis provides the opportunity to immediately course correct as necessary. Having a continued focus on negative outcomes, as well as positive ones, will allow them to spot early signs of harm and remove or redesign materials as appropriate.**
APPENDIX A – CHILD REPORTED SURVEY

STATEMENT FROM THE RESEARCHERS
The Ariel Trust and Dartington Service Design Lab are working in partnership with your school. We are asking you to complete an anonymous survey (we won’t know who you are or be able to link how you responded to you). Please read the information below carefully. You can then decide if you want to take part.

Why am I being asked to complete a survey?
All children in your year and who are taking part in the SafeSkills programme are being asked to take part. Taking part in the survey will help our school, Ariel Trust and researchers better understand whether SafeSkills is a useful tool. The survey will help the school and wider community to better tackle the issues addressed in the SafeSkills programme.

Is the survey anonymous?
Yes. Please do not write your name anywhere on this paper.
This means no one at home or school will be able to see how you answered the questions.
This means we will not be able to contact you in future.

Do I need to take part?
The survey is completely voluntary. You don’t need to take part if you don’t want to. You can skip any questions you don’t want to answer and stop taking the survey at any time.

What if I am upset by some of the questions?
If you feel upset, you can stop the survey at any time or skip any question you don’t want to answer. You can also talk to your teacher or family about the survey or your answers.

What if I have an incident I want to disclose?
If you have experienced an incident and you want to tell someone about it, please talk to your teacher, support officer, or another adult you trust at the school. Please do not write it on this paper as we will not know who you are and will not be able to help you.

Do you want to take part?
I agree to take part in the before/after SafeSkills survey.
Remember, even if you say yes, you can stop the survey at any time.

YES, I want to take part NO, I do not want to take part

SafeSkills: Pupil Response Pre-intervention

Name of school: ____________________________
Year: __________ Date: __________

DARTINGTON SERVICE DESIGN LAB
ariel trust
Below, you will see a set of statements; please tell us whether you think each is usually: true, false or you don’t know by ticking the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If you don’t like how someone is treating you it’s okay to say “no”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Even someone you like can make you feel bad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes it’s ok to say “no” to grown-ups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You always have to keep secrets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strangers look like ordinary people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You can always tell who’s a stranger – they look mean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If someone does something you don’t like, you should never tell anyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If a mean kid at school tells you to do something, you should do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If someone has made you feel bad, you should keep telling until someone believes you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is okay to say “no” and move away if someone makes you feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If a grown-up tells you to do something you always have to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If you friend says they won’t be your friend anymore if you don’t give them your last sweet, then you should give it to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For these next questions, think about a situation where someone you know is being bullied or pressured by others. Please tell us how easy or hard you’d find it to do each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
<th>VERY EASY</th>
<th>EASY</th>
<th>NEITHER EASY NOR HARD</th>
<th>HARD</th>
<th>VERY HARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trying to make others stop pressuring someone would be...</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Telling others to stop pressuring someone would be...</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supporting or comforting the victim would be...</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encouraging the victim to tell a trusted adult would be...</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, please tell us your opinion on the following statements, and how strongly you feel for each one by telling us whether you strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most people are basically honest.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most people are trustworthy.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people are basically good and kind.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most people are trustful of others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am trustful.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Most people will be trusting if they are trusted by others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>