The safe use of new technologies

This report is based on evidence from a small-scale survey carried out between April and July 2009 in 35 maintained schools in England. It evaluates the extent to which the schools taught pupils to adopt safe and responsible practices in using new technologies, and how they achieved this. It also assesses the extent and quality of the training the schools provided for their staff. It responds to the report of the Byron Review, *Safer children in a digital world*.

Contents

Executive summary

In 2007 the Government commissioned from Dr Tanya Byron a review of the risks that children face when using the internet and video games. Following its publication in 2008, Ofsted was asked, among other things, to evaluate the extent to which schools teach pupils to adopt safe and responsible practices in using new technologies; and that is the focus of this report. It also assesses training on internet safety for the staff in the schools visited and considers the schools' links with families in terms of e-safety.

Between April and July 2009, inspectors visited 35 schools: infant, primary, and secondary schools (11−16 and 11−18); a state boarding school; a special school and a pupil referral unit. They were selected to represent differing geographical locations, different sizes and contexts. The sample did not include schools which had been judged to be inadequate at their previous whole-school inspections, since these are monitored termly by Ofsted.

The provision for e-safety was outstanding in five of the schools, good in 16, satisfactory in 13, and inadequate in one.

The schools visited reported that they had dealt with a variety of e-safety incidents, such as pupils accessing inappropriate websites, as well as problems with social networking sites and instant chat sites. However, the 21 most effective schools visited had a well-considered, active approach to keeping pupils safe when they were online and helping them to take responsibility for their safety. There was a close relationship between the provision that the schools made and the pupils' knowledge and understanding. The training for staff was well established and the curriculum was planned and coordinated effectively. Taken together, these factors had a positive impact in terms of e-safety for pupils.

The five schools where provision for e-safety was outstanding all used 'managed' systems to help pupils to become safe and responsible users of new technologies. 'Managed' systems have fewer inaccessible sites than 'locked down' systems and so require pupils to take responsibility themselves for using new technologies safely.

Although the 13 schools which used 'locked down' systems kept their pupils safe while in school, such systems were less effective in helping them to learn how to use new technologies safely. These pupils were therefore more vulnerable overall. This was a particular concern when pupils were educated away from their main school, for example, in work-based learning.

The weakest aspect of provision in the schools visited was the extent and quality of training provided for staff. It did not always involve all the staff and was not provided systematically. Even the schools that organised training for all their staff did not always monitor its impact systematically. In addition, although they had policies and procedures for e-safety, most of the schools did not review these systematically.

This meant that they were not able to evaluate accurately whether what they were doing was having a positive impact in terms of keeping their pupils safe.

The schools visited needed to focus more consistently on a number of important areas. These included: developing a curriculum for e-safety which builds on what pupils have learnt before and which reflects their age and stage of development; providing training which enables all staff, not just teachers, to support pupils; and helping families to keep their children safe. To do this schools need more support from the Department for Children, Schools and Families, Becta, the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) and local authorities, in developing and maintaining good practice.

Key findings

- In the five schools where provision for e-safety was outstanding, all the staff, including members of the wider workforce, shared responsibility for it. Assemblies, tutorial time, personal, social, health and education lessons, and an age-appropriate curriculum for e-safety all helped pupils to become safe and responsible users of new technologies.

- Pupils in the schools that had 'managed' systems had better knowledge and understanding of how to stay safe than those in schools with 'locked down' systems. Pupils were more vulnerable overall when schools used locked down systems because they were not given enough opportunities to learn how to assess and manage risk for themselves.

- In the outstanding schools, senior leaders, governors, staff and families worked together to develop a clear strategy for e-safety. Policies were reviewed regularly in the light of technological developments. However, systematic review and evaluation were rare in the other schools visited.

- The outstanding schools recognised that, although they had excellent relationships with families, they needed to keep developing these to continue to support e-safety at home.

- Few of the schools visited made good use of the views of pupils and their parents to develop their e-safety provision.

- In some schools there were weaknesses in e-safety where pupils were receiving some of their education away from the school site.

- The weakest aspect of provision in the schools visited was the extent and quality of their training for staff. It did not involve all the staff and was not provided systematically. Even the schools that organised training for all their staff did not always monitor its impact systematically.

Recommendations

The Department for Children, Schools and Families, in conjunction with Becta, CEOP and local authorities, should:

■ seek ways to reinforce the importance of e-safety in all schools and homes, ensuring that families and schools work together to support the e-safety of pupils

■ continue to support the training of all staff in all schools in e-safety

■ encourage and support schools to move from locked down to managed systems.

