

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE SELF-ASSESSMENT



SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Designated Safeguarding Lead		Interview with DSL(s) or team to understand the DSL role.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where one member of staff had their time fully protected with no additional responsibilities (i.e. teaching).</p> <p>A school would score amber where a DSL had teaching responsibilities but some protected time.</p>
Recording and referral pathways internally within school		<p>Student engagement sessions and review of safeguarding and behaviour logs to compare student reports on the frequency of HSB in school with incidents recorded on the school systems.</p> <p>Staff engagement session to understand whether staff have access to and use recording systems.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where following an instance of homophobic or sexualised name calling in class, the majority of teachers in the school would have access to, and would record, the incident on an electronic safeguarding log, even if it was deemed as a 'one-off' event.</p> <p>A school would score amber where they had an electronic safeguarding system in place that all staff can access, however staff would predominantly record inappropriate touching (such as touching bums), or the distribution of sexual images, but not sexist or homophobic name calling.</p>
Harmful Sexual Behaviour policy		Review school policies including the safeguarding, behaviour and other relevant policies	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where they had a sexual harassment and sexual violence policy that makes explicit reference to HSB (for example, sexual harassment, sexual violence, non-consensual/indecent sexual imagery and online abuse) and is in accordance with statutory guidance and local MA advice on sexual violence in schools.</p> <p>A school would score amber where types of HSB (for example sexual assault or 'sexting') are only referenced within the behaviour policy.</p> <p>A school would score red where there is no reference to types of HSB in any policy.</p>

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Engagement in local context		Interview DSL about the meetings they attend in the MA partnership and how they act on information gained in these meetings.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where, following a MA meeting in which concerns are raised about a new social media platform (for example where a young person's location may be known) an assembly is held within the school for students, and/or parents are notified.</p> <p>A school would score amber where, following a MA meeting where concerns are raised about sexual harassment in a park by students of another school, the school only acts once this affects their own students.</p> <p>A school would score red if it does not attend any local meetings such as DSL networks.</p>
Partnership input		Student engagement sessions and surveys and interview with DSL. Speak to students about PSHE/RSE and any sessions conducted by external organisations on topics related to HSB and ask how relevant these are for them. Speak to the DSL about local agencies they work with and evidence of MA resources that they draw upon to inform the school's response.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it regularly brings in external partners (for example a voluntary organisation for victims of child sexual exploitation) to inform their approaches and works with the MA partnership when reviewing and adapting policies.</p> <p>A school would score amber where it delivers PSHE on healthy relationships but develops this with limited reference to evidence or national or local resources.</p> <p>A school would score red if it does not engage a local LGBTQ+ organisation for fear of parental backlash.</p>
Parental engagement		Parent survey and interview with DSL. Survey questions ask about the level of communication and relationship parents have with the school on HSB.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it delivers tailored emails or learning and/or delivers surveys to parents to gauge their perspective on HSB.</p> <p>A school would score amber if it consistently contacts/informs parents after incidents of HSB, but has minimal engagement through raising awareness, surveys, or communication on HSB outside of incidents.</p> <p>A school would score red if it doesn't speak to parents about HSB, except following incidents when they are required to do so, because of fears that parents may be resistant to school policies.</p>