Schools should:

■ audit the training needs of all staff and provide training to improve their knowledge of and expertise in the safe and appropriate use of new technologies

■ work closely with all families to help them ensure that their children use new technologies safely and responsibly both at home and at school

■ use pupils' and families' views more often to develop e-safety strategies

■ manage the transition from locked down systems to more managed systems to help pupils understand how to manage risk; to provide them with richer learning experiences; and to bridge the gap between systems at school and the more open systems outside school

■ provide an age-related, comprehensive curriculum for e-safety which enables pupils to become safe and responsible users of new technologies

■ work with their partners and other providers to ensure that pupils who receive part of their education away from school are e-safe

■ systematically review and develop their e-safety procedures, including training, to ensure that they have a positive impact on pupils' knowledge and understanding.

Introduction

1. New technologies are central to modern life. They enable people across the world to have instant communication with one another. They allow for the rapid retrieval and collation of information from a wide range of sources, and provide a powerful stimulus for creativity. They allow people to discuss sensitive topics which, face to face, they might find difficult. However, these technologies are also potentially damaging. They can give access to harmful and inappropriate materials and, because of the anonymity offered, vulnerable individuals may be harmed or exploited.

2. In its submission to the Byron Review, Ofcom estimated that 99% of those in the seven to 17 age group access the internet.[1] Against this background, the Government commissioned a study from Dr Tanya Byron of the risks that children face when using the internet and video games. Her report recognised the advantages of new technologies and the ease and confidence with which children and young people use them.[2] At the same time, the report emphasised that children and young people do not always have the knowledge, skills and understanding to keep themselves safe. It highlighted the need for the Government to 'empower children and raise the skills of parents' by:

   ■ delivering e-safety through the curriculum

   ■ providing teachers and the wider children's workforce with the skills and knowledge they need

   ■ taking steps to ensure that Ofsted holds the system to account.

3. Ofsted was asked to report on how schools responded to e-safety in the self-evaluation form that they are invited to complete before an inspection.[3] It was also asked to evaluate internet safety (e-safety) training in schools as part of its report on information and communication technology (ICT).[4] Finally, it was asked to evaluate the extent to which schools teach pupils to adopt safe and responsible practices in using new technologies. The final aspect is the focus of this report.

4. In the better schools visited, there was a close relationship between the provision they made for e-safety and pupils' knowledge and understanding. In contrast, in the one school visited where the provision for e-safety was

---

[1] *Ofcom's response to the Byron Review*, Ofcom, 2008; www.ofcom.org.uk/research/telecoms/reports/byron/.
[2] *Safer children in a digital world: the report of the Byron Review*, (PP/D16 (7576)/03/08), DCSF and DCMS, 2008; www.dcsf.gov.uk/byronreview/.
[3] *School self-evaluation: a response to the Byron Review* (080203), Ofsted, 2008; www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/080203.
[4] *The importance of ICT: information and communication technology in primary and secondary schools 2005/8* (070035), Ofsted 2009; www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/070035.

inadequate, the pupils relied on their peers, siblings and, sometimes, members of their families for advice. Not all the pupils had enough knowledge to enable them to use new technologies safely in all contexts.

Teaching pupils to adopt safe and responsible practices

What constitutes safety?

5. The report of the Byron Review discusses the difference between being safe and being responsible. Children who hold a parent's hand every time they cross the road are safe. However, unless they are taught to cross the road by themselves, they might not learn to do this independently. A child whose use of the internet is closely monitored at school will not necessarily develop the level of understanding required to use new technologies responsibly in other contexts.

6. Of the 35 schools visited, 13 of them had 'locked down' their systems, meaning that many websites were inaccessible. In such systems, almost every site has to be unbarred before a pupil can use it. This keeps the pupils safe, because they can use only sites vetted by their teachers, the technicians or, in two of the schools visited, by the local authority. However, this approach had disadvantages in the schools visited. As well as taking up time and detracting from learning, it did not encourage the pupils to take responsibility for their actions. For example, in two of the schools, students in Key Stage 4 and the sixth form said to inspectors that they often spent a great deal of time researching on the internet, only to find that the relevant sites were blocked. They had to ask teachers or technicians to unlock the systems, thereby taking up valuable learning time.

7. Although managed systems also have inaccessible sites, there are fewer of them. The schools where the provision for e-safety was good or better recognised the potential dangers of new technologies, but tried to equip their pupils to deal with them. Where the provision for e-safety was outstanding, the schools had managed rather than locked down systems. In the best practice seen, pupils were helped, from a very early age, to assess the risk of accessing sites and therefore gradually to acquire skills which would help them adopt safe practices even when they were not supervised.