PREVENTION

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Training		Staff engagement sessions to discuss how confident staff feel to respond to HSB, and whether the training provides them with enough information on school-specific approaches to HSB.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it provides training on safeguarding which includes topics related to HSB, and also provides regular updates, bulletins and resources for staff specific to HSB.</p> <p>A school would score amber if it provides annual training on safeguarding which includes topics related to HSB.</p> <p>A school would score red where the DSL receives less-than annual training relevant to HSB, and the training is not disseminated to school staff.</p>
Relationships and sex education		Student engagement sessions (focus groups or surveys) to ask students whether the education they receive on relationships and sex education matches the reality of their lives and to gain their thoughts on the education and how it could be improved.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where lessons on sexting prioritise education on coercion and imbalances of power, with a focus on problematic onward sharing, but also recognise the range of ways that young people share images that are not sexual, and that some forms of image sharing are consensual for some age groups.</p> <p>A school would score amber where all year groups are taught about sexting, but with a focus predominantly on the law and an emphasis on not sending the images in the first place.</p>
Prevention and incident management		Student engagement sessions to speak with students about what types of sexual harm happens at school, and how they think the school would respond to each of these harms	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where students and staff perceive that issues associated with HSB are addressed; for example a swift response to an allegation of online sexual harassment demonstrates to students that such behaviours are unacceptable and will not be tolerated, and that complaints will be taken seriously.</p> <p>A school would score amber where swift action is taken in response to all incidents, but students only perceive that certain harmful behaviours are responded to, for example, contact offences but not those occurring online.</p> <p>A school would score red where action is only taken to respond to contact incidents such as sexual assault, but not to online sexual harassment, which therefore normalises such behaviours.</p>



IDENTIFICATION

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Definition		<p>Staff engagement sessions sessions to speak with staff and ask them what HSB is and what types of behaviours fall under this term.</p> <p>Review school policies including the safeguarding, behaviour and other relevant policies.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where its safeguarding policy makes reference to either HSB or peer-on-peer abuse and outlines a range of behaviours that fall within this – for example, sexual harassment and sexual violence. This is the same definition as used by the MA partnership. When asked, staff understand the range of behaviours that fall within the definition.</p> <p>A school would score amber if some school staff, when asked, are unable to describe what would constitute HSB or would consider some types of HSB (for example, child sexual exploitation) to be HSB but not others (for example, sexist name calling).</p>
HSB recording and tracking		<p>Review school safeguarding and behaviour logs to understand how HSB is recorded by different staff members and to identify the use of HSB flags.</p> <p>Interview with DSL(s) or team to understand how trends in HSB are mapped in the school.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it had recording systems in place to flag HSB and there is evidence of different teachers using the HSB flag for incidents even if they were deemed as a ‘one-off’ incident (e.g., an incident of bra pinging). The DSL would recognise growing trends of behaviours to create a chronology that is used to contextualise incidents, using key-terms so that the records are easily searchable.</p> <p>A school would score amber where staff, when asked, were able to discuss HSB trends (e.g., bra-pinging is an issue in school), but these behaviours and trends are not recorded or do not allow for the easy searching of HSB, using a key-term search.</p>
Resources		<p>Interview with DSL(s) or team to understand resources available to support the identification of HSB and how regularly these resources are updated.</p> <p>Staff engagement session to explore staff knowledge of resources and confidence in using these.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where there are resources for staff to draw upon to support their identification of HSB and where the DSL would frequently (more than three times a year) receive updates on HSB resources and support staff to use these resources.</p> <p>A school would score red where a student with special educational needs is consistently sexually touching other students, but the DSL does not respond to this behaviour, based on the assumption that this behaviour is related to that individual’s learning needs. The DSL does not draw on any specialist resources on young people with learning needs to make this decision.</p>

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Disclosure options		<p>Student engagement session to explore students' awareness and perception of disclosure options in the school.</p> <p>Staff engagement session to explore staff knowledge of disclosure options, confidence in managing a disclosure and knowledge of the school's safeguarding process.</p> <p>Review school policies including the safeguarding, behaviour and other relevant policies.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where there is evidence of trusted relationships between students and individuals; for example students may have trusted relationships with a pastoral tutor, a mentor, or a teacher. The school would also have safe and private space (e.g., a therapeutic space) where students could discuss concerns. The school may allow for anonymous reporting, for example through an app or post boxes, but this approach is well supported through trusted adults and a safeguarding policy that is transparent and available to the whole student body. For example, a student that reports being raped by a student from another school already knows that after disclosing to a trusted member of staff, that the staff member will have to report this to the DSL and their parents, and how and when their parents will be informed.</p> <p>A school would score amber where students are expected to disclose to staff members, but there is no designated space or time to do so or this space is not private and staff other than the DSL are not trained or prepared to take disclosures.</p>



RESPONSE AND INTERVENTION

Staff motivation

Staff engagement and interview with DSL to ask staff questions on the level of support they receive and if there are variations between staff responses. Explore where these differences lie in the workforce.