> In one local authority, the schools adopted a 'think before you click' policy. From an early age, pupils were taught that, before clicking onto a site, they should ask questions such as:
>
> ■ who wrote the material on this site?
> ■ is the information on it likely to be accurate or could it be altered by anybody?
> ■ if others click onto the site, can I be sure that they are who they say they are?

- what information about myself should I not give out on the site?

8. The most successful schools visited in terms of their e-safety ensured that pupils knew what to do when things went wrong. Three primary schools visited, for example, made sure that if pupils came across an unsuitable site they could activate a cartoon character which covered the screen; it meant that they did not have to look at the site and had the opportunity to tell an adult.

9. These schools recognised the advantages of new technologies, but were also aware of possible dangers. For example, in searching for information on the Holocaust, pupils can be led, unwittingly, to Nazi propaganda websites. Teachers have to be alert to the dangers, enabling pupils to deal with problems if they arise.

Instant chat sites and passwords

10. Most of the incidents discussed with inspectors during the survey concerned instant chat sites, where young people use text to interact with each other quickly and easily. In one of the secondary schools visited, the students said that most of the incidents they knew about had started outside school and that all of them had involved instant chat sites. They recognised the advantages of such sites in terms of the speed of communication, but also their disadvantages, the main one being the danger of misinterpretation in the absence of clues from facial expression.

11. The inappropriate use of passwords was also common. Sometimes pupils gave other pupils their password; on other occasions, pupils found it out. In one primary school visited, it led to the following incident.

> Two pupils started to receive unpleasant messages through instant chat. The pupils saved the messages and checked where they had come from. When dealing with the incident, the school discovered that some pupils had told other pupils their passwords. It dealt with the incident in the same way as other bullying, but it also took the opportunity to reinforce messages about the safety and security of passwords. In addition, teachers used 'circle time' to discuss how the meanings of words change when words are read rather than heard and how the nuances of spoken language are lost.

Good practice

12. In the schools visited with the best e-safety provision, even the youngest pupils were clear about the policies and procedures on e-safety. Their knowledge was appropriate to and sufficient for their age and stage of development, enabling them to stay safe and use new technologies confidently.

13. In the five outstanding schools, the planning and coordination of the curriculum for e-safety were very effective, with all subjects taking responsibility. The staff

were supported by senior leaders, the ICT coordinator and, in one of the schools visited, by the e-safety team, to embed e-safety into their lessons and adapt them to meet the pupils' needs and interests. Schools also received support from the police, Becta and CEOP. The schools adapted the policies and advice from external agencies to their own circumstances and applied them consistently. The outstanding schools also catered particularly well for potentially vulnerable pupils, including those in the early stages of learning English and those who did not have access to new technologies outside school.

14. Planning for progression was also managed well, as in this example:

> In a primary school, judged outstanding for its e-safety, pupils in Years 3 and 4 learnt about methods for communicating electronically, such as email, blogs, discussions and online chat, and discussed the importance of personal safety at home as well as in school. In Years 5 and 6, this learning was taken further when they considered the importance of personal safety when using any electronic communications, as well as wider issues, such as cyber-bullying and 'phishing', and how to minimise risk.[5]

15. One secondary school visited had a clear understanding of the needs of potentially vulnerable students and the importance that ICT played in supporting their learning. The students were encouraged to stay after school to use the learning centre and the school's managed ICT system. The school had developed an approach to e-safety, individual to each student, which involved working closely with families and students. Both the student and the family received good advice on e-safety, covering chat rooms, mobile phones, monitoring software and filtering systems. Provision was made for all students, including the most potentially vulnerable, to discuss safe, appropriate and reliable use of the internet, the safe storage of personal information, and the use of mobile phones and social networking sites; these topics were revisited at later stages.

16. The leaders and managers in the five schools where e-safety provision was outstanding had a clear vision for it and ensured that it was everyone's responsibility. They identified their strengths, worked to eradicate their weaknesses and were determined to keep improving the provision. In particular, they recognised the importance of improving their links with families. They reviewed their vision and the strategy for achieving it regularly with the school community, which included governors, senior managers and the school council.

---

[5] 'Phishing' refers to the fraudulent practice of sending an email which purports to come from a legitimate company. The email asks the recipient to release a password, credit card details or other personal information.

17. This was not the case, however, in all the schools visited. Governing bodies had usually ratified the policy and some members were trained in e-safety, but this was usually only the Chair of Governors or a small number of other governors. Only five of the schools visited had involved their pupils in developing policies and procedures. This meant that, instead of being embedded throughout the school, e-safety was seen as an additional job to do and it therefore had limited impact on improving outcomes for pupils.

18. Each school judged outstanding for e-safety had decided the best approach to e-safety and had tailored its approach to its own circumstances. In a primary school with outstanding e-safety provision, its unconventional approach to managing e-safety worked extremely well, as described here.

> The headteacher decided not to have a coordinator for ICT. Instead, the staff accepted collective responsibility for all aspects of ICT, including e-safety. Consequently, ownership was strong and e-safety pervaded a rich ICT curriculum. Good ideas, experiences and resources were shared, and consistent practice reflected the vision which the headteacher promoted. While safety was paramount, there was a clear drive to 'create polite online citizens' and to provide pupils with the skills to cope with and manage risk.
>
> The local authority's learning network was exploited productively. The staff evaluated resources for and approaches to e-safety through an effectively developed shared network area and contributed to the robust monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes for pupils.
>
> Partnerships were used effectively and parents were engaged positively through daily contact and family learning sessions. The school's outstanding e-safety curriculum enabled pupils of all ages and backgrounds to be independent and manage new technologies confidently and safely.

19. Outstanding practice in e-safety was also found in one of the secondary schools visited.

> A core team for e-safety comprised a senior pastoral manager, the systems manager and the ICT manager (who took the lead role). They established a clear whole-school vision for the safe use of new technologies, reflected in the unambiguous 'acceptable use' policies.
>
> A vital element of the team's work was an excellent e-safety curriculum. This formed part of the personal, social and health education programme, provided through tutorial time. To ensure consistency, 10 lessons, to be taught by tutors, were available on the school's website: on e-safety; social networking; cyber-bullying; online grooming; protection and prevention; and acceptable use. The lessons supported students to:

- recognise and manage the potential risks associated with online activities
- behave responsibly online
- recognise when pressures from others in the online environment might threaten their personal safety and well-being
- develop effective ways of resisting pressure.

The lessons were age-related and built on earlier learning. The topic of online grooming was briefly introduced to younger students and then made progressively more explicit as students matured. The resources were used flexibly to support all students, including those who arrived at short notice, those learning English and those who were vulnerable, including looked after children.

Assemblies on the topic of e-safety complemented the above. These incorporated what had been learnt from incidents and other events and the students' experiences of the latest technology. Contributions from the police reinforced the development of the essential personal skills and confidence needed to manage risk.

The e-safety team actively involved the staff in evaluating the programme, so it remained relevant and up to date.

Education off site

20. An increasing number of students receive part of their education off site, as a result of increasing flexibility in the 14 to 19 curriculum.[6] However, some of the secondary schools visited had not taken into account their students' e-safety off site, whether at college, another school or with a provider of work-based learning. One of the schools visited thought that the college to which they were sending the students would cover the topic. The same school was also unsure whether the students' work experience placements were checked in terms of e-safety. This meant that this school, and some of the others surveyed, were unaware of their pupils' e-safety when they were away from the school site.

Links with families

21. Schools have a major role to play in developing pupils' understanding of how to use new technologies safely. However, pupils spend the greater part of their lives away from school, where the extent to which they are safe and use new technologies responsibly depends on how effectively their families oversee what they do. To ensure continuity of care, it is therefore essential that schools and families work closely together.

---

[6] *Implementation of 14–19 reforms, including the introduction of Diplomas* (080267), Ofsted, 2009; www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/080267.

22. Almost all the schools visited required families to sign an 'acceptable use' policy, detailing what their children were allowed and not allowed to do when using new technologies at school. Pupils were required:

- not to reveal personal details when using the internet
- not to give their password to other people
- to report any suspicious sites
- to ensure that any mobile devices that they might wish to attach to school equipment were free of viruses
- not to make defamatory comments about others online.

The best policies set out clearly the consequences of breaching the regulations, usually by banning pupils from using the school's computer system for a defined period. Two schools confiscated mobile phones if they were being misused and returned them only to a parent or carer, not to the pupil. In the best cases, the schools monitored whether families had signed the 'acceptable use' policy and were rigorous in contacting any who had not done so. However, not all the schools did this systematically.