For example:

A school would score **green** if following an incident of HSB, staff members are provided with a regular form of supervision to discuss cases and where staff feel supported by colleagues to respond. In such a school, when a female staff member challenges sexist language she will be confident that her male colleagues will support her to do so.

A school would score **amber** where some staff recognise HSB as a problem, but feel they would not be supported to tackle this because other staff see these behaviours as 'banter' or 'boys being boys'.

A school would score **red** where, while staff understand that some forms of HSB are abusive, staff accept this as part of youth culture and take limited steps to respond or where staff feel if they were to raise concerns, they would not be taken seriously/a response wouldn't be put in place.

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Thresholds		<p>Staff and student engagement and interview with DSL. Ask students how school staff respond to different cases (for example consensual and non-consensual image sharing). Ask staff about their responses to different cases of HSB and what thresholds they use to make these decisions.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would be green where there is recognition that individual case management can affect school-wide culture, peer response and all children's ability to speak out. Such a school would have an internal threshold document that allows all staff to identify where different behaviours fall on an HSB continuum – ranging from developmentally normal sexual behaviour to abusive and violent behaviours – which allows staff to respond proportionately. For example in a case where two 16 year olds have been found to share sexual images consensually with each other, the school and staff manage this internally (with an understanding of adolescent sexual development) whilst still recognising the legal implications. While an incident of non-consensual image sharing would be referred to social care services, and understood as abusive.</p> <p>A school would score amber where both examples would be considered abusive and result in the same response; the consensual and non-consensual elements not being recognised as requiring a different response.</p> <p>A school would score red where staff are unsure what behaviours require a response, and have no access to guidance to make these decisions. This might be characterised by very few referrals to the MA partnership for HSB, with the school focusing instead on abuse of children by adults.</p>
Response to incidents		<p>Reviewing safeguarding logs, staff and student engagement to identify evidence of victim-blaming language, consistency within responses, and actions and interventions following incidents.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green where, following an incident where a student is sexually assaulted while meeting up with other students in a park, the victims and instigators (and any witnesses) receive welfare support (and sanctions where appropriate). Friends and peers are also part of this response, and the wellbeing of all students involved is prioritised. Interventions focus on understanding the instigators' behaviour.</p> <p>A school would score amber where the instigators receive a fixed-term exclusion, and on return are kept separate from the victims but receive no welfare support.</p> <p>A school would score red if the victims receive welfare support, but are seen to be blamed for the harm they experience, for example by staff using terminology such as 'students putting themselves at risk' and interventions focus on changing the victim's behaviour – such as, monitoring social media, changing their timetable, or providing healthy relationships guidance/support to the victim with limited interventions to the instigators.</p>

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Physical environment		Reviewing safeguarding logs to identify whether staff record locations of HSB incidents, and student engagement sessions to understand any spaces where students feel safe or unsafe, how locations can be made safer and perceptions of any changes that need to be or have been made to unsafe locations.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green when, following an incident of unwanted touching in the drama theatre, the school conducts a location assessment to consider the supervision, lighting, and students' experience of that location, and takes steps to prevent further harm. The school routinely uses hotspot mapping to assess the broader school environment.</p> <p>A school would score amber when, in this instance, the drama theatre is noted on the recording system, but the environment is not changed in any way.</p>
Multi-agency / External incident referral		Reviewing safeguarding logs to identify actions taken and engagement with students and staff to understand responses to incidents.	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green when, following an incident of sexual assault by multiple students in the school, referrals are made to social care services. Social care then provide support to the young people involved. There would be an emphasis on how schools work within a child protection system that relies on strategic and operational alignment for effectiveness. Staff from the school attend relevant meetings, and work alongside social care services to tackle ongoing harm within the school.</p> <p>A school would score red where, following an incident of 'revengeful' sexual image sharing after a break-up, the school does not refer the case to social care or the police.</p>
 CULTURAL CONTEXT			
Prevalence		<p>Student engagement sessions to identify types of harm happening in the school and where these occur.</p> <p>Staff engagement session, interview with DSL, review of safeguarding logs and behaviour logs to identify incidents.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score amber if data captured on the scale of HSB in schools is based on student disclosure and staff awareness, but no attempt is made to gain students' perspectives.</p> <p>A school would score red if the school's data on prevalence is based only on disclosure by students.</p>