23. The schools visited had a variety of strategies for working with families. At the simplest level, they displayed prominent posters on e-safety in the areas of the school which families were most likely to visit. Three of the schools provided advice to families through one-to-one meetings with trained staff, including learning mentors, pupil support officers and social workers. Through these sessions, families were taught how to ensure that they adopted safe practices at home, such as monitoring the sites their children used, how to block access to unsuitable sites, and how to get further information from national agencies, such as CEOP. One of the local authorities had produced a CD for families on using computers, which the schools distributed.

24. One of the secondary schools worked with its primary schools to arrange an evening meeting for all the families, advertised through the local press and radio. It also organised a talk about e-safety for the families of students at Key Stage 3, linked to the national e-safety week.[7] Although these were good initiatives, they were of only limited usefulness because the school did not monitor which families attended and had not considered what the impact on the students might be as a result.

25. Other potentially powerful initiatives also had less impact than expected because the schools had not considered fully the implications of their approach. One school, for example, had established an online forum for families, so that they could share information on ensuring their children's safety. This was very

---

useful support for families who had access to computers, but the school had not considered how to provide this information for families who did not have this facility.[8] The school had also made no allowance for the fact that, even in homes with no computer, children often have games consoles through which they can gain access to the internet.

26. One school had made a successful bid for funding from its local authority to provide laptops for all Year 1 pupils which they could use at home as well as in the classroom. Recognising that parents can often be less well informed than their children, the school made it a condition of providing the laptop that families should attend training alongside their children and teachers.

27. The pupils themselves often recognised that they were better informed than their parents about technology. In one example found during the survey, a student did the parents' internet banking as they could not do it themselves. Pupils were concerned that their parents did not understand new technologies and that they had to remind them of basic e-safety, such as not giving out personal information or that people they talked to on social networking sites might not be the people they said they were.

Internet safety training for teachers and the wider workforce

28. Training for staff was the weakest aspect of e-safety. In 21 of the 35 schools visited, the survey identified e-safety training as an area for improvement. Most training provided was 'one size fits all' and therefore did not always meet needs. There was very little evidence of schools drawing systematically on the views and concerns of pupils, their families or governors in identifying priorities for such training.

29. E-safety training was usually weak when the headteacher had not delegated responsibility for it, or plans had not been made to include it in training in child protection or for ICT. The training tended to be informal only. Nine of the schools visited provided training and support for staff only in response to specific concerns.

30. Often the training involved all the teaching staff. However, support staff received little or no training on e-safety. It frequently focused on relaying information about compliance with e-safety procedures rather than on how to teach pupils to adopt safe and responsible practices when using new technologies.

---

[8] Ofcom's response to the Byron Review in 2008 suggested that 'parents seem to be less aware of out-of-home exposure to potentially harmful or inappropriate content'. In other words, their children could be exposed to dangers online, even if the families themselves did not have access to such technology.

31. The best training, however, was planned systematically and included all the teaching staff and all the support staff. Often, information was provided for families and governors. Such training reflected participants' previous experience, including that of support staff. The schools identified e-safety training needs in various ways, including through using Becta's framework for auditing, the school's own policy for acceptable use and by drawing on monitoring and evaluation of ICT use and any incidents that had occurred. On rare occasions, staff completed an audit beforehand.

32. The schools used a wide range of external resources for support, including the local authority, Becta, CEOP, the International Youth Advisory Congress, the local City Learning Centre and the police.

> In one school visited, the students and a member of staff attended centrally provided training on cyber-bullying and e-safety, which the school then developed into training for all its staff and students. The teacher provided feedback to members of staff. Training was also provided for all new members of staff, both teaching and support staff.

33. Training was provided specifically on the risks of technologies, such as laptops, websites and the virtual learning environment. In both primary and secondary schools, the most frequent topics for e-safety training were:

- using social networking sites and websites
- dealing with cyber-bullying.

Other common topics were:

- managing mobile phones, email and instant messaging
- sharing personal images
- using data and protecting passwords
- avoiding pornography.

This provided pupils with satisfactory knowledge. However, the knowledge of older students about the more sophisticated aspects of e-safety, such as financial safety, was less secure.

34. In the best schools, the training for staff had a direct impact on the students' knowledge and understanding. As a result of such good training, all students, including the more vulnerable, had good awareness of what they might face when using new technologies. The students also had simple but effective strategies for protecting themselves. They said:

> 'I would not meet anyone who asked me to online.'

> 'I don't let anyone I don't know on a social networking site see my photographs or know where I live.'

35. The best training programmes recorded evaluations of e-safety training and provided staff with feedback, including on e-safety incidents, through newsletters as well as training.

36. Training increased the awareness of staff and improved policies for e-safety. In the five outstanding schools, it led to additional opportunities to learn about e-safety in different parts of the curriculum. In the best cases, pupils were more informed about the use of new technologies. They understood the rules and discussed e-safety confidently with each other and with staff.

37. Of the schools visited, 26 of them said that the training had had a positive impact on helping pupils to be safe, but few were able to provide evidence of this. However, they gave inspectors anecdotal evidence of a reduced number of incidents of bullying.

38. Individual schools referred to a continuing need for training and development to understand and deal with the different levels of access, support and guidance that pupils have at school and at home. In particular, they acknowledged the need to involve pupils and families more in identifying needs.

Notes

Inspectors visited a sample of 20 primary schools, 13 secondary schools, one pupil referral unit and one special school between April and July 2009 to evaluate their approaches to e-safety. The schools were selected to represent differing geographical locations, variations in school size, and urban and rural contexts. Schools which had been judged to be inadequate at their last whole-school inspections were excluded from the sample.

During the one-day visits, inspectors observed lessons and assemblies, held discussions with senior leaders and other staff, and talked to pupils. Inspectors also scrutinised a range of documentation, including minutes from governors' meetings, curriculum documents, lesson plans and pupils' work.

Further information

Publications by Ofsted

School self-evaluation: a response to the Byron Review (080203), Ofsted, 2008;
www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/080203.

The importance of ICT: information and communication technology in primary and secondary schools, 2005/2008 (070035), Ofsted, 2009;
www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/070035.

Other publications

Ofcom's response to the Byron Review, Ofcom, 2008;
www.ofcom.org.uk/research/telecoms/reports/byron/.

Safer children in a digital world: the report of the Byron Review
(PP/D16(7578)/03/08), DCSF and DCMS, 2008; www.dcsf.gov.uk/byronreview/.

Websites

Becta is the government agency which is responsible for leading the national drive to ensure the effective and innovative use of technology throughout learning. Guidance to schools on software licensing costs, open source software and further information on the ICT self-review framework and the harnessing technology strategy can be found at: www.becta.org.uk/.

The Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) is part of the UK police service and is dedicated to protecting children from sexual abuse. It runs the website thinkuknow which gives online help and support to families, pupils and teachers.

www.ceop.gov.uk

www.thinkuknow.co.uk

The website of the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) provides links to many aspects of school policy, guidance and performance, including using virtual learning environments.

www.dcsf.gov.uk

Annex: Schools visited for this survey

Schools	Local authority
Angley School – A Sports College, Cranbrook	Kent
Beechen Cliff School	Bath and North East Somerset
Bishop Wilson Church of England Primary School, Birmingham	Solihull
Caldew School, Dalston	Cumbria
Camps Hill Community Primary School, Stevenage	Hertfordshire
Carlton Bolling College	Bradford
Colchester Royal Grammar School, Colchester	Essex
Cotelands PRU c/o John Ruskin College	Croydon
Drapers Mills Primary School, Margate	Kent
Falconer School, Bushey	Hertfordshire
Farsley Springbank Junior School, Pudsey	Leeds
Glenmoor School	Bournemouth
Grace Academy Solihull, Birmingham	Solihull
Ivegill CofE School, Carlisle	Cumbria
Kineton Green Primary School, Olton	Solihull
Lambourne Primary School, Romford	Essex
Linton CofE Infant School, Linton	Cambridgeshire
Little Stanmore Nursery, First and Middle School, Edgware	Harrow
Longhill High School, Rottingdean	Brighton and Hove
Longwell Green Primary School, Bristol	South Gloucestershire
Low Moor CofE Primary School	Bradford
Nessfield Primary School, Keighley	Bradford
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour Roman Catholic Primary School	Blackburn with Darwen
Oval Primary School	Croydon
Rawmarsh Community School – A Sports College, Rawmarsh	Rotherham
Savio Salesian College, Bootle	Sefton
South Norwood Primary School, South Norwood	Croydon

St Augustine's Catholic Primary School	Solihull
St Edward's Roman Catholic Primary School Blackburn	Blackburn with Darwen
Stuart Road Primary School, Stoke	Plymouth
The Ockendon School, South Ockendon	Thurrock
The Streetly School, Sutton Coldfield	Walsall
Two Mile Hill Junior School, Bristol	City of Bristol
Wombwell High – A Humanities College	Barnsley
Worth Valley Primary School, Keighley	Bradford

The safe use of new technologies