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Student disclosure		<p>Student engagement session (focus group or survey) to explore students' awareness and perception of disclosure options in the school and barriers to disclosure.</p> <p>Staff engagement session to explore staff knowledge of disclosure options, confidence in managing a disclosure and knowledge of the school's safeguarding process and barriers to disclosure.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it takes time to ask students (through surveys/focus groups) about what HSB occurs in school, and if students would disclose. Following the session the school would proactively address any barriers identified. For example, if a student stated that sexual image sharing happens without consent and that students would not disclose this because of a fear of being blamed or socially isolated, the school would update the curriculum to specifically address cultures of 'snitching' and ensure that non-consensual image sharing is understood not to be the victim's fault.</p> <p>A school would score amber if it takes steps to understand what barriers exist but does not attempt to address them.</p> <p>A school would score red if any of the following circumstances are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A culture of snitching and fear of social isolation exist in the school and the school accepts this as inevitable • Students fear that the school will take punitive, sanctions-based response to the instigator if they disclose HSB, and the school continues to use a zero-tolerance based approach • Students have concerns that staff lack discretion and discuss cases of HSB with other staff members outside of safeguarding processes • Students fear that the school does not, and will not, respond to all forms of HSB, or responses are not perceived to be effective/visible to all students.
Peer support		<p>Student and staff engagement sessions to understand the role of friendships and peer influence, how students are currently managing disclosures or responding to incidents and what support students would need to manage a disclosure.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if, in response to an incident of a sexual assault within a relationship, peers socially isolate and blame the victim, the school proactively prevents harm through peer intervention approaches, such as bystander approaches, that challenge these negative behaviours.</p> <p>A school would score red where, following a sexual assault within a relationship, peers in the school socially isolate the victim and victim-blame and the school takes no action to challenge this.</p>

LEVER	RATING (green, amber or red)	EXAMPLE METHODS THAT COULD BE USED	REASON FOR RATING (strengths and gaps identified, quotes or evidence from focus groups) See the Beyond Referrals traffic light tool for further reference on rating guidance
Ethos		<p>Student and staff engagement sessions to identify attitudes amongst students and staff in relation to equality, LGBTQ rights and difference and students' perception of the school's ethos on these issues.</p> <p>Review school policies including the safeguarding, behaviour and other relevant policies.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if it takes a proactive stance on issues such as LGBTQ+ rights. When homophobic slurs are used, students and staff challenge this.</p> <p>A school would score amber where it takes steps to promote LGBTQ+ rights but does not engage students within this.</p> <p>A school would score red where LGBTQ+ rights are not promoted within the school, and when an incident of sexual assault occurs between two boys, it is not recognised as HSB.</p>
Language and challenging normalisation		<p>Student and staff engagement sessions to identify attitudes and norms amongst students and staff in relation to HSB and related issues.</p> <p>Observations of the school environment (including classes) to identify interactions between students and between students and staff.</p> <p>Review of safeguarding logs and behaviour logs to review language used by staff.</p> <p>Review school policies including the safeguarding, behaviour and other relevant policies.</p>	<p><i>For example:</i></p> <p>A school would score green if the student body support a student whose personal messages of sexual communication are shared without consent and condemn the student who shared the messages without consent, recognising the influence of coercion and power to send sexual messages.</p> <p>A school would score red if a student calling another student a 'slag' in class is laughed at by students who witnessed it and dismissed or unchallenged by the teacher.</p>